



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

**National Evaluation and Technical  
Assistance Center for the Education of  
Children and Youth who are Neglected,  
Delinquent, or At-Risk**

Contract No. EDOESE-02-001-267

Review of the Literature (REVISED)  
Deliverable T4.23

**May 30, 2003**

PREPARED FOR:  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Compensatory Education Programs  
400 Maryland Ave. SW  
Washington, DC 20202

PREPARED BY:  
Teresa Duncan  
Nina Van Dyke  
Natalia Pane  
Joyce Burrell  
David Osher

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary of Recommendations.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of Findings .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Research Question 1: What types of data are available to evaluate the effectiveness of N/D programs? .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Research Question 2: How are N/D data reported across states? .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Research Question 3: What are the key issues in determining states’ abilities to systematically collect high-quality effectiveness data? .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Research Question 4: What successful programs and effective practices have states used to collect high-quality effectiveness data (including software and linkages to other states)? .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix A: Summary of Methods Undertaken for This Review .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Methods.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Approach to Summarizing the Articles .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Appendix B: Study Summaries.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix C: Summary Table.....</b>	<b>95</b>

---

## INTRODUCTION

Obtaining accurate nationwide assessments of program performance and impacts outside of large-scale external evaluations is a challenge for any program. But when the target of the intervention is literally moving—neglected and delinquent students, who pass and cycle through institutions and schools frequently—even the most basic tracking requires substantial commitment and coordination by the agencies involved.

We assessed the level of data currently available on neglected and delinquent students, specifically those children who fall under the umbrella of the U.S. Department of Education’s (the Department’s) Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (N/D). The N/D Program is authorized under Title I, Part D, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Subpart 1 of the Act provides federal financial assistance to state-operated educational programs for children and youth in institutions for neglected and delinquent children and for youth in adult correctional facilities. Subpart 2 provides assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) to serve children and youth who are in locally operated correctional facilities or who are at risk of dropping out. In 2000–2001, the N/D program served 124,034 of the nation’s most disadvantaged students.

We reviewed the current practices nationwide and within states for collecting data relevant to assessing the progress of educating neglected and delinquent children. Our analysis is organized around four central questions:

1. What types of data are available to evaluate the effectiveness of state N/D programs?
2. How are N/D data reported across states?
3. What are the key issues in determining states’ abilities to systematically collect high-quality effectiveness data?
4. What successful programs and effective practices have states used to collect high-quality effectiveness data (including software and linkages to other states)?

This report is organized in the following manner. The first section summarizes our recommendations of next steps for the Department of Education. The next section summarizes our findings. It is organized under the four central questions and presents our assessment of the gaps in the current information collections. The next section provides a more detailed question-by-question discussion. There are three Appendices. Appendix A describes the methods underlying this review. Appendix B provides all 68 study summaries on which this report is based.<sup>1</sup> Appendix C provides a table summarizing relevant elements of each study, such as the types of data collected.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix B includes summaries of all the documents reviewed for this report. Although studies were selected for their potential to answer the research questions, some of these studies did not directly address the research questions and, therefore, were not included in body of the report.

---

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Five general recommendations resulted from this review. The question-by-question discussion section presents more detailed recommendations.

***Visit states and attain input from N/D administrators and stakeholders on what measures are important and useful and the feasibility of getting high-quality data on those measures.***

The N/D data collected and reported under the federal requirements are not useful according to states and are not consistent or meaningful in an aggregated form according to research studies. Fifty-nine percent of facility coordinators reported that annual program evaluations were not useful measures of program success. The most frequent reason given by these coordinators was that federal evaluation guidelines are not realistic in the corrections environment (LeBlanc & Ratnofsky, 1991). The research also offered suggestion about which indicators are more meaningful. For example, Tashjian's interviews with N/D staff indicated that measures of student behavior (e.g., attend class regularly) and attitude were considered to be more realistic indicators of program success than test scores.

Inconsistent data across institutions and incomplete or unavailable data are also widespread difficulties. For example, Tashjian's 2000 study of local education agencies (LEAs) found that although most of the sampled districts were able to identify the number of youth served, data on student achievement were often incomplete. Tashjian specifically recommended keeping a close eye on the usefulness and feasibility of data collection, knowing that good intentions may produce a meaningless paper-pushing process. Anderson and Welsh (2000) noted that fewer than half the state N/D administrators they surveyed reported that local consolidated plans or applications gave them information about key aspects of their programs "very well" or "fairly well." Problems with incomplete and inconsistent measures were also cited in the 2001–2002 Program Performance Report for N/D Programs. Sinclair and Gutmann (1993, 1994) noted that many coordinators lacked a background in standardized testing and were unable to assess the completeness of test score information. As a result, they submitted incomplete or implausible information.

After the useful and important measures have been determined, N/D sites must be asked about what barriers they face in collecting those data. Although the literature gives some indication about key obstacles—namely, roadblocks to student participation in N/D programs, financial constraints, and lack of or difficulty in obtaining data—targeting technical assistance to the central barriers will be critical to achieving high-quality data.

***Partner with offices producing PBDMI, NAAL, and other potential data sources.***

The Department's Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) can offer a core of essential information (e.g., data on student achievement). Using this information will allow the N/D program office to focus on collecting supporting data.

In addition, the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) may be an ideal partner. N/D program leadership should explore the

---

possibility of adding a question or two to the National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL), which NCES produces. The NAAL includes a component that specifically assesses the literacy levels of incarcerated youth (over age 16) and adults and is now in the development phase. Given that NCES intends to increase the frequency of the NAAL, the assessment may become significantly more useful for the N/D program and its policy. Thus, it would be advantageous to build ties with the NCES staff producing the survey.

Other outside groups, such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation, could also be data-providing partners.

***Develop a small core group of required but useful indicators that are based on the lessons learned from this summary.***

Once the N/D program office knows what is meaningful to N/D administrators and stakeholders and what data can be obtained by partnering with other groups, the remaining data needs can be aligned with national data needs. We have incorporated the more than 104 different types of measures in this review into our evaluation model to form a pool from which to select the core measures.

***Produce guidance, including a data-definition handbook, even for data that are not part of the core indicators.***

Nationally standardized data definitions and other data-quality guidance are greatly needed, even at the most basic levels. Tashjian's (2000) profile of nine N/D institutions for the Department of Education noted that although basic information, such as demographic characteristics (gender, race) and numbers of youth served, seems to be relatively easily available from N/D institutions, there is no standard definition of which students should be included in those counts. This lack of a standard definition makes federal aggregation, or even comparison from site to site, meaningless. Polk County, Florida, for example, where students are included in totals only if they have resided at a facility for 30 consecutive days, will appear to serve fewer students than will a county that counts every student who enters its facilities.

***Develop a national online N/D reporting system verified through site visits or phone calls to a sample of sites.***

A web-based online system offers the flexibility and access needed for a multistate, multisite reporting tool. . More information needs to be gathered, however, on exactly what such a system should look like and how it would work. We strongly suggest that any discussions of the development of a national N/D reporting system include representatives from California's Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) system and the Pennsylvania N/D system, who can offer important advice and information about lessons learned.

---

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The summaries of findings for each of the four research questions are presented below. They are followed by a more in-depth discussion of each question.

### *What types of data are available to evaluate the effectiveness of state N/D programs?*

The data available at the federal level address questions regarding the *nature* of N/D programs across the nation. However, they do not provide sufficient information for evaluating the *effectiveness* of these programs. Furthermore, and all data carry some quality concerns. Federal data can tell us how many youth are served by N/D institutions, the demographics of students at N/D institutions, the number of institutions that offer N/D programs, the types of institutions that offer N/D programs, and the services offered at N/D programs. But data on student achievement and educational outcomes and details regarding program implementation are lacking.

The three state-level summaries reviewed indicate the availability of some student achievement and outcome indicators, as well as somewhat more detailed information regarding N/D programs, such as assessments and supplemental instructional programs. These kinds of data would be much more useful than simple counts of types of programs and student demographics in evaluating the effectiveness of N/D programs. Given that we have studies from only three states (California, Ohio, and Pennsylvania), it is unclear how difficult it would be to obtain these types of data from the other states.

Data reported across individual studies encompass a much wider range of possible measures useful for evaluating the effectiveness of N/D programs than do the relatively few federal- and state-level studies. However, few studies include long-term student outcomes, such as high school graduation and GED passing rates or post-institutional placement, and none reports on accumulated credits. Although broad measures of program quality are reported (e.g., teacher preparation and professional development), few studies include specific information about such key components as the existence and contents of transition plans; relationships among the program, the community, and community schools; and program dosage (e.g., number of hours of instruction per day, number of days in care). We found almost no data regarding program quality and curriculum content.

### *How are N/D data reported across states?*

The most typical strategy for data collection has data collected by local education agencies and compiled at the state level. These data collection efforts generally involve distributing some form of a survey through mail questionnaires, telephone surveys, or online data collection. However, the types of data that are gathered, the specific methods and frequency by which data are collected, and the mechanisms by which data are reported vary greatly. Despite this variability, two statewide reporting systems provide promising mechanisms for N/D reporting purposes. The new ASAM system in California and the Pennsylvania N/D reporting tool are both web-based online systems, which are ideal for large states whose constituents are widely dispersed geographically. Both systems are user-friendly

---

with clearly defined indicators, are electronically secure, and are accompanied by adequate user training and technical assistance to minimize error.

***What are the key issues in determining states' abilities to systematically collect high-quality effectiveness data?***

We identified four key challenges that prevent many N/D institutions from collecting and reporting to the states high-quality data about the effectiveness of their N/D programs. The first challenge to the systematic collecting and reporting of effectiveness data is the lack of a federal requirement that states do so. Without such a requirement, institutions have little incentive to collect data. A second challenge faced by institutions in collecting high-quality data is financial. N/D institutions often have very limited resources available for evaluation efforts. The third challenge has to do with the low quality of available N/D data. Questionable methodology, a lack of control groups and experimental designs, data management errors, and non-standardized metrics are among the data-quality problems identified by N/D researchers. The fourth challenge is related to the difficult population under study. The mobility of N/D students and their lack of motivation to participate in studies are particularly difficult obstacles to overcome. These challenges as a whole pose difficulties for high-quality data collection.

***What successful programs and effective practices have states used to collect high-quality effectiveness data (including software and linkages to other states)?***

The tremendous challenges faced by N/D institutions mention above severely attenuate the likelihood of collecting high-quality program data, although some states are demonstrating innovations in collection practices. The California ASAM model is very promising, it is in an early stage of implementation and its success has yet to be determined. The Pennsylvania system offers reasonable data-reporting procedures, but the data that are gathered tend to focus on participants' characteristics rather than program quality. We were not able to find information about cross-state collaborations to gather high-quality effectiveness data.

Therefore, the need for the development of a uniform evaluation model is great. This model should identify relevant and useful data that are feasible to collect nationally so that data can be obtained from each state, the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Puerto Rico. With this uniform evaluation model in place and with appropriate technical assistance, evaluations can provide local and federal governments with scientifically based evidence on the effectiveness of N/D programs.

# RESEARCH QUESTION 1

## WHAT TYPES OF DATA ARE AVAILABLE TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF N/D PROGRAMS?

Although N/D institutions collect a vast array of data, none of this information can be aggregated in a way that meaningfully speaks about the effects of N/D programs. No information is available that can be used to evaluate N/D programs against one another across the nation. Institutions, which measure factors from cognitive skills to attendance, may be good sources for workable and creative indicators. But when it comes to national comparison data, the federal government has a significant gap to fill.

<b>Types of Data Collected, Methods of Data Collection, and Overall Study Design*</b>	
<b>TYPES OF DATA COLLECTED</b>	<b>N=104*</b>
<b>Institutional Practices</b>	<b>26 (57%)</b>
Cognitive Skills	20
Behavioral	15
Student Characteristics	12
Educational Attainment and Participation	11
Instructional and Service Provider Characteristics	10
Attitudinal	6
Other	3
Parental	1
<b>METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION</b>	<b>N=36</b>
<b>Survey</b>	<b>16 (35%)</b>
Interview	11
Site Visit	6
Observations	2
Focus Group	1
<b>STUDY DESIGNS</b>	<b>N=46</b>
<b>Descriptive/Case Study</b>	<b>16 (35%)</b>
Secondary Analysis	16
Pre-Post One Group	7
Longitudinal	3
Non-Equivalent Group With No Control	2
Causal-Comparative	2
*The total number reported in Types of Data Collected exceeds the 68 documents reviewed because studies often collected multiple forms of data. The numbers reported for Methods of Data Collection and Study Designs each total to less than 68 because many documents contained limited information regarding methodology.	

---

Relatively few data-intensive state- and federal-level reports exist. Those that do largely provide only basic information regarding characteristics of the N/D population and programs: student demographics and numbers of students served; general program characteristics, such as types of services offered; and some student outcomes. Many more individual studies exist regarding N/D institutions. When taken as a whole, these studies report on a relatively wide variety of data (see inset) but still lack important indicators.

For example, few studies include long-term student outcomes such as high school graduation and GED passing rates or post-institutional placement, and none report on accumulated credits. Although broad measures of program quality are reported (e.g., teacher preparation and professional development), few studies include specific information about such key components as the existence and contents of transition plans; relationships among the program, the community, and community schools; and program dosage (e.g., number of hours of instruction per day, number of days in care). The literature contains almost no data regarding program quality and curriculum content (e.g., which core academic classes are offered and whether counseling, tutoring, and extracurricular classes are also offered). Although these data are difficult to collect, they are crucial for a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of N/D programs.

In the following sections, we present the information by level:

- Federal
- State
- Institution/Other

A summary of the data available at each level is presented first, followed by a table of the studies and a more detailed presentation of supporting information.

## **Federal Data**

### **Summary of Data Available**

The data available at the federal level address questions regarding the nature of N/D programs across the nation, but limited information is available that allows us to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs. Federal data can tell us how many youth are served by N/D institutions, the demographics of students at N/D institutions, the number of institutions that offer N/D programs, the types of institutions that offer N/D programs, and the services offered at N/D programs. However, student achievement, educational outcomes, and details about program implementation are lacking. In the few cases where such data are reported, the information was gathered through self-report questionnaires and interviews of youth by researchers; the institutions themselves did not collect such data. This finding is unsurprising, given the mobility of this population and the wide array of available standardized achievement measures.

Notably, N/D administrators report that the data also do not represent their programs effectively. Anderson and Welsh (2000) found that fewer than half the state N/D administrators surveyed reported that local consolidated plans or applications gave them information about key aspects of their programs “very well” or “fairly well.”

Exhibit 1 summarizes the federal-level studies.

## EXHIBIT 1

### Federal Data Sources

<b>Data Source/Sponsor</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Available</b>
Anderson & Welsh (2000)	Results of surveys sent to Title I, Part D administrators	Student performance, program implementation, and program performance
LeBlanc & Ratnofsky (1991) U.S. Department of Education	Description of data collected from on-site interviews and two follow-up phone interviews at 5-month intervals	Student demographic data, academic/vocational achievement, services received, and recidivism rates
Rowe & Pfannenstiel (1994) U.S. Department of Education	Compilation of data from several national articles	Program information and analysis
Tashjian (2000) U.S. Department of Education	Description of data collected from visits to nine N/D facilities across the country, chosen, in aggregate, to represent all major regions of the country and include states of different sizes	Student demographic data; academic achievement; program strengths, weaknesses, and plans for improvement
Tashjian (2001) U.S. Department of Education	Meta-analysis of state data collected by mail survey from N/D facilities across the country	Demographic characteristics of students served, services offered, academic achievement, program characteristics, use of N/D funds
U.S. Department of Education (1999)	Collection of data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and state- and district-reported results	Data categorized into promising results and continuing challenges and including student outcomes, available resources, and areas that need improvement
Sinclair & Gutmann (1993, 1994) U.S. Department of Education	Data taken from Consolidated State Performance Reports	Number of participants eligible for and receiving N/D program services, disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, by age and type of institution, and by service area by type of institution
Sinclair (2002, 2003) U.S. Department of Education	Data taken from Consolidated State Performance Reports.	Numbers and percentages of state agency N/D participants receiving Title I services in each state, broken down by type of institution (neglected, delinquent, adult correctional); numbers and percentages of N/D institutions in each state of each of the three types

---

## Supporting Information

Basic descriptive data on the numbers of N/D participants and the types of institutions that educate youth with N/D funds are regularly gathered as part of the Department of Education's oversight of the program (e.g., consolidated applications and reports) and are included in public reports. Sinclair and Gutmann (1993; 1994), for example, reported the number of participants in each state broken down by race/ethnicity, age span<sup>2</sup> by institutional designation, service area by institutional designation, and eligibility for and actual receipt of services. Almost 10 years later, Sinclair (2002; 2003) reported on numbers and percentages of state agency N/D participants receiving Title I services in each state, broken down by type of institution (neglected, delinquent, adult correctional). Sinclair presents the numbers and percentages of neglected, delinquent, and adult correctional facilities in each state in separate tables.

Although Tashjian's (2000) profiles of nine N/D institutions for the Department of Education noted that such basic information as demographic characteristics (gender, race) and numbers of youth served seem to be relatively easily available from N/D institutions,<sup>3</sup> even these basic data suffer from serious data-quality issues. For example, there is no standard definition of which students should be included in those counts. To illustrate: in Polk County, Florida, students were included in totals only if they had resided at a facility for 30 consecutive days, which means that those totals do not include the many students who stay for a shorter time. According to Anderson and Welsh (2000), somewhat better data are available on the types of services offered by institutions. They reported that they were able to collect more complete data on program implementation items, such as the services that programs provided, than they were on outcome data.

Reliable and accurate achievement data are even more difficult to find. Several federal reports noted difficulties in gathering achievement data from N/D institutions. Anderson and Welsh (2000) sent surveys to Title I Part D administrators and reported significant difficulties obtaining from institutions data regarding student performance indicators. Tashjian (2000) echoed the difficulty in gathering performance data: when achievement data were available, they were often incomplete, and gain scores (change from pre- to post-test) were extremely difficult to obtain because of high student mobility.

Of the sources of data available from the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL) is the most promising for assessing the N/D population. Last administered in 1992, the NAAL is currently being prepared to go out into the field<sup>4</sup> and will sample incarcerated youth (over 16) and adults. NCES intends to increase the frequency of the NAAL, which may make the assessment significantly more useful for the N/D program and policy. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), which NCES also administers, offers some longitudinal achievement data at the district and state levels on Title I schools as a whole (e.g., United States Department of Education, 1999) but does not assess the N/D population specifically.

---

<sup>22</sup> Several states apparently did not collect data from the school districts regarding participants' year of birth. Instead, for the purpose of federal reporting, birth years were estimated from grade level.

<sup>4</sup> AIR is an NCES contractor working on the 2003 NAAL.

Additional national studies done for the Department offer high-quality data on a sample of indicators and populations. For example, the data used by LeBlanc and Ratnofsky (1991) and Rowe and Pfannenstiel (1994) were collected by the researchers, not by the N/D institutions. LeBlanc and Ratnofsky asked a nationally representative sample of youth in 38 correctional facilities to complete a questionnaire about family, education, employment, and correctional background. Two follow-up phone interviews were completed at 5-month intervals. In addition to the standard information on student demographics, the report provided data on such important variables as average length of confinement, dosage of services received while incarcerated, rate of high school diplomas or GEDs received while incarcerated, types and amount of transition services received, and rates of education and employment post-release.<sup>5</sup>

National data, although available, primarily reflect the required consolidation application or Title I, Part D data and suffer from data quality issues, such as a lack of standard definitions. Potential partnership with other national data collections, such as the PBDMI or NAAL offer complementary high-quality sources of data. In addition, program evaluations have proven a useful mode of learning and verification even if on only a sample of sites.

## State Data

### Summary of Data Available

Available studies and our review of states' websites suggest that states do not collect information on N/D students beyond what is required of them by the federal government, with a few notable exceptions. The authors of the federal N/D studies reviewed above indicated that most states currently do not have the capacities to gather outcome information. The states that do gather these data, particularly California (ASAM, see "Supporting Information" section), may serve as models for national- and state-level development. Exhibit 2 presents the citations for the state-level information sources and a brief description of the information found within the document or at the website.

## EXHIBIT 2

### State Data Document and Web Sources

State	Citation or Web Site	Data Available
Arizona	<a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/nd/">http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/nd/</a> ; <a href="http://www.ade.state.az.us/menus/eleven.asp">http://www.ade.state.az.us/menus/eleven.asp</a>	N/D contact listed; statistics site lists general school data (e.g., overall drop out rate) and test data including for special education

<sup>5</sup> The data that LeBlanc and Ratnofsky collected were where participants were institutionalized; why they were institutionalized; urbanicity; gender; ethnicity; age; family environment prior to incarceration; highest grade in school completed prior to incarceration; dropout rates; average length of confinement; types of services received while incarcerated; dosage of services received while incarcerated; assessment of attitude (locus of control and self-worth); substance abuse history; educational attainment while incarcerated (high school diploma or GED); rates of return to education post-release; rates of employment post-release; types and amounts of transition services received both pre- and post-release; home environment post-release; and rate of recidivism.

<b>State</b>	<b>Citation or Web Site</b>	<b>Data Available</b>
California	The Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) is California's attempt to establish a uniform model of evaluation. The first year of implementation was 2001–2002, and data are not yet available. <a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/psaa/asam/">http://www.cde.ca.gov/psaa/asam/</a>	No data are currently available, but ASAM will measure schools by using 15 indicators in the following three categories: Readiness Indicators (discipline problems, student persistence); Contextual Indicators; Academic and Completion Indicators (achievement, meeting goals, school completion).
Connecticut	<a href="http://www.state.ct.us/sde/dsi/rfp/ndrfp.htm">http://www.state.ct.us/sde/dsi/rfp/ndrfp.htm</a> ; <a href="http://www.state.ct.us/sde/dsi/reform/eseaIndex.htm">http://www.state.ct.us/sde/dsi/reform/eseaIndex.htm</a> ; <a href="http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/der/schools/index.htm">http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/der/schools/index.htm</a>	N/D administrator contact information; Title I evaluation link "under construction"; school profiles available for all schools
Idaho	<a href="http://www.sde.state.id.us/sasa/neglectedordelinquent.asp">http://www.sde.state.id.us/sasa/neglectedordelinquent.asp</a>	N/D consolidated report data are online and contact information
Maryland	<a href="http://www.msde.state.md.us/titlei/index.html">http://www.msde.state.md.us/titlei/index.html</a>	General Title I (not N/D) information and school profiles.
Ohio	Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus Division of Federal Assistance. (1996). Title I in Ohio, including Title I, Migrant, State Neglected or Delinquent, Title VI, Homeless Children and Youth: Elementary and Secondary Education Act: 31st annual evaluation report, fiscal year 1996. Columbus, OH: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 442 592)	Detailed information is available on Title I school and local institution participation, student participation, instructional areas, student performance, expenditure patterns, staff positions, professional development, and parental involvement. Specific N/D information is given for supplemental instruction programs and N/D participation and instructional patterns.
Oklahoma	<a href="http://www.sde.state.ok.us/home/defaultie.html">http://www.sde.state.ok.us/home/defaultie.html</a>	N/D administrator contact information
Oregon	<a href="http://www.ode.state.or.us/iasa/">http://www.ode.state.or.us/iasa/</a>	List of Title I allocations and the consolidated application (not the data)
Pennsylvania	The state collects data on students receiving N/D funds through a computer-based, online assessment tool on the Pennsylvania Department of Education website.	Each N/D agency enters individual student demographic data, information on services provided, and data on academic performance
Rhode Island	<a href="http://www.rido.net/edpolicy/TitleI.htm">http://www.rido.net/edpolicy/TitleI.htm</a>	Very basic Title I and N/D information
South Dakota	<a href="http://www.state.sd.us/deca/TA/neglect/index.htm">http://www.state.sd.us/deca/TA/neglect/index.htm</a>	N/D legislation and data requirements

## EXHIBIT 2 (continued)

State	Citation or Web Site	Data Available
Texas	<a href="http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.support/statute/TIpartD.htm">http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.support/statute/TIpartD.htm</a> ; <a href="http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.support/ndOct2002.html">http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.support/ndOct2002.html</a>	N/D legislation and student count data by facility
Washington	<a href="http://www.k12.wa.us/title1/">http://www.k12.wa.us/title1/</a>	General information about Title I only
Wyoming	<a href="http://www.k12.wy.us/">http://www.k12.wy.us/</a>	General contact information

At the state level, in addition to reviewing the literature, we reviewed a sample of state websites to examine and compile the information available pertaining to N/D youth. We selected the following states to reflect diversity in such characteristics as geographic region and size, urbanicity, and student population: Arizona, Connecticut, Idaho, Maryland, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming. We supplemented this information with a few regional sites: Chicago, Los Angeles County (LACOE), Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), and the District of Columbia.

Our review of these websites led to three findings:

- the most common type of information available was general descriptive information about Title I and Title I Part D legislation and programs (AZ, DC, Chicago, ID, LAUSD, LACOE, MD, NY, OR, OK, RI, SD, TX);
- the majority of websites also contained contact information for the Title I or N/D administrators (AZ, CT, DC, ID, LAUSD, LACOE, OK, RI, SD, WY); and
- specific N/D individual school or program information was also found, but with less consistency across regions and states: a school report card (LACOE), student enrollment information (TX), N/D funding allocations (NY), surveys of children in N/D schools (ID, TX), evaluative reports (SD), and information on N/D planning or guidance (OR, SD).

In summary, general N/D information is readily available online, but appears bounded by the federal requirements on collection. However, there are a few innovative states and those are covered in the following discussion section.

### Supporting Information

Innovations in California, Pennsylvania, and Ohio offer good examples of the range and types of data available at the state level. California with its Alternative Schools Accountability Model appears to be pushing the hardest in the direction of data collection improvement.

The California Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM)<sup>6</sup> is a promising model. The state of California established the ASAM as a uniform model of evaluation that maintains validity without sacrificing flexibility. The ASAM was established as part of the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999 to help schools improve the academic

<sup>6</sup> Additional information is available online at [www.cde.ca.gov/psaa/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/psaa/)

---

achievement of all students. With the guidance of and approval from the California State Board of Education, the subcommittee appointed to guide the development of the ASAM produced 15 indicators on the basis of four primary sets of criteria:

- Validity, reliability, and usefulness
- Feasibility and technical accuracy
- Reasonableness of impact and cost
- Flexibility and stability.

The 15 indicators fall into three broad categories. The first category consists of Readiness Indicators, which are indicators of discipline problems<sup>7</sup> and student persistence.<sup>8</sup> The second group comprises Contextual Indicators.<sup>9</sup> The third group, Academic and Completion Indicators, includes indicators of achievement<sup>10</sup> and indicators of meeting goals and school completion.<sup>11</sup> The California Department of Education has defined each indicator and provides formulas for calculating which indicators may be used in conjunction with others (e.g., “only one of Indicators 3, 4, or 6 may be used”). This approach mandates a standardized, uniform evaluation model of data that also gives some flexibility in reporting across diverse institutions.

Data are reported by means of a password-protected online reporting system.<sup>12</sup> The 2001–2002 school year was the first year of the ASAM implementation; 1,166 eligible schools registered to participate in ASAM and agreed to be held accountable through its measures. Information regarding the quality of implementation and the effectiveness of the ASAM approach should become available in the coming months.

Pennsylvania goes a step further: it has established an online reporting system<sup>13</sup> for its N/D institutions (Sheffer, 2002) and appears to gather more specific information about individual students. Staff members from N/D institutions use this online system to enter detailed information for each N/D student served: student identification number, gender, ethnicity, age, placement date, discharge date, services received, assessments performed, and educational outcomes such as promotion, school credits earned, transition to regular classroom, high school graduation, and employment. These data can be disaggregated by age, gender, and ethnicity and are reported across these three demographic characteristics.

The Ohio Department of Education published a report about its Title I program in 1996, which provided detailed information on Title I school and local institution participation, student participation, instructional areas, student performance, expenditure patterns, staff positions, professional development, and parental involvement. Relatively

---

<sup>7</sup> (1) Improved student behavior (2) Suspension

<sup>8</sup> (3) Student punctuality, (4) Sustained daily attendance, (5) Student persistence

<sup>9</sup> (6) Attendance, (7) English language development

<sup>10</sup> (8) Writing achievement, (9) Reading achievement, (10) Math achievement

<sup>11</sup> (11) Promotion to next grade, (12) Course completion, (13) Credit completion, (14) High school completion, and (15) GED completion, CHSPE certification, or GED section completion

<sup>12</sup> [www.cde.ca.gov/psaa/asam/](http://www.cde.ca.gov/psaa/asam/)

<sup>13</sup> [www.iu5host.org/federalprograms](http://www.iu5host.org/federalprograms)

less information was available for N/D programs, but the report did provide information about N/D supplemental instruction programs (programs, participants, grant award money) and N/D participation and instructional patterns (number of participants by state agency, number of participants by instructional areas).

This review of the limited number of state-level N/D evaluation reports shows that states are gathering data that allow more thorough assessments of the effectiveness of N/D programs but that there is little overlap in the types of data collected and the frequency by which data are collected. We learned more specific information about the N/D institutions of individual states but cannot make any generalizations about N/D programs nationwide.

## **Individual Studies of N/D Facilities (and Other Related Institutions)**

### **Summary of Data Available**

Data reported across individual studies (see Exhibit 3) encompass a much wider range of possible measures useful for evaluating the effectiveness of N/D programs than do the relatively few federal- and state-level studies. Most prevalent in these studies are data similar to those available in the federal and state-level studies—namely, numbers of participants and programs and types of services available. Also common at the individual-study level are data on cognitive skills (especially English and mathematics skills) and behavior (mostly anti-social behaviors, particularly recidivism rates). Although these elements are important to consider in N/D evaluations, data for evaluating programs in terms of specific student outcomes are still lacking. These missing data include student grades and grade promotion; program goals and objectives; assessment practices; specific data regarding curriculum content; program dosage (e.g., number of days in case, number of instruction per day); details regarding transition plans; and relationships among programs, the community, and community schools. Exhibit 3 presents the citations for the studies reviewed and a description of the studies and the data available.

## **EXHIBIT 3**

### **Data Sources for Individual N/D Facilities (and Other Related Institutions)**

<b>Data Source/ Sponsor</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Data Available</b>
Advocates for Children of New York & New York Immigration Coalition (2002)	Documentation of the increase in dropout rates for English language learners (ELLs) in the New York City Public Schools	Graduation and dropout rates compiled from previously published state and city reports. Also, responses of high school ELLs from focus groups.

### EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Data Source/ Sponsor	Description	Data Available
Advocates for Children of New York, Inc. (2000)	Results of surveys completed by people involved in the foster care system describing the systemic problems for the education of foster children in New York City	Information on problems with appropriate enrollment of foster children in preschool and school programs (percentages participating in early childhood education/preschool, average age of first school enrollment), lack of continuity of education (number of schools attended in an academic year, length of delay in transfer of records), and quality of education received (academic achievement data, grade-level completion, student satisfaction with their education).
American Bar Association & National Bar Association (ABA & NBA, 2001)	Description of the increase in the number of girls in the juvenile justice system.	Data taken from previously published reports include arrest and detention rates for girls versus the general youth population.
American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF; 2002)	Outline of the accomplishments in educating children with disabilities and continuing challenges	Data from the Office of Special Education Programs on number of children served; access to public education; inclusion in regular classrooms; early childhood services; academic achievement; graduation rates; college/ employment outcomes.
Archwamety & Katsiyannis (2000)	Study of the Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Center in Kearney, Nebraska, over 7 years	Scores on Peabody Individual Achievement Test.
Brown, Maxwell, DeJesus, & Schiraldi (2002)	Description of barriers and promising practices for practitioners	Data available include a literature review on youth justice and workforce development, historical and statistical context of the juvenile justice system, effective programs, and profiles of policy initiatives.
Burley & Halpern (2001) Washington State Institute for Public Policy	Summary of statewide analysis of academic performance and educational attainment of foster children in Washington state public school system	Assessment results from Iowa Test of Basic Skills for grades 3 and 6 and Iowa Test of Educational Development (grade 9); school history; family background; views regarding school
Burrell (1999) The Annie E. Casey Foundation	Report on the 5-year, five-site experiment of the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative	Findings from site visits, walk-throughs, and interviews with facility staff

### EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Data Source/ Sponsor	Description	Data Available
Casper, Hull, & Jurich (2001)	Description of a three-part study to inform a training for correctional educators in the Virginia Department of Correctional Education	Qualities of good teachers and weaknesses in teacher training as identified by focus group; survey ranking the importance of 20 training topics and suggesting others; observations to determine whether the survey result reflected classroom realities
Center on Crime, Communities, & Culture (1997)	Collection of data on the state of education in U.S. prisons (prisons in general, not juvenile correctional facilities) from previously published reports	Correlation between education and recidivism; literacy rates of prisoners; educational attainment rates of prisoners
Chamberlain (1994) Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation	Description of tutorial program in language development in Chapter 1—eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent	Pre- and post-test scores for reading comprehension collected, although no pupils actually attended enough days of the program to be included in the evaluation sample (owing to high student mobility)
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York (2000)	Study of the aftercare services offered to juvenile delinquents following release from residential placement in New York state	Number of youth with transition plans in place prior to release; average caseload of advocates and aftercare counselors
Cox, Davidson, & Bynum (1995)	Meta-analysis to quantitatively summarize prior empirical research on alterative schools	Data collected on school performance; attitudes toward school; self-esteem; delinquency
Curry, Doolittle, Huskey, Koehler, & Washington (2002) Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation	Overview of the use of Title I funds by the Austin Independent School District	Data collected on student demographics; number of children served; educational achievement (credits earned, returned to normal classroom, grade advancement; high school diploma/GED awarded); results on Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) disaggregated by race and socioeconomic status

### EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Data Source/ Sponsor	Description	Data Available
Dedel (1998) National Council on Crime and Delinquency.	Concept paper and work plan describing the process for instituting an Educational Data Reporting System (EDRS)	Currently no data on file, just a plan to collect future individual-level data on students in the juvenile justice system, which will be collected in a National Council on Crime and Delinquency database and include demographic information; and educational history; entry, exit, and follow-up information
DeWoody, Ceja, & Sylvester (1993) Child Welfare League of America	Book detailing the additional challenges facing youth leaving out-of-home care environments and reporting results of a Child Welfare League of America survey	Agency-provided data on educational services; individual, group, and family counseling services; employment services; and health, housing, legal, social, and aftercare services
Durkin, Carroll, & Hattie (1997)	Study on the different goals identified by delinquent, at-risk, and not at-risk youth	Results of ratings on Importance of Goals Scale in eight categories: delinquency, reputation, educational, physical, career, interpersonal, freedom-autonomy, and self-presentation
Edwards, Cisneros, & Sanchez (1990) Houston Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation	Final report of a tutorial program for neglected and delinquent students in Houston, Texas	Data collected included demographic information; pre- and post-tests to evaluate programs impact on mathematics and reading scores
Evans (2000) Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Adult Basic & Literacy Education.	Description of the education system in the county adult prison in Northampton County, Pennsylvania	Data collected: GED pass rates; educational assessments that identify educational strengths and weaknesses; a learning style inventory; achievement test pre- and post-test scores in reading, mathematics, and language; write-ups for bad behavior; instructor self-evaluations; student evaluations of teachers
Fuchs, Fuchs, Mathes, & Lipsey (2000)	Meta-analysis of reading differences between low-achieving students with and without disabilities	Studies coded by study design and other characteristics; the primary effect sizes analyzed were five reading domains: decoding isolated words, reading connected text, reading comprehension, overall reading, and vocabulary; LD-LA student comparability data based on a comparison of three general fields: achievement, demographic characteristics, and gender comparability (which included IQ and SES comparability)

### EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Data Source/ Sponsor	Description	Data Available
Gerrard, Owen, Lahti-Johnson, & Wunderlich (2000) Wilder Research Center	Description of Hennepin County's Targeted Early Intervention model, which targets and tracks greatly at-risk delinquents under age 10	Assessments of behavior conducted with the Behavior Assessment System for Children
Hamilton & McKinney (1999)	Description of project CRAFT, a vocational program that can be implemented as a prevention or intervention program	Data on rates of job placement and recidivism
Harlow (2003) U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics	Study comparing the educational attainment of inmates with that of the general population	Educational attainment and demographic data taken from the National Adult Literacy Survey, the Current Population Survey, and statistics from the Bureau of Justice Statistics
Ingersoll & LeBoeuf (1997) U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention	Discussion of promising practices in dealing with the education of youth transitioning out of the justice system	Data collected: Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs); recidivism rates; and test scores in reading, writing, and mathematics
<i>Krisberg &amp; Dedel (1997) National Council on Crime and Delinquency</i>	Concept paper discussing the key issues involved in the conceptualization, implementation, and evaluation of Title I, Part D educational services	Extensive data: characteristics of institutions, characteristics of juveniles in custody, types of offenses committed, youth incarceration trends over time, correctional education, characteristics of correctional education students, standards and regulations, goals of correctional education, legislative context for Title I part D, funding, characteristics of institutions offering Title I Part D programs, identification of eligible participants, intervention, linkages, and the goals of Title I Part D programs
Leone (1994)	Research presented on disabled youth in the juvenile justice system	Educational services offered
Macallair & Males (2001)	Discussion of the increase in juvenile incarceration in San Francisco under Mayor Willie Brown	Previously reported data on recidivism and successful programs

### EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Data Source/ Sponsor	Description	Data Available
Mendel, R. (2000).	Identifies successful rehabilitative programs in the United States and discusses the rhetoric that has interfered with their successful implementation	Recidivism rates from previously published reports.
Michigan Department of Evaluation Services (1994)	Description of an education program for neglected and delinquent youth in Saginaw, Michigan	Pre- and post-tests of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement
National Institute for Literacy (2002)	Transcription of a presentation by researchers to legislators to increase funding for prisoner education	Literacy rates on those in the correctional system
Parker (1993) New York City Board of Education, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment	Description of a program that provides supplementary career education, academic remediation, and daily living skills for students in institutions for neglected and delinquent children in Brooklyn, New York	Student achievement data for 492 students out of about 500 collected on Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment–designed student data–retrieval forms, called DRFs, for recording quantitative student progress; teacher surveys, teacher and supervisor interviews, and site observation forms
Rutherford, R. B., Bullis, M., Anderson, C. W., & Griller-Clark, H. M. (2002). Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.	Discussion of the prevalence of individuals with special education needs in the juvenile justice system and as well at the lack of services available to address those needs.	Data provided (from previously published reports) include: Juvenile crime statistics (numbers incarcerated, reasons for incarceration); prevalence of special ed needs among juveniles in the criminal justice system and compared to the general school population- divided into Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, Mental Retardation and ADD/ADHD.
<i>Schiraldi &amp; Ziedenberg (2003) Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice</i>	Discussion of the disproportionate number of minorities in confinement	Descriptive statistics from Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the Annie E. Casey Foundation and reports from non-profit organizations

### EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Data Source/ Sponsor	Description	Data Available
Torbet et al. (1996) U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention	Report documenting the changes in the handling of serious and violent juvenile offenders through an analysis of all legislation enacted from 1992 to 1995	Rates of conviction for juveniles as adults
Wilson, Lipsey, & Soydan (2003)	Analysis examining the question of whether programs that are not culturally tailored for minorities are still as effective for minority youth as they are for majority youth	Academic achievement, attitude change, behavior problems, employment status, family functioning, internalization of problems, peer relations, psychological adjustment, school participation, and self-esteem
Winkokur, Blankenship, Cass, Hand, & Schuck, (2002) Justice Research Center, Inc.	Report on the Program Accountability Measure (PAM), which details Florida's annual assessment and ranking of non-residential and residential juvenile justice programs on the basis of client outcomes and program costs	Demographics, youth who successfully completed non-residential and residential facilities, offense histories, and adult records compiled from the Department of Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Florida Correctional Information Center (FCIC), and the Florida Department of Corrections (DC)
Wolford (2000) Council for Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth	National survey on how state department of education funds were being used to serve youth in the juvenile justice system	Per-pupil funding; educational services provided

### Supporting Information

The most common types of data collected were behavioral and short-term student outcome data, particularly cognitive skills. Behavioral data generally involved anti-social behavior, with recidivism rates the most common type of information collected (Archwamety & Katsiyannis, 2000; Hamilton & McKinney, 1999; Harlow, 2003; Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997; National Institute for Literacy, 2002; Winkokur et al., 2002). Other anti-social behavioral data reported in the literature included arrest rates (ABA & NBA, 2001; Macallair & Males, 2001); detention rates (ABA & NBA, 2001; Macallair & Males, 2001); delinquent behavior (Gerrard et al., 2000; Wilson et al., 2003); parole violation (Archwamety &

---

Katsiyannis, 2000); severity of crime (Macallair & Males, 2001); write-ups for bad behavior (Evans, 2000); and scores on the Behavioral Assessment System for Children (BASC), which measures aggression, conduct problems, and learning problems (Gerrard et al., 2000). More positive behaviors tracked include improved social competency (Gerrard et al., 2000; Parker, 1993; Wilson et al., 2003) and psychological adjustment (Wilson et al., 2003).

Several studies reported data on language and literacy skills (Center on Crime, Communities, & Culture, 1997; Chamberlain, 1994; Evans, 2000; Fuchs et al., 2000; Harlow, 2003; Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997; National Institute for Literacy, 2002; Parker, 1993); and mathematics skills (Evans, 2000; Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997; Parker, 1993). Other cognitive skills data included intelligence quotient (Archwamety & Katsiyannis, 2000; Fuchs et al., 2000), school performance (Cox et al., 1995), learning style (Evans, 2000), student self-evaluations (Evans, 2000), and tutors' perceptions of the impact of instruction on students' academic performance (Edwards et al., 1990). Two studies reported on school attendance (Gerrard et al., 2000; Wilson et al., 2003), and one reported on involvement in correctional education and the use of education resources during incarceration (Harlow, 2003). No data, however, were reported for short time measures which provide information on factors that mediate long-term academic outcomes. Examples include tardiness rates, election of additional classes, class participation, grades, or grade promotion.

Although long-term student outcome data are more difficult for institutions to compile, they are crucial for evaluating the lasting effectiveness of these programs. A number of studies reviewed provided such information. Several studies, for example, reported on student performance on state or national tests or on college entrance examinations (Archwamety & Katsiyannis, 2000; AYPF, 2002; Edwards et al., 1990; Michigan Department of Evaluation Services, 1994; Wilson et al., 2003). Standardized tests of achievement included the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, the Wide Range Achievement Test, and the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement. Other reported measures were high school graduation (AYPF, 2002; Center on Crime, Communities, & Culture, 1997); high school diplomas (National Institute for Literacy, 2002; GED pass rate (Evans, 2000); postsecondary enrollment, persistence, and graduation (AYPF, 2002); and access to public education, inclusion in regular classrooms, and participation in general curriculum (AYPF, 2002).

Studies also collected information on program inputs. Input data are most abundant in three areas: program characteristics, program quality, and student characteristics. In the subcategory of program characteristics, studies reported on number of children served (AYPF, 2002; Edwards et al., 1990), services delivered and characteristics of service settings (AYPF, 2002; Center on Crime, Communities, & Culture, 1997; Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997; Leone, 1994; Parker, 1993; Torbet et al., 1996; Wilson et al., 2003), condition of facilities (e.g., cleanliness, new uses of behavior management systems that reward positive behavior, educational resources) (Burrell, 1999), and use of funds and cost of program (Michigan Department of Evaluation Services, 1994; Winkokur et al., 2002). In addition, Anderson & Welsh (2000), although highlighted under the "Federal Data" section of this document, reported on the ways state administrators respond to and implement new laws, the extent to which states implement standards-based accountability systems, state efforts to build local capacity to support standards-based reform, and the use of performance indicators across states.

---

Data on program quality included teacher preparation and professional development (AYPF, 2002), quality of correctional education experience (e.g., correctional education philosophy, communication skills, human behavior, teaching techniques, and definition of a successful educator) (Casper et al, 2001; Parker, 1993), training needs of correctional educators (e.g., teaching skills and techniques for dealing with behavioral problems, improving transition resources, and improving the teaching environment) (Casper et al, 2001), aftercare counselors' caseloads and access to community support services (Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, 2000), and teacher self-evaluations (Evans, 2000). Other aspects of program quality included in the literature were the timing of the development of youth service plans (Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, 2000), the timing of arrangements for school placements (Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, 2000), the development of IEPs (Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997; Leone, 1994), and the acquisition of students' records from prior school programs (Leone, 1994). Missing were data regarding program dosage (e.g., number of days in care, number of days of instruction per day, number of hours of therapy per day, number of services per child); details regarding students' transition plans; and relationships among the program, community, and (community) school.

Finally, several studies reported on various student characteristics. The most common were student demographics (Archwamety & Katsiyannis, 2000; Edwards et al., 1990; Fuchs et al., 2000; Harlow, 2003; Macallair & Males, 2001; Wilson et al., 2003; Winkokur et al., 2002). Other personal characteristics included students' self-esteem (Cox et al., 1995; Wilson et al., 2003), attitudes toward school (Cox et al., 1995; Wilson et al., 2003), goals (academic, delinquency, and freedom-autonomy) (Durkin et al., 1997), and age at first offense and first commitment (Archwamety & Katsiyannis, 2000). Data were not gathered on English as a second language (ESL) status; learning and other disabilities; emotional, mental, and physical health; drug and alcohol use; past and current academic skills; or past record of negative behaviors. Students' home characteristics included parental involvement (AYPF, 2002), home exposure to violence or neglect (Gerrard et al., 2000), family functioning (Wilson et al., 2003), and number of family advocates (Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, 2000). Variables not included were parents' (or mother's) education level, household income, homelessness status, geographic region of home, and distance between home and facility.

## **Question 1 Summary**

A wide array of data exists that may be collected and used to evaluate the effectiveness of N/D programs. Federal and state data are primarily demographic and the most basic types of counts with some spotty achievement data. The data reported in individual studies do illustrate the much wider range of possible measures, but nevertheless ignore some important variables.

To conduct effective evaluations of N/D educational institutions that provide sound, scientifically based evidence of what works and what does not, the data elements included in the uniform evaluation model and provided by participating institutions must be consistent, valid, and reliable, as well as integral to the functioning of the programs and the educational and other related outcomes of its students (Krisberg & Dedel, 1997; Dedel, 1998). Moreover, the measures required must be clear to those gathering the data and must not be overly burdensome. Given institutional differences in program design and goals, measures also will

---

need to be flexible enough to accommodate such variability without abandoning the goal of a uniform evaluation (see Krisberg & Dedel, 1997).

## **RESEARCH QUESTION 2**

### **HOW ARE N/D DATA REPORTED ACROSS STATES?**

In general, local education agencies (LEAs) collect the data and report it to the state SEAs, but there are some significant differences in what are collected and when they are collected.

Generally, LEAs apply to state education agencies (SEAs) for Subpart 2 funds, and the reporting requirements that accompany those funds are compiled by the SEAs (Tashjian, 2000). For example, the Ohio Department of Education report (1996) indicated that data are collected by districts and then compiled at the state level. However, there are differences in the types of data collected as well as the methods and frequency of collection across states (Tashjian, 2000). Tashjian's case studies of nine N/D institutions in nine states suggest diversity in the types of data that are gathered and the methods and frequency by which data of collection:

- In Orange County, California, the Alternative, Charter, and Correctional Education Schools and Services (ACCESS), a division of the Department of Education, performs annual evaluations; end-of-year reports are submitted to the SEA.
- In Bartow, Florida, the school district collects caseload and student assessment data from each facility once a year.
- In Columbus, Kansas, all Subpart 2 funds go to a single alternative classroom to which students (both those who do and do not receive N/D funds) who are having behavior and academic problems are referred as an alternative to suspension. Attendance is taken daily. Although there is no long-term evaluation, students who graduate from the high school are contacted through mail surveys. Results from assessments given while students are in the alternative classroom are recorded.
- Kentucky requires only that the district complete a checklist along with the application for funds. Students receiving Subpart 2 funds are held to the same academic standards as the rest of Kentucky's students and take the same assessments. Their scores on these assessments are recorded, with those of all other students, in the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System but are usually not disaggregated, which makes it difficult to compare N/D students with the general student population.
- The Kalamazoo Public School District in Michigan requires facilities receiving N/D funds to report basic demographic information on students served. However, no mention is made of the process of reporting that information back to the state.
- In the Duluth Public Schools in Duluth, Minnesota, staff at each of the three facilities that receive N/D funding collected student data on daily classroom work while in treatment, pre- and post-test scores on Plato 2000 (testing

---

software), attendance, behavior reports, grades, and anecdotal comments. These data were reported to the SEA in 1998 as part of a 3-year evaluation of program activities.

- Nebraska requires its LEAs (one of which administers Subpart 2 funds to the Lincoln Public School District) to conduct a yearly evaluation. The district has a Title I evaluator who collects demographic information on the students served and data on academic progress from N/D education staff.
- The San Marcos Consolidated Independent School District in San Marcos, Texas, assesses students with the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS). However, not all Subpart 2 students take the TAAS, and the SEA does not keep track of which students do or do not take the test. Districts receiving Subpart 2 funds complete for the SEA a yearly application that identifies the objectives for students and multiple assessment measures for each objective.
- The Southwest Supervisory Union in Bennington, Vermont, is the only LEA in the state to receive Subpart 2 funding. The Title I Coordinator collects and provides the SEA with the total number of students served by the program (which is usually quite small), disaggregated by age and ethnicity. The program staff document the number of students who earn their general equivalency diploma, but it is unclear whether this information is reported to the state.

Despite the variability demonstrated by these examples, statewide reporting systems do exist and provide promising mechanisms for N/D reporting purposes. The new ASAM system in California and the Pennsylvania N/D reporting tool are both web-based online systems, which are ideal for large states whose constituents are widely dispersed geographically. Both systems are relatively user-friendly with clearly defined indicators, are electronically secure, and are accompanied by adequate user training and technical assistance to minimize error.

The California ASAM system appears to have several advantages over the Pennsylvania system. The reporting screens for the ASAM system clearly define the indicators and simplify the task for users by automating calculations. In contrast, the Pennsylvania system allows users to define educational gain locally, and the lack of on-screen definitions opens the possibility of misinterpreting the information requested. Although the Pennsylvania system gathers detailed information at the student level, this approach also creates the likelihood of data entry errors owing to the sheer number of student records entered. The Pennsylvania Department of Education has noted these difficulties and plans to provide additional user training and improve the online system.

For the purpose of a national, state-level, uniform evaluation model, a web-based, online system seems to offer the flexibility and access needed for a multistate reporting tool. More information needs to be gathered, however, on exactly what such a system should look like and how it would work. We strongly suggest that any discussions of the development of a national N/D reporting system include representatives from California's ASAM system and Pennsylvania's N/D system, who can offer lessons learned and advice.

---

### **RESEARCH QUESTION 3**

## **WHAT ARE THE KEY ISSUES IN DETERMINING STATES' ABILITIES TO SYSTEMATICALLY COLLECT HIGH-QUALITY EFFECTIVENESS DATA?**

We have identified four key challenges that prevent many N/D institutions from collecting and reporting to the states high-quality data regarding the effectiveness of their N/D programs:

- Data may not be perceived as useful and therefore are not collected beyond the requirements of the federal government.
- Adequate financial support for such data collection is often lacking.
- Technical assistance, which might aid states and individual institutions both generally in gathering data and specifically in setting up experimental designs, is often unavailable.
- Gathering data on the N/D population is inherently very difficult.

Several of the challenges lead to or interact with each other. For example, lack of financial resources and inherent difficulties in collecting data on the N/D population are magnified by the lack of attention to data on these students. Resources may be shifted if these data became a federal focus and were communicated as such to grantees.

States are generally able to provide statistics on the number of institutions offering N/D programs, the number of students served by these institutions, basic student demographics, and such general program characteristics as types of services provided. Less frequently, they can report on some student outcomes, such as anti-social behavior and English and mathematics skills (Tashjian, 2000). Moreover, many of the indicators on which high-quality data are available, however, are not particularly useful for evaluating the success of N/D programs, and the data that are the easiest to gather (e.g., counts of institutions and students) are perhaps the least useful for this purpose. Indeed, a number of indicators largely missing from the reports and studies reviewed are among those most useful for such an evaluation, including pre- and post-test achievement scores, credits accumulated toward high school graduation, high school graduation or GED passage, grade promotion, program goals and objectives, assessment practices, curriculum content, program dosage, components of transition plans, and relationships with the community and community schools.

Since states generally do not collect data beyond the federally mandated collections, they arguably do not see the use for data beyond a reporting function. The challenge is to either make the reported information useful or to convince administrators that additional data are worth the resources. A central factor prescribing the level of data collection is simply the federal mandate regarding what should be collected. With competing priorities for scarce dollars, states generally do not appear to go beyond the data collection requirements of the federal government. The U.S. Department of Education, in its Consolidated State

---

Performance Report,<sup>14</sup> requires states to report only such information as the number of institutions receiving N/D funds; the number of students receiving services, disaggregated by type of facility (neglected, delinquent, or adult correctional); the number of institution-wide versus targeted assistance schools (TAS); student demographics (gender, race/ethnicity, age); and for TAS (a minority of the programs), the numbers of students receiving various types of instructional and support services. This list closely matches the list of the types of data most commonly gathered by N/D institutions and reported by the states.

A second challenge faced by institutions in collecting high-quality data is financial. N/D institutions often have limited resources available for evaluation efforts (Dedel, 1998). In addition, even the money to support an institution's education programs is relatively low. LeBlanc and Ratnofsky (1991) reported that education expenditures represent, on average, about 8% of correctional institutions' expenditures (15% in youth facilities and 5% in adult facilities). It is unlikely that evaluation of education programs will be made a priority of funds when the programs themselves are not a priority.

Third, whether because of a lack of finances, incentive, or training, the absence of or difficulty in obtaining data from N/D institutions poses a real problem for N/D evaluators (Edwards et al., 1990). The dearth of experimental designs in studies of N/D programs makes drawing sound conclusions regarding program effects impossible. None of the studies we reviewed was experimental in design: groups were not randomly assigned, and when groups were compared, control groups were not created. This deficit should be of concern to evaluators because despite the good work and promising practices described in these studies, we cannot definitively identify program effects without using more rigorous study designs.

Cox et al. (1995) noted the lack of experimental design studies as a drawback in N/D research, but other researchers have also highlighted other methodological difficulties in the N/D literature that make drawing conclusions regarding program effectiveness problematic. These difficulties include

- questionable methodology (AYPF, 2002; National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice (EDJJ; 2002b),
- lack of control groups (Larson & Turner, 2002),
- data entry and statistical analyses errors (Sheffer, 2002), and
- non-standardized metrics and units of analyses (Sinclair & Guttman, 1993).
- lack of standardized achievement test data (AYPF, 2002; Sheffer, 2002; Sinclair & Gutmann, 1993, 1994)
- scarcity of longitudinal and trend data (AYPF, 2002; Cox et al., 1995; Evans, 2000; Mendel, 2000),
- paucity of program outcome data (DeWoody et al., 1993),
- lack of assessments of quality of services received (DeWoody et al., 1993), and
- general problems with data quality and timeliness (Sinclair, 2002, 2003).

Technical assistance in this area could help ensure the use of more rigorous methods to evaluate N/D program effectiveness.

---

<sup>14</sup> [www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/CFP/cpr.doc](http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/CFP/cpr.doc)

---

Related to the issue of a lack of experimental designs is the presence of significant environmental and confounding effects that cannot be effectively removed. A program's effectiveness is affected by many factors, including the educational program's status as voluntary or required, varying risk factors at program enrollment, level of participation in the program, students' success at school, and relationships between students and providers.

Other data interpretation difficulties cited by researchers included a wide variation in services offered (DeWoody et al., 1993), limitations of self-reported data (AYPF, 2002), heavy influence of one highly variable component of a multicomponent indicator, lack of a standardized measure of educational gain (Sheffer, 2002), lack of detail regarding data collected and programs studied (Cox et al., 1995), and the caution that low scores on standard achievement measures may be due to students' low motivation or unwillingness to participate in education programs rather than to low ability per se (Edwards et al., 1990).

Finally, a fourth challenge to collecting high-quality data is related to the nature of child welfare, juvenile justice and correctional processes and the youth themselves. The mobility of the N/D students and the lack of student incentive to participate in studies are particularly difficult obstacles to overcome. Collecting complete and accurate student outcome and educational progress data from these youth is problematic because they arrive at and leave the institutions on varying dates and often stay at the institution for only weeks or months (Chamberlain, 1994; Edwards et al., 1990; Sheffer, 2002). N/D youths may be unwilling to participate in educational efforts such as testing or other evaluations because of a lack of interest or because of behavioral problems. Researchers studying youth incarcerated in adult facilities also face the possibility of scheduling conflicts between school and work activities (LeBlanc & Ratnofsky, 1991). Other difficulties hindering high-quality N/D data collection that are related to the unique characteristics of the N/D population include the diversity of students and their IEPs (AYPF, 2002; Edwards et al., 1990; Sheffer, 2002); the diversity in program implementation and practice (Tashjian, 2001); the high turnover rate for correctional educators (Casper et al., 2001), and difficulties locating and tracking students for follow-up (LeBlanc & Ratnofsky, 1991). Also mentioned were the under-diagnosing of youth who qualify for special education (Rutherford et al., 2002) and the under-diagnosing and treating of mental disorders among this population (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2001b).

## **RESEARCH QUESTION 4**

### **WHAT SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS AND EFFECTIVE PRACTICES HAVE STATES USED TO COLLECT HIGH-QUALITY EFFECTIVENESS DATA (INCLUDING SOFTWARE AND LINKAGES TO OTHER STATES)?**

Most effectiveness data about N/D programs is not of high quality. The tremendous challenges faced by N/D institutions severely attenuate the likelihood of collecting high-quality program data. Although the California ASAM model is very promising, it is in an early stage of implementation; the success of the program has yet to be determined. The Pennsylvania system offers reasonable data-reporting procedures, but the data that are

---

gathered focus on participants' characteristics rather than program quality. We were unable to find information about cross-state collaborations to gather high-quality effectiveness data.

Because the quality of data is related to the data collection approach used, a summary of the wide variety of data collection methods represented among the 68 articles reviewed is appropriate. The survey questionnaire approach, implemented through online state reporting systems (ASAM, 2002; Sheffer, 2002), paper-and-pencil surveys (Anderson & Welsh, 2000; Casper et al., 2001; Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, 2000; Gerrard et al., 2000; Parker, 1993, Tashjian, 2001), or telephone surveys (Anderson & Welsh, 2000; Torbet et al., 1996) was often used. Interviews with N/D youth, staff, administrators, parents, and teachers were also reported (Burrell, 1999; Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, 2000; Edwards et al., 1990; Gerrard et al., 2000; Leone, 1994; Parker, 1993). Site visits and other types of observations were less common, which is likely due to their time- and labor-intensive nature.

Although each survey mode of data collection can be an effective means of gathering high-quality effectiveness data, the survey research literature suggests that interviews (whether in person or by telephone) tend to produce higher quality data than self-administered surveys (Babbie, 1990). The ability of a skilled interviewer to probe and to follow-up ambiguous, confusing, or non-responsive answers can be invaluable. Self-administered mail surveys offer the lowest administrative costs but also involve the greatest levels of respondent error because no interviewer or electronic system is present to ensure a standardized administration.

We suggest an online system as the mode of data collection verified through site visits or phone calls of a sample of sites. If such an approach is used, however, great care must be taken to optimize the system's usability, develop user training, and provide comprehensive technical support.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Self-administered online reporting systems open the possibility of cutting-and-pasting materials from pre-existing documents, so responses may or may not be relevant to the questions actually posed. But online reporting systems can be designed to limit the maximum number of characters allowed in an open-ended response and thereby guard against the cutting-and-pasting strategy.

---

## REFERENCES

- Advocates for Children of New York. (2000). *Educational neglect: The delivery of educational services to children in New York City's foster care system*. New York: Author.
- Advocates for Children of New York & New York Immigration Coalition. (2002). *Creating a formula for success: Why English language learners are dropping out of school, and how to increase graduation rates*. New York: Authors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 467 109)
- American Bar Association & National Bar Association. (2001). *Justice by gender: The lack of appropriate prevention, diversion and treatment alternatives for girls in the justice system*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/justicebygender.pdf>
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2002). *Twenty-five years of educating children with disabilities: The good news and the work ahead*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum and Center on Education Policy.
- Anderson, L. M., & Welsh, M. (2000). *Making progress: An update on State implementation of Federal education laws enacted in 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 443 199)
- Archwamety, T., & Katsiyannis, A. (2000). Academic remediation, parole violations, and recidivism rates among delinquent youths. *Remedial & Special Education, 21*(3). (EBSCO AN 3535703, ISSN 0741-9325)
- Arnette, J. L., & Stephens, R. D. (2000). From the courthouse to the schoolhouse: Making successful transitions. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at [http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2000\\_02\\_1/transed.html](http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2000_02_1/transed.html)
- Ayasse, R. H. (1995). Addressing the needs of foster children: The Foster Youth Services program. *Social Work in Education, 17*(4), 207–216.
- Babbie, Earl (1990). *Survey Research Methods*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Brown, D., Maxwell, S., DeJesus, E., & Schiraldi, V. (2002). *Barriers and promising approaches to workforce and youth development for young offenders*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available at <http://www.aecf.org/publications/pdfs/workforce.pdf>
- Burley, M., & Halpern, M. (2001). *Educational attainment of foster youth: Achievement and graduation outcomes for children in state care*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. (ERIC Document Retrieval Service ED 460 220)

- 
- Burrell, S. (1999). *Improving conditions of confinement in secure juvenile detention centers*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available at <http://www.aecf.org/publications/index.php>
- Casper, M., Hull, K. A., & Jurich, S. (2001). Training correctional educators: A needs assessment study. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 52(1), 23–27. Available at [http://www.easternlinks.org/correctional\\_education/articles/jurich-training.pdf](http://www.easternlinks.org/correctional_education/articles/jurich-training.pdf)
- Center on Crime, Communities, & Culture. (1997). *Education as crime prevention: Providing education to prisoners*. New York: Open Society Institute, Criminal Justice Initiative. Available at [http://www.soros.org/crime/research\\_brief\\_2.html](http://www.soros.org/crime/research_brief_2.html)
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. (2003). *A preliminary analysis of detention expansion in Alameda County*. San Francisco: Author. Available at <http://www.cjcj.org/pubs/comparison/comparison.html>
- Chamberlain, E. (1994). *Neglected or Delinquent Program, 1992–1993: Final evaluation report, Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Chapter 1*. Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 494)
- Citizens' Committee for Children of New York. (2000). *Returning home: A look at aftercare services provided to delinquent youth*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 162)
- Coalition for Juvenile Justice. (2001a). *Abandoned in the back row: New lessons in education and delinquency prevention. CJJ 2001 annual report: An overview*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.juvjustice.org/publications/overview2001.pdf>
- Coalition for Juvenile Justice. (2001b). *Handle with care: Serving the mental health needs of young offenders. CJJ 2000 annual report: An overview*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.juvjustice.org/publications/overview.pdf>
- Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1996). *Federal efforts to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency: FY 1995 Delinquency development statements*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.ncjrs.org/jdds.htm>
- Cox, S., Davidson, W., & Bynum, T. (1995). A meta-analytic assessment of delinquency-related outcomes of alternative education programs. *Crime and Delinquency*, 41(2), 219–234. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 513 116)
- Curry, J., Doolittle, M., Huskey, B., Koehler, H., & Washington, W. (2002). *Title I evaluation report, 2000–2001*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 462 420)
- Dedel, K. (1998). *Concept paper and work plan to implement an educational data reporting program. A supplement to the final report the feasibility study to improve the quality*

- 
- and availability of educational data for incarcerated youth.* Washington, DC: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- DeWoody, M., Ceja, K., & Sylvester, M. (1993). *Independent living services for youths in out-of-home care.* Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- Durkin, K., Carroll, A., & Hattie, J. (1997). Goal setting among adolescents: A comparison of delinquent, at-risk, and not-at-risk youth. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 441–450.
- Edwards, N., Cisneros, E., & Sanchez, K. (1990). *Chapter I: Neglected or delinquent program, Final report 1988–89.* Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 271)
- Evans, T. S. (2000). *Corrections education: How we do it: Pennsylvania ABLE administrators handbook.* Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Adult Basic & Literacy Education.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Lipsey, M. W. (2000). Reading differences between low-achieving students with and without learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. In R. Gersten, E. Schiller, & S. Vaughn (Eds.), *Contemporary special education research: Synthesis of the knowledge base on critical instructional issues.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gerrard, M. D., Owen, G., Lahti-Johnson, K., & Wunderlich, C. (2000). *Delinquents under 10: Targeted early intervention. Phase 2 evaluation report.* St. Paul, MN: Wilder Research Center. Available at <http://www.wilder.org/research/reports.html?summary=90>
- Griller-Clark, H. (2001, Spring). Transition services for youth in the juvenile justice system. *Focal Point*, 15(1), 23–25.
- Hamilton, R., & McKinney, K. (1999, August). Job training for juveniles, Project CRAFT. *OJJDP Fact Sheet*, 116. Available at <http://www.ceardy.org/craft.pdf>
- Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and correctional populations.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ecp.htm>
- Howell, K. W., & Wolford, B. I. (2002). *Corrections and juvenile justice: Current education practice for youth with learning and other disabilities.* Washington, DC: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice at the American Institutes for Research. Available at <http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Corrections%20and%20Juvenile%20Justice%20-%20Interventions.pdf>
- Ingersoll, S., & LeBoeuf, D. (1997). *Reaching out to youth out of the education mainstream.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at [http://www.ceardy.org/reaching\\_out.pdf](http://www.ceardy.org/reaching_out.pdf)

- 
- Krisberg, B., & Dedel, K., (1997). *Improving the education of incarcerated youth: A concept paper. Submitted to the United States Department of Education (ED)*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Larson, K. A., & Turner, D. (2002). *Best practices for serving court involved youth with learning, attention and behavioral disabilities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Office of Special Programs. Available at <http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Promising%20and%20Preferred%20Procedures.pdf>
- LeBlanc, L., & Ratnofsky, A. (1991). *Unlocking learning: Chapter 1 in correctional facilities* (Contract Number 300-87-0124). Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Leone, P. E. (1994). Education services for youth with disabilities in a State-operated juvenile correctional system: Case study and analysis. *Journal of Special Education*, 28(1). (EBSCO AN 9412161913, ISSN 0022-4669)
- Leone, P. E. et al. (1991). *Juvenile corrections and the exceptional student*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 340 153)
- Macallair, D. E., & Males, M. A. (2001). *An analysis of San Francisco juvenile justice reforms during the Brown administration: A report to the San Francisco Board of Surveyors*. San Francisco: Center of Juvenile and Criminal Justice. Available at <http://www.cjcj.org/pubs/index.php>
- Mendel, R. A. (2000). *Less hype, more help: Reducing juvenile crime, what works—and what doesn't*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. Available at <http://www.aypf.org/mendel/>
- Michigan Department of Evaluation Services. (1994). *Holland House/Boysville Chapter 1 Neglected and Delinquent Program*. Saginaw, MI: School District of the City of Saginaw. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387 549)
- Murphy, T., O'Sullivan, K., & Rose, N. (2001, July). PEPNet: Connecting juvenile offenders to education and employment. *OJJDP Fact Sheet*, 29. Available at <http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS14212>
- National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice. (2002a). *Juvenile correctional education programs: The case for quality education in juvenile correctional facilities*. College Park, MD: Author. Available at <http://www.edjj.org/education.html>
- National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice. (2002b). Transition: Best and promising practices for youth in long-term correctional facilities. *EDJJ Notes*, 1(5). Available at <http://www.edjj.org/edjjnotes/volume1number5.doc>
- National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice. (2002c). *Transition planning and services*. College Park, MD: Author. Available at <http://www.edjj.org/TransitionAfterCare/transition.html>

- 
- National Institute for Literacy. (2002). *Fighting crime with education: A briefing on recent research about reducing recidivism rates for adult and juvenile offenders and the next steps for Federal policy makers* (Transcript). Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl/webcasts/20020319/transcript3-19.html>
- Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus Division of Federal Assistance. (1996). *Title I in Ohio, including Title I, Migrant, State Neglected or Delinquent, Title VI, Homeless Children and Youth: Elementary and Secondary Education Act: 31st annual evaluation report, fiscal year 1996*. Columbus, OH: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 442 592)
- Oldenettel, D., & Wordes, M. (2000). The community assessment center concept. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile and Delinquency Prevention. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 181)
- Parker, J. (1993). *Citywide Programs/District 75. E.C.I.A. Chapter I, Part B Institutional facilities program*. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 135)
- Rowe, B., & Pfannenstiel J. C. (1994). *Formula Grants to States for Neglected or Delinquent Children*. (CFDA No. 84.013). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- Rutherford, R. B., Bullis, M., Anderson, C. W., & Griller-Clark, H. M. (2002). *Youth with disabilities in the correctional system: Prevalence rates and identification issues*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at: <http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Youth%20with%20Disabilities.pdf>
- Schiraldi, V., & Ziedenberg, J. (2003). *Reducing disproportionate minority confinement: The Multnomah County Oregon success story and its implications*. San Francisco: Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. Available at <http://www.cjcj.org/pubs/portland/portland.html>
- Sheffer, J. M., & Neglected & Delinquent State Advisory Committee. (2002). *2000–2001 Title I N&D assessment report*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.
- Sinclair, B. (2002). *State ESEA Title I participation information for 1999–2000: Final summary report*. Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Sinclair, B. (2003). *State ESEA Title I participation information for 2000–2001: Summary report: Second draft*. Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Sinclair, B., & Gutmann, B. (1994). *State Chapter I participation and achievement information—1992–93 summary report*. Rockville, MD: Westat. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377 277)

- 
- Sinclair, B., & Gutmann, B. (1993). *A summary of State Chapter 1 participation and achievement information—1990–91*. Rockville, MD: Westat. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 376 226)
- Stanfield, R. (1999). *The JDAI Story: Building a better juvenile detention system*. Baltimore: The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available at <http://www.aecf.org/publications/index.php>
- Steurer, S. J. (2001). *Historical development of a model for correctional education and literacy*. Lanham, MD: Correctional Education Association. Available at [http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional\\_education/articles/historical-development-steurer.pdf](http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional_education/articles/historical-development-steurer.pdf)
- Tashjian, M. (2000). *Study of local agency activities under the Title I, Part D program*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education
- Tashjian, M. D. (2001). *State agency activities under the Title I, Part D, program: Mail survey of agencies that operate Title I programs for neglected or delinquent youth in State institutions: Final report*. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.
- Torbet, P. et al. (1996). *State responses to serious and violent juvenile crime*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *Promising results, continuing challenges: Final report of the national assessment of Title I: Highlights*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/hlights.html>
- Wilson, J. J. (1994). OJJDP Update on Research. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Wilson, S. J., Lipsey, M. W., & Soydon, H. (2003). Are mainstream programs for juvenile delinquency less effective with minority youth than majority youth? A meta-analysis of outcomes research. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 13(1), 3–26.
- Winkokur, K., Blankenship, J., Cass, E., Hand, G., & Schuck, A. (2002). *The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice's program accountability measures: The 2003 PAM report, a two-year analysis*. Tallahassee, FL: Justice Research Center. Available at <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/statsnresearch>
- Wolford, B. (2000). *Juvenile justice education: Who is educating the youth?* Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University, Council for Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth.
- Yoshikawa, H. (1994). Prevention as cumulative protection: Effects of early family support and education on chronic delinquency and its risks. *Pathological Bulletin*, 115(1), 28–54.

---

**APPENDIX A**

**SUMMARY OF METHODS UNDERTAKEN FOR  
THIS REVIEW**

---

## METHODS

To address the four research questions, avoid duplication of efforts in the field, and reduce the time burden on N/D administrators, we undertook a data mining procedure. This approach involved 1) obtaining information from expert panel members; 2) reviewing and compiling information relevant to N/D youth through the research literature; and 3) searching databases and online sources.

As suggested by the Panel of Experts and Practitioners, the AIR team conducted a wide-ranging search of the literature. We searched by broad key words (e.g., *delinquency*, *transition*, *evaluation*) and visited the websites suggested by the Panel to identify potential articles for review. We spent 3 weeks searching and gathering articles and 4 weeks reading and summarizing articles. This review summarizes 68 articles.

### APPROACH TO SUMMARIZING THE ARTICLES

We reviewed the content of each article to address the following three areas:

- a) ***Overview and Findings.*** A short description of what the authors found regarding a particular N/D outcome (e.g., mentoring programs raise the percentage of N/D youth who complete high school or who obtain a GED)
- b) ***Methods and Data Collected*** The means by which those effectiveness data were collected (e.g., how were the educational attainment data obtained? Using a state or city database? Keeping track of the youth individually?)
- c) ***Challenges/Recommendations.*** A summary of difficulties with gathering or obtaining the data that were noted by the authors (e.g., problems with following up the youth; tips or recommendations for other researchers)
- d) ***Key Words.*** The words in each article that we identified for possible inclusion in a searchable database (see description of the literature review web database, below).

Those article summaries follow in Appendix B.

---

## **APPENDIX B**

### **STUDY SUMMARIES**

---

**Advocates for Children of New York. (2000). *Educational neglect: The delivery of educational services to children in New York City's foster care system.* New York: Author.**

- a) ***Overview and Findings.*** This article is an overview of the systemic problems of the education of the children in New York City's foster care system. Advocates for Children of New York City, Inc. (AFC), a private organization, examines three primary areas of concern and recommends ways to improve the educational outcomes for New York City foster children in these three areas.

The first area of concern is initial enrollment in educational programs. The AFC found that despite the fact that children in the foster care system are at increased risk for developmental delay owing to abuse and neglect, they rarely receive Early Intervention (EI) services. In addition, children in foster care are much less likely to be enrolled in public day care, preschool programs, and kindergarten classes because school attendance in New York City is not compulsory for children under the age of 6. Lack of information about available services was given as the primary reason for this oversight. The third important finding regarding initial enrollment was the high rate of delay in school enrollment experienced by foster children. Most foster children, caseworkers, and law guardians reported a delay (on average 2–4 weeks) in school enrollment when a child entered foster care. The primary reason given for this delay was lost or misplaced school and immunization records, despite the fact that New York law states that children should never be excluded from school for this reason; rather, they should be admitted for a short period of time while the records are recovered.

The second area of concern is the continuity of education services. Most foster children reported experiencing multiple school moves within one school year, including school transfers in the middle of the academic year. Seventy-five percent of children had to switch schools upon entering foster care, and the majority of children in foster care were never given an explanation about why they had to change schools. Additionally, almost half of the moves could not be explained by the Board of Education, indicating that the transfers had not been made for academic reasons.

The third area of concern identified by the AFC survey was access to and quality of educational services. Children in foster care are suspended more frequently and have higher drop out rates, higher holdover rates, and lower graduation rates than do their peers not in foster care. One major problem in this area was the appropriate diagnosis and placement of children in need of special education services. Another area where foster care children were found to experience a deficit in services was in transitional planning services to enable them to live independently after leaving foster care. Over half of foster care youth felt unprepared to support themselves after leaving foster care, only one-third received any kind of job training, and more than 50% were dissatisfied with the education they received while in foster care.

- 
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data are based on the results of more than 280 surveys completed by foster parents, biological parents, educators, social workers, case workers, lawyers, and foster children. The survey developed by the AFC collected information in three key areas in which educational services for children in the foster care system fall short: (1) appropriate enrollment of foster children in preschool and school programs; (2) continuity of educational services for foster children (of lack thereof); and (3) the quality of educational services.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** AFC gathered its own data because as of 1999, neither the New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS) nor the New York City Board of Education maintained statistics on educational services for foster children. In addition to recommending a comprehensive data collection system, the AFC calls for state laws clarifying the state's obligation to "assure proper educational services to foster care youth," better enforcement of existing laws, a higher level of information for foster care case workers about available services, the removal of barriers to timely school enrollment, more communication with older children about their educational options, and legislation requiring compulsory participation for 4- and 5-year-olds in preschool and kindergarten programs.
- d) **Key Words.** education, neglect, foster youth

**Advocates for Children of New York & New York Immigration Coalition. (2002).  
Creating a formula for success: Why English language learners are dropping out  
of school, and how to increase graduation rates. New York: Authors. (ERIC  
Document Reproduction Service No. ED 467 109)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This article documents the increase in dropout rates for English Language Learners (ELLs) in the New York City (NYC) public schools, largely as a result of stricter graduation standards. In addition, the article provides an assessment of the Action Plan in place to improve ELL achievement and recommendations to improve the academic success of ELLs.

Beginning with the class of 2001, the New York City Board of Education (BOE) adopted new graduation standards that include a requirement that all students pass the English Language Arts (ELA) Regents exam to graduate from high school. Before the new graduation standards were in place, ELLs who had the opportunity to become English proficient (EP) had the highest graduation rates and lowest dropout rates of any students in NYC schools, indicating that bilingual education programs were highly successful. As a result of the new standards, more ELLs are dropping out of school than are graduating. In addition, dropout rates are increasing for ELLs at a greater rate than for any other group, and ELLs have reported being encouraged to leave school and take the GED instead of trying to earn a diploma. Finally, test results indicate that ELLs in middle school are not being properly prepared for high school.

To improve the education of ELLs, the BOE developed an Action Plan. To a large extent this action plan has been unsuccessful. The main components of the action plan (and how successfully each is being implemented) are as follows:

---

Provide Intensive Language Instruction: Most schools were found to be non-compliant with this requirement. The main problem seems to be a lack of curriculum available for English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers to prepare their ELL students for the ELA exam.

Extend the School Day/Year: This component includes longer school hours, summer school, year-round programs, and Saturday classes. Many schools are providing these services. Only one of every five schools that applied for funding received it.

Offer Professional Development (e.g., Bilingual/ESL Staff Academies for Raising Standards to train ESL teachers): No such academies are available at the elementary level, and few exist at the middle school level.

Encourage Certified Teachers to Teach ESL: 59% of all ESL teachers are un-certified or approaching retirement. No effort has been made to secure additional ESL certified teachers.

Communicate Effectively with Parents: Many parents of ELL students do not speak English themselves and therefore have no way of communicating with their children's schools. BOE adopted a new policy to improve communication with non-English-speaking parents, but it has yet to be implemented.

Finally, Title I requirements are not being properly implemented and Title I plans produced by schools and districts typically do not include ELLs in their accountability systems.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data on graduation and dropout rates are taken from previously published state and city reports. In addition, Advocates for Children (AFC) conducted focus groups with high school ELLs.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** (1) Increase school accountability. (2) Develop new strategies to help those ELLs most at risk (such as those entering the NYC system late in their academic careers). (3) Improve ESL instruction (implement curriculum to prepare ELLs for ELA exam). (4) Increase the number of certified teachers teaching ESL classes. (5) Improve core subject instruction for ELLs (the ELA Regents exam is the first that is to be required by all students. In coming years additional subjects will be added). (6) Maintain high standards for ELLs but also offer alternative assessments for late-arriving ELLs. (7) Implement a comprehensive language access program for parents of ELLs.
- d) **Key Words.** high risk, Title I, education reform

**American Bar Association & National Bar Association. (2001). *Justice by gender: The lack of appropriate prevention, diversion and treatment alternatives for girls in the justice system.* Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/justicebygender.pdf>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** In this report, the ABA and NBA outline their concerns over the increasing numbers of females involved in the juvenile justice system, how this came to be, and what should be done in the future. From 1988 to 1997, the rate of detention for girls increased more than twice as much as the increase

---

for boys. Girls are more likely to be detained for minor offenses such as status offenses or probation violations than boys.

Some gender-specific characteristics of females are that they generally come from fragmented families, are victims of abuse, have physical or mental health disorders, and are non-violent offenders. These characteristics are not being addressed by traditional detention centers, which are overcrowded and have limited services to offer. More alternative programs are needed to address girls' gender-specific needs, as well as more research on the flow of girls through the justice system and the ways that girls can be helped more effectively.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data are taken from previously published reports. Main indicators are arrest and detention rates for girls versus the general youth population.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** female, girl, incarceration, arrest, delinquency, gender, alternatives, overcrowding

**American Youth Policy Forum. (2002). *Twenty-five years of educating children with disabilities: The good news and the work ahead.* Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum and Center on Education Policy.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The report outlines accomplishments in educating children with disabilities, and the key challenges and needs in special education.

The article outlines key accomplishments related to the following indicators: numbers of children served; access to public education; inclusion in regular classrooms; services to infants, toddlers, and preschoolers; service settings for infants and toddlers; participation in state testing; performance on state assessments; participation in national assessments; college entrance exams; high school graduation; postsecondary enrollment and persistence; college services; employment outcomes; teacher preparation and professional development; parents' involvement; and other types of progress.

The article outlines challenges related to the following indicators: participation in the general curriculum; higher achievement; over-representation of minority students; high school graduation; post-secondary enrollment and completion; preparation for employment; teacher development; paperwork and procedural requirements; access to technology; and other work ahead.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The majority of information provided in this report comes from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS). Additional information comes from other federal agencies including the Census Bureau, the Social Security Administration, the Department of Labor, and the National Council on Disability. Other information was collected from periodic surveys and studies by nonprofit organizations and research centers.

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The challenges were the overall lack of “good data.” Specifically: (1) The diversity of students with disabilities and the individualization of their educational programs make it difficult to reach general conclusions. (2) Until recently, very few students with disabilities have participated in large-scale standardized achievement tests. (3) Self-reported data about such issues as college graduation, employment, and earnings have limitations. (4) Some key outcomes of special education may not be known until many years after a student leaves high school. (5) Data that measure trends over time are scarce. (6) Baseline years of data vary considerably. (7) States have different capacities for collecting and reporting data.
- d) **Key Words.** children with disabilities, promising practices, challenges, data limitations

**Anderson, L. M., & Welsh, M. (2000). *Making progress: An update on State implementation of Federal education laws enacted in 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 443 199)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This study focuses on the work of state administrators of federal programs. It follows up on baseline information collected during late fall 1996 and early winter 1997, analyzing the ways state administrators have continued to respond to the new laws. The programs included in the follow-up study are the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; Title I-A: Improving Basic Programs Implemented by Local Educational Agencies; Title I-B: Even Start Family Literacy; Title I-C: Education of Migratory Children; Title I-D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, and At-Risk of Dropping Out; Title II: Eisenhower Professional Development Program; Title III, Subpart 2: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund; Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities; and Title VI: Innovative Education Program Strategies. The study focuses on changes in program administration 4 years after the 1994 enactment of Goals 2000 and ESEA. Specifically, the study asks how state program managers are implementing the laws' provisions, how implementation has changed when compared with state practices under the predecessor programs, and what federal and state factors have influenced these changes. Very extensive findings on flexibility on implementation of laws, the extent to which states implementing standards-based accountability systems, local capacity building by states to support standards-based reform, and the use of performance indicators across states. The study found that states have made significant progress in implementing Goals 2000.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Telephone surveys were administered to state-level managers in 51 state education agencies for a total of 468 respondents. The questions were open/closed ended. An additional survey was developed and administered to the relevant program coordinators knowledgeable in the Ed Flex program.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned

- 
- d) **Key Words.** state administrators, federal legislation, neglected/delinquent youth, accountability, capacity-building, standards-based reform, performance indicators

**Archwamety, T., & Katsiyannis, A. (2000). Academic remediation, parole violations, and recidivism rates among delinquent youths. *Remedial & Special Education*, 21(3). (EBSCO AN 3535703, ISSN 0741-9325)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The authors examined the records of 505 delinquent males (ages 12–18) committed to the Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Center in Kearney, Nebraska, during a 7-year period (1991–1997, inclusive). Three groups were identified: one group receiving remediation in mathematics, one group receiving remediation in reading, and one group receiving no remediation (the control group).

Results indicated that members of the remedial groups were twice as likely to be recidivists or parole violators as members of the non-remedial group. The study also indicated that cognitive factors (IQ) seem to be the most important predictors of group membership. The fact that verbal IQ predicts academic remediation better than performance IQ underscores the importance of language. The race factor was found to be second, and the background and institutional factors (i.e., recidivism, parole violation, age at first offense, and age at first commitment) were third. Finally, this study and others have established that gains in academic achievement have an inverse association to recidivism. Unfortunately, individuals with academic deficits experience a host of other factors that have been associated with recidivism. Correctional facilities, therefore, need to intensify and expand efforts in addressing the needs of those individuals. Such supports may include programs in chemical dependency, abuse, vocational training, and social skills training.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** All youths in the three groups had Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PLAT) pretest scores on file (obtained at the time of placement in the remedial groups). The selection process resulted in 161 youths in the reading group, 178 youths in the mathematics group, and 166 youths in the control group. A data-recording sheet was used to collect archival data from each selected youth's existing record, and two graduate assistants trained by the investigators recorded the needed information directly from each youth's file.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned.
- d) **Key Words.** delinquent, youth, secondary, recidivism, remediation, parole violation, IQ, race, academic achievement

**Arnette, J. L., & Stephens, R. D. (2000). From the courthouse to the schoolhouse: Making successful transitions. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at [http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2000\\_02\\_1/transed.html](http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2000_02_1/transed.html)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Article does not have data-intensive information but does discuss promising practices and outcomes:

---

*Section 7—Correctional Education: Preparation for Reintegration*

Correctional institutions must prepare inmates for successful integration into life outside the institution. Twenty years of research shows that inmates in education programs while incarcerated are more likely to be employed when they leave the institution and less likely to end up back in prison. However, there are many problems with academic programs in juvenile institutions: sometimes they are not offered at all, often credits do not transfer to regular schools, and they do not take into account individual needs. According to the National Office for Social Responsibility (NOSR), the most successful education programs involve basic academic skills, high school completion, general educational development (GED) test preparation, special education, pre-employment training, and other programs aimed at enhancing students' social, cognitive, and life skills. In 1992, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and NOSR funded a 3-year grant to assist juvenile corrections administrators in improving educational services. NOSR selected the Adobe Mountain School in Arizona, the Lookout Mountain Youth Center in Colorado, and the Sauk Center in Minnesota as examples of state-operated model learning environments.

*Section 9—Traditional Educational Placements*

Reentering regular public schools right after being in juvenile corrections is often overwhelming for these students and sets them up for failure. Alternative schools or transitional educational centers make a good alternative to going directly to public schools. In these placements, students can get the appropriate amount of supervision, be carefully assessed, and slowly learn how to adjust to regular classrooms. New Jersey's Gateway Academy and the Arizona Pathfinder Project are examples of alternative schools that work this way. In Arizona, students who were properly prepared through the Pathfinder Model's alternative schools were more likely to succeed when they transitioned to regular schools.

The Pathfinder Project provides alternative education for youth transitioning back to the community. This model teaches court-involved youth a leadership style that focuses on personal development and lifelong learning. Students learn responsibility, and so they are empowered to achieve success. Observed behavioral changes show that they gain literacy at increased rates and increase their commitment to learning. Students properly prepared in the Pathfinder Model are more likely to successfully transition to regular school. Many also choose to do work-study.

The Kentucky Youth Assistance Alliance is an alliance between various Kentucky youth-serving organizations that want to ease the transition of institutionalized youth to community settings. They found that nearly 95% of formerly incarcerated youth failed to transition successfully to either regular or alternative schools. Lack of community support, gaps in services, and inconsistent school reentry processes led to these failures. The alliance decided to create a uniform system for transfer of youth to school settings; create a bridge coordinator position in each school district to assist returning students with adjustment; create an "educational passport" that went with students to their placements; recruit and train mentors for each student; monitor progress; provide drug, alcohol, and other types of counseling to youth and families; and offer

---

support for juveniles who had witnessed violence, especially domestic violence. It has successfully addressed many previous problems.

*Section 10—School Enrollment*

Many steps can be taken to help juveniles adjust to regular school again. One is curriculum coordination. The individualized education plan for the student while incarcerated should parallel his or her mainstream school curriculum as much as possible to help with reentry. Another is prerelease information sharing. Discussions about placement should begin long before the student is released from corrections, and the student's academic and therapeutic needs should be shared with the school. This can also be assisted with a prerelease visit, to get both the student and the school staff used to each other. After release, meetings with the student's family and proper counseling for the family, if applicable, should be provided. An admissions interview should be conducted with the reentering student and parents, and transitional counseling for the student after release also helps with adjustment. Policies and rules should be explained thoroughly to students and their parents, especially zero-tolerance policies. The student and his or her family should also have their own handbook on school rules and policies. Students and parents should also enter into a violence elimination contract with the school. An Individual Education Plan must be completed if the student qualifies for special education; if not, an Individual Service Plan can be completed. Plans can specify academic and behavioral goals. Teachers should be carefully selected, and a student's participation in extracurricular activities should also be carefully selected and monitored.

*Section 13—Remaining Problems*

Identifying at-risk youth from a young age is increasingly encouraged but very difficult to do. There may be few outward signs. Often, juvenile corrections are overcrowded, and someone must be released before someone new is incarcerated. Often, those who are released for these reasons are not ready to go back to regular school and society. Educators often have misconceptions about students who were once incarcerated. Teacher training should include training in how to deal with students who have been in the justice system. Schools, juvenile justice systems, and community social institutions have often been uncoordinated, although these three must act in unity.

*Other Suggestions for Transitions*

Probation officers can be placed in schools with re-released juveniles. Schools and detention centers have to agree to share information on a need-to-know basis. Often, information is not shared for fear of privacy issues.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The article does not have data-intensive information but does discuss promising practices and outcomes.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** correctional education, reintegration, juvenile, juvenile institutions, Pathfinder Project, Kentucky Youth Assistance Alliance, individual education plan, placement, at-risk, transition

---

**Ayasse, R. H. (1995). Addressing the needs of foster children: The Foster Youth Services program. *Social Work in Education, 17(4), 207–216.***

- a) ***Overview and Findings.*** This article identifies the increase in numbers of children in foster care, the special needs that many children have, and the impact those needs have on their school performance. Ayasse also describes the efforts of California Foster Youth Services (FYS) to address these special needs.

Foster children perform at or above grade level in smaller numbers than do their peers and have a higher need for special education services, yet less than half actually receive services. These discrepancies are largely explained by multiple school placements, the frequent residential transfer of foster care children, and the lack of continuity of services and care. In addition, children in foster care often have behavioral and academic problems as a result of neglect and abuse. In general, neglected children experience more severe academic deficits than do abused children.

Foster Youth Services aims to improve the academic performance of foster care children through the implementation of four service components: school placement/student advocacy, tutoring, counseling, and employment readiness. FYS programs integrate multiple agencies to encourage the success of foster children, including schools, foster families, caseworkers, or probation officers. The most important component of FYS services is the tracking of school transcripts, immunization records, IEP documents, and past credits for each child, which ensures a smooth transition between educational agencies. In addition, FYS provides one-on-one tutoring, develops behavior modification plans, and places a high premium on high school graduation.

The success of FYS's approach has been evaluated by Seashore, the California Health and Welfare Agency, the California Health and Welfare Agency, the California Department of Education, and the Children's Services Foundation. All the studies found that children in foster care who had received services from FYS had improved academic performance, decreased behavior problems, lower drop-out rates, and more successful transitions to employment or higher education.

- b) ***Methods and Data Collected.*** Data are taken from previously published reports. This is an evaluation of promising practices.
- c) ***Challenges/Recommendations.*** None mentioned
- d) ***Key Words.*** foster children, interagency communication, liaison, program design, school-link services, high risk students

**Brown, D., Maxwell, S., DeJesus, E., & Schiraldi, V. (2002). *Barriers and promising approaches to workforce and youth development for young offenders.* Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available at <http://www.aecf.org/publications/pdfs/workforce.pdf>**

- a) ***Overview and Findings.*** This report provides extensive information for practitioners: (1) a brief history of the juvenile justice system in the United States;

---

(2) a review of research on the linkage between employment and youth delinquency; (3) a review of 15 promising programs and the seven characteristics that those effective programs have in common, 27 policy initiatives, and funding approaches; and (4) an appendix that provides in-depth profiles of all the programs and policy initiatives included in the study

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data were collected on the literature review on youth justice and workforce development, historical and statistical context of the juvenile justice system, effective programs, and profiles of policy initiatives.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** practitioner, policy initiatives, literature review, employment, delinquent, promising practices, youth, program descriptions

**Burley, M., & Halpern, M. (2001). *Educational attainment of foster youth: Achievement and graduation outcomes for children in state care.* Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. (ERIC Document Retrieval Service ED 460 220)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This article summarizes findings from a statewide analysis of the academic performance and educational attainment of foster children in the Washington state public school system. The study findings in brief are as follows: on average, foster youth score from 15 to 20 percentile points lower than do non-foster youth on statewide achievement tests; 59% of foster youth in grade 11 complete high school by the end of grade 12 compared with 86% of youth in the general population; youth entering foster care have lower test scores and graduation rates; twice as many foster youth repeat a grade, change school during the year, or are enrolled in special education; the length of time in foster care does not appear to be related to educational attainment.

Several factors help explain the lower educational attainment of foster youth. The first is pre-care experience; most foster children enter the system because of abuse and neglect by one or more parents. These experiences often make it difficult for foster children to form bonds with their foster parents or with other adults, such as teachers. Many children in foster care also face emotional challenges that can negatively affect their academic performances. Finally, the instability of education that many foster children face, often switching schools multiple times or within the academic year, is a contributing factor to their lower academic performance. However, even taking into account all these differences, “a student’s foster care status alone is associated with a 7–8 percentile point decrease in test scores.”

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The data for this study were taken from the students in Washington who took the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (grades 3 and 6) or the Iowa Test of Educational Development (grade 9) in the spring of 2000. Educational testing data from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction were merged with foster care data from the Division of Children and Family Services. Finally, questionnaires covering general information about a youth’s school history, family background, and views regarding school were

---

administered as part of the Iowa standardized assessment tests, providing a more complete picture of all students taking the tests. Data were collected from 217,880 students, 4,559 of whom were in foster care. Data were also taken from previously published reports.

- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** A key point of the article was the need for increased exchange of information among foster parents, educators, and social workers. The authors recommend expanding the Foster Care Passport program, a program already in place in Washington to record each foster child's dental, medical, behavioral, psychological, and education status. The primary recommendation is to institute computerized data transfer to regularly update foster children's education data, much in the same way their immunization records are currently updated.
- d) **Key Words.** academic achievement, foster children, elementary and secondary education, outcomes of education.

**Burrell, S. (1999). *Improving conditions of confinement in secure juvenile detention centers*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available at <http://www.aecf.org/publications/index.php>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** In 1995 the Annie E. Casey Foundation created the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), a 5-year experiment in five sites, to create more efficient and effective systems for juvenile detention and cheaper alternatives to traditional detention centers. The JDAI found that since the 1980s, detention center expenses had more than doubled and that centers had become overcrowded, often causing the living conditions inside to greatly deteriorate. JDAI's four objectives were to (1) eliminate unnecessary use of detention centers, (2) reduce failures to appear and continued delinquent behavior, (3) promote community-based programs as alternatives to detention centers, and (4) improve conditions in detention centers. JDAI also created for its own experiment a conditions-assessment instrument that could be duplicated by others so that all detention systems could be evaluated. Some of the many specific achievements listed for the JDAI experiment are increased access to counsel for juveniles, improved facility cleanliness, improved staff training, new uses of behavior management systems that reward positive behavior, and improved educational resources.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The Youth Law Center (YLC) is the technical assistance provider of the JDAI. The conditions-assessment instrument created by attorneys at the YLC based acceptable standards for detention centers on constitutional, statutory, and case laws, as well as on professional standards. Assessments of centers were conducted twice a year and included reviews of all documentation; walk-throughs of facilities; and interviews with juveniles in detention, staff, and administrators. Findings from site visits are analyzed in conjunction with earlier findings outlined in *Conditions of Confinement: Juvenile Detention and Corrections Facilities*, published by the U.S. Department of Justice in 1994.

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Detention center staff reports may not reflect the reality of conditions in the centers. States have varying legal standards for conditions in detention centers—the conditions assessment instrument may have to be re-assessed to be applicable to a particular region. Owing to lack of progress or insufficient political support, two of the five sites were not eligible to continue with the experiment for the full 5 years.
- d) **Key Words.** JDAI, juvenile, detention, Annie E. Casey, community-based programs, crowding, overcrowding, training, alternatives

Casper, M., Hull, K. A., & Jurich, S. (2001). Training correctional educators: A needs assessment study. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 52(1), 23–27. Available at [http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional\\_education/articles/jurich-training.pdf](http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional_education/articles/jurich-training.pdf)

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Before holding a 3-day training for new correctional educators, the Virginia Department of Correctional Education (DCE) conducted a three-part study (focus group, survey, and classroom observation) to assess the current needs of correctional educators and to focus the training on these needs.

The focus groups included male and female adult offenders, male juvenile offenders, and adult and juvenile education staff members. The concerns of the participants were grouped by theme, with the following found to be the most common: (1) correctional education philosophy, (2) communication skills, (3) human behavior, (4) teaching techniques, and (5) definition of a successful educator. The survey was addressed only to educators and found that their greatest training needs were in improving (1) teaching skills and techniques for dealing with behavioral problems, (2) transition resources, and (3) the teaching environment. The educator profile revealed that although educators have adequate education, they have a very high turnover rate. The classroom observations identified four major educational issues unique to teaching in a correctional facility that should be addressed by trainings: (1) intellectual isolation, (2) multiplicity of challenges, (3) absence of grade-related structure (many levels grouped in a single class), and (4) unique safety concerns.

Overall, the study results showed that DCE educators desired more multidisciplinary training to deal with the unique challenges of teaching in a correctional setting. Improving communication skills, having a greater knowledge of psychology and counseling, and maintaining a safe environment were some of the many additional skills that would benefit correctional educators. The DCE felt that another success of the study was that teachers felt more in control of the training process and as a result were highly enthusiastic about it.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The DCE funded three types of data collection. (1) A series of focus groups included students, teachers, and administrators, 57 participants in all. The participants were asked to focus on the qualities of good teachers and the weaknesses in current teacher training. Extensive notes taken during the sessions were grouped by key words and themes. (2) A survey distributed to 478 teachers in correctional facilities resulted in 337 responses. The survey asked teachers to rank the importance of 20 potential training subjects, to

---

suggest additional training topics, and to give their opinion on the relevance of developing a resource manual. The survey also contained questions to create a general profile of Virginia correctional educators. (3) Consultants performed observations in six juvenile correctional facilities to determine whether survey results reflected the classroom reality.

- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** education, training, correctional educators, juvenile, adult

**Center on Crime, Communities, & Culture. (1997). *Education as crime prevention: Providing education to prisoners.* New York: Open Society Institute, Criminal Justice Initiative. Available at [http://www.soros.org/crime/research\\_brief\\_2.html](http://www.soros.org/crime/research_brief_2.html)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The report looks to research findings published by other organizations to make general observations and recommendations about the state of education in U.S. prison institutions. Studies have found that a strong correlation exists between education level and incarceration—literacy rates among inmates are dramatically lower than the national average, and the majority of inmates have not completed high school. Studies have also shown that since the early 1990s, education services in prisons have been reduced in spite of findings that prisoner education dramatically decreases recidivism rates. The report uses a variety of data sources to illustrate how increasing education services helps lower recidivism, provide a stabilizing influence on prisoner behavior, and increase successful employment on release.

The article makes the following recommendations: (1) Incarcerated juveniles should be guaranteed a quality education. (2) Programs should receive sufficient funding from a variety of sources. (3) Post-release services should be provided and adequately funded. (4) Funding should be provided to evaluate program effectiveness.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data were taken from previously published reports.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Long-term follow-up evaluations should receive greater funding to provide more accurate information on effective practices.
- d) **Key Words.** education, literacy, higher education, corrections, correctional education, crime prevention, recidivism, re-arrest, Pell, juvenile

**Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. (2003). *A preliminary analysis of detention expansion in Alameda County.* San Francisco: Author. Available at <http://www.cjcj.org/pubs/comparison/comparison.html>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Four tables describe how Alameda County's proposed 450-bed detention facility compares with detention centers of other demographically similar jurisdictions around the country and gives a cost estimate of county detention centers of various bed capacities. There is no discussion of the table data in the description.

- 
- b) *Methods and Data Collected.* Not discussed
  - c) *Challenges/Recommendations.* None mentioned
  - d) *Key Words.* cost, juvenile detention center, county

**Chamberlain, E. (1994). *Neglected or Delinquent Program, 1992–1993: Final evaluation report, Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Chapter 1.* Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 494)**

- a) *Overview and Findings.* The program, which lasted 136 days, was designed to provide classroom or tutorial services in language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50% of the pupils in the sample—those who were English-speaking and had a valid pretest-posttest score for Reading Comprehension—would gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period.
- b) *Methods and Data Collected.* Norm-referenced tests were administered in grades 2–12 in a spring-to-spring cycle.
- c) *Challenges/Recommendations.* Owing to the high degree of pupil mobility, no pupils attended enough days for inclusion in the evaluation sample. The evaluation of the program was supposed to be based on standardized achievement test information (grades 2–12), but there were not enough students.
- d) *Key Words.* neglected/delinquent youth, tutorial programs, language development, institutions, student achievement, pupil mobility

**Citizens' Committee for Children of New York. (2000). *Returning home: A look at aftercare services provided to delinquent youth.* New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 162)**

- a) *Overview and Findings.* A study of the aftercare services offered juvenile delinquents after residential placement was conducted in New York state. The emphasis was on the Juvenile Aftercare Services program, which serves the majority of youth being conditionally released into the community. The major findings follow: (1) Aftercare counselors' caseloads are too high and should be reduced. (2) The Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) should develop a youth's service plan before the youth is released from a facility. (3) The New York City (NYC) Board of Education should have a school placement arranged at least 1 month prior to the youth's release to aftercare. (4) Aftercare counselors should have access to a broader array of community support services for youth released to aftercare. (5) OCFS should expand the number of family advocates to work with families before and after their children return from juvenile facilities. (6) Youth released from contract residential facilities should be provided aftercare services like those given to youth released from state-run facilities. (7) Contract residential providers should be required to have a school placement arranged for every youth at least 1 month prior to the youth's release.

- 
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Survey instruments were used for on-site interviews with aftercare counselors, senior staff at contract residential facilities, and contract agencies that provide residential services to juvenile delinquents. Meetings with the NYC Department of Probation and the NYC Department of Juvenile Justice were also conducted.
  - c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Because researchers interviewed only 8 of the 21 aftercare counselors in NYC, they do not intend for their findings to be representative of all aftercare counselors.
  - d) **Key Words.** delinquency, residential program, aftercare, counselors, individual service plan, community support

**Coalition for Juvenile Justice. (2001a). *Abandoned in the back row: New lessons in education and delinquency prevention. CJJ 2001 annual report: An overview.* Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.juvjustice.org/publications/overview2001.pdf>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Young students who perform poorly in school or who have only poor educational resources available to them are greatly at risk to become juvenile offenders. This overview identifies the risk involved in not providing adequate support to at-risk students in school and suggests steps that should be taken. Congress should acknowledge the correlation between education and delinquency and enact legislation and funding to support educational programs. Zero tolerance policies in schools should be changed to allow a more supportive way of dealing with rule breakers. Parents should be more involved in supporting their children's education.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Not data-intensive
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** delinquency prevention, juvenile, education, zero tolerance

**Coalition for Juvenile Justice. (2001b). *Handle with care: Serving the mental health needs of young offenders. CJJ 2000 annual report: An overview.* Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.juvjustice.org/publications/overview.pdf>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This is a general overview of the problem of undiagnosed and untreated mental disorders among at-risk and delinquent students. Children of color, sexual minorities, and females tend to be especially at risk for depression and other health disorders, which lead to a greater chance of juvenile delinquency. Multifaceted treatment approaches for these youths, such as Multisystematic Therapy or wraparound programs, have been found to be effective in reducing recidivism rates for offenders in these groups. The article gives four final recommendations: (1) Congress should appropriate \$100 million to moving mental health services to community-based settings. (2) Special attention should be given to assisting the mental needs of the most at-risk groups of students. (3) Parents should never be in a position where relinquishing custody of their children is the only way to get them sufficient mental health care. (4)

---

Training on mental health care issues should be regularly provided to juvenile detention facility staff.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Not data-intensive
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** delinquency prevention, juvenile, education, mental health, counseling, wraparound, Multisystematic Therapy

**Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1996). *Federal efforts to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency: FY 1995 Delinquency development statements.* Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.ncjrs.org/jdds.htm>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The report lists the programs that federal agencies are currently undertaking that relate to juvenile delinquency prevention, intervention and treatment strategies, or control strategies; brief summaries of the programs; the funding amounts given by each agency; and programs planned for the future. The report contains program overview statements from the Corporation for National Service, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the National Endowment for the Arts, the President's Crime Prevention Council, and the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor, Transportation, and Treasury.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Study uses Individually prepared statements from separate government agencies. Report is not data-intensive.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile delinquency, intervention, control, prevention, federal agencies, Corporation for National Service, Office of National Drug Control Policy, National Endowment for the Arts, President's Crime Prevention Council, Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor, Transportation, Treasury

**Cox, S., Davidson, W., & Bynum, T. (1995). A meta-analytic assessment of delinquency-related outcomes of alternative education programs. *Crime and Delinquency*, 41(2), 219–234. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 513 116)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Reports the results of a meta-analysis to quantitatively summarize prior empirical research on alternative schools. This analysis found that alternative education programs have a small overall effect on school performance, attitudes toward school, and self-esteem, but no effect on delinquency. Programs that target a specific population of at-risk youth produce larger effects than those with open admissions.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The study employed a meta-analysis, a quantitative method for summarizing findings from empirical research. Out of

---

241 citations reviewed, 57 evaluations of alternative schools were included in the meta-analysis.

- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** (1) Alternative school literature lacked true experimental research designs and extended follow-up studies. (2) Many studies were omitted because the required statistics were not provided. (3) Some studies did not give detailed descriptions of the programs. (4) The majority of meta-analytic reports were found in ERIC as unpublished reports.
- d) **Key Words.** delinquency, meta-analysis, alternative schools, student achievement

**Curry, J., Doolittle, M., Huskey, B., Koehler, H., & Washington, W. (2002). *Title I evaluation report, 2000–2001*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 462 420)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report provides an overview of the use of Title I funds by the Austin Independent School District (AISD) for 2000–2001, including the number of students served and such student demographic information as race and socioeconomic status. According to this report, three facilities for neglected youth, serving 247 students, received funds, but those funds came from the Title I, Part A program. In addition, four facilities for delinquent youth used Title I, Part D funds to serve 1,471 students. In 2000–2001, positive academic outcomes were reported by some facilities, including students returning to their regular school classroom, academic credits earned, students meeting state requirement to advance to the next grade, and completion of high school (diploma) or GED.

Descriptions of instructional programs in the three facilities for neglected youth were also provided. Helping Hands Home uses volunteers and staff to provide scheduled after-school homework time, reading practice, tutoring, and computer assistance. Settlement Home provides weekly academic instruction, skill building, and tutoring to its residents. Lifeworks/Youth Options uses volunteers to provide tutoring to homeless youth until they can be placed in AISD.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data were collected at all campuses receiving Title I funds. Information collected included number of students and percentage of students at each campus eligible for Title I funds; socioeconomic status of students receiving Title I services; and race of students receiving Title I services. A longitudinal analysis of academic achievement examined passing rates on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) for students at Title I campuses and those at other AISD campuses. Those results were disaggregated by race and socioeconomic status.

In spring 2001, AISD sent a survey packet to N/D facilities, private schools, and Title I public schools. Eight N/D facilities responded with descriptions of their supplementary instruction program, how they spent their Title I funds, and program impact.

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Recommendations include (1) increasing the effort to ensure that funds are used in a complete and timely manner; (2) examining the extent to which campuses are exhibiting best practices (such as collecting and using data, instruction) to boost student achievement; and (3) providing more academic support to students with low test scores.
  - d) **Key Words.** Title I, neglected youth, education, evaluation

**Dedel, K. (1998).** *Concept paper and work plan to implement an educational data reporting program. A supplement to the final report the feasibility study to improve the quality and availability of educational data for incarcerated youth.* Washington, DC: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This concept paper and work plan describe the process for instituting an Educational Data Reporting System (EDRS). The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) conducted a feasibility study to test educational data collection protocols and procedures. The concept paper is a supplement to the final report discussing the feasibility study: Feasibility Study to Improve the Quality and Availability of Educational Data for Incarcerated Youths. NCCD aims to introduce an EDRS with the following elements: solicitation of participation from the targeted states; individualized implementation reports; on-site technical assistance; annual conferences; data management and system of audits; and report generation. Two strategies for nationwide implementation of an annualized EDRS are discussed in the paper: (1) an Incremental Recruitment Strategy, which over 2 years using the seven states researched in the feasibility study, defines the activities, supports, products, and resources needed to launch a full-scale data reporting effort and (2) a Comprehensive Recruitment Strategy, which tracks all 50 states in the EDRS over 4 years. Costs and timelines are outlined for both strategies. Proposed budgets for the Incremental Recruitment Strategy and the Comprehensive Recruitment Strategy are included in the appendix of the paper.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** In the EDRS implementation process, NCCD plans to use site visits to create individualized implementation reports for each state. The site visits will consist of meetings with key administrators, educational staff, and individuals responsible for data management. In the feasibility study, two meetings, one at the initiation and the other at the completion of the pilot project, provided valuable insight and information about the project. The meetings consisted of Department of Juvenile Justice and State Education Agency representatives. NCCD hopes that the annual conferences proposed for the EDRS will serve as a similar good source of data. As outlined in the feasibility study, NCCD will ask states to provide individual-level data for students in the juvenile corrections system. These data will be collected in an NCCD database and include demographic information, educational history information, entry information, exit information, and follow-up information. A table of the basic and expanded data elements is included in the appendix of the concept paper. The NCCD will conduct a multivariate analysis of these data.

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** This paper highlights the importance of U.S. Department of Education and NCCD support in the EDRS implementation process. Also emphasized is the need to gain the support of the executive agency responsible for the custody of committed juveniles or the Department of Juvenile Justice in each state.
- d) **Key Words.** data collection, data reporting system, database, evaluation, tracking

**DeWoody, M., Ceja, K., & Sylvester, M. (1993). *Independent living services for youths in out-of-home care*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This book describes the additional challenges facing youth leaving out-of-home care environments, assesses the federal Independent Living Program, reports the results of a 1992 survey of youth-serving agencies conducted by the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA), and sets forth recommendations for independent living services.

Youth who enter out-of-home care often come from environments of abuse, neglect, homelessness, and parental substance abuse. Additionally, youth leaving out-of-home care have lower rates of academic success including high school completion, fewer job skills or experience, higher rates of disabling emotional conditions, higher rates of drug and alcohol abuse, higher rates of pregnancy and parenting, and higher rates of health problems that require ongoing care.

The Independent Living Program is administered by the federal government under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act and provides all states with funds to assist youth in out-of-home care make the transition to independence. A statewide breakdown describes the amount of funds given to each state and the type of services provided by each state.

As a result of the 1992 CWLA survey, three statewide independent living programs were identified as being extremely successful. The Connecticut program offers services for youth up to age 21 in four areas: The Community Life Skills Project, preparation for adult living settings, community housing assistance, and aftercare. The second program is Minnesota's Support for Emancipation and Living Functionally (SELF) Program. SELF is administered by the county and implemented by public and private agencies. The program is based on life-skills training with individual and group instruction provided by coordinated state, federal, and community resources. The final program is Cincinnati's New Life Youth Services, a private non-profit that provides housing support and training for up to 30 clients ages 16–20.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** In 1992, the Child Welfare League of America conducted a survey to measure how well its member agencies met the needs of youth in out-of-home care as set forth in its Standards for Independence. In response, 103 agencies provided information in the following areas: individual, group, and family counseling services; educational services; employment services; health services; housing services; legal services; social, cultural, and recreations services; and aftercare services.

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The services offered with funds from the Independent Living Program vary widely. Little information is available on the outcomes of the various programs, and the quality of services received has not been assessed.

To improve services received by youth making the transition to independent living, CWLA makes the following recommendations: (1) Continue and expand services to provide a comprehensive range of independent living services. (2) Enhance the involvement of the community and the clients themselves in the planning and delivery of services. (3) Strengthen aftercare services. (4) Improve services to at-risk youth. (4) Expand housing resources for youth. (5) Identify alternative funding sources for youth services.

- d) **Key Words.** high risk, youth, group homes, education

**Durkin, K., Carroll, A., & Hattie, J. (1997). Goal setting among adolescents: A comparison of delinquent, at-risk, and not-at-risk youth. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(3), 441–450.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** A series of studies was conducted to compare group differences in the goal orientations of delinquent, at-risk, and not-at-risk adolescents. An importance of goals scale was developed. The study identified differences in the importance attributed to different goals by not-at-risk, at-risk, and delinquent youths, particularly with various types of goals associated with an academic image. Not-at-risk adolescents attached importance to goals associated with knowledge, study skills, schooling, and good relationships. At-risk and delinquent adolescents attached importance to delinquency and freedom-autonomy goals, goals associated with law-breaking activities. Delinquent and not-at-risk adolescents attached a similar level of importance to physical goals compared with the at-risk participants, who scored significantly lower than the delinquent group.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** A series of goals was identified from previous research with differences in the goals of high-achieving young people and those of their low-achieving peers. A provisional pool of 75 goals was created and subsequently cut to 51 to eliminate identical and irrelevant items. Participants were 230 students from four metropolitan senior high schools in Western Australia. In the validation stage, 260 adolescent boys (80 delinquent, 90 at risk, 90 not at risk) were administered the importance of goals scale to assess the extent to which it could be used across different data sets and to determine whether the scale could differentiate between delinquents and non-delinquents. In both administrations of the scale, the factorial structure and reliabilities were strong. The study identified eight categories of goals that are important to adolescents: delinquency, reputation, educational, physical, career, interpersonal, freedom-autonomy, and self-presentation goals.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** No difficulties were experienced in administration. The author recommends that future research include further investigation of whether the goal content (as well as the goal importance) of

---

adolescents differs because of the pursuit of different reputations. Also the “individual progresses” from at-risk to delinquents status is another specific point that requires further investigation because of its possible implications for future intervention programs that attempt to cater to these populations.

- d) **Key Words.** delinquent, at-risk youth

**Edwards, N., Cisneros, E, & Sanchez, K. (1990). Chapter I: Neglected or delinquent program, Final report 1988–89. Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 271)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The program provides tutorial or full-time teacher services designed to assist N/D students residing at 10 participating institutions overcome educational deficiencies. The N/D program was financed through federal funds authorized by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA). The cost of the program was \$111,168, which was less than 1% of the total Chapter 1 expenditures of \$20,217,752.

The evaluation was designed to provide answers for the following research questions:

RQ1: How many students participated in the tutorial program and what were their demographic characteristics?

RQ2: Were all the students who were referred to the Chapter 1 program tested to determine their Chapter 1 eligibility?

RQ3: Did all students who remained in residence after testing receive Chapter 1 instruction, provided that there was room in the program?

RQ4: What were the tutor’s perceptions of the impact of Chapter 1 instruction on students’ academic performance?

The following findings were reported: (1) of the 987 students served, 62% were male, 46% were black, 77% were between the ages of 14 and 17, and 81% were in grades 7–10; (2) 51% of the students were tutored in both reading and mathematics, 11% were tutored in reading only, and 14% were tutored in mathematics only; (3) 23% of the students tested for eligibility were not tutored because they did not remain in the institution long enough to receive instruction; (4) all students referred for tutoring were tested for eligibility; (5) 93% of the students at nine of the institutions received tutoring, but 57% of the students at one institution were not tutored; and (6) teachers perceived that the program helped most students but that the students' non-academic problems made it difficult for them to improve their academic achievement. Statistical data are included on four tables.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Evaluation information was collected from teacher and tutor service rosters, site visits to all 10 institutions, and structured interviews with Chapter 1 personnel.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The authors mentioned a number of challenges: (1) The institutions and the residents were so diverse that the evaluators were not

---

able to apply one outcome measure to them all. (2) Institutional records were not readily available to the tutors. (3) Records were not available to evaluators because of legal confidentiality requirements. (4) The evaluator could not evaluate the program with a pre- and post-test design because students enter and leave the program unpredictably. (5) Follow-up records were not available to the evaluator. (6) There were difficulties with using the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) test: Students may have taken the test before because it is used by juvenile probation, mental health, and other programs. (7) Students may score low because of their unwillingness to participate in the educational programs.

- d) **Key Words.** neglected/delinquent youth, institutions, tutorial programs, federal funding, evaluation

**Evans, T. S. (2000). *Corrections education: How we do it: Pennsylvania ABLE administrators handbook*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Adult Basic & Literacy Education.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Most of this article describes the education system in the county prison in Northampton County. The facility is for adults, and much of the education is adult basic and literacy education. However, there are inmates under the age of 21, and there are provisions made for their needs. The summary here focuses particularly on what the article says about under-21 education.

For inmates under 21, a separate classroom and program are funded by the Easton Area School District. They attend classes 5 days a week, 6 hours a day and have a full-time instructor. GED testing is available for all inmates, who have a pass rate of 90%. Community volunteers come in to provide different types of class programs, such as art and personal decision making to the inmates. Inmates under 21 who are in high-security housing have their educational needs met in their cells. All inmates under 21 are tested and have intake interviews during their second week and then are immediately placed in appropriate classes. The instructor and student work together to make an individual plan that is based on these results and on a few paragraphs the students write about their short- and long-term goals. In class, instruction is provided to small groups and individually. Post-test scores for inmates overall reveal that learning is happening. The number of write-ups for bad behavior is also low.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The following data are collected: GED pass rate; educational assessments that identify educational strengths and weaknesses; a learning style inventory; achievement test pre- and post-scores in reading, mathematics, and language; write-ups for bad behavior; instructor self-evaluations; and student evaluations of instructors.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The county system in Pennsylvania makes it difficult to track recidivism after release. The article states that many former inmates have been encountered in the community and that positive changes were seen in them.

- 
- d) **Key Words.** Pennsylvania, literacy, adult education, individual education plan, corrections, corrections education

**Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Lipsey, M. W. (2000). Reading differences between low-achieving students with and without learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. In R. Gersten, E. Schiller, & S. Vaughn (Eds.), *Contemporary special education research: Synthesis of the knowledge base on critical instructional issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Since the introduction of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1977, educators have been faced with the task of defining and identifying students who qualify as having learning disabilities (LD). Often this definition has involved finding discrepancies between achievement and ability, but this approach does not address the differences between students with LD and those who are low-achieving (LA) but without LD. Using meta-analysis, this study looks for ways these two groups differ.

The meta-analysis reached three main conclusions. (1) There does indeed exist a dramatic difference in achievement of LD and LA students; 72% of LA students perform better in reading than the mean of LD students. (2) Effect sizes were much greater with timed tests than untimed tests. LD students performed better, and more like their LA counterparts, on untimed tests, which suggests that difficulty with rapid-naming tasks may be an integral characteristic in students with LD. (3) Studies that relied on objective forms of measurement, such as reading tests, found much greater differences between the performance of LD and LA students. This suggests that relying on human judgment to identify which students are LD or LA may be less accurate than using objective measures.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The meta-analysis included 79 studies in its database. To qualify for inclusion, studies had to present reading data for school-age children and report data separately for LA and LD students. Studies were coded on the basis of their study design and other characteristics. Five reading domains were the primary effect sizes analyzed in the study: decoding isolated words, reading connected text, reading comprehension, overall reading, and vocabulary. LD-LA student comparability data were based on a comparison of three general fields: achievement, demographic characteristics, and gender comparability (which included IQ and socioeconomic status (SES) comparability).
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Previous studies on this same issue have had widely differing conclusions, possibly owing to significant methodological variations among the studies. Studies that involved descriptive or intervention changes over time were not included in this meta-analysis because of insufficient numbers of available studies. The analysis included only studies that were categorized as “descriptive/one point in time” or “intervention/post-test only.”
- d) **Key Words.** learning disabilities, low achieving, meta-analysis, children, handicapped, education

---

Gerrard, M. D., Owen, G., Lahti-Johnson, K., & Wunderlich, C. (2000). *Delinquents under 10: Targeted early intervention. Phase 2 evaluation report*. St. Paul, MN: Wilder Research Center. Available at <http://www.wilder.org/research/reports.html?summary=90>

- a) **Overview and Findings.** In 1995, the Hennepin County Attorney's Office, with funding from the Minnesota Legislature, began a program targeting and tracking greatly at-risk delinquents under 10 years old. The Targeted Early Intervention (TEI) model's long-term goals were (1) a reduction in delinquent behavior; (2) a reduction in exposure to abuse, neglect, and violence at home; (3) school success; and (4) social competency. The TEI has two components. The first, the integration of county service delivery, involves a team of specialists, including social workers, a psychologist, a financial worker, a health nurse, and others, that assesses the ability of each child's family to support the goals of the program and gives advice and assistance to the whole family. The second part uses "Primary Organizations," community agencies that evaluate each child and create an Individual Success Plan to guide that child toward his or her long-term goals.

The most used services of the Primary Organization were advocacy, case management, and counseling and education. The vast majority of youths also participated in Primary Organization extra-curricular activities, outings, and school support. Study results showed a number of improvements for the TEI youths: a reduction in delinquent behavior, a reduction in exposure to violence or neglect at home, improved school attendance, and improved social competency.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** To be included in the study, children were required to participate in the program for a minimum of 18 months. The TEI conducted interviews with participants and parents, surveys for teachers, and behavioral assessments. It collected data on school attendance, police reports, and social service records. Behavioral assessments were done with the Behavioral Assessment System for Children (BASC), using data from teachers. Data collection began in 1995 and was still being conducted in 2000. Participants were grouped into two phases. Phase 1 entered the program between April 1997 and July 1998. Phase 2 entered the program between August 1998 and July 2000.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Evaluations must take into account the voluntary nature of the program when analyzing outcomes. Also, varying risk factors at enrollment, the level of the student's and his or her family's participation in the program, the student's success at school, and the relationship between the student and workers from the Primary Organization are all factors affecting study results. The evaluation for Phase 2 is not yet finished; these data will be published later.
- d) **Key Words.** early intervention, attendance, behavior, tracking, behavioral assessment, social services

Griller-Clark, H. (2001, Spring). Transition services for youth in the juvenile justice system. *Focal Point*, 15(1), 23–25.

- 
- a) **Overview and Findings.** This brief article describes several of the primary challenges involved in developing and maintaining effective transition services for youth in the juvenile justice system, then offers several suggestions, most of which are based on the successful program the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections Education System (AZ-DJCES) implemented in 1996.

Historically, few transition programs have proven successful for adjudicated youth. However, recent research and practical experience have yielded evidence regarding best practices in this area and have highlighted the need for a comprehensive approach to transition services for youth within the juvenile justice system.

One problem in understanding why different education and transition programs exist in the same field is the three competing theories on how to best prepare delinquent youth for the transition to the community: (1) “micro” theories, (2) “systems” theories, and (3) “macro,” or “ecological,” theories. Another challenge relates to the apparently arbitrary time that delinquent youths must serve in the institutions. It is not clear when the regular public school district's responsibility to provide services ends and the correctional facility's services begin. Finally, there is the long-running criticism concerning the dearth of special education services within the correctional education systems.

One problem identified with the original AZ-DJCES was that too many individuals were involved in the outreach to schools and the community. As a result, each teacher was required to have a working knowledge of all the school districts, employers, and community programs in the Phoenix area. But in 1996, AZ-DJCES hired a full-time Transition Specialist who is responsible for meeting with the youth within the first 30 days of incarceration, assisting in developing an Individualized Vocational Transition Education Plan (IVTEP), attending a transition staffing 30 days prior to release, and finding appropriate educational or vocational programs for the youth upon release.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None pertaining to evaluation or data collection is mentioned.
- d) **Key Words.** youth, transition, juvenile justice, juvenile court, special education, records transfer

**Hamilton, R., & McKinney, K. (1999, August). Job training for juveniles, Project CRAFT. OJJDP Fact Sheet, 116. Available at <http://www.ceardy.org/craft.pdf>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The Community Restitution and Apprenticeship Focused Training program, or Project CRAFT, is a vocational training program sponsored by the Home Builders' Association (HBA). This program can be implemented as a prevention or intervention program or as an alternative to incarceration, or it can be implemented within a juvenile correctional facility. Project Craft offers training and placement in the home-building and related industries. After completion, students are placed in industry-related jobs. The

---

program has developed partnerships with local school districts so that students can receive education credits through CRAFT. Resource Development Group, Inc. (RDG) published in 1999 a summary that evaluated the project over 4 years. It found that Project CRAFT had a high rate of job placement for its graduates. At the time of the survey, 94 of the 140 graduates had jobs in the home-building industry. The cumulative recidivism rate at three CRAFT sites was 26%, which is significantly lower than the national average of 70%. At the Nashville, Tennessee, site, recidivism was 15% in one year and 5.9% the next year. The long-term follow-up provided by CRAFT has contributed to stability and adjustment in its graduates' return to communities.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Recidivism rates were collected.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile, job training, Project CRAFT, vocational training, at-risk, incarceration, alternative, placement

**Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and correctional populations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ecp.htm>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This article uses a large collection of datasets to compare the education currently attained by inmates with that of the general population. It also compares various demographic groups within institutions and other factors related to correctional education. The data show that in general, inmate populations are less educated than the general population; more than half of prison inmates have used the education resources available to them; female inmates are better educated than male inmates; and inmates with higher education levels are less likely to be recidivist than those with lower education levels.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The article combines data from the National Adult Literacy Survey in 1992, the Current Population Survey, and surveys by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, which involved personal interviews with nationally representative samples of inmates in federal, state, and local institutions and people currently on probation.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** education, correctional, juvenile, adult, prison, GED, literacy, statistics, population

**Howell, K. W., & Wolford, B. I. (2002). *Corrections and juvenile justice: Current education practice for youth with learning and other disabilities*. Washington, DC: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice at the American Institutes for Research. Available at <http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Corrections%20and%20Juvenile%20Justice%20-%20Interventions.pdf>**

- 
- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report discusses IDEA legislation, analyzes it point by point, and addresses issues of confusion. It also discusses violations of IDEA legislation within educational programs at correctional facilities. Often, student placement in programs is based on current institutional policy and not on the student's needs. Discussions revolve around what is already available and not on professional judgment of the student's needs. Students in restricted settings, such as lock ups, detention, or isolation, often do not get their education even though it is mandated. Individual Education Plans should include provisions for security measures and methods for delivering education when students are in high security or cannot be in contact with other students. The article identifies problems in common teaching practices in correctional facilities and illustrates how these practices are often the worst teaching methods for learning-disabled students, who make up a large percentage of juveniles in corrections. This article also introduces best practices for learning disabled students and discusses barriers to using best practices in juvenile corrections education.
  - b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned
  - c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None pertaining to evaluation or data collection is mentioned.
  - d) **Key Words.** IDEA, corrections, juvenile justice, Individual Education Plan, best practices, learning disabilities, educational program, placement

Ingersoll, S., & LeBoeuf, D. (1997). *Reaching out to youth out of the education mainstream*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at [http://www.ceardy.org/reaching\\_out.pdf](http://www.ceardy.org/reaching_out.pdf)

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Each year, in more than 500,000 juvenile delinquency cases, the juvenile either remains in the community on probation, or returns to the community after having been in residential placement. However, various institutional barriers interfere with these juveniles' academic success when they return to school. Some promising approaches in assisting with this transition are model learning environments where education is the centerpiece of the institutional experience; prerelease strategies, where a cluster group of people from multiple agencies provides treatment and services for the family and placement considerations begin well in advance of the student's placement in school after being institutionalized; and transitional settings. Transitional settings include alternative schools, short-term enrollment, restorative justice models, probation officers on campus and law-related education, and school-to-work programs.

One promising project is the Barron Assessment and Counseling Center, which is run by the Boston public school system. If a student has a weapon on school property, the parents are contacted and a hearing is held. If the charges are warranted, the student is referred to this center. Staff prepare individualized service plans for each student, and the student continues to receive assignments

---

from school. The center also provides support after the student is released. Internal evaluation shows a first-time offender recidivism rate of 5%.

The Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections (ADJC) offers another promising system. It has three accredited schools for adjudicated youth. This program transitions students from secure care to the appropriate public school or work environment. As a result of this program, students' test scores in reading, writing, and mathematics are 40% higher than they had been previously.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The study used Individual Educational Plans (IEPs); recidivism rates; and test scores in reading, writing, and mathematics.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None discussed
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile delinquency, transition, model learning environment, prerelease strategies, transitional settings, Barron Assessment and Counseling Center, Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections

**Krisberg, B., & Dedel, K., (1997). *Improving the education of incarcerated youth: A concept paper.* Submitted to the United States Department of Education (ED). San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This concept paper discusses the key issues involved in the conceptualization, implementation, and evaluation of Title I, Part D educational services. Specifically, the paper reviews the following program elements: (1) the context of Title I, Part D programs; (2) the methods for identifying eligible participants in Title I, Part D programs; (3) the specifics of Title I, Part D interventions; (4) the organizational linkages that influence the provision of Title I, Part D programs; (5) the goals of Title I, Part D programs and the criteria for determining the success in meeting these objectives; and (6) recommendations for future program evaluations. The paper provides extensive data on the following areas: characteristics of institutions, characteristics of juveniles in custody, types of offenses committed, youth incarceration trends over time, correctional education, characteristics of correctional education students, standards and regulations, goals of correctional education, legislative context for Title I part D, funding, characteristics of institutes offering Title I Part D programs, identification of eligible participants, intervention, linkages, and the goals of Title I Part D programs. The paper summarizes this information and provides recommendations.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The paper compiles information from existing literature and from interviews with representatives from six jurisdictions.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The article asserts that there is a scarcity of the information needed for quality program implementation. The article recommends conducting further research on correctional education; instituting regular, dependable, and useful communication among stakeholders; establishing clearly defined goals and educational outcomes for programs and students; and stating recommendations regarding the implementation and evaluation of programs.

- 
- d) **Key Words.** neglected or delinquent youth, concept paper, juvenile corrections, correctional education, student characteristics, educational standards and regulations, funding, intervention, linkages, evaluation

Larson, K. A., & Turner, D. (2002). *Best practices for serving court involved youth with learning, attention and behavioral disabilities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Office of Special Programs. Available at <http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Promising%20and%20Preferred%20Procedures.pdf>

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This article focuses mainly on a variety of interventions for court involved youth, institutionalized or not. Vocational education and skills training are mentioned within a larger context of therapy, medication, and other types of interventions. A section on transitions from institutions to the community discusses how to prepare youth for these transitions and how to follow up with them, but nothing on placements specifically and not much on education itself. Recommendations are given regarding specific steps to be taken during transitions. The article also includes summaries of some model programs for juveniles involved in the court system. The authors list a few research-supported best practices for court-involved youth in general, institutionalized or not: counseling, social skills training; academic intervention; academic accommodation for youth with learning, attention, and behavioral disabilities; vocational intervention; life skills and a multimodal approach; medical interventions; substance abuse programs; family involvement; transition planning; and wraparound care. Best practices under these topics are discussed generally without reference to specific studies. Most are unrelated to education particularly, but the authors do give some examples of education programs for incarcerated youth.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned (see below)
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The authors state in the introduction that they had originally wanted to include only model programs that have some empirical evaluation showing their effectiveness. However, this criterion was too restrictive. Because they found almost no programs with empirical evaluation, they included programs that had evaluated themselves without controls.
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile, youth, learning, attention, behavioral, disability, court, transition, counseling, social skills training, academic intervention, academic accommodation, vocational intervention, life skills, multimodal approach, medical interventions, substance abuse programs, family involvement, transition planning, wraparound care, best practices, Oregon, Farrell School, Ferris School for Boys, Delaware

LeBlanc, L., & Ratnofsky, A. (1991). *Unlocking learning: Chapter 1 in correctional facilities* (Contract Number 300-87-0124). Rockville, MD: Westat.

- 
- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report presents longitudinal findings assessing the pre-release services and post-release experiences of youth in state-operated juvenile and adult correctional facilities for a 3-year study of the Chapter 1 Neglected and Delinquent Program. The data indicated that a majority of participants were male, black, from urban areas, and from single parent households and that the average age was 18. Most had an educational achievement level of grade 9. Most received some pre-release services that they generally found useful. Post-release, half the participants returned to school, most returned to the same environment they knew before, and most found or looked for work primarily at low paying, low stability jobs. By the second interview, 90% of released participants had held more than one job, and 40% had experienced further problems with the law.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** An initial sample of 670 youth was selected to participate in this study and was followed for 10 months. Participants were nationally representative of inmates in Chapter 1 N/D facilities. Of these 670 youth, 585 completed baseline questionnaires that included such questions as where they were institutionalized, why they had been institutionalized, what their educational experiences were prior to confinement, and what educational services they were receiving while in the correctional system. Researchers also conducted site visits to collect additional information. After completing the baseline questionnaires, participants were asked if they could be contacted for follow-up interviews. Telephone follow-up interviews were conducted with the 585 youth who completed base-line questionnaires. Of these youth, 459 were retained after the first follow-up call. At the time of the second follow-up, 64% of youth in the study were released. Some 338 students were located and responded to the second follow-up.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Locating and tracking the students for follow-up was sometimes difficult; some students could not be located.
- d) **Key Words.** neglected or delinquent youth, longitudinal study, student characteristics, correctional education, transition, student experiences, student attitudes

**Leone, P. E. (1994). Education services for youth with disabilities in a State-operated juvenile correctional system: Case study and analysis. *Journal of Special Education, 28*(1). (EBSCO AN 9412161913, ISSN 0022-4669)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This research, collected as part of the discovery phase of a lawsuit brought against the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) of a large Midwestern state, suggests that some students with disabilities received education, but few received related services. There were lengthy delays in obtaining students' records from prior school programs, and no system of referral existed for students suspected of having disabilities. Students enrolled in special education programs, as well as those with potential mental health problems and mental retardation, received a disproportionate number of disciplinary actions and spent a disproportionate amount of time in confinement.

---

Although the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires each state to develop a system of child identification to assist in locating, screening, and assessing youth who may be eligible for special education and related services, the state inexplicably did not identify DJS as an agency participating in this process. Findings reveal that DJS facilities provided special education services only to youths who had been previously identified by public schools as disabled. IDEA also requires that for youths age 16 and over, transition goals and objectives be included in each Individualized Education Program (IEP), yet none of DJS's goals or objectives addressed the transition of students from DJS facilities back to their home communities or to other institutions or treatment settings.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** This report was based on 8 days of visits to the DJS facilities over the course of 1 year. In addition to observing classrooms, sitting in on case management meetings, and reviewing students' files, the researcher interviewed students and staff; examined current and archival documents and reports related to the education program within the agency; and reviewed federal and state statutes, regulations, and the state plan for special education.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The litigation that prompted this study provided the researcher with a rare opportunity for relatively unrestricted access to all aspects of the school program and juvenile correctional system.
- d) **Key Words.** youth, transition, special education, disabilities, individualized education program (IEP), corrections education, juvenile justice

**Leone, P. E. et al. (1991). *Juvenile corrections and the exceptional student*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 340 153)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This article answers a variety of questions about incarcerated juveniles and their education. It states that for a variety of reasons, juvenile offenders with disabilities are more likely to be incarcerated than those without disabilities. For example, those who are mentally retarded may not understand the rights that are read to them and may have difficulty communicating. In addition, they are more likely to plead guilty, are less likely to plea bargain for reduced sentences, and serve longer sentences than others incarcerated for the same crimes. It is recommended that education for these juveniles include teaching them their legal rights and helping them develop a sense of community. Disabled juveniles are entitled to appropriate education, but it is often difficult to implement education for those with special needs in the juvenile justice system. Juveniles are held in a variety of settings, ranging from detention centers to training and reform schools. Some are in camps and on ranches where they spend half their time working and half their time in school. The mobility of students, moving from school to corrections or from one facility to another, makes it difficult to offer appropriate special education. According to this article, special education services are offered at most facilities, but they are often not adequate. Juvenile corrections have usually been operated by the

---

criminal justice system, but there has been a move to use private agencies to provide these services. Teachers who work with incarcerated youth may be employed by public schools, social service agencies, the juvenile justice system, or a private agency. Studies show that students who had strong relationships with program specialists were more successful academically and in their work than those who did not develop these relationships. Staff, families, probation, aftercare professionals, and educators need to be coordinated to help students make a successful transition back to the community. Often these students do not deal well with changes to their environments. One model for transitioning juveniles back to the community is the Juvenile Corrections Interagency Transition Model, which has been tested in Washington state and other areas. This model includes awareness activities, transfer of records, pre-placement planning, and maintenance of placement and communication.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The study gives references to past studies but does not offer new data of its own.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** A variety of practices support meaningful special education programs. Functional assessments, which are continuous measurements that show discrepancies among the student's educational achievement, social and vocational adjustment, and ability to function independently in the educational program, work much better than standardized assessments. However, standardized assessments are usually used for new students in the facility and rarely identify disabilities. In addition to academic training, students need social, daily living, and vocational skills. The focus of instruction should be on reinforcing appropriate academic and social behaviors. Behavior should be analyzed, and skills to learn should be measurable and evaluated.
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile corrections, incarcerated, disability, special needs, special education, criminal justice, legal rights, functional assessments, Interagency Transition Model, Washington

**Macallair, D. E., & Males, M. A. (2001). *An analysis of San Francisco juvenile justice reforms during the Brown administration: A report to the San Francisco Board of Surveyors*. San Francisco: Center of Juvenile and Criminal Justice. Available at <http://www.cjcf.org/pubs/index.php>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Under the administration of Mayor Willie Brown, San Francisco devoted \$20 million to juvenile justice reform, from 1996 to 2000. The focus of the reform was to create a decentralized intake system that could refer individual youths to various community-based programs and decrease its reliance on traditional detention centers.

Analysis of the changing rates of arrest and detention in San Francisco over these years showed, however, that detention rates actually increased. The article attributes this to “net widening”—with more open spaces available in detention centers because of the increased use of community-based programs, these spaces were filled with lower-risk youth, such as females and youths arrested for minor

---

offenses. Another finding was that institutional practices for the most part remained unchanged by smaller, new initiatives, which were simply marginalized. Systemwide changes require greater overall efforts on the part of the administration.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Much of the analyzed data was gathered by the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department and published in its Annual Report. Indicators used for evaluation were arrest rates and detention rates, which were then broken down by ethnicity, gender, and severity of the crime.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** San Francisco, juvenile, probation, gender, ethnicity, detention, arrest, confinement

**Mendel, R. A. (2000). *Less hype, more help: Reducing juvenile crime, what works—and what doesn't.* Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. Available at <http://www.aypf.org/mendel/>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Using the collected data on recidivism among juvenile offenders participating in various kinds of rehabilitative programs across the United States, the author points out the most successful of these programs and advises on approaches for maximizing the use of only proven successful programs. The decrease in re-arrest rates and the overall cost of the program are the two main factors used to appraise whether it is worthwhile for the program to continue.

The article finds that rather than institute the many promising programs that have shown an effective ability to reduce recidivism, the government has chosen to respond to the rhetoric of the child as “superpredator” with a tough on crime approach. The result has been the continuing overuse of ineffective training schools and an increase in transfers of juveniles to adult courts.

The article recommends shifting the emphasis in juvenile corrections from out-of-home placements to counseling and community-based programs. Most important, all programs should carefully track the behavior of former students and report on the program’s effectiveness. Using these data, programs that can present evidence that they are successful should be duplicated nationwide; all others should be discontinued.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data were borrowed from earlier published reports, programs, and institutions’ own reporting and from local government published statistics.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Some programs and institutions, such as D.A.R.E., Student Assistance Programs, or the Tarrant County, Texas, correctional programs, have insufficient evaluation studies or recidivism tracking to allow accurate evaluations of their effectiveness.

- 
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile delinquency, youth crime, recidivism, training school, counseling, wraparound, multidimensional therapy, structural family therapy

**Michigan Department of Evaluation Services. (1994). *Holland House/Boysville Chapter 1 Neglected and Delinquent Program*. Saginaw, MI: School District of the City of Saginaw. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387 549)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Holland House is a residential program for neglected and delinquent youth in Saginaw, Michigan. In 1993–1994, the program used Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Chapter 1 funding to purchase materials and pay teacher and aide salaries for a reading skills tutorial program in a special classroom at a Catholic high school and in the evenings at Holland House. Of the program's 24 participants, 10 were considered in this study of reading achievement. Six of the 10 students evidenced gains in both basic and advanced reading, 2 gained in one area and lost in the other, and only one demonstrated losses in both areas. The program achieved its goal. No implementation data were collected.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Pre- and post-tests of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement were used.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** residential program, neglected/delinquent youth, assessment, tutorial programs, student achievement

**Murphy, T., O'Sullivan, K., & Rose, N. (2001, July). PEPNet: Connecting juvenile offenders to education and employment. *OJJDP Fact Sheet, 29*. Available at <http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS14212>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The Promising and Effective Practices Network (PEPNet) is administered by the National Youth Employment Coalition (NYEC) and funded by the U.S. Department of Labor. In addition to providing information and materials to organizations that work with young offenders, PEPNet has developed a national recognition system for awarding the most comprehensive and effective programs.

PEPNet has five broad categories for identifying effective programs. (1) Purpose and activities—Programs must have a rehabilitative mission rather than a disciplinary one and must help youth develop necessary skills for future employment. (2) Organization and management—Programs should collaborate with other organizations to bring as many resources as possible to their students. (3) Youth development—Programs should demand accountability from youth, which teaches them life skills such as responsibility and leadership. (4) Workforce development—Vocational instruction should be incorporated into the program. (5) Evidence of success—Programs must provide evidence of success by looking at the following indicators: re-arrest rates, re-incarceration rates, and post-completion employment over at least 12-months.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Not discussed

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
  - d) **Key Words.** effective practices, PEPNet, NYEC, juvenile, education, employment, award, youth, vocational

**National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice. (2002a). *Juvenile correctional education programs: The case for quality education in juvenile correctional facilities.* College Park, MD: Author. Available at <http://www.edjj.org/education.html>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The majority of youth who enter correctional facilities have intense educational, mental health, medical, and social needs. Many are illiterate, marginally literate, or have learning problems and special education needs. However, appropriate educational services are often not a priority in juvenile corrections owing to a lack of funds and resources. The trend in corrections has been to minimize services for delinquent youth despite the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Young adults (18 to 23 years olds) who are the least proficient in basic mathematics and reading skills are more likely to be living in poverty, without work, and not in school. Juvenile corrections should implement a range of education options, including literacy and functioning skills for the students with the most learning problems, academic courses with Carnegie unit credits for students likely to return to public schools or who may earn a diploma while in corrections, GED preparation for students not likely to return to school, and vocational training related to student interests in employment. However, a variety of problems related to both the students themselves and major systemic impediments prevent quality programs from being implemented.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned; this is a policy piece.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The EDJJ will put more research into this issue so that adequate education can be implemented in juvenile corrections.
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile, corrections, education, disability, special education, illiterate, IDEA, ADA

**National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice. (2002b). *Transition: Best and promising practices for youth in long-term correctional facilities. EDJJ Notes, 1(5).* Available at <http://www.edjj.org/edjnotes/volume1number5.doc>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This short article lists services and aspects of education that are considered to be best and promising practices to help juvenile offenders deal with transfers within facilities and to the larger community. Items on the list include the placement of students in classes with supportive teachers, an individual transition plan for all students upon entry into the correctional institution, and a process that allows the immediate transfer of educational records to long-term correctional facilities or schools.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** See *Challenges/Recommendations.*

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Many of these ideas are limited by research and questionable methodology, and so findings have to be interpreted cautiously.
  - d) **Key Words.** juvenile justice, corrections, long-term facilities, transitions, placement, promising practices, best practices

**National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice. (2002c). *Transition planning and services*. College Park, MD: Author. Available at <http://www.edjj.org/TransitionAfterCare/transition.html>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The goal of transition interventions is to successfully reintegrate juveniles into the community. It is often the most ignored part of corrections education, and many juveniles do not receive the necessary vocational, educational, and other types of training to succeed in the greater community. Even for youth with disabilities, successful transition planning is often absent from the Individualized Education Plans (IEP).

Effective transitions require interagency collaboration among correctional educational staff, mental health and social service workers, and others involved with the student. Different members of these agencies must work as a team along with the family to make sure that the student gets appropriate services and placements. Juveniles who have transitioned must be systematically monitored to ensure that they are achieving transition goals.

There are many barriers to effective transition services for juveniles. Most are a result of lack of coordination between agencies. Service providers often do not have adequate professional development and transition training. Providers are fragmented, and the juveniles' records are not transferred from one to the other in a timely manner. Lack of family involvement is also a great problem.

Some promising practices have been identified. Linkages with community, business, and professional organizations provide a continuum of care for juveniles after their release. Wraparound services that focus on the strengths of the individual and his or her family also help create connected services. Evidence shows that students who receive social skills, independent living, and pre-employment training succeed better after release. The EDJJ will focus on identifying comprehensive and coordinated linkages between courts, public schools, correctional education programs, and aftercare agencies.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned; this is a policy piece.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None pertaining to evaluation or data collection is mentioned.
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile, corrections, transition, individual education plan, IEP, interagency collaboration, promising practices, linkages, coordination

**National Institute for Literacy. (2002). *Fighting crime with education: A briefing on recent research about reducing recidivism rates for adult and juvenile offenders and the next steps for Federal policy makers* (Transcript). Washington, DC:**

---

Author. Available at <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl/webcasts/20020319/transcript3-19.html>

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This is a transcription of a presentation by researchers to legislators to increase funding for prisoner education. Some findings were presented from the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS): prisoners in correctional facilities have lower literacy rates than the overall population. The survey also found that one quarter of the general public does not have a high school diploma, whereas half of the prison population lacks a high school diploma. The report also discusses a 3-year longitudinal study of 3,000 prisoners who were released from prison in Minnesota, Ohio, and Maryland. This study found that just going to school reduced re-incarceration by 29%.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS) was used to evaluate prisoners in correctional facilities in 1992. A longitudinal study on 3,000 prisoners controlled for selection bias (specific methods not discussed).
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Researchers suggested that legislators provide more funding for prisoner education and increase the age in which prisoners can receive monies from up to 25 years to the range of 25 to 35 years.
- d) **Key Words.** correctional education, literacy, longitudinal data, policy brief

**Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus Division of Federal Assistance. (1996). *Title I in Ohio, including Title I, Migrant, State Neglected or Delinquent, Title VI, Homeless Children and Youth: Elementary and Secondary Education Act: 31st annual evaluation report, fiscal year 1996.* Columbus, OH: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 442 592)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The first section in this 31st annual report summarizes activities provided in Ohio through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act during fiscal year 1996. The second section addresses educational programs for homeless children in domestic violence shelters, runaway shelters, emergency shelters, and transitional shelters. The final section discusses Title VI innovative assistance programs, which support local education reform efforts, efforts to accomplish the National Education Goals, improvement in library services and instructional and media materials, and programs to serve at-risk and high-cost students. Information is presented on 5-year trends, participation rates, expenditure patterns, and successes. The whole article represents findings in tables. Viewing the articles is suggested.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** homeless children, state programs

**Oldenettel, D., & Wordes, M. (2000). *The community assessment center concept.* *Juvenile Justice Bulletin.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of**

---

**Juvenile and Delinquency Prevention. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 181)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This is a bulletin from the U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) on the Community Assessment Center Concept model (CAC). The CAC model has four key elements that when implemented properly have the potential to have a positive impact on the lives of youth and divert them from serious and violent delinquency: (1) a single point of entry into the juvenile justice system; (2) immediate and comprehensive assessments; (3) a management information system; and (4) integrated case management. Single point of entry: CAC coordinates the services of various agencies and organizations involved with youth through a “one-stop shop.” The idea is to have a 24-hour centralized point of intake and assessment for those who become involved in the system. This could also be “virtual” in that all youth receive the same assessment and case management procedures from the same or different agencies. Immediate and comprehensive assessments: OJJDP suggests consistent policies and procedures, selects appropriate assessment tools, and defines the scope of the assessment process. A management information system: CAC advocates developing a comprehensive and integrated data system instead of pulling information from different offices. It proposes linking data from multiple agencies and monitoring trends in its own operations and services and also in the juvenile justice system. Integrated case management: OJJDP suggests developing individualized, flexible, and responsive treatment plans and defining criteria to determine levels of case management.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** This plan did not say how the model was created but did have case studies that provided examples of how the CAC worked.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Evaluation of the model is not complete. Problems with the model could include: lack of due process, “net widening,” the unavailability of needed youth services, the possibility of stigmatizing youth, and increasing overrepresentation of minorities.
- d) **Key Words.** model, delinquency, single point entry, assessment, management information system, individual service plans

**Parker, J. (1993). *Citywide Programs/District 75. E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B Institutional facilities program.* Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 135)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Program provides supplementary career education, academic remediation, and daily living skills for about 500 students in 15 institutions for neglected and delinquent children in Brooklyn, New York. The evaluation was conducted by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) through the public schools system. Overall, 82% of the students mastered 80% or more of their attempted objectives (above the state-mandated goal of 75%) and more than 76% achieved all their attempted objectives. Instructional, career-building, and social skills objectives are specifically listed.

---

Teachers emphasized individual instruction and included small-group discussion. Teachers generally developed instruction to meet the needs and interests of the students. Program strengths included cooperative and supportive staff, successful use of computers and software, specialized programming for students, and excellent rapport between teachers and students.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** OREA designed student data retrieval forms called DRFs to record quantitative student progress. It collected student achievement data for 492 students out of about 500. It used teacher surveys, teacher interviews, and site observation forms and interviewed supervisors.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None mentioned
- d) **Key Words.** vocational education, remediation, institutions, evaluation, student achievement, daily living skills

**Rowe, B., & Pfannenstiel J. C. (1994). *Formula Grants to States for Neglected or Delinquent Children.* (CFDA No. 84.013). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report constitutes one section of the Biennial Evaluation report FY 1993–1994 and provides a program profile and analysis of facilities offering compensatory education to children in institutions for neglected or delinquent (N/D) children, children attending community day programs for neglected or delinquent children, and juveniles in adult correctional institutions.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The National Study of the Chapter 1 N or D Program (III.2) includes data on N/D programs in juvenile and adult correctional facilities. Data were collected through site visits and follow-up interviews. The data collected were primarily demographics and program characteristics.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** One-half of Chapter 1 N or D participants continue their education when they leave the correctional facility by enrolling in school. However, many of those who enroll subsequently drop out. The information provided to youth while in the facility on how to continue their education or training after release appears to have little influence on whether they do so.

The report recommended that facility administrators view education as a primary institutional goal. Education administration is structured separately from corrections administration. State education administrators need to support the N/D program and facilitate communication with state agency administrators. State agency administrators, in turn, should facilitate communication with educational administrators at the facility level. Effective programs, according to the report, coordinate instruction between the Chapter 1 and regular programs and continuously monitor student progress through frequent teacher-student interaction. In addition, the authors found that motivational approaches such as awards, certificates, contests, use of high-interest materials, and promotion of students to the position of “teacher’s helper” are used in effective programs.

- 
- d) **Key Words.** neglected/delinquent, children, grants

**Rutherford, R. B., Bullis, M., Anderson, C. W., & Griller-Clark, H. M. (2002).** *Youth with disabilities in the correctional system: Prevalence rates and identification issues.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Available at:

<http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Youth%20with%20Disabilities.pdf>

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This document discusses the prevalence of juveniles with special education needs in juvenile and adult corrections. It discusses the importance of proper labeling of disabilities in order for juveniles to receive the proper education geared toward their particular needs. It specifically discusses the definitions of learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, mental retardation, and ADHD. It defines these and notes that their prevalence among juveniles in corrections is higher than in the general population. The authors state that the number of youth in corrections that qualify for special education is much higher than is officially stated, because many juveniles are not being diagnosed properly. They offer a variety of methods to alleviate this problem and to take better account of juveniles in corrections that qualify for special education.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data provided from previously published reports including: juvenile crime statistics; prevalence of specific learning disabilities among juvenile delinquent and general populations; prevalence of emotional and behavioral disorders among juvenile delinquent and general populations; prevalence of mental retardation among juvenile delinquent and general populations; and prevalence of ADD/ADHD among juvenile delinquent and general populations.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The authors analyze the problem of assessment, and offer ways to improve current assessment tests of special education needs.
- d) **Key Words.** learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, mental retardation, ADHD, special education, juvenile, corrections, assessment

**Schiraldi, V., & Ziedenberg, J. (2003).** *Reducing disproportionate minority confinement: The Multnomah County Oregon success story and its implications.* San Francisco: Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. Available at

<http://www.cjcj.org/pubs/portland/portland.html>

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This policy brief describes the disproportionate number of minorities in confinement (DMC), reform strategies to counteract DMC, and a county in Oregon that has succeeded in reducing the number of minority youth detained. Three key factors were cited as contributing to the success of the county: (1) the development of alternatives to detention; (2) training sessions addressing and raising awareness about overrepresentation; and (3) the design and implementation of a risk assessment instrument.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The description of the policy problem is (i.e., DMC) substantiated by descriptive statistics from Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and reports

---

from non-profit organizations. The reform strategies were developed from the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). Descriptions of the County's reform strategies are outlined by the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJJC).

- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** No concrete recommendations are given; however, the policy brief stresses the benefits of the reform strategies used by the county in Oregon.
- d) **Key Words.** detention, county, Disproportionate minority confinement (DMC), policy brief, minority, overrepresentation

**Sheffer, J. M., & Neglected & Delinquent State Advisory Committee. (2002). 2000–2001 Title I N&D assessment report. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report was submitted as part of the assessment requirement of Title I, Part D programs. Statistics are disaggregated by age, gender, and race/ethnicity. The overall conclusion of the authors was that despite some limitations (listed below), students made significant gains in the areas of statutory requirements.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The Neglected & Delinquent Advisory Committee developed an online reporting system for data collection, with information on individual students entered by the agency providing services. The system collected two forms of student information: (1) student files containing demographic information and (2) educational profiles containing academic performance and service information. All data entered into the system were then reviewed by the local education agency for the purpose of approval and submitted to the Pennsylvania Department of Education.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The report identifies the following limitations to the assessment: (1) The definition of an educational gain was developed on a local level. (2) The length of stay and the variety of program services had an impact on the institutions in measuring student progress and reporting educational gains. (3) Various data entry and statistical analysis errors are present. (4) N/D institutions were not always informed by local schools about whether their students had taken the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment tests. (5) Institutions had a difficult time tracking many of the students following discharge from their agencies because of the students' high mobility. (6) Although the data indicate that 1,462 students received no services, this statistic is in error because by definition, all students in the database received some form of educational service.
- d) **Key Words.** Pennsylvania, assessment, age, gender, race, ethnicity, Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), services, reading, mathematics, writing, science, social studies, behavior, grade promotion, school credit, GED, transition, employment, post-graduate education, military

---

**Sinclair, B. (2002). *State ESEA Title I participation information for 1999–2000: Final summary report*. Rockville, MD: Westat.**

- a) ***Overview and Findings.*** This report summarizes data for two parts of the Title I program: Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and the State Agency Program for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (State N or D). This summary focuses only on information in the report regarding the latter. The report includes one chart and two tables regarding state N/D data. The chart includes two sets of data. The first is the percentage of State Agency Neglected or Delinquent participants across the United States who are receiving Title I services in each of three types of institutions: Neglected, Delinquent, and Adult Correctional. In 1999–2000, these figures were 10%, 66%, and 24%, respectively. The second set of data is the percentage of N/D institutions across the United States that fall into each of these three types. In 1999–2000, these figures were 35%, 47%, and 18%, respectively. The two tables break down these data by state, indicating for each the numbers and percentages of participants and institutions in each of the three types of institutions in both 1998–1999 and 1999–2000. (Each table also contains a footnote stating that the Bureau of Indian Affairs does not have state N/D participants and that Rhode Island and Vermont were unable to provide data for 1998–1999.)
- b) ***Methods and Data Collected.*** Data were submitted by each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico beginning in spring 2002 and continuing through summer 2002. As of March 2003, a complete 2000–2001 consolidated report submission had not yet been received for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The report also mentions that as part of the verification process, states can and do revise information submitted for 2000–2001 as well as for earlier years. See “Overview and Findings” for a discussion of data collected.
- c) ***Challenges/Recommendations.*** This report states that “data quality and timeliness continue to be issues, but ED is working with states to both improve the quality of their submissions as well as improve their timeliness.” It also notes under the tables discussed above that the figures reported should be viewed with caution because the participation figures reported by California represent one-fifth of all program participants and vary significantly from year to year. It also states that Rhode Island and Vermont were unable to provide data for 1998–1999. Otherwise, there is no discussion of challenges. The report does not make any recommendations; it simply summarizes data received from the states.
- d) ***Key Words.*** Title I participation, N/D participation, N/D institutions, summary report

**Sinclair, B. (2003). *State ESEA Title I participation information for 2000–2001: Summary report: Second draft*. Rockville, MD: Westat.**

- a) ***Overview and Findings.*** This report summarizes data for two parts of the Title I program: Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and the State Agency Program for Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (State N/D). This summary focuses only on information in the report regarding the latter. The

---

report includes one chart and two tables regarding state N/D data. The chart includes two sets of data. The first is the percentage of State Agency Neglected or Delinquent participants across the United States who are receiving Title I services in each of three types of institutions: Neglected, Delinquent, and Adult Correctional. In 2000–2001, these figures were 9%, 59%, and 32%, respectively. The second set of data is the percentage of N/D institutions across the United States that fall into each of these three types. In 2000–2001, these figures were 36%, 46%, and 19%, respectively. The two tables break down these data by state, indicating for each the numbers and percentages of participants and institutions in each of the three types of institutions in both 1999–2000 and 2000–2001. (Each table also contains a footnote stating that the Bureau of Indian Affairs does not have state N/D participants.)

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data were submitted by each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico beginning in spring 2002 and continuing through summer 2002. As of March 2003, a complete 2000–2001 consolidated report submission had not yet been received for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The report also mentions that as part of the verification process, states can and do revise information submitted for 2000–2001 as well as for earlier years. See “Overview and Findings” for a discussion of data collected.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** This report states that “data quality and timeliness continue to be issues, but ED is working with states to both improve the quality of their submissions as well as improve their timeliness.” Otherwise, there is no discussion of challenges. The report does not make any recommendations; it simply summarizes data received from the states.
- d) **Key Words.** Title I participation, N/D participation, N/D institutions, summary report

**Sinclair, B., & Gutmann, B. (1994). *State Chapter 1 participation and achievement information—1992–93 summary report*. Rockville, MD: Westat. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377 277)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report summarizes the 1992–1993 State Performance Reports for the Chapter 1 Local Education Agency (LEA) program and the Chapter 1 State Agency Neglected or Delinquent Program. The Neglected or Delinquent (N/D) Program serves youth in state-operated correctional facilities and in facilities for neglected youth. Chapter 1 participation has steadily increased: the 1992–1993 level of more than 6.4 million students represents an 8% increase over participation in 1991–1992. Public and nonpublic student participation was concentrated primarily in the lower grades; participation in the N/D Program was focused to a greater degree in secondary grades. Nearly three-quarters of participating students received instruction in reading, and nearly half received instruction in mathematics. Among the Chapter 1 students who were tested in reading, average post-test scores were higher than pretest scores at every grade level. The same was true for mathematics and for language arts. Nationally, 22% of Chapter 1 schools were identified for program improvement in 1992–

---

1993 because students in those programs showed no change or a decline in the aggregate achievement scores during the year.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The report used reporting data from states, such as the number of school districts receiving basic and concentration grants, the number of schools operating Chapter 1 programs, and the number of public and nonpublic students eligible to participate in Chapter 1. Achievement data from basic and advanced skills in reading, mathematics, and other language arts were used.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Reporting problems include data quality, use of norm-referenced tests, and alternative Chapter 1 data.
- d) **Key Words.** institutions, neglected/delinquent youth, accountability, achievement data, assessment, data limitations

**Sinclair, B., & Gutmann, B. (1993).** *A summary of State Chapter 1 participation and achievement information—1990–91.* Rockville, MD: Westat. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 376 226)

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report summarizes the 1990–1991 State Performance Reports for the Chapter 1 (Education Consolidation and Improvement Act) local education agency (LEA) program and the Chapter 1 State Agency Neglected or Delinquent program. More than 5.5 million students participated in 1990–1991. Nearly three-quarters of these students received instruction in reading and almost half received instruction in mathematics. This report is organized into four chapters: (1) participation information, (2) achievement information, (3) allocation and cost information, and (4) information on the neglected or delinquent program. Six appendixes provide technical background, information about data collection, and supplemental information. The findings are very extensive and cannot be summarized simply.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The document used state reporting forms and student achievement data.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Reporting difficulties include data quality, unit of analysis, use of norm-referenced tests, and alternative Chapter 1 Data.
- d) **Key Words.** neglected/delinquent youth, accountability, student achievement, cost information, data limitations

**Stanfield, R. (1999).** *The JDAI Story: Building a better juvenile detention system.* Baltimore: The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available at <http://www.aecf.org/publications/index.php>

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This article gives an introductory summary of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's 5-year experiment, the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). JDAI was launched in 1995 at five sites across the country with the goal of assisting in the implementation of cheaper community-based alternatives to traditional juvenile detention centers. The Annie E. Casey

---

Foundation found that since the 1980s, the rate of juvenile detention had dramatically increased and many detention centers were overcrowded, but alternatives to detention were not being adequately explored. Alternatives proposed by JDAI include home detention, electronic monitoring bracelets, and supervised day and evening programs in the community. JDAI also worked with judicial officials and probation officers to create accurate risk assessment instruments for determining whether a juvenile is a flight risk or a risk to others and to improve coordination between the different offices involved in the detention process.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The primary indicator of success, the reduction of the number of juveniles held in detention centers, can be easily misinterpreted. Post-trial juveniles are sometimes placed in any empty spaces in detention centers owing to difficulties in finding them space in permanent facilities. Complete comprehensive evaluative data is not yet available. Owing to lack of progress or insufficient political support, two of the five sites were not eligible to continue with the experiment for the full 5 years.
- d) **Key Words.** juvenile, detention, corrections, alternatives, JDAI, Annie E. Casey, courts, community-based programs, probation

**Steurer, S. J. (2001). *Historical development of a model for correctional education and literacy*. Lanham, MD: Correctional Education Association. Available at [http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional\\_education/articles/historical-development-steurer.pdf](http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional_education/articles/historical-development-steurer.pdf)**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This article focuses on adult basic and literacy education in prisons but may have some material that is relevant to corrections education for juveniles. The author tracked the history of corrections education since the 1960s and worked personally as a teacher in various prisons. He stated that in the past, teachers shied away from instructing students individually but would instruct in a large group. If an adult was not literate already, teaching him or her was thought to be impossible. Prisons also did not like to use the inmates as tutors, believing that it would give them too much power. However, through various kinds of research into literacy and education, teachers are now more willing to give one-on one-instruction, to help with students' special needs, and to use inmates to tutor their peers. Academic, vocational, life skills, and literacy training are all seen as essential to inmates' success in the community.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** None pertaining to evaluation and data collection is mentioned.
- d) **Key Words.** correctional education, literacy, adult, basic education, prison

**Tashjian, M. (2000). *Study of local agency activities under the Title I, Part D program*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education**

- 
- a) **Overview and Findings.** The nine local programs visited varied widely with respect to purpose, grant amount, number of students served, and number of participating facilities or schools. All but one of the programs provided some amount of academic instruction in the detention environment. The author's discussions with state Title I coordinators during the selection process indicated that local programs are much less likely to use program funds to pursue either of the program's other two goals: dropout prevention in the regular public schools and formal transition services for youth returning from a detention facility. Most district staff believed that the need for supplementary academic instruction in facilities for delinquent youth far exceeded the need for dropout prevention services in the regular schools.

Formal transition or aftercare programs remained scarce, despite widespread awareness of the need for such services, because of a lack of knowledge in how to set up such programs, the absence of a mandate assigning this responsibility to any one state or local agency, and inadequate funding. The absence of post-release monitoring, in turn, resulted in a lack of continuity in the education of many delinquent youth, especially because students' length of stay at any one facility was frequently less than a full school year. The report points out that gains in achievement or improvements in attitudes toward education that students may have experienced in the structured environment of a correctional facility can erode in the absence of post-release services. A few of the states and districts visited were improving the continuity of education for delinquent youth by using integrated instructional software systems, which are aligned with state standards for curriculum mastery. Students who are released from a detention facility and enter another facility or school in these districts (or states) may continue to learn at the same pace, using the same materials and standards, to the extent that other schools or facilities in the district (or state) employ the same software.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Nine sites were chosen on the basis of diversity with respect to geographic location and program design and the existence of on-site data. Interviews during site visits were conducted. Data collected from the sites included the specific goals of the districts, the roles of their respective LEA and SEA, students and student selection, program structure, program services and activities, program staffing, and business, and other local agency and parent involvement.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The high mobility of students made it difficult for some districts to obtain student achievement data. In many cases, information collected by the districts was incomplete. Students often exited abruptly from a facility before they had fully reached individual goals or grasped the importance of education for their future. Many facility staff told interviewers that although their students thrived under the structured environment of a detention center, these same students would lose that structure after release and return to behaviors that first led them to incarceration. Education plans for delinquent youth were frequently delayed because of the transfer of academic records from the students' previous schools. Mandated pretests administered a day or two after a student arrived at a facility may not accurately assess a student's achievement level because of the emotional instability associated with recent incarceration; some

---

districts now wait up to 1 week after admittance before testing new students. According to many facility and school staff, inadequate funding is also an impediment to more effective programs. Additional funding could be used to purchase additional computers and software, upgrade existing equipment, hire more instructional staff, and begin formal transition programs.

- d) **Key Words.** grants, Title 1 Part D, neglected, delinquent, students

**Tashjian, M. D. (2001).** *State agency activities under the Title I, Part D, program: Mail survey of agencies that operate Title I programs for neglected or delinquent youth in State institutions: Final report.* Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

- a) **Overview and Findings.** In 1998, the U.S. Department of Education contracted with the Research Triangle Institute to conduct a mail survey of the universe of state agencies that administer the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 program. The survey included questions about the characteristics of participating agencies, institutions, and students; regular education services available; Title I funded services; and administration of the Title I program. This report presents survey findings and three broad conclusions: (1) The Title I N/D program remains concentrated in facilities for neglected or delinquent youth, as it did a decade ago. (2) One of the two current performance indicators is that an increased percentage of institutions will operate institution-wide programs, but given that more and more facilities are doing this, continued improvement on this indicator will become increasingly difficult for state agencies to sustain over time. (3) Most state agencies were unable to maintain or report student outcome data (number of students obtaining the GED and number earning high school course credits).
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** The survey was distributed to 84 state agencies with responsibility for administration of the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 program. The list of state agencies was compiled from information provided by the U.S. Department of Education from state directors or coordinators of Title I. A total of 67 agencies completed the survey.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** This report states that the survey obtained comprehensive information on state agency policy and practice but was somewhat more limited in its ability to obtain data describing projects at the institution level. It states that this constraint stems from the wide variability in how correctional education programs are administered across the country, essential differences in the manner in which adult and juvenile institutions approach educational programming and the difficulties these differences impose on the ability to aggregate institutional-level data statewide.

This report provides three recommendations regarding how state agencies that receive Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds can improve their programs to meet statutory requirements: (1) provide guidance and technical assistance to state agencies and institutions to build their capacity to accurately collect, maintain, and report data on the outcomes of the program; (2) provide guidance and technical assistance on the design and implementation of states' program

---

evaluations that are of high quality and useful for making improvements to the program; and (3) focus on monitoring state agency compliance with the requirements of their State Plan for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 program.

- d) **Key Words.** survey, regular education services, Title I services, administration, statistics

**Torbet, P. et al. (1996). *State responses to serious and violent juvenile crime*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** This report documents the changes in the handling of serious and violent juvenile offenders through an analysis of all legislation enacted 1992–1995.

Jurisdictional authority: More serious and violent juvenile offenders are being removed from the juvenile justice system in favor of criminal court prosecution.

Judicial disposition/sentencing authority: More state legislatures are experimenting with the new disposition and sentencing options.

Correctional programming: Correctional administrators are under pressure to develop programs as a result of new transfer and sentencing laws.

Confidentiality of juvenile court records and proceedings: Traditional confidentiality provisions are being revised in favor of more open proceedings and records.

Victims of juvenile crime: Victims of juvenile crime are being included as active participants in the juvenile justice process.

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Telephone surveys of juvenile justice practitioners in all 50 states provided evidence of changes resulting from the new laws.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Authors list a series of issues.

Implementation issues with respect to jurisdictional authority statutes include the following:

Increased demands on court and prosecutor resources. Criminal prosecutions require more prosecutor resources; three strikes statutes mean fewer pleas and more jury trials.

Longer pretrial stays. The increase in the number of transferred juveniles, the potential for appeals, and normal criminal justice processing delays mean that more juveniles are being detained for longer periods in juvenile detention facilities or adult jails.

Overcrowding and programming problems. Juvenile detention facilities are not programmed for lengthy pretrial stays or while awaiting placement; jails do not provide educational or other services typically available in detention facilities.

Lack of guidelines or reporting requirements for prosecutors. Unlike statewide reporting requirements for courts, there are no such requirements for prosecutorial decisions, nor are there guidelines for making decisions.

---

Procedural issues related to habitual offender statutes. New “three strikes and you’re an adult” statutes are in vogue; however, juveniles may be denied some protections that are accorded to adult defendants in criminal court, such as the right to counsel.

Implementation issues with respect to judicial disposition and sentencing include the following:

Rights of juveniles. Because many of the new sentencing options put juveniles at risk of adult sentences, rights to counsel and a jury trial are critical.

System ambivalence. Blended sentencing options demonstrate ambivalence and a lack of resolve about what to do with serious and violent juvenile offenders on two fronts: transferring juveniles for whom the juvenile justice system is inadequate, and bolstering the resolves and the resources of the juvenile justice system to adequately address the needs of these very difficult offenders.

System confusion. Blended sentencing options create confusion among system actors: When is a juvenile a juvenile, and when is he or she considered an adult? This issue is especially critical during processing and subsequent placement.

Inquiries into correctional options for serious and violent juvenile offenders revealed a wide range of correction system responses:

Straight adult incarceration. Juveniles are sentenced and incarcerated as adults with little differentiation in programming.

Graduated incarceration. Juveniles are sentenced as adults but incarcerated in juvenile correctional facilities until they reach a certain age at which they may be transferred to adult facilities for the remainder of their sentence.

Segregated incarceration. Juveniles are sentenced as adults but housed in separate facilities for younger adult offenders, occasionally with specialized programming.

Youthful offenders. Certain juveniles are designated “youthful offenders” with or without special programming or legal protections.

Back to basics. Juvenile corrections systems are enhanced with a wide range of sanctions to hold juveniles accountable and to protect the public.

Implementation issues with respect to correctional programming include the following:

Turf issues. Some critics contend that had the juvenile justice system received the resources necessary to improve that system, it could have done as good a job, or a better job, and at less cost.

Funding and capacity issues. Few states have a good plan for paying for changes, nor do they have a mechanism for implementing them.

Programming issues. Adult corrections departments are being asked to develop programs for a population they neither want nor have the expertise to

---

address. Reform overlooks community corrections as a legitimate sanction for some serious and violent juvenile offenders.

Implementation issues with respect to confidentiality provisions include the following:

Quality of records. The quality and completeness of juvenile arrest and court records must be addressed, particularly when juvenile records are required to be a part of a central repository.

Disclosure. Reporting arrest information without a subsequent requirement to report adjudication outcomes may lead to unfair assumptions about a juvenile's behavior.

Open proceedings. Courtroom security and judicial authority to close proceedings to protect either the victim or the offender are concerns.

Implementation issues with respect to victims of juvenile crime include the following:

Extent of victim's involvement. Victims should be encouraged but not forced to participate.

Reparation and restitution. New and expanded components of offender accountability can create operational problems and raise fairness issues.

The composite of change produced by recent legislative and executive actions includes the following:

Change is everywhere. Since 1992, 48 of the 51 state legislatures (including the District of Columbia) have made substantive changes to their laws targeting juveniles who commit violent or serious crimes.

Change is consistent. The nature of justice for a subset of juveniles now involves an increased eligibility for criminal, rather than juvenile, court processing and adult correctional sanctions. The underlying intent of change was to ease and support the state's decision to punish, hold accountable, and incarcerate for longer periods of time those juveniles who had, by instant offense or history, passed a threshold of tolerated "juvenile" criminal behavior.

Decision-making roles are changing. Either directly through prosecutorial direct filing or indirectly through the charging process in exclusion cases, the prosecutor has clearly emerged with an expanded role in justice system responses to serious and violent juvenile offenders. The juvenile court judge, in 1996, had significantly less authority to make decisions regarding the venue for, or the dispositional outcome of, cases involving violent or other serious crime than he or she did in 1992.

Changes will have an impact on minority juveniles. Because minority juveniles are already over-represented in the crime categories targeted by new laws (e.g., serious and violent offenses, particularly those involving weapons, and juveniles with more extensive histories), these laws will have a disproportionate impact on minorities.

---

Change involves secure placement. With few exceptions, changes in sentencing and correctional programming options available to courts have been in the direction of increased incarceration of juveniles convicted of violent or other serious crimes without comparable attention to community corrections, including probation and aftercare.

Change precedes capacity. Legislative prescriptions for enhanced accountability for serious and violent juvenile offenders have, in many cases, anticipated resources and capacity that do not exist.

Change is not tested. In most instances, the reliance on changes that expand existing systems of criminal prosecution and adult corrections for serious and violent juvenile offenders has not been based on evidence that clearly demonstrates the efficacy of the intervention.

- d) **Key Words.** juvenile, crime

**U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *Promising results, continuing challenges: Final report of the national assessment of Title I: Highlights*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/hlights.html>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The summary provides highlights (i.e., promising results and continuing challenges) from a report evaluating the implementation and impact of Title I. Additionally, the summary provides improvement options. Promising results include student outcomes in reading and mathematics and resources, instruction, and related supports.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** NAEP longitudinal data are outlined in charts. The project collected state and district reports from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Methods are not discussed in depth.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Continuing challenges include large performance gaps between highest-poverty schools and other schools; inappropriate staffing and inadequate teacher preparation; inadequate implementation of parent involvement provisions; and weak Title I accountability or dual accountability in some states. Improvement options are discussed also: maintain an emphasis on challenging standards for all students; provide targeted high-performance school grants to strengthen the highest-poverty schools; strengthen instruction; strengthen parent involvement; and focus on accountability.
- d) **Key Words.** Title I, accountability, challenges, promising practices, student achievement, NAEP data, evaluation, implementation

**Wilson, J. J. (1994). OJJDP Update on Research. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The bulletin provides recommendations for educating incarcerated youth.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** None mentioned

- 
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Education for incarcerated youth has often been considered just another service, but it needs to be more than that. One characteristic of effective schools for incarcerated youth is that facility administrators consider education the most important part of rehabilitation. Education has to offer basic skills, high school completion, GED preparation, and pre-employment training. Classroom curriculum is often very traditional and based on drills and memorization. More emphasis has to be put on complex problem-solving skills. Because the majority of delinquents 16 and over do not return to school, educators need to find better ways to motivate them to stay in school, but also offer them preparation for entry-level jobs. Transitional services are also important because much of the education in incarceration can be undone. Effective transitional services help keep juveniles enrolled in school, living independently, or successfully employed. Students should be properly scheduled and pre-registered before returning to public schools. Educational information should be used for appropriate placements. Little research has been done into these issues. Rigorous research needs to be done, with baseline data being collected for entering juveniles so that legislators and funding agencies can see that education programs are effective for incarcerated students.
- d) **Key Words.** education, transition, juvenile, delinquency

**Wilson, S. J., Lipsey, M. W., & Soydon, H. (2003). Are mainstream programs for juvenile delinquency less effective with minority youth than majority youth? A meta-analysis of outcomes research. *Research on Social Work Practice, 13*(1), 3–26.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Because of a recent upsurge in interest in finding the specialized needs of different ethnic groups, this analysis examines the question of whether programs that are not culturally tailored for minorities are still as effective for minority youth as they are for majority youth. To answer this question, 305 studies conducted between 1950 and 1996 were used for a meta-analysis database. The studies dealt with youth between the ages of 12 and 21 who resided in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia. The studies covered a wide variety of programs, most commonly institutional and non-institutional counseling and casework. The findings of the analysis indicated that overall, programs had a small positive effect on all youth and no significant difference in their effects on minority youth and white youth. The effect sizes were largest in continued delinquency outcomes and were greater than zero for all other outcomes except family functioning.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Of the 305 studies analyzed, 141 studies focused on groups that were at least 60% minority youth, mostly African American, and 164 on groups that were at least 60% white youth. To establish program effectiveness, the following indicators were considered: academic achievement, attitude change, behavior problems, employment status, family functioning, internalizing problems, peer relations, psychological adjustment, school participation, and self-esteem. More than 150 aspects of each program, including methods, participant characteristics, and effect sizes for indicators, were coded and compared. The weighted mean effect size for delinquency outcomes for

---

minority youth was .11 and for white youth .17. These effect sizes were statistically significant, but the difference between them not statistically significant.

- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The mean effect sizes for the programs were appreciably smaller than the effect sizes found in other comparable meta-analyses, raising the possibility that the analyzed programs were relatively ineffective for both white and minority youth. Additional studies are needed to examine whether culturally tailored programs have greater effect sizes for minority youth than do mainstream programs. Also, all studies included in this meta-analysis dealt solely with indigenous minority youth, not immigrant youth. Effect sizes for these youth could be considerably different.
- d) **Key Words.** minority, education, culture, mainstream, meta-analysis, effectiveness, achievement

**Winkokur, K., Blankenship, J., Cass, E., Hand, G., & Schuck, A. (2002). *The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice's program accountability measures: The 2003 PAM report, a two-year analysis*. Tallahassee, FL: Justice Research Center. Available at <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/statsnresearch>**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** The Program Accountability Measure (PAM) Report details Florida's annual assessment and ranking of non-residential and residential juvenile justice programs on the basis of client outcomes and program costs. The PAM Report was started in 1986 to evaluate the performance of juvenile justice programs that provide care, custody, and treatment for youth committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ).

The PAM model takes into account the risk factors of youth served by programs and estimates the probability of those youth recidivating. From this, it is possible to calculate how well a program is expected to do on the basis of the risk of re-offending (expected success) of youth in their care and to compare this with how well those youth actually performed (observed success) after release.

The PAM score is calculated for each program to provide a program rank that is based on its effectiveness and cost relative to other commitment programs. The score is derived from a formula based on (1) effectiveness as measured by reduced re-offending and (2) cost per youth who completed the program.

Extensive findings are outlined in tables. The report provides findings by (1) restrictiveness level in descending order of PAM score; (2) restrictiveness level in descending order of program effectiveness; and (3) program effectiveness categories in ascending order of cost (with separate tables for non-residential and residential programs).

- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data on demographics, youth who successfully completed non-residential and residential facilities, offense histories, and adult records were compiled from the Department of Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Florida Correctional Information Center (FCIC), and the Florida Department of

---

Corrections (DC). Program results are presented for 32 non-residential and 155 residential programs that released at least 15 youth during the 2-year period. Statistical methods and rationale for calculating the PAM score are described in detail.

- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The authors cite the following challenges: (1) The expected success measure explains only a portion of the variation in recidivism for both non-residential and residential programs. The remainder of differences between observed success and expected success is due to program effects and to the effects of unmeasured factors. (2) Other predicting factors of recidivism were examined but failed to remain statistically significant in the final models.
- d) **Key Words.** recidivism, residential juvenile justice programs, non-residential juvenile justice programs, risk-factor indicators, program effectiveness, restrictiveness levels, cost information

**Wolford, B. (2000). *Juvenile justice education: Who is educating the youth?* Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University, Council for Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Respondents to this national survey reported that in more than half the states, no state department of education funds were directed to educate youth in juvenile justice settings. The per-pupil funding for youth in juvenile justice educational programs ranged from \$2,259 to \$9,000 per year. In 25% of the states surveyed, there was no way to calculate the per-pupil cost of education. Federal court interventions related to education were in place in 20% of the surveyed states. The most extensive education delivery system for at-risk and delinquent youth was found in Kentucky. Youth in Kentucky who are placed in a residential or day treatment program funded by the state's child welfare, justice, and mental health agencies are served by local education agencies with support and funding from a statewide collaborative. It appears that local school districts remain the agency most frequently responsible for delivering educational services to all youth in the juvenile justice system, followed by the juvenile justice agency and contract providers. However, state juvenile justice agencies do appear to be the major providers of educational services to youth housed in state-operated residential programs.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** Data were collected through interviews and telephone surveys. The findings come from a survey conducted in 1999 of 20 state juvenile justice agencies. The survey focused on the administration, funding, and monitoring of educational programs for youth in the juvenile justice system. The report includes a summary report and charts regarding the survey findings, a profile of the 20 states in the study, and detailed profiles of some promising practices in Kentucky, Alabama, Pennsylvania, and California.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** Some of the most challenging issues facing juvenile justice, according to the report, were related to governance, financing,

---

and personnel selection and retention. Combinations of these challenges were found in most of the 20 states involved in the study.

The report recommended that systems avoid employing educators as traditional juvenile justice agency staff and include the education budget as a component of the overall cost of care (at the program or state level). A few practices present in a number of jurisdictions appear to hold promise as efficient and effective mechanisms: the ability to contract out educational services, the ability on the part of the facilities to grant transferable credit, flexibility in teaching assignments, and a formal (external) governance or advisory mechanism. The most impressive juvenile justice programs exist when education and juvenile justice professionals work together in a collective spirit to meet the needs of youth.

- a) **Key Words.** neglected/delinquent, children, grants

**Yoshikawa, H. (1994). Prevention as cumulative protection: Effects of early family support and education on chronic delinquency and its risks. *Pathological Bulletin*, 115(1), 28–54.**

- a) **Overview and Findings.** Chronic delinquency was found to exhibit certain characteristics that may make it particularly amenable to primary prevention: early age of onset, high stability, and lack of specialization in type of antisocial behavior. Research showed that programs combining early family support and education, serving urban low-income families, and involving a child-focused educational support component might represent a promising method of primary prevention of early-onset, chronic delinquency.
- b) **Methods and Data Collected.** A review of the early intervention literature revealed that the family support component is associated with effects on family risks, whereas the early education component is associated with effects on child risks. Both components may be necessary for effects on multiple risks and later reductions in delinquency.
- c) **Challenges/Recommendations.** The author stressed that the proposal included in the review is preliminary. Characteristics of the early family support and educational programs that limit the generalizability of their effects include their high status as high-quality demonstration projects with relatively low sample sizes, low staff-to-child ratios, and the pressure of needing to show research results. Most of the risk literature reviewed applied to boys; research on risks for female delinquency is scant. Evaluation studies suggest a program with the following characteristics: an intervention of at least 2 years, provision of a high-quality educational infant day-care or preschool program for children, provision of informational and emotional support focused on development and child-rearing issues for parents, and provision of prenatal-postnatal care and educational and vocational counseling or training when otherwise unavailable.
- d) **Key Words.** prevention, delinquency, education, family

---

## **APPENDIX C**

### **SUMMARY TABLE**

Citation	Student Characteristics	Behavioral	Cognitive Skills	Attitudinal	Educational Attainment and Participation	Institutional Practices	Instructional and Service Provider Characteristics	Parental	Other	Population	Relevant Data Information
Advocates for Children of New York & New York Immigration Coalition. (2002). <i>Creating a formula for success: Why English language learners are dropping out of school, and how to increase graduation rates</i> . New York: Authors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 467 109)		X		X	X	X				New York	Data on graduation and dropout rates are taken from previously published state and city reports.
Advocates for Children of New York. (2000). <i>Educational neglect: The delivery of educational services to children in New York City's foster care system</i> . New York: Author.					X	X				New York	AFC gathered its own data because, as of 1999, neither the New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS) nor the New York City Board of Education maintained statistics on educational services for foster children.
American Bar Association & National Bar Association. (2001). <i>Justice by gender: The lack of appropriate prevention, diversion and treatment alternatives for girls in the justice system</i> . Washington, DC: Author. Available at: <a href="http://www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/justicebygender.pdf">http://www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/justicebygender.pdf</a>		X								United States	Data are taken from previously published reports. Main indicators are arrest and detention rates for girls vs. general youth population.
American Youth Policy Forum. (2002). <i>Twenty-five years of educating children with disabilities: The good news and the work ahead</i> . Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum and Center on Education Policy.										United States	Data from the Office of Special Education Programs on number of children served; access to public education; inclusion in regular classrooms; early childhood services; academic achievement; graduation rates; college/employment outcomes
Anderson, L. M., & Welsh, M. (2000). <i>Making progress: An update on state implementation of Federal education laws enacted in 1994</i> . Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 443 199)			X		X	X	X		X	United States	Data on student performance, program implementation, and program performance gathered from surveys to Title I, Part D administrators.
Archwamety, T., & Katsiyannis, A. (2000). Academic remediation, parole violations, and recidivism rates among delinquent youths. <i>Remedial &amp; Special Education</i> , 21(3). (EBSCO AN 3535703, ISSN 0741-9325)	X	X	X							Nebraska	Scores on Peabody Individual Achievement Test taken over 5-year period at the Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Center in Kearney, NB.
Burley, M., & Halpern, M. (2001). <i>Educational attainment of foster youth: Achievement and graduation outcomes for children in state care</i> . Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 460 220)	X	X	X	X						Washington	Assessment results from Iowa Test of Basic Skills for grades 3 and 6 and Iowa Test of Educational Development (grade 9). School history; family background; views regarding school also included.
Burrell, S. (1999). <i>Improving conditions of confinement in secure juvenile detention centers</i> . Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available at <a href="http://www.aecf.org/publications/index.php">http://www.aecf.org/publications/index.php</a>										Cook County, IL ; Milwaukee County, WI; Multnomah County, OR; New York City, NY; Sacramento County, CA	Findings from site visits, walk-throughs, and interviews with facility staff
Casper, M., Hull, K. A., & Jurich, S. (2001). Training correctional educators: A needs assessment study. <i>Journal of Correctional Education</i> , 52(1), 23-27. Available at <a href="http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional_education/articles/jurich-training.pdf">http://www.easternlincs.org/correctional_education/articles/jurich-training.pdf</a>								X		Virginia	Focus group identified qualities of good teachers and weaknesses in teacher training; survey ranked the importance of 20 training topics, suggested others; observations determined if survey result reflected classroom realities
Center on Crime, Communities, & Culture. (1997) <i>Education as crime prevention: Providing education to prisoners</i> . New York: Open Society Institute, Criminal Justice Initiative. Available at <a href="http://www.soros.org/crime/research_brief__2.html">http://www.soros.org/crime/research_brief__2.html</a>			X		X	X				United States	Correlation between education and recidivism; literacy rates of prisoners; educational attainment rates of prisoners
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. (2003). <i>A Preliminary Analysis Of Detention Expansion In Alameda County</i> . San Francisco, CA: Author. Available at <a href="http://www.cjaj.org/pubs/comparison/comparison.html">http://www.cjaj.org/pubs/comparison/comparison.html</a>										Alameda County, CA	A comparison of Alameda's detention facility and others in similar jurisdictions around the country.
Chamberlain, E. (1994). <i>Neglected or delinquent program, 1992-1993: Final evaluation report, Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1</i> . Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 378 494)			X							Columbus, OH	Pretest- posttest scores for Reading Comprehension collected, although no pupils actually attended enough days of the program to be included in the evaluation sample (due to high student mobility)

Citation	Student Characteristics	Behavioral	Cognitive Skills	Attitudinal	Educational Attainment and Participation	Institutional Practices	Instructional and Service Provider Characteristics	Parental	Other	Population	Relevant Data Information
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York. (2000). <i>Returning home: A look at aftercare services provided to delinquent youth</i> . New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 162)						X	X			New York	Number of youth with transition plans in place prior to release; average caseload of advocates and aftercare counselors
Cox, S., Davidson, W., & Bynum, T. (1995). A meta-analytic assessment of delinquency-related outcomes of alternative education programs. <i>Crime and Delinquency</i> , 41(2), 219-234. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 513 116)			X	X							Data collected on school performance; attitudes towards school; self-esteem; delinquency.
Curry, J., Doolittle, M., Huskey, B., Koehler, H., & Washington, W. (2002). <i>Title I evaluation report, 2000-2001</i> . Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Retrieval Service ED 462 420)	X	X		X	X	X				Austin, TX	Data collected: student demographic data; number of kids served; educational achievement (credits earned, returned to normal classroom, grade advancement; high school diploma/GED awarded); results on TAAS disaggregated by race and socioeconomic status.
DeWoody, M., Ceja, K., & Sylvester, M. (1993). <i>Independent living services for youths in out-of-home care</i> . Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.						X				United States	Agencies provided data on: educational services offered; individual, group and family counseling services offered; employment services offered; health, housing, legal, social and aftercare services offered.
Durkin, K., Carroll, A., & Hattie, J. (1997). Goal setting among adolescents: A comparison of delinquent, at-risk, and not-at-risk youth. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i> , 89(3), 441-450.				X							Results of ratings on importance of Goals Scale. Eight categories identified: delinquency, reputation, educational, physical, career, interpersonal, freedom-autonomy, self-presentation
Edwards, N., Cisneros, E., & Sanchez, K. (1990). <i>Chapter I: Neglected or delinquent program, Final report 1988-89</i> . Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District, Department of Research and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 271)	X	X			X					Houston, TX	Data collected included demographic information; pre and post-tests to evaluate programs impact on math and reading scores.
Evans, T. S. (2000). <i>Corrections education: How we do it: Pennsylvania ABLE administrators handbook</i> . Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Adult Basic & Literacy Education.		X	X	X		X				Northampton, PA	Data collected: GED pass rates; educational assessments which identify educational strengths and weaknesses; a learning style inventory; achievement test pre- and post-test scores in reading, mathematics, and language; write-ups for bad behavior; instructor self-evaluations; student evaluations of teachers.
Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Lipsey, M. W. (2000). Reading differences between low-achieving students with and without learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. In R. Gersten, E. Schiller, & S. Vaughn (Eds.), <i>Contemporary special education research: Synthesis of the knowledge base on critical instructional issues</i> . Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.	X		X								Studies were coded on the basis of their study design and other characteristics. Five reading domains were the primary effect sizes analyzed in the study: decoding isolated words, reading connected text, reading comprehension, overall reading, and vocabulary. LD-LA student comparability data was based on a comparison of three general fields: achievement, demographic characteristics, and gender comparability (which included IQ and SES comparability).
Gerrard, M. D., Owen, G., Lahti-Johnson, K., & Wunderlich, C. (2000). <i>Delinquents under 10: Targeted early intervention. Phase 2 evaluation report</i> . St. Paul, MN: Wilder Research Center. Available at <a href="http://www.wilder.org/research/reports.html?summary=90">http://www.wilder.org/research/reports.html?summary=90</a>		X			X			X		Hennepin County, MN	Description of Hennepin County's Targeted Early Intervention model which targets and tracks greatly at-risk delinquents under age 10. Assessments of behavior conducted with the Behavior Assessment System for Children
Hamilton, R., & McKinney, K. (1999, August). Job training for juveniles. Project CRAFT. <i>OJDP Fact Sheet, 116</i> . Available at <a href="http://www.ceardy.org/craft.pdf">http://www.ceardy.org/craft.pdf</a>		X								United States	Data on rates of job placement and recidivism as a result of a rehabilitation program which offered training and placement in the home building and other industries.
Harlow, C. W. (2003). <i>Education and correctional populations</i> . Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at <a href="http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ecp.htm">http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ecp.htm</a>	X	X	X		X					Florida	Educational attainment and demographic data are included- data taken from National Adult Literacy Survey, Current Population Survey, and statistics from the Bureau of Justice Statistics

Citation	Student Characteristics	Behavioral	Cognitive Skills	Attitudinal	Educational Attainment and Participation	Institutional Practices	Instructional and Service Provider Characteristics	Parental	Other	Population	Relevant Data Information
Ingersoll, S., & LeBoeuf, D. (1997). <i>Reaching out to youth out of the education mainstream</i> . Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at <a href="http://www.oeady.org/reaching_out.pdf">http://www.oeady.org/reaching_out.pdf</a>		X	X			X				United States	Discussion of promising practices in dealing with the education of youth transitioning out of the justice system. Data collected include IEPs, recidivism rates, and test scores in reading, writing, and mathematics.
Krisberg, B., & Dedel, K. (1997). <i>Improving the education of incarcerated youth: A concept paper</i> . San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.	X	X				X				Boston, MA; Arizona	Extensive data on: characteristics of institutions; characteristics of juveniles in custody; types of offenses committed, youth incarceration trends over time, correctional education, characteristics of correctional education students, standards and regulations, goals of correctional education, legislative context for Title I part D, funding, characteristics of institutes offering Title I Part D programs, identification of eligible participants, intervention, linkages, and the goals of Title I Part D programs
LeBlanc, L., & Ratnofsky, A. (1991). Unlocking learning: Chapter 1 in correctional facilities (Contract Number 300-87-0124). Rockville, MD: Westat.	X	X				X	X			United States	Description of data collected from on-site interviews and two follow-up phone interviews at 5-month intervals. Student demographic data, academic/vocational achievement, services received, and recidivism rates
Leone, P. E. (1994). Education services for youth with disabilities in a state-operated juvenile correctional system: Case study and analysis. <i>The Journal of Special Education</i> , 28(1). (EBSCO AN 9412161913, ISSN 0022-4669)				X	X						Research presented on disabled youth in the juvenile justice system. Data collected: educational services offered.
Macallair, D. E., & Males, M. A. (2001). <i>An analysis of San Francisco juvenile justice reforms during the Brown administration: A report to the San Francisco Board of Surveyors</i> . San Francisco: Center of Juvenile and Criminal Justice. Available at <a href="http://www.cjcr.org/pubs/index.php">http://www.cjcr.org/pubs/index.php</a>	X	X								San Francisco, CA	Discusses the increase in juvenile incarceration in San Francisco under Mayor Willie Brown. Includes previously reported data on recidivism and successful programs.
Mendel, R. A. (2000). <i>Less hype, more help: Reducing juvenile crime, what works – and what doesn't</i> . Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. Available at <a href="http://www.aypf.org/mendel/">http://www.aypf.org/mendel/</a>		X								United States	Identifies successful rehabilitative programs in the United States and discusses the rhetoric that has interfered with their successful implementation. Includes recidivism rates from previously published reports.
Michigan Department of Evaluation Services. (1994). <i>Holland House/Boysville Chapter 1 Neglected and Delinquent Program</i> . Saginaw, MI: School District of the City of Saginaw. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387 549)			X			X				Saginaw, MI	Description of an education program for neglected and delinquent youth in Saginaw, Michigan. Data includes pre- and post-tests of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement
National Institute for Literacy. (2002). <i>Fighting crime with education: A briefing on recent research about reducing recidivism rates for adult and juvenile offenders and the net steps for federal policy makers</i> (Transcript). Washington, DC: Author. Available at		X	X		X					Minnesota, Ohio, Maryland	This is a transcription of a presentation by researchers to legislators to increase funding for prisoner education.
Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus Division of Federal Assistance. (1996). <i>Title I in Ohio, including Title I, Migrant, State Neglected or Delinquent, Title VI, Homeless Children and Youth: Elementary and Secondary Education Act: 31st annual evaluation report, fiscal year 1996</i> . Columbus, OH: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 442 592)						X	X	X		Ohio	Detailed information on Title I school and local institution participation, student participation, instructional areas, student performance, expenditure patterns, staff positions, professional development, and parental involvement. Specific N/D info on supplemental instruction programs and N/D participation and instructional patterns.
Parker, J. (1993). <i>Citywide programs/District 75. E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B institutional facilities program</i> . Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 135)			X		X	X				Brooklyn, NY	OREA designed student data retrieval forms called DRFs to record quantitative student progress. They collected student achievement data for 492 students out of about 500. They used teacher surveys, teacher interviews, and site observation forms. Interviewed supervisors.

Citation	Student Characteristics	Behavioral	Cognitive Skills	Attitudinal	Educational Attainment and Participation	Institutional Practices	Instructional and Service Provider Characteristics	Parental	Other	Population	Relevant Data Information
Rowe, B., & Pfannenstiel J. C. (1994). <i>Formula Grants to States for Neglected or Delinquent Children</i> . (CFDA No. 84.013). Washington, DC: Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.	X					X	X			US	Compilation of data from several national articles. Includes program information and analysis.
Rutherford, R. B., Bullis, M., Anderson, C. W., & Griller-Clark, H. M. (2002). <i>Youth with disabilities in the correctional system: Prevalence rates and identification issues</i> . Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at: <a href="http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Youth%20with%20Disabilities.pdf">http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Youth%20with%20Disabilities.pdf</a>											Data provided (from previously published reports) include: Juvenile crime statistics (numbers incarcerated, reasons for incarceration); prevalence of special ed needs among juveniles in the criminal justice system and compared to the general school population- divided into Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, Mental Retardation and ADD/ADHD.
Sheffer, J. M., & Neglected & Delinquent State Advisory Committee. (2002). <i>2000-2001 Title I N&amp;D assessment report</i> . Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education	X		X							Pennsylvania	State collects data on students receiving N/D funds through a computer-based, online assessment tool on the Pennsylvania Department of Education website.
Sinclair, B. (2002). <i>State ESEA Title I participation information for 1999-2000: Final summary report</i> . Rockville, MD: Westat.						X				US	Data taken from Consolidated State Performance Reports. Numbers and percentages of state agency N/D participants receiving Title I services in each state, broken down by type of institution (neglected, delinquent, adult correctional), also numbers and percentages of N/D institutions in each state of each of the three types
Sinclair, B. (2003). <i>State ESEA Title I participation information for 2000-2001: Summary report: Second draft</i> . Rockville, MD: Westat.						X				United States	Data taken from Consolidated State Performance Reports. Numbers and percentages of state agency N/D participants receiving Title I services in each state, broken down by type of institution (neglected, delinquent, adult correctional), also numbers and percentages of N/D institutions in each state of each of the three types
Sinclair, B., & Gutmann, B. (1994). <i>State Chapter 1 participation and achievement information—1992-93 summary report</i> . Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377 277)			X			X				United States	Data taken from Consolidated State Performance Reports. Number of participants eligible for and receiving N/D program services, disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, by age and type of institution, and by service area by type of institution.
Sinclair, B., & Guttman, B. (1993). <i>A summary of State Chapter 1 participation and achievement information – 1990-91</i> . Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 376 226)			X							United States	Data taken from Consolidated State Performance Reports. Number of participants eligible for and receiving N/D program services, disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, by age and type of institution, and by service area by type of institution.
Tashjian, M. (2000). <i>Study of local agency activities under the Title I, Part D program</i> . Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education.										Counties in California, Florida, Texas, Michigan, Minnesota, Vermont, Nebraska, Kansas, Kentucky	Collection of data from NAEP and state and district reported results. Data is categorized into promising results and continuing challenges. Student outcomes, available resources, and areas that need improvement are included.
Tashjian, M. D. (2001). <i>State agency activities under the Title I, Part D, program: Mail survey of agencies that operate Title I programs for neglected or delinquent youth in state institutions: Final report</i> . Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.						X	X			United States	Meta-analysis of state data collected by mail survey from N/D facilities across the country. Demographic characteristics of students served, services offered, academic achievement, program characteristics, use of N/D funds.

Citation	Student Characteristics	Behavioral	Cognitive Skills	Attitudinal	Educational Attainment and Participation	Institutional Practices	Instructional and Service Provider Characteristics	Parental	Other	Population	Relevant Data Information
Torbet, P., et al. (1996). <i>State responses to serious and violent juvenile crime</i> . Washington, D.C: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.						X				United States	This report documents the changes in the handling of serious and violent juvenile offenders through an analysis of all legislation enacted 1992-1995.
U.S. Department of Education. (1999). <i>Promising results, continuing challenges: Final report of the national assessment of Title I: Highlights</i> . Washington, DC: Author. Available at <a href="http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/highlights.html">http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/highlights.html</a>			X		X						Collection of data from NAEP and state and district reported results. Data is categorized into promising results and continuing challenges. Student outcomes, available resources, and areas that need improvement
Wilson, S. J., Lipsey, M. W., & Soydon, H. (2003). Are mainstream programs for juvenile delinquency less effective with minority youth than majority youth? A meta-analysis of outcomes research. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i> , 13(1), 3-26.	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	United States, New Zealand, Great Britain, Australia	The following indicators were considered: academic achievement, attitude change, behavior problems, employment status, family functioning, internalizing problems, peer relations, psychological adjustment, school participation, and self-esteem
Wolford, B. (2000). <i>Juvenile justice education: Who is educating the youth?</i> Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University, Council for Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth.						X				United States	National survey on how state department of education funds were being used to serve youth in the juvenile justice system. Data include per pupil funding; educational services provided.