

CHAPTER 16

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

16.1 Introduction

With the publication of this 2000 Annual Report, the Juvenile Justice Educational Enhancement Program (JJEPP) completes nearly three years of operation. During this period, many policy and practice changes have occurred that together have contributed to higher expectations, standards, and performance in Florida's provision of quality and effective juvenile justice education. This chapter includes three subsequent sections. Section 16.2 provides an individual summary of each chapter that comprises this annual report. Section 16.3 discusses particular implications of some of our 2000 activities and research efforts, and 16.4 closes with a series of policy recommendations.

16.2 Summary

Chapter 1: Introduction

General oversight of education programs for students in juvenile justice programs is through the Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services, Division of Public Schools and Community Education, the Florida Department of Education (DOE). Consistent with the provisions of §228.081(5), F.S., DOE awarded JJEPP, a discretionary project, which operates under the auspices of the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Florida State University, to assist DOE in ensuring high-quality education for youths in juvenile justice education programs through the following functions:

- conduct quality assurance (QA) reviews of the education programs in Florida's juvenile justice facilities
- provide technical assistance to improve education programs
- conduct research that identifies most promising educational practices and validates best practices
- provide policy recommendations to DOE to ensure the successful transition of students back into their school, community, and/or work settings

Chapter 2: Juvenile Justice Education Legislation: Implementation Updates

House Bill 349 (1999 Legislation)—In 1999, the Florida Legislature enacted important and comprehensive legislation in House Bill (HB) 349 for Florida juvenile justice education. This legislation mandated a series of interrelated actions aimed at achieving and maintaining quality juvenile justice education throughout Florida. In 2000, the legislature made several refinements to juvenile justice education requirements in Senate Bill (SB) 2464.

Included in HB 349 are specific requirements for DOE, which include the development of:

- a new administrative rule
- model contracts for educational service providers
- QA evaluation of school districts, both as providers and as contract managers
- model transition procedures for students moving into and out of Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) programs
- a standardized content of educational records as part of the student’s commitment record
- model procedures for securing educational records in DJJ programs
- the waiving of General Education Development (GED) testing fees for students in DJJ programs
- the notification to school districts to allow students 16 years of age and over to take the GED exams prior to their exit from the program
- the designation of a coordinator for juvenile justice educational programs to serve as the DOE point of contact
- the development or selection and implementation of a common battery of assessment tools for DJJ programs
- the establishment and operation either directly or indirectly through a contract, a mechanism to provide QA, technical assistance, and research related to education “best practices” in juvenile justice
- the annual reporting of QA results, the status of cooperative agreements and contracts, exceptional student education (ESE), funding, and recommendations
- the development of a system for collecting information on the academic performance of students and reporting on the results

These requirements have been and are continuing to be addressed through multiple strategies, including (1) the development of Rule 6A-6.05281, FAC, which addresses procedures for student assessment, student records, transition services, contract requirements, and interventions and sanctions for low-performing programs, (2) the development and dissemination of DOE memoranda, technical assistance papers, and other documents to school districts that address student assessment, transition services, contract requirements, GED procedures, ESE services, and other issues that effect juvenile justice education programs, (3) the revision of QA standards to address the requirements in HB 349, and (4) numerous inservice training opportunities for school district and provider personnel, including regional meetings, trainings, and conferences.

SB 2464 (2000 Legislation)—Among other initiatives, SB 2464 clarified, modified, and/or amended requirements resulting from HB 349. The majority of the modifications included “the intent of the legislature that youth in the juvenile justice system be provided...effective education that will meet the individual needs of each child.” SB 2464 reverses the funding formula that was implemented under HB 349 to remain the same as that for public schools, and the administrative fees for General Education Development (GED) testing that were waived in HB 349 are clarified in SB 2464 to be the responsibility of the school district who may require providers to pay by contractual agreement.

New requirements in SB 2464 include (1) school districts providing instructional personnel at facilities of 50 beds/slots or more access to the district’s school system database for the purpose of accessing student records, (2) a cooperative agreement and plan for juvenile justice education service enhancement between DJJ and DOE be developed annually, (3) youths who have not received a high school diploma or its equivalent and are not employed while in a DJJ program or on conditional release status shall participate in vocational/technical education or post secondary education, subject to available funding, (4) full-time juvenile justice teachers are eligible for the critical teacher shortage tuition-reimbursement program, (5) juvenile justice programs may use a 30-day exemption for students’ immunization records, (6) encourages the development of academic and vocational protocols, and (7) provides for education services for minors in local jails.

Most of these requirements are now being implemented. A cooperative agreement between DOE and DJJ has been developed and is awaiting the approval of the newly elected Commissioner of Education. The multi-agency vocational plan will address the issue of providing vocational and/or post secondary education services to youths who have already received their high school diplomas. The 2001 educational QA standards require commitment and day treatment programs to offer elective courses in life skills, vocational, or post secondary opportunities to these youths, and the standards clarify that programs of 50 beds/slots or more should have access to the school district’s student database in the same manner as other schools in the district.

Among the mandates in SB 2464 is the completion of three studies to be coordinated by DOE. SB 2464 requires DOE to conduct a facilities study, a funding study, and develop a multi-agency plan for vocational/technical education. These studies are available through the DOE, and it is anticipated that the results of these studies could influence the 2001 legislative session and future QA standards and DOE requirements.

DOE will continue to provide program models, training, and assistance to ensure effective implementation of the various components of quality educational programs for students in juvenile justice facilities. Standards and indicators, which address these components, have also been incorporated into the 2001 QA process.

Chapter 3: Analyses of 2000 Quality Assurance Review Results

During 2000, JJEPP reviewed 203 education programs. During the time the QA reviews were conducted, the programs supervised 9,138 students. Approximately 7,219 (79%) of

these were male, while 1,919 (21%) were female. Regarding race/ethnicity, approximately 4,295 (47%) of these students were African-American, 4,021 (44%) were white, and 822 (9%) were of other race/ethnic backgrounds. Further, 3,381 (37%) of these youths participated in ESE programs.

Among the 166 regular (non-deemed) QA reviews during 2000, 140 were long-term commitment programs, 5 were short-term commitment programs, and 21 were detention centers. Short-term commitment programs scored the highest overall (5.50), followed closely by long-term commitment programs (5.36), and detention centers (5.14). The overall mean score for all programs reviewed was 5.33. The highest rated standard in 2000 was Service Delivery, which averaged 5.59.

Level two and level six programs represented more than half of all programs in the state in 2000. Level six programs scored the highest of all security levels (5.50). With the exception of level 10 programs, all levels achieved a satisfactory performance, overall.

Forty-five school districts supervised juvenile justice educational programs that received full QA reviews in 1999 (one other school district supervised a program that was deemed). School districts were broken down into four categories, based on the number of programs supervised by each district to allow comparisons among districts with a similar number of programs. These districts supervised one to fourteen programs, with scores ranging from 3.06 to 6.56. Overall, six supervising districts received scores in the high satisfactory range, and four districts received scores in the below satisfactory range. No school districts received overall scores in the poor range. In general, larger school districts with more programs had the highest QA scores, and districts with only one program had the lowest scores.

There was substantial compliance among deemed and special deemed programs in meeting the requirements of the six priority indicators. As with non-deemed programs, results for the indicator relating to contract management and cooperative agreement were not calculated in the overall program score. For all programs, 96% of all indicators were rated satisfactory, including 97% among long-term commitment programs, 83% for the single short-term commitment program reviewed, and 50% for the single deemed detention center that was reviewed. The lowest rated indicator among deemed programs was Student Planning at 86% satisfactory. There was very little variation in compliance across security levels, school districts, or program providers among the deemed programs.

Overall, in 2000, 50 programs (30%) scored in the high satisfactory or superior range while 18 programs (11%) scored below satisfactory in overall performance. Programs with greater than 101 students showed the lowest average score of 4.74.

In comparing QA scores between 1999 and 2000, it must be emphasized that the 2000 QA standards were raised in several areas. Nonetheless, the 2000 QA scores continued to improve. Specifically, the number of superior or high satisfactory programs increased from 40 in 1999 to 50 in 2000, an increase of 25%. The number of poor or below satisfactory

programs decreased from 22 to 18, a decline of 18%. These data indicate that the overall quality of juvenile justice education in Florida is making major annual progress.

Chapter 4: Technical Assistance

DOE and JJEEP have continued their comprehensive efforts toward improved juvenile justice education programs through increased levels of technical assistance. Major methods of technical assistance are on-site assistance, written recommendations, information and resource dissemination, telephone consultations, as well as conferences, meetings, and training sessions that include the following:

- continued funding and support of the JJEEP project for QA reviews, follow-up assistance, and research
- staff and contracted consultant visits to school districts and juvenile justice sites
- conducting regional workshops on assessment for juvenile justice educators
- networking of juvenile justice education programs with related support projects (Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS), Multiagency Service Network for Students with Severe Emotional Disturbance, the Transition Center, Florida Inclusion Network)
- developing specialized resource documents on statutes and rules, literacy/reading instruction, assessment, model programs
- developing a futures planning guide for students with disabilities in juvenile justice education programs
- funding of a special project (Transition to Independence) to improve vocational awareness, employability readiness, and post-secondary outcomes for students, including those in juvenile justice programs
- coordinating a statewide institute for juvenile justice educators
- developing a comprehensive resource guide for juvenile justice education programs and continued dissemination of related information
- ongoing interagency workgroup on the implementation of 1999 legislation
- statewide meeting for input on QA standards
- regional meetings for training on QA standards
- training on curriculum development, assessment, facility planning, alternative education, quality improvement, contract management

As in 1999, transition continued to be the principal area requiring technical assistance. Technical assistance data show that the frequency of the provision of technical assistance by standard was:

- transition (87)
- service delivery (56)
- administration (47)
- contract management (17)

Data from the previous three years show a consistent pattern of technical assistance being provided most often in the areas of curriculum development, exit transition and the writing of academic plans.

Beginning in the spring of 2001, the fully operational, interactive JJEEP web site will allow school districts, programs, and other interested individuals to gain or request data or technical assistance from JJEEP online.

Chapter 5: Corrective Action Process

The corrective action process is intended to ensure that juvenile justice programs provide timely and quality educational services to juvenile justice students. The corrective action process for the 2000 QA cycle involved the addition of five priority indicators for long-term commitment and the addition of priority indicators for both short-term programs and detention centers. During the 2000 QA cycle, ten “priority” indicators were designated for both short-term and long-term commitment programs and nine “priority” indicators were designated for detention centers. Indicators designated as “priority” represent critical areas that require immediate attention by the program to ensure timely and quality educational services. The 2000 QA priority indicators included enrollment, student planning, exit transition, academic curriculum, ESE support services, instructional personnel qualifications, funding and support, cooperative agreement and contract requirements, contract management, and school district oversight and assistance.

During the 2000 QA cycle, JJEEP reviewers identified 219 corrective actions for commitment programs, which resulted in 85 programs being required to develop corrective action plans; and 23 corrective actions for detention programs. This resulted in 10 detention programs being required to write corrective action plans. The most frequent corrective actions concerned enrollment, student planning, and academic curriculum. These were also the three areas that received the most technical assistance in 2000.

The 2000 corrective action process also required DOE to utilize interventions and sanctions for programs under corrective actions. The interventions and sanctions are taken from Rule 6A-6.05281, FAC and are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

For the 2000 QA review cycle, 20 programs received letters of notification from DOE of funding reductions because of the school district’s failure to implement a 300-minute school day. Twenty-six (26) juvenile justice programs were required to write corrective action plans in both the 1999 and 2000 QA cycles. Of the programs that continued to have areas of noncompliance, only six had the same corrective action in both the 1999 and 2000 review cycle. Eight programs continued to have noncompliance issues within the same corrective action area during the 2000 QA review. The remaining 12 programs had new corrective action areas.

Programs that were found noncompliant in a priority indicator for two consecutive years will be required to have a follow-up visit by a JJEEP staff member to ensure that the corrective action plan has been implemented in an appropriate manner.

Corrective actions, along with the technical assistance provided by DOE and JJEEP staff, have proven to be an effective strategy in the improvement of educational programs. The level of cooperation from the programs during this process is to be commended. Each of the 85 programs working on corrective actions this year has made and continues to make every effort to correct areas of noncompliance.

Chapter 6: Pre- and Post-Education Outcomes

In a preliminary assessment of pre- and post-education outcomes of 64 juvenile justice education programs, it was found that youths in these juvenile justice commitment facilities are, in general, academically deficient as determined by grade level and pre- and post-academic test results measured in relation to their age. These youths are, on average, two to three years behind in their educational levels. However, the findings indicate that while in the facilities, youths are actively involved in education programs and are accumulating academic credits that reflect normal pupil progression rates, and are improving their academic ability levels based upon academic pre- and post-tests. Moreover, and very importantly, these preliminary outcome analyses indicate a positive correlation between higher education program QA scores and positive education outcome measures. While these data are not conclusive, they demonstrate the potential importance of quality education in facilitating successful community reintegration of these youths. Beginning in July 2001, JJEEP plans statewide data collection and analysis of pre- and post-education outcomes through the state database for student information for each commitment program operating in the state.

Chapter 7: Longitudinal Research

In the initial implementation of JJEEP's longitudinal research, six programs were selected for a pilot study based upon their QA scores, type of students served, and geographic location. Preliminary findings from these six programs demonstrate that higher QA performing programs have more students returning to school compared to those programs with lower QA scores. During the 2001 cycle, JJEEP will continue to develop and expand its longitudinal research efforts to include a larger group of programs and expanded data measurements of community integration (i.e., recidivism, school, work, family, and self report data).

Chapter 8: Evolving Best Practices in Juvenile Justice Education

Several best practices have been identified that include: initial multiple assessments, individual academic student planning, multi-faceted curriculum, psychosocial educational curriculum, individualized instructional delivery, effective school environment, and transition/aftercare services. Programs operating with increased numbers of these best practices received proportionately higher QA scores than programs with fewer of these best practices.

Chapter 9: Aftercare Research

To date, in JJEEP's efforts to determine the effectiveness of various aftercare programs, the focus has been on recidivism rates. The findings indicate that day treatment aftercare programs have higher recidivism rates than community-based aftercare programs. However, these results may merely reflect the fact that day treatment aftercare programs serve primarily higher risk youths. No significant differences in recidivism rates were found between publicly operated aftercare programs and private not-for-profit aftercare programs. However, different geographic regions of the state have different rates of recidivism. During the 2001 cycle, JJEEP, as part of the longitudinal research effort, will be expanding the assessment of aftercare beyond recidivism to include other measures of community reintegration.

Chapter 10: Privatization

Whether juvenile justice commitment programs are administered publicly, privately not-for-profit, or privately for-profit was not found to be significant to the quality of education services provided to students as measured by QA scores. However, who administers the education programs within these facilities is very significant to the quality of education programs as measured by QA scores. Specifically, public providers of education received higher QA scores than did private providers. The major areas in which this difference is found relate directly to the quality of the educational administration and the academic competencies of the teachers in the classroom. For example, among public education providers, 79% of the instructors are full-time professionally certified teachers compared to 33% for private not-for-profit providers and only 21% for private for-profit providers.

Chapter 11: Special Education Services in Juvenile Justice Education

The data gathered by JJEEP during the 2000 QA cycle indicates that approximately 37% of all incarcerated youths are identified as in need of ESE services. Moreover, nearly 1/3 of these youths are identified as Severe Learning Disabled (SLD), and 41% are identified as emotionally disabled. These statistics demonstrate that juvenile justice educators need to be especially prepared to teach students with disabilities. Specifically, all educators must have complete access to accommodations to meet the needs of these students and should be certified in the area of ESE whenever possible.

A review of QA scores compiled for two years indicates that long-term commitment programs generally are providing satisfactory services to disabled youths. Further, there has been slight improvement in 2000 scores for most indicators addressing special education services over 1999 scores.

The QA scores for both 1999 and 2000 reveal that overall program performance for modifications and accommodations in the curriculum as required for students with disabilities fell in the satisfactory range and demonstrate that programs are making

determined efforts to apply modifications and accommodations as required for students with disabilities. The number of programs receiving a score of partial has decreased by 50% since 1999. It is imperative that all programs score at least in the satisfactory range to ensure that students with disabilities are being served appropriately.

The data indicate that the majority of programs and school districts are providing support services and support personnel to deliver services outlined within existing IEPs. Overall, these data reveal that programs have improved the quality of support services and that 79% of programs in 2000 provided full student support services.

Chapter 12: Gender

During the past five years in Florida, for each of the major categories of crime (violent, property, drug, and public order), the percentage increase in commitment admissions for girls was considerably greater than for boys. Prior research has conclusively established a need for gender-specific programming and education services for incarcerated girls. Several gender-specific services and education models have been developed and appear to be promising. However, in Florida and elsewhere throughout the country, efforts aimed at gender-specific programming have been fragmented with most states continuing to operate with a male focus.

Chapter 13: Contracts and Contract Management

The update in Chapter 13 on the status of contracts and contract management reported that HB 349 required DOE to develop model contracts and that the QA process evaluate school districts both as direct service providers and as contract managers. To address these requirements, JJEEP developed and added a new standard (contract management) to the 2000 QA standards, and Rule 6A-6.05281, FAC, was initiated by DOE. A technical assistance paper (TAP) will also be written explaining the requirements for cooperative agreements and contracts with private providers, and effective contract management strategies. Rule 6A-6.05281, FAC, also requires that school districts submit all of their cooperative agreements and contracts annually to DOE.

Overall, 68% of all the statutory and rule requirements were present in the 40 cooperative agreements reviewed, but only 49% of the total requirements for contracts were found in the 60 contracts reviewed.

Most programs reviewed were in compliance with the contract management indicators, with only 15 of 166 noncompliant for E4.02 and E4.03. However, the results are quite different for public and privately operated education programs. Public programs that are directly operated by local school districts had a full compliance rating that was 30% higher than privately operated programs, and the mean QA score for Standard Four was significantly higher for public education providers. This finding may suggest that school districts, which are responsible for contract management, may provide better administrative oversight of the programs that they directly operate than those they contract with for educational services.

Chapter 14: Facility Size, Education, and Other Performance Measures

Florida, with the employment of tough love and economy of scale rationales, is moving toward larger and more custody focused juvenile justice facilities with 100 bed capacities or more. JJEEP's research on the role of facility size revealed a number of negative consequences for education, including lower QA education scores for larger facilities. Additionally, larger schools have a negative impact on student exam-performance measures; and student participation, satisfaction, and discipline. Whether consideration is given to the square footage of the facility, the number of students in the facility, or measures of density/crowding, the accumulated research evidence supports the conclusion that larger facilities have more negative consequences than do smaller community-based facilities for education as well as other performance measures, such as recidivism. Small, community-based programs appear to offer the greatest prospects for effective education and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders by equipping them with the skills necessary for successful community reintegration.

Chapter 15: Teacher Certification

In 2000, there were 877 teachers in Florida's more than 200 juvenile justice education programs. Of this total, 482 or 55% of these teachers are professionally certified, 228 (26%) have either statements of eligibility or temporary certificates, 42 (5%) had vocational certification, and 125 (14%) were not certified. Many factors prevent a higher number of teachers with professional certification in juvenile justice educational programs, including a lack of newly trained teachers, raised education standards and higher expectations, lower salaries for teachers, and very high rates of attrition because of difficult working conditions. As a result, in an effort to hire certified teachers, many Florida juvenile justice programs have relied upon alternative and temporary certificates. Given the long and well-established relationship between certified teachers and quality education, innovative efforts to develop, recruit, and retain certified teachers in Florida's juvenile justice education programs are needed. Ongoing professional development and increased targeted training are planned for the 2001 QA cycle. Additionally, given the importance of employing teachers with professional certification in juvenile justice education programs, JJEEP will continue to collect data on teacher certification and encourage expanding the research in this area.

16.3 Discussion

It was reported in JJEEP's 1999 Annual Report to the Department of Education, that Florida's QA, technical assistance, and research efforts were found by consultant, Dr. Bruce Wolford, a national expert on juvenile justice education, to be exemplary and worthy of replication throughout the country. In fact, and as stated previously, during 2000, JJEEP shared its purposes, methodology, and findings at a number of national and international meetings. Additionally, in 2000, JJEEP produced an edited book titled, *Data-Driven Juvenile Justice Education*, which details its procedures and practices. This book is being published by the Correctional Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth Association

(CEARDY) and will be distributed nationally by the American Correctional Association (ACA).

Florida, as evidenced by these efforts and accomplishments, has clearly elevated its juvenile justice education practices. However, as reported in Chapter 14 on facility size, the state may be embarking upon a trend that could alter this progressive path. Specifically, in the aftermath of *Bobby M.* in the early 1980s, Florida was required to move toward smaller community-based facilities for juvenile justice youths. Additionally, the state implemented a QA system and enacted a series of legislative requirements in the 1990s, which truly distinguished Florida with regard to accountable juvenile justice education and treatment practices. Further, the QA system, initially implemented in 1994, has not remained static but rather has been annually modified and improved by combined DJJ, DOE, and legislative action. HB 349, for example, mandated a series of policy changes that were driven, not only by professional concerns and changing needs, but very importantly, by research and data. Specifically, HB 349 legally mandated ongoing research to identify and validate best practices to ensure continuous quality improvement. Such legislative vision and action mandating that juvenile justice education policy be guided by best practice research is truly remarkable and unprecedented.

While these actions and their results have indeed set Florida apart from the rest of the nation, the state may now be moving in a direction that could undermine these previous gains. To elaborate, the *Bobby M.* consent decree was fully vacated in 1996. At that time, the approximate average population within Florida's juvenile justice facilities was 30, and the largest juvenile justice facilities were Dozier and Okeechobee School for Boys with populations of 100. Between 1996 and 1999, Dozier's population almost doubled to 196. In late 1996, DJJ opened two new facilities namely Polk Youth Development Center and Pahokee Youth Development Center. Both of these facilities opened with populations of 350 youths. In 1999, Hastings Youth Academy opened with a population of 185 youths. Currently, there are plans for a Miami/Dade facility with a 300-population capacity and a Martin County facility with a 220-population capacity.

JJEEP's 2000 QA review of Sago Palm Academy (formerly Pahokee Youth Development Center) provides illustration of the critical role of facility size and population on program quality. In August 2000, JJEEP and DJJ conducted their annual QA review of the Sago Palm Facility. The program failed the QA review by both DJJ and JJEEP in 2000, as it had in 1999. Further, the program failed the education QA in 1997 and 1998 resulting in marginal performance in its overall QA rating. During these four years, the program operated with a population of 350 youths. Following JJEEP's 2000 QA review, a letter from JJEEP to the DOE reported the QA results and urged immediate steps be taken to reduce the population at Sago Palm Academy. Subsequent action by the Commissioner of Education, the Governor's Office, and DJJ resulted in a 100 youth reduction. In January 2001, JJEEP conducted a follow-up visit to Sago Palm Academy to determine what steps had been taken to improve the facility's education program. It was found that numerous corrective actions were underway, and because of the reduction in size, these actions appeared to have contributed to a more effective and safe learning environment for students. While the facility has a number of other problems to overcome, serious consideration of further population reductions would

likely facilitate the reduction in these problems and substantially increase the program's quality.

It is clear from past experience and reported research results, that larger facilities and larger schools are not as effective as smaller facilities and schools. This does not mean that large is automatically bad, but rather, it means that most often smaller facilities and schools produce better outcomes. Since Florida's ultimate goal for its juvenile justice facilities is the successful community reintegration of juvenile justice youths, and because smaller juvenile justice facilities have proven to be most effective in achieving this goal, Florida should seriously reconsider its move toward larger juvenile justice facilities.

While it has been suggested from an economy of scale argument that operating larger facilities rather than smaller facilities can produce major cost savings, several issues warrant mention. While some modest initial cost savings might be achieved in comparing the average per youth costs between larger and smaller facilities, if smaller facilities are indeed more effective in ultimate community reintegration, any modest initial cost savings would be erased and numerous other cost factors would greatly increase. The question is simple: Should our juvenile justice policies be guided by short-term or long-term gains? For example, it has been reported by the National Institute of Justice (1996) that the annual cost of crime, not including drug offenses, is \$450 billion per year. However, when pain, suffering, and decreased quality of life are factored in, the annual cost would mean many billions more. Clearly, crime is expensive, and any effective means to reduce crime should not be ignored because of prevailing belief or convenience. Stated differently, do we pay now, or pay a lot more later because of ineffective policies?

With regard to best juvenile justice educational practices, several comments warrant mention. To begin, JJEEP has found that the more "best practices" are used, the higher the QA scores. Moreover, the higher the QA scores, the better the pre- and post-outcomes and community reintegration measures. While continuing research is underway to refine and validate these relationships, it is essential that lower QA performing programs be encouraged and supported through various measures to incorporate more "best practice" activities. Such support could include the identification of a number of demonstration program sites where visits and training can be offered. Further, DOE's funding study may well have direct implications that will assist programs with their respective implementations of these recognized best practices.

Concerning teacher qualifications, the use of professionally certified teachers for academic core areas and ESE certified teachers for ESE services must be expanded greatly if Florida is to significantly embrace quality education in juvenile justice. Certified and high quality teachers are strongly correlated with quality and effective education.

16.4 Recommendations for System Improvement

In relation to JJEEP's 2000 activities and research results, the following recommendations are provided:

- ❖ DOE should consider requiring only professionally certified teachers to teach in their respective certified core academic areas (i.e., reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science).
- ❖ DOE should consider requiring only ESE professionally certified teachers to provide ESE services.
- ❖ DOE should consider requiring all education programs to report, during their QA review, all generated education funds and expenditures.
- ❖ DOE should recommend to the legislature a request for funding to conduct a special study concerning gender specific programming for girls in Florida's juvenile justice system that includes recommendations for the 2002 legislative session.
- ❖ DOE should consider convening a conference involving DJJ, legislators, and educators to reconsider the development and use of larger juvenile justice facilities. The conference should focus upon research concerning what is "known" about the effectiveness and real costs of larger versus smaller juvenile justice facilities.
- ❖ In 2001, JJEPP should provide a statewide training on contract management. All school district administrators assigned as contract managers should be invited. The training should include the use of measurable, objective contract language and the use of a contract database to measure providers' performances. The training should also include effective interagency collaboration strategies for implementing policy at the local level.
- ❖ DOE should consider requiring and holding school districts and programs accountable for collecting and submitting various DJJ student education outcome data.
- ❖ DOE and JJEPP should develop specific benchmarks to be used for outcome analysis, such as credits earned, pre- and post-assessment testing, and pupil progression rates applicable to DJJ student education outcomes.
- ❖ DOE should consider requiring statewide standardized testing to determine if students in juvenile justice facilities are acquiring competitive education skills.
- ❖ DOE should work with JJEPP to develop an annual report prepared by DOE's automated student data information system on the following information for individual DJJ students: last school attended, last grade completed, number of high school credits earned, grade point average (GPA), ESE information, and prior school behavior (such as incident reports, suspensions, expulsions, and attendance).
- ❖ DOE should consider providing resources for the needed expansion of technical assistance for juvenile justice education teachers and administrators throughout the state.

