

## **CHAPTER 3**

# **ANALYSES OF 2000 QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW RESULTS**

### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents data collected by the Juvenile Justice Educational Enhancement Program (JJEED) throughout the 2000 quality assurance (QA) review cycle. The primary sources of the data are the QA reviews, during which reviewers collect information relating to transition, service delivery, administration, and contract management for each juvenile justice educational program. Additionally, each program is asked to complete a supplemental data collection form that provides general information about the facility and educational providers, facility and educational staff, and current student demographics. These data provide the basis from which to analyze QA review results in relation to various program characteristics and to assist in the specification of facility and student outcomes, such as school success (e.g., graduation rates, standardized test scores, pre- and post-test results) and continuation of delinquency (e.g., arrest rates, recommitment rates). These outcome and longitudinal tracking capabilities are still being developed, but the data already collected provide the foundation for subsequent research.

The data and analyses presented in this and following chapters are primarily derived from the 203 QA reviews conducted by JJEED during the 2000 QA review cycle. Thirty-seven of these programs have deemed or special deemed status and, therefore, received shorter deemed QA reviews (see Chapter 1 for a discussion of the deemed QA review protocol). On the days the QA reviews were conducted, these programs supervised 9,138 students who, depending on program type and students' performance in the programs, remain in the programs from one day (in detention centers) to three years (in level 10 facilities). The students' gender, race/ethnicity, and participation in exceptional student education (ESE) programs have been estimated from the self-reported population data that were provided to JJEED by most of the programs reviewed. The overall proportions of students in each category in relation to the total number of students provide the following estimates. The 2000 data indicate that 7,219 (79%) students in Florida's juvenile justice educational programs were male, and 1,919 (21%) were female. With regard to race/ethnicity, 4,295 (47%) students were African-American, 4,021 (44%) were white, and 822 (9%) were of other race/ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, 3,381 (37%) students participated in ESE programs.

This chapter is comprised of four subsequent sections that provide information relating to the database and its uses and general analyses of the 2000 QA review data findings. Section 3.2 provides specifics on the JJEED database, including data available and data reports that can be generated by JJEED staff upon request. Section 3.3 explains the QA review performance rating system. Section 3.4 presents QA review results by program type, security level, school

district, and educational program provider (for both regular and deemed status QA reviews). This section also presents tables relating to overall program performance and program scores by numbers of students. Section 3.5 presents a comparison of QA review scores from 1999 to 2000. Section 3.6 summarizes the QA review findings for 2000.

## **3.2 Database**

One of JJEEP's fundamental activities since its inception has been the ongoing development of a database. The database has evolved into a comprehensive research tool that has enabled JJEEP to address many important questions concerning effective educational practices in juvenile justice facilities.

The database is comprised of various data fields that include numerous program information items and related variables. This information, as well as various other related variables and pre- and post-academic outcome measures, is collected by the QA reviewer during the QA review and is based on interviews, observations, and document reviews.

These data are useful in diagnosing program needs and identifying potential needs for technical assistance, as well as providing a snapshot of overall performance by educational programs. The expectation is that as the database grows over the next several years, more comprehensive program descriptions, explanations, and predictions will be made to facilitate major improvements and best practices in Florida's juvenile justice educational programs.

Currently, the database contains information on each QA review conducted by JJEEP and includes detailed QA review ratings and program information. For the 2000 QA review cycle, for example, the database contains over 100 fields of data for each program. While variables within the database may change from year to year, usually by the inclusion of more detailed information, the overall categories remain consistent and include the following: contact information, program information, provider information, educational information, student information, and QA review score information.

JJEEP staff frequently use the database in their efforts to provide technical assistance to programs, network educational program personnel, and conduct internal research. JJEEP is also able to provide information relating to the educational QA review process that is useful to juvenile justice educators, program providers, and school districts in Florida. The information contained in the JJEEP database is used in preparing the data presented in this annual report, but there are numerous other reports that can be—and are—generated from the database upon request.

An ongoing purpose of the database is to assist programs, contracted providers, and school districts in obtaining information relevant to the educational QA process. Comparing one program's QA review scores with another's, or comparing one school district or provider to another, is often useful in diagnosing program needs or identifying potential needs for technical assistance.

Currently, the JJEEP database is capable of providing a variety of reports to assist programs, providers, school districts, and other interested parties in understanding factors relating to the quality of juvenile justice education in Florida. All data can be grouped, sorted, or otherwise organized for various analyses. Frequently requested—and, for most purposes, the most useful—are the groupings of QA review scores by school district, provider, security level, and other program characteristics, and the groupings of all programs sorted either alphabetically or by QA review scores.

When requesting information from the JJEEP database, please be as specific as possible concerning the exact information needed and how the data will be used. This information will be helpful in generating reports. Information can be requested by contacting JJEEP by mail, phone, or fax (345 S. Magnolia Drive, Suite D-23, Tallahassee, FL 32301-2987; phone: 850-414-8355; fax: 850-414-8357).

### **3.3 Performance Rating System**

The QA review process uses multiple data sources to evaluate the quality of educational services provided by each DJJ educational program. Information about educational performance is gathered by QA reviewers through (1) reviews of policies, documents, and files; (2) interviews with school administrators, support personnel, teachers, and students; and (3) observations of educational activities and services. Indicator ratings are based on substantiated information using these multiple sources to verify program practices. Educational QA review ratings are determined using the same methodology and rating scales for each DJJ educational program.

Educational QA reviewers examine each program utilizing the set of indicators designed for each program type: residential short-term commitment, residential long-term commitment, and detention centers. Residential short-term commitment programs are designed to supervise students for periods up to 60 days. Residential long-term commitment programs supervise students from 61 days to 3 years, depending on program security level, the judge's sentence, and student performance. Detention centers hold students between one day and one year, usually until students are sentenced or while students are awaiting placement in a commitment program. Because of the different time frames and purposes of these different program types, each type is held to its own educational requirements.

Though each program type is expected to perform specific functions within the three QA standards for which programs are responsible (transition, service delivery, and administration), each program type's set of indicators is adapted to meet the needs of students in that program type. The specific content of and total number of indicators within each standard vary by program type. As a result, comparisons of averages of a specific indicator across program types are not appropriate. However, comparisons across program type are possible using the means of each standard and the overall mean of the three standards for which programs are responsible. Scores for Standard Four: Contract Management do not affect the overall mean for a program; they reflect the responsibilities of the local school district.

## Performance and Compliance Indicators

There are two types of indicators—performance and compliance—and each type has its own rating scale. For performance indicators, programs may receive superior, satisfactory, partial, or nonperformance ratings. For compliance indicators, programs may receive full compliance, substantial compliance, or noncompliance ratings. For complete information on the educational QA review rating scales, see Chapter 1.

In the tables that appear in this chapter, for each program, an average score of all applicable indicators under each of the four QA standards is calculated. This is called the “mean QA review score for a QA standard” or the “standard mean.” Also, for each program, an overall average score for the three QA standards for which an educational program is responsible (transition, service delivery, and administration) is calculated. This is called the “overall mean.”

## Categories of Overall Performance

There are six categories of overall performance that educational programs are divided into, based on the overall mean of their QA review scores for Standards One through Three:

- Superior Performance (an overall mean of 7.00-9.00)
- High Satisfactory Performance (an overall mean of 6.00-6.99)
- Satisfactory Performance (an overall mean of 5.00-5.99)
- Marginal Satisfactory Performance (an overall mean of 4.00-4.99)
- Below Satisfactory Performance (an overall mean of 1.00-3.99)
- Poor Performance (an overall mean of 0.00-0.99)

The 2000 QA review scores (including specific indicator scores for each program) for every program reviewed are listed in Appendix D. This appendix groups all programs according to the analyses provided in this chapter, namely: program type, security level, school district, program provider (including specific providers and their profit status), and number of students.

## 3.4 2000 Educational QA Review Findings

The following comparisons provide information regarding the performance of various program types and administrative models. It is important to take into account the changes in the educational QA standards from 1999 to 2000 when making cross-year comparisons and in drawing conclusions about changes in performance scores from year to year. Specifically, it should be noted that the standards have generally become more demanding, reflecting the “raising of the bar” and expected improvement in performance each year. It is also important to note that educational QA standards have changed significantly from 1999 (see Chapter 1) and that Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean of a program.

Because of the changes in the QA standards from 1999 to 2000, it is not appropriate to directly compare the overall mean from one year to another; however, general comparisons can be made regarding overall performance of programs from one year to another and are summarized in Section 3.5.

Of the 203 programs reviewed by JJEEP in 2000, 37 were deemed or special deemed, and 166 were nondeemed (i.e., regular). Because deemed/special deemed programs do not receive a full regular QA review and are not given numerical ratings for each indicator, the analyses of QA review findings for deemed/special deemed programs and nondeemed programs are separated. Tables 3.4-1 through 3.4-4 and Tables 3.4-9 through 3.4-12 provide QA review data for nondeemed programs and Tables 3.4-5 through 3.4-8 provide similar analyses for deemed/special deemed programs.

Average QA review ratings for Standard Four: Contract Management are not included in the computation of a program's overall mean score because this standard is intended as a measure of the supervising school district's performance and, therefore, does not reflect directly on an individual program's score. For more information on the standard for contract management, see Chapter 13.

Table 3.4-1 identifies mean QA review scores by program type (residential short-term commitment programs, residential long-term commitment programs, and detention centers). Although each of these program types is subject to different QA standards for education, including a different number of indicators and modified programmatic requirements, each is reviewed according to the same four standard areas: transition, service delivery, administration, and contract management. Programs can be compared by the mean of each QA standard as well as the mean of the overall QA review scores.

**Table 3.4-1: 2000 Mean QA Review Scores for Each QA Standard and Overall Mean Scores by Program Type**

Program Type	# of Programs	Transition	Service Delivery	Administration	*Contract Management	Overall Mean
Detention Centers	21	4.45	5.42	5.63	5.02	5.14
Short-Term Commitment	5	5.45	6.25	5.03	5.20	5.50
Long-Term Commitment	140	5.12	5.59	5.35	4.99	5.36
All Programs Combined	166	5.05	5.59	5.38	5.00	5.33

Note: The total number of programs across all program types does not include deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. Furthermore, the overall mean cannot be calculated by summing the three standard averages and dividing by three—each standard must be weighted by the number of indicators within each standard, which varies by program type. Similarly, the means for all programs combined must be weighted by the number of programs in each category.

\*Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean for the 2000 QA review cycle.

All programs combined had an overall mean of 5.33 for educational QA review ratings. This finding is not surprising, as this score represents a mid-range (i.e., “satisfactory”) level of educational services. In other words, programs generally provided services that met the expectations and requirements of the State of Florida. Of course, there was substantial variation in the QA review scores for different programs and for different program types. For instance, individual program scores ranged from 2.24 to 7.72. Detention centers scored lower than residential short-term and long-term commitment programs in 2000, particularly in the area of transition, which is a difficult area for detention centers primarily because students enter and exit frequently and on an unpredictable schedule. Residential short-term commitment programs scored the highest, with an overall mean of 5.50. Of the QA standards for transition, service delivery, and administration, the highest rated standard across all program types was service delivery, which averaged 5.59. In contrast, transition was the lowest rated standard, with an average score of 5.05. The contract management standard, which reflects the responsibilities of the supervising school district, had an average score of 5.00.

Table 3.4-2 identifies the 2000 mean QA review scores for each QA standard and overall by security level. Overall mean scores range from 4.56 in the only level 10 program reviewed in 2000 to 5.50 in the level 6 programs reviewed. Level 2 and 6 programs constitute over half (96) of the total nondeemed programs (166).

**Table 3.4-2: 2000 Mean QA Review Scores for Each QA Standard and Overall Mean Scores by Security Level**

Level	# of Programs	Transition	Service Delivery	Administration	*Contract Management	Overall Mean
Detention	21	4.45	5.42	5.63	5.02	5.14
**2	39	5.33	5.62	5.32	5.21	5.42
4	17	5.20	5.67	5.21	4.55	5.34
6	57	5.21	5.79	5.49	5.12	5.50
8	20	4.75	5.23	5.23	4.63	5.07
10	1	5.00	4.00	4.67	6.00	4.56
Mixed Level	11	4.65	5.49	5.09	4.79	5.08
All Levels Combined	166	5.05	5.59	5.38	5.00	5.33

Note: The total number of programs across all program types does not include deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. Furthermore, the overall mean cannot be calculated by summing the three standard averages and dividing by three—each standard must be weighted by the number of indicators within each standard, which varies by program type. Similarly, the means for all programs combined must be weighted by the number of programs in each category.

\*Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean for the 2000 QA review cycle.

\*\*Programs operated by PACE Center for Girls, Inc. (day treatment prevention) and Orlando Marine Institute SAFE (aftercare) are included with level 2 (day treatment) programs.

Table 3.4-3 identifies the 2000 mean QA review scores for each QA standard and the overall mean scores for each of the 46 supervising school districts (not necessarily the same county in which the program is located) for both district-operated and district-contracted nondeemed programs. Because it is important to consider the total number of programs supervised by a school district when determining the overall quality of their juvenile justice educational programs, the table has been broken down into four categories based on the number of programs under the school districts' supervision (i.e., 1 program, 2 to 3 programs, 4 to 6 programs, and 7 to 14 programs). Within each category, the supervising school districts are listed in descending order by the overall mean of the QA review scores.

There are 16 school districts with only 1 program under their supervision. These programs display the widest range in overall mean QA review scores, with overall mean scores ranging from 3.06 for St. Johns County School District to 6.56 for Monroe County School District. Fourteen school districts supervise two to three programs, with overall mean scores ranging from 3.28 for Hendry County School District to 6.00 for Charlotte County School District and Washington County School District. Eight school districts supervise four to six programs, with overall mean scores ranging from 4.08 for Seminole County School District to 5.93 for Okaloosa County School District. Eight school districts supervise seven to fourteen programs, with overall mean scores ranging from 4.56 for Duval County School District to 6.28 in Volusia County School District.

As identified in Table 3.4-3, the overall mean QA review score increases as the number of educational programs supervised increases. For school districts supervising only one program, the overall mean score was 4.90; for school districts supervising two to three programs, it was 5.11; for school districts supervising four to six programs, it was 5.16; and for school districts supervising seven to fourteen programs, it was 5.61. As previously stated, the widest range of overall mean scores is seen in school districts supervising only one program. School districts that supervise more than one program have a smaller range because programs are averaged together and do not reflect the performance of a single program.

Of school districts supervising one program, three received high satisfactory scores (6.00-6.99), and three received below satisfactory scores (1.00-3.99). None of these school districts received poor scores (0.00-0.99). Of school districts supervising two to three programs, two received high satisfactory scores, and only one received below satisfactory scores. Of school districts supervising four to six programs, all received satisfactory scores (5.00-5.99). Of school districts supervising seven to fourteen programs, one scored in the high satisfactory range, and none scored in the below satisfactory range.

In total, 6 supervising school districts had overall mean scores in the high satisfactory range (6.00-6.99), 23 had overall mean scores in the satisfactory range (5.00-5.99), 13 had overall mean scores in the marginal satisfactory range (4.00-4.99), and 4 had overall mean scores in the below satisfactory range (1.00-3.99). No supervising school districts had overall mean scores in the superior range (7.00-9.00) or the poor range (0.00-0.99).

While it may not be appropriate to judge a particular school district when its ranking is a reflection of a single program in one year, the high ratings for Pinellas, Broward, and Volusia school districts are notable considering the relatively large number of programs supervised by each of these school districts. It is also important to take into consideration the number of deemed/special deemed programs per school district because the exclusion of deemed/special deemed programs removes some very high-scoring programs from the calculation of the means (see Table 3.4-7).

**Table 3.4-3: 2000 Mean of QA Review Scores for Each QA Standard and Overall Mean Scores, Ranked by Overall Mean for District-Operated and District-Contracted Educational Programs**

# of Programs Supervised	Supervising School District	# of Programs	Transition	Service Delivery	Administration	*Contract Management	Overall Mean
1 Program	Monroe	1	6.83	7.00	5.83	4.67	6.56
	Osceola	1	5.67	6.50	6.33	6.00	6.17
	DeSoto	1	5.50	6.50	6.33	6.00	6.11
	Liberty	1	6.33	5.83	5.17	5.33	5.78
	Holmes	1	6.17	5.33	5.67	5.33	5.72
	Hamilton	1	5.67	5.33	5.67	6.00	5.56
	Walton	1	4.33	6.50	5.67	5.33	5.50
	Glades	1	4.67	6.00	5.00	2.00	5.22
	Bradford	1	6.00	5.75	3.83	6.00	5.00
	Citrus	1	5.00	4.00	4.67	6.00	4.56
	Nassau	1	4.33	4.67	4.33	1.33	4.44
	Highlands	1	3.83	4.67	4.17	3.33	4.22
	Levy	1	4.50	4.50	3.50	0.00	4.17
	Jefferson	1	2.00	2.67	4.83	4.00	3.24
	Hernando	1	2.83	3.17	3.33	4.67	3.11
St. Johns	1	2.00	3.00	4.17	0.00	3.06	
	<b>Mean</b>		<b>4.73</b>	<b>5.09</b>	<b>4.91</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.90</b>
2-3 Programs	Charlotte	3	6.28	6.00	5.72	6.00	6.00
	Washington	3	5.95	5.89	6.17	5.78	6.00
	Martin	2	4.92	6.92	5.50	4.34	5.78
	Okeechobee	2	5.75	5.59	5.50	6.00	5.61
	Collier	3	5.89	5.45	5.06	5.33	5.46
	Sarasota	3	5.86	5.86	4.94	4.67	5.45
	Manatee	3	4.11	6.17	5.89	5.33	5.36
	Madison	3	4.72	5.83	4.72	3.55	5.09
	St. Lucie	2	4.59	5.67	5.00	5.34	5.04
	Lee	3	3.67	5.11	5.00	5.78	4.60
	Alachua	3	4.06	4.83	4.83	3.33	4.56
	Santa Rosa	2	3.42	5.34	4.67	3.00	4.52
	Escambia	3	4.00	4.97	4.33	2.89	4.39
	Hendry	2	2.50	4.50	2.83	4.00	3.28
		<b>Mean</b>		<b>4.76</b>	<b>5.58</b>	<b>5.05</b>	<b>4.68</b>

4-6 Programs	Okaloosa	5	5.60	6.17	6.00	6.00	5.93
	Brevard	4	5.34	6.21	5.75	5.83	5.77
	Pasco	5	5.60	5.55	5.43	4.93	5.52
	Leon	6	5.25	5.60	5.36	5.67	5.42
	Bay	4	4.29	5.11	5.29	5.33	4.91
	Marion	4	4.21	5.23	5.13	5.17	4.84
	Palm Beach	5	3.91	5.03	4.74	5.47	4.57
	Seminole	4	3.42	4.57	4.38	4.67	4.08
	<b>Mean</b>		<b>4.76</b>	<b>5.45</b>	<b>5.28</b>	<b>5.41</b>	<b>5.16</b>
7-14 Programs	Volusia	10	6.23	6.31	6.30	6.00	6.28
	Hillsborough	9	5.07	6.42	6.22	5.93	5.88
	Orange	10	5.78	5.80	5.82	5.67	5.79
	Pinellas	14	5.44	5.84	5.82	4.57	5.70
	Broward	12	5.81	5.54	5.61	5.83	5.65
	Miami-Dade	7	5.05	5.42	5.40	4.86	5.29
	Polk	7	4.76	5.33	5.55	4.19	5.22
	Duval	7	4.33	5.18	4.14	3.24	4.56
	<b>Mean</b>		<b>5.40</b>	<b>5.77</b>	<b>5.68</b>	<b>5.13</b>	<b>5.61</b>
<b>All Districts Combined</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>5.05</b>	<b>5.59</b>	<b>5.38</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.33</b>

Note: The total number of programs across all school districts does not include deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. Furthermore, the overall mean cannot be calculated by summing the three standard averages and dividing by three—each standard must be weighted by the number of indicators within each standard, which varies by program type. Similarly, the means for all programs combined must be weighted by the number of programs in each category.

Although 47 school districts supervise juvenile justice educational programs in the state, one, Union County School District, supervises only one juvenile justice educational program, which was deemed/special deemed in 2000 and, therefore, did not receive a full QA review and is not included in this table.

\*Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean for the 2000 QA review cycle

Table 3.4-4 presents the 2000 mean QA review scores for each QA standard and the overall mean scores, ranked by overall mean, of educational program providers for both district-operated and district-contracted programs.

**Table 3.4-4: 2000 Mean of QA Review Scores for Educational Providers, Ranked by Overall Mean of Educational Providers (for School Districts and Contractors)**

Educational Provider	# of Programs	Transition	Service Delivery	Administration	*Contract Management	Overall Mean
Florida Sheriff's Youth Ranches, Inc.	1	6.33	7.33	6.67	4.00	6.78
PACE Center for Girls, Inc.	7	6.93	6.86	6.17	5.62	6.65
Santa Rosa School District	1	5.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.43
Osceola School District	1	5.67	6.50	6.33	6.00	6.17
Bay School District	2	5.25	6.29	6.83	6.00	6.15
Volusia School District	9	6.06	6.14	6.17	6.00	6.12
Okaloosa School District	4	5.71	6.38	6.17	6.00	6.09
Washington School District	3	5.95	5.89	6.17	5.78	6.00
Orange School District	8	5.69	6.05	6.15	6.00	5.96

Hillsborough School District	7	5.05	6.63	6.26	5.90	5.95
Human Services Associates, Inc.	2	5.42	5.75	6.59	5.00	5.93
Bay Point Schools, Inc.	3	6.17	6.00	5.44	4.00	5.87
Pinellas School District	8	5.46	5.97	6.17	5.58	5.86
Pasco School District	3	5.78	6.03	5.72	4.66	5.83
Brevard School District	3	5.22	6.17	6.00	5.78	5.80
Twin Oaks Juvenile Development	1	6.33	5.83	5.17	5.33	5.78
Martin School District	2	4.92	6.92	5.50	4.34	5.78
Broward School District	12	5.81	5.54	5.61	5.83	5.65
Okeechobee School District	2	5.75	5.59	5.50	6.00	5.61
Hamilton School District	1	5.67	5.33	5.67	6.00	5.56
Coastal Recovery Centers, Inc.	2	5.83	5.33	5.42	6.00	5.53
Hurricane Island Outward Bound School, Inc.	3	5.06	5.78	5.39	5.11	5.44
Leon School District	1	5.33	4.75	6.00	5.33	5.44
Gateway Community Services, Inc.	1	5.33	5.50	5.17	6.00	5.33
Youthtrack, Inc.	3	5.00	5.72	5.28	5.56	5.33
Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc.	5	5.13	5.47	5.10	2.67	5.23
YMCA, Inc.	1	4.50	5.67	5.33	6.00	5.17
Associated Marine Institutes, Inc.	23	4.99	5.23	5.03	4.87	5.08
Securicor New Century, Inc.	2	4.83	5.34	5.09	4.33	5.08
Marion School District	3	4.17	5.53	5.56	5.33	5.06
Palm Beach School District	4	4.30	5.46	5.30	5.67	5.03
Bradford School District	1	6.00	5.75	3.83	6.00	5.00
Miami-Dade School District	4	4.21	4.98	5.37	5.50	4.86
Sarasota School District	1	6.25	6.25	3.00	2.00	4.86
DISC Village, Inc.	3	4.39	5.44	4.39	3.77	4.74
Lee School District	2	4.17	4.84	4.92	5.67	4.66
Correctional Services Corporation	3	4.78	4.44	4.33	3.78	4.52
David Lawrence Center	1	5.17	5.00	3.33	5.33	4.50
Manatee School District	1	2.33	6.00	5.67	4.67	4.50
Nassau School District	1	4.33	4.67	4.33	1.33	4.44
Alachua School District	2	3.50	4.92	4.84	3.00	4.40
Excel Alternatives, Inc.	3	3.83	4.34	4.45	4.89	4.20
Florida Department of Agriculture	1	4.50	4.50	3.50	0.00	4.17
Duval School District	3	4.06	4.97	3.33	2.22	4.14
North American Family Institute, Inc.	4	2.83	4.54	4.04	4.33	3.83
Polk School District	1	2.50	4.17	4.83	4.67	3.83
Seminole School District	1	2.17	5.25	4.17	4.00	3.69
St. Lucie School District	1	2.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	3.63
Escambia School District	1	2.00	4.75	4.33	2.00	3.56
Hernando School District	1	2.83	3.17	3.33	4.67	3.11
St. Johns School District	1	2.00	3.00	4.17	0.00	3.06
Children's Comprehensive Services, Inc.	1	2.00	3.17	3.00	3.33	2.72
University of West Florida	1	1.83	3.67	2.33	0.00	2.61
<b>All Programs Combined</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>5.05</b>	<b>5.59</b>	<b>5.38</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.33</b>

Note: The total number of programs across all program types does not include deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. Furthermore, the overall mean cannot be calculated by summing the three standard averages and dividing by three—each standard must be weighted by the number of indicators within each standard, which varies by program type. Similarly, the means for all programs combined must be weighted by the number of programs in each category.

\*Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean for the 2000 QA review cycle.

Scores in Table 3.4-4 range from a high of 6.78 for the program operated by Florida Sheriff's Youth Ranches to a low of 2.61 for the program operated by the University of West Florida. Although no providers scored in the superior range, eight scored in the high satisfactory range. These highest scoring providers included 6 school districts with a total of 20 programs and 2 contracted providers with a total of 8 programs. Nine providers scored in the below satisfactory range, but none scored in the poor range. These lowest scoring programs included six school districts with a total of six programs, one contracted not-for-profit provider with four programs, one contracted for-profit provider with one program, and one governmental provider with one program. With the exception of North American Family Institute, Inc., all educational providers with more than two programs scored at least a 4.00 overall. As with the rank listing by school district, it is necessary to take into consideration the number of deemed/special deemed programs per provider since the exclusion of deemed/special deemed programs from scoring also removes some potentially high-scoring programs from the calculation of the mean scores (see Table 3.4-8). For example, PACE has a total of 17 programs, but only 7 are included in this analysis because 10 of the PACE programs are deemed/special deemed. If deemed/special deemed programs were included, PACE would likely receive a higher overall average. The educational provider Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc. also fits this category since 5 of the 10 programs for which they operate the educational program are deemed/special deemed.

Tables 3.4-5 through 3.4-8 identify summary results of the deemed and special deemed QA reviews across the six priority indicators addressing the following areas: E1.01 Entry Transition: Enrollment, E1.02 On-Site Transition: Student Planning for residential short-term programs, E1.03 On-Site Transition: Student Planning for detention centers and residential long-term programs, E2.01 Curriculum: Academic, E3.02 Instructional Personnel Qualifications, E3.06 Funding and Support, and E4.01 Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement. The percentages under each indicator represent the average percentage of the minimal requirements met for that indicator. For example, if four programs met the minimal requirements of the indicator (and, therefore, 100% of the minimal requirements were met) and one program did not (and, therefore, 0% of the minimal requirements were met), then the average would be 80% of the minimal requirements were met. Indicator E4.01 Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement is not included in the overall calculation of performance for deemed/special deemed programs. As with the nondeemed programs, this QA standard is included as a measure of the local school district's performance and does not impact individual program scores.

Table 3.4-5 indicates the priority indicator ratings for all deemed/special deemed programs by program type (detention centers, residential short-term commitment programs, and residential long-term commitment programs). Of the 203 programs reviewed in 2000, 37 (18.2%) were deemed/special deemed. Of these, 35 (94.6%) were residential long-term commitment programs, 1 (2.7%) was a residential short-term commitment program, and 1 (2.7%) was a detention center. These figures are approximately proportionate with the numbers of each program type in the state. Specifically, of the 203 juvenile justice educational programs in Florida, 175 (86.2%) are residential long-term commitment programs, 6 (3.0%) are residential short-term commitment programs, and 22 (10.8%) are detention centers.

It is clear that there is substantial compliance across deemed/special deemed programs in the priority indicators, with an overall average of 96% meeting minimal requirements. The 35 residential long-term commitment programs met 97% of the minimal requirements, the 1 detention center reviewed met 40% of the minimal requirements, and the 1 residential short-term commitment program reviewed met 100% of the minimal requirements. All deemed programs combined met 86% of the minimal requirements for the indicator for student planning, which was the lowest percentage of minimal requirements being met of all the priority indicators reviewed. In each case where a program did not meet the minimal requirements for any of these indicators, a corrective action plan (CAP) was initiated, and the deficiency was corrected through the joint efforts of the program, the school district, JJEEP, and DOE.

**Table 3.4-5: Percentage of Minimal Requirements Met for Deemed/Special Deemed Programs by Program Type**

Review Type	# of Programs	Enrollment	Student Planning	Curriculum: Academic	Personnel Qualifications	Funding & Support	*Contract Management	Overall % of Minimal Requirements Met
Detention	1	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%	100%	40%
Short-Term	1	100%	**100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%
Long-Term	35	97%	89%	100%	100%	100%	94%	97%
All Deemed Combined	37	95%	86%	100%	100%	97%	92%	96%

Note: The total number of programs across all program types includes only deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. The overall percentage of minimal requirements met for all deemed/special deemed programs combined must be calculated by weighting the rows by the total number of programs in each.

\*Indicator E4.01: Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement is not included in the calculation of the overall percentage of minimal requirements met for deemed/special deemed programs in the 2000 QA review cycle.

\*\*The indicator for student planning is E1.03 for residential long-term commitment programs and detention centers and E1.02 for residential short-term commitment programs. There was only one deemed/special deemed residential short-term commitment program in the 2000 QA review cycle; therefore, the indicators have been combined in this table.

Table 3.4-6 identifies the percentage of minimal requirements met for all deemed/special deemed programs by security level. It is interesting to note that almost half of all the deemed/special deemed programs reviewed in 2000 were level 2. The majority of these deemed/special deemed programs were operated by PACE Center for Girls, Inc., which is a day treatment prevention program. There is very little variation in overall percentages of minimal requirements being met as indicated by the uniformly high percentages of minimal requirements being met across security levels, with percentages ranging from 87% to 100% for commitment programs. However, the one detention center that received a deemed QA review met only 40% of the minimal requirements.

Within individual indicators there is also little variation, with the exception of the one detention center that met 0% of the minimal requirements for the enrollment, student

planning, and funding and support indicators and the exception of the mixed level programs that met an average of 33% of the minimal requirements for the student planning indicator. Otherwise, all security levels across the other indicators had similar percentages. Level 4, 8, and 10 programs met 100% of the minimal requirements for the five indicators that are calculated in the overall percentage. Indicator E4.01 Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement is not included in the overall percentage of minimal requirements met.

**Table 3.4-6: Percentage of Minimal Requirements Met for Deemed/Special Deemed Programs by Security Level**

Level	# of Programs	Enrollment	Student Planning	Curriculum	Personnel Qualifications	Funding & Support	*Contract Management	Overall % of Minimal Requirements Met
Detention	1	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%	100%	40%
***Level Two	17	94%	94%	100%	100%	100%	94%	98%
Level Four	3	100%	**100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	100%
Level Six	10	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	91%	99%
Level Eight	2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Level Ten	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mixed Level	3	100%	33%	100%	100%	100%	67%	87%
All Deemed Combined	37	95%	86%	100%	100%	97%	92%	96%

Note: The total number of programs across all program types includes only deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. The overall percentage of minimal requirements met for all deemed/special deemed programs combined must be calculated by weighting the rows by the total number of programs in each.

\*Indicator E4.01: Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement is not included in the calculation of the overall percentage of minimal requirements met for deemed/special deemed programs in the 2000 QA review cycle.

\*\*The indicator for Student Planning is E1.03 for residential long-term commitment programs and detention centers and E1.02 for residential short-term commitment programs. There was only one deemed/special deemed residential short-term program in the 2000 QA review cycle; therefore, the indicators have been combined in this table.

\*\*\*Programs operated by PACE Center for Girls, Inc. are day treatment prevention programs and are included with level 2 (day treatment) programs.

Table 3.4-7 identifies the percentage of minimal requirements met for all deemed/special deemed programs by supervising school district (not necessarily the county in which the program is located). All supervising school districts met at least 80% of the minimal requirements. Fourteen of the twenty school districts supervising deemed/special deemed programs met 100% of the minimal requirements.

Again, the indicator with the most variation across school districts is student planning. Several school districts met less than 80% of the minimal requirement for this indicator. All deemed/special deemed programs combined met 86% of the minimal requirements for this indicator.

Though the majority of school districts supervise no deemed/special deemed programs, and many supervise only one or two programs, two school districts, Pinellas and Manatee, supervise seven and four, respectively. Pinellas is unique in that it contracts with Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc. for educational services throughout the state. Eckerd maintains a number of deemed/special deemed programs, accounting for four of the seven deemed/special deemed programs supervised by the Pinellas County School District.

**Table 3.4-7: Percentage of Minimal Requirements Met for Deemed/Special Deemed Programs, Alphabetical by Supervising School District (District-Operated and District-Contracted Educational Programs)**

Supervising District	# of Programs	Enrollment	Student Planning	Curriculum	Personnel Qualifications	Funding & Support	*Contract Management	Overall % of Minimal Requirements Met
Alachua	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Brevard	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Broward	3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Collier	1	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%
Duval	2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Escambia	2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hillsborough	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Leon	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Manatee	4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Martin	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Miami-Dade	3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	100%
Monroe	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Nassau	1	100%	**100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%
Orange	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Palm Beach	3	67%	67%	100%	100%	67%	100%	80%
Pinellas	7	86%	71%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%
Polk	1	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%
Union	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%
Volusia	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Washington	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>All Deemed Combined</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>96%</b>

Note: The total number of programs across all program types includes only deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. The overall percentage of minimal requirements met for all deemed/special deemed programs combined must be calculated by weighting the rows by the total number of programs in each.

\*Indicator E4.01: Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement is not included in the calculation of the overall percentage of minimal requirements met for deemed/special deemed programs in the 2000 QA review cycle.

\*\*The indicator for Student Planning is E1.03 for residential long-term commitment programs and detention centers and E1.02 for residential short-term commitment programs. There was only one deemed/special deemed residential short-term program in the 2000 QA review cycle; therefore, the indicators have been combined in this table.

Table 3.4-8 identifies the percentage of minimal requirements met for all deemed/special deemed programs by educational program provider (including school district-operated and district-contracted programs). All programs met 80% or more of the minimal requirements, except Palm Beach County School District, which met 70%. There is little variation within individual indicators. The main exception to this trend remains in student planning.

It should be noted that nearly half of all deemed/special deemed programs in 2000 were operated by two providers. Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc. operated the educational components of five deemed/special deemed programs, and PACE Center for Girls, Inc. operated the educational components of ten deemed/special deemed programs. With this in mind, it is clear that had these programs been reviewed and given scores, the overall rankings of Eckerd and PACE in Table 3.4-4 would have been substantially higher.

**Table 3.4-8: Percentage of Minimal Requirements Met for Deemed/Special Deemed Programs, Alphabetical by Educational Provider (Districts and Contractors)**

Educational Provider	# of Programs	Enrollment	Student Planning	Curriculum	Personnel Qualifications	Funding & Support	*Contract Management	Overall % of Minimal Requirements Met
Associated Marine Institutes, Inc.	4	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%
Brevard School District	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Broward School District	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Children's Comprehensive Services, Inc.	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Collier School District	1	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%
Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc.	5	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%
Escambia School District	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hurricane Island Outward Bound School, Inc.	1	100%	**100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%
Leon School District	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Manatee School District	3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Martin School District	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
PACE Center For Girls, Inc.	10	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%
Palm Beach School District	2	50%	50%	100%	100%	50%	100%	70%

<b>Pinellas School District</b>	2	50%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%
<b>Polk School District</b>	1	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%
<b>Volusia School District</b>	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>Washington School District</b>	1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>All Deemed Combined</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>96%</b>

Note: The total number of programs across all program types includes only deemed/special deemed programs and represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities included in the reviews. The overall percentage of minimal requirements met for all deemed/special deemed programs combined must be calculated by weighting the rows by the total number of programs in each.

\*Indicator E4.01: Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement is not included in the calculation of the overall percentage of minimal requirements met for deemed/special deemed programs in the 2000 QA review cycle.

\*\*The indicator for Student Planning is E1.03 for residential long-term commitment programs and detention centers and E1.02 for residential short-term commitment programs. There was only one deemed/special deemed residential short-term program in the 2000 QA review cycle; therefore, the indicators have been combined in this table.

Table 3.4-9 identifies an overview of program performance. Of the 166 nondeemed programs, 8 (5%) scored in the superior performance range and 42 (25%) scored in the high satisfactory performance. The largest proportion of programs (60 programs or 36%) scored in the satisfactory performance range. Thirty-eight (23%) programs scored in the marginal satisfactory performance range, and only eighteen (11%) programs scored in the below satisfactory performance range. There were no programs that scored within the poor performance range.

**Table 3.4-9: Categories of Overall Performance by Number and Percentage for Nondeemed Programs**

<b>Overall Performance Category</b>	<b>Score Range</b>	<b># of Programs With This Score</b>	<b>% of Programs With This Score</b>
<b>Superior Performance</b>	7.00 - 9.00	8	5%
<b>High Satisfactory Performance</b>	6.00 - 6.99	42	25%
<b>Satisfactory Performance</b>	5.00 - 5.99	60	36%
<b>Marginal Satisfactory Performance</b>	4.00 - 4.99	38	23%
<b>Below Satisfactory Performance</b>	1.00 - 3.99	18	11%
<b>Poor Performance</b>	0.00 - 0.99	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	—	<b>166</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 3.4-10 identifies the programs receiving poor or below satisfactory overall mean scores during the 2000 QA review cycle. Note that there were no programs that scored overall in the poor range (0.00-0.99). However, 18 (11%) of the 166 nondeemed programs reviewed scored below satisfactory (1.00-3.99). It is notable that 4 of these 18 below satisfactory programs were detention centers, since only 21 nondeemed detention centers were reviewed in 2000.

**Table 3.4-10: Programs Receiving Poor or Below Satisfactory Overall Mean Scores in 2000, Rank-Ordered by Overall Mean Score**

Program Name	Supervising District	Level	Transition	Service Delivery	Administration	*Contract Management	Overall Mean
Bartow Youth Training Center	Polk	6 & 8	2.50	4.17	4.83	4.67	3.83
Juvenile Unit for Specialized Treatment (JUST)	Leon	8	4.33	3.83	3.33	4.66	3.83
Children and Adolescent Treatment Services	Seminole	4	3.33	3.67	4.17	5.33	3.72
Visionary Adolescent Services	Seminole	4	3.33	3.67	4.17	5.33	3.72
Seminole Detention Center	Seminole	Detention	2.17	5.25	4.17	4.00	3.69
St. Lucie Detention Center	St. Lucie	Detention	2.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	3.63
Escambia Detention Center	Escambia	Detention	2.00	4.75	4.33	2.00	3.56
Deborah's Way	Miami-Dade	6	3.00	3.17	4.33	4.67	3.50
NAFI Hendry Halfway House	Hendry	6	2.83	4.50	2.83	4.00	3.39
Monticello New Life Center	Jefferson	8	2.00	2.67	4.83	4.00	3.24
NAFI Hendry Youth Development Academy	Hendry	6	2.17	4.50	2.83	4.00	3.17
Duval Detention Center	Duval	Detention	2.67	2.75	3.83	1.33	3.15
Withlacoochee STOP Camp	Hernando	6	2.83	3.17	3.33	4.67	3.11
Hastings Youth Academy	St. Johns	6 & 8	2.00	3.00	4.17	0.00	3.06
Palm Beach Marine Institute	Palm Beach	2	2.33	3.33	2.50	4.67	2.72
Bay Behavioral HOPE Program	Bay	6	2.00	3.17	3.00	3.33	2.72
Blackwater Career Development Center	Santa Rosa	6	1.83	3.67	2.33	0.00	2.61
Sago Palm Academy	Palm Beach	8	1.20	2.67	2.67	4.67	2.24

\*Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean for the 2000 QA review cycle.

Table 3.4-11 identifies the programs receiving high satisfactory or superior overall mean scores during the 2000 QA review cycle. Of the 166 nondeemed programs reviewed during 2000, 42 (25%) programs scored in the high satisfactory range, and 8 (5%) programs scored in the superior range. It should also be noted that many of the deemed/special deemed programs likely would have scored very high if a full QA review had been conducted. These high scoring programs represent a wide variety of program types and providers, though few discernable differences or trends are apparent.

**Table 3.4-11: Programs Receiving High Satisfactory or Superior Overall Mean Scores in 2000, Rank-Ordered by Overall Mean Score**

Program Name	Supervising District	**Level	Transition	Service Delivery	Administration	*Contract Management	Overall Mean
PACE Volusia-Flagler	Volusia	2	7.83	7.83	7.50	6.00	7.72
Palm Beach Halfway House	Palm Beach	6	7.50	7.67	7.17	6.00	7.44
Orange Detention Center	Orange	Detention	6.50	7.25	7.67	6.00	7.13
PACE Immokalee	Collier	2	7.50	7.17	6.67	6.00	7.11
Stewart Marchman Timberline Halfway House	Volusia	6	7.16	6.83	7.17	6.00	7.06
Dozier School for Boys	Washington	8	6.67	7.17	7.17	6.00	7.00
Stewart Marchman Terrace Halfway House	Volusia	6	7.17	6.67	7.17	6.00	7.00
Stewart Marchman Lee Hall	Volusia	6	7.00	6.83	7.17	6.00	7.00
Stewart Marchman Transitions Day Treatment	Volusia	2	7.17	6.67	7.00	6.00	6.94
Crossroads Wilderness Institute	Charlotte	6	7.17	7.33	6.33	6.00	6.94
ACTS Group Treatment Home I and II	Hillsborough	4	6.83	7.00	7.00	5.33	6.94
Sheriffs Teach Adolescent Responsibility (STAR)	Polk	4	6.33	7.33	6.67	4.00	6.78
Elaine Gordon Sexual Offender Program	Broward	8	6.83	6.83	6.67	6.00	6.78
Charter-Pinellas Treatment Center	Pinellas	8	6.67	6.50	7.00	6.00	6.72
PACE Pinellas	Pinellas	2	6.83	6.67	6.67	6.00	6.72
Okaloosa Detention Center	Okaloosa	Detention	6.83	6.50	6.67	6.00	6.69
Polk Halfway House	Polk	6	6.33	6.50	7.00	5.33	6.61
Perspective Group Treatment Home	Orange	4	5.83	6.83	7.00	6.00	6.56
PACE Lower Keys	Monroe	2	6.83	7.00	5.83	4.67	6.56
Martin County JOTC Aftercare	Martin	2	5.50	7.33	6.50	6.00	6.44
PACE Treasure Coast	St. Lucie	2	7.17	6.83	5.33	6.00	6.44
LEAF Group Treatment Home	Broward	4	6.50	6.67	6.17	6.00	6.44

<b>Gulf Coast Marine Institute–North</b>	Manatee	2	6.50	6.50	6.33	5.33	6.44
<b>Catalyst Day Treatment Sex Offender Program</b>	Pinellas	2	6.00	6.50	6.83	5.33	6.44
<b>Blackwater STOP Camp</b>	Santa Rosa	4	5.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.43
<b>Okeechobee Redirection Camp</b>	Okeechobee	6	6.83	6.17	6.17	6.00	6.39
<b>Kelly Hall Halfway House</b>	Charlotte	6	6.83	6.33	6.00	6.00	6.39
<b>Pinellas County Boot Camp</b>	Pinellas	6	6.83	6.50	5.83	6.00	6.39
<b>Gulf Coast Marine Institute–South</b>	Sarasota	2	6.83	5.67	6.50	6.00	6.33
<b>Friends of Children Youth Center</b>	Broward	2	6.50	6.00	6.50	6.00	6.33
<b>Hillsborough Academy</b>	Hillsborough	8	5.50	6.83	6.67	6.00	6.33
<b>Gulf Coast Youth Academy</b>	Okaloosa	6	5.67	6.83	6.33	6.00	6.28
<b>Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center</b>	Pasco	6	6.33	5.83	6.50	5.33	6.22
<b>Bay Boot Camp</b>	Bay	6	4.83	6.83	6.83	6.00	6.17
<b>PACE Leon</b>	Leon	2	6.50	6.33	5.67	6.00	6.17
<b>Cannon Point Youth Academy</b>	Broward	6	6.00	6.67	5.83	6.00	6.17
<b>Adolescent Residential Campus (Combined)</b>	Osceola	6 & 8	5.67	6.50	6.33	6.00	6.17
<b>Brevard Detention Center</b>	Brevard	Detention	5.33	6.00	7.00	6.00	6.13
<b>Volusia Detention Center</b>	Volusia	Detention	6.00	5.75	6.50	6.00	6.13
<b>Bay Detention Center</b>	Bay	Detention	5.67	5.75	6.83	6.00	6.13
<b>LEAF Halfway House</b>	Pinellas	6	5.67	6.33	6.33	5.33	6.11
<b>Camp E-Nini-Hassee</b>	Pinellas	6	5.67	6.67	6.00	4.67	6.11
<b>Peace River Outward Bound School</b>	DeSoto	6	5.50	6.50	6.33	6.00	6.11
<b>Marion Intensive Treatment</b>	Marion	8	6.00	6.17	6.17	4.00	6.11
<b>Orlando Marine Institute-SAFE</b>	Orange	2	6.50	6.25	5.67	6.00	6.07
<b>Seminole Work and Learn Center</b>	Leon	6	6.17	6.33	5.67	6.00	6.06
<b>Northside Girls Program</b>	Hillsborough	6	5.33	6.50	6.33	6.00	6.06
<b>Jackson Juvenile Offender Correction Center</b>	Washington	8 & 10	6.67	5.67	5.83	6.00	6.06
<b>Camp E-Ma-Chamee</b>	Pinellas	6	5.50	6.50	6.00	4.67	6.00
<b>Okaloosa Youth Development Center</b>	Okaloosa	6 & 8	5.50	6.17	6.33	6.00	6.00

\*Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean for the 2000 QA review cycle.

\*\*Programs operated by PACE Center for Girls, Inc. (day treatment prevention) and the Orlando Marine Institute SAFE program (aftercare) are included with level 2 (day treatment) programs.

Table 3.4-12 identifies the overall mean QA review scores for programs grouped by the number of students at the time of the review. To determine if program size affects the overall quality of educational service, programs were grouped by the number of students enrolled during the time of the educational QA review. No clear trend emerges from this analysis. While the largest programs (101 students and above) have substantially lower overall mean QA review scores compared to all other program groupings, the category including programs with between 51 and 100 students scored above the mean for all nondeemed programs (5.33). Programs with between 1 and 20 students and programs with between 21 and 30 students received the highest overall mean score of 5.41. Programs with between 31 and 50 and programs with between 51 and 100 students scored similarly, with overall means of 5.29 and 5.37, respectively. For further discussion of the effects of facility size on program QA review score averages, see Chapter 14.

**Table 3.4-12: Overall Mean Scores  
by Number of Students at Time of QA Review**

Number of Students	Number of Programs	Transition	Service Delivery	Administration	*Contract Management	Overall Mean
1-20	46	5.20	5.68	5.38	5.26	5.41
21-30	40	5.16	5.70	5.37	4.85	5.41
31-50	37	5.17	5.51	5.20	4.88	5.29
51-100	33	4.85	5.63	5.64	5.25	5.37
101 and above	10	4.14	4.93	5.12	3.93	4.74

\*Standard Four: Contract Management is not included in the overall mean for the 2000 QA review cycle.

### 3.5 Comparison of 2000 and 1999 QA Review Scores

The standards were modified for the 2000 QA review cycle, and the “bar was raised” in several areas. In general, however, the QA review scores of programs reviewed in 2000 continued to improve in relation to the scores of programs reviewed in previous years. For example, the number of superior or high satisfactory programs increased from 40 to 50, an increase of 25%. Conversely, the number of poor or below satisfactory programs decreased from 22 to 18, a decrease of 18%.

Of the 40 programs in 1999 that were either superior or high satisfactory, in 2000, 15 remained in one of these two designations. Of these 15 programs, in 2000, 3 decreased from superior to high satisfactory, 5 increased from high satisfactory to superior, and 7 were in the same category as in 1999. Additionally, 9 of the 40 programs that were either superior or high satisfactory in 1999 were deemed/special deemed in 2000 and likely would have earned either a superior or high satisfactory if they had received a full QA review in 2000 rather than a deemed QA review. Four programs closed prior to the 2000 QA review cycle, thus leaving only 12 programs that dropped out of the superior or high satisfactory category. Of these 12, 10 scored in the satisfactory range, and 2 scored in the marginally satisfactory range.

Of the 22 programs in 1999 that were either poor or below satisfactory, in 2000, 9 remained in one of these designations, 3 were closed, and 10 improved their scores so they were no longer classified as poor or below satisfactory. Of the 18 programs that were poor or below satisfactory in 2000, 6 were new programs receiving their first QA review. Four programs decreased from being satisfactory in 1999 to below satisfactory in 2000.

Because the 2000 QA standards are not the same as the 1999 QA standards, direct comparisons cannot be made of the mean scores for all of the standards or of the overall mean scores. There are, however, 16 indicators that can be directly compared, and they are presented in Table 3.5-1.

Of these 16 indicators listed in Table 3.5-1, 12 had higher scores in 2000 than in 1999, and only 4 declined. For four of the indicators (enrollment, assessment, support services, and guidance services) that had higher scores in 2000, the increase was statistically significant. None of the indicators that had a lower score in 2000 had a statistically significant decrease.

**Table 3.5-1: 1999 and 2000 Mean QA Review Scores of Comparable Indicators**

Indicator Number 1999 / 2000	Indicator Content Area	1999 Mean	2000 Mean	Change
**E1.01 / E1.01	Enrollment	4.45	5.11	*0.66
E1.02 / E1.02	Assessment	5.05	5.44	*0.39
E1.03 / E1.03	Student Planning	4.50	4.68	0.18
E1.04 / E1.04	Student Progress	5.18	5.19	0.01
E1.05 / E1.06	Exit Transition	5.05	4.82	-0.23
E2.01 / E2.01	Academic Curriculum	5.34	5.39	0.05
E2.02 / E2.02	Practical Arts Curriculum	5.56	5.69	0.13
E2.03 / E2.03	Instructional Delivery	5.18	5.36	0.18
**E2.04 / E2.05	Support Services (ESE)	4.87	5.46	*0.59
E2.05 / E1.05	Guidance Services	4.86	5.55	*0.69
E2.06 / E2.06	Community Support	5.46	5.67	0.21
E3.05 / E3.02	Teacher Qualifications	5.50	5.63	0.13
E4.01 / E3.01	Communication	5.64	5.66	0.02
E4.02 / E3.04	Program Evaluations (SIP)	4.80	4.96	0.16
E4.03 / E3.03	Professional Development	5.45	5.41	-0.04
E4.05 / E3.06	Funding and Support	5.15	5.23	0.08
<b>All 16 Indicators</b>	<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>5.25</b>	<b>5.39</b>	<b>0.14</b>

\*Difference is statistically significant at .05 level.

\*\*Note that in 1999, E1.01 Enrollment and E2.04 Support Services were categorized as performance indicators, but, in 2000, they were changed to compliance indicators; also, for 2000, E2.04 was renumbered as E2.05. Because the rating scale for performance indicators (score of 0 through 9) differs from the rating scale for compliance indicators (score of 0 or 4 or 6), in order to compare the 1999 mean scores with the 2000 mean scores, it was necessary to link the 1999 mean scores with the compliance rating scale. Thus, scores of 0 through 3 are equivalent to 0, scores of 4 or 5 are equivalent to 4, and scores of 6 through 9 are equivalent to 6.

## **3.6 Summary**

During the 2000 QA review cycle, JJEEP reviewed 203 educational programs. Of this number, 37 were programs with deemed/special deemed status, including 35 residential long-term commitment programs, 1 residential short-term commitment program, and 1 detention center. As stated previously, deemed QA reviews are shorter, focus on only six priority indicators, and do not receive numerical scores that can be compared to nondeemed scores. Consequently, the analyses presented in this chapter are separated by nondeemed versus deemed QA reviews.

Among the 166 regular (nondeemed) QA reviews conducted during 2000, 140 were of residential long-term commitment programs, 5 were of residential short-term commitment programs, and 21 were of detention centers. Residential short-term commitment programs scored the highest overall (5.50), followed closely by residential 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 Standard Two: Service Delivery, which averaged 5.59.

Standard Four: Contract Management received an overall mean score of 5.00; the scores for this standard were not included in the calculation of the programs' overall mean scores because this standard was intended to measure only the performance of the supervising school districts.

Level 2 and level 6 programs represented more than half of all programs in the state in 2000. Level 6 programs scored the highest of all security levels (5.50). With the exception of the one level 10 program reviewed, all levels achieved an overall satisfactory performance.

Forty-six school districts supervised juvenile justice educational programs that received full QA reviews in 2000 (one other school district supervised a program that was deemed/special deemed). School districts were broken down into four categories, based on the number of programs each supervised, to allow comparisons among school districts with a similar number of programs. The school districts supervised from one to fourteen programs, with scores ranging from 3.06 to 6.56. Overall, six supervising school districts received scores in the high satisfactory range, and four received scores in the below satisfactory range. No supervising school districts received scores in the poor range.

There was substantial compliance among deemed/special deemed programs in meeting the minimal requirements of the six priority indicators. As with nondeemed programs, the result for the indicator relating to contract management and cooperative agreement was not calculated in any deemed/special deemed program's overall score. All deemed/special deemed programs combined met 96% of the minimal requirements. Residential long-term commitment programs met 97% of the minimal requirements. The one residential short-term commitment program reviewed met 83% of the minimal requirements. The one deemed/special deemed detention center that was reviewed met 50% of the minimal requirements. The indicator with the lowest percentage (86%) of minimal requirements met

for deemed/special deemed programs was student planning. There was very little variation in meeting minimal requirements across security levels, school districts, or program providers.

In overall performance in 2000, 50 programs (30%) scored in the high satisfactory or superior range, and 18 (11%) programs scored in the below satisfactory range.

Programs with more than 100 students showed a lower average score (4.74) while programs with 100 or fewer students ranked near the overall mean of 5.33 in terms of their overall averages.

Due to changes in the QA standards from 1999 to 2000, direct comparisons of the means for programs from year to year cannot be made. However, a comparison can be made across 16 indicators that measure identical content. This comparison shows an increase in the overall mean from 1999 to 2000. Twelve of the sixteen indicators increased in overall average while only four decreased. Furthermore, the number of superior or high satisfactory programs increased from 40 in 1999 to 50 in 2000, an increase of 25%. Conversely, the number of poor or below satisfactory programs decreased from 22 in 1999 to 18 in 2000, a decrease of 18%.

Refer to Appendix D, Tables D-1 through D-11, for detailed data on the individual educational program.