

# CHAPTER 11

## LONGITUDINAL OUTCOMES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

### 11.1 Introduction

Since the inception of the Juvenile Justice Educational Enhancement Program (JJEED) in 1998, a fundamental goal has been to implement an evaluation research capacity to conclusively determine the role of quality juvenile justice education upon pre- and post-academic gains and the subsequent community reintegration experiences of juvenile justice youths. During 2000, for example, JJEED conducted a pilot pre- and post-academic outcome and longitudinal assessment. Among the findings of this pilot study were a positive relationship between high educational program quality assurance (QA) review scores and the pre- and post-measures of academic test scores, credits earned, and diplomas and certificates received. With regard to longitudinal outcomes of recidivism and return to school, it was found that educational programs with higher QA review scores were sending more youths back to public schools and fewer back to juvenile justice facilities compared to educational programs with lower QA review scores. These findings were reported with considerable caution because of the small number of programs included in the study and the voluntary nature of the program's participation in the study.

During 2001, JJEED and the Florida Department of Education (DOE) continued to expand both the pre- and post-academic outcome data collection for every juvenile justice educational program and the longitudinal data collection through the integration of several state data bases and the implementation of a self-report study. This chapter presents some of the longitudinal findings related to recidivism and return to public school. No pre- and post-academic outcome data were available for analyses in 2001 because of the necessary start-up time required for school districts to implement data collection and methods for entering these various data into their respective management information systems (MIS). Once these data collection and entry systems are in place, JJEED will be able to assess pre- and post-academic gains for every juvenile justice educational program throughout the state.

The chapter is comprised of four subsequent sections. Section 11.2 reviews the results of three annual recidivism studies of Florida's juvenile justice facilities covering fiscal years (FY) 1996-1997, 1997-1998, and 1998-1999 to describe what is known about juvenile recidivism without consideration of the role of facility type, namely, the five different levels of restrictiveness. Section 11.3 presents recidivism findings for youths released between July 1999 and June 30, 2000, in relation to educational program QA review scores from 1999 to 2000. Section 11.4 presents findings on return to public school and length of stay in school for 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 in relation to educational program QA review scores for 2000. Section 11.5 closes the chapter with a summary discussion of JJEED's expectations for

subsequent research on educational program quality and pre- and post-academic gains and multiple measures of community reintegration.

## **11.2 Prior Recidivism Studies of Florida's Juvenile Justice Facilities**

In its 1999 annual report, the Juvenile Justice Accountability Board (JJAB) reported recidivism findings on youths released to the community from juvenile justice programs during FY 1996-1997. These findings were reported in relation to the security level of the program from which the youths were released. When the Florida Legislature transferred the JJAB from the legislative branch to the executive branch, the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) integrated the JJAB and its staff, and assumed the statutory responsibility for producing the annual Outcome Evaluation Report. Therefore, the 2000 and 2001 Outcome Evaluation Reports, examining FY 1997-98 and FY 1998-99, respectively, were produced by DJJ using a similar methodology and contained similar findings. These annual evaluations assessed program performance using three recidivism indicators for each program: subsequent referrals to DJJ (the juvenile equivalent of an arrest), subsequent adjudications (the juvenile equivalent of a conviction), and subsequent commitments, probation, or prison for offenses which occurred within one year of a youth's actual release date from the program. Although the evaluations of 2000 and 2001 included an examination of re-offending from all five security levels, the 1999 report was unable to incorporate level 10 (now called maximum risk) programs because there were no releases to the community from level 10 programs in FY 1996-1997 (JJAB, 1999).

During the periods covered in these reports, the security levels for DJJ commitment programs included: non-residential (level 2), low-risk residential (level 4), moderate-risk residential (level 6), high-risk residential programs (level 8), and maximum-risk residential programs (level 10). (DJJ no longer uses non-residential commitment as a security level.) Level 2 programs were designed to serve those youths who pose the least risk to the public and themselves and do not require residential programs. Day treatment programs are now intended to serve this population, but youths are not formally committed to these programs. Level 4 (now called low-risk) programs serve those youths who are considered to be at low risk to themselves and the community and require only minimal special services, such as substance abuse or mental health treatment. These programs are the least restrictive residential programs available and consist of short lengths of stay (JJAB, 1999).

In contrast, level 6 (now called moderate risk) residential programs have a larger population capacity than do level 4 programs, are more structured, and provide services that are more specialized. These programs serve youths who are deemed to be of moderate risk to themselves or the public. Level 8 (now called high risk) programs provide a longer length of stay to youths who are considered high risk to themselves or the public. Unlike the lower-level programs, these programs do not allow the youths to leave the facility for educational or vocational purposes. Finally, the level 10 (as noted earlier, now called maximum risk) programs provide services to those youths who are considered the most serious offenders. These facilities are physically more secure than the lower security level programs and have a

mandated minimum length of stay of 18 months, but can serve youths for as long as three years (JJAB, 1999).

While the 1999 study's findings demonstrated a consistent recidivism pattern across all three recidivism indicators, the 2000 and 2001 studies found that the recidivism patterns by security level varied according to which recidivism indicator was examined (DJJ, 2000; DJJ, 2001). For example, in FY 1998-1999, juveniles released from level 10 programs had one of the higher rates for subsequent referrals or arrests but the lowest rates for subsequent adjudications or convictions and subsequent commitments, probation, or prison (DJJ, 2001).

Similar recidivism patterns do appear, however, across the three years of program evaluations. The youths released from the level 2 non-residential programs consistently had a low rate of recidivism across all three recidivism indicators in comparison to level 4, 6, and 8 program releasees, a condition which persisted across all three outcome evaluations. Similarly, in the 2000 and 2001 reports, youths released from maximum-risk residential programs also had low rates for readjudication or conviction and recommitment in contrast to those youths released from level 4, 6, and 8 programs. Youths released from the low-risk, moderate-risk, and high-risk programs showed similar rates of re-offending based on the three recidivism indicators across all three years (DJJ, 2000; DJJ, 2001; JJAB, 1999).

When looking at program security level and recidivism, therefore, it appears that the relationship is lowest for those youths released from the two extremes of restrictiveness, namely the minimum-risk non residential and maximum-risk residential programs. A variety of other factors, such as age, race, gender, length of stay, and number of prior commitments have been found to further impact recidivism rates and should be considered (DJJ, 2000). It is also important to consider that at the time of these evaluations, there were only two level 10 programs in Florida (presently there are three), and the youths in these programs tend to be older and have longer lengths of stay, on average, than their peers at lower security levels. It is also possible that when an offense serious enough to warrant level 10 commitment is present, that a disproportionate number of these youths are transferred to the adult system (either through direct file or judicial or prosecutorial discretion). Because such a determination denotes a change in legal status, once a youth is transferred to adult court, that youth is treated as an adult for all subsequent arrests and prosecutions. DJJ is able to match to these systems and captures many reoffenses, but since the burden of proof is substantially greater in adult court than in juvenile court, some offenses, which might have been adjudicated, may result in a not-guilty verdict in adult court. In addition, the JJAB's research has shown that an offender's age is negatively correlated with recidivism. Maximum-risk offenders are often older than their peers at lower security levels and, because of the longer length of stay in maximum risk programs, this age gap widens considerably before youths are released. Youths who are transferred to adult court at an early age may bypass the maximum risk security level altogether and become young, chronic recidivists plaguing the adult system. Any or all of these factors could contribute to the drop in recidivism rates among maximum risk programs.

One important area of examination, which is often overlooked by program evaluators, is the quality and impact of a program's educational services on recidivism. Each security level

has distinct educational provisions and components. For example, in comparison to levels 4, 6, 8 and 10 programs, the level 2 programs allowed many more of their youths to attend off-site educational programs, including their home public school (JJAB, 1999), which could influence recidivism.

An examination of the length of stay and size of the educational programs may also contribute to a further understanding of the recidivism patterns. While level 10 programs have a minimum length of stay of 18 months and maximum of 36 months, level 4, 6, and 8 programs, in general, have significantly shorter lengths of stay. Furthermore, the level 10 programs have a minimum of 100 residents within the program. In comparison, level 4, 6, and 8 programs have a variety of sizes, ranging from approximately 6 to in excess of 100 residents. Many of these programs are much smaller than the level 10 facilities (JJAB, 1999). Finally, the impact of education QA scores and various educational program variables in relation to recidivism community reintegration outcomes is essential if we are to understand the role of education upon delinquency. Sections 11.3 and 11.4 provide findings from such analyses.

### **11.3 Recidivism and Educational Program Quality**

Arguably, the most important outcome to be expected of any juvenile justice educational program is successful community reintegration of juvenile justice youths upon release. Often presented as an inverse (or negative) outcome, a lack of successful community reintegration can be operationalized using recidivism as a proxy variable. The purpose of this analysis is to examine how educational QA performance indicators may relate to re-offending when controlling for the effects of other factors that may also affect recidivism.

The data used in this analysis were obtained from two sources: program performance indicators collected during QA reviews in 1999 and 2000, and program-level recidivism data obtained from the DJJ's Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) for students released between July 1999 and June 30, 2000. (Please note that none of the data in this analysis uses results from the 2001 review cycle because of the time required for conducting recidivism research.)

For the purposes of this analysis (and consistent with DJJ's own methodology), recidivism is defined as any adjudicated referral (except for a few administrative exceptions) for an offense that occurred within one year of a student's actual date of release from the program. Because the measurement of recidivism requires the passage of at least one year from the date of release, the most recent data on recidivism are those for youths released from juvenile justice facilities in FY 1999-2000. Program-level recidivism rates are calculated by dividing the number of youths who recidivated within one year of release from the program by the number of youths released from that program during the same period. The program-level recidivism rates ranged from 0.09 to 0.78.

Although of particular interest to JJEEP researchers, QA indicators of educational programs within juvenile justice facilities are not the only factors that can potentially affect recidivism

at the program level. Previous research indicates that security level, length of stay in the program, gender, and race may also have an impact on recidivism. These four variables are included in this analysis. By controlling for the effects of these variables, JJEEP researchers were able to estimate the *net* effect of QA-related education performance. In other words, the effects of education QA indicators are estimated as unique effects after accounting for the impact of other factors included in the model.

There are approximately 203 programs in the JJEEP database that received education QA reviews during 2000. It was not possible, however, to collect complete information for all of these programs. As a result, any program with missing data on the variables used in the analysis, including education QA indicators, security level, average length of stay, percentage of males, and percentage of African Americans, was excluded. Also excluded from the analyses were the deemed programs because they received only an abbreviated review designed to determine compliance with minimum education standards. Finally, day treatment and detention centers were also excluded from the analysis in an effort to control for variability among program type and the fact that the QA standards are different for these programs. Due to these deliberate exclusions, methodological inconsistencies and missing or incomplete data, JJEEP was able to use only 62 of the 203 programs in its database to conduct this analysis. The results in Table 11.3-1 are based on the 62 non-deemed residential commitment programs with valid data on the variables included in the analysis.

The dependent variable is the variable the researcher is trying to explain, so in Table 11.3-1 the dependent variable is recidivism. To estimate the effect of each of the education QA indicators, each indicator was entered into a statistical formula (multivariate regression model) along with the four control variables. Because the performance indicators are highly correlated, it was necessary to enter only one indicator at a time into the statistical equation. To enter more than one indicator into the equation at the same time would make it difficult or impossible to distinguish the independent effect of any single indicator.

**Table 11.3-1: Effects of QA Indicators on Program-Level Recidivism**

QA Standard Indicator	Coefficient	t-test
<b>Transition:</b>		
Enrollment	-0.003	-0.59
Assessment	-0.006	-0.83
Student Planning	-0.011	-2.13*
Student Progress	-0.012	-1.87*
Guidance Services	0.003	0.38
Exit Transition	-0.004	-0.62
<b>Service Delivery:</b>		
Academic Curriculum	-0.002	-0.40
Practical Arts Curriculum	-0.013	-1.48
Instructional Delivery	-0.002	-0.29
Classroom Management	-0.005	-0.75
Support Services	-0.004	-0.33
Community Support	-0.004	-0.48
<b>Administration:</b>		
Communication	0.001	0.09
Instructional Personnel Qualifications	-0.004	-0.53
Professional Development	0.006	0.85
Program Evaluations	0.003	0.42
Program Management	0.005	0.61
Funding and Support	0.002	0.33
<b>Contract Management:</b>		
Contract and/or Cooperative Agreement	-0.002	-0.41
Contract Management	0.007	1.12
Oversight and Assistance	0.000	0.05
<b>Standard Mean Scores:</b>		
Standard One Mean Score: Transition	-0.009	-1.22
Standard Two Mean Score: Service Delivery	-0.008	-0.79
Standard Three Mean Score: Administration	0.004	0.44
Standard Four Mean Score: Contract Management	0.002	0.29
<b>Overall Mean Program Score</b>	<b>-0.006</b>	<b>-0.55</b>

\*Significant at the 0.05 confidence level for one-tailed test

Table 11.3-1 lists the performance indicators in the first column. There are four different standards: transition, service delivery, administration, and contract management. In addition to individual indicators, mean scores for the four standards and the overall mean program score are contained in the last five rows of the tables. Numbers in the **Coefficient** column indicate the relationship between each of the indicators and recidivism. The coefficient for each indicator is interpreted as the percentage change in recidivism that is produced by a

change of 1.0 (from 4.0 to 5.0, 5.0 to 6.0, etc.) in the indicator. The last column contains *t*-test values used to determine whether the relationship between the independent variable and recidivism is statistically significant, meaning it could not occur simply by chance.

As shown in Table 11.3-1, five of the six transition indicators (guidance services is the exception) are negatively related to recidivism. The indicators that are most strongly related to recidivism are student planning and student progress. A unit increase in the scores of these indicators (for example, an increase from four to five) is associated with more than one percent decrease in recidivism rates at the program level. The relationship between each of these two indicators and recidivism is statistically significant at the .05 level. This means that a coefficient of this magnitude could occur by chance only five times out of 100.

Indicators of service delivery also are negatively related to recidivism as predicted. A unit increase on any indicator in this category is associated with a decrease in recidivism rates. With the exception of Practical Arts Curriculum, however, most of the relationships are weak. None of the coefficients in this category is statistically significant.

The findings for the remaining two categories are mixed. There are more positive relationships than negative ones. It should be noted that all of these relationships are weak, and none are statistically significant. Factors in these two categories do not appear to have a significant impact on recidivism regardless of whether the effect is positive or negative. This set of results suggests that the indicators in these two standards are only marginally related to recidivism.

The overall mean program score is negatively related to recidivism as predicted, although the strength of this relationship is weak and non-significant. Among the four standard mean scores, transition and service delivery are negatively related to recidivism while administration and contract management are positively related to recidivism. The effects of transition and service delivery, however, are much stronger than those of administration and contract management. While both transition and service delivery are associated with a one percent reduction in recidivism, administration and contract management show only a very small impact on recidivism. Once again, none of the standard coefficients reaches an acceptable level of statistical significance.

Despite these weak and inconsistent findings, the overall results of this longitudinal study can be considered encouraging. The programs that performed well in student transition and service delivery tended to have slightly lower recidivism rates. The mean QA score was also negatively related to recidivism although this relationship was not as strong as those associated with some of the individual indicators. Transition and service delivery are the two sets of standards with the most direct impact on individual students; therefore, it is encouraging that facilities with higher QA scores in these areas would be linked to lower recidivism rates.

The preceding results should be interpreted with caution. Potentially many factors can affect recidivism. This analysis included only four control variables. Among the four variables, length of stay in the program had the strongest effect on recidivism. Facilities with longer

average lengths of stay had lower recidivism rates. Higher security level, on the other hand, was positively related to recidivism. Holding all other variables constant, the facilities with higher levels of security tended to have higher rates of recidivism.

Other factors that may potentially affect recidivism at the program level include average severity of prior offenses, average age at first referral, access to non-educational treatment programs, number of students with strong family ties and social bonds, and availability of aftercare. Due to current data limitations, JJEEP was unable to include these variables in the analysis although security level may serve as a "proxy" for some of them. It is certainly possible that the relationships between QA indicators and recidivism will change when these variables are included. Another reason for caution in interpreting these results is the selection of our sample. Sixty-two programs were included in the analysis based on availability of data. Because this sample is not randomly chosen, it is questionable whether the results drawn from this sample can be generalized to the entire population of Florida juvenile justice facilities with educational programs. The study needs to be replicated using the entire population of such facilities, and future studies of this type will move in this direction.

More than anything else, this analysis provides a demonstration of what is possible using data available from DJJ, JJEEP, and DOE. These results should not be considered as definitive, however, concerning the relationship between education QA and recidivism. As data collection and analytical techniques are refined, JJEEP will use data from these and other sources to develop progressively more complete and definitive findings and conclusions on the relationship between educational QA and recidivism.

The lack of a relationship between the QA score in the administration and contract management standards, and the lack of any significant relationship with particular indicators in these standards, is not unexpected. Administration standards evaluate the organizational structure of the school programs and, therefore, do not necessarily affect the way teachers and students interact.

On the other hand, the transition and service delivery standards directly evaluate the interaction between educational staff and students. Moreover, the transition and service delivery indicators have incorporated most of the promising practices found in the JJEEP literature reviews, such as individualization of services and instruction, assessment testing, transition planning, parent involvement, and the use of a multifaceted curriculum that addresses the individual needs of students in academic, vocational, General Education Development (GED), literacy, and psychosocial education.

The transition standard, which had the strongest relationship to recidivism, is designed to address community reintegration outcomes through the implementation of a specific process from student entry into a juvenile justice education program through exit. This process includes (1) identifying individual student needs through evaluation of past records and assessing students both academically and vocationally, (2) developing individual student goals and objectives relevant to identified student needs and deficiencies, tracking each student's progress on goals and objectives through multiple means of evaluation, and (3)

preparing the student for return to school and the community by developing exit plans and education portfolios that will assist students with meeting their community reintegration goals.

The two indicators within the transition standard that had the greatest relationship with recidivism were Student Planning and Student Progress. As described above, these indicators relate to the second phase in the transition process, which is the development of individual student goals and objectives relevant to identified student needs and deficiencies, and tracking each student's progress on goals and objectives through multiple means of evaluation. These indicators relate directly to the extent of individualized services and individualized instruction within the educational program.

It is important to note that in implementing these specific promising practices in transition and service delivery requires highly trained and qualified teachers who possess specific skills and knowledge. Through multiple years of college education and experience (gained through student teacher interaction), teachers gain specific knowledge and skills related to successful teaching. The more skills teachers gain through schooling and experience, the more likely it is that they are able to implement promising and/or best education practices during student/teacher interactions. In fact, one of the most widely recognized best education practices is the use of certified and experienced teachers. Chapter 15 on teacher certification highlights the positive relationship between high QA findings and the prevalence of professionally certified teachers within each program.

## **11.4 Returning to School, Number of Days in School, and Educational Program Quality**

A direct community reintegration measure of juvenile justice education outcomes is returning to school. If a juvenile justice educational program is successful, it could be expected that students released from the facility would return to public schools at a greater rate than those released from an unsuccessful educational program. Furthermore, it could be expected that students from successful programs would stay in public schools longer than those from unsuccessful programs. To test these relationships, JJEEP computed two variables as measures of educational outcomes. One is *returning to school*, measuring whether the student returned to a regular public school in the following semester after he or she was released from a juvenile justice facility. The other is *survival time in school*, which measures the number of days the student stayed in the public school.

To conduct this study of educational outcomes, JJEEP needed two years of consecutive data on release date and school enrollment for a sample of students. Currently, JJEEP has this information for about 2,200 students in the database. We surveyed these students last year in our study of pre- and post-educational outcomes. For this analysis, JJEEP matched its survey data with student enrollment data obtained from the DOE for the school years of 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. Using the students' social security numbers, 1,826 students were identified in the DOE database. Of the 1,826 students, 1,623 (89%) were released from the juvenile facilities during the 1999-2000 school year, including 613 released in the fall semester of

1999, and 1,010 released in the spring semester of 2000. The analysis in this section was based on these 1,623 students. For those students released in the fall semester of 1999, JJEEP examined whether they were enrolled in a public school in the spring semester of 2000 and how long they stayed in the school. For those released in the spring semester, JJEEP examined if they returned to a public school in the fall semester of 2000 and the number of days they stayed in the school before the semester ended.

To test the relationship between QA scores and educational outcomes, JJEEP computed proportion of students returning to public schools and average number of days the students stayed in the school for each program with five or more students enrolled in regular schools in a given semester. JJEEP then correlated QA scores with proportions of students returning to school and average number of days in school. By requiring at least five students per program, we minimized the impact that students with extreme values on length of stay would have had on the correlations between QA scores and the outcome measures.

Table 11.4-1 provides the correlations between QA scores and proportion of students returning to public schools at the program level. Both zero-order correlation and partial correlation with several variables controlled are listed. The number of programs used to compute each correlation coefficient is also listed. In the partial correlation analysis, average age, percentage of males, security level, and average days served in the program were included as control variables. If any of these variables affected both QA scores and educational outcomes, the relationship between these variables would not be measured accurately by zero-order correlations. As a result, the partial correlations represent more accurate measures of these relationships with the effects of four other variables controlled.

**Table 11.4-1: Correlations between QA Scores and Return to School**

	Zero-Order	Partial
<b>Correlation</b>	0.09	0.17
<b>Number of Programs</b>	38	37

As shown in Table 11.4-1, QA scores are positively correlated with returning to school as predicted. Programs with higher QA scores tended to have a higher proportion of students returning to school. The strength of this relationship, however, is weak. After controlling for the effects of age, gender, security level, and time served, the correlation increased considerably, from 0.09 to 0.17, but neither of these coefficients is statistically significant.

Table 11.4-2 shows the correlations between QA scores and number of days in school. The relationship between these two variables is strong and positive. Both the zero-order correlation and the partial correlation are statistically significant. The correlation coefficient increased only slightly after the control variables were introduced, suggesting that the QA scores might be positively related to days of staying in school across age, gender, security levels and lengths of time served in the program.

**Table 11.4-3: Correlations between QA Scores and Number of Days in School**

	Zero-Order	Partial
Correlation	0.47**	0.49**
Number of Programs	30	29

\*\*Significant at the 0.01 confidence level

Overall, these correlation analyses suggest that QA scores have a strong and positive relationship with one of the two indicators used to measure educational outcomes, namely, length of time the students remained in public schools after they were enrolled in these schools. Programs with higher QA scores appeared more likely to have students who remained in public schools for a longer period. This relationship between QA scores and days in school seems to hold constant for all DJJ programs included in this analysis, regardless of age and gender distributions, security level, and average length of time served at these institutions.

QA scores are related in the expected direction to whether a DJJ student would return to a public school after he or she was released from a correctional facility, but this relationship was neither strong nor statistically significant. A separate analysis (not shown here) suggested that age was the strongest predictor of returning to a public school. Younger students were more likely to return to public school than older students. How the programs performed in terms of the QA scores was not strongly related to the percentage of students returning to public school at the program level.

Like the recidivism results, these results need to be interpreted with caution. These analyses were based on a small sample of programs. The results from these analyses may not be generalizable to the entire population of programs. As JJEPP receives more data from DOE, DJJ, and other sources, it will be possible to conduct similar analyses to verify these findings using more programs. In addition, it is important to recognize that correlations do not, by definition, establish cause/effect relationships that enable empirically based predictions. Rather, JJEPP's analyses show that QA scores are positively correlated with number of days in public schools. To establish a causal relationship between these two sets of variables requires more rigorous testing procedures, which will be possible once more comprehensive data are available.

## 11.5 Summary Discussion

These data analyses represent JJEPP's continuous effort to improve juvenile justice education through evidence-based research. The analyses demonstrate how data from JJEPP, DOE, and DJJ can be integrated and used to evaluate educational and community reintegration outcomes. With more comprehensive data and more sophisticated methodologies, JJEPP will be able to produce more reliable evidence about what works and for whom in juvenile justice education in Florida. The immediate steps that JJEPP is taking toward achieving these goals is to replicate the findings presented in this chapter using a

larger sample, possibly the entire population of juvenile justice programs. Students will be followed for a longer period to evaluate whether programs with higher QA scores will help students achieve not only short-term academic gains but also long-term successes in community reintegration.

Future analyses will include more control variables obtained from DJJ, DOE, and JJEEP's self-reported survey. Larger datasets and more refined measurements will enable us to use more rigorous statistical methods, such as multilevel hierarchical modeling and survival analysis, to establish compelling cause/effect relationships between educational program indicators and community reintegration outcomes. With the new data that JJEEP expects to receive this year from its self-report study and DJJ, DOE and the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) databases, it will be possible to assess a series of interrelated community reintegration outcomes in relation to specific juvenile justice educational program characteristics and resulting pre- and post-academic gains. Some of these community reintegration outcomes include various self-report indicators of post-release behavior and experiences, grades earned in public schools, high school completion rate, percent of students receiving diplomas and certificates, students enrolled in post-secondary educational programs, employment, and earnings.

Together, these educational programs and multiple self-report and official outcome data will enable JJEEP to provide comprehensive empirical descriptions, explanations, and predictions concerning the complex relationship between the education of juvenile justice youths and their subsequent community reintegration experiences.