

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF 2003 QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW RESULTS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents data collected by the Juvenile Justice Educational Enhancement Program (JJEED) during the 2003 quality assurance (QA) review cycle. The primary data source is QA reviews, during which reviewers collect information relating to transition, service delivery, administration, and contract management for each juvenile justice educational program. Additionally, reviewers collect supplemental data that provide general information about the facility and educational providers, program and educational staff, and current student demographics. These data provide the basis for analyzing QA review results in relation to various program characteristics¹.

This chapter is comprised of six subsequent sections that describe the educational program database and its uses, and provide general analyses of the 2003 QA review data. Section 3.2 describes program and student characteristics. Section 3.3 provides specific information on the database, including available data and reports, which can be generated by JJEED staff upon request. Section 3.4 explains the QA review methods and performance rating system. Section 3.5 presents QA review results by program model, security level, school district, and educational program provider for both regular and deemed program QA reviews. Section 3.6 compares QA review scores from 2001 through 2003. Section 3.7 provides summary discussion of QA review findings for 2003.

3.2 Educational Program and Student Characteristics

There were 196 programs that were under the purview of educational quality assurance in 2003. One of these was a special deemed program that received no QA review. Four new programs, which opened in 2003, and 11 programs undergoing a provider change did not receive QA reviews. The data and analyses presented in this and subsequent chapters are primarily drawn from the remaining 180 QA reviews that JJEED conducted during the 2003 review cycle. Fifty of these programs were deemed in 2003 and received shorter QA reviews.

¹ These data also assist in the specification of facility and student outcomes, such as school success (e.g., graduation rates, rates of return to school) and continuation of delinquency (e.g., arrest rates, recommitment rates). Beginning last year, some of these outcomes and longitudinal tracking capabilities were made available from the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) and Florida Education Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), Florida Department of Corrections (FLDOC), and Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) databases. These new data, along with those already collected by JJEED over the past six years, provide the foundation for JJEED's ongoing multiple research efforts.

During the 2003 QA review cycle, data on student populations were collected both from the registrar and through a head count of students present on the days when the reviews were actually conducted. The head count indicates that these programs supervised 9,416 juveniles of which 9,148 were enrolled in school. Two hundred thirty-eight students already had high school diplomas. The remaining 30 juveniles were not currently enrolled due to transition periods upon entering and exiting the programs. Depending on program type and student performance, students remained in facilities anywhere from one day (in detention centers) to up to three years (in maximum risk facilities).

Table 3.2-1 provides a break down of the different types and security levels as well as summary length of stay and population information for all programs that were under JJEEP's purview during the 2003 review cycle. All 25 detention programs are public, with a range of stay from one to 365 days and a capacity ranging from 39 to 215 students. For day treatment programs, all prevention, intensive probation, and mixed programs are private not for profit programs with length of stays ranging from one to 730 days and a maximum capacity 22 to 190 students. Two of the four conditional release programs are public, and one is private for profit. Among the residential programs, 72 are public, 41 are private not for profit, and 12 are private for profit. Lengths of stay in residential programs range from 30 to 1,095 days, and the capacity varies from 12 to 350 students. All but one of the private for profit programs is a residential program.

Table 3.2-1: 2003 Facility Type, Length of Stay, and Capacity by Security Level

<i>Security Level</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private Not For Profit</i>	<i>Private For Profit</i>	<i>Range of Stay (days)</i>	<i>Max. Capacity Range</i>
Detention						
Detention Secure	25	25	0	0	1-365	39-215
Detention Total	25	25	0	0	1-365	39-215
Day Treatment						
Prevention	19	0	19	0	1-730	26-84
Intensive Probation (IP)	3	0	3	0	90-360	22-65
Conditional Release (CR)	4	2	1*	1	90-540	16-38
Mixed = IP & CR	18	0	18	0	120-300	30-190
Day Treatment Total	44	2	41	1	1-730	16-190
Residential						
Low Risk	10	6	4	0	30-220	18-52
Moderate Risk	84	45	31*	8	30-540	12-240
Mixed - Moderate & Low	2	1	0	1	120-270	62-72
High Risk	22	14	5	3	120-720	15-350
Maximum Risk	3	1	1	1	365-1095	50-100
Mixed - Moderate & High	6	5	1	0	180-720	65-185
Residential Total	127	72	41	12	30-1,095	12-350
TOTAL FOR ALL	196	99	82	13	1-1,095	12-350

Note. Facility Type categories include government-run programs that are not directly operated by school districts.

As indicated in Table 3.2-1, moderate risk programs comprise 66% of residential facilities and house the majority of youths, while maximum risk programs comprise only 2% of residential facilities. Given the longer lengths of stay in maximum risk institutions (identified by the Florida Legislature as juvenile prisons), these facilities transition far fewer youths. Further, while conditional release programs have closed over the years, resulting in fewer opportunities for youths to receive aftercare services, several new detention facilities have been built.

Table 3.2-2 provides student demographics on gender and race in the 180 programs that JJEEP reviewed during the 2003 review cycle.

Table 3.2-2: 2003 Gender and Race of Students By Program Type (In Percentages)

Program Type	Gender			Race				Total
	Male	Female	Total	Black Non-Hispanic	White Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Other	
Detention Centers	80% (1,366)	20% (342)	100% (1,708)	50% (846)	40% (681)	10% (166)	1% (17)	101% (1,710)
Day Treatment	44% (907)	56% (1,162)	100% (2,069)	41% (839)	46% (950)	12% (247)	2% (34)	101% (2,070)
Residential	81% (4,674)	19% (1,078)	100% (5,752)	45% (2,581)	46% (2,627)	8% (437)	2% (94)	101% (5,739)
All Programs Combined	73% (6,947)	27% (2,582)	100% (9,529)	45% (4,266)	45% (4,258)	9% (850)	2% (145)	101% (9,519)

Note. Gender is based on a head count roster of juveniles in a program. Race is based on the number of students enrolled in school, and therefore, may differ. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding. Total percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Due to the preponderance of Practical, Academic, and Cultural Education (PACE) prevention programs for girls, females are disproportionately represented in day treatment programs, though the overall population is overwhelmingly male. African-American youths remain over-represented in the juvenile justice population as compared to the general population in Florida.

Table 3.2-3 provides a break down of the total number of students identified as needing exceptional student education (ESE) services into different primary disabilities as a percentage of the total ESE population.

Table 3.2-3: 2003 ESE Student Population By Program Type (In Percentages)

<i>Program Type</i>	<i>EH or SED</i>	<i>SLD</i>	<i>MH</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Total</i>
Detention Centers	46% (320)	34% (238)	11% (79)	8% (55)	99% (692)
Day Treatment	35% (194)	49% (272)	6% (35)	10% (58)	100% (559)
Residential	52% (1,416)	35% (960)	8% (213)	5% (141)	100% (2,730)
All Programs Combined	48% (1,930)	37% (1,470)	8% (327)	6% (254)	99% (3,981)

Note. ESE disabilities designated in this table are EH = emotionally handicapped, SED = severely emotionally disturbed, SLD = specific learning disability, MH = mentally handicapped. Total ESE is computed as a percent of total registered students, and does not include juveniles who just entered and were not enrolled or who have attained their high school diploma or its equivalent. EH and SED categories have been combined to reflect the percentage of students with behavior disorders.

Since 1999, the percentage of students identified as needing ESE services has increased from 36% to 44%, indicating that school districts and educational providers are increasing their efforts to appropriately identify students in need of these special services as they enter juvenile justice facilities. This is most likely the result of continuing QA monitoring on the identification of, and services for, students in need of ESE services. According to the 2003 SEA PROFILE brief 2004-08B (December 2003) from the FLDOE, 15% of the students enrolled in public school for Fall 2003 were identified as students with disabilities. The percentage of ESE students in Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) schools was 44%, more than twice that of public schools. More specifically, students with behavior disorders comprise 48% of the ESE juvenile justice population, but represent only seven percent of the ESE public school population. Learning disabled and mentally handicapped populations vary only slightly between DJJ and public schools. Clearly, students identified with behavior disorders are much more likely to enter the juvenile justice population than any other type of ESE student. This potentially predicting variable needs further examination to determine the causal factors of this finding. In contrast, gifted students comprise 22% of the ESE public school population, but represent less than one percent in DJJ schools.

3.3 Database

One of JJEPP's fundamental activities is the ongoing development of a historical juvenile justice educational program database for the State of Florida. This database has evolved into a comprehensive research tool that has enabled JJEPP to identify 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 is collected by QA staff during on-site visits and is based on interviews, observations, and a review of documentation. These data are useful in diagnosing program needs, trends, and

identifying potential areas for technical assistance, as well as for providing an overview of each educational program's performance. As the database continues to expand, analysis of its contents will continue to facilitate major improvements and assist Florida's juvenile justice educational programs with implementing best practices.

Currently, the database contains information from every JJEEP QA review and includes detailed QA review ratings and program information. In the 2003 QA cycle, for example, the database contains more than 100 fields of data for each program. While variables within the database may change from year to year through the inclusion of more detailed information, the overall categories remain consistent. These categories include facility characteristics, provider information, educational staff characteristics, student characteristics, educational program information, and QA review scores.

JJEEP staff frequently use the database to provide technical assistance to programs, network educational program personnel, and conduct internal research. Additionally, JJEEP is able to provide useful information on the educational QA review process to juvenile justice educators, program providers, and Florida school districts. The JJEEP database is used to prepare the data presented in the JJEEP and DOE annual reports. Numerous other reports may be generated from the database upon request.

An ongoing purpose of the database is to inform programs, contracted providers, and school districts about the educational QA process. Comparing one program's QA review scores to another, or comparing one school district or provider to another, is often useful for diagnosing program needs or identifying potential areas for technical assistance. Additionally, these comparisons can identify high and low performing programs and their specific educational program practices, assisting JJEEP in the identification of specific examples of best practices that may be disseminated. In 2004, JJEEP plans to conduct case studies of selected high and low performing programs based on five years of QA data and available student outcomes. For detailed information on the selection and identification of these demonstration sites, see Chapter 11.

Currently, the JJEEP database can provide a variety of reports to assist programs, providers, school districts, and other interested parties in understanding the multiple factors relating to the quality of juvenile justice education in Florida. Data can be grouped, sorted, or otherwise organized for various analyses. The most frequent and useful requests are the groupings of QA review scores by school district, provider, security level, and other program characteristics.

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 via mail, phone, fax, or through the JJEEP website (325 John Knox Rd., Bldg. L, Suite 102, Tallahassee, FL 32303; phone: 850-414-8355; fax: 850-414-8357; www.jjeep.org).

3.4 QA Methods

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

In conducting reviews, JJEPP personnel rely upon the preponderance of available evidence to determine scores for all indicators. Ultimately, reviewers must consider all information and decide whether the weight of the evidence demonstrates that the intent of the indicator is being met. The preponderance of evidence determinations are based on the multiple data sources that JJEPP staff review during the QA process. Moreover, there are occasions when reviewers will document that a particular process guideline is not being met, but the overall intent of the indicator is being achieved. In such instances, the reviewer will determine the numerical QA score in relation to all the indicator's performance evidence, not just in relation to a single guideline that is not being met.

Educational QA reviewers examine each program according to the indicators appropriate to the program type. Although educational standards are largely consistent across all program types, specific indicators have been designed for residential commitment programs, day treatment programs, and detention centers. Residential commitment programs supervise students for up to three years, depending on program security level, the judge's sentence, and student performance. Day treatment programs can be either voluntary or involuntary and allow students to remain in their home environment while attending the program during the day. Detention centers hold students anywhere from one day up to one year, usually until students are sentenced or while students are awaiting placement in a residential 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's set of indicators are adapted to meet the needs of students specific to that program type. The specific content and total number of indicators within each standard varies by program type. As a result, comparisons of averages of a specific indicator across program types are not appropriate. Comparisons across program types are possible, however, using both 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 score for a program. Instead, these scores reflect the performance of the local school district responsible for the program.

Historically, deemed and special-deemed programs have presented a unique challenge to evaluating the educational programs within Florida's juvenile justice system. Deemed status

is conferred upon programs by DJJ based on each program's combined DJJ and JJEPP QA score; however, the educational standards account for only a small percentage of a program's overall DJJ QA score. Once they are so designated by DJJ, special-deemed programs do not receive any review from DJJ or JJEPP for one year and receive an abbreviated review for two subsequent years. In contrast, deemed programs only receive an abbreviated review for two years. Therefore, direct inclusion of deemed programs within the overall computation of indicator, standard, and overall mean averages was not previously possible.

In past years, JJEPP reported only pass/fail scores for programs that DJJ assigned as deemed. The result of this practice was that, over time, as more and more programs became deemed, the data available to conduct research into best educational practices was diminished. Therefore, this year JJEPP expanded the deemed review from one to two days, and modified the deemed process so that numeric scores were assigned to these deemed programs. Deemed programs receive scores on a subset of nine indicators that have been selected for their correlation with the program's overall score as well as their relative importance with regard to compliance with state statutes. These indicators include enrollment, assessment, student planning, exit transition, academic curriculum, instructional delivery, classroom management, funding and support, and instructional personnel qualifications. The complete standards and indicators for all program types can be found in Appendix B.

If deemed programs only made up a relatively small proportion of the programs in Florida, the problem would not substantially affect analyses, and JJEPP would continue reporting on deemed programs separate from those programs that receive a full review; however, the number of deemed programs has consistently increased over the five year time span that JJEPP has been evaluating Florida's juvenile justice education. In 1999, 18% of all programs in the state were deemed. In 2002, 24% of the programs within the state were deemed, which triggered the reanalysis of the process. This trend continued, and the number of Florida's deemed programs increased in 2003 to 28%. Since deemed status is not necessarily an indication of educational quality due to the low weight the educational QA review is given in the overall QA score, it is important to assess the educational quality of deemed programs independent of DJJ's methodology and review process.

Rating System

There are two types of indicators: performance and compliance. For performance indicators, programs can receive ratings of superior (rating of 7, 8, or 9), satisfactory (rating of 4, 5, or 6), partial (rating of 1, 2, or 3), or nonperformance (rating of 0). For compliance indicators, programs may receive ratings of full compliance (rating of 6), substantial compliance (rating of 4), or noncompliance (rating of 0).

Table 3.4-1 shows the rating definitions used by reviewers to score individual indicators during reviews.

Table 3.4-1: Indicator Rating Definitions

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR RATING DEFINITIONS	
<p>Superior Performance = 7, 8, 9 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met; there are no exceptions to the specific requirements of the indicator being met, and the program has exceeded the overall requirements of the indicator through an innovative approach, extended services, or an apparently evident program-wide dedication to the overall performance of the indicator.</p>	<p>Superior – 9 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met; there are no exceptions to the specific requirements of the indicator being met, and the program has exceeded the overall requirements of the indicator, with no room for improvement, through an innovative approach, extended services, or an apparently evident program-wide dedication to the overall performance of the indicator.</p> <p>Superior – 8 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met; there are no exceptions to the specific requirements of the indicator being met, and the program has exceeded the overall requirements of the indicator through an innovative approach or extended services.</p> <p>Superior – 7 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met; there are no exceptions to the specific requirements of the indicator being met, and the program has met the requirements of the indicator seamlessly through an apparently evident program-wide dedication to the overall performance of the indicator.</p>
<p>Satisfactory Performance = 4, 5, 6 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met, and all of the requirements of the indicator are being met, or there are only minor exceptions or inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p>	<p>Satisfactory – 6 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met; all of the requirements of the indicator have been met, or there are very few if any minor exceptions or inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator; and the program has dedicated consistent attention to meeting the requirements of the indicator.</p> <p>Satisfactory – 5 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met, and all of the requirements of the indicator are being met, or there were few minor exceptions or inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p> <p>Satisfactory – 4 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met, but there is a pattern of minor exceptions or inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p>
<p>Partial Performance = 1, 2, 3 The expected outcome of the indicator is not being met, and/or there are frequent exceptions and inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p>	<p>Partial – 3 The expected outcome of the indicator is not being met, and/or there are several exceptions and inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p> <p>Partial – 2 The expected outcome of the indicator is not being met, and/or there are frequent exceptions and inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p> <p>Partial – 1 The expected outcome of the indicator is not being met, and the specific requirements are not being systematically addressed.</p>
<p>Nonperformance = 0 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly not being met, and the specific requirements of the indicator are not being significantly addressed.</p>	
COMPLIANCE INDICATOR RATING DEFINITIONS	
<p>Full Compliance = 6 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met, and all of the requirements of the indicator have been met, or there are very few if any exceptions or inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p>	
<p>Substantial Compliance = 4 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly being met, but there are minor patterns of exceptions or inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p>	
<p>Noncompliance = 0 The expected outcome of the indicator is clearly not being met, and/or there are frequent exceptions and inconsistencies in the specific requirements for the indicator.</p>	

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* and is reported in the tables of this and subsequent chapters.

Additionally, 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*. Since the highest score on a compliance indicator is a 6, the actual maximum possible overall mean score for detention is 8.29, for day treatment 8.53, and for residential 8.50.

Categories of Overall Performance

Six categories of overall performance are used to identify and divide educational programs based on the overall mean of their QA review scores for standard one through standard 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 2003 QA review scores, including specific indicator scores for each program, are listed in appendix D for the 180 programs reviewed. This appendix groups all programs according to the analyses provided in this chapter: program type, security level, school district, facility size, and program provider, including specific providers and their profit status.

3.5 2003 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 2002 to 2003 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 commitment of FLDOE and JJEEP to high standards and continuous improvement. It is also important to note that standard four, contract management, is not included in the overall mean score for a program, as this standard is intended to measure the supervising school district's performance and does not reflect directly on individual program performance.

Of the 196 educational programs that were under the purview of educational quality assurance during 2003, Falkenburg Academy was special deemed and did not require a review. Bartow Youth Training Center Halfway House, Intensive Halfway House, and Serious Habitual Offender Program (SHOP) were temporarily closed for reconstruction and

did not receive a review. They will reopen as one program in 2004 and will be renamed Polk Achievement Center. Twelve other programs did not receive a review due to a provider change. These programs are Brevard Halfway House, Dina Thompson Academy, Cypress Creek Academy, Miami Halfway House, Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center, Palm Beach Halfway House, Polk Halfway House, Sabal Palm School, Blackwater Career Development Center, Blackwater Short Term Offender Program (STOP) Camp, Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment, and Volusia Halfway House. Of the 180 programs that were reviewed, 50 were deemed, and 130 were non-deemed. Beginning this year, the deemed programs, while still not receiving a full review, received numerical scores on nine major indicators and on all standards except contact management. This allowed the inclusion of deemed programs in analyses with non-deemed programs. In order to compare the QA results of deemed and non-deemed programs and to determine the impact on overall QA results due to the scoring of deemed programs in 2003, Table 3.5-1 provides QA review data for deemed and non-deemed programs separately. The remaining tables in this chapter provide information concerning the overall spread of QA scores and rank the highest and lowest performing programs.

Table 3.5-1 identifies mean QA review scores for deemed and non-deemed separately by program type—residential commitment programs, day treatment 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, they are all reviewed according to the same three standard areas (transition, service delivery, and administration). Programs can be compared by the mean of each QA standard, as well as the mean of the overall QA review scores.

Table 3.5-1: 2003 Standard Means and Overall Means for Non-Deemed and Deemed Programs by Program Type

Program Type	Number of Deemed Programs	Number of Non-Deemed Programs	Transition		Service Delivery		Administration Deemed	Administration Non-Deemed	Overall Mean Deemed	Overall Mean Non-Deemed
			Deemed	Non-Deemed	Deemed	Non-Deemed				
Detention Centers	5	20	5.80	5.86	6.53	5.91	7.10	6.40	6.33	6.06
Day Treatment	20	24	5.16	5.40	5.58	5.80	4.83	5.47	5.24	5.57
Residential	25	86	6.05	5.21	6.67	5.61	6.38	5.53	6.33	5.46
All Programs Combined	50	130	5.67	5.35	6.26	5.69	6.10	5.65	5.97	5.57

Note. The total number of programs across all program types represents only educational programs reviewed, not necessarily the number of DJJ facilities open in 2003. 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 2003 QA review cycle and was not scored for deemed programs.

Of the 180 programs reviewed in 2003, 50 (28%) were deemed. Of these, 25 (50%) were residential commitment programs; 20 (40%) were day treatment programs, and five (10%) were detention centers. Deemed day treatment programs were overrepresented (45%) compared to both residential (23%) and detention (20%). The deemed residential programs scored higher than their non-deemed counterparts on all standards, and detention centers scored higher on all but transition. Although day treatment programs have a higher proportion of deemed programs, they scored lower than their non-deemed counterparts, specifically in the area of administration, where day treatment programs historically score lower.

Table 3.5-2 contains the standard means and the overall means for programs reviewed in 2003, by security level. Overall mean scores range from 4.45 in maximum risk programs to 6.11 in detention centers.

Table 3.5-2: 2003 Standard Means and Overall Means by Security Level

<i>Security Level</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>	<i>Transition</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Administration</i>	<i>Contract Management</i>	<i>Overall Mean</i>
Detention	25	5.84	6.04	6.54	5.67	6.11
Prevention	19	5.38	6.19	5.21	4.78	5.62
Intensive Probation	3	5.61	5.29	5.06	4.67	5.34
Conditional Release	4	4.83	6.18	5.83	5.00	5.64
Mixed Day Treatment	18	5.18	5.08	4.92	5.33	5.08
Day Treatment Total	44	5.29	5.68	5.17	5.17	5.41
Low Risk	9	5.73	6.29	5.78	5.62	5.90
Moderate Risk	73	5.38	5.93	5.71	4.80	5.68
High Risk	20	5.48	5.64	5.87	4.77	5.65
Maximum Risk	2	4.42	4.21	4.75	3.67	4.45
Mixed Residential	7	5.14	5.67	5.79	5.05	5.54
All Residential	111	5.38	5.85	5.72	4.83	5.65
All Programs Combined	180	5.43	5.84	5.70	5.02	5.65

Note. 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 2003 QA review cycle.

All programs combined had an overall mean of 5.65. This finding is an improvement over the previous year's score (5.42). This finding is due, in part, to the scoring of deemed programs; however, when removing deemed programs from the analysis, the 2003 overall mean is 5.57, which still demonstrates an improvement from the previous year. A score of 5.0 represents a mid-range (i.e., "satisfactory") level of educational services. In other words, the average program generally provided services that met or exceeded 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 total mean scores ranged from 2.68 to 7.78. Detention centers scored higher than day treatment and commitment programs in 2003 across all standards. For the second consecutive year, this finding contradicts previous observed trends where detention centers tended to score lower than commitment programs. This is particularly surprising since Section 3.4 indicates that the maximum possible score for detention centers was slightly lower than the other two types of programs due to the scoring process, which includes a larger proportion of compliance indicators.

Of the QA standards for transition, service delivery, and administration, the highest rated standard across all program types was service delivery, which averaged 5.84. In contrast, transition was the lowest rated standard, with an average score of 5.43.

Table 3.5-3 identifies the 2003 mean QA review scores for each standard and the overall mean scores for each of the 43 supervising school districts (not necessarily the same as the county in which the program is located) for both district-operated and district-contracted programs. (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 school district's supervision. Within each category, the supervising school districts are listed in descending order by the overall mean of the QA review scores.

Table 3.5-3: 2003 Standard Means and Overall Means Ranked by Overall Mean for District-Operated and District-Contracted Educational Programs

<i>Number of Programs Supervised</i>	<i>Supervising School District</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>	<i>Transition</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Administration</i>	<i>Contract Management</i>	<i>Overall Mean</i>
1 Program	Bradford	1	6.17	6.33	6.33	6.00	6.28
	Holmes	1	6.75	6.33	5.00	N/A	6.22
	Hardee	1	5.33	5.86	5.00	5.33	5.42
	Jefferson	1	4.83	5.57	5.33	5.33	5.26
	Hamilton	1	3.67	6.43	4.50	4.00	4.95
	Levy	1	4.33	5.43	5.00	3.33	4.95
	Glades	1	4.33	4.29	4.33	2.67	4.32
	Total	7	5.06	5.75	5.07	4.44	5.34
2-3 Programs	Nassau	2	6.12	6.71	6.50	6.00	6.42
	Martin	2	5.38	6.50	5.25	N/A	5.72
	Osceola	3	5.60	5.65	5.83	5.78	5.70
	Monroe	2	5.38	6.62	4.83	5.33	5.70
	St. Johns	2	4.83	5.76	6.42	4.67	5.58
	Charlotte	2	5.50	5.93	5.08	3.67	5.53
	St. Lucie	2	5.40	5.05	5.17	4.33	5.31
	Liberty	2	5.00	5.71	4.58	6.00	5.13
	Lee	3	4.83	4.67	5.44	5.56	5.01
	Walton	2	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
	Sarasota	2	4.92	5.07	4.75	4.33	4.92
	Madison	3	3.72	5.38	4.78	2.00	4.58
	Okeechobee	2	3.67	4.57	3.33	3.33	3.89
	Hendry	2	3.17	3.86	3.67	1.33	3.58
	Total	31	4.88	5.44	5.08	4.42	5.14
4-6 Programs	Washington	4	6.88	6.83	7.25	N/A	6.94
	Collier	4	6.04	6.44	6.29	4.83	6.25
	Volusia	6	5.72	6.32	6.69	5.56	6.19
	Brevard	4	6.04	6.07	6.17	6.00	6.10
	Bay	4	6.04	5.68	6.79	5.33	6.09
	Polk	6	6.08	5.90	5.83	6.00	5.97
	Escambia	5	5.88	5.75	5.67	5.33	5.72
	Alachua	4	5.00	6.19	5.96	4.33	5.69
	Seminole	4	5.23	5.36	5.71	5.17	5.46
	DeSoto	4	5.50	5.03	5.58	5.17	5.35
	Leon	5	5.25	5.65	4.87	5.78	5.34
	Marion	5	5.20	5.22	5.37	4.67	5.26
	Palm Beach	5	4.81	5.35	5.30	5.33	5.19
	Total	60	5.66	5.83	5.94	5.30	5.80
7+ Programs	Okaloosa	7	6.37	6.41	6.31	6.00	6.36
	Pinellas	19	5.81	6.35	5.97	5.54	6.07
	Pasco	7	5.74	6.24	6.10	5.47	5.99
	Orange	8	5.72	5.93	6.15	5.56	5.92
	Broward	7	5.58	6.27	5.83	5.33	5.88
	Hillsborough	8	5.39	5.71	5.77	6.00	5.59
	Dade	10	4.82	5.73	5.75	3.22	5.46
	Manatee	8	5.19	5.79	5.31	4.00	5.38
	Duval	8	4.74	5.30	5.06	5.14	5.04
	Total	82	5.49	6.00	5.82	5.14	5.77
	All Districts Combined	Total	180	5.43	5.84	5.70	5.02

Note. The total number of programs across all school districts 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. Contract management totals for each group are computed from non-deemed programs only. Standard four, contract management, is not included in the overall mean for the 2003 QA review cycle, and deemed programs did not receive scores in contract management. The contract management cells for these programs are, therefore, left blank.

There are seven school districts that supervise only one program. These programs' overall mean scores range from 4.32 for Glades County to 6.28 for Bradford County. Fourteen school districts supervise two to three programs, with overall mean scores ranging from 3.58 for Hendry County to 6.42 for Nassau County. Thirteen school districts supervise four to six programs, with overall mean scores ranging from 5.19 for Palm Beach County to 6.94 for Washington County. Nine school districts supervise seven to 20 programs, with overall mean scores ranging from 5.04 for Duval County to 6.36 for Okaloosa County.

Of the school districts supervising only one program, two received an overall high satisfactory score (6.00-6.99); two received a satisfactory score (5.00-5.99), and three received a marginally satisfactory score (4.00-4.99). None of these school districts received below satisfactory scores (0.00-3.99). Of school districts supervising two to three programs, one received a high satisfactory score (6.00-6.99); 10 received satisfactory scores (5.00-5.99); one received a marginally satisfactory score (4.00-4.99), and two received below satisfactory scores (0.00 to 3.99). Of school districts supervising four to six programs, five received high satisfactory scores (6.00-6.99); eight received satisfactory scores (5.00-5.99), and none received marginally satisfactory scores (4.00-4.99) or lower. Of school districts supervising seven to 20 programs, two scored in the high satisfactory range (6.00-6.99); seven received satisfactory scores (5.00-5.99), and none received marginally satisfactory scores (4.00-4.99), or lower.

In total, 10 supervising school districts had overall mean scores in the high satisfactory range (6.00-6.99); 26 had overall mean scores in the satisfactory range (5.00-5.99), five had overall mean scores in the marginal satisfactory range (4.00-4.99), and two had an overall mean score in the below satisfactory range (1.00-3.99).

While it may not be appropriate to judge a particular school district as weak when its ranking is a reflection of a single program in one year, the high average rating for Pinellas County School District is notable, considering the large number of programs supervised by the district. Additionally, Okaloosa with seven programs and Brevard, Collier, and Washington with four each are to be commended for receiving high satisfactory scores for each standard as well as their overall scores. It is also interesting to note that of all districts with more than three programs, none received overall below satisfactory scores.

Table 3.5-4 presents the 2003 standard means, ranked by overall mean, of educational program providers in both district-operated and district-contracted programs.

Table 3.5-4: 2003 Standard Means for Educational Providers, Ranked by Overall Mean of Educational Providers (School Districts and Contractors)

<i>Educational Provider</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>	<i>Transition</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Administration</i>	<i>Contract Management</i>	<i>Overall Mean</i>
Escambia	2	6.66	7.33	7.33	6.00	7.05
Washington	4	6.88	6.83	7.25	N/A	6.94
Three Springs Corporation	1	6.75	7.00	7.00	N/A	6.89
Leon	1	6.57	6.75	6.83	6.00	6.71
Okaloosa	6	6.73	6.76	6.69	6.00	6.71
Bay	2	6.13	6.67	7.75	N/A	6.67
Collier	2	6.42	6.73	6.67	5.33	6.58
First Step Adolescent Services II	1	6.75	6.33	6.50	N/A	6.56
Alachua	2	5.71	6.74	7.42	4.67	6.53
Martin	2	6.38	6.50	5.25	N/A	5.72
Volusia	4	5.83	6.65	6.92	5.56	6.42
Securicor New Century	1	6.17	6.57	6.33	6.00	6.37
Keystone Educational Youth Services	1	6.17	6.71	6.17	5.33	6.37
Nassau	1	5.83	6.43	6.83	6.00	6.37
Bradford	1	6.17	6.33	6.33	6.00	6.28
Polk	3	6.18	6.09	6.44	6.00	6.23
Crosswinds Youth Services	1	6.50	6.00	6.00	N/A	6.22
Orange	5	5.97	6.03	6.63	6.00	6.20
Pinellas	8	5.51	6.50	6.52	5.50	6.19
Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc	9	6.23	6.46	5.67	5.89	6.16
Bay Point Schools	2	4.75	6.86	6.50	3.33	6.08
Hillsborough	5	5.59	6.30	6.37	6.00	6.02
Brevard	2	5.50	6.21	6.33	6.00	6.01
Manatee	2	5.25	6.73	6.17	6.00	5.98
Seminole	1	5.43	5.00	7.17	6.00	5.94
Pasco	5	5.30	6.11	6.17	5.11	5.81
Broward	5	5.26	6.15	5.93	5.50	5.75
Children's Comprehensive Services, Inc	1	4.67	6.57	5.83	5.33	5.74
Osceola	3	5.60	5.65	5.83	5.78	5.70
EXCEL, Inc	1	5.33	5.71	5.83	4.67	5.63
Human Services Associates	3	5.89	5.10	6.00	6.00	5.63
PACE Center for Girls, Inc	19	5.38	6.19	5.21	4.78	5.62
St. Johns	2	4.83	5.76	6.42	4.67	5.58
Central Florida Youth Service	1	5.33	5.86	5.00	5.33	5.42
St. Lucie	1	6.14	4.25	5.33	6.00	5.41
Twin Oaks Juvenile Development	1	5.00	6.29	4.67	6.00	5.37
DISC Village	2	4.17	6.57	5.50	4.00	5.35
North American Family Institute	2	4.83	5.57	5.42	5.67	5.29
Associated Marine Institutes, Inc	26	5.40	5.28	5.04	5.15	5.26
Affiliated Computer Services (ACS)	2	5.08	5.36	4.92	5.00	5.13
Hurricane Island Outward Bound	4	5.52	5.25	4.67	4.67	5.12
Marion	3	5.00	4.79	5.61	3.67	5.11
Youthtrack, Inc	2	4.67	5.07	5.42	5.33	5.05
Lee	2	4.83	4.71	5.33	5.33	5.01
Radar Group, Inc	2	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
Department of Agriculture	1	4.33	5.43	5.00	3.33	4.95
Hamilton	1	3.67	6.43	4.50	4.00	4.95
Dade	4	4.05	4.82	5.88	3.17	4.91
Liberty	1	5.00	5.14	4.50	6.00	4.89
Police Athletic League Charter School	3	5.06	5.14	4.39	2.00	4.88
Coastal Recovery, Inc	1	4.67	5.14	4.33	1.33	4.74
Palm Beach	3	3.93	4.63	5.44	5.11	4.70
Duval	4	4.80	4.49	4.83	4.83	4.70

<i>Educational Provider</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>	<i>Transition</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Administration</i>	<i>Contract Management</i>	<i>Overall Mean</i>
Okeechobee	1	4.00	4.43	4.00	5.33	4.16
Sarasota Family YMCA, Inc	1	4.17	4.43	3.50	3.33	4.05
Vision Quest, Ltd	1	3.33	4.71	2.67	1.33	3.63
Hendry	2	3.17	3.86	3.67	1.33	3.58
Correctional Services Corporation	1	2.83	3.00	3.33	.00	3.05
Total	180	5.43	5.84	5.70	5.02	5.65

Note. 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. Contract management totals for each group are computed from non-deemed programs only. Standard four, contract management, is not included in the overall mean for the 2003 QA review cycle, and deemed programs did not receive scores in contract management. The contract management cells for these programs are, therefore, left blank.

Scores in Table 3.5-4 range from a high of 7.05 for the programs operated by Escambia County School District to a low of 3.05 for the programs operated by Correctional Services Corporation. Escambia was the only provider to score in the superior range, but 22 providers scored in the high satisfactory range. These highest scoring providers included 16 school districts with a total of 49 programs and seven contracted providers with 15 programs. Three providers scored in the below satisfactory range. These lowest scoring programs included Hendry County School District, with two programs (3.58), and two contracted providers, Correctional Services Corporation (3.05) and Vision Quest, Ltd (3.63), with one program each.

Table 3.5-5 provides an overview of program performance by listing the percentage of programs in each performance category.

Table 3.5-5: Categories of Overall Performance by Number and Percentage for Reviewed Programs

<i>Overall Performance Category</i>	<i>Score Range</i>	<i>Number of Programs With This Score</i>	<i>Percentage of Programs With This Score</i>
Superior Performance	7.00 - 9.00	14	8%
High Satisfactory Performance	6.00 - 6.99	56	31%
Satisfactory Performance	5.00 - 5.99	72	40%
Marginal Satisfactory Performance	4.00 - 4.99	31	17%
Below Satisfactory Performance	0.00 - 3.99	7	4%
Total	—	180	100%

Of the 180 reviewed programs, 14 (eight percent) scored in the superior performance range, and 56 (31%) scored in the high satisfactory performance. The largest proportion of programs (73 programs, or 40%) scored in the satisfactory performance range. Thirty (17%) programs scored in the marginal satisfactory performance range, and only seven (four percent) programs scored in the below satisfactory performance range. With eight percent of the programs scoring in the superior range and four percent in the below satisfactory range,

this represents a slight positive skew to the distribution of QA scores for 2003. See appendix D1 for the 2003 ranking of all programs by overall mean score.

Table 3.5-6 identifies the programs receiving below satisfactory overall mean scores during the 2003 QA review cycle.

Table 3.5-6: Below Satisfactory Programs

<i>Program Name</i>	<i>Supervising District</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Service</i>			<i>Contract Management</i>	<i>Overall Mean</i>
			<i>Transition</i>	<i>Delivery</i>	<i>Administration</i>		
Tallahassee Marine Institute	Leon	Mixed Day Treatment	4.75	4.00	1.50	N/A	3.78
Vision Quest Okeechobee	Okeechobee	Mixed - Mod & Low	3.33	4.71	2.67	1.33	3.63
Hendry Halfway House	Hendry	Moderate Risk	3.17	3.86	3.67	1.33	3.58
Hendry Youth Development Academy	Hendry	Moderate Risk	3.17	3.86	3.67	1.33	3.58
JoAnn Bridges Academy	Madison	Moderate Risk	2.83	3.00	3.33	0.00	3.05
Tampa Marine Institute	Hillsborough	Mixed Day Treatment	3.25	2.00	4.00	N/A	3.00
Impact Halfway House	Duval	Moderate Risk	2.50	2.00	3.67	2.67	2.68

Note. Standard four, contract management, is not included in the overall mean for the 2003 QA review cycle, and deemed programs did not receive scores in contract management. The contract management cells for these programs are, therefore, left blank.

Seven (four percent) of the 180 programs scored below satisfactory. Four of the seven programs in the below satisfactory range are operated by private providers. This is a decrease in the number of programs performing below satisfactory from previous years, falling from 17 in 2001 and nine in 2002.

Table 3.5-7 identifies the programs receiving superior overall mean scores during the 2003 QA review cycle.

Table 3.5-7: Programs Receiving Superior Overall Mean Scores in 2003, Rank-Ordered by Overall Mean Score

<i>Program Name</i>	<i>Supervising District</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Transition</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Administration</i>	<i>Contract Management</i>	<i>Overall Mean</i>
Dozier Training School for Boys	Washington	High Risk	7.50	8.00	8.00	N/A	7.78
Jackson Juvenile Offender Correction Center	Washington	High Risk	7.50	7.67	7.50	N/A	7.56
Gulf Coast Youth Academy	Okaloosa	Moderate Risk	7.33	7.71	7.33	6.00	7.47
Okaloosa Youth Academy	Okaloosa	Moderate Risk	7.25	7.67	7.50	N/A	7.44
Bay Regional Juvenile Detention Center	Bay	Detention Secure	7.00	7.33	8.00	N/A	7.33
PACE Broward	Broward	Prevention	7.25	7.67	6.50	N/A	7.22
Pensacola Boys Base	Escambia	Moderate Risk	6.75	7.67	7.50	N/A	7.22
Polk County Boot Camp	Polk	Moderate Risk	7.00	7.33	7.50	N/A	7.22
Orange Regional Juvenile Detention Center	Orange	Detention Secure	7.00	7.00	7.33	6.00	7.12
Vernon Place	Washington	High Risk	7.25	6.33	8.00	N/A	7.11
Alachua Regional Juvenile Detention Center	Alachua	Detention Secure	6.25	7.33	8.00	N/A	7.00

<i>Program Name</i>	<i>Supervising District</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Transition</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Administration</i>	<i>Contract Management</i>	<i>Overall Mean</i>
Eckerd Intensive Halfway House	Pinellas	Moderate Risk	7.25	7.67	5.50	N/A	7.00
Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	Pinellas	Moderate Risk	6.75	7.33	7.00	N/A	7.00
Volusia Regional Juvenile Detention Center	Volusia	Detention Secure	7.00	6.75	7.17	6.00	7.00

Note. Standard four, contract management, is not included in the overall mean for the 2003 QA review cycle, and deemed programs did not receive scores in contract management. The contract management cells for these programs are, therefore, left blank.

Of the 180 programs reviewed during 2003, 14 (eight percent) programs scored in the superior range. Four of these programs are detention centers, while only one is a day treatment program. Public school districts operate ten of the 14 programs in the superior range. Fifty-six (31%) programs scored in the high satisfactory range, ranging from 6.00 to 6.95.

3.6 Comparison of 2001 Through 2003 QA Review Scores

The QA standards were modified for the 2003 review cycle, and the required performance level was increased in several areas. In general, QA scores have continually improved since 1999. Scores continued to increase this year. Also observed was a dramatic increase in the number of superior and high performing programs. In examining the 70 programs that were rated superior or high satisfactory in 2003, 20 of these also were rated superior or high satisfactory in 2002. Two of these programs have maintained this status since 1998. Five of the 45 high scoring programs in 2002 changed providers; one obtained special-deemed status, and one combined with another program, leaving only 17 scored programs that dropped out of the superior or high satisfactory category. Of these 17 programs, 15 remained in the satisfactory range, and only one program declined into the below satisfactory category in 2003.

The number of below satisfactory programs decreased from 17 in 2001 to nine in 2002 to seven in 2003. Of the nine programs that were below satisfactory in 2002, only three remained in one of these designations in 2003; one program was closed, and five improved their scores above these low categories in 2003.

A different kind of comparison is made between QA scores in 2002 and 2003. Table 3.6-1 presents 22 indicators that can be directly compared.

Table 3.6-1: Average Mean Comparison for Each Indicator, Excluding those for Detention Centers

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>2002 Mean</i>	<i>2003 Mean</i>	<i>Difference</i>
E1.01	5.66	5.83	0.17
E1.02	4.87	5.13	0.26
E1.03	4.96	5.06	0.10
E1.04	5.2	5.23	0.03
E1.05	5.58	5.88	0.30
E1.06	4.32	4.95	0.63
E2.01	5.26	5.52	0.26
E2.02	5.4	5.72	0.32
E2.03 Day Treatment /2.04 Residential	5.18	5.39	0.21
E2.04 Day Treatment /2.05 Residential	5.54	5.96	0.42
E2.05 Day Treatment /2.06 Residential	5.49	5.79	0.30
E2.06 Day Treatment /2.07 Residential	6.15	6.3	0.15
E2.07 (Day Treatment only)	6.15	6.22	0.07
E3.01	5.78	6.04	0.26
E3.02	5.09	5.15	0.06
E3.03	5.54	5.54	0.00
E3.04	5.45	5.74	0.29
E3.05	5.44	5.38	-0.06
E3.06	5.36	5.52	0.16
E4.01	5.07	5.24	0.17
E4.02	5.33	5.46	0.13
E4.03	4.24	4.11	-0.13
AVERAGE	5.35	5.58	0.23

Note. Detention centers are excluded due to differences within indicators.

Of the 22 indicators, 20 had higher scores in 2003 than in 2002, while only two showed a decline. Exit transition (E1.06) showed the greatest increase, while policies and procedures (E3.05) and data management (E4.03) showed a slight decline. See Appendix C for detailed descriptions of each indicator.

3.7 Summary Discussion

During the 2003 QA review cycle, there were 196 educational programs under the purview of educational quality assurance. Sixteen of these programs received no review. Of the 180 programs that received reviews, 111 were of residential commitment programs, 44 were of day treatment programs, and 25 were of detention centers. Detention centers scored the highest overall (6.11), followed by residential commitment programs (5.65), and day treatment programs (5.41). Moderate risk programs represented the greatest proportion of all programs in the state in 2003, and their average was in the satisfactory range (5.68), which is slightly above the average for all programs (5.65). All levels achieved an overall satisfactory performance. The overall mean score for all programs reviewed was 5.65, which is an increase from the previous year. The highest rated standard in 2003 was standard two, service delivery, which averaged 5.84. Standard one, transition, was lowest, receiving an overall mean score of 5.43.²

Historically, detention centers have scored lower than day treatment and residential programs. In 2002, however, this situation reversed itself – a trend that persisted in the 2003 QA cycle. This is most likely due to a combination of factors, including the fact that all detention centers are district operated, and that the standards have been revised to remove measures that are inappropriate given the relatively short length of time that most students spend in detention.

Forty-three school districts supervised juvenile justice educational programs that received QA reviews in 2003. 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 19 programs, with scores ranging from 3.58 to 6.94. Overall, 10 supervising school districts received scores in the high satisfactory range, and two received a score in the below satisfactory range.

In overall performance in 2003, 70 programs (39%) scored in the high satisfactory or superior range, and seven programs (four percent) scored in the below satisfactory range. This is a definite improvement from last year when 30% scored high satisfactory or superior, and six percent scored below satisfactory. In fact, the number of below satisfactory programs decreased from 17 in 2001 to nine in 2002 to seven in 2003.

Again, one finding that is important to note concerns the prevalence of particular ESE students in Florida's juvenile justice system. The percentage of ESE students in DJJ schools was 44%, almost three times that of public schools (15%). More specifically, students with behavior disorders comprise 48% of the ESE juvenile justice population, but only seven percent of the ESE public school population. Learning disabled and mentally handicapped populations vary only slightly between DJJ and public schools. Clearly, students identified with behavior disorders are much more likely to enter the juvenile justice population than any other type of ESE student. This potentially predicting variable needs further examination to

² Overall means for contract management are not included, because contract management indicators are compliance and cannot be compared with other standard means.

determine the causal factors of this finding. In contrast, gifted students comprise 22% of the ESE public school population, but represent less than one percent in DJJ schools.

Refer to appendix D, Tables D-1 through D-11, for detailed data on individual educational programs.