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About the Council of State Governments Justice Center

CSG is a national non-profit, nonpartisan membership association of state government officials that engage members of all three branches of state government.

The CSG Justice Center provides practical, nonpartisan, research-driven strategies and tools to increase public safety and strengthen communities.
CSG Justice Center Conducted First-of-its-Kind National Survey on Educational Outcomes for Incarcerated Youth

- Survey disseminated to all 50 states through CJCA

- Asked 3 main questions:
  - What services are provided?
  - What outcomes are collected?
  - What supports are provided for transitions?

- Findings, recommendations, and examples

** Follow-up survey and brief focused on career-technical education and employment in progress
Youth in Juvenile Justice Facilities Experience Numerous Educational Challenges

- **Over 1/3** of incarcerated youth are identified as eligible for special education services – a rate nearly four times higher than youth attending school in the community.

- **Over half** of incarcerated youth have reading and math skills significantly below their grade level, and as many as **60 percent** of these youth have repeated a grade.

- The **majority** of incarcerated youth were suspended and/or expelled from school, and many had dropped out of school altogether before being incarcerated.
States Struggle to Address Incarcerated Youths’ Unique Needs and Context

• The **lengths of stay** for youth in facilities can vary dramatically—from less than six months to several years – and youth can cycle in and out multiple times.

• Programs in facilities often offer **fewer hours of educational programming and fewer math and science courses** than traditional public schools.

• Facilities struggle to **hire and retain quality teachers** (including special education teachers when applicable) who are properly certified, trained and permanently assigned.
States Also Struggle to Provide Quality Education to Incarcerated Youth as More Youth Now Incarcerated in Privately Run Facilities

Incarcerated Youth: 1997
- State Run Facilities: 54%
- Privately Run Facilities: 34%
- Locally Run Facilities: 12%
- Total: 75,406 youth incarcerated

Incarcerated Youth: 2015
- State Run Facilities: 39%
- Privately Run Facilities: 41%
- Locally Run Facilities: 20%
- Total: 31,487 youth incarcerated
And, Responsibility for Education in Juvenile Justice Facilities Varies Significantly Between and Within States

AYPF and CSG Justice Center Released Report on Opportunities to Improve Accountability for Juvenile Justice Schools through ESSA

- Summarizes relevant ESSA provisions
- Provides key questions to help state leaders consider their current policies and identify gaps and opportunities for improvement
- Features states that are carrying out promising practices, which can serve as examples for other states that are seeking to improve accountability for juvenile justice schools
President Obama Signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015, Providing States with Additional Flexibility

- AYP replaced with a state-defined system of accountability
- All states must “annually measure for all students and separately for each subgroup of students” several indicators used to hold “all public schools in the State” accountable for student performance
- ESSA provides an opportunity to develop an accountability system inclusive of educational services within juvenile justice facilities
Efficient and timely data sharing across education and juvenile justice agencies is critical to improving educational outcomes for incarcerated youth

• Youth in the juvenile justice system are often serviced by multiple youth serving systems, including criminal justice, education, mental health, and child welfare

• Barriers (real or perceived) often inhibit effective collaboration and the sharing of educational outcome data between juvenile justice and education agencies

• State and local juvenile justice and education agencies must work to streamline the collection and sharing of educational outcome data through information sharing agreements and protocols

• Developing data-sharing agreements can help ensure the smooth transfer of educational records, as well as the ability to track longer-term youth outcomes
Key Questions for Consideration: Data Collection and Information Sharing

1. Do long-term juvenile justice facilities in your state collect educational outcome data for youth who are incarcerated? If so, what educational outcome data do juvenile justice facilities collect and for what purposes?

2. Do juvenile justice facilities report educational outcome data to state and local education agencies and/or juvenile justice agencies? If so, for what purposes?

3. Are there data-sharing agreements in place to facilitate the exchange of educational outcome data? Are there protocols in place to support the efficient transfer of educational records?
Under ESSA, states must hold all educational institutions accountable for the educational services they provide students

- Categories set by SEAs (e.g., program, school, or other) specify how educational services in juvenile justice facilities are or are not included in accountability systems

- Depending on the category assigned by the SEA, states are currently taking different approaches to holding schools and programs in long-term juvenile justice facilities accountable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems of Accountability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Same</strong></td>
<td>as traditional public schools, often because the facility is considered a school within a LEA or is an LEA itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified</strong></td>
<td>from traditional public schools, typically developed to accommodate the variety of alternative/non-traditional educational options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinct</strong></td>
<td>from traditional or alternative/non-traditional public schools and/or potentially aligned with another state agency’s accountability system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration: Accountability System

1. Are long-term juvenile justice facilities currently held accountable for the educational progress of students? What entity (or entities) is responsible for holding these facilities accountable? Do juvenile justice facilities receive a school report card?

2. Are educational programs and schools within long-term juvenile justice facilities included in your state’s ESSA statewide accountability plan?

3. Does the state enforce consequences for schools that are not making sufficient progress? What technical assistance or supports, if any, are available to improve educational performance in these facilities?
States and localities should consider what educational outcome measures best capture the unique context of their juvenile justice population.

- Success for incarcerated youth must be defined more broadly than recidivism.
- Measures should also be aligned with the unique population and context of juvenile justice facilities.

### TABLE 1: Creating ESSA-Compliant Accountability Measures for Educational Services in Juvenile Justice Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Accountability Category: SSA</th>
<th>Academic Achievement is measured by proficiency on state assessments in reading and math, which may include growth in proficiency in each of grades 3–8 and any one grade in high school or one additional academic indicator in grades below high school.</th>
<th>High School Graduation Rate is measured by the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for high schools, which may include an extended year adjusted cohort graduation rate.</th>
<th>English Language Proficiency is measured by progress toward English language proficiency for English language learners in each of grades 2–6, and any one grade in high school.</th>
<th>Student Success/School Quality is measured by at least one additional non-academic indicator of school quality or student success that is valid, reliable, and comparable, and allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance. These measures must be given less weight for accountability purposes than the other academic measures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success for incarcerated youth must be defined more broadly than recidivism.</td>
<td>Measures should also be aligned with the unique population and context of juvenile justice facilities.</td>
<td>Are youth in long-term juvenile justice facilities participating in state assessments? Are facilities using growth measures (e.g., credit recovery, pre/post-assessment tests, grade-level reading growth, scores from state assessments, etc.) as a demonstration of educational progress?</td>
<td>Can youth in long-term juvenile justice facilities work toward earning a traditional diploma, high school equivalency (GED/HSED/TASC), or other type of credential/certificate? If so, are schools and programs in these facilities able to award diplomas, equivalency, or other credentials? If not, what entity awards them (LEA, SEA, etc.)?</td>
<td>Are long-term juvenile justice facilities collecting data on career and technical education and/or workforce outcomes (e.g., job training, certification, employment, etc.)? If so, are these outcomes measures aligned with the measures used by the SEA to hold all schools accountable in your state accountability system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are youth in long-term juvenile justice facilities participating in state assessments? Are facilities using growth measures (e.g., credit recovery, pre/post-assessment tests, grade-level reading growth, scores from state assessments, etc.) as a demonstration of educational progress?</td>
<td>Can youth in long-term juvenile justice facilities work toward earning a traditional diploma, high school equivalency (GED/HSED/TASC), or other type of credential/certificate? If so, are schools and programs in these facilities able to award diplomas, equivalency, or other credentials? If not, what entity awards them (LEA, SEA, etc.)?</td>
<td>Are youth in long-term juvenile justice facilities participating in state assessments of English proficiency? Are facilities using growth measures as a demonstration of progress toward English language learner reclassification?</td>
<td>Are long-term juvenile justice facilities collecting data on career and technical education and/or workforce outcomes (e.g., job training, certification, employment, etc.)? If so, are these outcomes measures aligned with the measures used by the SEA to hold all schools accountable in your state accountability system?</td>
<td>What postsecondary educational outcomes data are facilities collecting? Do students have the opportunity to earn college credits while in a juvenile justice facility? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Questions for Consideration: Accountability Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What education accountability measures does your state use for traditional public schools? Are these measures also being used for programs and schools within juvenile justice facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What additional measures should juvenile justice facilities collect to accurately capture educational progress and attainment for this unique student population? Do any of the current measures capture growth in addition to proficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What assessments are administered in your state’s juvenile justice facilities? Are these assessments appropriate for the unique context of the juvenile justice population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To submit live questions, please use the “Questions” box on the control panel.
Indiana Department of Correction: Division of Youth Services

Derek A. Grubbs
Director of Juvenile Education
Overview of Correctional Juvenile Education in Indiana

- The primary function of the IDOC juvenile facility schools is to close the academic gap for students and to continue current Individual Education Plans for the Special Education students between youth’s incarceration and the time (s)he returns to their community’s school.

- IDOC currently provides education services to students in its three juvenile facilities; LaPorte (all girls), Logansport and Pendleton (all boys).
Overview of Correctional Juvenile Education in Indiana Cont.

- The schools provide access to Indiana’s junior high curriculum, high school courses aligned to the Indiana Core 40 Diploma, vocational courses, and high school equivalency (TASC) testing. All teachers are dually certified in special education and the content area that they teach.

- All three Juvenile Correctional Schools are accredited by AdvancED to ensure IDOC- DYS Stakeholders, that credits earned in our facilities are educationally grounded and that our teaching staff are certified for the disciplines in which they teach.
Core 40 and the Test Assessing Secondary Completion (TASC)

- Indiana's Core 40 is what the IDOE's has deemed as the academic foundation that all students need to succeed in college, apprenticeship programs, military training and the workforce.
  - IDOC: DYS schools offer every credit needed for a student to obtain their High School Diploma.
  - IDOC: DYS schools also offer a High School Equivalency through the TASC.
- In January of 2014, Indiana DOE moved from the GED to the TASC that is administered by the Data Recognition Corporation.
  - TASC is aligned with College and Career Readiness Standards.
STN: Student Tracking Number

- Number is assigned to students upon enrollment in school in Indiana.
- Number follows the student through their entire academic career, regardless of enrollment status, to an accredited: public, private, charter, parochial, and/or juvenile justice school(s). Home Schooled students are the exception.
- Ensures that all student data is reflected in the Indiana’s Educational Outcome Data.
  - Such as: attendance, graduation rates, special education status, etc.
Indiana Juvenile Correctional Schools are accredited by AdvancED.

AdvancED verifies that our policy and practices are aligned with standards of the industry and that our schools meet curricular guidelines, that the teaching staff is properly licensed, and that we are able to show academic growth to the students we are entrusted to educate.

Our accreditation status is then shared with all other accredited schools that the DOE supervises.
June 29, 2017

Dear School Administrator:

As a point of information, the Indiana Department of Correction juvenile facility schools are accredited by AdvancED as Comprehensive Special Purpose Schools. The typical student is engaged in instruction for a minimum of 305 minutes daily. All core academic subjects are taught by highly qualified teachers, and all IDOC learners in juvenile facilities possess licensure in special education as well as content area licensure.

High school credits earned in these schools may be recognized and counted towards an Indiana high school diploma. Please collaborate with the IDOC school to facilitate the transfer of credits to assist the student with completing his/her diploma upon returning to the community. Please also note that the transfer of student records between schools does NOT require written consent from the student’s parent or guardian.

If you have any questions regarding this issue, please contact Catherine Dansyluk, Director, Office of Student Services at (317) 255-9120 or cdansyluk@education.state.in.us.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Catherine Dansyluk, Director
Office of Student Services
Indiana Department of Education

Derek Grubbs
Director of Juvenile Education
Indiana Department of Correction
ESSA in Indiana and Juvenile Corrections

The Title I Part D Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program provides a formula grant to the IDOE for supplementary education services to help provide educational continuity for children and youth in State and local institutions so that these youths can make successful transitions to school or employment once they are released. Institutions for delinquent children provide services at a public or private residential or day facility for youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision.
Monthly Accountability
Report Cards

- We look at 28 data collection points and break them down into three categories
  - 1) Data Collection;
  - 2) Performance of the students;
  - 3) The schools response to the data.
## Providence Jr./Sr. High School
### School Report Card

**Overall Grade:** C

### Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Attendance Entered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Behavior Scores Entered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students with Current Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3/6/2018 Students with General Consults Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transition Consultations Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wth SRI Pre Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wth SRI Post Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wth SRI Post Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Wth SRI Final Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wth SSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wth SSQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wth Guardian Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Case Conference Dates Compliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Case Conference Finalized Compliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Percent of Students with Success Plans that are now passing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Percent of Students who Gained on Wrt Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Percent of Students who Gained in Wrt Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Percent of Students who Gained in Math or Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Percent of Students who Gained on SRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Percent of Students who Earned Expected number of Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Percent Passing GED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Percent of SpeEd Students progressing on &gt;=83% of Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response to Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3/7/2018 Students having Success Plans who need them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3/7/2018 Percent of Students meeting EPS that have them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/7/2018 Percent of Students meeting PPI that have them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3/7/2018 Students with Orasaki Accommodations that need them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3/7/2018 Students whose Grade Avg and Behavior Avg are below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Percent of Eligible Students with Pre-GED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentages
- **91%**
- **65%**
- **55%**
- **45%**
Audience Q&A

To submit live questions, please use the “Questions” box on the control panel.
50 State Scan of Education Services in Juvenile Justice Facilities

Jesse Kannam, American Youth Policy Forum
Overview

- Scan of 50 states and Washington, D.C.
- Conducted through interviews with education and juvenile justice agency representatives by phone and email
- Survey of questions regarding structure and accountability for education in long-term facilities serving post-adjudicated youth
- Questions addressed topics such as:
  - Who are providers of education services
  - How facility schools/programs are funded
  - What education information facilities collect
  - Who is education information reported to
  - How facility schools/programs are held accountable
Which state agency oversees the provision of education services that post-adjudicated youth receive in long-term juvenile justice facilities?

- Education: 24
- Justice: 16
- Other: 10

N=50
Earning High School Credentials

Can youth in juvenile justice facilities earn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential</th>
<th># of States (n=51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Diploma</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Diplomas (GED/HiSET/TASC)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other credentials/certificates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who awards the traditional diplomas?

- Juvenile justice agency
- Home/sending district
- School district the facility is located
- Facility school itself
- Other
Pursuing Postsecondary Education

Can youth earn college credits while in juvenile justice facilities?

Yes (86%)

No (14%)

N=36
Accountability

Do juvenile justice facilities get a “school grade”, “school report card”, or any other report mechanism, like traditional public schools in the state?

- Yes (55%)
- No (45%)

N=49

Do schools/programs in facilities report the same educational accountability information as traditional public schools in the state?

- Yes (57%)
- No (43%)

N=51
Relationship with alternative education and accountability for alternative settings

Is accountability for schools/programs within juvenile justice facilities distinct from other types of alternative schools/programs in the state?

- Yes (51%)
- No (35%)
- Unsure (14%)

N=51
How would you characterize the way long-term juvenile justice facilities are held accountable for the education information reported about youth served compared to public schools in the state?

### Systems of Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>as traditional public schools, often because the facility is considered a school within a LEA or is an LEA itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>from traditional public schools, typically developed to accommodate the variety of alternative/non-traditional educational options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct</td>
<td>from traditional or alternative/non-traditional public schools and/or potentially aligned with another state agency’s accountability system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

- Variety across states
  - Structure of system (ex. oversight, funding, information sharing and reporting)
  - Accountability system and mechanisms
- States are excited and eager to learn about how other states approach education in facilities and share best practices
- Common challenges
  - Information sharing, transferring credits, and reentry to community
- Consider needs of youth served in facilities in creation of accountability systems for alternative settings
- Areas for further inquiry
  - Areas of uncertainty among states
  - Factors that affect inclusion in accountability systems
    - School size
    - Classification as school or program
  - Measures used in accountability systems for education services in juvenile justice facilities
Next Steps and Additional AYPF Resources

- Written publication on 50 state scan findings (forthcoming)

- 50 state scan of ESSA State Plans for alternative education and juvenile justice education (forthcoming)

- Check out our Foster Care, Juvenile Justice, and Crossover Youth Resource Page for more resources!
To submit live questions, please use the “Questions” box on the control panel.
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Join Us for Part 3 of the Series!

Effective Juvenile Justice Reforms in the Era of ESSA

Thursday, April 12, 2018
1:00-2:15pm ET

Register here: https://secure.aypf.org/np/clients/aypf/event.jsp?event=1689
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Thanks for Attending!

- Please fill out the survey upon exiting the webinar
- Materials and recording will be posted on our website: [www.aypf.org](http://www.aypf.org)