PREDICTING EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS RETURNING FROM INCARCERATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to

the Temple University Graduate Board

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Jaures P. Johnston, Jr.

May 2009

ABSTRACT

Predicting Educational Outcomes for Students
Returning From Incarceration
Jaures P. Johnston, Jr.
Doctor of Philosophy
Temple University, 2009
Doctoral Advisory Committee Chair: Catherine A. Fiorello, Ph.D.

During the 2005-2006 school year, 967 students returned from incarceration and were assigned to RETI-WRAP (Re-Entry Transition Initiative-Welcome Return Assessment Process), a ten-day transition program operated by the School District of Philadelphia designed to review, evaluate, and make recommendations for appropriate school placement upon their return to the public school system. The current study employed a retrospective analysis of archival data from the '05-'06 school year in order to identify those variables that predict successful transition (active in school or graduated).

The data included demographic information (e.g., gender, grade, high school credits, and race), educational placement (e.g., regular or special education), severity of crime and reading and math scores as determined by standardized testing conducted by RETI-WRAP personnel. Eight variables were used to determine the prevalence, relationships, and predictive power of demographic, academic, and crime-related variables. Frequency distributions, Pearson correlations, Phi coefficients, and discriminant function analysis were conducted to examine prevalence, associations between variables, and predictions to successful re-entry.

A significant Wilks' Lamba of .945 was obtained for the sole discriminant function. Three variables emerged as significant predictors of successful re-entry: the number of credits obtained, the severity of the crime committed, and the age of the

student. Younger students with more credits who committed less severe crimes were more likely to have achieved a successful transition. The amount of variance (5%) explained by the statistical model was limited by the imbalanced nature of the sample, in that few students (21.9%) experienced a successful transition.

The current study highlighted the dynamics and overall profile of one of the most challenging and vulnerable populations in the public school system. By using database decision- making and providing a comprehensive framework to understand the characteristics of students who transition successfully, policy makers are in a better position to identify an optimal placement match based on empirical findings, thus decreasing the number of students who drop out of school or who remain involved with the juvenile justice system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have been instrumental in the completion of this dissertation and include friends, colleagues, mentors, and family. I realize now that the current journey began well before my entrance to graduate school, and will hopefully continue for many years to come. The experience has been exhilarating as well as humbling, in that the more I learn, the more I realize I have to learn. The number and variety of people who have shared their knowledge during this quest are too numerous to mention, but I will attempt to offer thanks to a few of those who were truly beacons along the way.

Although gone from my life for many years now, my grandparents, Dorothy and Warren G. Johnston, remain for me, the yardstick upon which all others are measured. As public school teachers, they undoubtedly influenced the lives of generations of students and instilled in me a love and passion for learning that continues to resonate to this day. Their contribution to my life is incalculable. To my mother, who is also no longer with us, I offer a piece of my heart for loving me unconditionally and always believing in me.

To my wife, Debbie, who has continuously supported and encouraged my seemingly never-ending status as a student, I thank you for your patience and sense of humor during all of those times when I could not locate my own. To my children, Krista, Matt, and Michael who cheered me on and provided "tech support" whenever those skills eluded me, which was often. My children became my teachers, a role reversal for which I am proud. I also wish to acknowledge my friend of many years, Tom Long, who has stood by my side during many pivotal points in my life and who never allowed me to waver from my goal.

Thank you to my dissertation committee, Drs. Catherine Fiorello, Joseph DuCette, Joseph Rosenfeld, Philip Kendall, and Frank Farley for their invaluable guidance and encouragement. I offer a special thanks to my committee chair, Dr. Fiorello, for pushing and prodding me when necessary and when that failed, for kicking me in the butt! I also want to thank all of my other professors at Temple, especially Dr. Irwin Hyman, for sharing their knowledge and wisdom with me.

I am also grateful to the staff of the RETI-WRAP program, particularly Heloise Jettison, Esq., Kahary Moody, and John Regan, Ph.D. Without their support and cooperation, none of my research would have been possible. Special thanks goes to Faith Sproul, a friend and fellow graduate student who generously offered her time and energy in helping to guide me during those times when I needed a map.

And lastly, I offer heartfelt thanks to all of those special people throughout my life that provided me with the confidence and resilience I needed to experience this celebratory moment. I invite each and every one of you to revel in my accomplishment, for without you this would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile Incarceration in a National Context

More than one in every hundred adults and more than 109,000 youth are incarcerated in the United States (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). The United States incarcerates more people than any country in the world, including far more populous China. Currently, there are approximately 2.3 million adults incarcerated in the U.S.; China is second with 1.5 million.

The ethnic breakdown is even more compelling. As of January 1, 2008, one in nine Black males ages 20-35 were incarcerated in the United States. One in 36 Hispanic males 18 and older were incarcerated during this time period, while White males were imprisoned at a rate of one in 106. Black women, ages 35-39, were incarcerated at a rate of one per 100, while the figures for Hispanic women in the same age group were one in 297, and White women were imprisoned at a rate of one in 355.

The incarceration of so many individuals comes at significant expense. The average yearly cost for prisoners in 2005 was $23, 876 in the state prison system. Rhode Island's expenditure of $44,860 per inmate was the highest, with Louisiana having the lowest per inmate expenditure at $13,009. Total spending topped 49 billion in 2007, up from 12 billion in 1987. The expense of incarcerating juvenile offenders is even higher. The average cost nationwide for placing youth in detention facilities is approximately $60,000, with some placements exceeding $200,000 (Tyler, Ziedenberg & Lotke, 2006). When constructing new facilities for juvenile offenders, capital costs approximate $100,000 per cell, with operating costs often exceeding $60,000 per cell (Donziger,

1996). In stark contrast to these numbers, average per pupil expenditures for education in the United States approximates $8,700 per year (US Census Bureau, 2005). States that fall below the national average in education spending have the largest prison populations (Carroll, 2008). Unfortunately, in the adult population, nationally, more than half of released offenders are back in prison after three years for new crimes or for violating the terms of their release (Langan & Levin, 2002).

The picture for the juvenile population is no more encouraging. Data from the Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006) indicated that a majority of youth that were candidates for reintegration (reentry to school or other placements in society) had been incarcerated at least one time prior to their current commitment. Among those youth who had been in custody previously, two in 10 indicated that they had been in custody only once before, four in 10 had been held two to four times, and another four in 10 indicated they had been held five times or more before their most recent offense (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Of the youth that were incarcerated in our nation's juvenile justice facilities in 2003, 12% were 14 years of age or younger, 44% were age 15 or 16, and 44% were age 17 or older (Sickmund, Sladky & Kang, 2008). Clearly, a majority of the youth who were court committed to residential facilities were of high school age and had previous contact with the juvenile justice system. These statistics indicate that, for a significant number of youth returning from incarceration, a successful reentry has not been previously achieved, creating an argument for transition services that could assist in reducing recidivism.

Youth that are incarcerated in the United States share common demographic characteristics and societal trajectories. Incarcerated youth have been found to be

disproportionately poor, male, and members of a minority group (i.e., Black, Latino, and Native American), and although approximately one-third of the youth population in the United States is composed of racial or ethnic minorities, they make up two-thirds of the individuals who are incarcerated in local detention and state correctional facilities (Jones, & Poe-Yamagata, 2000). Many of these young men and women have a history of poor academic achievement, emotional dysfunction, medical issues, and social maladjustment. Previous research indicates that significant numbers of incarcerated youth are only marginally literate and have a school history that is rife with grade retentions and a pattern of academic failure (Center on Crime, Communities and Culture, 1997).

An estimated 30 to 70% of incarcerated youth have been identified as having learning and/or behavioral handicaps (Robinson & Rapport, 1999; Zenz & Langlett, 2004). These learning problems qualify them for special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which was reauthorized in 2004, and is now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) (Public Law 108-446), mandating that all special education students receive an Individualized Education Program (IEP). The high prevalence of learning problems among incarcerated youth has been known for many years and continues to be true today (Eggleston, 2008). The rates of learning and emotional disorders in students involved in the juvenile justice system has led some to suggest that juvenile justice is, in essence, a "default system" for students exhibiting poor math and literacy skills, mental health issues, and at risk for dropping out of school (Nelson, 2000; Otto, Greenstein, Johnson & Friedman, 1992; Teplin, Abram, McClelland, Dulcan & Mericle, 2002).

In large urban settings, these numbers are quite high. Recent data indicate that 90% of students who experienced a juvenile justice placement during their academic careers in the public schools of Philadelphia, the nation's 9th largest public school system (*Digest of Education Statistics, 2007)* eventually dropped out of school. Additionally, students who had been assigned to one of the District's alternative disciplinary schools had an almost 100% chance of dropping out (Mezzacappa, 2007). The lifetime of financial and emotional costs for those students who drop out of school are well documented, and demonstrate the negative impact this decision has on their lives (Gates Foundation, 2006). When dropping out is coupled with a prior history of incarceration, success becomes even more elusive. Michael Nutter, who was elected mayor of Philadelphia in 2007, announced that one of his major priorities would be to reduce the dropout rate and improve academic outcomes for all students. He has ambitiously "vowed to cut the school district's dismal drop-out rate in half over the next five to seven years" (Snyder, 2008). Jerry T. Jordan, president of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers stated recently: "Philadelphia has the highest rate of incarceration (for adults) in the country. At a yearly cost of approximately $24,000 per inmate, Philadelphia's prison budget is the fastest growing city expense and dwarfs the $9,951 a year Philadelphia spends to educate each of its 207,000 public and charter school students" (Jordan, 2008).

In order to combat youth recidivism and decrease their future contact with juvenile justice authorities, the young men and women involved in the reintegration process must increase their level of academic skills (Ingersoll & LeBouf, 1997). Students who do not improve their academic standing, either while incarcerated or upon their return to school, face a future of unemployment or underemployment, thus putting them

at further risk for future criminal behavior (Gemignani, 1994). Currently, the competition for jobs that are low skilled and do not require at least a high school education is increasing. Employers are less willing, or able, to train workers who are entering the work force with less than the credential of a high school diploma. Entry level, low skilled, low paying jobs are no longer a stepping-stone to future economic opportunities, and have become an end point in themselves. Ever increasing technology and the mechanization of our industries has resulted in a rather bleak outlook for youth who lack the basic academic foundation from which to enter the labor market. Because adjudicated youth generally have lower levels of education, higher drop out rates and less work experience than their non-adjudicated peers, competition for entry-level positions is even more problematic (Freeman, 1996). In order to assist court-involved youth in the process of improving their employment outcomes, steps needed to be taken to address this ever-increasing problem (Wilson, 2000).

Conceptual Framework for Understanding Juvenile Incarceration

School failure and juvenile delinquency are themes that are frequently discussed when theories of criminality are debated. Students who drop out of school have been found to have higher rates of criminal behavior while they are in school, as well as after they drop out, when compared to their peers who graduate. This outcome is supported by most theories of delinquency and is consistent with prior research in the field (Thornberry, Moore, & Christenson, 1985). Although there are a number of theoretical underpinnings in regard to delinquent behavior, three major theories emerge in the literature: Social Learning Theory; Strain Theory; and Control Theory. The following is an overview of these three approaches.

Social learning theory focuses primarily on the learning that takes place within a social context and is based on the principles of operant conditioning as established by B. F. Skinner (Skinner, 1959) and expanded by Albert Bandura (Bandura, 1977). It posits that people learn from each other by way of observational learning, imitation, and modeling. Reinforcement of the behavior occurs in a response-stimulus-response process in which behavior produces consequences that in turn increase the probability of the behavior being repeated. Social learning theory as it relates to criminology and juvenile delinquency has been researched extensively by Ronald Akers and Gary Jenson (Akers, 1977; Akers & Jensen, 2003). Akers' theory draws upon the work conducted by Edwin Sutherland (Sutherland, 1947), whose theory of differential association paved the way for Akers and other contemporary proponents of social learning theory.

Based on the work of Akers (Akers, 1977) and Sutherland (Sutherland, 1947), individuals learn to engage in crime through their association with others. They are subsequently reinforced for crime, learn a belief system that is favorable to delinquent acts, and are exposed to criminal models. According to social learning theory, youth learn to engage in crime the same way they learn to engage in conforming behavior. Delinquent activity increases in probability when it is frequently reinforced and infrequently punished, resulting in reinforcement that is desirable (e.g., social approval, pleasure, money, etc.), and is more likely to be reinforced than alternate behaviors (Burgess & Akers, 1966).

Strain theory, as it relates to delinquency, states that strainful events and conditions result in people feeling uncomfortable, subsequently placing them in a stressful (strain) situation. These negative feelings result in the need for an individual to

take action in order to relieve the strain (Agnew, 1992). Some theories of delinquency note that students who eventually drop out manifested substantially higher rates of delinquent behavior when they attended school, than did students who eventually graduated (Thornberry, Moore & Christenson, 1985). For example, if a student is not doing well in school and is experiencing a consistent pattern of frustration and failure (which has been found to increase delinquent behavior) the strain of these occurrences will generally motivate the individual to take action in an attempt to eliminate the stress. For high school age students, dropping-out of school may be one of the options that they consider. When youth are unable to achieve their aspirations through legitimate paths of behavior, they may resort to illegitimate activities in order to reach their goals (Agnew, 1985). Strain theory states that dropping out would eliminate their sense of frustration and failure, thereby resulting in a reduction in stress and decrease in delinquent behavior shortly after leaving school.

In addition to other variables, strain may increase the likelihood of individuals with poor coping skills to resort to delinquent behavior. Youth who lack age appropriate expressive language development may have difficulty negotiating a peaceful (legal) solution to social conflicts. Limited financial resources and the pressure to conform to adolescent needs for material goods (e.g., clothing, music components, jewelry, etc.) can result in criminal behavior for youth at risk. According to Agnew (1992), strain often results from a failure to achieve a number of goals, but three related examples stand out: money, status/respect, and an important aspect of adolescence, autonomy from adults. He identifies anger, however, as the most important emotion in strain, in that it is almost always directed outward and is positively related to crime and social deviance. Indeed,

research indicates that anger has been found to have a major influence on delinquency (Richards, Berk, & Foster, 1979).

Control theory, also identified as social bonding theory, essentially looks at crime as a given and is less concerned with why it occurs, than the factors that lead people to conform to societal norms and values. A number of researchers have contributed to its theoretical foundation (Nye, 1958; Reckless, 1961; Reiss,1951), with Travis Hirschi (Hirschi, 1969) indicating that social bonds and having an investment in conformity are major factors in the restraint of criminal activity. Groups that act as strengthening agents to social bonding include family, school, peers, community and religious institutions, and social and athletic organizations (Boy/Girl Scouts, youth sports associations, etc.). These factors, along with an individual's internal controls, are elements that help predict whether a youth will engage in criminal activity.

Proponents of control theory identify three major structural components of the theory: Direct control, stake in conformity, and internal control (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Direct control is generally viewed as either direct or indirect monitoring by others, most significantly supervision provided by family members. Direct control is characterized by setting rules, monitoring behavior, and implementing consequences for crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Although direct control is often identified as the most significant contributory factor in the management of delinquency, it is not an effective strategy for everyone. The extent to which juveniles identify with, or conform to, established social norms is also an important component of control theory. Those who believe that they have more to lose will be less likely to be involved in the criminal justice system. Juveniles who have strong bonds to family, school, and community have

a greater stake in maintaining pro-social behavior. Those who lack these connections and have experienced failure in school are less likely to be restrained by these factors. Finally, internal control is the factor that mitigates juvenile involvement in delinquency according to control theory. The extent to which juveniles perceive crime as wrong, is a characteristic of internal control and is affected by external influences such as parents, teachers, etc. (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990).

These theories highlight the importance of individual, family, and societal factors that contribute to outcomes for incarcerated youth. It provides the background for the consideration of salient variables that enhance or reduce children's successful reintegration into their environment and allows us to consider the combination of variables that might relate to their outcomes.

Definition of Key Terms

For clarity, the following definition of terms will be used in this study.

Detention Center/Correctional Facility: A temporary, secure holding facility for juvenile offenders. Juveniles are adjudicated delinquent and sent to local, regional, state, or national facilities that also provide educational services to both regular and special education students.

Individualized Education Program (IEP): A written plan that specifies the special education programs and services that the student will receive as identified during the evaluation, or reevaluation process.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA-2004): A federal law ensuring services to children with disabilities throughout the United States. IDEA

governs how states and public agencies provide special education and related services to children and youth with disabilities.

Juvenile: A person younger than 18 years of age.

Juvenile Delinquency: A violation of the law committed by a person under the age of 18, that would be considered a crime if it was committed by a person 18 or older.

Recidivism: The behavior of a repeat or habitual criminal. A measurement of the rate by which offenders commit additional crimes by conviction baselines, following release from incarceration.

Students with Disabilities: Youth who have been identified as manifesting a disability as delineated by federal guidelines (IDEA-2004), and who are found eligible for, and in need of, specially designed instruction. A disabled/handicapped students' educational program is guided by the IEP.

Successful Transition: A student who, after returning from incarceration, and at the time of the data collection, is attending school or has graduated.

Transition/Re-entry/Reintegration: A coordinated set of activities for a juvenile offender, designed within an outcome-oriented process, which promote successful movement from a correctional setting to post-incarceration activities including public or alternative education, vocational training, and integrated employment (including supported employment).

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to identify variables correlated with a successful transition for students returning to public school after being incarcerated. A dearth of research exists in relation to those factors that contribute to positive reintegration

outcomes (Keeley, 2006). Studies that have been conducted are essentially limited to institutionally based programs and services, rather than those that are implemented in the home schools and communities to which the youth will eventually return. This study will attempt to identify those variables that predict a successful transition for students who return to school or other placements after incarceration.

The primary research questions addressed in this study are:

1. What is the prevalence of demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in a population of previously incarcerated high school students completing a transition program in a large, urban, northeastern school district?
2. What are the relationships between the demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in the same aforementioned population?
3. Which demographic, academic, and crime-related variables predict successful transition (i.e., Active/Graduated status) for the same aforementioned population?

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Overview of Juvenile Delinquency

Although childhood delinquent behavior has undoubtedly been a part of civilization for thousands of years, juvenile delinquency as it is presently viewed has not always existed. This is not to imply that there were no previous laws identifying consequences for negative behavior on the part of juveniles in our country. Indeed, as pointed out by Sutton in "Inventing the Stubborn Child," (Sutton, 1996) the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed a number of laws in 1646 that were designed to formalize responsibilities of Colony members. One of the enacted statutes made it a capital offense for a child to disobey his parents. The text of the "stubborn or rebellious" child law was essentially taken by the Puritan legislators from Deuteronomy 21:18-21, and read as follows:

> "If a man have a stubborn child or rebellious son, of sufficient years (16 years of age), which will not obey the voice of his Father, or the voice of his Mother and that when they have chastened him will not harken unto them: then shall his Father and Mother being his natural parents, lay hold on him, and bring him to the Magistrates assembled in Court, and testify unto them, that their son is rebellious and will not obey their voice and chastisement, but lives in sundry notorious crimes, such a son shall be put to death." (Sutton, 1996, p. 5).

Although there is no record of the death penalty ever being enforced for the aforementioned youthful transgression, the effect of the statute undoubtedly made a child think twice about disobeying his parents. Of greater significance, however, was the statute's effect on the future of juvenile justice enforcement. It was the first child law of its kind in the New World in that it separated illegal behavior on the part of youth from that of adults and defined the parents as an integral part of a child's life. More

importantly, however, it provided a legal basis for when government officials could intervene in the life of a family and the consequences they could impose. Remarkably, this statute remained in effect in Massachusetts, primarily in amended form until 1973 (Sutton, 1996). This concept became known as the doctrine of *parens patriae*, which essentially translates to the "state is parent, or guardian of its children" (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1998; Feld, 1999a).

The current conceptualization of juvenile crime is essentially a modern legal formulation and can be traced to the passage of the first juvenile court law in the United States as enacted by the Illinois legislature in 1899 and known as the Illinois Juvenile Court act of 1899. Until the first part of the 19th century children in the United States who were as young as age seven were considered old enough to be prosecuted in a criminal court with adults, and if found guilty of an offense could be sent to prison or even given a sentence of death (Schlossman, 1983).

Passage of the 1899 Illinois statute was primarily the result of the child-saving movement of the 1880's and 1890's and reflected the growing philosophy of prison reformers that, unlike adults, children and adolescents should be considered as malleable and responsive to social redemption. The theory of positivism, a concept that considered causal factors in a person's life as being a reason for their engaging in acts of crime and delinquency, was put forth by those who thought that criminals and delinquents could be rehabilitated. Positivists believed that intervention on a case-by-case basis could act to bring about behavioral change in the individual (Feld, 1999b).

By establishing a legal venue that was separate from the court for adults, children were now to be judged with the intent of rehabilitation, rather than punishment

and retribution (Platt, 1969). The child-saving movement was part of a larger crusade of reform that was known as the Progressive Era, and marshaled in a number of changes in the life of a child, including child labor laws, kindergarten, mandatory education, and vocational education. These laws were primarily aimed at children growing up in cities during the industrial revolution, and were designed to improve the outcomes, both educational and social, of youth who were felt to be of greatest risk for criminal behavior (Schlossman, 1983). The movement was frequently dominated by women, who it was felt were more "naturally inclined" to the task of monitoring the welfare of children. These "feminists" were essentially responsible for establishing the penalizing of children through "juvenile court" and creating a new environment (i.e., the reformatory) in which juveniles could be educated and socialized in a domain that reflected the prevailing Protestant ethic (Platt, 1969).

Reformatories were the precursors to the residential detention facilities of today, and established a philosophy that punishment should not be based primarily on threats and intimidation, but should be replaced by a system that was more humanitarian and rehabilitative in its orientation. The prevailing thought was that a new approach to juvenile delinquency could ameliorate the impact of a poor family life, a sinful community, and poverty, while simultaneously preparing youth to reenter society after their period of incarceration was over.

Juvenile courts acted not only to channel youth away from criminal court proceedings, but allowed for an increasing role on the part government authorities to monitor and adjudicate young people on the basis of "status offenses" (Platt, 1977; Schlossman, 1977). Status offenders were juveniles whose behaviors, if they were adults,

would not be considered unlawful, and included, for example, acts such as truancy, running away from home, drinking alcohol, and having sex (Platt, 1977; Schlossman, 1977).

Although many of the reforms that were established at the turn of the century (i.e., courts being mandated to act in the best interests of the child, rehabilitation, and confidentiality of records) resulted in improved outcomes for juvenile offenders, systemic problems still remained. By the late 1960s, the juvenile court system had evolved to the point where most of the cases that involved youth under the age of 18 were administered as civil proceedings, rather than the more formal criminal courts for adult offenders. As a result, however, of previous efforts to separate juvenile delinquency from adult criminal activity, youth were not afforded the same constitutionally protected rights as those of adults. For example, the right to a trial by jury and the freedom against self-incrimination (5^{th} Amendment), as well as the right of due process (14^{th} amendment), were not part of the juvenile justice system before 1967 (Koroknay-Palicz, 2004). It was in that year that the authority of juvenile court proceedings was challenged. In the landmark case, In *re Gault*, the Supreme Court ruled that Gerald Francis Gault, a fifteen-year-old youth from Arizona, who had been arrested for making an obscene phone call to a neighbor while on probation, had not been provided his due process rights as established by the Constitution. Subsequent to his arrest, Gault had been placed in detention without notice of the charges pending and without legal representation. If he had been arrested as an adult, the offense would have resulted in a penalty of not more than a $50 fine or two months in jail. The Arizona juvenile court, however, decided to place him in a state industrial training school for up to six years (until age 21), or until he was "discharged by

due process of law" (Juvenile Justice FYI, 2004). In its ruling, delivered by Justice Abe Fortas, the Supreme Court affirmed that juveniles had a right to fair treatment as provided by the 14th amendment, as well as the following additional rights of minors (*In re Gault*, 1967): (a) the right to receive notice of charges, (b) the right to obtain legal counsel, (c) the right to cross-examination, (d) the privilege against self-incrimination, (e) the right to receive a transcript of the proceedings, and (f) the right to appellate review. It must be noted, however, that there was a dissenting voice to the decision. Justice Potter Stewart, foretelling the future, expressed a concern that the ruling would transform juvenile proceedings into more of a criminal prosecution, thereby reversing the historical intent of the juvenile justice system, which emphasized the rehabilitation and education of youth rather than punishment and retribution.

The seminal *In re Gault* decision set the stage for a number of subsequent legal and legislative changes, the impact of which are felt today. In 1968, Congress passed the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act (JDPCA). This legislation was adopted in order to encourage states to develop plans and programs at a community level that were designed to discourage juvenile delinquency (JDPCA, 1968). Federal funding would be provided to plans that were approved. In 1973, a report by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals initiated a momentum toward preventing juvenile delinquency, keeping juvenile and adult offenders separated, and eliminating the incarceration of status offenders (JJDPA, 1974; Senna & Siegel, 1999). Consequent to this report, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (JJDPA) (42 U.S.C. *§§* 5601-5640) was passed by Congress. The Act also provided for the creation of a Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

(OJJDP) within the Department of Justice, as well as The Runaway Youth Program, and The National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP). This Act provides funds to states that follow a series of guidelines regarding the rights of juvenile offenders and has been amended a number of times since 1974, most recently in 2007.

Individual and Societal Effects of Juvenile Incarceration

One of the most compelling results of incarceration is the high cost to society. In 2007, total state spending for corrections exceeded $49 billion. This figure represents a substantial increase in comparison to the $12 billion spent in 1987. By 2011, if projected costs in prison growth continue, it is expected to cost the states an additional $25 billion (Public Safety Performance Project, 2007). Nationally, for every dollar spent on higher education (colleges and universities) in 1987, 32 cents was spent on corrections. In 2007, for every dollar spent on higher education, 60 cents was spent on corrections (National Association of State Budget Officers, 2007). This figure is even more pronounced in Pennsylvania, where during fiscal year (FY) 1987, for every dollar spent on higher education, 20 cents was spent on corrections. During FY 2007, for every dollar spent on higher education, 81 cents was spent on corrections (National Association of State Budget Officers, 2007). This represents an increase of more than 300% in corrections spending over approximately the past twenty years. State spending for corrections is competing with funding for education programs at the university level, as well as at the elementary and secondary levels of public schools; two constituencies that continue to face ever more dwindling sources of revenue (Public Safety Performance Project, 2008).

In 1993, approximately 63% of high school dropouts were unemployed (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1993). In 2003, 3.5 million youth ages 16 to 25 did not have a high school diploma and were not enrolled in school (Barton, 2005). High school dropouts were over three times more likely than college graduates to be unemployed (Laird, Cataldi, KewalRamani, & Chapman, 2008), and were much more likely than those who graduate to be living in poverty, receiving public assistance, in prison, on death row, unhealthy, divorced, and ultimately single parents with children who drop out of high school themselves (Gates Foundation, 2006).

Society pays a significant price for the failure of children in school. It is estimated that 34% of inmates in 1991 and 29% in 1986 have completed high school (Beck et al., 1993). In 1993, 17% of offenders under the age of 18 entering adult prisons had not completed grade school (i.e., eighth grade or less). Twenty-five percent had completed 10^{th} grade, and 2% had completed high school or had a general equivalency diploma (GED) (Austin et al., 1995). It has been estimated that each year's dropouts cost our nation in excess of $240 billion in lost earnings and foregone taxes over their lifetimes. Billions of dollars more will be spent on law enforcement, prison programs, welfare, healthcare, and other forms of social service (Committee for Economic Development, 1987).

On average, individuals who drop out of high school earn $9,200 less per year than their fellow classmates who graduate, and approximately $1 million less over their lifetime than college graduates (Doland, 2001). Additionally, four out of every ten young adults, aged 16 to 24, who lacked a high school diploma, received some form of government assistance in 2001, with a dropout also being eight times as likely to be in

jail or prison than a person with at least a high school diploma (Harlow, 2003). Other studies demonstrate that the lifetime costs to the nation for each individual who drops out of school and later gets involved in long- term crime or drug use, ranges from $1.7 to $2.3 million (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).

Once youth enter the juvenile justice system, their chances of remaining in school upon their release decline dramatically, placing them at significant risk for continuing a pattern of criminal behavior. Most of the youth who are incarcerated in juvenile facilities and are age appropriate to earn a high school diploma or GED, will not do so before their release. Fewer still will earn either of these credentials after their release. Additionally, very little information is available as to what factors influence whether a student makes a successful return to school after their period of incarceration (Keeley, 2006).

Regardless of the outcomes as a result of juvenile incarceration, research has demonstrated that children's lack of success can be mitigated through the use of selected interventions. Research demonstrates that enrollment in a high quality; pre-kindergarten program will increase the chance that a student will achieve success in school, and is most compelling in disadvantaged families. "Participation in pre-kindergarten programs reduced participation in juvenile and adult crimes, increased high school graduation rates, as well as future employment and earnings, with a total benefit cost ratio of 16:1" (Schweinhart et al., 2005). Although early childhood intervention goals are generally established in order to develop improved academic outcomes for youngsters and not to act as delinquency prevention programs, positive outcomes are often realized in regard to mitigating future delinquent behavior. Longitudinal research involving the Perry Preschool study indicated that attendance in the program was associated with fewer

arrests or criminal charges, involvement in less serious crimes, fewer grade retentions, and higher scores on standardized measures of academic achievement than the control group (Zigler, Taussig, & Black, 1992). Other early intervention initiatives, such as the Syracuse University Family Development Research Program and the Yale Child Welfare Research Program demonstrated similar longitudinal outcomes in regard to delinquency reduction. The Syracuse program revealing an average cost of $186 per participant for later court proceedings, compared to $1,985 for each child in the control group when the participants were reevaluated between the ages of 13 -16 (Lally, Mangione, & Honig, 1988). These examples suggest that primary prevention programs may limit the effects of early risk factors for delinquent behavior and result in substantial cost savings when compared to the dollars spent on incarceration and social welfare benefits.

Transition planning has been identified as one of the most important factors in regard to successfully reintegrating delinquent youth back into school and community. These services, however, remain poorly planned and implemented throughout many of the youth correctional facilities in the United States (Eggleston, 2008). This is true for both special education and regular education students.

Juvenile Offenders and Educational Outcomes

It has been estimated that "one third of all juvenile offenders read below the fourth grade level, and about two-thirds of prison inmates are high school dropouts" (Reading at Risk, 2006). If one is unable to read and comprehend written or electronic material in our present society, the chances of academic and vocational success are quite limited. The lack of academic proficiency is even more problematic among minority students, where it is estimated that approximately half of African American and Latino

8th grade students read at a below basic level (Grigg, Daane, Jin & Campbell, 2002). Students in large, urban high schools with significant levels of poverty manifest even more problematic performance, where estimates suggest that about half of incoming 9th grade students read three years or more below grade level (Balfanz, McFarland, & Shaw, 2002). These levels of reading deficiencies have been observed directly by the current researcher, who has spent considerable time working with high school students within that demographic category. Indeed, many of the delinquent youth in the present research study have attended public schools where overall academic achievement is far below age and grade level expectations, thus placing them at even greater risk for delinquent behavior. Whether or not levels of academic achievement can predict successful transition for incarcerated youth is one of the questions that the present research will attempt to answer.

IDEA 2004 maintains or enhances most of the mandates that have been established throughout the history of special education law dating back to the inception of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) of 1975 (Public Law 94-142). Despite the legal mandates guaranteeing transition services for identified handicapped students under IDEA, special education students who are incarcerated remain poorly served in regard to transition planning.

Since 1975, research studies have been undertaken in order to determine the number of educationally disabled students incarcerated in juvenile corrections facilities (Morgan, 1979; Rutherford, Bullis, Anderson, & Griller-Clark, 2002; Zenz & Langelett, 2004). Results of these studies consistently demonstrate that the percentage of delinquent students in juvenile justice facilities who are identified as educationally handicapped far

exceeds the percent of disabled students in the general population. It has been estimated that approximately 11 to 13% of public school students are identified as qualifying for special education supports and services, whereas the percentages for incarcerated youth range from 30 to 70% (Robinson & Rapport, 1999; Zenz & Langelett, 2004). Delinquent students not identified as educationally handicapped are more academically deficient than non-delinquent students who attend our nation's public schools (Hirschi & Hindelang, 1977). Research indicates that a disproportionate number of educational deficiencies are found with students who are subsequently incarcerated, and are not merely the result of their placement in a juvenile correctional facility (Wang, Blomberg, & Li, 2005).

Given the Federal mandates under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), the academic achievement of delinquent students takes on greater significance for local school districts, in that "all students" are expected to achieve at grade level or above by 2014, with various sanctions, both financially and structurally, being imposed on those schools who fail to achieve these goals. These mandates have already posed challenges to many large, urban public schools, where a disproportionate number of students have had a history of delinquent behavior. Although rarely reported or even acknowledged, many school administrators balk at allowing delinquent students to transition to their schools, knowing that students who have been incarcerated often exhibit academic deficiencies (Finn, Scott & Zarichny, 1988; Pollard, Pollard & Meers, 1994; Silverberg & Silverberg, 1971), and generally score lower on standardized tests than their fellow non-delinquent students (Hirschi & Hindelang, 1977). Additionally, delinquent students frequently exhibit poor attendance (Leschied, Coolman, & Williams, 1984), tardiness, poor relations with their classmates, and manifest a greater number of

discipline problems than their peers (Empey & Lubeck, 1971; Lewis, Schwartz & Ianacone, 1988). As schools struggle to meet the Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) goals of NCLB, students who represent potential barriers to achieving these goals (i.e., delinquent students transitioning from incarceration) will not be welcomed with open arms back to their home schools, thus exacerbating the difficulties of reentry.

Juvenile correctional facilities are not immune from the requirements of IDEA or NCLB, and have struggled to meet mandates related to finding and employing teachers with appropriate subject matter certification, providing all students with empirically validated educational interventions, and maintaining contact with a student's local education agency (LEA) (Eggleston, 2008). All of these areas are identified responsibilities of juvenile justice facilities under the Neglected and Delinquent section of NCLB (Section 1425), that identifies aspects of the law that correctional facilities must address. Section 1425 also discusses the provision for transitioning assistance and support programs for youth with a focus on the reentry of the student to their home school after completing his/her time at the juvenile correctional facility. It is designed to support qualified teachers with appropriate certification for both regular and special education students, ensure that the facility's educational programs are aligned with programs in the regular education environment, and solicit parental involvement in regard to the student's educational plan (U.S. General Accounting Office, 2004).

Over the past three decades, the need for appropriate transition services and supports have been well-documented (Coates, Miller & Ohlin, 1975; Gemignani, 1994; Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997; Le Blanc, Pfannenstiel, & Tashjian, 1991; Lewis, Schwartz & Ianacone, 1988; Maddox et al., 1984; Rider-Hankins, 1992; Stafford & Sellers, 2001;

Stephens & Arnette, 2000; and Wilson, 2000). Despite these efforts, there is little documentation as to what variables predict whether a youth will make a successful return to school after having spent time in a juvenile corrections facility.

In order for students to make a positive transition back to school and community, a coordinated effort among a number of stakeholders including detention facility staff, the student's family (guardians), probation and aftercare professionals, and school personnel, are absolutely necessary (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1991; Gemignani, 1994; Pollard, Pollard & Meers, 1994; Catalano, Wells, Hawkins, & Jenson, 1988). Research indicates that a failure to develop appropriate planning and transition services for youth who are incarcerated may quickly undo many of the benefits that the students received as a result of their educational program at the correctional facility. It is frequently noted in the literature that transition planning should begin as soon as the students enter the correctional facility, so that while incarcerated, the students can begin to develop the necessary skills and support systems they will need when they are transitioned from the facility to their home school (Quinn, Rutherford, & Osher, 1999).

Given the high rate of recidivism among delinquent youth who have been incarcerated, it is apparent that they often find it difficult to move from a highly structured juvenile facility, where expectations for appropriate behavior are clear, and consequences for negative behavior are strictly enforced, to a school and community setting where there is often a lack of structure, and where individual initiative and personal responsibility are expected. In order to increase the probability of a positive transition for these youth, we must gain a better understanding of those factors that lead

to a successful reentry. The following is a review of some reintegration programs developed previously, and represent examples of current practice.

One model that is designed to promote and facilitate a positive transition back to school and community for juvenile offenders is the Juvenile Corrections Interagency Transition Model (Webb, Maddox, & Edgar, 1985). This program was piloted more than thirty years ago and continues to be used by correctional facilities. The model is very systematic and emphasizes four basic areas of need in relation to transitioning from a juvenile placement: 1) awareness activities involving interagency cooperation, 2) transfer of records, 3) pre-placement planning, and 4) maintenance of placement and communication. The study's primary emphasis was on transitioning activities pertaining to a special education delinquent population, with a key component being the time of the "handoff," or that period when the juvenile facility transfers the student back to the home school and community. Research indicates that this model has resulted in successful outcomes for youth who have been involved in the reintegration process (Moran, 1991).

A review conducted by Altschuler, Armstrong, and MacKenzie (1999) evaluated the efficacy of a number of transitioning initiatives based on the Intensive Aftercare Program Model (IAP) developed by Altschuler and Armstrong (1994a; 1994b) with funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The evaluation/review looked at how various initiatives had been implemented throughout the country and why they had been either successful or unsuccessful in assisting delinquent youth during their reentry to the community. Much of the structure of these community-based aftercare programs was designed to mirror those practices and services that were initially introduced when the students were placed in an institution for juvenile offenders.

By maintaining a level of treatment and supervision in the community similar to that which is implemented in the institution, it is theorized that youth will be more likely to adhere to the prescribed aftercare interventions. This model, however, has faced many challenges, the most significant of which is the ability of community-based agencies to provide the level of support and surveillance/supervision that was a part of the institutional setting. Providing adequate resources and follow-up has historically been problematic once youth return home to their family, school, and community.

One of the IAP's examined by Altschuler, Armstrong and MacKenzie's (1999) nationwide program review was the Philadelphia Probation Department's Intensive Probation Aftercare initiative. The program was developed as an attempt to address some of the most serious and violent delinquents who were transitioning back to the community from secure placements. It was thought that this population was being inadequately served, due at least in part to probation department caseloads that were exceedingly large, thus limiting the direct contact that the parole officers had with their parolees.

Juveniles that participated in the program were primarily African American (81%), with an average age of 17.2 years and an average of five prior arrests. The average period of confinement was 10.8 months. IAP parole officers were given a caseload of no more than 12 delinquent youth compared to the average caseload of 60 delinquent youth for non-IAP parole officers. Youth were randomly assigned to the IAP program or a control group that received standard aftercare support services. Although the outcome of the study indicated that the youth assigned to the IAP manifested a significantly lower average number of re-arrests than the control group (1.65 versus

2.79), and a significantly lower number of felony arrests (0.41 versus 0.76), the overall percentage of youth re-arrested for felonies was essentially the same (24.8% versus 27.2%) (Sontheimer & Goodstein, 1993). As noted in some of the other IAP reviews conducted by Altschuler, Armstrong, and MacKenzie (1999), the Philadelphia initiative was negatively impacted by an initial lack of treatment integrity, high staff turnover, and a failure to define adequately the philosophy and mission of the program to the participating staff members.

The aforementioned programs (Juvenile Corrections Interagency Transitioning Model and Intensive Aftercare Program Model), like much of the existing research, looked at transitioning initiatives that focused on the coordination of services between the juvenile facility and community based services that only indirectly included communication with the local school districts. Although successful reintegration to school and obtaining a high school diploma are consistently identified in the literature as keys to reducing recidivism and establishing a foundation from which delinquent youth can become contributing members of society, there has been surprisingly little research that empirically identifies those factors that predict a successful transition once the student leaves a juvenile facility and reenters an academic environment. Research that has been conducted identifies only those factors that promote a successful transition before, during, or shortly after release. Of the studies that exist, they tend to be descriptive in nature, examining one variable/outcome at a time, and lacking multivariate analysis. Additionally, a majority of the studies focus solely on youth with disabilities, rather than including regular education students in their analyses.

A study by Keeley (2006) avoided some of the previously mentioned limitations. The sample consisted of 348 males who were adjudicated to a low security, residential youth forestry camp in rural Pennsylvania. The average age was 17.8 years and the length of placement was 5.3 months. One hundred and twenty-one of the youth had been identified as qualifying for special education supports prior to their placement. A discriminant analysis was used to determine the relationship between nine independent variables and one criterion variable: whether delinquent youth returned to school after release from residential placement in a youth forestry camp. The independent variables were as follows: plan to return to school, age at release by category, race, special education identification by categories, number of months in placement, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R) verbal scores, and the Wide Range Achievement Test-3 (WRAT-3) Reading and Math pre and post-tests. Of the 348 youth in the study, 191 had complete data available for the analysis. The variables, "plan to return" and "age at release" were statistically significant, and accounted for 28.5% of the variance in relation to whether students actually returned to school after their release. Overall, 75.9% of students followed their original plan of returning to school or not, and 51% of the youngest age category (under 17 years of age) were more likely to return to school than the older group. It was recommended that this knowledge base, "intention to return to school" and "age at release" could be used in the future to assist juvenile facilities and schools in developing more specific personal intervention plans for transitioning youth.

Research conducted at Arizona State University over a twelve-year period looked at contextual factors that affected youth with disabilities who were transitioning from incarceration, and attempted to determine what variables led to the success or failure of

the youth as they returned to school, work, and the community (Baltodano, Mathur, & Rutherford, 2005). Ten studies were conducted at the University during the twelve-year period, and included both quantitative and qualitative measures. Although no single variable emerged as statistically significant in relation to predicting a successful transition, the results did reveal that a combination of variables were predictive of a positive re-entry. Successful transition resulted from factors that included the following: pre-planning for transition, internal locus of control, engagement in school and/or work, positive versus negative peer influence, high quality transition programming, addressing gender differences in programming, and adult mentoring (Baltodano, Mathur, & Rutherford, 2005).

Because of the high number of juvenile offenders in large urban settings, urban school districts face special challenges for managing this specific youth population. Philadelphia is presently the ninth largest public school district in the United States. During the '05-06' school year, 205,909 students attended public and charter schools in the School District of Philadelphia. During that time, 967 students returned from incarceration and were assigned to RETI-WRAP (Re-Entry Transition Initiative-Welcome Return Assessment Process), a ten-day transition program within the School District of Philadelphia designed to review, evaluate, and make recommendations for an appropriate school placement upon their reentry.

RETI-WRAP is a non-instructional transition program operated by the School District of Philadelphia, in collaboration with the Philadelphia Family Court Juvenile Probation Department, The Department of Human Services (DHS), Community Behavioral Health (CBH), the District Attorney's Office, and the Defender Association.

Its current mandate is to enable students to return successfully from adjudicated placements, and to integrate back to the public school system as well as their communities.

As a result of Act 88, a law passed by the Pennsylvania Legislature in 2002, it is mandated that any adjudicated delinquent youth in Philadelphia, discharged or released from a court-ordered residential placement or day treatment program must report to RETI-WRAP before returning to school. Prior to July 20, 2005, Act 88 stipulated that any Philadelphia student, who had been adjudicated delinquent and was returning from placement, was barred from attending regular classes until assessed by a transition center. It further required that many of these youth be assigned to alternative schools for disruptive students for an indefinite period of time. As enacted by the Pennsylvania General Assembly in June 2002, Act 88 applied only to public school students in Philadelphia. This included both regular and special education students and did not take into consideration their placement prior to being adjudicated delinquent (e.g., whether they were attending a "regular school" or a "remedial disciplinary school"). Attorneys from the Juvenile Law Center brought suit on behalf of three Philadelphia public school students who, under Act 88, were unilaterally assigned to alternative schools for disruptive students upon their return from juvenile placement. The court subsequently ruled that students assigned to alternative schools for delinquent behavior were entitled to the same informal hearing process as students transferred to alternative schools for disciplinary purposes. The decision stated that due process for these students included "written notice to the parents or guardian of the reasons for the action, an offer to hold an informal hearing within the first five days of the action, sufficient notice of the time and

place of the informal hearing, and the right of the student to speak and to produce witnesses in his or her own behalf." The court found the statute unconstitutional to the extent that it established an absolute bar to a student's ability to return to a regular classroom.

As a result of this ruling, RETI-WRAP established a reintegration process, whereby each student attending the ten-day program is provided with an Individualized Transition Plan that is developed after the student participates in a needs assessment that includes a battery of educational, social service, mental health, and behavioral health evaluations. The educational evaluation includes an assessment of both reading and math skills. Students returning from placement, who have been identified as being in need of special education supports and services via an Individualized Education Program (IEP), also participate in the aforementioned process, with the results being incorporated in the existing IEP during the ten-day review process.

The RETI-WRAP program operates from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, on a year-round basis. As new students arrive, the intake and orientation process begins. Each student must attend the program for a total of ten days. On the tenth day of their attendance, the students are given their school assignments. These assignments are based on a number of factors, including the following: 1) Charges that led to incarceration (violent or nonviolent offense), 2) Number of credits toward graduation, 3) Overall adjustment to the RETI-WRAP Program, and 4) Current reading and math levels. After these factors are considered, the following school assignments are made: 1) Return to a regular, age-appropriate neighborhood school (one which the student would attend based on his/her address), 2) Alternative School (i.e., Remedial Disciplinary School), 3)

Educational Opportunity Programs (Twilight Schools), 4) General Education Development (GED) Programs, and 5) Overaged Accelerated Programs. Unless there are compelling (extenuating circumstances) reasons against assignment to the neighborhood school (e.g., gang activity, prior history of disruptive behavior on the student's part at that school, violent offense that led to incarceration), the first consideration is the neighborhood school.

An Alternative School (previously defined by the District as a Remedial Disciplinary Center) is a structured learning environment designed to teach appropriate and responsible behavior in addition to providing academic instruction. Alternative Schools feature a greater ratio of adults to students, a behavior modification program, and additional support services for students and their families. Students are referred to Alternative Schools as a result of level 2 violations of the Code of Student Conduct (School District of Philadelphia: 2006-2007) and is based on the following infractions: 1) repeated violations of the Code (violations of Level 1 rules), 2) Destruction and theft of property, 3) Bullying and serious threats, 4) Harassment, 5) Voluntary sexual acts, 6) Sexual assault, 7) Assault on school personnel, 8) Aggravated Assault, 9) Robbery, 10) Possession of a weapon, and 11) Placing another in danger. Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP – "Twilight School") are programs in high schools that provide academic and elective courses for students needing to recover credits and move toward completing graduation requirements in an after-school learning environment with modified instructional approaches and student supports. EOPs operate from 3:30 to 6:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Overage Accelerated Programs are designed for high school age students who have minimal credits and are seeking to earn a high school diploma.

These are primarily computer-based instruction and employ individual learning modules that allow students to progress at their own pace, and with the possibility of accumulating more credits than would be possible in a regular marking period. These programs operate during the regular school day. RETI-WRAP students who are interested in being considered for a Charter School, GED Program, Private School, or Parochial School are provided with information regarding the application process to these types of schools, but can only be guaranteed enrollment in a School District of Philadelphia school or program following their completion of the RETI-WRAP process.

National demographic data indicate that there has been a growth in the number of females entering the juvenile justice system, sparking a growing need for gender specific research. Females now compose 29% of the juvenile arrests in the United States, an increase of 9% since 1980 (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Part of the focus of the current research was to identify those variables that may identify factors specific to female offenders, thus contributing to the research that presently exists in this domain.

Summary and Conclusions

Thus far, attempts have been made to establish connections between students' incarceration status and the variables that may contribute to their outcomes. Several limitations, however, are apparent in this body of literature. First, the relative scarcity of literature on transition and student outcomes provides limited opportunities for researchers, practitioners, and policy makers to have the information necessary to evaluate programs and make relevant changes and interventions. Second, studies that exist tend to be descriptive in nature and limited to overall program evaluation versus taking a close look at specific student-centered variables. Additionally, studies are often

based on the experiences of special education students, although national guidelines for transition and youth incarceration highlight the need to consider appropriate transition for all students regardless of disability. A final limitation of the studies relates to the variables that are used to study outcomes. Studies often utilize a limited number of variables, for example, focusing on reading only, and fail to consider other factors that contribute to the whole child's ecology. Lack of multivariate models presents a limited view of the factors that contribute to the challenges apparent in this population, and the potential interventions that may mitigate some of their negative outcomes.

The RETI-WRAP transition program represents an attempt by a large, urban school district to move to the forefront of educational innovation, as well as meeting the goals mandated by NCLB legislation. The RETI-WRAP program has now been in place since 2000, and the information collected from students in the program presents an opportunity to gain insight into the characteristics of a large, urban population of students who have been involved with the juvenile justice system. In order to evaluate the factors that influence students' entry and exit from the program, a multivariate approach needs to take into account the many variables that influence students' life and their later success or failure, after they have returned from incarceration.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Participants

In order to examine the contribution of demographic, social, academic, and crime-related variables to students' ability to make a successful transition, a dataset from the RETI-WRAP program was obtained through the cooperation of the School District of Philadelphia. An initial review of the data indicated that a total of 855 students completed the re-entry program during the 2005-2006 (July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006) school year. These students were returning to public school after having been incarcerated in various juvenile facilities in the state of Pennsylvania, as well as other sites throughout the United States. An additional 112 students were assigned to the program, but did not complete it, and were not included in the data collection. Of those students who completed the program (N=855), 76.3% did not transition back to school successfully (i.e., remained in school following their transition, or graduated). A total of 30.8% were re-arrested and/or re-committed to a juvenile facility; 34.7% dropped out of school; and 10.8% were placed on bench warrants. The current analysis excluded those students in 8^{th} grade or below and was based on the 799 students in 9^{th} – 12^{th} grades. The predictive model was based on the 689 students with complete data.

Procedures

Program Components. Students in RETI-WRAP were admitted based on their status of: adjudicated delinquent, placement in a residential facility for juvenile offenders for a period of at least 30 days, and were residents of Philadelphia County. Students spend a minimum of 10 days in the program, with an average time of 14 days needed to

complete the program because of missed attendance. Twenty to 70 students attend on a typical day. Although there is a continual influx of students, attendance tends to be highest during typical transition points in the school calendar (i.e., September, January, and May). Students attend the program from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m., five days per week throughout the calendar year. They are separated into two groups (16 and younger and 17 and older). Both groups include males and females and they spend the majority of their day together, including lunch. Given the small class size and staff limitations, regular and special education students are grouped together. The program arranges for speakers to provide workshops 3-4 days per week. Workshops involve didactic presentations and/or open discussions on a host of topics including violence prevention, job search/placement, drug/alcohol abuse, HIV/AIDS prevention, sex education, parent education, exposure to victims of violent crimes, information from the district attorney's office, and motivational speakers.

Typical staff includes employees of the School District of Philadelphia (SDOP) as well as other city-funded agencies. Staff members include: one Coordinator for Special Education Services (SDOP), one Special Projects Assistant (SDOP), two Classroom Facilitators (SDOP), one Probation Officer (Philadelphia Family Court), one school police officer (SDOP), one Social Services Coordinator (Department of Human Services), one Behavioral Specialist (Community Behavioral Health), and one Secretary (SDOP). During the 2005-2006 year, staff also included two certified part-time teachers.

Data Collection. Data were obtained from student records, during intake, and throughout the 10-day transition period. Academic transcripts and information regarding criminal history were provided through prior records. Students also provided

demographic and contact information during intake. Additional data such as reading and math scores were a result of measures administered to students by certified teaching staff.

Obtaining the Dataset. The dataset of the RETI-WRAP program was obtained with the assistance of personnel assigned to the transition program. A formal request to the Philadelphia School District's Institutional Review Committee (IRC) was submitted on November 3, 2008 and subsequently approved for use in the current study on December 15, 2008. The archival dataset included one complete data file with variables attached to ID numbers. No individual student names or identifying characteristics were included in the dataset. Criteria for inclusion in the analysis were variables with less than 20% of missing data. All variables met this criterion.

Measures

Demographics: Information related to students' gender, race, grade, and age were included in the dataset. Additional academic information included the number of earned high school credits and regular education or special education designation. One credit, also referred to as a Carnegie Unit, is 120 hours of class or contact time with a teacher over the course of the school year at the high school level. A semester (one-half of a full school year) earns a half credit or half of a Carnegie unit (Shedd, 2003). Public school students in Philadelphia must earn a total of 23.5 credits in the following subject areas in order to graduate: English, 4 credits; Mathematics, 3 credits; Science, 3 credits; Social Studies, 3 credits; Health/ Physical Education, 1.5 credits; Arts/Humanities, 2 credits; World Languages, 2 credits; Electives, 5 credits. During the course of the regular school year (September-June), students have the potential to earn a total of 6 credits.

Status: The dataset identified six types of student status: Active, Active GED, Active Office Roll (AOR), Graduated, GED Grad, or Withdrawn. Students who were "Active" were those attending school on a regular basis. The "Active" status was determined at the time the data were available in June of the school year. Students may have been actively attending school for ten months or only one or two months, depending upon their transition date. "Active GED" were those students who were enrolled in a GED program. Students designated as "Active Office Role (AOR)" were those students that were technically enrolled in school but had not attended for at least 10 consecutive days. Students labeled as "Graduated" were those that had graduated from 12th grade. "GED Grads" graduated from a GED program. "Withdrawn" students were not enrolled in school. Students were listed as withdrawn for a variety of reasons including:

(a) Re-arrested/re-committed (30.8%),

(b) Bench Warrants and are not attending school (10.8%), or

(c) Dropped out of school (34.7%)

(d) Two students from the 2005-2006 RETI-WRAP population were homicide victims.

While there were variations within the Withdrawal subcategories, the final withdrawal percentages (Regular Education=64.0%; Special Education=36.0%) were comparable to the population percentages for Regular Education (64.2%) and Special Education (35.8%) students in RETI-WRAP.

Further vulnerability of RETI-WRAP students to re-arrest/ re-commitment was evidenced from the number of students (17.5%) who had completed RETI-WRAP previously. This percentage represented students who completed the RETI-WRAP

process at least one time before, transitioned to a public school, and were subsequently re-arrested/re-committed to a juvenile facility, and subsequently went through the RETI-WRAP process once again.

For the purposes of analyses, students were grouped into two categories: Active/Graduated, or Withdrawn. The Active category included those students listed as "Active" or "Graduated." The Graduated category was based on those listed as "Graduated" or "GED Grad." The second category, Withdrawn, were those students listed as "AOR" or "Withdrawn." The second category included "AOR" students because those students were absent at least 10 consecutive days, and were unlikely to return. Students determined to have made a "successful transition" were those individuals who were in the Active/Graduated category. Students did not meet the criteria of a "successful transition" if they were in the Withdrawn category.

Reading and Math Scores: Reading and Math scores were provided through direct assessment of students at the time they entered the program. A review of the measure was provided in the Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook (Psychological Corporation, 1995). Technical information for the measure is as follows. The measure used to test students was the Stanford Test of Academic Skills-8th Edition (TASK), a subset of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT). The SAT assesses reading, math, and language skills for children in grades K-12. It comprises a series of 13 battery levels across all grades. The TASK has three levels covering grades 9-12 and is often considered a "basic skills" test. It has been used to establish yearly progress for schools and programs based on the No Child Left Behind Legislation. It is also used to provide information about students' skills in general skill areas (clusters) or more specific skills (standards).

The SAT is a standardized norm-referenced test. Approximately 530,000 students participated in the national standardization. Forty-nine states and the District of Columbia were represented in the standardization sample based on a randomized cluster sampling design. The sample was balanced based on geographic region, socioeconomic status (high, medium, and low), urbanicity, and ethnicity. Stratification reflects the 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Special education students were included in the randomization sample. The measure reports several scores including raw scores, scaled scores, individual percentiles, stanines, grade equivalents, Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs), Achievement/Ability comparisons (AACs) group percentile ranks and stanines, content cluster and process cluster performance categories, and performance standards. Qualitative classifications are also provided (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced). Scaled scores are relevant for each content area separately but do not necessarily apply across content areas. Reports of internal consistent reliability are in the mid-.80s to .90s. Coefficients for abbreviated tests are slightly lower (.80s). Alternate-form reliability, a measure of the equivalency of different forms of the test, range from .53 to .73 based on correlations across various tables. No test-retest reliability was reported for the measure. According to the technical report, content validity was built into the test during test development.

Class: Students were listed as either "Regular Education" or "Special Education." Students placed in special education were previously evaluated for a range of learning or social-emotional concerns and determined to be in need of specialized instruction. Special education students had an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) as part of their academic program.

Severity of Crime: Students were designated as "1" or "0" depending on the severity of the crime. Crimes against a person were considered more severe. This would include rape, assault, aggravated assault, armed robbery, indecent exposure, drug charges, arson, crimes committed with a weapon, etc. Crimes listed as less severe were those in which persons were not the target. This might include robbery (without a weapon), shoplifting, possession of a weapon, truancy, etc. The severity of the students' crime affects the placement decision. Those individuals incarcerated for more severe criminal behavior, face an increased likelihood of being assigned to a remedial disciplinary placement (Alternative School) versus a regular school setting.

Placement: Students were sent to a variety of placements. A Comprehensive High School is a regular, age appropriate high school that students attend based on their address. Students attending RETI-WRAP are, however, often assigned to comprehensive high schools outside of their geographical areas in order to distribute evenly, those individuals returning from court-mandated placements at juvenile justice centers.

An Alternative School (previously defined by the District as a Remedial Disciplinary Center) is a structured learning environment designed to teach appropriate and responsible behavior in addition to providing academic instruction. Alternative Schools feature a greater ratio of adults to students, a behavior modification program, and additional support services for students and their families. Students are referred to Alternative Schools as a result of level 2 violations of the Code of Student Conduct (School District of Philadelphia: 2006-2007) and is based on the following infractions: 1) repeated Violations of the Code (violations of Level 1 rules), 2) Destruction and theft of property, 3) Bullying and serious threats, 4) Harassment, 5) Voluntary sexual acts, 6)

Sexual assault, 7) Assault on school personnel, 8) Aggravated Assault, 9) Robbery, 10) Possession of a weapon, and 11) Placing another in danger

Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP – "Twilight School") are programs in high schools that provide academic and elective courses for students needing to recover credits and move toward completing graduation requirements in an after-school learning environment with modified instructional approaches and student supports. EOPs operate from 3:30 to 6:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

General Education Development (GED) Programs are placements developed for those students who are continuing their education in a learning environment designed to assist students with the process of preparing to take the GED examination.

Overage Accelerated Programs are designed for high school age students who have minimal credits and are seeking to earn a high school diploma. These are primarily computer-based and employ individual learning modules that allow students to progress at their own pace, and with the possibility of accumulating more credits than would be possible in a regular marking period. These programs operate during the regular school day.

Research Questions and Data Analytic Procedures

The following research question guided this inquiry.

1. What is the prevalence of demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in a population of previously incarcerated high school students completing a transition program in a large, urban, northeastern school district?
2. What are the relationships between demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in the same aforementioned population?

3. Which demographic, academic, and crime-related variables predict successful transition (i.e., Active/Graduated status) for the same aforementioned population?

First, frequencies, Pearson product moment correlations, and Phi coefficients were run to determine the prevalence and relationships between each variable and student outcome. The research questions were then analyzed using discriminant analysis. Discriminant function analysis was used to determine the variables that affect whether students experienced a successful outcome (e.g. they had graduated or were actively enrolled in school, or were in a GED program). Discriminant analysis allows the researcher to determine group membership based on multiple classifier variables. The procedure maximizes distances between groups and minimizes within-group differences. Factors that need to be considered when undertaking discriminant analysis include assumptions of normality. This, however, was mitigated due to the sample size of the population (N=799).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The current research analyzed the prevalence of demographic, school, and crime-related variables and their prediction to successful reintegration in a population of high school students returning to public school following incarceration in a juvenile correctional facility. Frequencies, correlations, and discriminant function analysis were conducted in order to describe and identify these relationships and predict group membership. Three research questions were addressed and the results are presented below.

Prevalence

The first research question asked: What is the prevalence of demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in a population of previously incarcerated high school students completing a transition program in a large, urban, northeastern school district? Frequency distributions were computed for the demographic, academic, and crime-related variables to obtain a comprehensive description of the RETI-WRAP population. Demographic information (i.e., race, gender, age, and grade) is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables

	N	%
Race		
White	32	4.01
Black	671	83.98
Latino/a	86	10.76
American Indian	1	0.13
Asian	9	1.13
Total	799	100.00
Gender		
Male	696	87.11
Female	103	12.89
Total	799	100.00
Age		
13	5	0 .63
14	36	4.51
15	132	16.54
16	201	25.19
17	235	29.45
18	147	18.42
19	39	4.89
20	3	0.38
Missing	1	0.01
Total	799	100.00
Grade		
9	299	28.93
10	274	34.47
11	184	23.14
12	107	13.46
Missing	4	0 .01
Total	799	100.00

Clearly, Black students (83.98%) and males (87.11%) comprised the majority of participants in the RETI-WRAP population. Students ranged from 13 to 20 years of age and clustered within grades nine and ten.

Frequencies for academic-related variables (i.e., placement, credits, reading and math scores, class) by demographic characteristics are presented in Tables 2-6.

Table 2

Demographic Information by Placement

	N	%
Placement		
Comprehensive High School	323	40.43
Alternative School	256	32.04
EOP	177	22.15
GED	13	1.63
Overage/Accelerated	30	3.75
Total	799	100.00

The majority of students (40.43%) were placed in Comprehensive High Schools throughout the city. Alternative Schools (32.04%) comprised the second highest percentage of student placements.

Table 3
Demographic Information by Credits

	N	Mean	SD	t	*p*
Race					
White	32	6.95	5.95		
Black	671	7.92	6.76		
Latino/a	86	6.82	6.16		
American Indian	1	12.50			
Asian	9	7.33	4.40		
Gender					
Male	696	7.92	6.62		
				-1.712	.087
Female	103	6.72	6.74		
Total	799	7.76	6.64		

Note. 23.5 credits were required to graduate.

Although male students in RETI-WRAP had higher reported mean number of credits (7.92) compared to female students (6.72), this difference was not found to be significant (t=-1.712, *p*=.087).

Table 4
Demographic Information by Reading Scores (Grade Equivalents)

	N	Mean	SD	t	*p*
Race					
White	30	6.24	2.79		
Black	573	5.42	2.45		
Latino/a	78	5.33	2.81		
American Indian	1	9.00			
Asian	9	5.27	2.78		
Gender					
Male	601	5.38	2.46		
				-1.895	.059
Female	90	5.91	2.84		
Total	691	5.45	2.51		

Reading scores ranged from below first grade to post-high school with an overall mean score of 5.45. There was no significant difference between the mean Reading scores for female students (5.91) compared to male students (5.38; t=-1.895, *p*=.059).

Table 5

Demographic Information by Math Scores (Grade Equivalents)

	N	Mean	SD	t	*p*
Race					
White	30	5.88	2.38		
Black	573	5.81	1.87		
Latino/a	78	5.70	2.03		
American Indian	1	11.00			
Asian	9	5.71	3.11		
Gender					
Male	601	5.77	1.95		
				-1.314	.189
Female	90	6.05	1.81		
Total	691	5.80	1.93		

Math scores ranged from below first grade to 12th grade with an overall mean score of 5.80. There was no significant difference between the mean Math scores for female students (6.05) compared to male students (5.77; t=-1.314, *p*=.189).

Table 6

Demographic Information by Class (Regular or Special Education)

		Regular Education	Special Education	Total
Race				
White	N	19	13	32
	% within Race	59.4%	40.6%	100.0%
	% within Class	3.7%	4.6%	4.0%
	% of Total	2.4%	1.6%	4.0%
Black	N	442	229	671
	% within Race	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
	% within Class	85.5%	81.2%	84.0%
	% of Total	55.3%	28.7%	84.0%
Latino/a	N	47	39	86
	% within Race	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%
	% within Class	9.1%	13.8%	10.8%
	% of Total	5.9%	4.9%	10.8%
American Indian	N	1	0	1
	% within Race	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Class	.2%	.0%	.1%
	% of Total	.1%	.0%	.1%
Asian	N	8	1	9
	% within Race	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
	% within Class	1.5%	.4%	1.1%
	% of Total	1.0%	.1%	1.1%
Total	N	517	282	799
	% within Class	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%

At 64.7%, Regular Education students constituted the majority of the RETI-WRAP population. At 35.3%, Special Education students in RETI-WRAP are overrepresented
in comparison to national estimates of incarcerated youth receiving special education support (28%).

Due to the high percentage of Special Education students within the population of RETI-WRAP participants, additional frequencies were calculated to examine the differences between Class and other variables present in the dataset. Results are presented in Tables 7-15.

Table 7

Severity of Crime by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	Class					
	Regular		Special Ed.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Severity						
Less Severe	218	42.17	101	35.81	319	39.92
Severe	298	57.64	180	63.82	478	59.83
Total	516	99.81	281	99.63	797	99.75
Missing	1	.19	1	.36	2	.25
Total	517	100.00	282	100.00	799	100.00

The majority of the students committed more severe crimes (i.e., crimes against persons) at 59.83% compared to 39.92% committing less severe crimes. The percentage of Special Education students committing more severe crimes (63.82%) was higher than their Regular Education counterparts (57.64%).

Table 8

Placement by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	Class					
	Regular		Special Ed.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Placement						
Comprehensive High School	222	42.94	101	35.82	323	40.43
Alternative	158	30.56	98	34.75	256	32.04
EOP	111	21.47	66	23.40	177	22.15
GED	9	1.75	4	1.42	13	1.63
Accelerated	17	3.28	13	4.61	30	3.75
Total	517	100.00	282	100.00	799	100.00

A higher percentage of Special Education students were assigned to Alternative schools (34.75%) in comparison to those students in Regular Education (30.56%).

Table 9

Gender by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	Class					
	Regular		Special Ed.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Male	434	83.95	262	92.91	696	87.11
Female	83	16.05	20	7.09	103	12.89
Total	517	100.00	282	100.00	799	100.00

Females comprised only 7.09% of the Special Education population even though they are 12.89% of the total population. Males comprise a larger segment of the Special Education population (92.91) compared to their representation in the total population (87.11).

Table 10

Race by Class (Regular and Special Education

	Class					
	Regular		Special Ed.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race						
White	19	3.67	13	4.61	32	4.01
Black	442	85.49	229	81.21	671	83.98
Latino/a	47	9.09	39	13.83	86	10.76
American Indian	1	.19	0	0.00	1	0.13
Asian	8	1.56	1	0.35	9	1.13
Total	517	100.00	282	100.00	799	100.00

At 83.98%, Black students in RETI-WRAP are overrepresented in comparison to their overall representation in the School District of Philadelphia at 65%.

Table 11

Grade by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	Regular		Special Ed.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade						
9	160	30.95	70	24.82	230	28.79
10	167	32.30	107	37.94	274	34.29
11	118	22.82	66	23.41	184	23.03
12	69	13.35	38	13.48	107	13.39
Total	514	99.42	281	99.65	795	99.50
Missing	3	.58	1	.35	4	99.50
Total	517	100.00	282	100.00	799	100.00

The largest percentage of students clustered within 10th grade for Regular (32.30%) and Special Education (37.94%).

Table 12

Credits by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	Credits				
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	*t*	*p*
Class					
Regular	517	7.64	6.63		
				-.733	.463
Special Education	282	8.00	6.67		

There was no significant difference between the mean number of Credits for Regular Education students (7.64) compared to Special Education students (8.00; t= -.733, *p*= .463).

Table 13

Math Scores (Grade Equivalents) by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	*t*	*p*
Class					
Regular	441	6.18	1.92	7.061	.0001
Special Education	250	5.14	1.77		

Regular Education students had significantly higher mean Math scores (6.18) compared to Special Education students (5.14; t=7.061, *p*<0001).

Table 14

Reading Scores (Grade Equivalents) by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	*t*	*p*
Class					
Regular	441	6.05	2.55	8.869	.0001
Special Education	250	4.38	2.06		

Regular Education students had significantly higher mean Reading scores (6.05) compared to Special Education students (4.38; t=8.869, *p*<0001).

Table 15

Age by Class (Regular and Special Education)

	Class					
.	Regular		Special Ed.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age						
13	4	0.77	1	0.35	5	0.63
14	27	5.23	9	3.19	36	4.50
15	82	15.87	50	17.73	132	16.52
16	141	27.27	60	21.28	201	25.16
17	147	28.43	88	31.21	235	29.41
18	92	17.79	55	19.50	147	18.40
19	22	4.26	17	6.03	39	4.88
20	1	0.10	2	0.71	3	0.37
Total	516	99.81	282	100.00	798	99.88
Missing	1	0.19	0	100.00	1	.12
Total	517	100.00	282	100.00	799	100.00

The majority of students in the population were 16 (25.16%) and 17 (29.41%) years of age. The clustering of these students was consistent for Regular and Special Education.

Frequency distributions were also computed to describe the prevalence of all classifier variables for each predicted group (i.e., Active/Graduate and Withdrawn). Results are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Classifier Variables by Group Membership

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Valid N (listwise)
Active/Graduated			
Race	1.14	.49	
Gender	1.16	.37	
Age/Yr.	16.25	1.25	
Reading	5.53	2.54	
Math	5.96	2.10	
Credits	9.58	7.52	
Class	1.36	.48	
Severity	.46	.50	
Withdrawn			
Race	1.18	.38	
Gender	1.12	.33	
Age/Yr.	16.49	1.29	
Reading	5.43	2.51	
Math	5.76	1.88	
Credits	7.00	6.17	
Class	1.36	.48	
Severity	.60	.49	

Table continues

Table 16 cont.

	Valid N (listwise)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation
Total		
Race[a]	1.18	.38
Gender[b]	1.13	.34
Age/Yr.	16.44	1.28
Reading	5.45	2.52
Math	5.81	1.93
Credits	7.58	6.58
Class[c]	1.36	.48
Severity[d]	.57	.50

Note. Coding for specific variables is described below.
[a]Race was dichotomized as 1 (Black) and 2 (Other) for inclusion in the discriminant analysis. [b]Gender was coded as 1 (Male) and 2 (Female). [c]Class was coded as 1 (Regular Education) and 2 (Special Education). [d]Severity was coded as 0 (Less Severe) and 1 (More Severe).

Correlations

The second research question asked: What are the relationships between demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in a population of previously incarcerated high school students completing a transition program in a large, urban, northeastern school district? Pearson-product moment correlations and Phi coefficients were computed to determine the relationships between variables that would be entered into the discriminant analysis equation to predict group membership. Three of the ten variables used for the analysis were dichotomous, thus necessitating the use of Phi coefficients. The remaining seven variables were computed using Pearson correlations. All correlations/coefficients for variables entered in the model are presented in Table 17 on page 59. Due to the significantly high correlations found between credits and grade as well as placement and severity, grade and placement were removed from further analysis to avoid redundancy.

Table 17

Pearson-Product Moment Correlations and Phi Coefficients computed to determine the relationship between variables

Pooled Within-Groups Matrices

	Race	Gender	Age/Yr.	Grade	Reading	Math	Credits	Class	Severity	Placement
Correlation										
Race	-----	-.01	.00	-.04	-.03	-.00	-.02	-.00	.04	-.03
Gender		-----	-.06	-.08*	.08*	.05	-.05	†-.13***	†-.11**	-.05
Age/Yr.			-----	.36****	.06	-.01	.37****	.09	.33****	.41****
Grade				-----	.06	.06	.75****	.05	-.02	.06
Reading					-----	.48****	.08*	-.32****	-.12**	-.06
Math						-----	.08*	-.26****	-.11**	-.08
Credits							-----	.04	-.08*	.04
Class								-----	†.06	.09
Severity									-----	.58****
Placement										-----

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$. *Note*. † denotes Phi coefficients.

Predicting Group Membership

The third research question asked: Which demographic, academic, and crime-related variables predict successful transition (i.e., Active/Graduated status) in a population of previously incarcerated high school students completing a transition program in a large, urban, northeastern school district? A direct discriminant analysis was performed using eight variables as predictors of membership in two groups. Predictors were race, gender, age, SAT-9 reading scores, SAT-9 math scores, credits, regular or special education classification, and severity of the crime. The variable, Race, was dichotomized into "Black" and "Other" for the purposes of analyses. The category, "Black," was a significantly higher percentage of the total population (84%) than all other racial categories. In addition, a Chi-Square analysis was calculated to determine if there was a significant difference between the original racial categories and the outcome variable, Status (see Appendix C for Chi-Square results). There was not a significant difference between groups thus allowing for the inclusion of the variable as a dichotomy to assess its relative contribution to the prediction of group membership. The category, Race, is an important and pervasive part of the literature base for this line of research and was deemed necessary for inclusion.

Of the original 799 cases, 110 were dropped from the analysis due to missing data. Most of the missing data involved absent reading and math scores. Other types of missing data appeared to be missing at random. For the remaining 689 cases, 155 were in the Active/Graduated group and 534 were in the Withdrawn group. Evaluations of assumptions of linearity, normality, multicollinearity, and singularity were satisfactory. Statistically significant heterogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was observed ($p <$

.0001). However, discriminant analysis has shown to be robust regardless of the assumption when dealing with large sample sizes (Tabacknick & Fidell, 2007).

One discriminant function was calculated. A significant Wilks' [lambda] of .945, $F(8,681) = 15.77$, $p < .0001$, was obtained for the discriminant function allowing further interpretation. The results for the Wilks'Lamba are presented in Table 18. The canonical correlation of .234, analogous to the R, indicates a strong relationship between variables and the prediction of group membership. The function accounted for more than 5% of the total relationship between predictors and groups. The discriminant function evaluated at group means (centroids) were .445 for Active/Graduated students and -.129 for Withdrawn students.

Table 18

Wilks' Lambda Test of Significance

Test of Functions(s)	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	.95	38.34	8	.000

The structure loadings of the discriminant function identifies the relative importance of the variables in the model. The analysis revealed three significant contributors to the prediction of group membership: Credits, Severity of the crime, and Age. Students who were younger, committed less severe crimes, and had more credits upon re-entry were more likely to make a successful transition. Credits provided the most significant contribution with a correlation of .69 between the variable and the discriminant function. Severity of the crime produced the second highest correlation of -

.48 and Age had a correlation of -.33. Table 19 provides a summary of structure loadings for all variables entered in the model.

Table 19

*Structure Loadings of Correlations Between Predictors and the Discriminate Function**

	Group Membership
Credits	.69
Severity	- .48
Age/Yr.	- .33
Gender	.22
Math	.18
Race	- .18
Reading	.07
Class	.00

* Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions. Variables are ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.

Classification results indicated correct prediction of group membership with an overall percent of 78.1% for grouped cases correctly classified. See Table 20 for comparison of actual group membership to predicted group membership. The discriminant results strongly support the significance of three variables to determine the difference between Active/Graduated students and Withdrawn students. Although the classification is good, this classification is optimistic because it was done on the basis of the data that produced the discriminant function. A further test will be the classification of new cases based on the established discriminant function.

Table 20

Classification Results

		Predicted Group Membership*		
	Status	Active/Graduated	Withdrawn	Total
N	Active/Graduated	8	147	155
	Withdrawn	4	530	534
%	Active/Graduated	5.2	94.8	100.0
	Withdrawn	.7	99.3	100.0

* 78.1% of original grouped cases correctly classified.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to assist in predicting the educational outcomes for high school students who re-enter a large, urban, public school system following a period of incarceration in a court mandated juvenile justice facility. This was accomplished by employing a retrospective analysis of archival student data from the 2005-2006 school year that were collected by personnel at RETI-WRAP, a ten-day transition program operated by the School District of Philadelphia. The literature indicates that over the past three decades, the need for appropriate transition services and supports has been well-documented (Coates, Miller, & Ohlin, 1975; Gemignani, 1994; Ingersoll& LeBoeuf, 1997; LeBlanc, Pfannenstiel, & Tashjian, 1991; Lewis, Schwartz, & Ianacone, 1988; Maddox et al., 1984; Ride-Hankins 1992; Stafford & Sellers, 2001; Stephens & Arnette, 2000; and Wilson, 2000). Despite these efforts, there is little research as to what variables predict whether a youth will make a successful return to school after having spent time in a juvenile corrections facility. The current study was therefore guided by three major research questions. First, what is the prevalence of demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in a population of previously incarcerated high school students completing a transition program in a large, urban, northeastern school district? Second, what are the relationships between demographic, academic, and crime-related variables in the same aforementioned population? And third, which demographic, academic, and crime-related variables predict successful transition (i.e., Active/Graduated status) for the same aforementioned population?

Prevalence of Demographic, Academic, and Crime-Related Variables

Data on prevalence of criterion variables are presented for each demographic, academic, and crime-related variables alone and in relationship to Class (Regular and Special Education).

Race

Based upon national and School District data, Black students were over-represented within the RETI-WRAP population. Over-representation, as defined by Sickmund (2004) refers to a greater representation of a particular group relative to their share of the total juvenile population. Within the Philadelphia School District, Black students represent 65% of the student population (Great Schools, 2007); yet Black students represented 84% of the high school RETI-WRAP population. This over-representation is consistent with national values in which Black youth, who represent 16% of the general population, constitute 39% of incarcerated juveniles (Snyder, 2005). Whether such over-representation represents discrimination or the higher crime rates associated with negative social conditions remains a point of debate (Pope & Snyder, 2003). White students (4.0%) were under-represented within RETI-WRAP since they constitute 59% of the national juvenile population (Snyder, 2005) and 14% of the Philadelphia School District population (Great Schools, 2007). The Latino/a RETI-WRAP population (10.8 %) was, to a lesser degree, also under-represented based upon a national juvenile population of 20% (Snyder, 2005) and a Philadelphia School District population of 15 % (Great Schools, 2007).

Under-representation for Asian (1.1%) and American Indian (0.1%) was evident from national data of 4% and 1% respectively and School District data of 6% and less than 1%

respectively. It must be noted, however, that caution is warranted concerning generalizations for populations when such small numbers are involved.

A review of the RETI-WRAP population by Regular and Special Education groups demonstrated an over-representation of Special Education students (35.3%) when compared with 8.8% for the national value and 12.8% for the Philadelphia District's Special Education value (Office of Information Technology, December 14, 2008; US DOE, 2005). This over-representation is generally consistent with national studies (US DOE, 2005) that revealed 28% of incarcerated youth were identified as Special Education students. This national figure, however, was exceeded by the 35.3% Special Education composition of RETI-WRAP. The literature indicates that there is a higher incarceration rate for Special Education students as is evidenced in a report by Burrell and Warboys (2000) in which they cite an earlier study by the Chesapeake Institute that, "Twenty percent of students with emotional disturbances are arrested at least once before they leave school, as compared with six percent of all students….. By the time youth with emotional disturbances have been out of school for three to five years, 58 percent have been arrested. Similarly, by the time youth with learning disabilities have been out of school for three to five years, 31 percent have been arrested" (p. 2).

The Race over-representation within the RETI-WRAP Special Education population was considerable when compared to the representation of Special Education students within the Philadelphia School District as a whole. Excluding Mentally Gifted students and Charter School students, the racial composition for the District's Special Education students during the 2005-2006 school year was: White 2.0%, Black 8.4%, and Latino/a 2.2%. Asian and "Other" groups were each less than 1%. Based upon RETI-

WRAP data, Black (28.7%) and Latino/a (4.9%) students were over-represented in the RETI-WRAP Special Education population. In summary, Black students (84%) were over-represented within the RETI-WRAP population. Black (28.7%) and Latino/a (4.9%) students were over-represented within the RETI-WRAP Special Education population.

Gender

Males represented the largest percentage (87.1%) of the RETI-WRAP population. This pattern was also evident within the Regular Education (54.3% males vs. 10.4% females) and Special Education (32.8% males vs. 2.5% females) cohorts. Nationally, female juvenile offenders constitute approximately 13% of juveniles in court mandated residential placements (Sickmund, 2004), which is consistent with the percentage of the overall RETI-WRAP female population (12.9%). If national trends continue, however, it is anticipated that the number of female RETI-WRAP students will increase in the future since females under 18 years of age represent the fastest growing population within the juvenile justice system (Loper, 2000; Snyder, 2005). Several authors (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004; Sharp & Simon, 2005) have highlighted the different developmental histories and dynamics between male and female delinquents and have contended that instructional programs and services for males and females need to be different or specialized by gender. This type of specialization is not a component of the current structure at RETI-WRAP. In summary, male students were found to represent a significant majority (87.1%) of the RETI-WRAP population and maintained this majority status within both the Regular Education (54.3%) and Special Education (32.8%) sectors.

Age

The average Age for the total RETI-WRAP population was 16.44. Division of the Age groups by Regular Education and Special Education students revealed a similarity in average Age, namely 16.49 for the former, and 16.66 for the latter. Students 15 to 18 years of age constituted the majority (89.61%) of the RETI-WRAP population with Regular Education students accounting for 57.90% of this group and Special Education students making up 31.71%. The slightly older age of Special Education students may be the product of more problematic academic histories, thus resulting in a higher rate of grade retention.

Grade

The 10th grade for the RETI-WRAP total population (34.47%), as well as for Regular (21.01%) and Special Education (13.46%) components, was the largest grade group. The next largest was the 9th (28.93%). Combined, the 9th and 10th grades represented 63.40% of the RETI-WRAP total population. Regular Education students tended to cluster more in the 9th and 10th grades, while Special Education students tended to cluster in the 10th grade with equal representations in the 9th and 11th grades. This distribution reflects a normal shaped curve for Special Education students versus a slightly negative skew for Regular Education students.

The "bulging" of RETI-WRAP students in the 10th grade, and to some degree the 9th grade, may reflect prior retentions or delayed grade advancement when compared to the students' average age (16.44). This raises a potential concern in that most students who drop out of school do so in the 9th and 10th grades (Mezzacappa, 2007). In summary, the 10th grade is the most frequent school placement for the total RETI-WRAP

population, with a more equal distribution of the 9th and 10th grades for Regular Education students. This clustering likely reflects delayed school advancement.

High School Credits

Students must meet the following credit requirements in order to be promoted from one grade level to the next: Grade 9 to grade 10, 5 credits; grade 10 to grade 11, 11.5 credits; grade 11 to grade 12, 17.5 credits. A total of 23.5 credits are needed in order to graduate from high school. For the total population of RETI-WRAP students, 7.76 represents the average number of credits earned. Special Education students had a higher average number of credits (8.00) than Regular Education students (7.64). Of the total population of 799 high school students who attended RETI-WRAP, 170 (21.3%) had not earned any credits upon their return from incarceration. When the total of 170 students was further defined in Regular Education (N=114) and Special Education (N=56), the percentage of Regular Education students without high school credits (14.3%) was twice the percentage of the Special Education students (7.0%). Lack of any earned high school credits reflects a lack of advancement and adds to the susceptibility for school dropout.

Reading and Math Levels

During the period of data collection, 691 (86.48%) of the 799 RETI-WRAP high school students completed both the Reading and Math assessments administered by RETI-WRAP teaching staff. Reading (5.45) and Math (5.80) grade equivalency scores for the total population were found to be significantly below age and grade level expectations and reflected considerable skill deficits. Not surprisingly, Special Education students score lower (4.38 Reading/ 5.14 Math) than their Regular Education

counterparts (6.05 Reading/ 6.18 Math). Current data indicated that approximately 93% of the students at RETI-WRAP were enrolled in high school, yet they were collectively achieving at a 5th grade level in relation to their overall reading and math skills. With a deficiency in earned high school credits, as well as academic skills that cluster in the 6th grade for Regular Education students and mid 4th to lower 5th for Special Education students, serious questions are thus raised in regard to their ability to sustain themselves in a high school environment successfully.

Current results are consistent with prior studies (Zabel & Nigro, 2001) that indicate that students associated with the juvenile justice system demonstrate a pattern of below grade level achievement, with Special Education students scoring below their Regular Education student cohort. Additionally, studies have also shown that educational achievement is a preventive force to recidivism (Baltodano, Harris & Rutherford, 2005) suggesting that a majority of RETI-WRAP students will transition from the program with an academic profile that magnifies their vulnerability to school failure. Special Education students, although exhibiting lower Reading and Math skills than their Regular Education cohort, have the advantage of an adapted curriculum and the remedial accommodations of their IEP. This type of individualized plan is not available to Regular Education students with severe academic deficits, thus making the challenge of coping with a high school curriculum even more problematic. It is interesting to note, however, that some studies of juvenile offenders (Svensson, Lundberg & Jacobson, 2003) propose that dyslexia and other innate causes are lesser factors in failure to learn than the environmental negative social experiences encountered by juvenile offenders, particularly minorities. Similarly, other studies (Malmgren & Leone, 2000) indicate that adjudicated

students can and do learn in environments that provide structure, support, and security, as evident from significant academic gains achieved during times of incarceration.

Placement

Upon successful completion of the 10-day program at RETI-WRAP, students are assigned to schools. The largest contingent (40.43%) was assigned to the School District's Comprehensive High Schools; while the next comparable contingent (32.04%) was assigned to the District's contracted services Alternative Schools. These were followed by assignment to EOP's (22.15%), with the final placements being made at Overage/Accelerated Programs (3.75%) and GED Programs (1.63%).

A review of school placements based upon Regular and Special Education categories illustrates a picture for Regular Education students that is comparable to the total population distribution: Comprehensive High School – 27.78%; Alternative Program – 19.77%; Educational Opportunity Program (EOP – "Twilight") - 13.89%; GED – 1.13%; Overage/Accelerated – 2.13%. For Special Education students, almost equal numbers were assigned to Comprehensive High Schools (12.64%) as were assigned to Alternative Schools (12.27%), with EOP sites accounting for 8.26%. The last two categories, Overage/Accelerated (1.63%) and GED (0.5%) accounted for the remaining placements of Special Education students.

Although the numbers were relatively small, referrals for Regular Education students to GED programs were twice the referral number for Special Education students. Similarly, the referral rate for Regular Education students (13.89%) to EOP, or "Twilight," is larger than the referral rate for Special Education students (8.26%). The differences in the referral rates tend to reflect the academic strengths of the students, in

that these programs essentially require higher reading and math skills in order to meet with success. Overage/Accelerated programs, unlike the aforementioned placement options, are primarily "computer based" and often do not have staff who are certified to provide specially designed instruction to students with an IEP, thus limiting the ability of some Special Education students (i.e., those with more significant educational handicaps) to benefit from this type of placement. Given that Special Education students comprised 35.3% of the RETI-WRAP population, their inability to participate successfully in programs developed specifically for non-traditional students is particularly problematic and may contribute to an unsuccessful transition.

Relationships between Predictors

Pearson product moment correlations and Phi coefficients were computed to examine the relationships between variables. Although there is literature about the relationship between selected variables and outcomes like school dropout, little is published about the relationships among variables that predict successful or unsuccessful outcomes. Many of the variables that were significantly correlated with each other were expected. Severity, which was shown to be predictive in the discriminant model, was significantly correlated with gender, age, reading and math scores, and credits. Students committing more severe crimes were more likely to be male and older. They also had lower reading and math scores and fewer high school credits. This subset of the RETI-WRAP population seems to face significant challenges that make re-entry all the more difficult. Studies have shown that students with lower reading and math scores are more likely to drop out of school (Rumberger & Ah Lim, 2008). These lower scores also produced significant correlations to Class, indicating that Special Education students

would also be more likely to drop out. However, based on the predictive model reported in the following section, Class did not emerge as a predictor of failed re-entry. Perhaps the mitigating factor is the additional supports and services they receive via their IEPs.

Predictors of School Re-Entry

The last research question regarding the demographic, academic, and crime-related variables that predict successful transition was examined using a discriminant analysis model. Credits were shown to be most predictive followed by Severity, then Age. Younger students, with more credits, who committed less severe crimes, were more likely to experience a successful transition. Students who are older and have few credits toward graduation may be less likely to remain invested in attending school. Students who have few credits may have been retained in school. Many studies show that retention in middle school significantly contributes to later high school dropout (Rumberger & Ah Lim, 2008) although results for the high school population are inconclusive (Alexander, Entwisle & Kabbini, 2001; Sweeten, 2006).

Severity, as a major predictor in the model, is consistent with the current literature related to delinquency and academic failure. In order for students to obtain a high school diploma, they need to get along with teachers and other students. But some students engage in deviant behaviors that lead to incarceration. Many studies show this pattern of behavior is likely to result in drop out. Research that investigated involvement in the justice system found that being arrested generally had a larger and separate effect on dropping out of school than only delinquency (Bernburg & Krohn, 2003; Hannon, 2003; Sweeten, 2006). Sweeten (2006) found that continued court involvement subsequent to

being arrested was a much stronger predictor of dropout than simply being arrested with no court involvement.

Limitations

Limitations of the current study draw attention to the need for more consistent and methodological data collection for students returning to public school following incarceration in a juvenile justice facility. As noted in the literature (Keeley, 2006), there is a considerable void in the information and data that are available to researchers in regard to delinquent youth who have been placed in a juvenile justice facility and the hurdles they encounter upon return to their home schools. The dearth of research is particularly evident when attempting to identify those factors that contribute to a successful reintegration and subsequent attainment of a high school diploma.

An inherent limitation of any retrospective analysis is the fact that it represents only a "snapshot in time," and may not be indicative of prior or future events. Since completion of the data collection, students may have and probably will have, moved from one category to the next (e.g., Withdrawn to Active; Active to Withdrawn; etc.), thus suggesting the need for a longitudinal study that would assist in determining stability of the profile. Additionally, and as noted previously, the current study did not include the 112 students assigned to RETI-WRAP but who did not complete the program during the data collection period. Another limitation in the sample was the missing data for approximately 113 of the students. The absent data were primarily in relation to missing reading and math scores. Given the large sample size (N = 799), however, this limitation likely had minimal impact on the overall results of the data analysis.

Although the current data set was quite large, the percentage of students (21.9%) who experienced a successful transition was relatively small in comparison to the percentage of students (78.1%) in the unsuccessful (i.e., Withdrawn) category. The amount of variance that can be explained by the model was therefore limited due to the unbalanced nature of the sample, in that few students had a successful transition. With a more balanced sample, the variables in question may have been delineated more accurately, thus leading to a more robust analysis.

A review of the literature (U.S. DOE, 2005; Snyder, 2005) indicates that the RETI-WRAP sample is, in many ways, consistent with the national juvenile justice population, thus making the results generalizable to students who have experienced placement in juvenile justice facilities. Although the current research has the potential for national generalization, it is probably more relevant to large, urban populations with similar demographic characteristics.

Implications for Future Research

The current study attempts to enhance and extend the limited base of research that is available to practitioners, researchers, and policy makers who are interested in developing effective transition programs for students returning to school after a period of incarceration. The research that does exist is generally limited to evaluating transitioning programs that exist at the juvenile facility to which the students are assigned and does not address what happens after they leave that placement. There is a dearth of information as to the eventual educational outcomes of previously incarcerated students once they return home, and given this lack of data, future research opportunities are plentiful and much needed.

Examples of future research include using student information from the current data set in a longitudinal study designed to evaluate profile stability. As noted in the Limitations section of the current research, present results are a "snapshot in time" and may not reflect the long-term outcomes of the identified population accurately. Since a number of students enter, withdraw, and subsequently re-enter the RETI-WRAP program, it is important to understand the dynamics of that process, as well as the outcome status of every other student. By determining the eventual outcomes of the total '05-'06 cohort, future researchers can add valuable information as to the long-term predictive value of the current model. In view of the similarities that exist between some aspects of the RETI-WRAP population and the national juvenile justice population, it would be informative to conduct an analysis of data from other large, urban school districts throughout the country using as many of the current variables as possible. This would assist in identifying common characteristics that predict the educational success (or failure) of other students returning from incarceration, thus establishing a national research base upon which successful programmatic designs can be emulated.

Female students under the age of 18 represent the fastest growing population within the juvenile justice system (Loper, 2000; Snyder, 2005) and may require educational placements that are different from their male counterparts. Although the current model did not identify gender as being predictive of a successful transition, the female sample size was limited, particularly within the special education population (N=23, or 2.7% of the total RETI-WRAP population). Future research could look at issues other than those identified in the current dataset that may better predict the factors contributing to successful female transition.

The present model was able to identify approximately 5% of the variance. By combining the results of the retrospective analysis with additional data using individual student interviews or questionnaires, future researchers could obtain potentially valuable personal insights from the participants, thus providing a perspective not currently available. Adding variables (e.g., family SES; age of student when first involved with the juvenile justice system; history of parental involvement with the justice system; etc.) not included in the present model might improve the predictive strength of future analyses.

Based upon the high estimates of mental disorders among juvenile offenders (Grisso, 2004), it is recommended that policy makers at RETI-WRAP consider the use of a mental status screening measure in order to determine the degree to which mental health problems impact the transition outcomes of this population. Research regarding prevalence rates and types of disorders would assist RETI-WRAP personnel in identifying school and community based supports and services for those students at greatest risk.

Implications for Future Practice

The current study evolved from a collaborative effort between a public school system and university-based researchers. Increasing federal oversight, such as *No Child Left Behind*, has made it difficult for public education entities to meet mandates that call for data-based decision-making and improved accountability while simultaneously decreasing the financial contributions of governmental agencies. Given the fiscal constraints imposed on a burgeoning number of urban school systems, it is imperative that interagency collaborations be established, strengthened, and maintained. By allowing the present data to be analyzed through the use of rigorous statistical standards,

RETI-WRAP personnel have taken the first step in establishing a research-based model of practice that may eventually lead to improved educational outcomes for what is obviously a very challenging population.

The vulnerability of RETI-WRAP students is clearly evident from the present research. Three of four students (a) are re-arrested/re-committed, (b) have bench warrants and are not attending school, or (c) have dropped out of school. Of the 799 students for whom data were collected, 170 had not earned any credits toward graduation, thus placing them at considerable risk for a negative outcome. Indeed, credits provided the most significant contribution to the prediction model, with a correlation of .69 between the variable (Credits) and the discriminant function.

With average reading and math levels of 5.45 and 5.80 respectively, future practice recommendations must include a plan of academic remediation for RETI-WRAP students as well as increasing accommodations that facilitate greater access to Accelerated Credit Recovery Programs. Although remedial reading and math programs have not been a traditional component of the high school curriculum, it is clearly evident from the current research that the receiving schools will have to consider establishing interventions that speak to the specific needs of the RETI-WRAP population. Use of a transitional classroom or individual advisor at the receiving school could help to facilitate the transition process and provide the student with guidance and support during the initial phase of their return. An empathetic teacher or similar member of the school community (i.e., guidance counselor, administrator, coach) has been identified as an important and valuable resource in the prevention of school dropout (Gates, 2006).

High school students comprised the largest portion (93.45%) of the RETI-WRAP population and experienced an unsuccessful outcome in a majority (78.1%) of the cases used for analysis. Due to the failure of most students to achieve a successful transition, consideration should be given to the establishment of a separate high school designed to meet the needs of this particular population. Such a school could be modeled along the lines of New York City's Community Prep, the first public high school for students who have been released from jails and various juvenile justice facilities (Rimer, 2004). Similar to the RETI-WRAP population, a majority of the students at Community Prep are Black, poor, have low reading scores, records of truancy, and few credits toward graduation. Approximately half of the students have also been identified as needing special education supports and services. Although not all students returning from incarceration would need such a specialized placement, a profile could be developed that identifies the most at-risk students assigned to RETI-WRAP, allowing for a transition option that does not currently exist.

In addition to credits, the student's age and the severity of the crime they committed were the other two variables contributing to the predictive value of the research model. Younger students with more credits who committed less severe crimes were more likely to achieve a successful transition. This outcome was validated after a rigorous statistical analysis conducted as a result of collaborative efforts between multiple public agencies (The Philadelphia School District, Family Court, DHS, CBH, The District Attorney's Office, and The Defender Association) and university researchers. By using data-based decision making and providing a comprehensive framework to understand the characteristics of students who transition successfully,

RETI-WRAP policy makers are now in a better position to identify an optimal placement match based on empirical findings.

The current study highlights the dynamics and overall profiles of one of the most challenging and vulnerable populations in the public school system. It is hoped that the information integrated in this report will be the first step toward a practice model that uses enhanced data collection systems in order to better inform educators as to the complex nature and needs of juvenile offenders**.**

REFERENCES

Act 88 of June 29, 2002, No. 88, § 19, 2002 Pa. Laws 524.

Agnew, R. (1985). "A revised strain theory of delinquency." *Social Forces, 64,* 151-167. Copyright 1985 by the University of North Carolina Press.

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory. *Criminology 30*(1), 47-87.

Akers, R. L. (1977). *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach*. (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Akers, R. L., & Jensen, Gary F., Editors. (2003). Social Learning Theory and the Explanation of Crime: A Guide for the New Century. Advances in Criminological Theory. Vol. 11. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Alexander, K.L., Entwisle, D.R., & Kabbini, N.S. (2001). The dropout process in life course perspective: Early risk factors at home and school. *Teachers College Record, 103,* 760-882.

Altschuler, D. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1991). Intensive aftercare for the high-risk juvenile parolee: Issues and approaches in reintegration and community supervision. In *Intensive Interventions with High-Risk Youths: Promising Approaches in Juvenile Probation and Parole,* edited by T.L. Armstrong. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 45-84.

Altschuler, D. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1994a). *Intensive aftercare for high-risk juveniles: An assessment.* Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Altschuler, D. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1994b). *Intensive aftercare for high-risk juveniles: A community care model*. Summary. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Altschuler, D. M., Armstrong, T. L. & MacKenzie, D. L. (1999). Reintegration, supervised release, and intensive aftercare. Program summary (Report No. NCJ-14757 Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Department of Justice.

Austin, J., Krisberg, B., DeComo, R., Rudenstine, S., & DelRosario, D. (1995). *Juveniles taken into custody: Fiscal year 1993* (Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, September 1995), 22.

Balfanz, R., McFarland, J. M., & Shaw, A. (2002). *Re-conceptualizing extra help for high school students in a high standards era* (Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 2002).

Baltodano, H. M., Harris, P. J., & Rutherford, R. B. (2005). Academic achievement in juvenile corrections: Examining the impact of age, ethnicity, and disability. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *29*(4), 361-379.

Baltodano, H. M., Mathur, S. R., & Rutherford, R. B. (2005). Transition of incarcerated youth with disabilities across systems and into adulthood. *Exceptionality 13*(2), 103-124.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Barton, P. E. (2005). *One-third of a nation: Rising dropout rates and declining opportunities.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Beck, A., Gilliard, D., Greenfeld, L., Harlow, C., Jankowski, L., Snell, T., & James, S. (1993). *Survey of state prison inmates 1991* (Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, March 1993), 3.

Bernburg, J.G., & Krohn, M.D. (2003). Labeling, life chances, and adult crime: The direct and indirect effects of official intervention in adolescence on crime in early adulthood. *Criminology, 41,* 1287-1318.

Burrell, S. & Warboys, L. (2000). Special education and the juvenile justice system. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Burgess, R. & Akers, R. (1966). A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems, 14,* 128-47.

Carroll, T. (2008, March 26). Education beats incarceration. [Electronic version]. *Education Week.* Retrieved July 4, 2008, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/03/26/29carroll.h27.html

Catalano, R. F., Wells, E. A., Hawkins, J. D., & Jenson, J. M. (1988). Transition and aftercare services for adjudicated youth. *A Guide to Developing Substance Abuse Treatment Programs for Adjudicated Youth.* L. Mixdorf, M. Goff, & P. Paugh, (Eds.). Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association, pp. 163-189.

Center on Crime, Communities, and Culture. (1997). *Education as crime prevention* (Occasional Paper Series No.2). New York: Author.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R. G. (1998). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R. G. (2004). *G Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Coates, R. B., Miller, A. D., & Ohlin, L. E. (1975). The labeling perspective and innovation in juvenile correction systems. In N. Hobbs (Ed.). *Issues to the classification of children: A sourcebook on categories, labels, and their consequences, 2*: 123-49, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Committee for Economic Development, *Children in need: Investment strategies for the educationally disadvantaged: Executive summary* (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1987), 2.

Digest of Educational Statistics (2007). "Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, dropouts, and graduates in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 students, by state: 1990, 2000, 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005." Retrieved June 27, 2008 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_the_largest_school_districts_in_the_United_States_by_enrollment

Doland, E. (2001). *Give yourself the gift of a degree.* Washington, DC: Employment Policy Foundation.

Donziger, S. A. (Ed). (1996). The *real war on crime: The report of the national criminal justice commission.* New York: Perennial.

Eggleston, C. (2008). Juvenile offenders with special education needs. In R. D. Hoge, N. D. Guerra, & P. Boxer. (Eds.). *Treating the juvenile offender*. (pp. 239-257). New York: Guilford Press.

Empey, L., & Lubeck, S.G. (1971). *Explaining delinquency: Construction, test, and reformation of sociological theory*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Feld, B. C. (1999a). *Bad kids: Race and the transformation of the juvenile court.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Feld, B. C. (1999b). Rehabilitation, retribution, and restorative justice: Alternative conceptions of juvenile justice. In G.A.L. W. Bazemore (Ed.), *Restorative justice: Restoring the harm of youth crime* (p. 399). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Finn, J. D., Scott, M. W. R., & Zarichny, K. T. (1988). School performance of adolescents in juvenile court. *Urban Education 23* (2): 150-61.

Freeman, R. B. (1996). Why do so many young men commit crimes and what might we do about it? *Journal of Economic Perspectives 10*(1), 25-42

Gates Foundation. (2006, March). *The silent epidemic: Perspectives of high school dropouts.* A report by Civic Enterprises in association with Peter D. Hart Associates for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Washington, DC: Civic Enterprises, LLC.

Gemignani, R. J. (1994). *Juvenile correctional education: A time for change.* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Great Schools. (2007). The *parent's guide to k-12 success.* Retrieved April 11, 2007, from http://www.greatschools.net/cgi-bin/pa/district_profile/397/

Grigg, W. S., Daane, M. C., Jin, Y., & Campbell, J. R. (2002). *The nation's report card: Reading 2002 (*Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 2003). Retrieved August 19, 2008 from www.nces..ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp pubid=2003521.

Grisso, T. (2004). *Double jeopardy: Adolescent offenders with mental disorders.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Hannon, L. (2003). Poverty, delinquency, and educational attainment: Cumulative disadvantage or disadvantage saturation? *Sociological Inquiry*, *73*, 575-594.

Harlow, C. W. (2003, January. Revised April 15, 2003). *Education and correctional populations.* Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved August 21, 2008 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T., & Hindelang, M.J. (1977). Intelligence and delinquency: A revisionist review.

American Sociological Review, 42, 571-87.

Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA), Public Law No. 101-476 (1990). *A 25 year history of the IDEA.* Retrieved September 1, 2008 from www.ed.gov/policy/speced.leg/idea/history.html

Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA), Re-authorization, (2004). Rules and regulations/158, Volume 71 Federal Register, Section 1414b (2004).

IN RE GAULT, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).

Ingersoll, S., & LeBoeuf, D. (1997). *Reaching out to youth out of the education mainstream.* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, Juvenile Justice Bulletin, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Jones, M. A., & Poe-Yamagata, E. (2000, April). "And justice for some: Differential treatment of minority youth in the justice system". Washington, DC: Building Blocks for Youth.

Jordan, J. T. (2008, April 11). Education-not incarceration. *The Philadelphia Inquirer,* p. B2.

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. (1968). *The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.* Retrieved September 1, 2008 from www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/compliance/jjdpchronology.pdf

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (1974). Public Law N. 93-415, 42 United States Code, §5601-5603.

Juvenile Justice FYI. (2004). *History of America's juvenile justice system.* Retrieved June 5, 2008 from http://www.juvenilejusticefyi.com/historyofjuvenilejustice.html

Keeley, J. H. (2006). Will adjudicated youth return to school after residential placement? *The Journal of Correctional Education, 57*(1), 65-85.

Koroknay-Palicz, A. (2004). *Review of In re Gault.* Retrieved September 4, 2008 from www.youthrights.org.

Laird, J., Cataldi, E. F., KewalRamani, A., & Chapman, C. (2008). *Dropout and Completion Rates in the United States: 2006* (NCES 2008-053). National Center

for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved July 18, 2008 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008053.

Lally, J. R., Mangione, P. L., & Honig, A. S. (1988). "The Syracuse University family development research program: Long-range impact on an early intervention with low-income children and their families," in D.R. Powell and I.E. Sigel (eds.), *Parent Education as Early Childhood Intervention: Emerging Direction in Theory, Research, and Practice. Annual Advances in Applied Developmental Psychology,* Volume 3, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002, June). *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994,* U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC: June 2002.

LeBlanc, L. A., Pfannenstiel, J. C., & Tashjian, M. D. (1991). *Unlocking Learning: Chapter 1 in Correctional Facilities: Final Report: National Study of the Chapter 1 Neglected and Delinquent Program.* (Contract No. 300-87-0124) U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Leschied, A.W., Coolman, M., & Williams, S. (1984). Addressing the needs of school failures in a delinquent population. *Behavioral Disorders, 10* (1): 40-46.

Lewis, K. A., Schwartz, G. M., & Ianacone, R. N. (1988). Service coordination between correctional and public school systems for handicapped juvenile offenders. *Exceptional Children 55* (1), 66-70.

Loper, A. B. (2000). Female juvenile delinquency: Risk factors and promising interventions. *Juvenile Justice Fact Sheet.* Charlottesville, VA: Institute of Law, Psychiatry, & Public Policy, UVA.

Maddox, M., Webb, S. L., Allen, L., Faust, T., Abrams, D., & Lynch Jr., A. T. (1984). Transitioning adjudicated youth back to community school. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35* (4) 124-28.

Malmgren, K. W., & Leone, P. E. (2000). Effects of short-term auxiliary reading program on the reading skills of incarcerated youth. *Education and Treatment of Children, 23*(3), 239-247.

Mezzacappa, D. (2007, Spring). How many students graduate? Why do students leave school? *Philadelphia Public School Notebook.* Retrieved August 1, 2008, from http://thenotebook.org/editions/2007/spring/how_manymany.htm

Moran, P. M. (1991). Special education and transition services in a detention center school [Electronic version]. *Journal of Correctional Education, 42*(3), 152-158.

Moran, R. (Posted 2006, January 23). Many Philadelphia homicide victims had records. *Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved October 11, 2006, from http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/special_packages/violence/1368...

Morgan, D. (1979). Prevalence and types of handicapping conditions found in juvenile correctional institutions: A national survey. *Journal of Special Education, 13,* 283-295.

National Association of State Budget Officers (2007). "*State Expenditure Report FY 2006*." (December, 2007). Retrieved July 21, 2008, from http://www.nasbo.org/Publications/PDFs/fy2006er.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. *Youth indicators 1993: Trends in the well-being of American youth* (Washington, DC: October 1993), 145.

Nelson, C. M. (2000). Educating students with emotional and behavioral disabilities in the 21st Century: Looking through windows, opening doors. *Education and Treatment of Children, 23,* 204-222.

No Child Left Behind Act. (2001). Public Law No. 107-110. Retrieved August 31, 2008 from www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf

Nye, I. F. (1958). Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley.

Office of Information Technology (personal communication, December 15, 2008).

Otto, R. K., Greenstein, J. J., Johnson, M. K., & Friedman, R. M. (1992). Prevalence of mental disorders among youth in the juvenile justice system. In J.J. Cocozza (Ed.), *Responding to the mental health needs of youth in the juvenile justice system* (pp.7-48). Seattle, WA: National Coalition for the Mentally Ill in the Criminal Justice System.

Platt, A. (1969). The rise of the child-saving movement. *American Academy of Political and Social Science, 381,* 21-38. Copyright 1969 by Sage Publications, Inc.

Platt, A. (1977). *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pollard, R. R., Pollard, C. J., & Meers, G. D. (1994). Determining effective transition strategies for adjudicated youth with disabilities: A national delphi study [Electronic version]. *Journal of Correctional Education, 45*(4), 190-96.

Pollard, R. R., Pollard, C. J., & Meers, G. D. (1995). A sociological, psychological, and educational profile of adjudicated youth with disabilities. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 17,* 56-61.

Pope, C. E., & Snyder, H. N. (2003). Race as a factor in juvenile arrests. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Psychological Corporation (1995). Review of Stanford Achievement Test-8th Edition. Conley, J.C., & Impara, J.C. (Eds.). (1995), The twelfth mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Public Safety Performance Project. (2007, February). *Public Safety, Public Spending: Forecasting America's Prison Population*, 2007-2011, Washington, D.C. The Pew Charitable Trusts,

Public Safety Performance Project. (2008, February). *One in 100: Behind bars in America*. Washington, D.C. The Pew Charitable Trusts,

Quinn, M. M., Rutherford, R., & Osher, D. M. (1999). Special education in alternative education programs. Reston, VA. ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education.

Reading at Risk: The state response to the crisis in adolescent literacy. The Report of the National Association of State Boards of Education. Revised Edition, July 2006.

Reckless, W. C. (1961). A new theory of delinquency and crime. *Federal Probation,* 25, 42-46.

Reiss, A. J. (1951). Delinquency as the failure of personal and social control. *American Sociological Review, 16*(April), 196-207.

Richards, P., Berk, R., & Forster, B. (1979). *Crime as play*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Rider-Hankins, P. (1992). *Review of research: The educational process in juvenile correctional schools.* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Grant 85JSCX0003), Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Robinson, T., & Rapport, M. (1999). Providing special education in the justice system. *Remedial and Special Education, 20*, 19-26.

Rumberger, R.W. & Ah Lin, S. (2008). Why students drop out of school: A review of 25 years of research. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, Linguistic Minority Research Institute: University of California, Santa Barbara.

Rutherford, R. B., Jr., Bullis, M., Anderson, C. W., & Griller-Clark, H. M. (2002). Youth with disabilities in the correctional system: Prevalence rates and identification issues. College Park, MD: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, American Institute for Research.

Schlossman, S. L. (1977). *Love and the American delinquent.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schlossman, S. L. (1983). Juvenile Justice: History and philosophy. In S. H. Kadish (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice*, Vol. 3, pp. 961-969, New York: Free Press.

Schweinhart, L. J., Montie, J., Xiang, Z., Barnett, W. S., Belfield, C. R., & Nores, M. (2005). *Lifetime effects: The High/Scope Perry preschool study through age 40.* (Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 14). Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Senna, J. J. & Siegal, L. J. (1999). *Introduction to criminal justice*. New York: West/Wadsworth.

Sharp, C., & Simon, J. (2005). Girls in the juvenile justice system: The need for more gender-responsive services. Online document. Retrieved April 12, 2007, from http://www.cwla.org/printable/printpage.asp

Shedd, J.M. (2003). "The History of the Student Credit Hour". *New Directions for Higher Education*, 122 (Summer), 5-12.

Sickmund, M. (2004). Juveniles in corrections: Minority disproportionality exists at various points in the juvenile justice system. *National Report Series.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved February 22, 2006 from http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdep/202885/page11.html

Sickmund, M., Sladky, T. J., & Kang, W. (2008). "Census of juveniles in residential placement databook." Retrieved July 10, 2008 from http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/cjrp/.

Silverberg, N.E. & Silverberg, M.C. (1971). School achievement and delinquency. *Review of Educational Research 41*(1): 17-38.

Skinner, B.F. (1959). *Cumulative record*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Snyder, H. & Sickmund, M. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report.* Pittsburgh, PA: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved July 5, 2008 from www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/toc.html.

Snyder, H. N. (2005). Juvenile arrests, 2003. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved June 18, 2008 from www.ojp.us.doj.gov/ojjdp.

Snyder, S. (2008, January 8). Educators hail Nutter's call to arms on dropouts. *The Philadelphia Inquirer,* pp. B1, B5.

Sontheimer, H. & Goodstein, L. (1993). Evaluation of juvenile intensive aftercare probation: Aftercare versus system response effects. *Justice Quarterly, 10*(2), 197-227.

Stafford, D. & Sellers, V. (2001). Juvenile transition: A pathway to success. *Corrections Today 63* (2), 166-67.

Stephens, R. D., & Arnette, J. L. (2000). *From the courthouse to the schoolhouse: Making successful transitions.* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Sutherland, E. H. (1947). Principles of Criminology. (4th ed.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Sutton, J. (1996). Inventing the stubborn child. In J. G. Weis, R. D. Crutchfield, & G. S. Bridges (Eds.) Juvenile Delinquency (pp. 5-6). Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Svensson, I., Lundberg, I., & Jacobson, C. (2003). The nature of reading difficulties among inmates in juvenile institutions. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 16*(7), 667-691.

Sweeten, G. (2006). Who will graduate? Disruption of high school education by arrest and court involvement. *Justice Quarterly, 23,* 462-480.

Tabacknick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc. (5th ed.).

Teplin, L. A., Abram, K. M., McClelland, G. M., Dulcan, M. K., & Mericle, A. A. (2002). Psychiatric disorders in youth in juvenile detention. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 59,* 1133-1143.

Thornberry, T., Moore, M., & Christenson, R. L. (1985). The effect of dropping out of high school on subsequent criminal behavior. *Criminology, 23,* 3-18.

Tyler, J. L., Ziedenberg, J., & Lotke, E. (2006). *"Cost effective corrections: The fiscal architecture of rational juvenile justice systems."* Washington, DC: The Justice Policy Institute.

U.S. Census Bureau (2005). Public education finances: 2005. U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. Retrieved August 19, 2008 from http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/education/010125.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2005). Special *education in correctional facilities II. Student characteristics.* Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Retrieved February 22, 2006 from http://www.edgov/osers/osep.

U.S. General Accounting Office (2004, July). *Special education: Additional assistance and better coordination needed among education offices to help states meet the NCLB teacher requirements* (Publication No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425). Retrieved September 7, 2008, from United States Government Accountability Office Reports Online via GPO http://www.gao.gov/newsroom/publication/2004/specialeducation.htm

Wang, X., Blomberg, T. G., & Li, S. D. (2005). Comparison of the educational deficiencies of delinquent and non-delinquent students. *Evaluation Review, 29*(4), 291-312.

Webb, S., Maddox, M., & Edgar, E. B. (1985). The juvenile corrections interagency transition model. Seattle: University of Washington, Experimental Education Unit.

Wilson, J. J. (2000). *Employment and training for court-involved youth.* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Zabel, R. H., & Nigro, F. A. (2001). The influence of special education experience and gender of juvenile offenders on academic achievement scores in reading, language, and mathematics. *Behavior Disorders, 26*(20), 164-172.

Zigler, E., Taussig, C., & Black, K. (1992). Early childhood intervention, A promising preventative for juvenile delinquency. *American Psychologist, 47*, 997-1006 .

Zenz, T. & Langelett, G. (2004). Special education in Wisconsin's juvenile detention. *Journal of Correctional Education, 55*, 60-68.

APPENDIX A
RETI-WRAP INTAKE FORM

Reti-Wrap

Re-Entry Transition Initiative-Welcome Return Assessment Process
1124 W. Allegheny Street
Philadelphia, PA 19133

INTAKE FORM

Today's Date ___/___/___

Name:_____

Student ID#:_____

Address:_____ (Zip code)_____

Date of Birth: _____/_____/_____ Age:____ Male____ Female___ Race:_____

Parent/Guardian:_____

Telephone:

(Home)_____(Work)_____(Cell)_____

Emergency Contact Name:_____

Address:_____

Telephone:_____

Probation Officer's Name:_____

Telephone#_____

Reintegration Worker's Name _____

Telephone#_____

From what court ordered placement were you discharged?

_____

List all other placements:_____

_____

What was the last Philadelphia Public School you attended?_____

APPENDIX A
RETI-WRAP INTAKE FORM

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. CIRCLE ANSWER AND EXPLAIN

What are your educational goals?

A. High School Diploma
B. GED
C. Vocational or trade school
D. I am not sure
E. Other (Please explain) _____

Do you need help with your school work? Yes or No

What activities or hobbies do you like? _____

Do you want to attend College or Trade School after High School? Yes or No

If yes, would you like information on college of trade school? Yes or No

Do you have any children, or are you expecting a child within the next six months? Yes or No

If yes, how many _____

Do you speak any other languages? Yes or No What language?_____

What religion do you practice?_____

Do you have a job? Yes or No Do you want a job? Yes or No

Are you taking any medications? Yes or No

What kind?_____

Have you ever received therapy or counseling? Yes or No

Have you ever been taken to the emergency room or hospitalized for mental health reasons?

Yes or No

Have you ever been prescribed medication by a doctor for behavioral, emotional, and/ or psychiatric needs? Yes or No

Would you like to speak to a Doctor, Therapist, or Counselor about any problems you are currently facing? Yes or No

Do you have problems staying awake in class? Yes or No

Did you come with your parent/ guardian for your first day of RETI-WRAP? Yes or No

APPENDIX B
RETI-WRAP
Ten-Day Activity Schedule

Ages 16 and Under — Week #1

	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
9:00- 9:15	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast
9:15-9:30					
9:30-9:45	American Red Cross- HIV/ AIDS Prevention	Educating Communities for Parenting- Character Development	Phila. Police Dept./ Heads UP "Drug Prevention and Awareness"	"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets	Social Services Presentation
9:45-10:00					
10:00-10:15				Choice- Safe Sex & Intimacy	
10:15-10:30		"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets			"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets
10:30-10:45	Identifying RETI-WRAP Staff		"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets	"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets	
10:45-11:00					
11:00-11:15	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
11:15-11:30					
11:30-11:45	Code of Student Conduct	Group Discussion "Life Skills"	Group Reading "Power Source"	Group Discussion "Life Skills"	Behavioral Health Presentation
11:45-12:00					
12:00-12:15				E-3 Center Presentation	Group Discussion "Life Skills"
12:15-12:30					
12:30-12:45	Documentary & Discussion "Peace Talks-Managing Anger"	Documentary & Discussion "Peace Talks- Resolving Conflicts"	Documentary & Discussion "Peace Talks- Drugs, Alcohol, and Guns: Triggers to Violence"		Documentary & Discussion "Peace Talks-Handling Dating Pressures and Harassment"
12:45-1:00					
1:00-1:15				Documentary & Discussion "Peace Talks- Preventing Violence"	
1:15-1:30					
1:30-1:45					
1:45-2:00					
2:00-2:15	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal
2:15-2:30					

APPENDIX B
RETI-WRAP
Ten-Day Activity Schedule

Ages 16 and Under

Week #2

	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9	Day 10
9:00- 9:15	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast
9:15-9:30					
9:30-9:45	Temple University Hospital "Cradle to the Grave"	Educating Communities for Parenting- Character Development	"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets	Career Planning Workshop	Social Services Presentation
9:45-10:00					
10:00-10:15					
10:15-10:30		"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets			"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets
10:30-10:45					
10:45-11:00					
11:00-11:15	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
11:15-11:30					
11:30-11:45	District Attorney/ Public Defender "Juvenile Justice"	"Academic Readiness" Basic Spanish	Group Reading "Power Source"	"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets	Behavioral Health Presentation
11:45-12:00					
12:00-12:15					Group Discussion "First Aid (Cont.)"
12:15-12:30	"Academic Readiness" Reading/ Math/ Science Worksheets			"Planning for the Future" Paul Shoe	
12:30-12:45		Documentary & Discussion "Peace Talks- Handling Peer Pressure and Gangs"	Movie & Discussion "The Great Debaters"		Movie & Discussion "Higher Learning"
12:45-1:00					
1:00-1:15	Group Discussion "Life Skills"			Group Discussion "First Aid and Emergency Preparedness"	
1:15-1:30					
1:30-1:45					
1:45-2:00					
2:00-2:15	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal
2:15 2:30					

APPENDIX B
RETI-WRAP
Ten-Day Activity Schedule

Ages 17 and Up

Week #1

	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
9:00- 9:15	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast
9:15-9:30					
9:30-9:45	American Red Cross- HIV/ AIDS Prevention	Group Reading "Survival Guide"	Self Inventory "Assessing Your Values"	Choice- Safe Sex & Intimacy	Support Networks
9:45-10:00					
10:00-10:15				Group Reading "Survival Guide"	
10:15-10:30		Educating Communities for Parenting- Character Development			Social Services Presentation
10:30-10:45	HIV/ AIDS Prevention Follow Up		Group Discussion "Gender Roles- Male vs. Female"		
10:45-11:00					
11:00-11:15	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
11:15-11:30					
11:30-11:45	Self Reflection- Why am I at RETI-WRAP?	Group Discussion "Qualities of a Good Parent"	Movie & Discussion "Higher Learning"	Self Reflection "The Consequence of My Actions"	Group Reading "Survival Guide"
11:45-12:00					
12:00-12:15					Behavioral Health Presentation
12:15-12:30					
12:30-12:45	Documentary & Discussion "American Gangsters"	Documentary & Discussion "American Gangsters"			
12:45-1:00					
1:00-1:15				E-3 Center Presentation	Current Events
1:15-1:30					
1:30-1:45					
1:45-2:00					
2:00-2:15	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal
2:15-2:30					

APPENDIX B
RETI-WRAP
Ten-Day Activity Schedule

Ages 17 and Up

Week #2

	Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9	Day 10
9:00- 9:15	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast	Sign in/ New Student Orientation/ Academic Assessment/ Breakfast
9:15-9:30					
9:30-9:45	Temple University Hospital "Cradle to the Grave"	Group Reading "Survival Guide"	Phila. Police Dept./ Heads UP "Drug Prevention and Awareness"	"Work Readiness" Stephanie Reynolds	Documentary & Discussion "Squash It" State Rep. Waters
9:45-10:00					
10:00-10:15					
10:15-10:30		Educating Communities for Parenting- Character Development			Social Services Presentation
10:30-10:45			Group Discussion "What Would You Like to Know?"	Code of Student Conduct	
10:45-11:00					
11:00-11:15	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
11:15-11:30					
11:30-11:45	Self Reflection "Self Improvement"	Movie & Discussion "The Great Debaters"	Group Discussion "Avoiding Confrontation with the Police"	"Planning for the Future" Paul Shoe	Group Reading "Power Source"
11:45-12:00					
12:00-12:15					
12:15-12:30	District Attorney/ Public Defender "Juvenile Justice"			Documentary & Discussion "American Gangsters"	Behavioral Health Presentation
12:30-12:45					
12:45-1:00					
1:00-1:15	Group Reading "Power Source"		Code of Student Conduct		
1:15-1:30					Driver's Preparation
1:30-1:45					
1:45-2:00					
2:00-2:15	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal	Sign-Out/ Dismissal
2:15-2:30					

APPENDIX C
RESULTS OF CHI-SQUARE TEST

Race/Status Crosstabulation

		Active	Withdrawn	Total
Race				
White	Count	7	25	32
	% within Race	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
Black	Count	151	520	671
	% within Race	22.5%	77.5%	100.0%
Latino/a	Count	15	71	86
	% within Race	17.4%	82.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	173	616	789
	% within Race	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	*p*
Pearson Chi-Square	1.141	2	.565

$p = .565$ N.S.

APPENDIX D
PHILADELPHIA INTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
APPROVAL FORM

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE
Office of Accountability, Assessment & Intervention
440 North Broad Street, 2nd Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19130

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Tel.: (215) 400-4260
FAX: (215) 400-4252

December 16, 2008

Juares P. Johnston, Jr., M.S.
636 Ashurst Road
Havertown, PA 19083

Dear Mr. Johnston:

Please allow this letter to serve as notice that The School District of Philadelphia, through its **Office of Research and Evaluation's Research Review Committee, has granted you approval to commence your study entitled, *Predicting Educational Outcomes for Students Returning from Incarceration.***

Any researcher interacting directly with children in the school(s) must have FBI clearance as well as completed child abuse and criminal checks. As with all research in the District, all student data must remain strictly confidential, and entry into a school is contingent on the principal's approval. Principals are under no obligation to participate in your study. **You are required to provide a copy of the final report to the Office of Research and Evaluation and abstracts must be furnished to each cooperative school or office and region leader.**

Please contact Dr. Julia Lavenberg at jlavenberg@phila.k12.pa.us if you have any questions or concerns related to this decision.

Regards,

Julia G. Lavenberg, Ph.D.
Chair, Research Review Committee

Catherine E. Johnson, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Research and Evaluation

APPENDIX E
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FORM

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY®
Office for Human Subjects Protections
Institutional Review Board
Medical Intervention Committees A1 & A2
Social and Behavioral Committee B
3400 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19140
Phone:215.707.3390 Fax:215.707.8387
e-mail: richard.throm@temple.edu

MEMORANDUM

To: **FIORELLO, CATHERINE**
PSYCH STUDIES IN EDUC (1904)

From: Richard C. Throm
Director, Office for Human Subjects Protection
Institutional Review Board Coordinator

Date: 17-Feb-2009

Re: Exempt Request Status for IRB Protocol:
12238: Predicting Educational Outcomes for Students Returning From Incarceration

---

It has been determined by Expedited Review that this study qualifies for exemption status as follows:

45 CFR 46 Protection of Human Subjects

Section 101 (b): Unless otherwise required by department or agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:

Exemption 4: Collection or Study of Existing Data. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subject.

Nothing further is required from you at this time; however, if anything in your research design should change, you must notify the Institutional Review Board immediately.

If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 215-707-8757.

Thank you for keeping the IRB informed of your clinical research.