PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N OR D)

Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This program is designed to improve the education and employment opportunities of neglected and delinquent students. It addresses the Department's Objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards).

FY 2000—$42,000,000
FY 2001—$42,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N OR D) STUDENTS WILL IMPROVE ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL SKILLS NEEDED TO FURTHER THEIR EDUCATION OR OBTAIN EMPLOYMENT.

Indicator 1.1 Progress and achievement: An increasing number of states will show that Neglected or Delinquent students are obtaining General Equivalency Diplomas and are earning high school course credits.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** A synthesis of state agency evaluations was intended to inform this indicator; however, it was not possible to aggregate findings across states because states did not report consistent measures of academic performance. The Study of State Agency Activities will provide numbers of GEDs and course credits completed by students served by this program.	**Source:** Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I. *Frequency:* Uncertain. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be validated by contractor internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** ED plans to conduct annual short surveys of state agencies administered by a contractor, so that consistent measures are collected and can be aggregated.
1999:	**No data available**	**Unable to set**		
2000:		Unable to set		
2001:		Unable to set		

OBJECTIVE 2: INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS WILL DEMONSTRATE OVERALL EDUCATIONAL REFORM THAT BETTER MEETS THE NEEDS OF NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, AND AT-RISK CHILDREN.

Indicator 2.1 Institution-wide programs: An increased percentage of institutions will operate institution-wide programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of N or D facilities that are institution-wide programs			**Status:** Target exceeded. **Explanation:** Data from state performance reports indicate a 7 percent increase. These data do not include California.	**Source:** Title I State Performance Report, 2000-01 (not yet published). *Frequency*: Annually. *Next Update:* 2001. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I. *Frequency*: Uncertain. *Next Update:* 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996:	9%			
1997:	16%			
1999:	**No data available**	**Continued increase**		
2000:		Continued increase		
2001:		Continued increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedure: Data will be validated by contractor internal review procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This is a limited measure of educational reform in juvenile facilities. The Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I, should provide new data on education reform, enabling development of another, more descriptive indicator.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Develop and disseminate guidance on conducting evaluations of N or D programs to state agencies.
- Conduct workshops to discuss promising practices in correctional education at major conferences, including the IASA conferences, the Title I conference, and the Correctional Education Association Meeting.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Will add questions to data collections administered by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Will review OJJDP's data collection instruments that pertain to education.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- These students are both extremely disadvantaged and highly mobile. Education programs in juvenile facilities serve extremely needy children for short periods of time, and therefore it is very difficult to assess their academic progress. In addition, state capacity to track students systematically after they leave an institution is limited, further confounding our ability to assess the effects of the program on the population served. ED could not draw any systematic conclusions about program effectiveness from state evaluation reports.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted because we did not have data on high school diplomas or GEDs completed.
- Indicator 2.1 was adjusted to delete "integrating other Federal and state programs" because we were not collecting data on the quality of implementation and didn't know for sure that programs were being integrated.
- Indicator 2.2 was revised to focus on research-based programs rather than innovative practices, because innovation does not guarantee effectiveness. Research-based programs are likely to be effective.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was adjusted to report on more specific measures of academic progress, since we now have a vehicle for collecting this information.
- Indicator 2.1 was changed so that it no longer states "improve curriculum and instruction across the institution." We have changed this indicator because we are only collecting data on the number of institution-wide programs; we are not assessing the quality of the institution-wide programs or whether they improve curriculum and instruction.

INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)
From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)
Dropped
- Objective 3 (transition to the community) and its three indicators were dropped. This objective is impossible to report on because states do not collect data on students once they leave institutions.
- Indicator 2.2 was dropped because it lacks specificity, and there is a scant research base on programs that are effective in serving this population of students, thus it would be difficult for agencies to adopt research-based programs.

New—None.