Spring 2021

Knowledge is Power: A Study of Juvenile Justice Facilities and Educational Programs

Molly Anne Latham
Western Kentucky University, molly.latham954@topper.wku.edu

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER:
A STUDY OF JUVENILE JUSTICE FACILITIES AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Presented to
The Faculty in the Department of Sociology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By
Molly Latham

May 2021

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER:
A STUDY OF JUVENILE JUSTICE FACILITIES
AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Date Recommended 4/7/2021

Holli Drummond Digitally signed by Holli Drummond Date: 2021.04.09 08:45:58 -05'00'

Holli Drummond, Director of Thesis

Crystal Bohlander

Noel, Christina Digitally signed by Noel, Christina Date: 2021.04.09 09:38:36 -05'00'

Christina Noel

Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Drummond for her never-failing guidance, wisdom, and the motivation she continuously gave me through this process. I would like to think Mrs. Bohlander and Dr. Noel for their willingness to serve on my committee, jump on board with my ideas, and for understanding my passion in this field of study. I would like to thank Dr. McClain for her constant support through graduate school, for challenging me, and pushing me toward success. I would also like to acknowledge and thank my mom, sister, and fiancé, for the confidence they unceasingly instilled in me. Through this unpredicted year, these individuals have remained constant and supportive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER:
A STUDY OF JUVENILE JUSTICE FACILITIES
AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Molly A. Latham May 2021 42 Pages

Directed By: Holli Drummond, Crystal Bohlander, Christina Noel

Department of Sociology Western Kentucky University

The Juvenile Justice System is established to maintain public safety, as well as rehabilitate youth that have involved themselves in criminal activity. The overall goal is to create a better future for these individuals and transform them into law-abiding citizens for the good of society. In order to understand where the system has failed in doing this, we must first examine what opportunities and programs these individuals have to help them succeed. The current study will employ a secondary analysis of a cross-sectional survey through which the United States Bureau of the Census (1995) collected data on the characteristic of different types of Juvenile Justice facilities; both public and private. Chi-squared tests, correlations, and a logistic regression analysis were specifically used to measure variation in accessibility of education in different juvenile correctional environments.

Introduction

Nelson Mandela (1994) once stated, “It is not beyond our power to create a world in which all children have access to a good education.” While education is not a basic right listed under the constitution, there is an equal protection clause stated within the Fourteenth Amendment; “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” (U.S. Constitution). In the U.S Supreme Court Case, Brown v. Board of Education it is stated “Where a State has undertaken to provide an opportunity for an education in its public schools, such an opportunity is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms” (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954). One outcome of such a promise, is that of a public education system which is equally accessible to all. Education is very important as it allows growth and sets the standard for the way in which one can conduct themselves in society. Failure to educate children can lead to high social costs including unemployment, welfare, and crime (Constitutional Rights Foundation, n.d). In relation to criminal offenders, this status can strip an individual of their dignity, their relationships, their achievements and their rights, but the knowledge they have obtained can never be taken from them.

In the United States, the juvenile justice system seems to shift continually between the public safety/ punishment, and offender rehabilitation (Burton & Butts, 2008). While the general purpose of the juvenile justice system is rehabilitation. Which includes educational programming, law and order concerns sometimes trump the priority

of rehabilitation in this system. Educational achievement is a striking predictor of delinquency and recidivism, as over 80% of all juveniles in the criminal justice system have experienced school failure or have dropped out (Sander et. al., 2011). Education may initially be a small step in the right direction, but it is a powerful tool for youth in custody.

To inform facility management within the Juvenile Justice System and advance academic attainment by providing the best practices to juvenile offenders the current project addresses three primary **research questions:**

How does the type of facility (comparison between juvenile detention centers, group homes, and youth development centers) predict the type of educational programs available to juvenile offenders?

Does the type of facility also predict the provider for educational programs (internal v. external)?

Does the type of facility also predict whether the educational program occurs onsite or is outside the facility?

The overall goal of the juvenile justice system is to establish policy and provide programs that are designed to identify youth problems and implement key strategies in order to reduce those problems (Barton & Butts, 2008). The current research seeks to establish variation in educational programs by the facility type listed previously. While many researchers have focused on the correlation of education and incarceration, as well as the impact of education within justice facilities, few have focused exclusively on the key programs/plans being offered to juvenile offenders by the type of facility a juvenile is institutionalized within. By gaining insight on juvenile justice facilities, programs set in place and how they are administered can be evaluated for transitioning these children into society.

Literature Review

Juvenile Detention Center Characteristics

A juvenile detention center is set in place to house and rehabilitate those under 18 years of age who have broken the law (Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, n.d.). Although this is the definition provided by the Department of Juvenile Justice, it is important to keep in mind that primary detention centers are also used for pre-trial detention as well, rehabilitation is not always a goal for each individual. In 2015, on any given day detention centers across the United States held more than 48,000 juveniles (Sullivan, 2018). Appropriate education in such a short-term facility is essential for a successful transition back into the community upon release. In the words of one juvenile correctional officer

> "We're supposed to help the kids. Holding them back further in school, that's not helping them, that's hindering them. If they could continue earning credits from the schools that they come from and getting caught up because in here all they have is time. When they're in their cells, they're just sitting there. And they're in school. That's the time to ask questions, to learn different things, and this is the perfect place to get caught up" (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016).

While juvenile offenders who are incarcerated may experience disruption in their education, sometimes it can be halted entirely (Sone & Zibulsky,2015), as many students cannot return to the regular school system after being released from custody. As such, educational programs within juvenile detention centers are especially important for these offenders.

All detention centers partner with the local school district to provide educational programs (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). A regular academic school year schedule is followed within the detention center as it correlates with the district school system; the youth receive a minimum of five hours of education per day

(Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). An IEP (individualized education plan) is also developed and administered to students within detention centers who have specialized learning needs. An IEP must be implemented wherever a student is receiving their education, including juvenile justice facilities (Miller, 2019). However, the length of stay a juvenile is placed in a specific facility can impact whether an IEP is created for them within the system.

Finally, average length of stay can provide challenges when designing an individual learning plan and as such there is a need for educational support when transitioning to and from the system and classroom (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). When students leave the school system to enter the detention facility, it is important that the school record follow them so that the mandated educational program at the facility can be tailored to their individual needs, particularly if they receive special individual services (Stone & Zibulsky, 2015). It is clear that the detention center and the sending school must work closely to ensure appropriate education is provided during a youth's custodial stay.

Computer-based programs offered in the detention centers are a well-known effective strategy for individualized learning (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). For those who decide not to continue their education, programs such as GED preparation courses, vocational training, short-term certificate and credential courses are often offered (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). A total of 4,547 youth were included within a study of the Washington State Juvenile detention centers, it was titled *Strengthening Education in Short-term Juvenile Detention Center*s. The purpose of the study was to understand how short-term and long-term

detention center stays influenced students' educational outcomes. The researchers imported data about the students educational and court history for six years prior to the focus year, which was a year they determined the short-term participant outcomes. In this study, 737 continued their K-12 education, 478 earned a high school diploma, 941 completed their GED during the period of their confinement, while 2,372 dropped out (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). By adding this study to the review, the current project is supported by the educational opportunities one may have when placed in a detention center. This study also allows another perspective on how vital it is to address educational curriculum/programs to juvenile justice facilities (this study only including the detention center, whereas the current study will employ three different types of facilities).

One of the main struggles with education and incarceration is reengaging students to appreciate learning once again, educators must notice the potential within the children and meet their needs (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). In detention centers, youth from differing ages and academic grades are placed together in the same classrooms. Therefore, teachers report that they are preforming at different levels and when catered to individually it is regarded as an effective instructional strategy (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). Findings from this study indicated that on average each educator had twenty years of teaching experience and held 11.3 years working in the current facility (Benner, Zeng, Armstrong, Anderson & Carpenter, 2016). Implications of education programs are monitored at the state level and differ from state to state, and with most regulated programs, they are not always carried out in the way they should be. Many critics advocate for a national solution, but

education even in juvenile detention centers are fundamentally a states' right issue (Sullivan, 2018). The previous literature concerning detention centers creates a base for the current project; in an effort to establish programs readily available to juvenile delinquents this literature has helped support the main objective of the study.

Group Homes Characteristics

A group home is a community-based, long term facility that holds juvenile offenders (OJJDP, 2008). This setting provides a transition from a higher level of residential care, whether that be a stay in a mental institution, a training school, or a juvenile detention facility (Morin, 2020). Within a group home these youth have contact with the community with regulations of staff; they can attend school outside of the home, and hold jobs (OJJDP, 2008). Group homes are often smaller facilities compared to other juvenile justice programs, there are usually four to twelve adolescents that live and receive guidance from program staff (Braukmann & Wolf, 1987). Education is by far the most powerful potential vehicle for making a long-term change in these individuals' lives, but more often than not education becomes second in line to other concerns such as shelter and safety (Parrish et. al, 2001).

When it comes to standards of education within these environments, there is not an abundant amount of research offered through the literature. Research does indicate that group homes are the least likely to report that all youth attend school, and the most likely to report that no youth attend school (NDTAC Fact Sheet, 2014). This finding could be associated with the fact that individuals placed in group homes have completed high school (or earned an equivalent degree). These programs are typically community-based; therefore, the youth are concurrently enrolled in the local public school

(Braukmann & Wolf, 1987). Because these individuals attend school outside (external education) the group home it is assumed that the educational programs offered would closely align with a typical public-school system; college preparation classes, vocational training, special education, and a basic primary and secondary education required by state law. In a 2001 study based on education in group home settings, many interview responses stated that there were no college prep classes and that educationally speaking, these individuals have been treated as "throw away kids" even if they remained in the public-school system (Parrish et. al., 2001).

In a recent article published by *The Imprint: Youth and Family News*; Author Alea Franklin discussed how education requirements for group home staff are very important, and that staff need to be prepared to know how to handle children that have emotional and mental needs (Franklin, 2013). The author states that while a high school diploma is an accomplishment, for staff to carry out their career effectively within this field they must obtain at minimum an associate degree in child development or social work (Franklin, 2013). As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the educators for those involved in group home placement are typically public-school educators who have a degree in teaching. Local schools are subjected to closely track and monitor youth placed in group home settings, but because they receive no support from state to do so, public schools are reluctant to serve group home children (Parrish et. al., 2001). In this same study, group home operators were found to work closely with the local district and the county office of education to insure proper educational placements and programs (Parrish et. al., 2001).

Training Schools/YDCs Characteristics

A juvenile offender placed in a youth development center will spend six months at minimum, the maximum time served within the center depends on the type of offense charged and the juvenile's progress made within the program (Campbell, 2003) The average length of stay is around a year, the majority of the juveniles committed are between the ages of 14 to 16 years old (Campbell, 2003).

The term training school and youth development center (YDCs) will be used interchangeable throughout the remainder of the project. The two terms are closely aligned in facility type and will be reviewed within the data. The Department of Juvenile Justice in the Commonwealth of Kentucky refers to this facility type as Youth Development Centers.

Training schools appear more like the average classroom than that of the detention center. Most programs have six-hour school days and offer alternative educational tracks such as GED and vocational opportunities (Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, n.d.). Further, some youth residing at YDCs will have the opportunity to virtually attend and receive college credit through a university program (Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, n.d.). The department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (DJJDP) is currently placing more emphasis on educational, clinical, medical, vocational and recreational programs rather than the correctional aspect of the facility (Campbell, 2003). A performance audit conducted by North Carolina department of Juvenile Justice found that 61% of offenders have specified educational needs and on average, only 13% of offenders completed their GED while placed at the Youth development Center/training school (Campbell, 2003).

Teaching juvenile offenders requires a unique set of skills and experience. Educators must meet State certification requirements; however, this does not always include specialized education programing (Campbell, 2003). Youth Development Centers must work closely with the public-school system in order to examine the qualifications and classifications for the educators within the facility (Campbell, 2003). According to Campbell (2003), the average turnover rate for educators within youth development centers is 13.5% (Campbell, 2003). Educators are the hardest group to create change in, it is difficult for them to step outside of the traditional role of what teachers do in the public-school system (Campbell, 2003). This creates a desperate need to have educators equipped for the needs of these students.

Basic Academic Instruction (Primary and Secondary)

The two terms 'Formal Education' and 'Basic Academic Instruction' will be used interchangeably within the remainder of the writing. According to the results of one study, most youth offenders (76%) state that they were enrolled within the school system at the time they entered placement, this leaves almost one in four youth (24%) who were not enrolled in school (Sedlak & Bruce, 2017). Seven percent of children within this same study were to be expelled, but most, 12%, had already dropped out (Sedlak & Bruce, 2017). Children that are involved in crime may not see the value of gaining an education; there are many circumstances in which they may struggle to find the importance for their education. One way to show youth who have engaged in criminal activity the value of education and to help them achieve their full potential is to mandate quality education services in Juvenile Justice facilities. As stated previously, most, if not all juvenile justice facilities incorporate a basic academic instruction program into their

daily schedule. State regulations are put in place to help facilitate educational curriculum.

Special Education

It is important to note that while special education is an important program within the current study, special education is a broad term and covers a multitude of different areas. It is estimated that anywhere from 12% to 70% of youth currently involved in the system are eligible for special educational program services (Riser & O'Rourke, 2009). Educators of incarcerated youth have identified student behavior problems as one of the most significant barriers to the education and rehabilitation aspect of juvenile justice (Gagnon, Barber, & Soyturk, 2018). Therefore, it is vital that special education programs be implemented into all juvenile justice facilities. All students are entitled to a free and public education, even incarcerated youth with disabilities; This is adhering to the Disabilities Education Act of 1990(Robinson & Rapport, 1999). Although this is mandated in the Juvenile Justice System, few correctional facilities provide adequate assessment for Individualized Education Program (IEP) (Robinson & Rapport, 1999). By taking a vulnerable population (juvenile offenders) and placing them within the criminal justice system without a proper rehabilitation pathway this creates a disservice to society at large. Most youth offenders do not receive a proper public education within their designated facilities, yet those with emotional/behavioral disorders (EBD) and learning disabilities (LD) are unquestionably not receiving their right to an education (Robinson & Rapport, 1999). Remedial classes that are offered in elementary, middle, and high schools are quite common; many students are enrolled in these classes to get additional help if they have fallen behind their peers. Education must be offered to children and youth with disabilities both at school and in juvenile justice facilities. School success may not stop

delinquency, but without it, children/youth have one less lifeline (Mazzotti & Higgins, 2006).

Youth with learning disabilities are disproportionally represented in juvenile justice and the system should account for these students in order to rehabilitate them in the manner they need. The National Center of Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice (EDJJ) reports that more than one in three youths entering juvenile justice or correctional facilities have previously received special education services, and national research has reported that students with disabilities are up to four times more likely to be committed to a juvenile facility than their nondisabled peers (Cavendish, 2014). Miller (2019) states

> "As of 2013, nearly 60 lawsuits had focused on the noncompliance of juvenile corrections with regard to provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004) including child find, individualized education plans (IEPs), least restrictive environment (LRE), and transition services".

This insufficient compliance is likely due to unfamiliarity of special education requirements from the correctional institution employees (Robinson & Rapport, 1999). When students leave the school system to enter a detention facility, it is essential that school records follow them, so that the mandated education program at the facility can be tailored to their individual needs, particularly if they receive special educational services. When students return to their school setting, it is just as necessary for these records to return with them (Stone & Zibulsky, 2015).

Juvenile Detention centers, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), must offer every child with a disability between the ages of 3 and 21 a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment (IDEA, 2004). According to the literature, specialized education is not specified within training school and group home facility types. The current project will be able to determine if these

facilities offer special education programs.

Vocational/Technical Education Programs

Vocational/Tech training in the Juvenile Justice System facilities is very rare and based on literature, there is a strong need for providing community-based options for the youth being adjudicated for low level offenses. In a 2016 article, Sicner (2016) states that the Department of Juvenile Justice in Georgia offers a number of vocational courses through the Career, Technical and Agricultural Education (CTAE) program. Detention centers are the only facilities currently offering this type of program. The justice system partners with the technical college to send over instructors to each facility (Sicner, 2016). This is a step in the right direction for rehabilitating juvenile offenders.

Learning a trade can change the whole trajectory of a young adult's life. When a sense of intelligence is restored in a person, rates of recidivism should continually go down. Vocational training programs that can be implemented into the educational criteria of juvenile justice facilities are oriented to help youth learn skills that will help them gain and maintain employment in the real world (Sicner, 2016). Ameen and Lee, (2012) propose the idea of vocational training as a positive implication to the system in order to provide offenders with marketable skills, fewer disciplinary problems, lower recidivism, fewer parole violations, greater post detention employment and reduced correctional cost through public partnerships. The authors findings align with positive mental and physical health, reduction of crime/defiance, as well as employment and job satisfaction (Ameen & Lee, 2012). Juvenile delinquents traditionally experience few economic opportunities; vocational development for offenders could possibly be the last chance to expose these youth to the idea of living a "non-criminal" lifestyle by exploring their capacities, skill

development and career opportunities (Ameen & Lee, 2012)

General Education Degree (GED) Preparation

While most incarcerated youth are involved in educational programs, most offenders do not earn a GED or even graduate from high school while they are in custody (Farn & Adams, 2016). Research shows that less than 20 % of incarcerated youth have obtained a GED (Farn & Adams, 2016). This finding brings up the question in which facilities offer a GED preparation program and which do not. In many training schools GED preparation classes are offered (Farn & Adams, 2016). Aside from training centers, GED prep within other juvenile justice facilities are close to nonexistent. Providing access to GED preparation is a prevalent program of correctional education; most detention centers provide GED prep course and offer the GED test to incarcerated individuals (Lockwood, Nally, Dowdell, McGlone & Steurer, 2013).

After close examination, the hypotheses listed below align with the literature presented as more specific statements of my expectations that the three research questions listed above. The following hypotheses will be tested in the current research project. First, I hypothesize that training schools offer more diverse educational programing (GED prep, Vocational/tech and college prep) when compared to group homes. Next, I hypothesize that detention centers are more likely to offer basic academic instruction, special education, and GED prep, but not as likely to offer vocational/tech training or college prep, when compared to group homes and training schools. Third, I hypothesize that detention center and group home educators are more likely than training school educators to be employed by the school system located outside of the facility. Lastly, I hypothesize that youth in group homes are more likely than either detention centers or

training schools to gain access to education outside of the facility in which they are lodged.

Methodology

Research Design

The current study will employ secondary analysis of a cross-sectional survey through which the United States Bureau of the Census (1995) collected data on the population and characteristic of different types of Juvenile Justice facilities; both public and private. The data contains information on the type of educational program (basic academic instruction, special education, vocational/Technical education, GED preparation, and college preparation), whether the education is paid for within the budget of the facility or from outside funds, and whether the programs available for juveniles institutionalized within a particular facility are located onsite or offsite. This includes salaried staff hired by the facility, public school employees hired by a state, county, municipal school system, or independent school district, there is also an option of "other" which included private contract teachers or volunteers. This data will help establish variation in educational programs and whether internal or external educators are common for the three facility types discussed above. The value of this study is to more clearly report the diversity in education by facility type, and the impact of such diversity on the ultimate education impact on the juveniles it serves.

The data that will be used is from the *Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities, 1994-1995* and the alternative title is *Census of Children in Custody (CIC), 1995*. For the present study, Shelters, Reception or Diagnostic Center, Ranch, Camp and Farm were omitted from the data and information

from detention centers, group homes, and youth development centers were included. The decision to exclude the previous facilities was made due to the familiarity in research of the three facilities selected and to keep the study minimal for further examination. The Department of Juvenile Justice in Kentucky operates four facility types, three of which are found in this database. A self-reported questionnaire was used to collect information for each facility type. Two questionnaires were used; the CJ-17 was sent to all public facilities and the CJ-29 went to private facilities which were in operation in the United States on February 15th, 1995 (annual data for the 1994 calendar year is included as well).

Participants and Sampling Procedure

All residential programs in operation on February 15th, 1995 were included in the Census report. Each institution included housed three or more residents and at least 50% of residents were juveniles. Nonresidential facilities and juvenile facilities that operated as part of adult jails were excluded from the initial study. In order to collect the data, a mailing list provided by the American Correctional Association Directory of Juvenile and Adult Correctional Institutions was used. A letter requesting the information was provided alongside the questionnaire. Variables that were appropriate for the study were selected from the codebook.

Independent Variables

The primary independent variable is *facility type*. Three types of facilities; *Detention Center, Group Home,* and *Training school/Youth Development Centers, referred to as YDCs throughout*, will be used in the current study. In the Chi-square and correlation analysis, the facility type is dichotomous as each facility is compared with the other two types. In the regression analysis, dummy variables are created with Group

Homes the reference category. The independent variable was pulled from section IV of the report, it states “This facility is primarily a – Mark the one box that best describes this facility”.

Dependent Variables

To observe the variation in educational opportunities available at different types of facilities, several variables were created to explore difference in formal (i.e., primary and secondary education), special (for juveniles with learning disabilities or handicaps), vocational, GED, and college educational opportunities. The education variables used in this study, were constructed from two questions asked in the questionnaire. These questions were found in section XI of the report titled Educational, treatment and medical programs. The first question asked whether the type of education (i.e., formal, special, vocational, GED, or college) was offered *inside the facility,* while the second question asked whether the type of education was offered *outside the facility*. Within the crosstab analysis, each type of education (i.e., formal, special, vocational, GED, or college) is observed as 0 if this type of education was not available, 1 if the education was available *inside the facility*, 2 if the education was available *outside the facility*, and 3 if the education was available *both inside and outside* the facility. In the logistic regression, those variables were changed to a dichotomous variable allowing distinction between *no [formal] education* available (coded 0) and *yes [formal] education* available. Secondly, *educational staff,* was created to distinguish the practice of providing education from staff paid by the institution or whether the instruction is externally sourced. Like the previous variable, this variable was created from a combination of two variables which ranged from no education staff (0), salaried staff (1), pubic staff (3)

providing such education.

Control Variables

While the study's primary interest is in observing the relationships between facility type and both, type of educational programming and funding source of that programming, the data includes several variables which stand to further enhance the understanding of these relationships. The first control variable assesses security as an important consideration in understanding variation by facility type. This measure will be assessed through the variable, *Security Level* (0= none; 1=minimum; 2=medium; 3= maximum). This variable was pulled from the security arrangements section of the census report. The question asked, "How would you describe the physical security for MOST juveniles at your facility?". The average (mean) *length of stay* is measured in months and days. This likely goes hand in hand with type of facility but will be a useful control to examine variation within a facility type. These variables were selected from section IX titled Population Movement and Length of stay. In the annual period covered by the report, the average length of stay in months and days is provided. Finally, whether the institution is *public* (0) or *private* (1) might also serve to predict the educational opportunities explored by this research.

Results

To evaluate the education programs offered inside and outside the facility type, as well as the source of financial support for those programs, cross tabs are performed. To evaluate the relationships between the control variables and facility type, correlations are presented. Finally, a logistic regression is used to determine the impact of facility type (group home as observed category) on education type (measured dichotomous) while also

including the control variables. After reviewing the data from the census report, 2,617 facilities participate in the present study. Specifically, 524 detention centers, 314 youth development centers and 1,1779 group homes. The following data results will be categorized based on statistical tests.

Crosstabs

Basic Academic Instruction

Table 1.1 observes variation in access to basic academic instruction by facility type, while Table 2.1 looks at how payment for basic instruction varies by facility type. From these analyses, three stories emerge. First, a surprising 5% (group homes) to 9% (detention centers) of facilities participating in this study report no access to basic academic education (Table 1.1). For those facilities which do, it most often occurs within the facility for detention centers (83%) and YDCs (82%), and outside the facility for group homes (67%). Finally, when it comes to payment, detention centers (63%) and group homes (77%) are most likely to rely on publicly paid staff, while most YDCs (55%) pay the salary of their instructors of basic education (Table 2.1). Variation in basic education varies significantly by facility type according to the *chi-square* results presented in Tables 1.1 and 2.1.

Table 1.1 Formal Education by Facility Type, Cross Tabs				
N=2,617	None	Yes, Inside the facility	Yes, outside the facility	Access both inside and outside
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	8.8% *(N = 46)*	82.6% *(N= 433)*	5.2% *(N=27)*	3.4% *(N= 18)*
Other *(N= 2,903)*	4.7% *(N=98)*	28.7% *(N=600)*	57.2% *(N=1198)*	9.4% *(N=197)*
X^2*=583.098, p<.000*				
Youth Development Center *(N=314)*	5.7% *(N=18)*	81.5% *(N=256)*	3.8% *(N=12)*	8.9% *(N=28)*
Other *(N=2,303)*	5.5% *(N=126)*	33.7% *(N=777)*	52.7% *(N=1213)*	8.1% *(N=187)*
X^2 *= 300.992, p<.000*				
Group Homes *(N=1,779)*	4.5% *(N= 80)*	19.3% *(N=344)*	66.7% *(N=1,186)*	9.5% *(N=169)*
Other *(N=838)*	7.6% *(N=64)*	82.2% *(N = 689)*	4.7% *(N=39)*	5.5% *(N=46)*
X^2 *= 1060.031, p<.000*				

Table 2.1 Origin of Financial Payment for Formal Instruction by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Salaried Staff	Public Staff	Both
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	10.9% *(N = 57)*	21.0% *(N=110)*	62.6% *(N=328)*	5.5% *(N=29)*
Other *(N= 2,903)*	6.2% (N=129)	17.7% (N=371)	69.8% (N=1460)	6.4% (N=133)
X^2*=19.139, p<.000*				
Youth Development Center *(N = 314)*	10.5% *(N=33)*	54.8% *(N=172)*	27.4% *(N=86)*	7.3% *(N=23)*
Other *(N=2,303)*	6.6% *(N=153)*	13.4% *(N=309)*	73.9% *(N=1702)*	6.0% *(N=139)*
X^2 *=351.239, p<.000*				
Group Homes *(N= 1,779)*	5.4% *(N= 96)*	11.2% *(N=199)*	77.2% *(N=1,374)*	6.2% (N=110)
Other *(N= 838)*	10.7% *(N=90)*	33.7% *(N=282)*	49.4% *(N=414)*	6.2% *(N=52)*
X^2 *=243.894, p<.000*				

Special Education

Like basic education above, variation in special education by facility type is found in Table 1.2, while payment for such education is presented in Table 2.2. Results indicate that a surprising 25% of detention centers reported no access to special education, while special education was not found at 6% of YDCs and 9% of group homes (Table 1.2). Like basic education above, special education is likely inside the facility at detention centers (70%) and YDCs, (85%) while more likely occurring outside the facility for group homes (62%). Also consistent with the results for basic education, special education (Table 2.2) is more likely covered by salaried staff at YDCs (55%), while provided by public staff at detention centers (55%) and group homes (71%).

Table 1.2 Special Education by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Yes, Inside the facility	Yes, outside the facility	Access both inside and outside
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	24.6% *(N= 129)*	69.8% *(N = 366)*	4.2% *(N=22)*	1.3% *(N= 7)*
Other *(N= 2,903)*	8.3% *(N=174)*	30.8% *(N=644)*	52.9% *(N=1107)*	8.0% *(N=168)*
X^2*=520.422, p<.000*				
Youth Development Centers *(N= 314)*	6.1% *(N= 19)*	85.0% *(N= 267)*	3.2% *(N=10)*	5.7% *(N=18)*
Other (N=2,303)	12.3% *(N=284)*	32.3% *(N=743)*	48.6% *(N=1119)*	6.8% *(N=157)*
X^2 *= 341.320, p<.000*				
Group Homes *(N = 1,779)*	8.7% *(N= 155)*	21.2% *(N= 377)*	61.7% *(N= 1097)*	8.4% *(N=150)*
Other (N=838)	17.7% *(N=148)*	75.5% *(N=633)*	3.8% *(N=32)*	3.0% *(N=25)*
X^2 *=942.458, p<.000*				

Table 2.2. Origin of Financial Payment for Special Education by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Salaried Staff	Public Staff	Both
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	28.8% *(N=151)*	13.5% *(N=71)*	54.8% *(N=287)*	2.9% *(N=15)*
Other *(N=2,903)*	10.8% (N=225)	18.8% *(N=393)*	64.9% *(N=1359)*	5.5% (N=116)
X^2=114.555, p<.000				
Youth Development Center *(N =314)*	13.1% *(N=41)*	55.1% *(N=173)*	28.0% *(N=88)*	3.8% *(N=12)*
Other *(N=2,303)*	14.5% (N=41)	12.6% (N=173)	67.7% (N=291)	5.2% (N=119)
X^2 =351.380, p<.000				
Group Homes *(N=1,779)*	10.3% *(N=184)*	12.4% *(N=220)*	71.4% *(N=1,271)*	5.8% *(N=131)*
Other *(N=838)*	22.9% (N=192)	29.1% (N=244)	44.7% (N=375)	3.2% (N=27)
X^2 =225.163, p<.000				

Vocational/Technical Training

As examined in the previous data shown, variation in vocational/technical training education by facility type is found in Table 1.3, while payment for such education is presented in Table 2.3. Results indicate that 77% of detention centers reported no access to vocational training, while vocational education was not found at 18% of YDCs and 30% of group homes (Table 1.3). Vocational education is likely inside the facility at YDCs (67%), while more likely occurring outside the facility for group homes (57%). Consistent with the data mentioned above, 80% of detention centers have no vocational educators. YDCs are more likely to have salaried staff (49%), while group homes are more likely to have public staff teaching vocational education (56%) (Table 2.3).

Table 1.3 Vocational Education by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Yes, Inside the facility	Yes, outside the facility	Access both inside and outside
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	76.5% *(N=401)*	17.0% *(N= 89)*	5.7% *(N= 30)*	0.8% *(N = 4)*
Other *(N= 2,903)*	28.3% (N=592)	17.5% (N=367)	49.7% (N=1041)	4.4% (N=93)
X^2=470.785, p<.000				
Youth Development Center *(N = 314)*	18.2% *(N=57)*	66.6% *(N = 209)*	8.0% *(N=25)*	7.3% *(N=23)*
Other *(N= 2,303)*	40.6% *(N=936)*	10.7% *(N=247)*	45.4% *(N=1046*)	3.2% *(N=74)*
X^2 = 638.570, p<.000				
Group Homes *(N= 1,779)*	30.1% *(N=535)*	8.9% *(N=158)*	57.1% *(1,016)*	3.9% *(N= 70)*
Other *(N= 838)*	54.7% *(N=458)*	35.6% *(N=298)*	6.6% *(N=55)*	3.2% *(N=27)*
X^2 =679.856, p<.000				

Table 2.3 Origin of Financial Payment for Vocational Education by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Salaried Staff	Public Staff	Both
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	79.8% *(N=418)*	6.1% *(N=32)*	13.4% *(N=70)*	0.8% *(N=4)*
Other *(N=2,903)*	33.3% *(N=698)*	13.9% *(N=290)*	50.3% *(N=1053)*	2.5% *(N=52)*
X^2=371.379, p<.000				
Youth Development Center *(N = 314)*	25.8% *(N=81)*	48.7% *(N=153)*	20.4% *(N=64)*	5.1% *(N=16)*
Other *(N=2,303)*	44.9% *(N=1035)*	7.3% *(N=169)*	46.0% *(N=1059)*	1.7% *(N=40)*
X^2 =465.216, p<.000				
Group Homes *(N= 1,779)*	34.7% *(N=617)*	7.7% *(N=137)*	55.6% *(N=989)*	2.0% *(N=36)*
Other *(N=838)*	59.5% *(N=499)*	22.1% *(N=185)*	16.0% *(N=134)*	2.4% *(N=20)*
X^2 =386.816, p<.000				

General Education Degree Preparation

Table 1.4 observes variation in access to GED preparation by facility type, while Table 2.4 looks at how payment for GED preparation varies by facility type. Results indicated that 40% of detention centers and 30% of group homes offered no GED preparation. Youth Development Centers had a significantly high percentage (78%) of GED prep offered inside when compared to the remaining facilities. While detention centers and YDCs are more likely to offer this type of education inside the facility, group homes are more likely to offer it outside (46%) the facility. While detention centers and YDCs are more likely to offer this type of educational program, the financial payment for education differs significantly, detention centers are more likely to have public staff (41%), while YDCs are more likely to have salaried staff (54%). Variation in GED preparation varies significantly by facility type according to the *chi-square* results presented in Tables 1.4 and 2.4.

Table 1.4 General Education Degree (GED) by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Yes, Inside the facility	Yes, outside the facility	Access both inside and outside
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	40.1% *(N= 210)*	55.2% *(N= 289)*	3.6% *(N=19)*	1.1% *(N=6)*
Other *(N= 2,903)*	27.7% *(N=579)*	25.7% *(N=537)*	39.9% *(N=835)*	6.8% *(N=142)*
X^2=329.432, p<.000				
Youth Development center *(N= 314)*	12.4% *(N= 39)*	78.3% *(N=246)*	6.4% *(N=20)*	2.9% *(N=9)*
Other *(N= 2,303)*	32.6% *(N=750)*	25.2% *(N=580)*	36.2% *(N=834)*	6.0% *(N=139)*
X^2 = 364.928, p<.000				
Group Homes *(N= 1,779)*	30.4% *(N=540)*	16.4% *(N=291)*	45.8% *(N=815)*	7.5% *(N=133)*
Other *(N= 838)*	29.7% *(N=249)*	63.8% *(N=535)*	4.7% *(N=39)*	1.8% *(N=15)*
X^2 = 735.324, p<.000				

Table 2.4 Origin of Financial Payment for General Education Degree by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Salaried Staff	Public Staff	Both
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	43.9% *(N=230)*	13.5% *(N=71)*	40.6% *(N=213)*	1.9% *(N=10)*
Other *(N=2,903)*	34.5% *(N=723)*	18.0% *(N=376)*	44.6% *(N=934)*	2.9% *(N=60)*
X^2*=17.793, p<.000*				
Youth Development Centers (N = 314)	18.8% *(N=59)*	54.1% *(N=170)*	24.8% *(N=78)*	2.2% *(N=7)*
Other *(N=2,303)*	38.8% *(N=894)*	12.0% *(N=277)*	46.4% *(N=1069)*	2.7% *(N=63)*
X^2 *= 346.960, p<.000*				
Group Homes *(N= 1,779)*	37.3% *(N=664)*	11.6% *(N=206)*	48.1% *(N=856)*	3.0% *(N=53)*
Other *(N=838)*	34.5% *(N=289)*	28.8% *(N=241)*	34.7% *(N=291)*	2.0% *(N=17)*
X^2 *=124.922, p<.000*				

College Education Programs

Like GED education above, variation in college education by facility type is found in Table 1.5, while payment for such education is presented in Table 2.5. College education is not offered in 93% of detention centers, 70% of YDCs, nor 58% of group homes. The only remaining finding that is significant within Table 1.5 is that 40% of group homes offer college education outside of the facility. This finding is consistent with where educational programming occurs for group home residents presented above, and will be deliberated in the discussion section of the study. The data found in Table 2.5 remained consistent with the findings in Table 1.5. All three facility types had significantly high percentages for no college educators; 94% of detention centers, 79% of YDCs and 65% of group homes. Once again, the only remaining finding that is significant within Table 2.5 is that 34% of group homes receive their college education

by public staff.

Table 1.5 College Education by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Yes, Inside the facility	Yes, outside the facility	Access both inside and outside
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	92.6% *(N=485)*	4.4% *(N=23)*	3.1% *(N=16)*	0.0% *(N=0)*
Other (N= 2,903)	59.5% *(N=1245)*	3.9% *(N=82)*	36.0% *(N=754)*	0.6% *(N=12)*
X^2*=227.421, p<.000*				
Youth development Center *(N = 314)*	70.1% *(N=220)*	15.0% *(N=47)*	14.3% *(N=45)*	0.6% *(N=2)*
Other *(N =2,390)*	65.6% *(N=1510)*	2.5% *(N=58)*	31.5% *(N=725)*	0.4% *(N=10)*
X^2 *=135.460, p<.000*				
Group Homes *(N =1,779)*	57.6% *(N=1025)*	2.0% *(N=105)*	39.9% *(N=709)*	0.6% *(N=10)*
Other *(N= 838)*	84.1% *(N=705)*	8.4% *(N=70)*	7.3% *(N=61)*	0.2% *(N=2)*
X^2 *=325.210, p<.000*				

Table 2.5 Origin of financial payment for College education by Facility Type, Cross Tabs

N=2,617	None	Salaried Staff	Public Staff	Both
Detention Centers *(N=524)*	93.9% *(N=492)*	1.1% *(N=6)*	5.0% *(N=26)*	0.0% *(N=0)*
Other *(N=2,903)*	66.7% *(N=1397)*	2.3% *(N=49)*	30.5% *(N=639)*	0.4% *(N=8)*
X^2*=155.460, p<.000*				
Youth Development Center *(N =314)*	79.3% *(N=249)*	7.3% *(N=23)*	13.1% *(N=41)*	0.3% *(N=1)*
Other *(N=2,303)*	71.2% *(N=1640)*	1.4% *(N=32)*	27.1% *(N=624)*	0.3% *(N=7)*
X^2 *=70.253, p<.000*				
Group Homes *(N=1,779)*	64.5% *(N=1,148)*	1.5% *(N=26)*	33.6% *(N=598)*	0.4% *(N=7)*
Other *(N=838)*	88.4% *(N=741)*	3.5% *(N=29)*	8.0% *(N=67)*	0.1% *(N=1)*
X^2 *= 204.430, p<.000*				

The crosstab data established the programs offered inside and outside the facility, as well as the source of financial support for the programs. Through this evaluation we find that YDCs are more likely than detention centers and group homes to offer formal education, special education, vocational education, and GED preparation. It is also found that college education is most likely not offered in any three of the facilities, except when it comes to outside the group home for those residents. The most consistent trend regarding how education types are paid in various facility types is that most detention centers and group homes fund access through public staff, while youth development centers are more likely to use salaried staff to ensure access to educational variety.

Correlations

The control variables within this study are examined to both clarify relationships with the primary independent variables (i.e., the variables observing facility type), and account for the influence of these additional facility characteristics when predicting access to education. First, correlation analysis was used to determine relationships among the independent variables. Regarding whether a facility is public or private, detention centers (-.57) and YDCs (-.23) are more often public, while group homes (.64) are frequently privately owned facilities (Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3). About security level, detention centers are consistently where maximum security is most likely to occur (.60) and minimum security the least likely found (-.36) (Table 3.1). YDCs are literally middle road when it comes to security having no relationship with minimum security and a moderate relationship with both medium (.16) and maximum (.08) security. At the other end, group homes are the least restrictive environment with a positive relationship with

minimum security (-.37) and a negative relationship with both medium (-.22) and maximum (-.57) security (Table 3.3). As detention centers have a negative correlation with length of stay in months, but a positive correlation with length of stay in days, these facilities are likely the shortest in length. Falling again in the middle, YDCs have a relatively weak correlation with months of stay (.05), and no significant relationship with days of stay. Finally, group homes have a positive correlation in months at .39, and a negative correlating in days at -.04, both reaching statistical significance.

These findings are also representative of the literature; group homes have a reputation of housing youth for longer periods within a less restrictive environment than that of detention centers. As the literature suggest that average length of time, the restrictive nature of the environment, and whether a facility is public or private will influence what educational opportunities they are offered. These correlations have been used to evaluate the relationships between the control variables and facility type.

Table 3.1 Correlations – Detention Center

	Detention Center	Public-private	No Security	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Length of Stay (Months)	Length of Stay (Days)
Detention Center	1	-.57**	-.24**	-.36**	.12**	.60**	-.49**	.06**
Public-Private	--	1	.26**	.27**	-.15**	-.48**	.43	-.04*
No Security	--	--	1	-.44	-.26**	-.22**	.12**	-01
Minimum	--	--	--	1	-.44**	-.38**	.21**	-.02
Medium	--	--	--	--	1	-.23**	-.10**	-.01
Maximum	--	--	--	--	--	1	-.30	.06**
Length of Stay (Months)	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	-0.33
Length of Stay (Days)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Table 3.2 Correlations – Youth Development Center

	Youth Development Center	Public-private	No Security	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Length of Stay (Months)	Length of Stay (Days)
Youth Development Center	1	-.23**	-.13**	-.08	.16**	.08**	.05**	-.01
Public-Private	--	1	.27**	.27**	-.15**	-.48**	.43**	-.04*
No Security	--	--	1	-.44**	-.26**	-.22**	.12**	-.01
Minimum	--	--	--	1	-.44**	-.38**	.21**	-.02
Medium	--	--	--	--	1	-.23**	-.10**	.01
Maximum	--	--	--	--	--	1	-.30**	.06**
Length of Stay (Months)	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	-.03
Length of Stay (Days)	--	--	--	--		--	--	1

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*
**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Table 3.3 Correlations – Group Homes

	Group Home	Public-private	No Security	Minimum	Medium	Maximum	Length of Stay (Months)	Length of Stay (Days)
Group Home	1	.64**	.29**	.37**	-.22**	-.57**	.39**	-.04*
Public-Private	--	1	.26**	.27**	-.15**	-.48**	.43**	-.04*
No Security	--	--	1	-.44**	-.26**	-.22**	.12**	-.01
Minimum	--	--	--	1	-.44**	-.38**	.21**	-.02
Medium	--	--	--	--	1	-.23	-.10**	-.01
Maximum	--	--	--	--	--	1	-.30**	.06**
Length of Stay (Months)	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	-0.3
Length of Stay (Days)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*
**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Logistic Regression

For each type of education, two regression models are observed. The first (step 1) includes only facility type as a predictor allowing contrast between group homes and either detention centers or YDCs. Next (step 2), control variables are added. Regarding formal education step 1, detention centers are 51% less likely to offer formal education when compared to group homes. Step 2 observes no change in variation of access to formal education by facility type as detention centers are 60% less likely to offer this instruction when other control variables are included in the model. Further, only one control offers clarity of when formal education is accessible such that access decreases by 2% with each additional month stayed. According to model fit statistics, neither model significantly enhances our understanding of when formal education is available (Table 4).

Regarding special education step 1, detention centers are 71% less likely to offer special education when compared to group homes, but there is no statistically significant difference in accessibility between group homes and YDCs. Step 2 observes a small change in the relationship between facility type and access to special education as detention centers are 84% less likely to offer that access when compared to group homes (the YDC comparison remains non-significant) when control variables are included. Further, we observe variation by all control variables when availability of special education is estimated. First, public facilities are 40% more likely to offer special education when compared to private. Next, when compared to facilities with no security, maximum security facilities are 102% more likely to offer special education. Regarding length of stay, an additional day increases the likelihood of accessing special education by 2% and each additional month increases access to special education by 3% (Table 4).

When considering vocational training step 1, detention centers are 87% less likely to offer vocational training when compared to group homes. Within this model we see that YDCs are significantly different from group homes as they are 94% more likely to offer vocational training. Step 2 observes a change in variation of access to vocational training by facility type as detention centers are 2% less likely to offer this instruction when compared to group homes. YDCs are 78% more likely to offer vocational training when other control variables are included in the model. Further, we observe variation by all control variables when availability of vocational education is estimated. First, we find that medium security facilities are 31% less likely to offer vocational training. Regarding length of stay, an additional day increases the likelihood of accessing vocational training by 2%. (Table 4)

Regarding general education degree programs step 1, detention centers are 35% less likely to offer GED programs when compared to group homes. Step 2 observes a small change in the relationship between facility type and access to GED programs as detention centers are 76% less likely to offer that access when compared to group homes. Next, we see that youth development centers are 2 times more likely to offer GED programs than group homes. YDCs are 95% more likely to offer GED programs when other control variables are included in the model. First, public facilities are 43% more likely to offer GED programs when compared to private. Next, when compared to facilities with no security, minimum security facilities are 28% more likely to offer GED programs, 44% more likely to offer it in medium secure facilities and 93% more likely at maximum secure facilities. Further, when GED programs are accessible, that access decreases by 3% with each additional month stayed. (Table 4)

Finally looking at variation in accessibility of college education step 1, detention centers are 89% less likely to offer college programs than group homes. Step 2 observes a small change in the relationship between facility type and access to college education as detention centers are 85% less likely to offer access when compared to group homes. YDC are 42% less likely to offer college education when compared to group homes. Worth noting, when control variables are entered into the model predicting access to college education, variation between YDCs and group homes becomes insignificant. Further, we observe variation by all control variables when availability of college education is estimated. When compared to facilities with no security, minimum security facilities are 23% less likely to offer college programs, whereas medium security is 55% less likely to offer college programs. (Table 4). Through the logistic regression we were able to determine how facility type impacts educational type, while also reviewing the control variables within the study.

Table 4: Logistic Regression

	Formal Education				Special Education				Vocational Training				GED				College			
	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)	B	Exp (B)
Detention Centers	-.72*** (.19)	.49	-.92*** (.35)	.40	-1.23*** (.13)	.29	-1.83*** (.27)	.16	-2.03*** (.12)	.13	-2.28*** (.20)	1.02	-.43*** (.10)	.65	-1.44*** (.19)	.24	-2.21*** (.17)	.11	-1.89*** (.23)	.15
Youth Development Centers	-.26 (.27)	.77	-.46 (.31)	.63	.39 (.25)	1.48	.04 (.27)	1.08	.66*** (.16)	1.94	.58** (.18)	1.78	1.12*** (.18)	3.07	.67** (.19)	1.95	-.54*** (.13)	.58	-.29 (.16)	.75
Private	---	---	-.24 (.27)	.79	---	---	-.51* (.20)	.60	---	---	-.26[t] (.14)	.78	---	---	-.56*** (.14)	.57	---	---	.22 (.13)	1.25
Minimum	---	---	.01 (.25)	1.01	---	---	.25 (.18)	1.28	---	---	-.07 (.12)	.93	---	---	.25* (.12)	1.28	---	---	-.26* (.11)	.77
Medium	---	---	.12 (.32)	1.12	---	---	.29 (.23)	1.33	---	---	-.37* (.65)	.69	---	---	.37* (.15)	1.44	---	---	-.80*** (.15)	.45
Maximum	---	---	-.02 (.38)	.98	---	---	.70* (.02)	2.02	---	---	-.20 (.20)	.82	---	---	.66** (.20)	1.93	---	---	-.37 (21)	.69
Length of Stay (Months)	---	---	-.02* (.01)	.98	---	---	.03* (.02)	1.03	---	---	.00 (.01)	1.00	---	---	-.03*** (.01)	.97	---	---	-.01 (.01)	.99
Length of Stay (Days)	---	---	.00 (.00)	1.00	---	---	.02** (.01)	1.02	---	---	.02*** (.00)	1.02	---	---	.00 (.00)	1.00	---	---	.00 (.00)	1.00
Model Diagnostics																				
X^{2} =	12.95**		12.16		95.14***		109.5***		430.05***		441.01***		78.54***		133.07***		265.76***		294.41***	
-2 log likelihood	1102.17		1042.90		1780.1		1720		3044.23		2998.41		3125.3		3034.06		3085.72		3031.33	
Nagelkerke R^{2}	.01		.01		.07		.08		.21		.21		.04		.07		.13		.148	

[t] *p<.01; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001*

Discussion

Partial support was found for my first hypothesis which stated that youth development centers offer more diverse educational programming (GED prep, vocational/tech training and college programs) when compared to group homes. While it is true that YDCs offer more GED and vocational tracks, when it comes to college programs, cross tab results reveal that there is a higher percentage found in group homes. Further, logistic regression results indicate that YDCs are 94% more likely to offer vocational education and two times as likely to offer GED instruction when compared to group homes but are 42% less likely to offer access to college when compared to group homes (Table 4). It is important to note, that the findings for college instruction are less robust as they become insignificant when control variables are included in the model.

Hypothesis two expected that detention centers are more likely to offer basic academic instruction, special education, and GED preparation, but not as likely to offer vocational/tech training or college rep, when compared to group homes and YDCs. In fact, logistic regression results confirm that detention centers are 51% less likely to offer basic academic instruction, 71% less likely to offer special education, 87% less likely to offer vocational training, 35% less likely to offer GED programs, and 89% less likely to offer college programs when compared to group homes.

Hypothesis three expects that detention center and group home educators are more likely than training school educators to be employed by the public-school system located outside of the facility. This hypothesis was created because in my experience with the juvenile detention center the educators worked within the facility itself, yet they were employed by the school system, not a salaried staff on payroll at the facility. Table 2.1 –

2.5 displays all percentages of facilities who have public staff educators, and no matter the type of education we learn that detention centers and group homes have higher percentages than youth development centers when it comes to public staff. Of course this finding should also be considered alongside the finding that group homes are more likely private versus public facilities (Table 3.3).

As a continuation of the above, the last hypothesis expects youth in group homes to more likely than either detention centers or YDCs gain access to education outside of the facility in which they are lodged. In tables 1.1-1.5 we see that group homes have a higher percentage of "yes, outside the facility" than detention centers or youth development centers, a finding that is consistently significant based on x^2 analysis. Specifically, basic academic instruction is offered outside of the facility in 5.2% of detention centers, 3.8% of YDCs and 66.7% of group homes (Table 1.1). Special education is offered outside of the facility in 4.2% of detention centers, 3.2% of YDCs and 61.7% of group homes (Table 1.2). Vocational education is offered outside of the facility in 5.7% of detention centers, 8.0% of YDCs and 57.1% of group homes (Table 1.3). GED Preparation is offered outside of the facility in 3.6% of detention centers, 6.4% of YDCs and 45.8% of group homes (Table 1.4). Finally, college Education is offered outside of the facility in 3.1% of detention centers, 14.3% of YDCs and 39.9% of group homes (Table 1.5). In sum, it is important to note that group homes are more often private, though rely on public (rather than salaried) staff to deliver access to education quite often outside of the facility itself.

While findings throughout the data have been surprising, it is important to revisit the literature and how the two correspond. First we see that college education within

juvenile justice facilities is close to nonexistent in literature, as well as the data within this study. Many of these children may not be given appropriate access to various types of education, therefore failing to enhance opportunity to better their futures through innovations such as a college education. In stating that, college education within detention centers and youth development centers were specifically underrepresented compared to other types of educational programs within the juvenile justice system. In contrast, group homes reported a higher percentage of college education programs, although it is also reported that the majority of group homes are private facilities where the youth within these facilities have greater access to education opportunities outside of the facility itself (39.9%).

The next outcome that needs further discussion is detention centers. As mentioned within the results section, detention centers have a negative correlation with length of stay in months, but a positive correlation with length of stay in days. This aligns with the literature, as we too find that a stay in a detention centers for juveniles is typically in days, due to initial detention and pre-adjudicated stays in days, rather than months. This would also defend the idea that some programs may not be offered to the residents in the detention center because they are not placed there for a long period of time compared to YDCs and group homes.

Limitations and Future Research Directions.

This study provides insight to what programs are available to juvenile offenders and how they receive said educational program. It is important, however, to address the limitations to the study. First, secondary data limits the way in which questions (hypotheses) can be asked and answered. Perhaps the most significant limitation, and a

justification for future research, is that the data is collected from the staff and not the juveniles themselves. Further, knowledge of Juvenile Justice facilities requires more understanding about both educational programming and its implementation by certified educators with measurable success outcomes. This study has opened the door for future research, it has enlightened the idea of just how vital it is to offer opportunities to this population in order to create a better future for themselves, as well as society. It is also important to remember that this data was collected in 1994-1995, therefore some findings could not directly affect the present-day findings. Older observations might not hold true when exploring answers to the above research questions in today's juvenile justice intuitions. Although this is true, the present literature reflects the hypotheses driven by the current study. It is imperative that the subject be researched further in order to give these children a life of success. The researcher also had to make inferences when interpreting what variables regarding access to education were measuring based on the limited detail in the codebook and the passing of time making requests for clarification difficult.

Conclusion

Overall, this study is an informative piece that can be a foundation for future researchers in the field of juvenile delinquency. This study has allowed insight to the functioning of facilities in an educational aspect. As the literature presented, education programs are vital to the success of juvenile offenders. Education is a striking predictor of crime involvement, by this study we see how, and where, the system is reintroducing educational programs to these individuals. It also indicates where programs should be

established. Education may initially be a small step in the right direction, but it is a powerful tool for youth in custody.

References

Ameen, E. J., & Lee, D. L. (2012). Vocational Training in Juvenile Detention: A Call for Action. *Career Development Quarterly*, *60*(2), 98–108. https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2012.00008.x

Barton, W. H., & Butts, J. A. (n.d.). Building on Strength: Positive Youth Development in Juvenile Justice Programs. *Chaplin Hall,* 1-66.

Benner, G. J., Ph.D., Zeng, S., M.S.E, Armstrong, A. L., M.A., Anderson, C., Ph.D., & Carpenter, E., M.A. (2016). Strengthening Education in Short-term Juvenile Detention Centers: Final Technical Report. *National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).*

Braukmann C.J., Wolf M.M. (1987) Behaviorally Based Group Homes for Juvenile Offenders. In: Morris E.K., Braukmann C.J. (eds) Behavioral Approaches to Crime and Delinquency. Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-0903-1_5

BRIA 7 4 c Education and the 14th Amendment. (n.d.). *Constitutional Right Foundation* from https://www.crf-usa.org/bill-of-rights-in-action/bria-7-4-c-education-and-the-14th-amendment

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Campbell, R. (2003). Performance Audit of the Youth Developmental Centers and Juvenile Detention Centers Within the North Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Cavendish, W. (2014) Academic Attainment During Commitment and Post release Education-Related Outcomes of Juvenile Justice-Involved Youth

with and Without Disabilities. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*. 22(1), 41-52

Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice. (n.d.). Retrieved January 19, 2021, from https://djj.ky.gov/Facilities/Pages/Youth-Development-Centers.aspx

Farn, A., M.S Ed, & Adams, J., J.D. (2016). Education and Interagency Collaboration: A Lifeline for Justice-Involved Youth. *Center for Juvenile Justice Reform*

Franklin, A. (2013). Education Requirements in Group Homes. *The Imprint: Youth and Family News*.

Gagnon, J. C., Barber, B. R., & Soyturk, I. (2018). Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Implementation in Secure Care Juvenile Justice Schools: Results of a National Survey of School Administrators. *Behavioral Disorders*, *44*(1), 3–19

Lockwood, S. R., Nally, J. M., Dowdell, J., McGlone, J., & Steurer, S. (2013). Implementing the 2014 Ged Exam and Computer-Based Ged Testing in Correctional Facilities: A Guide for Correctional Educators and Administrators. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *64*(2), 5–21.

Mazzotti, V. L., & Higgins, K. (2006). Public Schools and the Juvenile Justice System: Facilitating Relationships. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 41(5), 295–301.

Miller, A. A. (2019). Navigating Barriers to Special Education in a Juvenile Detention Center. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *70*(2), 2–30.

Morin, A., LCSW. (2020) What Is a Group Home for Teens Like? *Very Well Mind* https://www.verywellmind.com/group-homes-for-troubled-teens-2610445

NDTAC Fact Sheet: Youth with Special Education Needs in Justice Settings. *The National evaluation and Technical Assistance Center* (2014). 1-4.

OJJDP A Product of the Model Programs Guide. (2008). Retrieved from https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/group_homes.pdf

Parrish, T., Dubois, J., Delano, C., Dixon, D., Webster, D., Berrick, J., & Bolus, S. (2001). Education of Foster Group Home Children, Whose Responsibility Is It? *Studies of the Educational Placement of Children Residing in Group Homes*.

Risler, E., & O'Rourke, T. (2009). Thinking Exit at Entry: Exploring Outcomes of Georgia's Juvenile Justice Educational Programs. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 60(3), 225–239.

Robinson, T. R., & Rapport, M. J. K. (1999). Providing Special Education in the Juvenile justice System. *Remedial & Special Education*, *20*(1), 19.

Sedlak, A. J., & Bruce, C. (2017). Survey of Youth in Residential Placement: Youth Characteristics and Backgrounds. *PsycEXTRA* Dataset, 1–52.

Sicner, K., (2016). Juvenile Facilities Offer Vocational Programs to Engage Youths, Reduce Repeat Offenses and Offer Opportunity. *AIA Knowledge Net*

Stone, S., & Zibulsky, J. (2015). Maltreatment, Academic Difficulty, and Systems-Involved Youth: Current Evidence and

Opportunities. *Psychology in the Schools*, *52*(1), 22–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21812

Sullivan, K. (2018). Education Systems in Juvenile Detention Centers. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, 2018(2), 71–100.

United States Census Bureau, (2016) Nonsampling Error. \https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/sipp/methodology/nonsampling-error.html

U.S Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, (2011) Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities, 1994-1995. *United States Census Bureau*