2016

Addressing School Failure and Recidivism Among 10-13-Year-Old Incarcerated Juveniles: A Case Study

Beverly Savoy Nolan
Walden University

Walden University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Beverly Savoy Nolan

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Celeste Stansberry, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Sara Rofofsky Marcus, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Sydney Parent, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2016

Abstract

Addressing School Failure and Recidivism

Among 10-13-Year-Old Incarcerated Juveniles: A Case Study

by

Beverly Savoy Nolan

MA, Prairie View A&M University, 1996

BS, Lamar University, 1972

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2016

Abstract

Early involvement in delinquent behavior coupled with large academic deficiencies increase the chances of long-term offending over a lifetime. A 2012 Texas report on recidivism rates and types of judicial-related programs offered showed that 1-year re-offense rates for youth in secure placement rose slightly from 41.9% in 2007 to 43.3% in 2010. The primary purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine how a Texas-based juvenile probation department coordinated services to address the needs of incarcerated juveniles who are at risk of school failure and recidivism. Maslow's hierarchy of needs framework and Moffitt's developmental classification framework served as the conceptual framework for this study. This case study specifically examined the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism and how division staff collaborates to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth between the ages of 10–13. Staff interviews provided personal perceptions of these collaborative services. The study triangulated data from interviews with three subsets (residential, education, and administration) of the juvenile department that included 4 juvenile administrators and 8 line staff members. Interview data were recorded, coded, and analyzed to identify common themes and perceptions. Identifying effective programs for delinquent youth who are chronic offenders is critical to their successful return to their home schools and can motivate a positive social change in behavior. My research findings indicated that when juvenile probation departments utilize effective collaboration of services with a holistic approach it can result in positive changes in behavior that decrease recidivism and school failure in delinquent youth.

Addressing School Failure and Recidivism

Among 10-13-Year-Old Incarcerated Juveniles: A Case Study

by

Beverly Savoy Nolan

MA, Prairie View A&M University, 1996

BS, Lamar University, 1972

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2016

Dedication

First, giving honor to God. I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my mother for her unconditional love; in memory of my father, who died too young; my children – Demond (Jennifer), Devon, and Leon – and grandson Solomon, who are the wind beneath my wings.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the following individuals for their support throughout this process. To Dr. Celeste Stansberry, who believed in me, challenged me and encouraged me. To Drs. Rofofsky-Marcus and Parent, who challenged me to move from mediocrity to scholar. To my sister friend Cookie, who never doubted me, and my friends - Beverly, Birdie, Elvena, Shannon, Ms. Raymond and Minister Karen - whose prayers undergirded me and gave me the strength to keep moving forward. Finally, to the Texas Juvenile Probation Department that allowed me to pursue my passion: the education of all children. Thank God and thank all of you for helping me get to this point.

.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Section 1: Introduction of the Study

Background

According to a December 2014 report from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. courts in the juvenile system handled more than one million delinquency cases in 2011 (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2014). The same report indicated this increase was 7% higher than the OJJDP's 1985 report. Approximately 46% of juvenile delinquents in the United States are detained by six states: California, Florida, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas (Hockenberry, Sickmond, & Sladky, 2010). There is a significant relationship between delinquency and education: Sedlak and McPherson (2010) stated "youth with low commitment to school are at risk for delinquency and make up a large portion of the national population of youth in juvenile justice custody" (p. 5). Mathur, Clark, and Schoenfeld (2009) suggested that the ability to do well in school academics is a challenge for most juvenile delinquents. Mathur et al. (2009) argued that successful academic performance by any youth is significant in predicting whether a youth becomes delinquent and also influences recidivism.

This case study focused on education services and behavior modification provided to youth between the ages of 10 and 13 years of age while incarcerated at Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department (SCJPD; pseudonym), which is located in a large urban area in Texas. The U.S. juvenile justice system serves as the guardian for incarcerated youth and ultimately provides personalized social services and behavior

intervention programs for these youth (Schwalbe, Hatcher, & Maschi, 2009). If education

and behavior intervention programs are important, then collaboration among education

and residential services professionals is fundamental to providing appropriate services for

youth in juvenile correctional settings (Grisso, 2004). This juvenile probation department

detains more than 3,000 youth annually between the ages of 10 and 17 years and enrolled

in Grades 5–12. There are six divisions providing services to all delinquent youth:

administration, residential services/medical, education, intake and courts, facilities, and

field services. Services are provided to all delinquent youth incarcerated at the one

detention center and three placement facilities.

These facilities are located in different areas of the county served by this juvenile

probation department. There is a juvenile detention center where all youth who enter the

juvenile justice system are held until they go to court or go home. While in the detention

center, youth are provided education services and psychological and residential services

assessments. Juveniles are sent to a placement facility after going to court, if not sent

home. The youth sent to the three placement facilities are provided education services

and behavior modification to support the youth in an effort to decrease school failure and

recidivism. In addition, youth released from incarceration but still on probation continue

to receive services appropriate to their needs.

This study specifically examined the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation

Department, which includes one detention center and three placement facilities. For the

purpose of this study, I focused on behavior modification and education services. The

education division includes a charter school at the detention center and the three

placement facilities where students are incarcerated across the county. Because the

schools are licensed by the Texas Education Agency (since 2005), the education staff is

held to the same qualifications as the education staff in traditional public school districts

in the state.

In the context of this study, the term juvenile refers to youth involved in the

juvenile justice system in Texas between the ages of 10 and 17 years of age. The SCJPD

has a behavior modification program that promotes positive behavior change for all

juveniles in the three placement facilities. Education services are provided for all

incarcerated juveniles under the jurisdiction of the probation department, but behavior

modification is only provided at the three placement facilities. Serendipity County

Juvenile Probation Department's Annual Report for 2013 indicated an increase in the

number of youth entering the Detention Center from 3,824 in 2012 to 4,211 in 2013 to

4,836 in 2014. The 2012 statistics were collected before the implementation of the

behavior modification program and the 2013 statistics were during the first year of

implementation of the behavior modification program at the three placement facilities.

The 2014 statistics were one year after the implementation of the behavior modification

program.

Problem Statement

A significant problem with incarcerating juveniles is providing coordinated

educational and behavior modification services to address the needs of these youth

between the ages of 10 and 13 years and who are at risk of school failure and recidivism. The large number of youths entering the U.S. juvenile justice system has stimulated considerable research that the age of youths' first contact with law enforcement is a strong predictor of chronic offending (DeLisi & Piquero, 2011; DeLisi et al., 2013; Moffitt et al., 2008; Ribeiro da Silva, Rijo, & Salekin, 2012). Thomas et al. (2014) found that early exposure to the juvenile justice system places youth in jeopardy of serious behavioral tendencies that can result in court mandated residential treatment or commitment to the state for secure care confinement. Youth appearing before juvenile court judges are usually identified as having numerous challenges ranging from residential services problems to psychosocial problems (Thomas et al., 2014).

In 2012, there were 3,824 juveniles admitted to the Serendipity County Juvenile Detention Center (SCJPD, 2012). Of this total, 2,960 were males and 864 were females. More than 40% were 16 years of age or older, while 13.3% were between the ages of 10 and 13 years of age. Serving this group of 10-13 year olds is important because early research has consistently shown that early involvement in delinquent behavior coupled with large academic deficiencies increase the chances of long-term offending over a lifetime (Thomas et al., 2014; Thornberry & Krohn, 2003). Finding an effective way to address the educational deficiencies and behavioral issues representative of juvenile delinquent youth and redirecting their negative behavior into positive outcomes could be very beneficial.

SCJPD's Annual Report (2013) indicated an increase in youth admitted to the detention center with a total of 4,211 youth admissions. Of this total, 3,460 youth were male and 751 were females. Thirty-eight percent were 16 years old or older, while 12.6% were between the ages of 10-13, which was a decrease for that age group from the 2012 Annual Report. Services that result in a significant decrease in school failure and recidivism in the younger population (ages 10-13) of juvenile delinquents could eventually have a positive effect on the overall number of youth in the juvenile justice system. The issues surrounding the educational services and behavior modification program of these youth must be addressed to see positive changes in juvenile behavior, dropout rate, and recidivism (Kay, 2009). Juvenile practitioners find it very challenging and sometimes overwhelming to customize services to meet the diverse needs of this population of youth (Risler & O'Rourke, 2009).

Even though the SCJPD charter school division provided each child instructional services and many youth are given behavior modification based on their residential services assessments, many youth released to go home return to the juvenile probation department within a year. In my professional opinion based on observations, there is little research that examines the degree to which coordination between education services and behavior modification addresses 10-13-year-old juveniles who are at risk of school failure and recidivism. By focusing on these two services in this large urban juvenile probation department in Texas, this case study attempted to answer the question of how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral

services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism.

Finally, youth involved in juvenile delinquency present additional problems that impact the community, the state, and the society because of the significant expense involved in keeping youth incarcerated (McCollum, 2011). According to the same research by McCollum (2011), although other problems result from juvenile delinquency, illiteracy, poverty, and homelessness, the financial cost is most significant. This financial cost involves time and manpower spent investigating, along with medical, residential, and educational services that are provided.

Nature of the Study

This qualitative case study was set in a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas that includes a detention center and three placement facilities, which belong to the juvenile department. For the purpose of this study, I focused on juvenile justice practitioners who are directly involved with incarcerated youth in the areas of administration, education, and behavior intervention. As an employee of this juvenile probation department, I had personal connections with this site and interacted professionally with participants in the research study, but did not supervise any participants.

More than 3,000 youth between the ages of 10 and 17 are incarcerated annually at the study site. There is no known national recidivism rate for juveniles due to the fact that juvenile justice systems vary so much across states. According to the Texas Juvenile

Probation Commission, on average, 15% of juvenile probationers were readjudicated for offenses committed while they were under supervision. In Texas, the 1-year readjudication rate for juveniles starting probation in FY 2009 was 13% and 50% were rearrested within three years (2011 Texas Juvenile Probation Commission Data Coordinators Conference).

I designed the study as a concurrent triangulation case study to confirm and cross-validate findings. This case study reviewed how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated programs. The study triangulated data from interviews with three subsets of the juvenile department that included four administrators and eight line staff members. Interview data were recorded, coded, and analyzed to identify common themes and perceptions.

All interviews focused on the education and behavior modification program's goals, effectiveness, and outcomes. The first interview subset included four juvenile justice administrators: the Deputy of Education Services, Deputy of Residential Services, Executive Director of SCJPD, and Assistant Executive Director of SCJPD. The deputies were selected because they have oversight over juvenile programming and implementation in their specific areas (education and residential). Executives were chosen because they have oversight over the entire juvenile department and are knowledgeable about all programs in the department - benefits, effectiveness, and

shortfalls. These individuals are farther removed from the day-to-day operations and activities of the three placement facilities.

The second interview subset included the three principals who work directly with the youth on a daily basis. The third subset included the three superintendents and two behavior specialists at two of the three placement facilities. Interviews gathered qualitative data and collected elements of behavior modification and education services from the perspective of the staff working directly with youth in those program areas.

A case study approach was chosen because in the data analysis I examined a specific problem and from the data pulled out themes that have a much broader significance. In addition this satisfied the need for more-detailed steps beginning with the three phases of coding: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This is normal in the case study approach to inquiry. In qualitative studies, researchers often find things in the course of their research that are unexpected, but provide additional richness to the study. As the collections of data were being sifted through, ideas and themes, categories, and sub-categories emerged—and the detailed steps of this analysis strategy allowed for the opportunity to involve these new findings. In case studies, the researcher is the "primary instrument of the data collection and analysis process and normally employs an inductive strategy that results in a descriptive product" (Merriam, 2002, p. 179). Qualitative data from the interviews were recorded, transcribed, coded, and analyzed to identify common themes and perceptions. I gained a

better understanding of the research study by listening to the participants' responses and then developing themes and related categories.

The type of study that could provide the best solution for this project was research study with an outcomes-based evaluation. An outcomes-based evaluation asks questions to affirm whether or not the organization is, in fact, using the right program activities to bring about the outcomes considered to be needed by clients. Outcomes are benefits to clients from participation in the program and are usually in terms of some type of positive enhancement.

Research Questions

This was qualitative case study of a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas that has an education division with a charter school district that provided instruction of incarcerated youth and behavior modification for the same youth. The central research questions were:

- RQ 1: How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

- RQ 2: What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?

- RQ 3: How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

These questions aided in providing more information on the issue of collaboration of educational services and behavior modification for at-risk youth that may result in decreasing the dropout rate and recidivism.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the education services and behavior modification provided to incarcerated youth in a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. This case study examined how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalized educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program. More than 3,000 youth are incarcerated in this juvenile probation department each year. Of these 3,000 youth, this research focused on incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 and incarcerated in one of the three residential facilities that make up this juvenile probation department.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework was based on Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs and Moffitt's (1993) developmental classification framework. Maslow's hierarchy of needs framework stated that each person is motivated by needs that are inborn (Maslow, 1970). The hierarchy of needs framework explains that human needs motivate individual behavior. There are certain basic needs that must be satisfied that focus on survival, and once those needs are met, higher-order needs come into play that center on such things as

influence and personal development. Conversely, higher-order needs do not come into play without the satisfaction of basic needs. Delinquent youth whose basic needs are unfulfilled may then attempt to fulfill higher order needs in ways that are inappropriate. Given opportunities to fulfill the human needs (academically and socially) in more appropriate ways could be very beneficial to these youth.

Moffitt's (1993) developmental classification theory was the other conceptual framework for this study. Moffitt (1993) identified two distinct courses for offending – the limited offender and the chronic offender. Moffitt's findings indicated that most delinquents are limited offenders and, therefore, have short criminal histories. Much of this belief is based on Moffitt's theories that combine genetics with socialization, which created the idea that children are born with neuropsychological deficits. Moffitt's theory was brain development could be compromised in the womb because of a variety of factors. Though these deficits do not lead to antisocial or criminal behavior, they could lead to problem behaviors, poor socialization, or harsher discipline from parents as a reaction to the child's difficult behavior (Cullen & Jonson, 2012). For this reason, delinquency prevention programs should reinforce the parent child bonding as a means of preventing delinquent behavior.

Definitions of Terminology

Terminology is important to any research study because it is the vocabulary that guides the understanding of the researcher. These definitions are based on their relationship to this study and the state (Texas), in which the study took place.

Adjudicated: A court judgment that a juvenile committed an act (Sedlak & Bruce, 2010). Equivalent to *convicted*.

Delinquent Conduct: This study uses the Juvenile Justice Code definition as conduct, other than a traffic offense, which violates a penal law of the state of Texas and is punishable by imprisonment or by confinement in jail; or a violation of a reasonable and lawful order, which was entered by a juvenile court. In general, juvenile delinquency under Texas law results from either violation of the Texas Penal Code or violation of conditions of probation (Texas Penal Code, n.d.).

Detention: The temporary secure custody of a child, as defined in and authorized by Title 3 of the Texas Family Code (Garfinkel & Nelson, 2004).

Dropout: A person who drops out of school or who withdraws before graduating. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) definition of dropout is a student who is enrolled in grades 7-12, does not return to public school the following fall, is not expelled, and does not: graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED), continue school outside the public school system, or begin college (Dillon, 2009).

Incarcerated Juveniles: Children who have been committed to the care, custody, or control of the Juvenile Justice System (Sturgill, 2011).

Institution: A facility used for the lawful custody and/or treatment of youth (OJJDP, 2009).

Juvenile: A person (ages 10 to 17) who is under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, confined in a juvenile justice facility, or participating in a juvenile justice program administered or operated under the authority of the juvenile board (Vacca, 2008).

Juvenile Information Master System 2: A Juvenile Justice Information data system (Texas Juvenile Justice Department Publication/Texas Family Code).

Juvenile Probation: A penalty used by juvenile justice agencies as a sanction for juveniles adjudicated in court, and in many cases as a way of diverting status offenders or first-time juvenile offenders from the court system. Some communities use probation as a way of informally monitoring at-risk youth and preventing their progression into more serious problem behavior (Gagnon et al., 2009).

Juvenile Probation Department (JPD): The governing body that oversees the supervision of youth under the age of 18 years who violate any federal, state, or local law or municipal ordinance and are processed under the Juvenile Corrections Act (Gagnon et al., 2009).

Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS): A tool used for the collection of educational data; required of all school districts in the state of Texas (Texas Education Agency, TEC 42.006).

Probation: One of the dispositional options available to a juvenile court judge after a youth is adjudicated as delinquent; community-based corrections that presents the youth with a set of rules and regulations and addresses the needs of the youth and the family (Sedlak & Bruce, 2010).

Professionals: For the purpose of this case study:

1. Teachers certified as educators by the State Board for Educator Certification, including teachers certified by the State Board for Educator Certification with provisional or emergency certifications;

2. Residential services providers; and

3. Qualified residential services professionals.

Quarterly/Annual Report on Performance: Quarterly and annual reports submitted by state agencies showing planned and actual performance in terms of outcome and explanatory measures and output and efficiency measures (TJJD Performance Measures Report, 2012).

Recidivism: The proportion of a cohort of delinquent youth to have a recidivism event in a defined length of time, converted to a percent that includes a rearrest/referral, reincarceration, placement of a juvenile (Baffour, 2006).

Secure Facility: A judicial facility designed and operated to ensure that all entrances and exits are under the exclusive control of the facility's staff, thereby not allowing a youth to leave the facility unsupervised or without permission (Moore, McArthur, & Saunders, 2013).

Self-Actualization: The ability of a person to fully understand their potential (Maslow, 1970).

Assumptions, Scope, Limitations, Delimitations

Assumptions

I assumed that the adults participating in the study were experienced in working with juvenile delinquents as educators or in an administrative capacity. As juvenile justice practitioners, I assumed they would provide honest answers during the interview process. I chose individuals who have firsthand experience in providing educational services, behavior modification and counseling/therapy sessions to juvenile delinquents. All participants had at least one year of work experience within this juvenile probation department to increase credibility. I also assumed that cooperation between education services and residential services is targeted to reduce school dropout and recidivism among these youth.

The scope of the study included juvenile probation staffs who worked directly with juvenile youth (10 to 17 years of age) who are incarcerated in a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas and are at risk of school failure and recidivism. I interviewed juvenile justice educators, behavior specialist and juvenile supervision staff who work with juveniles while incarcerated. In addition, juvenile justice deputies and administrators provided a face-to-face interview. Finally, I explored the department's annual review for the year prior to implementation of the behavior modification program (2012) and two years after implementation (2014) to include in my interview instrument for depth. Getting the 2012 and 2014 annual review was not a problem since the department publishes a report annually and it is public record. The purpose of the data

were to get the juvenile justice staffs' perspectives on any changes in the two years since implementation of the collaborative between the behavior modification and education services

Limitations and Delimitations

In this section, I discussed the possible weaknesses (or limitations) of this study that are outside my control and the scope or boundaries (delimitations) of the study that are in my control (Creswell, 2012). Limitations of this research study included juvenile justice practitioners who are not a part of education, residential services, administration or the research department. This research study was delimited to incarcerated juvenile delinquents, juvenile education principals, behavior specialists, juvenile superintendents and administration that are involved directly or indirectly by providing services and behavior modification programming to the youth incarcerated on the three placement campuses of a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. The groups participating in the interviews were identified through a convenience sample. They are responsible for developing programs, implementing programs or supervising programs that the youth are involved in while incarcerated at the three placement facilities. These services and behavior modification program are provided at all three placement facilities. The study was also delimited to interviews of deputy directors in education and residential services, and the executives of the department who develop, financially support and approve programs for these divisions, respectively. Finally, the study was

done over a 6-week period of time and is delimited to the ethical research performed by me as the researcher.

Significance of the Study

This study was significant because juvenile delinquency affects local and state governments, and the nation as a whole. According to Vacca (2008), the inability to read among juveniles who later become adults costs over 220 billion dollars in welfare payments. It has been shown that a large percentage of the prison population is illiterate. Many juveniles who never finish high school become incarcerated adults (Vacca, 2008). In addition, poor academic performance by juveniles decreases their ability to learn skills that result in substantial employment (Mincey, Maldonado, Lacey & Thompson, 2008). Juvenile crime and recidivism in particular continue to plague policy and decision makers, both locally and nationally (Baffour, 2006).

This study examined the education services and behavior modification program provided to incarcerated youth at-risk of school failure and recidivism in a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. This case study reviewed how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalized educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program. More than 3,000 youth are incarcerated in this juvenile probation department each year. This research focused attention on incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13.

According to the literature reviews and research studies, the inability to be successful academically has a long-term negative effect on the individual, their family, and the general society (Henry, Knight, & Thornberry, 2012). Sturgill (2011) stated that a large number of juveniles fail to graduate from high school once released to their communities. This means they make less money because they have a high unemployment rate. As a result, many must seek public assistance (Sturgill, 2011). The ability to address the needs of youth involved with the juvenile justice system remains a major challenge to all who are involved in this arena. Dowdell and Craig (2008) stated "one can hardly stress enough the need for reclaiming human potential in this population by ensuring the access to transformative educational programming and services" (p. 22). They believed correctional educators, because of the nature of the job, have the ability to influence these youths' attitudes, values, and behaviors in such a way that they can become productive individuals and lead successful lives, free from any future incarceration.

Repeatedly, criminal behavior as a youth can lead to criminal behavior as an adult. "On any given day, about one in every 10 young male high school dropout is in jail or juvenile detention" (Dillon, 2009, p. A7). According to Dillon (2009) building more prisons has not led to a decrease in adult criminal behavior. Similarly, the detaining of youth has not led to a significant decrease in the criminal behavior of our youth. It is evident that fewer youth are being detained, but is that because of juvenile watchdog programs such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the (██████ County JDAI Report, 2011), a decrease in dollars for detention, or a decrease in criminal behavior. Working

adults contribute to the nation's tax base. Incarcerated youth and adults increase the nation's financial burden. "It's one of the country's costliest problems" (Dillon, 2009, p. A7). It has been shown that most adults in prison are school dropouts. "The dropout rate is driving the nation's increasing prison population, puts a drag on America's economic competitiveness and makes it clear that every American pays a cost when a young person leaves school without a diploma" (Dillon, 2009, p. A7). Providing juveniles with effective education services and behavior modification could aid in decreasing the number of youth entering adult prisons.

Summary

This study provided research based evidence on education services and behavior modification programs provided to incarcerated juveniles in a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. SCJPD incarcerates over 3,000 juvenile delinquents annually, but this research focused attention on youth between the ages of 10 and 13. The more we know about services and behavior modification programs that work best with juvenile youth, the better equipped juvenile justice and educational systems will be at providing these types of services.

In Section 2, a historical overview of juvenile justice education and residential services were presented to provide background on how these education and behavior modification services evolved. In addition, a view of the juvenile justice system was presented to highlight the percentage of youth that are incarcerated, including recidivism, in juvenile probation departments. A review of the literature included an examination and

analysis of related research studies, use of best practices, conceptual framework and qualitative methodologies. Section 3 includes further discussion of the research question and discussion of the context for the study, protections of participants, ethical considerations, my role as the researcher, and criteria for the selection of participants, data procedures for collection and analysis, and trustworthiness.

Section 2: Literature Review

Introduction

This inquiry examined how the education and residential divisions at a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas collaborated to provide educational services and behavior modification to youth between the ages of 10 and 13 years of age who are at risk of school failure and recidivism. The study explored what programs had been implemented to address the problems of recidivism and school failure in addition to any changes that may have resulted from these programs for these youth. A study goal was to identify means to facilitate these students being academically and socially successful after returning to their home schools. This literature review explores education programs and behavior modification services provided to juvenile delinquents while incarcerated in juvenile placement facilities. It specifically focused on program outcomes that address school failure and recidivism; special attention was given to youth between the ages of 10 and 13 years. The different methodologies addressing the educational and behavioral concerns of this population of youth would also be discussed.

The central research questions examined how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas used personalized educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism. The study data were obtained from staff perceptions collected in face-to-face interviews and a discussion of the collaboration of the divisions in the department.

This section includes a historical overview of juvenile justice mental health, education, behavior programs and evidence-based practices were presented to provide background on these services and the evolution of new practices. In addition, the conceptual framework is discussed in more detail along with qualitative methodologies. The review of the literature includes an examination and analysis of studies, concluding with a summary of this chapter.

Literature Search Strategies

The search strategies for this study included common research databases, criminal and juvenile justice databases to obtain relevant and current peer-reviewed articles: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), ProQuest and ProQuest Criminal Justice, Thoreau searches of multiple databases through EBSCO as host. In addition, I conducted Internet searches for online scholarly journals, including educational, psychological, and behavioral science journals.

The search focused primarily on peer reviewed articles and journals that address the research topic and research questions. All focused on juvenile delinquency and the implementation of education and behavior modification programs. Key words used to search most databases were *juveniles*, *delinquency*, *placement services*, *juvenile programs*, *education*, *behavior modification programs*, and *recidivism*. The results included current articles, journals, reports, publications, books, and peer reviewed research texts that provided in-depth resources, data, and information for this research study. Saturation was apparent when searches produced repetitive information and

sources. The focus was on literature and research within the last 5 years, but older studies included in the literature search were used to provide history and depth to the study.

Review of Related Research

History of Juvenile Justice Mental Health Services

The very first U.S. court system for juvenile justice was created in Cook County, Illinois more than a century ago (Huskey & Tomczak, 2013). The first studies examining the mental health service status of incarcerated youth were also initiated over a century ago in the Cook County juvenile department (Huskey & Tomczak, 2013). Like Illinois, Texas has seen the need to initiate residential services for its youth, both in and out of the juvenile justice system (Texas System of Care, 2011).

In Texas, over 600,000 children, youth, and families are impacted by residential services needs before age 18; the majority of these children (58 %) do not receive these services (Texas System of Care, 2011). Children who do receive services do so through some agency - education, child welfare, or juvenile justice systems. Failure to meet the needs of these youth can result in an increased risk of academic failure, alcohol/drug abuse, chronic health and residential services conditions. Many are faced with seeking services in correctional facilities through the child welfare or juvenile justice systems (Texas System of Care, 2011).

Juvenile watchdog programs like the Annie Casey Foundation (Mendel, 2011).. and the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) sites have been established throughout the United States to fight for juvenile justice reform. In the last decade,

significant progress has been made in decreasing the number of juveniles detained as a result of lawsuits and the initiatives of the JDAI program (Mendel, 2009). The Casey Foundation's vision is that all youth involved in the juvenile justice system have opportunities to develop into healthy, productive adults (Mendel, 2011)..

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department [SCJPD]'s involvement with the JDAI initiative has brought about many programs to support its incarcerated and probationary youth. Serendipity County completed its fourth year as an Annie E. Casey Foundation Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) site in 2011 (Serendipity County JDAI, July, 2011). Their initial goals were to:

Implement reform strategies to safely reduce reliance on secure detention while at the same time reduce juvenile crime and keep communities safe. Serendipity County's involvement with JDAI made them a leader in these efforts, working smarter and harder to use evidenced-based prevention and intervention programs to divert young people from the juvenile justice system. (Serendipity County JDAI, July, 2011)

Children and teenagers who are exposed to traumatic events can be helped with residential services by juvenile justice systems in their recovery if they incorporated a trauma-informed perspective to their practice of working with youth (Ko et al., 2008). This can include screening, providing services to the children and resources to the providers. The Residential Services Association in New York State (MHANYS) found that youth who find themselves in the juvenile justice system are at greater risk for the

development of residential services conditions (Ko et al., 2008). In addition, these conditions may have contributed to their offending and could interfere with their rehabilitation.

According to Ko et al., (2008), the most common disorders found in juvenile justice youth with residential services issues are mood disorders, such as major depression, dysthymia, and bipolar disorder. Other disorders such as obsessive-compulsive disorder, posttraumatic stress disorder, substance-related disorders, anxiety disorders, and disruptive behavior disorders such as oppositional defiant disorder and conduct disorder are also very likely to manifest themselves in these youth at some point (Ko et al., 2008). Ko et al. (2008) recommended providing mental health services to all youth within their first 24 hours in a juvenile facility. They also suggested that evidenced-based residential services treatment in the community would be supportive. Finally, Ko et al. recommended that putting policies in place to provide screening, and evaluations for youth no longer in juvenile justice facilities, including an individual treatment plan.

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department Residential Services

SCJPD's Residential Service division has recognized that they have an opportunity to provide guidance for the youth they serve in a positive way (SCJPD, 2014). At the core of their program is a comprehensive assessment and individualized treatment approach that addresses behavior and mental health needs. They provide immediate and comprehensive services based on identified needs of the youth. There is a

collaboration of efforts to increase the chances of the youth's successful reintegration into the community (SCJPD Annual Report 2014).

In 2013, the division implemented a new behavior modification program in the three placement facilities to address negative behavior. The Intensive Behavior Treatment (IBT) program is an evidenced-based program drawn from research around the country. It incorporates small group dynamics, treatment objectives, builds on incentives (not consequences) and capitalizes on strength-based training. It is headed by a Behavior Specialist at each facility who ensures the operations and administration of the behavior modification program. All juvenile justice supervision staff was trained at the three placement facilities. The program incorporates a point system, which determines how well a youth is progressing. There are also incentives and rewards to increase positive behavior. Services are coordinated with other divisions for maximum effectiveness. Though the program started in August 2013, its implementation on all campuses was not completed until 2014 (SCJPD Annual Report 2014).

History of Juvenile Justice Education

The U.S. Department of Justice has stated that providing juvenile delinquents a quality education can reduce their involvement with the juvenile justice system (Bloomberg, Bloomberg, Waldo, Pesta, & Bellows, 2006). As a result, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 includes very high standards in educational practice for youth detained in residential facilities that strongly encourage programs to increase opportunities for these youth to return to their communities (Bloomberg et al., 2001;

2006). Foley (2001) endorsed the benefits of having programs in juvenile facilities that coexist and meet both educational needs and transitional services that would benefit the youth once they are released from these facilities. In most cases, the more severe the offense, the more likely there would be incarceration. Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) sites were established throughout the United States by the Annie E. Casey Foundation to fight for juvenile justice reform (Mendel, 2009).

School Failure Among Incarcerated Youth

According to Vacca (2008), "delinquency is costly because of the dominancy of illiteracy and the cost to detain a juvenile is $29,000 per year or more" (p. 1060). Many juveniles who never finish high school become incarcerated adults (Vacca, 2008). According to Hess and Drowns (2009), many youth in the juvenile justice system have experienced consistent failure with a history of failure in school and consistent negative behavior. This is likely a major reason why agencies and organizations that worked with youth offenders placed a strong emphasis on academic and educational programming (Leon, Nelson, & Rutherford, 2004).

To shed more light on this issue, research done at the University of Pennsylvania reported that:

"only 12 percent of formerly incarcerated youth had a high school diploma or GED by young adulthood…only about 30 percent were in either school or a job one year after their release and delinquent youth are seven times more likely to

have a history of unemployment and welfare dependence as an adult." (Chung, Little, Steinberg, & Altschuler, 2005, p. 1).

Kaiser (2010) wrote "correctional education is the key to unlocking the shackles of intergenerational incarceration" (pp. 18–20). Research has shown that rehabilitation of these youth is the most economical method to ensure they remain outside of the juvenile justice system and become productive citizens (Kaiser, 2010).

Leone, Krezmien, Mason, and Meisel (2005) found that most delinquent youth are academically at least four years behind their normal peers and that the educational programs in juvenile facilities do not effectively address their educational needs in order for them to return to the schools in their communities. In addition, for many juveniles, educational needs were not met even in the schools in their community (Moreno, 2008). This is important because these youth have shown numerous academic deficiencies, with the inability to read being key (Houchins, Jolivette, Krezmien, & Baltodano, 2008). In addition, it has been shown that poor academic performance by juveniles decreased their ability to learn skills that result in substantial employment (Mincey, Maldonado, Lacey, & Thompson, 2008). It has also been shown that a strong academic program and effective vocational skills can reduce recidivism and promote employability for these youth upon release (Steurer, Linton, Nally, & Lockwood, 2010).

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department Education Services

The SCJPD Educational Services Division provides educational programming and services for delinquent youth (SCJPD Annual Report, 2013). It has included a Juvenile

Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP), a Juvenile Justice Charter School, and

Education Transition Center (ETC). The SCJPD's Education Division's Charter School is

where all youth have received education services under one comprehensive academic

program that is funded by the Texas Education Agency, state and federal funding. Youth

are provided with a regular school year program and a summer school program that has

allowed students the opportunity for continuous improvement of educational skills. The

educational focus has been on student progression in the core curriculum (math, science,

social studies, and ELA) and state assessments (TAKS/STAAR/EOC), remediation

and/or mastery. The Education Transition Center has allowed youth the opportunity for

GED preparation and testing. Older youth released from any SJPD facility and youth on

probation in the community can participate in this program, which also provides

community service opportunities and life skills programs (SCJPD Annual Report, 2013).

Juvenile Delinquency and Recidivism

Research has indicated that juveniles commit more than 2 million crimes every

year (Hamilton, Sullivan, Veysey & Grillo, 2007). Juvenile criminal behavior increased

during the 1980s. According to Garfinkel and Nelson (2004), "it is estimated that

upwards of 300,000 of these young people would be detained in a juvenile detention

center (p. 26)." Recent studies have shown a decrease in arrests of juveniles involved in

violent crimes since the mid-1990s (Puzzanchera, 2009). Yet reports have shown that

these youth comprise 43% of the youth that are in secure confinement, "even without

accounting for those adjudicated for probation or parole violations or those sentenced as

adults" (Sedlak & Bruce, 2010). In 2010, additional research showed that "U.S. Law enforcement officers made an estimated 1.6 million juvenile arrests, including 75,890 for violent crimes" (Ryan, Abrams & Huang, 2014).

Since states and counties vary in their methods of reporting recidivism, there has been no reliable method of measuring or estimating its accuracy (Henggeler & Schoenwald, 2011). Larger states like California have provided 3-year report rates of rearrest among state confined youth as high as 81% (Hipp, Petersilia & Turner, 2011). Texas also reported a five year longitudinal study of state confined juveniles and determined a rearrest rate of 85% (Trulson, Marquart, Mullings & Caeti, 2005). In addition to high recidivism rates, "research has consistently documented low rates of educational or vocational attainment" (Snyder, 2006), "the persistence of residential services and substance abuse disorders" (Ramchand, Morral & Becker, 2009), and "high mortality rates among youths who have spent time in correctional facilities" (Ramchand et al., 2009). A later investigative study of the relationship between abstinence and long-term educational and economic outcomes among high risk youth by Griffin, Ramchand and Edelen (2011) resulted in positive long-term educational and economical outcomes for youth abstaining for 12 months, though no effects were seen among youth abstaining for only 6 months.

Current research has suggested that the age of the youth at first contact with law enforcement and intellectual functioning are dominant predictors of chronic offending (DeLisi & Piquero, 2011; DeLisi et al., 2013; Moffitt et al., 2008; Ribeiro da Silva, Rijo

& Salekin, 2012). Translating research findings into effective programming may allow policy makers the opportunity to develop and implement programs that reduce the antisocial behavior of individuals over the life course (Marcum, Higgins, Ricketts & Wolfe, 2014).

Educational services for incarcerated youth are important according to the mission of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The law was designed to ensure that all children have the opportunity to learn through a quality education and provides justification and support for educational opportunities (NCLB, 2001). NCLB mandates minimum standards that are guaranteed to all youth, including a "fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education" (NCLB, 2001, Sec. 101). NCLB has pushed for a reduction in the numbers of youth involved in juvenile justice system, through policy and practice (Angelo, 2006). The idea behind education is to develop an array of services that result in a sense of public safety for society and rehabilitation for the juvenile (Steurer, Linton, Nally, & Lockwood, 2010). Kaiser (2010) believed "correctional education is the key to unlocking the shackles of intergenerational incarceration" (p. 19). Public safety is a key factor in advocating rehabilitation of these youth, because if juvenile education programs have a positive impact these youth are less likely to return to the unconstructive behavior that caused them to enter the juvenile system. Kaiser (2010) supported this idea especially with the decrease in correctional funding. Kaiser stated this to be the most feasible in an effort to decrease the recidivism rate and help these youth become productive adults.

Juvenile justice critics maintained that the system continues to fail to provide quality educational programs and services to support the youths' return to their communities (Mazzotti & Higgins, 2006). This is why education is so important, with its focus on quality programs and services for these youth in order to restore the loss of confidence in the juvenile justice system (Shook, 2005). According to Vacca (2008), the illiteracy has been costly and delinquency is a large contributor because too many juveniles drop out of school. His research had shown that a large percentage of the prison population is illiterate. As a result many juveniles who never finish high school become incarcerated adults. Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) sites have been established throughout the United States by the Annie E. Casey Foundation to fight for juvenile justice reform, but they still have a long ways to go (Mendel, 2009).

Education has been shown to be important to adjudicated youth. Researchers have attested to the benefits of educating youth who are incarcerated. Dowdell and Craig (2008) stated "one can hardly stress enough the need for reclaiming human potential in this population by ensuring the access to transformative educational programming and services" (p. 64). According to Hess and Drowns (2009), it has been shown that many youth in the juvenile justice system have experienced consistent failure; with a history of failure in school and consistent negative behavior. The goal should be for them to return to the community and become productive citizens (Risler & O'Rourke, 2009). It has been shown that a strong academic program and effective vocational skills can reduce recidivism and promote employability for these youth upon release (Steurer et al., 2010).

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department's Annual Report

Youth involved in the juvenile system has been a problem for this large metropolitan area. Most detained youth in this juvenile probation department are provided education services and behavior modification during their incarceration (SCJPD Annual Report, 2013). For many of these youth, these services have not lead to success in education once departing the department or a reduction in their rearrest or recidivism rate. This case study examined at how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program.

The strength of a research data source is that it already exists as a source (Merriam, 2002). I reviewed the department's annual review for the year prior to implementation of the behavior modification program (2012) and two years after implementation (2014) to include in my interview instrument for depth. Getting the 2012 and 2014 data would not be a problem since the department publishes a report annually, and it is public record. The purpose of the data were to get the juvenile justice staffs' perspectives on any changes in the two years since implementation of the collaborative between the behavior modification and education services.

I focused on the 10-to-13-year-old juvenile youth, as compared to the older juveniles aged 14-to-17-years-old. Sullivan and Latessa (2011) found that different programs produced different recidivism rates, but there were static variables (gender,

race, age at first offense, and number or prior arrests) that were more predictable of recidivism Other research has identified two common findings that are indicators of a lifestyle of violent and chronic criminal behavior. They suggested that early signs of delinquent or antisocial behavior coupled with evidence of low levels of intellectual functioning increases the youth's chances of following this lifestyle (Thomas et al., 2014). This is also consistent with Moffit's (1993) developmental classification, which identifies two distinct courses for offending: the limited offender and the chronic offender. Moffit's findings indicated that most delinquents are limited offenders and therefore, have short criminal histories.

<div align="center">**Juvenile Justices' Use of Evidence Based Practice**</div>

Instructional Practices

Isaack (2011) did a case study of how innovative and sustainable the Open Educational Resources (OER) model was in online learning and how it was able to provide more access for the learners, which resulted in the intended learning outcomes with no negative impacts on the learner. Burris (2011) conducted a qualitative case study to determine to what extent differentiated instruction was implemented in instructional practices to increase student academic performance. Burris revealed that teachers used a variety of strategies to implement differentiated instruction. In addition, Badejo (2011) used a qualitative research case study strategy to identify instructional practices of charter schools, the connection between motivation and learning, and students' perception of learning. Badejo found that charter schools used a variety of strategies to promote self-

determination and efficacy; for example, a more flexible school schedule, incentives and rewards, positive reinforcements, and a variety of instructional methods were among their strategies.

Nuoffer (2011) conducted a single case study to explore strategies for relational school-wide discipline in a small, private Christian school. Nuoffer's findings indicated that the building of positive, trust-based relationships does reduce the number of disruptions in the classroom. In juvenile detention centers or placements, most of the students need individualized instruction, and many suffer from behavioral and emotional disorders. According to Nouffer (2011), in any juvenile justice classroom setting there would be students exhibiting different learning abilities, different styles of learning, and different strengths and weaknesses. It is therefore a disadvantage for a teacher to instruct these youth one-on-one, who can be disruptive because of their inability to control negative behavior. This is different from traditional schools where the numbers of behavior problem are fewer and where teachers have the recourse to send students to the office.

A strong academic program along with other effective services has been demonstrated to reduce recidivism and promote employability for these youth upon release (Steurer, Linton, Nally, & Lockwood, 2010). Early research has supported this premise because a study released by the Correctional Education Association resulted in very strong support of these recommendations (Steurer et al., 2010). Juvenile delinquency impacts the community, the state, and the society financially because these youth leave

the juvenile justice system and many return to the same unconstructive activities (Hess & Drowns, 2009). The same study suggests as a result of continued involvement in nonconstructive activities, many youth return to the juvenile justice system or at age 17 enter the adult system.

Many youth in the juvenile justice system have experienced consistent failure, with a history of failure in school and consistent negative behavior (Hess & Drowns, 2009). The goal is also for them to return to the community and become productive citizens (Risler & O'Rourke, 2009). Unfortunately, juvenile justice education may attempt to provide customized education to meet the many diverse needs, but the secure institutions have challenging characteristics that still impede the educational setting. The National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice (OJJDP, 2009) has monitored class action lawsuits that identified areas of juvenile justice education found to be ineffective because inadequate services are not beneficial to juveniles.

The Albany Law Review (Teitelman & Linhares, 2011) reported that between 2000 and 2010 there is evidence that justice systems nationwide are using evidence-based treatment to provide safe and inexpensive ways to prevent a variety of offenders from reoffending. Courts using such practices, where possible, are able to consider services that offer offenders the opportunity to become more productive citizens. According to Teitelman and Linhares, many states have made positive advances in the use of evidence-based practices for adults, but fewer states have applied this methodology to the assessment and treatment of juvenile offenders as well as, Missouri. If the successes

experienced by Missouri are any indication, implementing evidence-based assessments and treatments for juvenile offenders will not only improve the lives of many youth at risk, but also improve the safety of public with the cost being minimal (Teitelman & Linhares, 2011).

Missouri was able to do this by eliminating their youth prison system. Instead, they developed a system of smaller facilities around the state. They also focused on hiring staff that could connect with the youth and understood their challenges. Missouri also changed the concept of their facilities to include the idea of transition, keeping in mind that their youth would be returning to their communities (Roush, Brazeal & Church, 2014). Failure on the part of states to reduce high rates of recidivism and rehabilitate youth offenders has resulted in advocacy for alternatives to incarceration, including diversion, home probation, restorative justice programs, and community-based treatment services, to name a few. This is especially recommended for younger and first time offenders (Mendel, 2011).

An alternative argument is that neither placement nor disposition matter in producing outcomes for these youth. For example, a comprehensive study of 4,355 Ohio juveniles concluded that different programs produced different recidivism rates, but there were static variables (gender, race, age at first offense, and number or prior arrests) that were more predictable of recidivism (Sullivan & Latessa, 2011). Other research has identified two common findings that are indicators of a lifestyle of violent and chronic criminal behavior. They suggested that early signs of delinquent or antisocial behavior

coupled with evidence of low levels of intellectual functioning increases the youth's chances of following this lifestyle (Thomas et al., 2014). This is also consistent with Moffit's (1993) developmental classification, in which Moffit identified two distinct courses for offending – the limited offender and the chronic offender. Moffit's findings indicated that most delinquents are limited offenders and therefore, have short criminal histories. The chronic offenders, though smaller in numbers (6%), were responsible for a disproportionately large amount of criminal behavior (Carroll, Hemingway, Bower, Ashman, Houghton, & Durkin, 2006).

Marshall, Powell, Pierce, Nolan, and Fehringer (2011) conducted a mixed methods study in the Kentucky Educational Collaborative for State Agency Children (KECSAC), which included youth in the Kentucky Department of Juvenile Justice, Community Based Services, and Residential services Developmental Disorders and addiction Services to describe the youths' understandings about transitioning in a state agency education program. The students involved in the study ranged in age from 14 to 17 years old, with 69 % being male and 31% being female. In addition program administrators also participated in the study. Administrator data were collected through electronic census surveys, interviews and audio-taped focus group interviews. Data analysis and coding resulted in themes for 105 KECSAC Program Improvement Reports (site summaries). The same was done for their Transition Program Plans.

To collect the youth data, five programs sites were selected through purposeful sampling. To maximize variety and comparative contrast across the sites, specific

characteristics were used. Data were collected through audio-recorded focus group interviews at different programs and later with individual interviews; all selected through convenience sampling. Qualitative and quantitative data collection and descriptive analyses were carried out without interaction between the two strands. The separate results of the two analyses were brought together in the interpretation phase. Results indicated that: transition was more narrowly defined within alternative education programs; key strengths of transition practice were present in nontraditional schools; and the coordination barriers within this fluid interagency transition system are most apparent in students' frequent inter-setting transitions between nontraditional and home schools. Based on this interpretation, alternative or nontraditional education programs (i.e. charter schools) that have the ability to coordinate interventions is key to youth transitioning successfully. This case study examined how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program.

Mental Health Courts

The last twenty years have seen an explosion of residential services courts (Kaiser, 2011). Mental illness has become an increasing problem in the juvenile justices system. The creation of Mental Health Courts that specialize in delinquent youth with mental illnesses has been beneficial to behavior improvement (Almquist & Dodd, 2009). They have proven to be beneficial because they allow delinquent youth a second chance.

The youth can voluntarily participate. The courts focus on providing treatment (behavior modification) through graduated sanctions for delinquent youth. Based on mental health assessments, 48 percent of the youth scored within the caution or warning range on the scale (Sedlak & McPherson, 2010). In response to the increased number of youth with mental illness entering the juvenile justice system, residential services have grown in the last decade (Redlich, Liu & Steadman, 2012). The main belief of therapeutic jurisprudence promotes a non-adversarial, treatment-oriented approach, while still upholding the delinquents' due process (Porter, Rempel, & Mansky, 2010).

Risk and Needs Assessment Tools

Mental health assessments are done to determine the need for interventions, such as behavior modification. Risk and needs assessments tools help juvenile practitioners gather and combine information about delinquent youth to determine their risks of recidivism and to identify factors that, if treated, could reduce the likelihood of reoffending (Lipsey, 2014; Vincent, Guy, & Grisso, 2012). Risk and needs assessments tools have also helped to classify offenders and target limited resources to juveniles who may need more intensive supervision and services (Pew Center on the States, 2011). More recent assessments included items that estimate risk levels of recidivism and define the need for treatment and other services (Singh, Desmarais & Dorn, 2013; Ore & Baird, 2014).

Instruments, like the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI), was used to review the juvenile's criminal record, conducted a semi-structured interview with

the juvenile, and examined the family, service agencies, police, and school officials

(Doren, 2006). The validity and reliability of the different assessment tools were

important to ensure accuracy and appropriateness. Therefore, inter-rater-reliability testing

was because it ensures that different juvenile practitioners reach the same conclusions

about a youth's risk level when assessing the same case information (Baird, Healy,

Johnson, Bogie, Dankert, & Scharenbroch, 2013). Validity ensures that juvenile's risk is

accurately categorized and all youth are assessed uniformly and fairly (Baird et al., 2013).

Finally, because minority youth are more likely to come into contact with the juvenile

system than whites, racial disparities have been a concern with these instruments because

prior offenses, which reflect the juvenile's past behavior could be an indication of the

juvenile justice system's unequal response to offending behavior of different racial

groups (Ho, Breaux, & Jannetta, 2014).

Positive Youth Development Programs

Residential services assessments provide guidance for behavior programs that

promote positive behavior, and develop protective attributes. School programs that focus

on clarifying norms about behavior can be effective in reducing delinquent behavior.

School prevention programs that foster positive classroom environment to reduce

negative behavior through strategic interventions can change the overall context, in which

they occur and have the capacity to build students' attachment to school (Gottfredson,

1998). Through positive youth development programs, the focus is on the positive

protective factors or attributes of youth and adolescents. This approach recognizes the

multilayered relationships, in which the youth is involved – family, school and community and suggested that positive youth development can occur at any time and place (Lerner, Napolitano, Boyd, Mueller, & Callina, 2013).

Research on positive youth development showed resiliency and suggested youth in high-risk environments tends to do well (Stephenson, Cohen, Montagne & Bobnis, 2014). A common factor found among juvenile delinquents who do well and overcome negative behavior is bonding to caring adults or groups that facilitate successful opportunities for these youth to gain a sense of legitimacy (Farineau & McWey, 2011; Tajima, Herrenkohl, Moylan, & Derr, 2011). Earlier research by Conrad and Hedin (1981) used survey data that showed student improvement in personal and social development, moral reasoning, self-esteem, and attitudes toward community service and involvement. More recent studies based on the 4-H Study of Positive Youth Development, used a longitudinal sequential design (Lerner et al., 2013). Systematic reviews of studies on positive youth development have all resulted in positive outcomes. The growing body of research sees positive youth development as a promising tool, among the many programs presently used to decrease problem behaviors.

Family Therapy

The family is a key factor in childhood development. Research indicated that how the family functions provides early clues on the sustained impact of family bonding, conduct disorders, school bonding, choice of peers, and subsequent delinquency (Barnes, Hoffman, Welte, Farrell, & Dintcheff, 2006). Kumpfer and Alvaredo (2003) suggested

that a reduction in problem behavior related to improving family functioning. Behavioral family therapy/behavior family training programs should provide separate skill building training for children and their parents in part of the sessions and together activities during the last part of the session (Gurman & Kniskern, 2014). In addition, multisystemic family therapy addresses the youth's behavior in the context of family, school, and community. Its interventions are goal oriented and emphasize family strengths (Evans-Chase & Zhou, 2014).

These are just a few of the programs that have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing adolescent problem behavior, including delinquency and crime rates. One more program, Brief Strategic Family Therapy, a short-term intervention program that prevented and treated child and adolescent problem behavior was not as successful. Robbins et al., (2011), found no significant differences for adolescent drug use or family functioning after BSFT intervention.

Additional research by Barrett, Katsiyannis, Zhang and Zhang (2014), examined the role of early adverse experiences, residential services problems, and disabilities in the prediction of juvenile delinquency and recidivism, using a matched-control group design. Their delinquent group included over 99,000 youth born between 1981 and 1988. Records of the 99,000 plus control were matched by age, race, and gender and drawn from the records of the South Carolina Department of Education, Data on Child Protective Services, foster care, residential services referrals, and diagnosis as well as information about eligibility for free/reduced lunch and obtained from the South Carolina

Budget and Control Board, Office of Research and Statistics. Data analyses used were logistic regression analysis. The results showed that parental maltreatment and foster care made a unique contribution to the prediction of delinquency.

In addition, classification of learning disability or emotional/behavioral disorder was a predictor of delinquent outcomes. Prearrest diagnosis relating aggressive behavior was the strongest indicator of delinquency. Additional analyses done on the delinquent sample had similar predictions for recidivism. Through this study, it was possible to examine if early educational and behavior modification could result in more positive results for these youth. This case study reviewed how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this case study was based on Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs framework and Moffitt's (1993) framework of developmental classification. The hierarchy of needs theory stated that each person is motivated by needs that are inborn. The hierarchy of needs framework explained how human needs motivate individual behavior (Appendix G). There are certain basic needs that must be satisfied that focus on survival, and once those needs are met, higher-order needs come into play that center on such things as influence and personal development. Conversely, higher-order needs do not come into play without the satisfaction of basic needs.

Delinquent youth whose basic needs are unfulfilled may then attempt to fulfill higher

order needs in ways that are inappropriate. Given opportunities to fulfill the human needs

(academically and socially) in more appropriate ways could be very beneficial to these

youth.

Moffitt's (1993) theory of developmental classification is the other context for

this study. Moffitt's (1993) developmental classification theory identifies two distinct

courses for offending: the limited offender and the chronic offender. Her findings

indicated that most delinquents are limited offenders and therefore, have short criminal

histories. Much of this belief is based on Moffitt's theories that combine genetics with

socialization, which created the idea that children are born with neuropsychological

deficits. Moffitt's (1993) developmental classification identifies two distinct courses for

offending: the limited offender and the chronic offender (Appendices H, I). The limited

offender would be involved in the juvenile system for a very short time, but the chronic

offender revolves in and out of the juvenile system. Other research also suggested that the

age of the youth at first contact with the juvenile system, along with cognitive abilities

are dominant indicators of chronic offending (DeLisi & Piquero, 2011). They found that

antisocial behavior contributed to arrests and youth with behavioral diagnosis had earlier

involvements than their peers without behavioral issues. The most consistent indicator of

a delinquency career was early contact with law enforcement.

Finally, a quantitative study done by Hong, Ryan, Chiu, and Sabri (2013),

investigated rearrest factors among incarcerated youth by focusing on two types - static

and dynamic. They specifically compared those with only one admission to a detention

center to those with multiple admissions. The Criminal propensity theory guided the

context of their study. Hong et al. defined static risk factors as socio-demographic factors

(gender, race/ethnicity, age, special education). Dynamic risk factors would include

things like substance use and residential services problems. Their sample consisted of

youth detained in an Illinois detention center from 2004-2009. Data collection consisted

of information extracted from the Detention Intake Instrument. Analysis was done by

computing descriptive statistics for the variables and estimating a Cox Regression model

using SPSS 16.0. Survival analysis was used to investigate the how the variables

influenced the survival rates. The result of the study indicated that for the types of

offenses, youth were arrested almost two and a half times on average while those with

multiple admittances were rearrested almost four times. For first offenses committed,

most youth were at 46.3%. Of youth with only one arrest almost 60% were charged with

a violent act, while youth with multiple arrests were at 41% for violent acts. Gender was

not a significant predictor in this study, but youth receiving special educations were 2.11

times more likely to be rearrested. Their study did not find that African American youth

were more likely to be admitted to the juvenile detention center more than once compared

to youth of other racial/ethnic groups. This study relates to my study in that most of these

youth have committed violent crimes, both first time and repeat offenders. There is

nothing in the study that indicated if behavior modification may have prevented some of

these youth reoffending. This case study examined how an urban juvenile probation

department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program..

Qualitative Methodologies

The qualitative case study design allowed me to provide depth and richness to the study. The case study would allow me to study a phenomenon within a restricted setting over time. It allowed for extensive data collection from many sources (interviews) that evolves into a number of themes, which describes the specific case study (Creswell, 2013). The type of case study is determined by the size of the restricted case or intent of the case analysis. For this study, I examined two programs in a single instrumental case study to illustrate the phenomenon. Purposeful sampling allowed me to bring in differing perspectives on the phenomenon, while holistic analysis of the entire case would bring out the details of the case study. The final phase is the interpretive meaning of the instrumental case that Lincoln and Guba (1985) referred to this as the "lessons learned" (p. 75) phase (Creswell, 2013).

Other research approaches, such as ethnography, phenomenology, narrative, and grounded theory, would not adequately provide relevant information to address the research focus and questions. According to Creswell (2013), ethnography typically described culture shared by a group; phenomenology describes concepts, or experiences of persons, or the phenomenon they live, and experience. Narrative is the description of the life of an individual; while grounded theory explores an issue to develop a theory.

None of these addresses the premise of the study, which was to examine how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program.

An eighteen month qualitative study by Moore, McArthur, and Saunders, (2013) focused on a group of young people (10 to 17 years of age) incarcerated by the courts at a secure facility (Australian Capital Territory) in Australia. The study examined the youth's experiences during their first incarceration and their life afterwards. This was a qualitative study that incorporated semi-structured interviews as a means of data collection. An analytic induction method was used to allow ideas to emerge through the multiple interviews. Over the course of the project, a majority of the youth reoffended, while only three maintained their freedom a significant length of time. The study was able to determine awareness on the part of the youth of what they could and couldn't do in their transition back to their communities.

They concluded that for transition to be successful for these first time youth, they had to develop strong ties with primary stakeholders – family, peers, schools, workplaces and the community. Additionally, they would need strong support in the areas of home environments that increased the risks of reoffending. This ties in with my research because it seeks to determine if a coordination of education services and behavior modification for incarcerated juveniles who are at risk of school failure and recidivism,

would provide a better outcome for these youth. In other words, would it help to decrease recidivism and the dropout rate for juveniles?

Summary

In summary, research continues to show that the majority of delinquent youth commit primarily minor or status offenses and have a relatively short criminal career. Chronic offenders, who comprise a much smaller percentage of offenders, are responsible for a disproportionate amount of delinquent acts (Carroll et al., 2006). Research has shown the following to be strong indicators of long-term criminal behavior: begin delinquency at an early age, have lower levels of intellectual functioning, often commit serious and personal crimes, and engage in antisocial and delinquent behavior throughout their lives (Remrey, 2014). In addition, they are characterized by aggressive behavior, complicated dispositions, an inability to control impulses, low levels of intellectual functioning, and often begin committing antisocial and delinquent acts early in life (Moffitt, 1993).

Further research indicated that there are a number of programs that attempt to improve the behavior of delinquents. Some programs focused on the youth, while others focused on factors that influence the youth. Others worked within the confines of the juvenile justice system while others were more community based. All have a common focus and that is to reduce or improve negative behavior, enhance the learning environment for learning, improve family function and reduce crime and recidivism. This research study has significant potential and examined how an urban juvenile probation

department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program. It particularly focused on incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13. Section 3 discussed the methodologies of the research study, which included the research design, research samples, research strategies, and data analysis procedures.

Section 3: Research Method

Methodology

I chose a qualitative methodology as the most appropriate for gathering information to address this research study and answer the research questions. I also chose this method because I wanted to understand the phenomenon from the perspective of the individuals who are directly involved with the juveniles receiving these services and programs. This case study embodied all the properties that would make for a quality study because it sought to examine how education and behavior modification programs can improve the dropout rate and recidivism rate of young juveniles.

Creswell (2013) listed nine characteristics and attributes that formulate an effective qualitative case study: natural setting, researcher as key instrument, multiple sources of data, inductive data analysis, participants' meanings, emergent design, theoretical lens, interpretive inquiry, and holistic account. For this study, I utilized the natural setting of the juvenile probation departments' placement facilities, myself as the primary data collection instrument, multiple sources of data collection that included an interview instrument. These are characteristics that provided me with an effective design. It also provided richness of data and opportunity for in-depth exploration of complex viewpoints of the juvenile justice system from a local perspective (Lyons & Coyle, 2007). In this qualitative study, through the data analysis, I was able to see patterns, relationships, and develop themes resulting in explanations and interpretations. This created a clear picture of the phenomenon being studied.

This qualitative case study was designed to examine how the education and residential divisions in a large probation department in Texas provide educational programs and behavior modification to youth between the ages of 10 and 13 years of age who are at risk of school failure and recidivism. The central research questions were:

- RQ 1: How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

- RQ 2: What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?

- RQ 3: How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

These questions aided in providing more information on the education services and behavior modification programs at this large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. The outcome of this study provided an indication of what programs have been implemented to address the problems of recidivism and school failure, in addition to any changes that may have resulted from these programs.

The case study method was chosen for several reasons in alignment with Hancock and Algozzine's (2006) definition of case studies as having three important components:

1. Case studies focus on a central experience (Hancock & Algozzine).

2. The experience being researched "is studied in its natural context, bounded by space and time," in most case studies (p. 15).

3. Being deeply rooted in the information gathered from the interview data.

In accordance with this:

1. This case study reviewed how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program.

2. The setting for this study was a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. The study took place in a six-week period.

3. This was done by obtaining the perspective of 9 juvenile justice practitioners, two deputy directors, and the two top executives in the juvenile department through face-to-face interviews.

Interview data were gathered from juvenile justice practitioners, deputies and executives who work in this juvenile probation department. The interviews allowed me to better understand the inside workings of programs within the juvenile probation department; both from a practical and administrative perspectives. Interviews were used for the purpose of obtaining the goal, purpose and practicality of the phenomenon through the perspective of juvenile justice staff and administration at the SCJPD. The individuals working closest with the juveniles on a regular basis are the principals, juvenile superintendents and behavior specialists. Their work experience provided a

personal account of these services (education and behavior modification) on this population of juveniles, 10-13 year olds.

The interview with the deputies from the residential and education divisions and executives was to better understand the purpose and goals of these programs - education services and behavior modification program. This allowed me to gather general and specific perspectives from the participants. Based on Hatch's (2002) characteristics, I formatted my interview questions to be open-ended with language that is familiar to my participants. They were clear and neutral, but also designed to respect participants and presume that they had valuable knowledge and would provide answers related to the objectives.

The triangulation of the data from the interview data allowed for expansion of understanding and meaning of the case study. The ability to review several sources of data and compare responses from the interview provided a strong case to review how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program. My use of triangulation added to the validity of the study.

The methodology and procedures used to investigate the research questions are presented in this chapter, as well as, a description of the context for the study, measures of ethical protections of participants, role of the researcher, description of participants, data collection procedures and tools, and methods of addressing validity and

trustworthiness. A quantitative research approach was not used because my aim was not

to answer an inquiry through numerical evidence, nor did I have a preconceived theory or

hypothesis. Instead, my aim was exploratory and I chose to use in-depth interviews for

data collection. Creswell (2013) stated "one of the chief reasons for conducting a

qualitative study is that the study is exploratory" (p. 30). Since this was not a heavily

explored topic, I listened to the participants and worked to develop a better understanding

based on their ideas.

I could have selected grounded theory, but the focus of this study was not to

develop a theory on the impact of these services. Therefore, I chose a case study

approach to provide detailed description specific to one program (Yin, 2013). Case study

is a methodology that gives intensive description and analysis of a social unit such as an

institution (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2013). The qualitative case study provided a detailed

description in response to all research questions. Yin (2013) reported that case study

research involves an in-depth exploration of issues within a bounded system through

multiple data sources. Finally, Merriam (1998) reported that case study approaches

provides an opportunity to experience participants and gain more understanding of the

study.

Context for the Study

This research study took place at a large urban juvenile probation department in

Texas, the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department (SCJPD; pseudonym. As

an agency of the county, at the time of the study the department received most of its

annual budget from the Serendipity County Commissioners' Court. In addition, the

department also received funding from the Texas Education Agency and federal title

funds (No Child Left Behind) because of its charter school district. The department was

headed by an Executive Director and Assistant Executive Director, with seven

department heads referred to as Deputy Directors. These seven departments were:

Budget/Support Services, Intake/Court Services, Field Services, Behavioral Health

Services, Education Services, Residential Services, and Administrative Services. For the

purpose of this study, I focused on the Residential Services and Education Services

divisions.

The SCJPD Residential Service division recognized that they have an opportunity

to provide guidance for the youth they serve in a positive direction. This was indicated by

participants' comments throughout the findings of this research study. At the core of their

program is a comprehensive assessment and individualized treatment approach that

address behavioral and mental health needs. They provide immediate and comprehensive

services based on identified needs of the youth. There is a collaboration of efforts to

increase the chances of the youth's successful reintegration to the community.

In 2013, the division implemented a new behavior modification program in the

three placement facilities to address negative behavior. The Intensive Behavior Treatment

(IBT) program is an evidenced-based program drawn from research around the country.

It incorporated small group dynamics, treatment objectives, builds on incentives (not

consequences) and capitalizes on strength-based training. It is headed by a Behavior

Specialist at each facility who ensures the operations and administration of the behavior modification program. All juvenile justice supervision staff were trained at the three placement facilities. The program incorporated a point system that determined how well a youth is progressing. There were also incentives and rewards to increase positive behavior. Services were coordinated with other divisions for maximum effectiveness. Though the program started in August 2013, its implementation in all residential facilities was not completed until 2014.

The Education Services division created a charter school district in 2005 to serve the youth detained in the detention center and incarcerated in one of its placement facilities, with the approval from the county commissioners' court. The charter school provides educational programs for expelled youth, delinquent youth placed in a county operated juvenile institution, and students on probation who want to earn a GED. Included under the Education Services umbrella are the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP), Excel Academy (juvenile justice charter schools), and the Education Transition Center (ETC). The JJAEP admits students who have been expelled from their one of the 22 local school districts for criminal activity or serious misconduct while at school. Excel Academy (charter schools) provides educational services under one comprehensive academic program that allows students to learn in a regular school setting during the school year. A summer school program provides opportunities for students to improve educational skills. Excel academy focuses on student progression in the core (math, science, social studies and ELA) academic curriculum, remediation,

credit recovery, CBE, GED preparation and testing, vocational education and life skills. The ETC campus provides GED preparation and testing for juveniles on probation.

This Texas juvenile probation department detains more than 3,000 youth annually between the ages of 10 and 17 years of age and enrolled in 5th to 12th grade (SCJPD's Annual Report, 2013). Its annual report still indicated an increase in the number of youth entering the detention center from 3,824 in 2012 to 4,211 in 2013. This case study focused on education services and behavior modification programs provided to youth between the ages of 10 and 13 years of age while incarcerated at a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. Of the totals mentioned in the previous sentences, thirty-eight percent were 16 years of age plus while 12.6% were between the ages of 10-13 years of age, which was a decrease for that age group from the SCJPD Annual Report 2012. What makes this group of 10-13 year olds unique is that research has resulted in consistent findings that early involvement in delinquent behavior coupled with large academic deficiencies increase the chances of long-term offending over a lifetime (Thomas et al., 2014; Thornberry & Krohn, 2003).

Finding an effective way to address the educational deficiencies and behavioral issues representative of juvenile delinquent youth and redirecting their negative behavior into positive outcomes could be very beneficial. Services that result in a significant decrease in recidivism in the younger population (ages 10–13) of juvenile delinquents could eventually have a positive effect on the overall number of youth in the juvenile justice system (SCJPD Annual Report, 2013).

The 12 participants represented a cross section of the department's staff (approximately 2%) and would include three principals, three juvenile superintendents, three behavior specialists and four juvenile department administrators. The first subset included three principals. The education staff (principals) providing leadership were solicited to participate because they ensure educational opportunities to enhance learning and earn middle school and high school credit. The second subset included juvenile placement superintendents and behavior specialist because they provide supervision, ensure the behavior modification program is enforced, recognize youth for rewards and provide incentives. The third subset included four administrators: the Executive and Assistant Executive Director of the SCJPD, the Deputy Directors of the Education Service and Residential Service Divisions whose interview data were used to cross validate the responses of the participants in the first and second subsets, as it relates to the research questions in this research study.

Protection of Participants Rights

As the researcher, I had an ethical responsibility to protect the participants in a research study by following the stated purpose of the research. Researchers are ethically bound to the organization that is allowing the study to take place (Creswell, 2012). No part of the research was done – contact with participants or data collection – until I had received approval for the study from the Research Committee of the SCJPD. After receiving approval from the SCJPD's Research Committee, I submitted an application to the Walden Institutional Review Board (IRB) to receive permission to begin research.

Following this approval, I met with the Assistant Executive Director and Chair of the Research Committee of the SCJPD to create a list of participants and arrange an interview schedule for collecting data. Data collection, analysis, and confidentiality were discussed as well. I adhered to the following protocol for all participants: they were adults, fully informed of the procedures and risks and benefits involved in the research and could decide if they wanted to participate in the study or not. Solicitation of participants was done according to the protocol agreed upon by me as the researcher, and the Research Committee Chair after approval of the research study.

The protocol included a letter of recruitment for the interview that was sent to all participants through the department's email system. All participants were given a pseudonym in place of their real names. No other identifiers were present on the interview form or in the interview data. The interviews were open-ended questions aligned with the research questions and the goals of qualitative research. All responses to the interview questions were kept anonymous. The interview identified participants as juvenile practitioners, with pseudonyms for names, if they chose to participate. All participants involved in the interview process gave their consent on a consent form to participate (Hatch, 2002). Anyone not wishing to participate in the interview was omitted from the study. Participants were assured that no identifying information was made available to anyone. Pseudonyms were used in lieu of their real names.

Interviews took place at the participants' perspective facility or the juvenile department's administration building at a predetermined time and meeting room that

provided privacy with no distractions. Interviews, transcripts and recordings were kept in

a secure place in the home of the researcher and would be retained at least five years

according to Walden University. After five years all data would be destroyed according

to regulations. I was sensitive, not only to how information is protected from

unauthorized access but also how participants are to be notified of any unforeseen

findings from the research that they may or may not want others to know. After

transcription, the participants had the opportunity to review their interviews and edit them

to ensure accuracy. This was also done at a predetermined time and place at the

participant's work facility (or elsewhere if they choose) that is private with no

distractions. Discrepant cases were avoided by knowing the limitations of the research

method and by being aware of the gaps from the start. This ensured unbiased analysis.

Any discrepancies found were acknowledged and addressed accordingly through

a follow-up interview, if needed, or reviewing coding and transcription for possible

errors. Member checking and triangulation of interview data were also in place. I sought

to confirm by cross checking with other sets, such as interview data from the three

subsets. Adverse events were handled ethically with the safety and protection of the

participants being a primary concern. My primary concern would always be the safety of

the research participants.

Ethical Considerations

In this qualitative study, I safeguarded participants' identities and information.

Prior to participating in the study, participants were informed of the topic and areas

encompassed by this project. Data were stored on the hard drive of my computer and protected by a password. Only I was able to access the data. Documents, notes from the interviews and research data were kept in a locked file cabinet in the home office of the researcher. Hatch (2002) mentioned that ethics can be maintained by the researcher by collecting and reporting factual material that highlights accurate views of the participating individuals. This was supported by taking accurate notes, recordings of the interviews and allowing for member checking. All federal, state, and local laws, as well as Walden University and SCJPD policies were adhered to and followed. All stakeholders and participants were fully informed of the procedures and risks involved in the research and gave their consent to participate. Participants were assured that all identifying information was held confidentially and would not be made available to anyone. My contact information was given to all participants, along with the contact information for my chair and IRB at Walden University.

Role of the Researcher

According to Creswell (2013), the researcher is an "instrument of data collection who gathers words or pictures, analyzes them inductively, focuses on the meaning of participants, and describes a process that is expressive and persuasive in language" (p. 14). As the instrument of investigation, I recognized and acknowledged the bias that could not be left outside the research space shared by the storyteller. I have been employed with the SCJPD since 2007. Presently, I am employed as an Education Specialist whose responsibilities include coordinating education training and quality

assurance. Though I work directly with the education services staff, I do not supervise any of the participants. In addition, I work indirectly with the behavior specialists and juvenile superintendents because of the nature of my job but do not supervise them. The deputy directors and executives who were interviewed are my superiors.

Establishing an appropriate researcher-participant working relationship was important. I did this by first presenting myself in a nonthreatening manner and explaining my role in the whole process by clarifying who I am, what I'm doing, why I'm doing this research and what I hope to accomplish with the study. This was followed by clearly explaining their roles as the participants and providing them the option to participate or refusal to participate through email or phone. The juvenile administrators, superintendents, behavior specialist and education staff choosing not to participate were omitted from the research study. In revealing the actual purpose of the study, I ensured clarity and understanding of the consent form, clarity and understanding of the participants' privacy and finally, clarity in understanding protection from any harm or danger.

I expected no problems in getting the individuals to participate once the purpose and scope of the research study was explained to them in detail, followed by a discussion that addresses their rights and the role of the researcher. Confidentiality was maintained for the research participants by not disclosing or releasing any information and exercising properly authorized methods throughout the study, to include keeping all notes and data secure. Additionally, confidentiality was maintained for the research participants through

the following methods: no disclosure or discussion of any confidential information with others, or divulgence, copying, releasing, selling, and destroying of any confidential information except as properly authorized. More detailed information could be found in the confidentiality agreement. The age of the participants was not important because they were adults.

Criteria for Selecting Participants

Hatch (2002) suggested that the researcher "have a clear description of who the participant would be, how many, how access would be gained and the criteria for selection and exclusion of potential participants" (p. 62). The participants were selected on the basis of characteristics of the juvenile probation department and their relationship with the youth in question. The characteristics included adults who worked at the three placement facilities and worked directly with the incarcerated youth either through education leadership (principals) or who are responsible for implementing (behavior specialists) and enforcing the behavior modification program (superintendents) with the juveniles in the placement facilities.

Other characteristics included the deputies of the two divisions of the probation department that had oversight of the education programs and behavior modification programs (Education Services and Residential Services). Finally, the executives of the juvenile probation department who have executive oversight over all programs were interviewed. The twelve participants were important for several reasons. They had years of varied work experiences within the juvenile department. The collaboration of

education services and behavior specialists involved the participation of all of these individuals. Finally, the planning and implementation had to be coordinated with all participants.

All participants worked for the SCJPD. A meeting was held prior to any data collection with the juvenile probation department's assistant executive director and the probation department's research committee chair (who has oversight over all research involving the department) to discuss the study, gain permissions and determine dates and times for data collection –interviews. I received approval from the research committee at the SCJPD to do my research study in this probation department. I submitted a current copy of my proposal to the research committee for review. A copy of the research guidelines were sent to me to sign and return to the research chair. The committee meets as needed. They review all proposals and provide feedback and questions to be answered by the researcher. After approval, a letter was issued to the researcher from the juvenile probation department's research committee chair. The letter is included in the appendix of my study once received.

I sent a letter of recruitment to all participants through the juvenile probation department's email system to the principals, juvenile supervisors, behavior specialists, administrators and executives. The interviews were set up by appointments acceptable to everyone with the approval of the executives and deputies at the administrative level and respective facilities for the principals, juvenile superintendents and behavior specialists.

Sampling Method and Criteria

A purposeful sampling method was chosen for this study because the participants and setting for the study can purposefully provide an understanding of the research question and main phenomenon (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2013). Both Merriam (1998) and Rubin and Rubin (2005) reported that the purposeful method of sampling is best in assisting the researcher to discover, gain insight, and have an in-depth understanding of residential services and education services through the perspectives of the participants. The participants provided depth through their personal perspectives and because they work directly with the youth on a regular basis. The size included three subsets of administrators, educators and juvenile staff. The strategy for selection was to eliminate possible sampling error and to provide data from individuals who provide services to juvenile youth in this juvenile probation department.

Purposeful sampling was conducted in choosing the participants for the study, based upon the services provided to the juvenile youth in this juvenile probation department. According to Rubin and Rubin (2005), when participants have personal or firsthand knowledge of the research topic, they add trustworthiness to the interview and topic being studied. Because the participants I chose had personal experiences with the youth in the juvenile department setting they were able to give substance to the research study.

This case study consisted of staff working in education services and those who implement and enforce the behavior modification program for incarcerated youth. Those

included were education, supervision and behavioral staff - principals, juvenile superintendents and behavior specialists. In addition, the administrators interviewed were the Executive and Assistant Executive Director of the juvenile probation department and Deputies over the SCJPD Education and Residential Services Divisions. Based on Rubin and Rubin (2005), the credibility of an interview is most reliable when the participants are experienced or have a knowledge base of the topic being researched (pp. 71–76); therefore, these participants were able to give substance to the research study.

Data Collection

Based on Merriam (2002), "as data collection proceeds, we find gaps in our data and holes in our theories…we go back to the field and collect delimited data…and conduct theoretical sampling (p.143)." Data collection occurred in the area of: face-to-face and phone interviews with staff and administrators from the juvenile department. Data collection incorporated a number of varied procedures to build a detailed picture of what is being studied (Creswell, 2013). Hatch (2002) reported on a variety of ways to collect data in a qualitative research study for a case study research approach. I was responsible for collection, maintaining confidentiality, and the anonymity of the data.

Data Collection Procedure

According to Merriam (2002) qualitative case studies search for meaning and understanding, and use the researcher as the primary instrument of data collection and analysis. This results in an inductive investigation strategy with a richly descriptive end product. The process began with the selection of a case, which is done purposefully.

Readers can learn from these case studies and transfer some of the knowledge to their own situations.

Based on Creswell (2013) qualitative research is often used to explore topics that have unknown variables with little or no written base or speculation. He further indicated that the overall goal of qualitative research is to promote further understanding of a specific experience. Data collection for a case study involves a wide array of procedures to develop an in depth description of the case (Yin, 2013). Janesick (2010) reported that the collection of data must be thorough, relevant, and triangulated to produce sufficient evidence on the issue explored. Hatch (2002) also reported that researchers should endeavor to obtain data that would answer their research questions. According to Yin (2013) the whole purpose of data collection in the context of this study was to collect enough data to have confirmatory evidence on the achievement of students.

In using several different methods of data collection and then triangulating data, the results of the study would provide an indication of what programs had been implemented to address the problems of recidivism and school failure, in addition to any changes that may have resulted from these programs. The development of effective interview strategies helped the researcher to avoid problems that may come up before, during and after the interview session. I used the following data collection strategy for this study: seek and obtain necessary approvals and consents, formally request research data, face-to-face and phone interviews (Appendix B). I listed strategies that would promote what Crawford et al. (2005) described as a strong and effective interview model.

My procedure included identifying participants for the interview and determining availability; providing interview instrument, consent form, confidentiality agreement, letter of cooperation, letter of recruitment and interview instrument for note-taking.

Rubin and Rubin (2005) suggested that a researcher's actions and feelings can greatly affect the quality of the exchange. Body language is important to the research, both from the perspective of the researcher and the informant. Eye contact is very important between the researcher and the participant, as well (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The room set-up should feel safe and comfortable. I established "a relaxed and open atmosphere for the interview" as suggested by Janesick (2004, p. 253). Remaining neutral throughout the interview and redirecting the participant's responses is important (Janesick, 2004). This is why listening intently to details and the need to be continually alert is so important (Rubin & Rubin, 2011).

Another important point is the way the questions are asked and how the researcher builds on the responses of the participants. This is what Janesick (2004) referred to as basic descriptive questioning with follow-up questions. Crawford et al. (2005) emphasized the importance of identifying and documenting the exact contact, verbal language and body language. That is why determining the exact contact and verbal language in the interview is also a major factor to consider. To do this, I recorded the interview process while taking written notes to capture all aspects of the interview session. Finally, the amount of preparation and time needed for interviews is important. Rubin and Rubin (p.128) saw interviewing as "more than learning how to word and ask

questions. It is a part of a developing relationship, in which issues of mutual interest are explored in depth." As researchers, decisions must be made about "contacting potential participants, gaining informed consent, arranging interview times and locations, and selecting or preparing recording equipment (Hatch, 2002). Upon gaining consent, participants were emailed to request a meeting in order to set up the interview times and locations.

Interviews. Qualitative researchers create a dialogue, in which they ask questions, encourage participants to discuss their perspectives on issues and listen for special language and clues to reveal meaningful structures that participants use to understand their worlds (Mishler, 1986; Seidman, 1998; Spradley, 1979). I am not using existing interview questions because an existing, appropriate interview tool that incorporates questions that I intend to ask participants regarding incarcerated juvenile school failure and recidivism was not available in published literature. The interview instrument (Appendix B) was developed for the purpose of this research study. The questions evolved from the researcher's experience in the targeted area, a review of the literature and further dialogue with experts in the area of juvenile justice and question design.

Questions were vetted through examination and feedback from a five member peer review panel prior to the beginning of the data collection process for the purpose of validity and reliability. The panel consisted of five juvenile justice practitioners and experts who are executives, directors and specialist in their respective juvenile probation

departments in Texas and Illinois. There was one assistant executive director, one executive director, a juvenile justice training specialist, and two directors. These juvenile justice practitioners provided an open review of the interview instrument. This method was used because juvenile justice is a narrowly defined discipline and the expert panels' feedback would improve the quality of the interview questions.

All were juvenile justice professionals and have expert knowledge in the juvenile justice field. They reviewed the interview questions based on a validation rubric given to them that was retrieved from the Internet (Appendix G). Criteria used for review included the following characteristics: clarity, wordiness, negative wording, overlapping responses, balance, and use of jargon and appropriateness of responses. The criteria incorporated operational definitions, scoring using a Likert scale and identifying questions not meeting standard and needing to be revised (with comments). Feedback provided by the panel included a request for clarification of framework of research, deletion of some questions and addition of new questions. Additional questions on clarifications from the panel included sentence structure, vocabulary selection and use of grammar. This expert panel vetted the interview questions to help determine reliability (Merriam, 2002). As a result of their feedback helped to establish validity. Per IRB guidelines, data collection for the pilot was not done prior to IRB approval.

The interview questions (Appendix B) were designed to illicit responses from three subsets of the SCJPD to answer the central research questions. Research questions were discussed earlier.

The first interview subset included the three principals. The second subset included three juvenile superintendents and two behavior specialists. The third subset included four juvenile justice practitioners: Deputy Director of the Education Services, Deputy Director of Residential Services, Executive Director of Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department, and Assistant Executive Director of Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department.

Data were collected according to preplanned questions from an interview instrument (Appendix B) composed of open-ended questions about their knowledge of the residential services intervention and education services. A semi-structured interview included audio taping of the interview, with the participants' permission, which was later transcribed. In addition to the audio taping, a journal was used to take additional notes of the interview session to include participant responses and body language (Rubin & Rubin, 2011). A meeting room in the administration building of the juvenile department and the three facilities, which provided privacy and minimal distraction or noise, was requested for the interview space at the juvenile probation's department administration building (Rubin & Rubin, 2011). Each interview was expected to last approximately 60-75 minutes. The interview instrument (Appendix B) involved several open-ended questions that would examine the "how, why, and perceptual issues" regarding the participants perspectives of education and residential services (Creswell, 2012, p. 133). I developed these questions based on the study's major research questions (Rubin & Rubin, 2011).

The interview questions (Appendix B), consent form and letter of recruitment were in English. I ensured an adequate audio recorder is available with a possible backup audio recorder for interviews. After reviewing the purpose of the study, timing, results of study and confidentiality with the participant, I obtained their consent. During the interview, questions from the interview instrument were adhered to, while being respectful and courteous to the participant. An introductory paragraph at the top of the interview page and consent form was used to introduce the study's purpose, review confidentiality and address aspects included in the consent form for participants. Written notes were taken on the protocol throughout the interview process for each question asked along with audio recording (where permissible). If any participant refused recording, only written notes were taken.

Data Analysis Procedures

The qualitative data from the interviews was recorded, transcribed, coded, and analyzed to identify common themes and perceptions (Creswell, 2012). Coding allowed me to glean those items that are most important in understanding my research topic (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). I pulled out themes from the data that have a much broader significance through transcription and coding. Themes can be gathered from examining published literature and questions asked during the interview (Rubin & Rubin, (2005). I identified some themes in the questions to be asked, and reviewed more from the participants' responses that may be indirectly revealed through responses during the interview, in alignment with Creswell (2013).

Examining the concepts and themes suggested ideas for coding. As the collections of data were being sifted through, ideas and themes, categories, and sub-categories would emerge—and the detailed steps of this analysis strategy would allow for the opportunity to involve these new findings. Boyatzis (1998) suggested that the researcher work out consistent and refined definitions for themes and concepts before coding. I reviewed all transcripts and placed a code next to each data unit, where there is a matching theme or concept. Coding was done with Dedoose software that highlighted key words and phrases to be reviewed later. This would satisfy the need for more-detailed steps beginning with the three phases of coding: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To complete the analysis, I combined the concepts and themes to show how they answer the research question, resulting in much broader themes.

Description of Data Analysis

My research was a case study, so I chose inductive analysis because it is based on interviews and research data as its primary data collection tools (Merriman, 2002). In reviewing the nine steps outlined by Hatch (2005) on the use of inductive analysis, I was able to develop semantic domains or shared meanings for the same phenomenon, identify supporting data, search for common themes among the different data collection methods, and create an outline showing relationships among the domains. In a semantic domain meanings and language are shared and hold their significance in a particular setting. During the decoding of research data, categories and common themes would result in identifying supporting data. The focus of this study was narrow with the interview

questions written to guide and capture the perspective of the individuals in order to

generate data from the interview that would provide ample evidence on the topic and

research question. Strauss and Corbin (1990) "envision categories as the cornerstone of

developing theories (p.7)." Therefore, categories emerged during the data analysis stage

of the research study. The interviews were analyzed using inductive content analysis

(Ericsson & Simon, 1984).

The collected data were transcribed daily by the researcher at the conclusion of

the interviews; and numbered by transcript, page, and line. The coding system would

identify the basic content of the categories of responses of the participants. Three levels

of coding were conducted: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. The first step

was to breakdown the data for purposes of categorization known as open coding. Once

the phenomenon was identified through the open coding, axial coding was used to review

the database to provide more insight into specific coding categories that explain the

central phenomenon (Creswell, 2012).

The axial coding gathered more defined associations from the initial categories

that may possibly be used to explain the relationships between them. This was done by

renegotiating the data to make new connections (Merriam & Associates, 2002). To

determine the saturation of categories, selective coding was used. This process was to

determine the definitive category that provided the common theme of all participants in

the study. It was at this stage that I was able to visualize the conditions related to the

central experience. The ultimate objective was to reduce the data to a small set of

themes/categories that describes the essence of what is being studied. With all items grouped, patterns and relationships between concepts and themes were drawn together to form a descriptive narrative. From here broader implications were drawn.

A computer program was used for further analysis of data gleaned from Creswell (2013) who highlighted several programs determined to be reliable. The DEDOOSE software program would provide the best analysis for my data because this program allows for systemization, organization and analysis of qualitative data. It also had easy to use analytical tools that allow data to be imported from interviews. Sinkovics and Alfoldi (2012) believed data analysis software enhances qualitative research because it is easy to use and enhances trustworthiness. I created my own coding system, organization, sorting and use of categories through Dedoose software. This allowed me to easily start to categorize my data. I explored the different perspectives of the principals, juvenile superintendents, behavior specialists, deputies and executives to examine common and uncommon perspectives in regards to the implementation of the coordination of education services and behavior modification for juvenile youth 10 – 13 years of age.

<div align="center">**Trustworthiness**</div>

Sinkovics and Alforldi (2012) made the argument that using data analysis software can improve trustworthiness because it allows all phases of the investigation to be open to public investigation because it can be electronically saved and made available, if needed. Data analysis software can allow for the development of ongoing perceptual changes from the interview data, which enhances trustworthiness and transparency. Other

standards are available to determine the quality of a research study, as well. Rigorous

data collection procedures incorporate the five known qualitative inquiry approaches. It

begins with a single focus with detailed methods of data collection, analysis and report

writing. This is followed by using different levels of construct for analyzing the data,

which is written credibly to reflect the background, culture and personal experiences of

the researcher, but proven to be ethical (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). To do this, I

engaged in multiple validation strategies or multiple ways of checking the accuracy of

my findings. Internal validity is considered a strong point of qualitative research because

it is the data derived from the participants themselves (Creswell, 2013).

The threat to internal validity results when the researcher is unable to effectively

draw out information that is correct or true from the participants and threatens the

accuracy of the data (Creswell, 2012). To ensure validity and reliability of data in this

research study, concurrent triangulation, peer review and member checking of data were

used. I used multiple sources of interview data. Concurrent triangulation uses multiple

and different sources and methods to provide corroborating evidence to shed light on a

theme or perspective (Creswell, 2012). I overcame any intrinsic bias that could come

from single method and single observer studies. The collaboration of different forms of

evidence shed significant light on the perspective (Creswell, 2012). Member checking

was used to allow the interview participants the opportunity to review their responses for

accuracy. Lincoln and Guba (1985) considered member checking an essential element in

determining credibility because it allows the participants to be more than just bystanders in the case study (Stake, 1995).

Those involved with qualitative research are normally the primary means for the collection and analysis of data, therefore interpretations of the truth were gleaned directly throughout the interviews and research data. Professional ethics and IRB requirements insisted that I carefully consider any possible harm that my work might cause to participants (Rubin & Rubin, 2011). Research studies in the educational setting have special ethical responsibilities especially when participants are teachers who many times see themselves in subordinate positions. Ethics comes down to me making the best judgments I can to insure that the individuals participating in the study are treated with fairness and dignity (Hatch, 2002).

Finally, Rubin and Rubin (2011) believed that credibility is gained when participants have first-hand experience regarding the research phenomenon. To prevent my research from being interpreted as skewed one way or another, the selection of participants was purposeful but included individuals from different career fields, ages, ethnic and racial groups; and hopefully with a variety of perspectives. The participants were able to give substance to my premise. Trustworthiness is important to any research study.

Summary

In this section, I discussed the methodology and procedures used to investigate the research questions. A description of the context for the study was given and measures

of ethical protections of participants were described. The role of the researcher and

description of the participants, along with the data collection procedures and tools were

explained. Finally, methods of addressing validity and trustworthiness were discussed.

Section 4 discusses data collection procedures, data analysis procedures and the results of

the study.

Section 4: Results

Introduction

The primary purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine how a juvenile probation department coordinates services to address the needs of incarcerated juveniles who are at risk of school failure and recidivism. This case study reviewed the perceptions of residential, educational, and executive staff on addressing school failure and recidivism and how division staff collaborated to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth between the ages of 10 and 13. The conceptual framework was based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs framework, which affirms that each person is motivated by needs that are inborn, and Moffitt's developmental classification framework, which identifies two distinct courses of offending for delinquents. Staff interviews provided personal perceptions of these collaborative services.

The central research questions addressed in this study were:

- RQ 1: How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

- RQ 2: What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?

- RQ 3: How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

Upon receiving approval from Walden University Institutional Review Board, (IRB; approval number #03-01-16-0082763; expiration 02-25-2017, I met with the Chair of the Research Committee of the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department (SCJPD; pseudonym) to discuss the list of participants and interview schedule for collecting data. Data collection, data analysis, and confidentiality were discussed as well. I adhered to the following protocol for all participants: they were adults, fully informed of the procedures, risks, and benefits involved in the research. As adults, they could decide if they wanted to participate in the study or not. Solicitation of participants was done according to the protocol agreed upon by myself as the researcher and the Research Committee Chair after approval of the research study.

The protocol included a letter of recruitment for the interview that was sent to all participants through the department's email system. All participants involved in the interview process gave their written consent on a consent form to participate and were given a pseudonym in place of their real names. No other identifiers were present on the interview form or in the interview data. The interview instrument included 14 open-ended questions aligned with the research questions and the goals of qualitative research. All responses to the interview questions were kept confidential and stored on a personal USB and laptop belonging to me in a locked file at my home.

The setting for this research study was a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas. Organizational conditions such as department policies, work schedules, and administrative approval were not a problem with the participants who were very eager to take part in the study. Personal conditions influencing participation were minimal and included acts of nature for several participants that delayed the interview process for a couple of weeks and personal illness that delayed one participant and excluded another participant from contributing.

This section includes an explanation of the data collection method that includes tables to illustrate certain aspects of this process. A discussion of the data analysis provides detailed descriptions of this procedure, along with chart illustrations for clarity. The results of the study addressed the research questions in relationship to the data findings with the use of excerpts and tables for illustration with a presentation of themes and brief discussion of any discrepant data. The discussion of steps to establish trustworthiness includes a discussion of credibility and validity, followed by a brief summary.

Data Collection

A total of 12 individuals participated in the interview process. There were three different interview subsets, which included four juvenile probation administrators, three principals in the juvenile probation charter schools, and five residential staff (two behavior specialists and three superintendents). The juvenile probation administrators were the Deputy Director of the Education Services Division, Deputy Director of

Residential Service Division, the Executive Director of the SCJPD, and the Assistant Executive Director of the SCJPD. The deputies were selected because they had oversight over juvenile programming and implementation in their specific areas (education and residential). Executives were chosen because they had oversight over the entire juvenile department. These individuals were farther removed from the day-to-day operations and activities of the three placement facilities, but were knowledgeable about all programs in the department – benefits, effectiveness, and shortfalls.

The education staff subset included the three principals who were the administrators at each of the three schools housed in the three placement (residential) facilities. They worked directly with the youth on a daily basis in the education setting. The Residential subset included the three superintendents and two behavior specialists at each of the three placement facilities, who worked directly with the youth in a supervisory and behavior modification setting on a daily basis. Their interviews enabled me to collect qualitative data pertinent to understanding the personal perceptions of residential and education staff working directly with youth in those two program areas.

Demographic data were collected from a brief questionnaire sent to the 12 participants by email. Four questions were asked of all participants:

1. How many years have you worked in this juvenile probation department?
2. How many years have you worked with youth behavior modification (in/out of this department)?

3. How many years have you worked in the education of youth (in/out of this

   department)? and

4. What is your age? (optional).

Answers to these questions are collected in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Demographics Questions

Questionnaire	Range 1	Range 2	Range 3
1. How many years have you worked in this juvenile probation department?	0-5	6-15	16 plus
2. How many years have you worked with youth behavior modification (in/out of this department)?	0-5	6-15	16 plus
3. How many years have you worked in the education of youth (in/out of this department)?	0-5	6-15	16 plus
4. What is your age? (optional)	39 minus	40 plus	

Once received, the results of the demographics questionnaire data were placed in

a spreadsheet to illustrate the staff positions of the three subsets in relationship to the

demographic data above (Table 2; Table 3)

Table 2

Result of Participant Demographic Questionnaire Administration

Position	Yrs. With Juv. Dept.	Yrs. in Behavior Mod	Yrs. in Edu	Age
Administration	6-15	0-5	16 plus	40 plus
Administration	16 plus	16 plus	0-5	40 plus
Administration	16 plus	0-5	6-15	40 plus
Administration	16 plus	16 plus	16 plus	40 plus

Table 3

Result of Participant Demographic Questionnaire Residential/Education

Position	Yrs. With Juv. Dept.	Yrs. in Behav. Mod	Yrs. in Edu	Age
Residential	16 plus	16 plus	0-5	40 plus
Residential	0-5	0-5	6-15	39 minus
Education	6-15	16 plus	16 plus	40 plus
Education	6-15	6-15	16 plus	40 plus
Education	6-15	6-15	6-15	40 plus
Residential	0-5	6-15	0-5	39-
Residential	16+	16+	16+	40+
Residential	16+	16+	16+	40+

Describe Data Collection

The participants were contacted initially by email with a letter of recruitment. Those who responded to the emails expressing interest in participating were contacted by phone ($n = 8$) or face-to-face ($n = 4$) to further explain the research study and to answer any questions or concerns they had prior to committing to the study. If the participants had no questions or concerns after the discussions and agreed to participate, a consent form was sent or given to them at that time. None of the participants asked questions or voiced concerns after the phone discussions or face-to-face discussions. Once the consent form was signed and returned, an interview (time, place, and date) was scheduled.

Prior to any interview, each participant was reminded that their participation was voluntary, all responses would remain confidential, they could stop at any time or refuse to answer any questions at any time, and they were provided a copy of the transcript for review once completed. They were also asked for permission to record their interviews. All interviews were recorded with permission of the participants. None of the participants declined to have their interview recorded. Interview questions were repeated at the request of any of the participants. For a couple of participants, questions were skipped to allow the participant time to think about and answer later during the interview. If requested, clarity was provided for certain words or phrases in an interview question.

An 8-week time period was originally suggested to complete data collection. However, the data collection took place over a period of six weeks in several different locations, mostly in the offices of the participants. For the convenience of some of the staff, two interviews took place in the department's administrative building, where the participants were visiting to conduct business independent of the research study. Interviews differed from the 60–75 minutes suggested in Section 3; the original times were longer to ensure that participants had more than enough time to answer all questions completely and comfortably. They actually lasted between 25–50 minutes each:

- Several participants provided a great deal of information about their area of expertise during the interview but did not feel knowledgeable enough about other areas to discuss them at length. These were the shortest interviews, 25–30 minutes.

- Other participants comfortably attempted to address all questions on the interview instrument but did not elaborate. These interviews lasted about 35–40 minutes.

- Participants who spoke openly and talked a lot about all areas covered in the interview questions did not speak more than 50 minutes. Their interviews were between 40–50 minutes.

All participants were given the opportunity at the end to address any prior questions or to add any further comments, which allowed for elaboration. Most had nothing more to add but any additional comments were added to the final transcripts.

Pseudonyms were assigned to the participants immediately after the interview process. At the conclusion of the interviews, the recordings were transcribed using Evernote computer software. This was followed by a review of the recorded interview to ensure I captured the essence of the participant's response. It was after this examination that transcripts were returned to the participants for review. Each participant was given five days to review their transcript; though several took longer. Member checking was used to allow participants to review their transcripts and make changes they felt were necessary. In addition to accuracy, credibility, and validity for the recorded interviews, member checking allows for critical analysis of the findings (Creswell, 2012).

Variations in Data Collection

Several variations of data collection are noted during the data collection phase. One variation included four phone interviews, instead of face-to-face. One phone interview took place due to inclement weather on the day of the interview and the

participant did not want to reschedule. A second face-to-face interview was changed to a phone interview because of rescheduling due to conflicts in the participant's schedule. Two participants requested to be interviewed by phone because of busy schedules involving implementation of state assessments and end-of-year exams for all students. (May is a major state assessment month for student testing in Texas during the first two weeks, and is followed by end-of-year exams the last two weeks of May.) All phone interviews followed the same set protocol, which included a brief overview of the study and the option to choose not to participate at any time. I also reminded them of the confidentiality of their interviews and sought permission to record them. Transcripts of their phone interviews were provided to them within the scheduled time of five days. Because they were phone interviews it was important these participants reviewed their transcripts very carefully to ensure that the information was accurate.

A second variation was in transcription because I used a software program to transcribe all the recorded interviews instead of transcribing the interview data myself. I chose to use computer software named Evernote. It permitted me to transcribe the interviews in half the time, which allowed me to get the transcripts back to the participants much quicker (2-5 days) for review. The software transcribed the speech-to-text and then I would review the transcripts with the audio and make necessary revisions, which were minimal, to ensure the text was accurate.

Finally, I was only able to interview 12 of the 13 potential participants. I opted not to replace one potential participant who was out ill and a member of the largest subset

(residential). This subset was originally six participants but was reduced to five participants.

The following chart (Table 4) displayed the interview schedule for the 12 research participants and total number of excerpts gleaned from the data for each participant's transcript. Column headings include the interview date, ID assigned, total number of excerpts extracted from transcripts and their position in the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department.

Table 4

Interview Schedule of Participants

Interview Dates	Participant ID	Total Excerpts	Position
4/25/2016	101	34	Administration
4/25/2016	102	25	Administration
4/26/2016	103	38	Administration
4/26/2016	104	26	Administration
5/10/2016	105	25	Residential
5/12/2016	106	42	Residential
5/16/2016	107	42	Education
5/17/2016	108	21	Education
5/18/2016	109	32	Education
5/18/2016	110	26	Residential
5/23/2016	111	36	Residential
5/26/2016	113	31	Residential

Data Analysis

The process used to move inductively from coded units to categories and themes consisted of reviewing written transcripts, coding the data into broad categories, and developing themes and subthemes. The purpose was to create understandable relationships within the research objectives to make it easier to summarize the findings

(Thomas, 2006). Open and selective coding allowed for constant comparisons of the data collected. Axial coding permitted the data to create categories around the phenomenon (Creswell et al., 2007). I addressed and answered three research questions in this research study by developing 14 open-ended interview questions for the participants. The relationship of what emerged in the results was discussed in later subsections of this chapter.

Themes were determined by coding the interviews after they were all completed. The coding involved going through the transcripts and determining themes and descriptors. As themes began to appear they were categorized according to the questions asked during the interviews. The transcripts were coded, through the categorization of themes and patterns that emerged as the data were analyzed (Merriam & Associates, 2002). In creating predetermined categories, this proved to be useful in the beginning of the data analysis process. They provided a starting point that could be revised and adjusted to as new categories emerged during the analysis process, which was done. From the collected data, themes emerged and were determined. Themes are the recognized patterns observed across the collected data sets in relation to the research questions.

Dedoose computer software was used strictly for data analysis. This computer software helped me to sort excerpts by content and theme (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). It highlighted themes and key terms through color-coding. As broad themes emerged from the raw data, I focused on answering the research questions and forming detailed

understanding of my central phenomenon (Hermanns & Mastel-Smith, 2012). Once I

uploaded the data (written transcripts) to Dedoose, I was able to see commonalities and

patterns, and began developing codes. The goal was to develop a rich and detailed

description of the experiences of the participant's interview data (Lodico et al., 2010). As

I worked through the program, I was able to identify major and minor themes in the

coded data. The themes with multiple codes allowed me to figure out answers to the

questions guiding the research. Like codes, the themes were usually short phrases that

identified major concepts I used to interpret and explain the data. I developed broad

categories of ideas from the data (Berg, 2004). As broad themes emerged, I examined the

data in detail to describe what was learned. Broad themes led to answering the research

questions and formed an in-depth understanding of the central phenomenon through

descriptions and thematic development (Merriam, 2001).

Interview and Research Questions

All 14 open-ended interview questions were aligned with the research questions.

Interview questions 1, 2, 6, and 7 were framed to answer Research Question 1: How does

an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral

services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism. Questions 3, 4, 8,

9, 11, 12, and 13 addressed Research Question 2: What are the residential, education, and

executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among

incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?   Finally, interview questions 5, 10,

and 14 were formulated to answer Research Question 3: How do the division staffs

collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

Many categories and themes emerged from a review of the data, but themes that presented themselves most prominently and resulted in coding are listed in the table below. The themes, along with the codes, are further aligned with the interview and research questions. Table 5 lists the major themes addressed, their correlation with the interview questions, and their correlations with the research questions. It also illustrates the summary of responses to the coded themes based on the excerpts from the participants. The summary of responses was the total number of coded excerpts from all participants that correlated with the specific theme based on the data analysis. The numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of negative perceptions within the total number of excerpts for that specific theme, interview question, and research question. For example, theme three had 49 total excerpts with 10 being negative and 39 positive.

Table 5

Themes, Codes, and Response Summary

Themes	Interview Questions	Research Questions	Summary of Responses to coded themes based on excerpts
1-Define Education Services: Code for evidence, staff development, teacher quality, instruction and individual services.	Interview questions 1, 2, 6, and 7	1-How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?	88
2-Define Behavior Modification: Code for evidence, implementation, individual services, and expected outcomes.	Interview questions 1, 2, 6, and 7	1-How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?	80
3-Staff perceptions of addressing school failure: Code for positive, negative responses	Interview questions 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12,	2-What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?	49 (10)
4-Staff perceptions of services addressing recidivism: Code for positive, negative responses	Interview questions 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12,	2-What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?	52 (11)
5-Collaboration within the facility: Code for examples	Interview questions 5, 10, and 14	3-How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?	47
6-Collaboration division wide: Code for examples	Interview questions 5, 10, and 14	3-How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?	33

Findings

The data received from the interviews served as a framework for my conclusions. This section is the collection and summary of the interview data from the 12 participants within the juvenile department. The overall expressions, viewpoints, and perceptions were consistent with the practices and framework highlighted in the literature review. Some innovative and collaborative conditions were uncovered and the data uncovered some effective implementations of education and behavioral services that have developed over time. The research questions were answered based on the thematic codes that resulted from the raw data. The raw data came from the participant responses to the interview questions. Research Questions 1–3 are discussed in the sections below, along with corresponding excerpts.

RQ 1: How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

An urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism through the creation of a charter school and implementation of an evidenced-based behavior modification program. Analysis of the interview data revealed that a charter school was developed to address the academic deficits of the youth and improve their educational success once they returned to their home schools. In addition, an evidenced-based behavior modification program was developed to address the behavior issues that caused

them to be removed from their home schools and resulted in them being detained as juveniles. From the findings it was determined that services existed, were personalized, and addressed school failure and recidivism.

Education Services

The first major theme focused on how did the participants define education in the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department? For this theme, I coded for things that define a school's existence - background, teacher qualifications, staff development, instruction, and individual services. There were 88 coded excerpts aligning with this theme. Perceptions of administrators, educators and residential participant subsets are included in this data response for the research question. There was an abundance of evidence that supported the existence of a charter school with qualified teachers that offered instruction and individualized services for all youth. One participant (101) commented:

> A charter was obtained by the juvenile board of the probation department in 2005…teachers at each facility who are highly qualified in…core subject areas, math, science, social studies, and ELA…offer special education services…as well as, ESL services for those who qualify… providing those education services in a one on one, small group.

> Additional evidence discussed the operations of a regular school that included enrolling youth, communicating with the home school, assessing the youth for proper grade placement, and class size. Some comments were "…they're enrolled, we receive

the records from the home school (103)…We have educational specialists who…test the kids to make sure they're on grade level...have to follow TEA (Texas Education Agency) guidelines for curriculum (106)…" Finally there is a big advantage to having qualified education staff who are also well trained since this is not a traditional school environment.

Another participant (107) discussed teacher qualifications, services for special populations, assessments and a normal school day. This participant stated:

Certified teachers …make a huge difference… My staff is thoroughly trained….ARD meetings and LPAC meetings are held to decide what kind of modifications they need…testing that is done as soon as they arrive on computer programs that help them to enhance their reading and math skills …a block schedule…provide two hours in each class.

Individualized education services are seen as important by participants in this juvenile department. They provided this through an assessment known as RTI or Response to Intervention. This participant's (104) comments illustrated how this process works for them:

The expectation for our charter school is that we do a pre and posttest on kids who stay with us for a certain period of time…with the pretest that we give the kids, we're able to identify where they are and then exercise the response to intervention approach in getting those kids the educational services or attention that they need to address any identified deficits at that point.

All participants provided input on some aspects of these themes - the existence of education services for all youth, the role of teachers, assessment and individualized services, the teaching environment, and the instructional day for the youth. This was evident at all three placement facilities in the juvenile department.

The overlapping data indicated that even though the education subset provided most of the research data aligned with this theme, the percentage of data provided by the non-education subsets (administration and residential) were almost equal. This is illustrated in Table 6 below that showed the percentage of excerpts addressing this theme by all three subsets. Overall the data results indicated that all juvenile justice staff had a general knowledge of the education services that exist in this juvenile probation department. This was evident in the excerpts chosen that came from all three subsets but the most meaningful comments were pulled from the administration and education subsets. And even within the subsets some participants provided more depth and their excerpts were used. In addition, Table 7 illustrated that the number of years the staff worked in this juvenile probation department did not make a big difference in the coded data count. This means staff with 0-5 years contributed more to the data results than those with 16 or more years. This was illustrated in Table 7 below.

Table 6

Percentages Based on Theme and Descriptor – Position

Theme	Administration	Education	Residential
Charter School	24. 1	51. 8	24. 1
Behavior Modification	20. 9	41. 8	37. 4

Table 7

Percentages Based on Theme and Descriptor - Years in Juvenile Department

Theme	0-5	16 plus	6-15
Charter School	37. 4	25. 7	36. 9
Behavior Modification	49. 8	27. 1	23. 1

In the next section on behavior modification, the counts in Table 6 and 7 are discussed as they apply to the second theme of research question one - Define behavior modification.

Behavior Modification

This section answers the second part of the research question, how is behavior modification addressed in the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department? The second theme – Define behavior modification and coding for the existence of behavior modification services, goals of program(s), and expected outcomes is covered in this section. There were 80 excerpts that aligned with and provided evidence of this theme and research question. This juvenile probation department addresses behavior modification through evidenced-based programs. Though several programs were mentioned in the data, one program stood out as the one that everyone was knowledgeable about and that addressed the behavior needs of the youth at all three facilities. This program was the Intensive Behavior Therapy (IBT) program that was implemented at all three placement facilities and all youth participate in. The program was developed in 2012 by the juvenile department to address the individual needs of the

youth in their placement facilities. Even though evidence-based programs already existed, this juvenile department developed their own behavior modification program. They did not want a cookie cutter or one-size-fits-all program because they recognized that different youth had different needs. For example, Participant 104 commented:

> We want to make sure that we're putting the kid in the right curriculum, and so it's making sure they (staff) know…and putting the kid in the right program, and, again, not using a cookie cutter approach. It should be really based on the kid's individualized need.

In developing a program to meet the individual needs of each youth there were some early considerations that had to be addressed including how the program should work. This participant (102) explained the process:

> At the onset of developing this program we realized that not all the kids are going to fit into the levels; it's not going to be all kids are going to progress...some kids that either have learning disabilities or mental health diagnoses…what we have to focus on is progress. Has the kid's overall behavior improved…even if it's just a little bit, that is progress…our behavior modification program is offered at our post facilities and it's based off of a point system where kids earn points…receive incentives for appropriate behaviors. The kids carry their own point cards and staff is able to write appropriate comments, good or bad…so that the kids are able to review…those comments periodically throughout the day learning how to learn from their mistakes basically.

Since this was a new program, behavior specialists were hired to develop the program and oversee the implementation and day-to-day operations of this program. Another participant explained this process:

Each facility has…a behavior specialist, and their main responsibility is to see that the incentive programs are in place, that they're working like they're designed work… identifying not just the triggers for kids and what turns them off, but what works as an incentive for that kid. (104)

The goal of the program was to provide these juvenile youth skills that they could draw from to counteract any negative behavior. The outcome of the program was for the youth to be successful once they returned to their home environment and home school, in their interaction with their peers and adults. This would result in a decrease in recidivism and school failure. Participant comments that supported this, "We touch on subjects of decision-making, peer pressure, basic etiquette, manners, stuff like that, hoping that some of these skills that we give our kids will help them make better choices once they get released from our facilities (102)." Other comments were:

It's like a platform…but it's individualized because each kid is responsible for his own card and your card is a reflection of your behavior for that day…the behavior modification program we have right now is really getting these kids to being better role models…being better students in the classroom. (111)

In the final comment, this participant thought these behavioral services had shown long-term benefits for the youth. This participant (102) stated:

We've already seen the impact that can make on the kids' behavior and their

attitude when there are things they want to work towards and they want to behave

because they want to participate in those incentives, so right now we're seeing

that it is benefitting…by encouraging the kids to follow the rules…we've made

great strides in trying to only keep the kids at the facility who truly need to be

here.

The overlapping data indicated that the education subset provided the highest

percentage of data followed by the residential subset, to support this theme. The more

significant data to answer this question and theme was gleaned from the administration

and residential subsets because of the depth of their responses. In Table 6, the evidence

showed that all subsets were knowledgeable enough to provide data on the theme –

Define behavior modification. On the other hand, Table 7 illustrated that staff in the

department less than five years provided almost 50% of the data for the behavior

modification theme followed by participants with 16 years or more. This is important

because the participants with fewer years in the department demonstrated a knowledge

base of behavior services. I think this is important even though the richer comments came

from those participants with the most experience. Tables 5 and 6 above illustrated the

participants count on percentages based on the descriptors positions and years in the

juvenile department for the theme Define behavior modification.

Discrepant Data

In addition to data results that address the first research question and its two themes, participants shared data that had broader implications even though they did not answer the first research question. For example, what do participants perceive as reasons youth were referred to the juvenile probation department? Participant 103 suggested,

A lot of the reasons they're referred to us for committing an offense is because of problems they had in school, the inability to follow directions, the inability to socialize, and that leads to recidivism. It's important that we meet the individual needs because every child's needs are different. So that's been a constant change our agency has made to improve, those types of individual services, and I think that we're seeing some good results from that.

Another participant (101) suggested ways this juvenile probation department sought to rectify the problem of juvenile youth becoming incarcerated adults:

The cradle to prison pipeline research has shown that when kids fail in school then they also tend to fail outside of school and end up in facilities like ours…We have a… advocacy group and they…look at these kids who have special needs and we aren't able to serve them properly; and they haven't been served in their home schools properly; …so that we can advocate for them when they leave our facility…get the proper services.

The point here is that all juvenile youth were different and what worked for one would not work for all. Providing programs that advocate for juvenile youth and result in a

decrease in school failure and recidivism, especially those needing more specialized services, is a major goal for this juvenile probation department. Finally, based on participant 103, developing individual services for incarcerated youth has been the result of ongoing changes in this department that have reaped positive results for the youth.

RQ 2: What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism, among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?

In research question number two, the major theme focused on staff perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 and 13 years of age. In this theme, I coded for positive and negative comments of participants on whether school failure and recidivism was being addressed for this age group. A perception on school failure was the first theme and a perception on recidivism was the second theme. Based on the results it became evident that this population of youth was extremely small at this probation department and data were limited. Regardless, I pulled out coded responses that aligned with this theme and research question for the targeted population (10–13 years of age) and the older population (14-17 years of age) of incarcerated youth to provide depth. The targeted younger (10–13 year olds) population is discussed separately from the older population. As mentioned earlier, both positive and negative responses are included in this section. I examined staff perceptions on addressing school failure for 10 -13 year old juveniles in the first section,

followed by staff perceptions on school failure for older juveniles (14-17) in the second section.

School Failure

There were a total of 59 excerpts, inclusive of all ages (10-17), pulled from the coded data results that adequately addressed perceptions of the first theme - school failure. Of this total number, only10 excerpts, inclusive of all ages (10-17) were found to be negative in nature. The next section discussed perceptions pertaining to the targeted population of 10-13-year-old juveniles.

Target juvenile population (10-13-years-old). *Positive perceptions.* Overall, participant comments were very encouraging in regards to addressing school failure. This was true in the case of our targeted population of younger juveniles (10-13 year old) and for older juveniles (14-17 years old), as well. Comments that specifically addressed our target population were few and emphasized the small number of youth in this age range that are ever detained. For example, Participant 103 stated:

We rarely have …10-13-year-olds, which is a minority of the kids that we have in our facilities…What we provide in the facilities is intended for that age group…to give them those tools so that they are able to reengage in school and the community…we have to look at their individual needs…and we've gotten a lot more individualized; and certainly in the education side, but also on the behavioral side in psychological services.

Participant 110 listed some reasons for considerable focus on individual needs of these youth, "When you're talking about 10-13-year-olds, you're often reviewing patterns and behaviors and traumas and experiences that have been there 10 to 13 years prior to coming to us." Comments from another participant (103) detailed the types of services used to address these traumas and experiences, "a 10-to-13-year-old…You're probably going to get additional attention; more therapists working with that age group…special Ed…additional attention…based on the whole compilation of where they're at in terms of educational development, social development."

Another participant confirmed earlier comments and provided observed outcomes:

> When they're that young…we have to look at their individual needs and kind of work more independently with them at providing their educational services…The fact that we're seeing less and less younger kids in the facility, I'm glad to see that because I don't think it's a good place for them.

As shown by the richness of these comments, participants believed this population of youth should and were receiving more individualized services when detained by this juvenile department. Negative perceptions were addressed in the next section.

Negative perceptions. As far as perceptions that the department was not addressing school failure, one participant stated the limitations in addressing this population's needs. This participant (108) stated, "My perception is it doesn't really address this pop and it tries to, at best, fill gaps that the kids have." Another participant (104) spoke about the overall design of the juvenile department in relationship to this

younger juvenile population, "Our program isn't designed to address the specific needs of that group." This comes as a surprise since so many earlier comments supported the concept that individual services were provided to all youth detained in this probation department and even customized for this younger population of juveniles.

Overall all participant subsets believed that this juvenile probation department was addressing school failure with this population of youth as shown by the data. And even those who disagreed still believed that something is being done, however limited, to address school failure. And even though the overall program in this juvenile department was not designed to address the specific needs of younger juveniles, data showed that the needs of the younger juveniles are very similar to those of the older juveniles and so they are receiving those services. The next section addressed perceptions for older juveniles (14- 17 years old).

Older juvenile population (10-17 years old). *Positive perceptions.* Participants 113, 109 and 101, respectively, had very positive perceptions in regards to behavioral and education services in the department. They discussed its effect on school failure, positive changes in youth behavior, and benefits of collaboration. Participant 113 stated, "I think the Behavior Modification Program (IBT), it helps to decrease school failure…They work harder to accomplish their goals, and then they find within themselves the ability to do work that thought that they couldn't do." Another participant (109) saw positive outcomes, "Based on my observations, I believe that it has made a positive impact on school failure…I've seen a positive change…they go on to become some of our better

students." Participant 101 affirmed the effectiveness of the programs and the benefits of collaborating with these comments, "When you add in an effective behavior modification program on top of that everybody's working with the student…this is going to naturally help with the recidivism and school failure rate because they're going to be more successful."

Other participants explained the benefits of these programs for the youth and the department. Participant 106 explained, "We place them in a position to be able to manage their behaviors and …identify within themselves what causes them to be reactive in a negative way." While Participant 104 discussed the positive results, "With the exception of serious offenses, referrals overall are going down, and that's a trend that we've seen for the past few years, so these numbers really are following that trend." This section is followed by negative perceptions.

Negative perceptions. All participants did not have positive perceptions of whether the department addressed school failure for these youth. This participant did not perceive any changes but still felt strongly about school. The participant commented, "Unfortunately, I can't say that I've seen any changes directly…so that's why it's important for us to make the push for school." Participant 111 did not feel that the department was doing enough to address school failure in this comment, "I don't think that we're doing enough." Finally, Participant 110 did not believe the department's expectations were high enough. The participant commented, "Our expectations for our youth are well below what they should be."

Overall, the research data supported the idea that this juvenile probation department was addressing school failure in their services for these incarcerated youth. The evidence showed positive behavior changes in the youth as a result of these programs. The programs taught them social skills to counteract negative behavior. This helped the youth to settle down and become more successful in school. And this supported the overall success for the youth while incarcerated and after release from the probation department.

Discrepant Data

To address the negative perceptions was important also because it is important to know that all individuals did not see positive changes or did not feel enough was being done. In addressing their concerns, there still may be additional programs or services that could be added or a review of the present services. Understanding how the participant defined "no change" in relationship to how the rest of the participants' defined "change" is important. Finally, how the department defined and shared successes so that all staff are aware of successful outcomes in services and programs was also significant.

Recidivism

In addressing the second part of this research question – perceptions on addressing recidivism, there were 52 excerpts that focused on this coded theme. Eleven of this total may be considered negative in nature. Positive comments are addressed first followed by negative comments.

Target juvenile population (10-13 years old). *Positive perceptions.* Comments that specifically addressed our target population were again few in numbers and emphasized the small number of youth in this age range that are ever detained. But the comments still provided depth and a sense of commitment to services for this target population. In addition, the evidence provided answers to this research question and themes. One participant (103) commented, "I think we've gotten a lot more successful at reducing recidivism for this age group…because we've really gotten away from what we call cookie cutter programs where all children receive the same program" Another participant (108) believed services provided to this younger population may have long-term results. The participant commented:

> I've seen that if, the younger the child is and they get these services, the better the recidivism rate is, meaning that they're able to get them while there's still time for repair…It helps them to understand what they should be doing and what's age-appropriate for their age, and it helps them with boundaries; personal boundaries, boundaries with kids and with staff.

Participant 103 summed up services for the target population with this statement:

> If we're looking at that particular age group in our facilities, the reality of it is if a kid ends up in one of our residential facilities that young, then that's indicative of some major issues at home, and it's going to take a lot more than just behavior modification program. It's going to take some intensive intervention. You're probably looking at some mental health issues, some serious family issues at

home, so it really goes way beyond the classroom, and then so you really have to

take a holistic approach to identify what got the kid there and then really address

it from all sides.

Again the results indicated individualization of services and intensive intervention for

this targeted population of youth. The results also showed that the programs provided

skills to counteract negative behaviors and addressed mental health issues. A holistic

approach was seen as the best way to help these youth.

Negative perceptions. One additional comment on addressing recidivism for this

younger juvenile population was not as much negative as just stating a reality for younger

juveniles who are released. This participant (102) stated:

Unfortunately with those target groups that you're looking at, the 10 to 13 year

olds …their only choice is to go back into the home …family, parental support is

a big indicator of youth's success to recidivate…trying to get the parents involved

is a big factor for us.

The results provided overall evidence that recidivism was being addressed in the services

proved to younger juveniles and their young age was seen as a benefit because it was felt

they still had time to be taught and instilled with alternatives to negative behavior. The

next section discussed perceptions for the older population of juveniles (14-17 years old).

Older juvenile population (14-17 years old). *Positive perceptions.* This section

answered research question two and focused on themes addressing recidivism. The

evidence demonstrated positive perceptions of all participants through their excerpts in

addressing recidivism with juvenile youth. The comments were concentrated on different

aspects of addressing recidivism in this juvenile department. Participant (103) discussed a

decrease in recidivism and feelings about the decrease. Participant 103 stated, "We have

somewhat control over recidivism…And again I think the decrease is due in large part to

the kids being more engaged in school and receiving the services that they actually need."

Additional comments explained visible results and advantages of the services. Participant

111 described changes in behavior, "…it is a complete transformation of behavior…and I

think it addresses recidivism…We engage these youth hoping that they take what they

have learned not only in the classroom but in the units…back into their community."

Participant 106 described the advantages of the services provided to youth as they relate

to recidivism. Participant 106 commented:

> I think once a child has the ability to …think in a more concrete terms of how
>
> their behaviors become a consequence and how those consequences lead to
>
> lasting effects …you'll see a decrease in the amount kids who come in…it helps
>
> identify those real issues early on …so that later on they're able to have more
>
> success.

Participant 102 listed different skills embedded within the services that help the

youth make better decisions after release, "We touch on the subjects of decision-making,

peer pressure, basic etiquette, manners…hoping that some of these skill…will help them

make better choices once they get released…" Participant 104 attributed much of the

success in addressing recidivism to the incentive program or Individual Behavior

Therapy program and discussed the incentives for the youth in the program:

> I think the incentive program really motivates the kids to really perform better in
> school, because again, there's a reward for that positive school performance, and
> when you tie that to incentives and then the kids are working towards something
> whether it's going to be a privilege or the ultimate release, or ultimately being
> released from the facility, I think it has a positive impact on this kid's school
> performance and thus having a positive impact on failure and then recidivism.

Finally, Participant 111 believed, "the services changed behavior for the long-term and

resulted in a decrease in the behaviors that brought them here and a decrease in

recidivism."

Overall, positive themes were embedded in the data and illustrated a strong

commitment to improving these youth circumstances. There was an emphasis on

avoiding cookie cutter programs and developing services that addressed the individual

needs of these youth through programs that resulted in the progress and success of the

youth. They addressed the importance of encouraging these youth so they could move

toward a more successful life after release. Participant 103 summed it up this way:

> It's very important that we focus on building up their confidence, getting them
> used to and acclimated with working with other children; not just in educational
> settings, but social setting, so that they, again, get engaged in the education that
> will then contribute to or result in them less likely to commit more offenses.

Negative perceptions. Some staff did not share the positive comments of their coworkers. There were 11 negative comments provided in this area of discussion from the participants as a whole. Their comments discussed a limited knowledge of what was offered in education services and how it influences recidivism. Another concern was education services involvement with the family, "I don't think they're receiving education services that reduce recidivism (110)." Participant 102 stated, "I don't know any special things they offer kids to reduce recidivism, as far as education." Another participant (105) stated, "I honestly don't think it's made a difference." And Participant 102 was concerned about family involvement, "I particularly don't know how they're individualized for these youth…I don't know what services are education staff … I don't know how involved they get with the family."

The overall evidence indicated a working relationship between education services and the rest of the department. The comments in this section may indicate a need for better communication since some staff did not know nor could explain the education services with clarity. In addition, the negative comments in this section did not elaborate on why they thought there is not a difference or why they did not think education services reduces recidivism. This was still worth mentioning. Finally, only 11 of the 51 excerpts pulled from the data were negative and this was for all the participants; inclusive of the targeted population and the older juvenile population.

Based on this theme, education staff contributed 50% of the positive data for addressing school failure and 38.3% of the data for addressing recidivism. The residential

staff contributed 45.5% of the negative data for addressing school failure and 66% of the

negative data for addressing recidivism (see Table 8).

Based on positions, it was the residential staffs' overall involvement (both in and

out of school) with the youth that would allow them to observe areas of services that may

need adjusting to successfully address school failure and recidivism. Finally, considering

there were only 21 negative comments overall from the 80 total comments, this was

important in that communication may be needed to see what was going on. But the

negative comments do not outweigh the evidence that overall, most participants stated

that school failure and recidivism were being successfully addressed by the department.

Table 8

Percentages Based on Theme and Descriptor – Position

Theme	Administration	Education	Residential
Address School Failure	34. 1	50	15. 9
Negative Perceptions	36. 4	18. 2	45. 5
Address Recidivism	29. 8	38. 3	31. 9
Negative Perceptions	16. 7	16. 7	66. 7

RQ 3: How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and

behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

In the third research question I focused on how division staff collaborated to

provide services to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism. The major theme for

this section was evidence of collaboration. In reviewing the transcripts there appeared to

be two distinct levels of collaboration within this juvenile department. I coded for evidence of collaboration on two levels – department-wide and facility-wide. Based on the excerpts gleaned from the transcript data, there were 80 rich and in-depth examples of collaboration of services between the divisions (i.e. education, residential, medical/mental health) and within the different facilities. Evidence of department-wide collaboration of services is discussed first, followed by facility-wide collaboration of services.

Department-Wide Collaboration

There were 33 excerpts pulled from the data aligned with collaboration of services for department-wide. This theme is supported throughout this section by comments significant enough to answer the research questions and support this theme of collaboration. Participant 102 discussed the teamwork involved in collaboration and how it benefits the youth:

> Everybody is working together to help raise a kid's either self-esteem, understanding… hopefully the kid has a better chance of succeeding…it's a multidisciplinary approach…not just each team working by themselves or each division doing their own thing…It's a collaborative effort.

Participant 106 explained the overall impact of working together this way, "I think the biggest impact it's made is getting people to work together as a community so that there's no gaps in services." Participant 108 believed the collaboration of services

has helped youth and stated, "The collaboration of the residential and education…has helped and it really aided the child …"

Participant 106 further explained how the school and probation department collaborate in identifying youth who may need services:

> The school and the probation department …works collaboratively to make sure that we identify those kids early on so the moment they go to the classroom they have the opportunity to be able to have those extra services…They are being tested for…any educational deficits…for mental health.

The earlier comments supported the theme of department wide collaborations and how it benefits the youth, but Participant 103 explained when collaboration starts, "The whole process through the juvenile justice system is collaboration. It starts at intake." And Participant 111 saw additional benefits for the department, "We get information that we ordinarily wouldn't be able to get had it not been for the collaborative efforts." Finally, Participant 101 summed up the overall impact of collaboration with, "I definitely think it's made a positive impact…because we're all working together…"

Overall, the evidence showed that participants in all subsets believe collaboration takes place department wide and creates teamwork. They saw many benefits in this teamwork. For example, starting collaboration at the intake stage gives them the ability to fill the gaps so these youth were properly served. In addition, they saw the positive impact for the youth because they are working as a team. Finally, the participants saw how it has helped the incarcerated youth.

Facility-Wide Collaboration

The second level of collaboration of services was facility-wide. Facility-wide collaboration was discussed in 47 of the total number of excerpts (80). The comments from those excerpts are discussed in this section. The evidence supports the theme of collaboration within the facilities. Participant 102 stated:

There's no doubt in my mind that collaborative efforts are the most impactful. When everyone's on the same page working towards a common goal…the kids can see that somebody is caring and trying to help them if all of us are speaking the same language with the kid…working with the child to motivate change in them and…trying to provide positive reinforcement…when we all know what's going on with the kids…we're more successful." This participant talked about changes brought about through the collaboration, "I think it has made a difference because of the fact that we didn't use to have JSOs inside the classroom and now we do.

Participant 103 noted facility wide improvements in collaboration, stating:

I think we've gotten a lot better…at the communication between the education and the caseworkers, the juvenile supervision officers and the afterschool activities…if a child is getting behind while they're in school…we've developed programs even at the juvenile supervision officer level… tutor them…We have…volunteers…work with them…to catch up in school…reading…there is that correlation between education, behavior and success in our facilities.

Participant 109 explained how staff from different areas worked together to encourage the youth to become successful:

Based on my observations, I believe that it has made a positive impact on school failure…Everyone working together for the common good of this kid whether it's the therapist, the JSOs, the supervisors; they're all encouraging the kid to make a positive change and correct the behavior…The RTI specialist works with other divisions to share info and gather info on our students.

Another participant (107) explained how everyone was kept informed of changes, "The superintendent attends meetings downtown regularly to stay abreast of any changes." Participant 104 pointed out collaboration between education and residential staff, "One of the things our education staff will do in the facilities is participating in the facilities point system." Finally, Participant 113 described everyone as a team and how they work together to ensure the success of the youth. This participant stated, "So everybody works together to support that resident in reaching their goal; be it mental health issues, drug issues and educational issues. So it's a team effort."

Again, the overall evidence of teamwork and collaboration was believed to be working within the facilities. And the youth were the beneficiaries of this effort on the part of the different staff as pointed out by the participants' comments. Table 9 illustrated the percentages of collaboration from each subset for each level of collaboration. The administration subset provided the most evidence of department wide collaboration of

services while the education subset provided the most evidence of facility wide

collaboration of services.

Table 9

Percentages Based on Theme and Descriptor – Collaboration

Theme	Administration	Education	Residential
Collaboration of Services Department Wide	47.1	17.6	35.3
Collaboration of Services Facility Wide	18.3	53.3	28.3

Discrepant Data

In this section on discrepant data we discussed nonconforming data and

discrepant data that resulted from the research. Our first participant (109) had

nonconforming data and expressed concern that education services was overlooked in the

original planning for the behavior modification program and may have been an

afterthought. It was explained this way:

> I really would like to see the school…have more of an influence in regards to the
>
> behavior program that's offered within the facility …meaning in the planning
>
> stage…just for feedback or to provide ideas…to help assist the school. The
>
> behavior program… was more or less created for residential services ...versus it
>
> being driven…for education.

Even though the evidence showed that most comments were supportive of the

collaboration within the facilities, including several from this participant, this comment

was worth mentioning. It appears that even though the collaboration did not begin at the

origination point of the new behavior modification program, after collaboration took place it had some very positive results.

The next three participants were included in our discrepant. Their comments do not necessarily address the research questions or themes but are still significant toward this research. Comments made by Participant 103 were encouraging because this participant looked forward to the results of this study:

> Really excited to see what the results of this is… curious to see what the perspective...is…We're constantly changing and…made a lot of improvements in the communication between education and…the facilities…excited to see what other perspectives are on that…we may make some more changes based on the results.

This statement is significant because it appears that the participants' perspectives were important to the juvenile department and indicated that the department was open to change if the results of the study indicate some change is necessary.

Another participant (111) saw the need for mandatory tutorials for all youth in the facilities:

> A lot of times, by the time the kids get to us they are so far behind in their…class work…imperative that those kids that are deficient in reading and math receive mandatory tutorials…maybe one hour a day for 5 days a week.

The significance of this statement goes back to what has been repeated through the data and that is a push to educating these youth so they can be successful in the long-term.

This participant saw the addition of mandatory tutoring as a way of helping the youth in achieving that end result.

The last participant (106) felt a proactive stance was more beneficial for these youth through additional funding:

The more we put resources, put funding and put support in preventative services early on prior to a kid having any interaction with a criminal justice system or having any issues in school, I think the better off their success rate would be.

Patterns, Relationships, and Themes

Patterns and relationships were found throughout the data analysis, which resulted in four overlapping themes all supported by the evidence. Each theme was discussed in this section.

Theme 1 – Education is Important

Throughout this study participants stated over and over that education was important to the long-term success of juvenile youth after release from juvenile probation departments. The development of a quality education program was evident in this juvenile probation department. The results of the data indicated that educational needs were addressed through the creation of a charter school with a campus at each of the juvenile probation department's facilities that is licensed by the state of Texas who determines the educational standards for all public schools in Texas. Certified and highly qualified teachers instruct youth in the core subjects (Math, Science, Social Studies and English Language Arts). In addition individualized services were available for youth

needing Special Education, English as a Second Language and 504 services. Students were assessed when they entered the department to determine their educational needs and educational tracking is ongoing through RTI (response to intervention). Classes were small, which resulted in more one on one service for students. One participant commented:

> A charter was obtained by the juvenile board of the probation department in 1998…teachers at each facility who are highly qualified in…core subject areas, math science, social studies and ELA…offer special education services…as well as, ESL services for those who qualify…providing those education services in a one on one, small group. (101)

Theme 2 – Changing Negative Behavior

The participants' results indicated that many of the youth came to the juvenile probation department because of negative behavior. Providing these youth the skills to address negative behavior both in and out of the juvenile department was a major goal of this juvenile department. It was the premise behind developing their own research and evidenced-based program that was multidimensional in nature. The behavior modification program provided to all youth at this juvenile probation department is IBT (Intensive Behavior Therapy). The IBT program was evidence and research based and monitored by Behavior Specialist were located at each facility and are responsible for implementation and success of the incentive program. The behavior specialists identify

not only the triggers for each youth, but what works as an incentive for each youth. One participant commented:

> Each facility has…a behavior specialist, and their main responsibility is to see that the incentive programs are in place, that they're working like they're designed work… identifying not just the triggers for kids and what turns them off, but what works as an incentive for that kid. (104)

This juvenile department has attempted to avoid programs where all youth treatment is the same. Another participant commented:

> We want to make sure that we're putting the kid in the right curriculum, and so it's making sure they (staff) know…and putting the kid in the right program, and, again, not using a cookie cutter approach. It should be really based on the kid's individualized need. (104)

The IBT program was a multidisciplinary program that involves everyone involved with the youth during any given day. The purpose of the IBT program was to provide the youth with skills to interact with their peers and others responsibly. The IBT program helped the youth to understand accountability, the importance of following rules, and developing more self-motivation to succeed and to be able to re-engage in school and their community.

Theme 3 – Saving Younger Juveniles

Even though this department was created to detain juvenile youth 10 -17 years old the evidence indicated that it is a major focus of this department to avoid detaining 10-13

year old juveniles. The participants pointed out that when these youth were detained they were provided intensive services. The purpose of these customized services was to address their individual needs and provide them with skills to avoid the behavior that brought them into the juvenile department to begin with. With their holistic approach, education and behavior services were a big part of the youths' plan. Addressing school failure and recidivism for 10-13 year old juveniles was supported by staff, which was indicated by the participant responses found throughout the data.

All three subsets had positive perceptions of the department's ability to address school failure and recidivism even though youth between the ages of 10 and 13 are rarely detained by this juvenile probation department. Some participants noted that the juvenile department customized services when these younger juveniles were detained. Participant subsets suggested a huge impact on the success of this younger population of juveniles would consist of intensive services within and once they left the department along with consistent parental support. Participant 110 explained some reasons for considerable focus on individual needs of these youth, "When you're talking about 10 – 13 year olds, you're often looking at patterns and behaviors and traumas and experiences that have been there 10 to 13 years prior to coming to us." Comments from another participant (103) detailed the types of services used to address these traumas and experiences. Participant 103 stated, "A 10- to 13-year old…You're probably going to get additional attention; more therapists working with that age group…special Ed…additional

attention…based on the whole compilation of where they're at in terms of educational development, social development." This participant provided observed outcomes:

> When they're that young…we have to look at their individual needs and kind of work more independently with them at providing their educational services…The fact that we're seeing less and less younger kids in the facility, I'm glad to see that because I don't think it's a good place for them. (102)

Participant 103 summed up services for the target population:

> If we're looking at that particular age group in our facilities, the reality of it is if a kid ends up in one of our residential facilities that young, then that's indicative of some major issues at home, and it's going to take a lot more than just behavior modification program. It's going to take some intensive intervention. You're probably looking at some mental health issues, some serious family issues at home, so it really goes way beyond the classroom, and then so you really have to take a holistic approach to identify what got the kid there and then really address it from all sides.

Theme 4 – Perceptions

Perceptions of staff in any organization are important because they can contribute to the success or failure of the organization. The perceptions of the participants in this study were positive in their overall comments. Their comments indicated that this juvenile probation department was addressing the school failure and recidivism for the juvenile youth they detained. If the juvenile probation staff perceptions were positive, this

would be a sign of encouragement for the juvenile youth they detain, which can result in positive outcomes for these youth. Positive educational and behavioral outcomes are supported by participant responses found throughout the data. Participant 104 attributed much of the success in addressing recidivism to the incentive program or Individual Behavior Therapy program:

I think the incentive program really motivates the kids to really perform better in school, because again, there's a reward for that positive school performance, and when you tie that to incentives and then the kids are working towards something whether it's going to be a privilege or the ultimate release, or ultimately being released from the facility, I think it has a positive impact on this kid's school performance and thus having a positive impact on failure and then recidivism.

The data showed that juvenile justice staff had seen decreases in school failure and recidivism over the last few years as a result of the coordination of these two programs. One participant (108) believed services provided to this younger population may have long-term results:

I've seen that if, the younger the child is and they get these services, the better the recidivism rate is, meaning that they're able to get them while there's still time for repair…It helps them to understand what they should be doing and what's age-appropriate for their age, and it helps them with boundaries; personal boundaries, boundaries with kids and with staff.

Participant data also indicated that staff believed their behavior modification program provided youth with skills to manage negative behavior and encourage student success in school. They also believed programs assisted youth in interacting with both peers and adults, successfully. Participant 111 described changes in behavior, "…it is a complete transformation of behavior…and I think it addresses recidivism…We engage these youth hoping that they take what they have learned not only in the classroom but in the units…back into their community." Overall, participants felt all juveniles receive services that were focused on improving their behavior management skills, along with accountability and responsibility. These skills and opportunities were platforms that supported the juveniles' success once they were released from the juvenile department.

Theme 5 – Collaboration and Sharing

The data indicated that this juvenile probation department had made a point of working in collaboration to address the needs of the juvenile youth they served. The evidence showed that as a result of this teamwork they were able to share more information and had seen positive outcomes with the youth and benefits to the department. Collaboration was supported by participants' responses throughout the data. Staff working together as a team for the long-term benefit of the youth was seen as beneficial. Collaboration was seen in the different facilities and divisions. In the facilities, teachers, supervision officers, and behavior specialist were collaborating on the needs and services of the youth they served. Participant 108 believed the collaboration of services helped, "The collaboration of the residential and education…has helped and it

really aided the child …" Still another participant (106) explained how the school and probation department collaborate in identifying youth who may need services:

> The school and the probation department …works collaboratively to make sure that we identify those kids early on so the moment they go to the classroom they have the opportunity to be able to have those extra services…They are being tested for…any educational deficits…for mental health.

In addition, division administrators were sharing information and meeting regularly to address youth as they entered the department in preparation for services while they were incarcerated but also planning for their future departure so that services will follow them after they leave. Participant 103 explained when collaboration started and noted improvements in collaboration:

> The whole process through the juvenile justice system is collaboration. It starts at intake. I think we've gotten a lot better…at the communication between the education and the caseworkers, the juvenile supervision officers…there is that correlation between education, behavior and success in our facilities.

The collaboration of services supported the long-term success for these youth when they returned home to their families and home schools. Participant 109 explained how staff from different areas worked together to encourage the youth to become successful, "Based on my observations, I believe that it has made a positive impact on school failure."

Theme 6 – Unique individuals

In developing programs at the juvenile probation department, attention was focused on creating programs that allowed for individual differences. Assessing youth upon entry to this juvenile probation department both educationally and behaviorally, allowed the department to determine what deficits each youth had in a holistic way and to address these needs with a multidisciplinary approach. By avoiding standard programs for all youth, they were able to address a youth's needs more successfully. Providing youth individualized education and behavioral services according to their personal needs were also interwoven through the data results.

In education, assessing youth when they came into the department and providing Special Education, 504, and English as a Second Language (ESL) services through modification was significant. Also providing intervention services for youth that have deficits in their learning is important. This participant discussed services for special populations, assessments and a normal school day, "…ARD meetings and LPAC meetings are held to decide what kind of modifications they need…testing that is done as soon as they arrive on computer programs that help them to enhance their reading and math skills (107)." Individualized education services were seen as important by participants in this juvenile department. They provided this through an assessment known as RTI or Response to Intervention. This participant's (104) comments illustrated how this process worked for them:

> The expectation for our charter school is that we do a pre- and posttest on kids
> who stay with us for a certain period of time…with the pretest that we give the

kids, we're able to identify where they are and then exercise the response to intervention approach in getting those kids the educational services or attention that they need to address any identified deficits at that point.

Individualization was also incorporated in the behavior modification program known as Intensive Behavior Therapy (IBT). This participant stated, "… identifying not just the triggers for kids and what turns them off, but what works as an incentive for that kid (104)." The goal of the program was to provide these juvenile youth skills that they could draw from to counteract any negative behavior. Other comments were:

It's like a platform…but it's individualized because each kid is responsible for his own card and your card is a reflection of your behavior for that day…the behavior modification program we have right now is really getting these kids to being better role models…being better students in the classroom. (111)

In developing a program to meet the individual needs of each youth there were some early considerations that had to be addressed including how the program should work. This participant explained this process:

At the onset of developing this program we realized that not all the kids are going to fit into the levels; it's not going to be all kids are going to progress...some kids that either have learning disabilities or mental health diagnoses…what we have to focus on is progress. Has the kid's overall behavior improved…even if it's just a little bit, that is progress. (102)

Another participant commented, "We want to make sure that we're putting the kid in the right curriculum, and so it's making sure they (staff) know…and putting the kid in the right program, and, again, not using a cookie cutter approach. It should be really based on the kid's individualized need. (104)

Evidence of Quality

A researcher must be able recognize any possible biases in order to maintain a neutral attitude and demeanor throughout the interview process. Because participants were from different subsets of the juvenile practitioner population I anticipated a variety of responses and recognized that their perspectives were different at times. I then adapted to those differences on an individual basis because it was my intent to maintain consistency throughout the process. According to Creswell (2009), "All researchers aspire to produce valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner. And both producers and consumers of research want to be assured that the findings of an investigation are to be believed and trusted (p. 22)."

Validity determined how accurate the findings are to reality. This was accomplished by adherence to a set protocol, concurrent triangulation, peer review, member checking of data, and data analysis software. Concurrent analysis was still used for validation in this qualitative study (Hollins-Martin, Snowden, & Martin, 2012). Lincoln and Guba (1985) considered member checking an essential element in determining credibility because it allows the participants to be more than just bystanders in the case study. Using data analysis software improved trustworthiness because it

allowed all phases of the investigation to be transparent and open to public investigation (Sinkovics & Alforldi, 2012).

Interview questions were vetted through examination and feedback from a five member expert panel (peer review) prior to the beginning of the data collection process for the purpose of validity and reliability. The panel consisted of five juvenile justice practitioners and experts who were executives, directors, and specialists in their respective juvenile probation departments in Texas and Illinois. All were juvenile justice professionals and had expert knowledge in the juvenile justice field. They reviewed the interview questions based on a validation rubric given to them that was retrieved from the Internet (Appendix G). Criteria used for review included the following characteristics: clarity, wordiness, negative wording, overlapping responses, balance, and use of jargon and appropriateness of responses. The criteria incorporated operational definitions, scoring using a Likert scale, and identifying questions not meeting standard and needing to be revised (with comments).

Member checking was also used throughout the study to ensure validity and accuracy because it was a valid means to achieve rigor and could be used to ensure that the themes were reviewed by the study participants, in alignment with Morse (2015). The participants for this qualitative case study reviewed their interview transcripts for accuracy to ensure validity. Transcripts were returned to participants within two to five days of the interview for their review. All participants were given five days to review and revise their transcript for accuracy. All but two of the participants returned their

transcripts within the 5-day period. The late return of the last two transcripts by participants was due to the illness of one participant and a preplanned vacation on the part of the second participant.

Trustworthiness in a study was essential and has been defined as "the extent to which research findings can be trusted" (Creswell, 2012, p. 27). Trustworthiness can be guaranteed by using member checking, the researcher's position, and the audit trail. I used data analysis software because it enhances trustworthiness, is auditable, and allows for transparency. An audio recorder was also used during data collection to ensure accuracy. The files were organized in folders and stored on a portable disk drive and laptop in the file cabinet in my home; only I have access to these files. To enhance the level of confidentiality, I assigned numbers to each participant. Upon completion of the study and after five years of doctoral-study publication, all related artifacts will be destroyed.

Summary

In conclusion, this section began with an introduction to the findings that included the research questions. A description of the data collection and analysis process was followed by a section on the findings. In the findings, research design was discussed along with the findings alignment with the research questions. Discrepant cases and nonconforming data were discussed followed by a section on overlapping data, which included patterns, relationships, and themes in the findings. Evidence of trustworthiness was addressed in the last section and followed by this summary. In Section 5, I discuss

key findings of this study, any limitations and implications, future recommendations, and applications.

Section 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The primary purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine how a juvenile probation department coordinated services to address the needs of incarcerated juveniles who were at risk of school failure and recidivism. This case study was set in a large urban juvenile probation department in Texas that included a detention center and three placement facilities belonging to the juvenile department. For the purpose of this study, I interviewed juvenile justice practitioners who were directly involved with incarcerated youth in the areas of administration, education, and behavior intervention.

The findings indicated several key points. First, the SCJPD personalized educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism through:

- a state licensed charter school,

- certified and highly qualified teachers,

- a state recognized curriculum, and

- small classroom settings with additional staff for more specialized educational support.

Second, this juvenile probation department provided all youth a research and evidenced-based individualized behavior modification program that was known as Behavior Intervention Therapy (IBT). Third, these services addressed school failure and recidivism for these incarcerated juveniles allowing them to experience success in academics and

behavior that could result in long-term success once they were released. These multidisciplinary services incorporated the collaboration of behavior specialists, educators, caseworkers, therapist, and all staff involved with each youth in any given day. The program provided youth with skills to interact with their peers and others responsibly by helping them to understand accountability and responsibility. Finally, the staff at the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department (SCJPD; pseudonym) had knowledge of and perceived that the department was successfully addressing school failure and recidivism through a collaboration of services and operated as a team for the success of the youth they served. This was mentioned repeatedly throughout the interviews.

Interpretation of the Findings

Findings confirm and extend knowledge in the area of addressing the education and behavioral needs of incarcerated youth who were at risk of school failure and recidivism. This juvenile probation department has shown that personalized education services and behavior modification programs, with trained and qualified staff can provide a platform for this population of youth to be successful. The study data showed that implementing their multidisciplinary behavior modification approach was associated with decreases in school failure and recidivism.

The U.S. Department of Justice states that providing juvenile delinquents a quality education is likely to reduce their involvement with the juvenile justice system (Bloomberg, Bloomberg, Waldo, Pesta, & Bellows, 2006). To ensure that the juveniles in this juvenile probation department were receiving a quality education, the department

created a public charter school under the jurisdiction of the Texas Education Agency. Under these guidelines, certified teachers were hired to teach the core courses (math, science, social studies, and ELA) and electives.

Many youth in the juvenile justice system have experienced consistent failure, with a history of failure in school and consistent negative behavior (Hess & Drowns, 2009). The collaboration of education and behavioral services addressed school failure and recidivism in a holistic approach. Services from both departments were individualized for each youth and staff worked together to ensure there were no gaps by including services from other departments (psychological and medical), if needed. This holistic approach resulted in improvements in behavior and academics for many of these youth. Just as important, the staff in the juvenile department perceived that these services were addressing school failure and recidivism.

Finally, this juvenile department saw a decrease in school failure and recidivism since the implementation of these programs. This may have been a major reason why agencies and organizations that worked with youth offenders placed a strong emphasis on academic and educational programming (Leon, Nelson, & Rutherford, 2004). Research has shown that rehabilitation of these youth is the most economical method to ensure they remained outside of the juvenile justice system and become productive citizens (Kaiser, 2010).

Conceptual Framework

Maslow's hierarchy of needs framework states that each person is motivated by needs that were inborn (Maslow, 1970). The hierarchy of needs framework attempted to explain how human needs motivated individual behavior (Appendix H). There are certain basic needs that must be satisfied that focus on survival, and once those needs are met, higher-order needs come into play that center on such things as influence and personal development. Conversely, higher-order needs do not come into play without the satisfaction of basic needs. Delinquent youth whose basic needs are unfulfilled may then attempt to fulfill higher order needs in ways that are inappropriate. Given opportunities to fulfill the human needs (academically and socially) in more appropriate ways could be very beneficial to these youth. The SCJPD addressed the basic needs of these youth by providing a broad assessment on all youth that enter the department. Regardless of whether the needs were medical, psychological, or educational, needs were addressed through in-house doctors and nurses, a large psychological staff and state mandated education services. These different entities collaborate for the overall betterment of the youth. Addressing these needs allowed the juvenile youth to be able to focus on things that would improve their life so they could be successful. Excerpts from the data illustrated this.

Moffitt's (1993) developmental classification was the other conceptual framework for this study. Moffitt's (1993) developmental classification theory identifies two distinct courses for offending: the limited offender and the chronic offender. Early

demonstrations of antisocial behavior could result in instability and continual negative behavior if not addressed. Negative behavior over a lifetime made these youth more susceptible to adult criminal behavior. Her findings indicated that most delinquents were limited offenders and therefore, had short criminal histories (Appendix I). Much of this belief was based on Moffitt's theories that combine genetics with socialization, which created the idea that children were born with neuropsychological deficits. Moffit's (DATE) theory was that brain development can be compromised in the womb because of a variety of factors. Though these deficits do not lead to antisocial or criminal behavior, they can lead to problem behaviors, poor socialization, or harsher discipline from parents as a reaction to the child's difficult behavior (Cullen & Jonson, 2012).

For this reason, delinquency prevention programs should reinforce the parent child bonding as a means of preventing delinquent behavior. This probation department recognized and acknowledged research and evidenced-based practices; and what works for one child does not necessarily work for all youth. Therefore, individualization of services was an important piece in addressing the development of these youth. Trying to understand individual triggers, as well as incentives that work with each youth was a major piece to the puzzle. Recognizing this they hired behavior specialists at each placement facility who do just that. They worked with supervision staff, teachers, caseworkers, and therapist – holistically - to develop individualized programs for each youth. This again was shown in the data or findings during analysis.

Implications for Social Change

The ability to address the needs of youth involved with the juvenile justice system remains a major challenge to all who are involved in this arena (Dowdell & Craig, 2008). The potential for positive social change as a result of the impact of this and future studies is broad for incarcerated youth in danger of school failure and recidivism. For the youth in this juvenile probation department, learning to understand themselves, as well as understanding what triggers cause them to react negatively, was important. The education and behavioral services staff collaborated to provide these youth with daily opportunities to improve their behavior that could result in positive social change. The juvenile learned to recognize, assess, and alter negative behavior through the IBT program both during and outside of the school day.

The support and encouragement of the residential and education staff were important to their success. In addition, if other services are needed (i.e. medical, psychological), a more holistic approach was implemented. As the juveniles' behavior and social skills improved, so did their success in the classroom. This was because they were able to participate in their learning. The advantages of these classrooms were they were smaller and tutoring was available. Additionally, students were provided special education and ESL services, if needed. Education credits earned while incarcerated were accepted at their home schools so they were not behind. After completion of the behavior program, these youth had gained a tool kit of positive options of responding to negative triggers. In the end, they understood that they were responsible for their actions.

The positive social change resulting from this behavior program was that juveniles were accountable in how they interacted with their peers, adults, and in the school setting. This was an advantage for the youth and the juvenile probation department. It was an advantage for the youth because they could experience success in social and educational settings. This means they were less likely to experience less behavioral infractions. The advantage for this juvenile department was knowledge that the programs they used enabled juvenile youth to be successful after they were released and resulted in less recidivism of the same youth. The benefit for the community was a decrease in juvenile crimes and having youth who were able to contribute in a positive way to their communities. Graduating from high school, maintaining a job, and accepting their role as responsible and accountable adults were beneficial for everyone. This perception was shared overall by the participants.

Organizationally, juvenile probation departments that are trying to rehabilitate incarcerated youth and focused on positive social change would have research based programs to explore that have been successful in helping incarcerated juveniles with educational and behavioral needs. Juvenile probation departments would be encouraged to develop better skills at implementing programs or services that address the individual needs of incarcerated youth who were at risk of school failure and recidivism. Additionally, juvenile probation staff willing to work collaboratively would see more positive results with the youth they served by using evidenced-based practices. More

positive results for the juvenile probation departments in rehabilitating incarcerated youth or juveniles would be beneficial for the society, as well.

There is a significant cost involved in keeping youth incarcerated. But when juvenile probation departments are able to address the specific needs of these youth it can be cost saving. The results indicated positive social changes resulting from education and behavioral services utilizing a holistic and collaborative approach to address school failure and recidivism can have positive results for juvenile youth. Programs that resulted in a decrease in school failure and recidivism among juveniles would also have a positive impact on the cost of incarcerating youth (McCollum, 2011). Serendipity Juvenile Probation department has shown that the creation of a public charter school that offers quality instruction through individualized assessments, small groupings, and special services (special education, 504, and ESL) can be beneficial to incarcerated youth when behavior is addressed simultaneously. Helping these youth improve academically while incarcerated could result in long-term success once they were released (Henry, Knight, & Thornberry, 2012).

Providing juvenile youth with the opportunity to correct negative behavior by understanding the behavior and their options is important and promotes positive social changes. Improving opportunities to graduate from high school or getting a GED are also important. This allows the youth to become a responsible adult capable of holding and keeping a job instead of a statistic for unemployment or public assistance (Sturgill, 2011). Creating a collaboration of services supported by the juvenile department staff that

provided a holistic and multidisciplinary approach has proven to be successful for the youth in this juvenile probation department. Much of this is due to juvenile staff teamwork – residential, education, therapist, and medical - providing the encouragement and positive support that these youth need to become rehabilitated. Ultimately, the rehabilitation of these youth results in a sense of public safety for society and positive social changes (Steurer, Linton, Nally, & Lockwood, 2010).

Recommendations for Action

Serendipity Juvenile Probation Department uses a holistic approach to address the needs of their incarcerated youth through a research and evidence-based program they developed. The reason this juvenile probation department changed the way they formerly addressed school failure and recidivism among this population of youth was to move toward more individualized services. The department wanted to provide more individualized services in these areas because they understood that all youth were not the same. Youth have different trigger points and respond differently to incentives. Other juvenile departments could learn from this approach.

Based on the results of this study, it is important that all juvenile probation departments address negative behavior and school failure for incarcerated youth. Negative behavior was normally why many youth come to a juvenile probation department. Many of these youth were academically behind in school because they did not attend school regularly prior to being detained.

The use of evidence-based programs to address behavior could be significant in improving the negative behavior of a juvenile youth. In addition to behavior modification programs, education services were also important in the rehabilitation of juvenile youth. The results show the education and behavior staff who collaborated on the individual needs and services of juvenile youth would have the most constructive results in working with juvenile youth.

In addition, assessing the individual needs of all youth entering a juvenile probation department was key to determining the needs of each youth. This allowed the department to individualize services for each youth, resulting in the right services. Services that were typical and were applied equally to all youth were only benefiting certain youth and not others. This means the problems those youth entered with were not being addressed.

Involving all areas of the juvenile department (education, medical, psychological, supervision, behavior specialist, field probation) in the improvement of educational and behavioral needs of juvenile youth was important because it encouraged departmental collaboration and support. When developing a plan of action for a juvenile youth's success, it is important that everyone involved with that youth is on the same page. Everyone working together resulted in a more holistic approach for the overall success of the youth both while incarcerated and once they were released to go home. This was shown in the results of this research study.

The results of this study should cause all juvenile probation departments to examine the services they were providing to their juvenile population, especially the younger juvenile population. This study should be shared with juvenile probation departments in search of evidenced-based studies that focus on programs that work. In addition, juvenile departments that have not addressed the concept of collaboration of services and teamwork within their department should review the results of this study. Finally, the results of this research study should be disseminated among juvenile probation departments, juvenile practitioners, and juvenile justice professional organizations and associations. This would affirm juvenile probation departments that are successful in addressing recidivism and school failure with their juvenile populations. The results should also challenge those juvenile probation departments that are not addressing these needs with the juvenile population.

Recommendations for Future Study

Regardless of how many research studies are available on addressing school failure and recidivism with juvenile youth, having current research and evidenced-based options to review is always an advantage for juvenile probation departments. This is because what may work for one juvenile probation department may not work for another, since they are all different. One recommendation for a future study would be to review the percentage of the youth (between 10 and 13 years of age) entering this probation department in 2014 and completing intensive services (behavioral and educational) and are still recidivating and at risk of school failure two years later.

A second recommendation for a future study would be to examine if the perceptions of the staff (Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department) have remained the same in regards to services addressing recidivism and school failure after two years, since the present services have only been used a few years. A third consideration for a future study would be to examine the present collaboration of services (residential and education) with a closer examination of the part mental health services contributed to this collaboration. Finally, this study could be the basis for an additional study to examine changes in the design of this juvenile probation department since one participant's comments noted that the design of the department was to address the needs of the older juvenile population.

Since this study focused on services for younger juveniles, the department may reconsider its original design and make appropriate changes. As seen in this study, younger juveniles were provided more intensive services in hopes of decreasing their risk of recidivism and school failure. In conclusion, current research helped to ensure that when addressing the educational and behavioral needs of this population of youth, best practices were the standard.

Summary

The research study opened my eyes to the different areas of this juvenile probation department that I may have never considered as a focus. I also learned a lot about the people who work in these subsets (education, residential, and administration). Reviewing the data of the different subsets overall confirmed several things. First, it

confirmed that the juvenile staff genuinely cared about delinquent youth. Many spoke of a personal commitment to help these youth become successful in life. After years of working in this juvenile probation department, I have seen staff come and go, but felt that the staff who remained were there because they wanted to make a difference. Second, I was somewhat surprised but pleased at how open many of the participants were with their perceptions, especially those who had negative perceptions or constructive criticism.

Even though I followed the protocol and reassured all the participants of confidentiality, I did not know if they would trust me enough to discuss any negative perceptions. Some participants felt comfortable enough to share things they did not agree with and some of the comments or concerns were valid and could lead to open conversations and possible changes that may result in even better programs for juvenile youth. I avoided any personal biases by sticking to the prescribed protocol. I avoided any preconceived ideas and kept my values to myself because I wanted to be open to the participants' responses, ideas, and perceptions to ensure an experience rich study.

The SCJPD incorporated risk and needs assessment tools to gather and combine information about delinquent youth to determine their risks of recidivism, educational needs, mental health, and medical needs and to identify factors that, if treated, could reduce the likelihood of reoffending (Lipsey, 2014; Vincent, Guy, & Grisso, 2012). In addition, behavioral family therapy programs provide the youth and their families' skill building training because the family is key in child development (Gurman & Kniskern, 2014).

This juvenile probation department illustrated that positive social change can occur through positive youth development programs, constructive and long term, changes can occur. By focusing on positive protective factors or attributes of youth and adolescents, juvenile probation departments can encourage positive change in delinquent youth. Finally, recognizing and addressing the multilayered relationships, in which the youth were involved – family, school, and community – provided a platform where positive social change could occur (Lerner, Napolitano, Boyd, Mueller, & Callina, 2013). Working with the youth on these different layers of relationships at the same time improved their chances of success after release from juvenile placement. Improved behavior on the part of the juvenile minimized the chance for recidivism and increased their opportunities for remaining in school, which was the juvenile department's ultimate goal.

References

Almquist, L., & Dodd, E. (2009). *Mental health courts: A guide to research-informed policy and practice*. New York: Council of State Governments, Justice Center.

Angelo, A. L. (2006). Competency development and evidence-based programs in the juvenile justice system. *Corrections Today, 68*(6), 19-20.

Badejo, F. M. (2011). *A case study of student achievement in a secondary charter school*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3458387)

Baffour, T. (2006). Ethnic and gender differences in offending patterns: Examining family group conferencing Interventions among at-risk adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 23*(5), 557-577.

Baird, C., Healy, T., Johnson, K., Bogie, A., Dankert, E. W., & Scharenbroch, C. (2013). *A comparison of risk assessment instruments in juvenile justice.* Madison, WI: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Barnes, G.M., Hoffman, J.H., Welte, J.W., Farrell, M P., & Dintcheff, B. A.(2006). Effects of parental monitoring and peer deviance on substance use and delinquency. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*(4), 1084-1104.

Barrett, D. E., Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., & Zhang, D. (2014). A structural equation modeling analysis of influences on juvenile delinquency. *Behavioral Disorders*, *39*(3), 113-127.

Bloomberg, T., Bloomberg, J., Waldo, G., Pesta, G., & Bellows, J. (2006, April).

Juvenile justice education, no child left behind, and the national collaboration

project. *Corrections Today, 68*(2), 143-146.

Bloomberg, T., & Waldo, G. (2001). Implementing research based best practices in

juvenile justice education. *Corrections Today, 63*(7), 144-147.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and

code development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Burris, L.A. (2011). *A case study of differentiated instruction in upper elementary

mathematics and reading classrooms.* Available from ProQuest Dissertations and

Theses database. (UMI No. 3469057).

Carroll, A., Hemingway, F., Bower, J., Ashman, A., Houghton, S., & Durkin, K. (2006).

Impulsivity in juvenile delinquency: Differences among early-onset, late-onset,

and non-offenders. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*(4), 517-527.

Chung, H.L., Little, M., Steinberg, L., & Altschuler, D. (2005, February). *Juvenile justice

and the transition to adulthood* (Policy Brief, Issue 20). Philadelphia, PA:

MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Transitions to Adulthood and Public

Policy.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1981). National assessment of experiential education:

Summary and implications. *Journal of Experiential Education, 4*(2), 6-20.

Crawford, T. N., Cohen, P., Johnson, J. G., Kasen, S., First, M. B., Gordon, K., & Brook,

J. S. (2005). Self-reported personality disorder in the children in the community

sample: convergent and prospective validity in late adolescence and adulthood. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *19*(1), 30-52.

Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Plano, V. L. C., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research designs selection and implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *35*(2), 236-264.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cullen, F. T., & Jonson, C. L. (2014). Labeling theory and correctional rehabilitation: Beyond unanticipated consequences. *Labeling theory: Empirical tests*, 63-88.

da Silva, D. R., Rijo, D., & Salekin, R. T. (2012). Child and adolescent psychopathy: A state-of-the-art reflection on the construct and etiological theories. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(4), 269-277.

DeLisi, M., Neppl, T. K., Lohman, B. J., Vaughn, M. G., & Shook, J. J. (2013). Early starters: Which type of criminal onset matters most for delinquent careers? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 41*(1), 12-17.

DeLisi, M., & Piquero, A. R. (2011). New frontiers in criminal careers research, 2000–2011: A state-of-the-art review. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *39*(4), 289-301.

Dillon, S. (2009, October 8). Study finds high rate of imprisonment among drop-outs. *The New York Times*. A12. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/09/education/09dropout.html?ref=prisonsandprisoners/

Doren, D. (2006). Recidivism risk assessments: Making sense of controversies. *Sexual offender treatment: Controversial issues*, 3-15. New York, NY, US: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, xviii, 282 pp.

Dowdell, J., & Craig, R. (2008). Note from the editors. *Journal of Correctional Education, 59*(2), 64.

Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1984). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books/MIT Press.

Evans-Chase, M., & Zhou, H. (2014). A Systematic review of the juvenile justice intervention literature what it can (and cannot) tell us about what works with delinquent youth. *Crime & Delinquency, 60*(3), 451-470.

Farineau, H. M., & McWey, L. M. (2011). The relationship between extracurricular activities and delinquency of adolescents in foster care. *Children and Youth Services Review, 33*(6), 963-968.

Foley, R. M. (2001). Academic characteristics of incarcerated youth and correctional education programs: A literature review. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 9*, 248-259.

Gagnon, J. C., & Barber, R. R. (2010). Characteristics of and services provided to youth in secure care facilities. *Behavioral Disorders, 36,* 7-19.

Garfinkel, L., & Nelson, R. (2004). Promoting better interaction between juvenile court, schools, and parents. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 13*(1), 26-28.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1998). *The general intelligence factor*. New York, New York. Scientific American, Incorporated.

Griffin, B. A., Ramchand, R., Edelen, M. O., McCaffrey, D. F., & Morral, A. R. (2011). Associations between abstinence in adolescence and economic and educational outcomes seven years later among high-risk youth. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 113*(2), 118-124.

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

Gurman, A. S., & Kniskern, D. P. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of family therapy*. New York, New York:Routledge.

Hamilton, Z., Sullivan, C., Veysey, B., & Grillo, M. (2007). Diverting multi-problem youth from juvenile justice: Investigating the importance of community influence on placement and recidivism. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 25*(1), 137-158.

Hancock, D.R., & Algozzine, R. (2006). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Henggeler, S. W., & Schoenwald, S. K. (2011). Evidence-Based Interventions for

      Juvenile Offenders and Juvenile Justice Policies that Support Them. Social Policy

      Report. Volume 25, Number 1. *Society for Research in Child Development.*

Henry, K. L., Knight, K. E., & Thornberry, T. P. (2012). School disengagement as a

      predictor of dropout, delinquency, and problem substance use during adolescence

      and early adulthood. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, *41*(2), 156-166.

Hess, K., & Drowns, R. (2009*). Juvenile Justice*, (5th ed.).Cengage Learning. 360.

Ho, H., Breaux, J., & Jannetta, J. (2014). Examining Racial Disparities in the Sixth

      Judicial District of Iowa's Probation Revocation Outcomes.

Hockenberry, S., & Puzzanchera, C. (2014). Juvenile Court Statistics, 2011.

Hockenberry, S., Sickmond, M., & Sladky, A., (2011). Juvenile Facility Census, 2008:

      Selected findings. US Department of Justice.

      http://www.ojjdp.gov/publications/PubResults.asp

Hollins Martin, C. J., Snowden, A., & Martin, C. R. (2012). Concurrent analysis:

      validation of the domains within the Birth Satisfaction Scale. *Journal of*

      Reproductive and Infant Psychology, *30*(3), 247-260.

Hong, J. S., Ryan, J. P., Chiu, Y. L., & Sabri, B. (2013). Re-Arrest Among Juvenile

      Justice-Involved Youth: An Examination of the Static and Dynamic Risk Factors.

      Residential Treatment for Children & Youth, *30*(2), 131-148.

Houchins, D. E., Jolivette, K., Shippen, M. E., & Lambert, R. (2010). Advancing high-quality literacy research in juvenile justice: Methodological and practical considerations. *Behavioral Disorders, 36,* 61-69. http://www.ojjdp.gov/publications/PubResults.asp

Huskey, B. L., & Tomczak, P. (2013). Trauma, psychiatric, substance use, and thought disorders among youth in the juvenile justice system and how to deal with them. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *64*(3), 29-40.

Isaack, S. (2011). OERs in Context—Case Study of Innovation and Sustainability of Educational Practices at the University of Mauritius. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, (1).

Janesick, V. J. (2004). *Standards and critical thinking*. na.

Janesick, V. J. (2010). *Oral history for the qualitative researcher: Choreographing the story*. Guilford Press.

Juvenile Recidivism Trends. Data Coordinators Conference Regional Training 2012. http://www.tjjd.texas.gov/statistics/2012

Kaiser, H. A. (2011). Too good to be true: Second thoughts on the proliferation of residential services courts. *Canadian Journal of Community Residential services*, *29*(2), 19-25.

Kaiser, M. (2010, August). Correctional Education, Because It Works. *Corrections Today, 72*(4), 18-20. Retrieved May 30, 2011, from Criminal Justice Periodicals. Document ID: 2117506541.

Ko, S. J., Ford, J. D., Kassam-Adams, N., Berkowitz, S. J., Wilson, C., Wong, M., ... & Layne, C. M. (2008). Creating trauma-informed systems: child welfare, education, first responders, health care, juvenile justice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *39*(4), 396.

Kumpfer, K. L., & Alvarado, R. (2003). Family-strengthening approaches for the prevention of youth problem behaviors. *American Psychologist*, *58*(6-7), 457.

Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research*. Routledge. Leone, P., Krezmien, M., Mason, L., & Meisel, S. (2005). Organizing and delivering empirically based literacy instruction to incarcerated youth. *Exceptionality, 13*(2), 89-102.

Leone, P. E., Nelson, C. M., & Rutherford, R. (2004). Youth delinquency: Prevention and intervention. In *Handbook of research in emotional and behavioral disorders,* 282-301. New York, NY: Guilford.

Leone, P., Krezmien, M., Mason, L., & Meisel, S. (2005). Organizing and delivering empirically based literacy instruction to incarcerated youth. *Exceptionality, 13*(2), 89-102.

Lerner, R., Napolitano, C., Boyd, M., Mueller, M., & Callina, K. (2013). Mentoring and positive youth development. *Handbook of youth mentoring,*, 17-28.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. *Naturalistic inquiry*, *1985*, 289-331.

Lipsey, M. W. (2014). Interventions for Juvenile Offenders: A Serendipitous Journey. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *13*(1), 1-14.

Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2013). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals*. Thousand Oaks, CA:SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Lyons, E., & Coyle, A. (2007). *Analyzing qualitative analysis in psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marcum, C. D., Higgins, G. E., Ricketts, M. L., & Wolfe, S. E. (2014). Hacking in high school: cybercrime perpetration by juveniles. *Deviant Behavior*, *35*(7), 581-591.

Marshall, A., Powell, N., Pierce, D., Nolan, R., & Fehringer, E. (2011). Youth and administrator perspectives on transition in Kentucky's state agency schools. *Child Welfare, 91*(2), 95-116.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maslow, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Maslow, A. H. (1943, July). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50(4)*, 370-396.

Mathur, S. R., Clark, H.G., & Schoenfeld, N.A. (2009, June). Professional development: a capacity-building model for juvenile correctional education systems. *Journal of Correctional Education, 60*(2), 164-185.

Mazzotti, V., & Higgins, K. (2006). Public schools and the juvenile justice system: Facilitating relationships. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 41*(5), 295-301.

McCollum, A. (2011, February 1). *The high cost and harm of juvenile detention centers*. [New Deal 2.0]. Retrieved from http://www.rooseveltinstitute.org/new-roosevelt/high-cost-and-harm-juvenile-detention-centers.

Mendel, R. A. (2009). *Two Decades of JDAI. From Demonstration Project to National Standard.* Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Mendel, R. A. (2011). No Place for Kids: The Case for Reducing Juvenile Incarceration. *Annie E. Casey Foundation*.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Merriam, S. G., & Associates (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mincey, B., Maldonado, N., Lacey, C., & Thompson, S. (2008). Perceptions of successful graduates of juvenile justice programs: Reflections and suggestions for success. *Journal of Correctional Education, 59*(1), 8-31.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *The analysis of interview-narratives* (pp. 233-255). TR Sarbin (Ed.), Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct.

Moffitt, T.E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: a developmental taxonomy. *Psychological review*, *100*(4), 674.

Moffitt, T. E. (2006). *A review of research on the taxonomy of life-course persistent versus adolescence-limited antisocial behavior* (Vol. 15, p. 277). Taking stock: The status of criminological theory.

Moore, T., McArthur, M., & Saunders, V. (2013). Young people talk about transitioning from youth detention to the community: Making good. *Australian Social Work*, *66*(3), 328-343.

Moreno, P. (2008). *Incarcerated Youths Get a Second Chance with CTE. Techniques.* (2008, February). Retrieved from http://www.acteonline.org.

Morse, J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative health research*, *25*(9), 1212-1222.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Nuoffer, M. (2011). *A Case Study on Positive and Relational Discipline Techniques* (Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3444981)

O'Cummings, M., Bardack, S., & Gonsoulin, S. (2010). *Issue Brief: The Importance of Literacy for Youth Involved in the Juvenile Justice System*. Washington, DC: National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk (NDTAC).

Retrieved from http://www.neglected-

delinquent.org/nd/docs/literacy_brief_20100120.pdf.

Ore, W., & Baird, C. (2014). Beyond Risk and Needs Assessments.

PEW Center on the States. (2008). *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*.

Washington, DC: The PEW Charitable Trusts. Retrieved from

http://www.pewtrust.org.

Porter, R., Rempel, M., & Mansky, A. (2010). *What makes a court problem solving?*

Universal performance indicators for problem-solving justice. Center for the

Court Innovation.

Puzzanchera, C., & Adams, B. (2011). Juvenile arrests 2009. Office of juvenile justice

and delinquency prevention.

Ramchand, R., Morral, A. R., & Becker, K. (2009). Seven-year life outcomes of

adolescent offenders in Los Angeles. *American Journal of Public Health*, *99*(5),

863-870.

Read, N., & O'Cummings, M. (2010). *Fact sheet: juvenile justice facilities*. Washington,

DC: National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of

Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk (NDTAC).

Retrieved from http://www.neglected delinquent.org/nd/docs/fact

Sheet_facilities.pdf

Redlich, A. D., Liu, S., Steadman, H. J., Callahan, L., & Robbins, P. C. (2012). Is diversion swift? Comparing residential services court and traditional criminal justice processing. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *39*(4), 420-433.

Remrey, L. (2014). Correlates of early vs. late onset criminality: a life-course and self-control theory analysis. *2014 National Conference of Undergraduate Research*.

Risler, E., & O'Rourke, T. (2009). Thinking exit at entry: Exploring outcomes of Georgia's juvenile justice educational programs. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 225-239.

Robbins, M. S., Feaster, D. J., Horigian, V. E., Rohrbaugh, M., Shoham, V., Bachrach, K., ... & Vandermark, N. (2011). Brief strategic family therapy versus treatment as usual: results of a multisite randomized trial for substance using adolescents. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *79*(6), 713..

Roush, D. W., Brazeal, M., & Church, W., II. (2014). Juvenile Detention. *Juvenile justice sourcebook*, 193.

Ryan, J. P., Abrams, L. S., & Huang, H. (2014). First-time violent juvenile offenders: probation, placement, and recidivism. *Social Work Research,* svu004.

Rubin, H. J., Rubin, I.S. (2011). *Qualitative Interviewing: the art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Schwalbe, C. S., Hatcher, S. S., & Maschi, T. (2009). The effects of treatment needs and prior social services use on juvenile court decision making. *Social Work Research*, *33*(1), 31-40.

Sedlak, A. J., & Bruce, C. (2010). Youth's Characteristics and Backgrounds: Findings

from the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement. Juvenile Justice Bulletin.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Sedlak, A., & McPherson, K. S. (2010). *Survey of youth in residential placement: Youth's

needs and services*. Washington, DC: Westat.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (2nd ed.) New York, NY:

Teachers.

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department. (2011). *2011 JDAI annual report of

the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department*. ▮▮▮▮▮. Donette

Reil Print & Design.Volume 3, Issue 3, July 2011

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department. (2012). *2011 annual report of the

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department*. ▮▮▮▮▮. Donette Reil

Print & Design.

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department. (2013). 2012 *annual report of the

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department*. ▮▮▮▮▮. Donette Reil

Print & Design.

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department, (2014). 2014 *annual report of the

Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department*. ▮▮▮▮▮. Donette Reil

Print & Design.

Shook, J. J. (2005). Contesting childhood in the US justice system: The transfer of juveniles to adult criminal court. *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research, 12*(4), 461-478. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Singh, J. P., Desmarais, S. L., & Van Dorn, R. A. (2013). Measurement of predictive validity in violence risk assessment studies: A second-order systematic review. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 31*(1), 55-73.

Sinkovics, R. R., & Alfoldi, E. A. (2012). Progressive focusing and trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Management International Review, 52*(6), 817-845.

Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 National report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stake, R. E.(1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage

Stephenson, R., Cohen, M., Montagnet, C., Bobnis, A., Gies, S., & Yeide, M. (2014). *Model programs guide implementation guides: background and user perspectives on implementing evidence-based programs*. Retrieved from http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/implementations/ImplementationGuides.pdf

Steurer, S., Linton, J., Nally, J., & Lockwood, S. (2010, August). The Top Nine Reasons to Increase Correctional Education Programs. *Corrections Today 72*(4), 40-43.

Retrieved May 30, 2011, from Criminal Justice Periodicals. Document ID: 2117506621.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sturgill, R. (2011). Improving high school completion through a community-based reentry program for previously incarcerated juveniles: findings from a case study. *Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration 2011 Yearbook: Leading in the Decade*, 47. http://srcea.info/Find_SRCEA_Journal_Fall[1].pdf#page+56

Sullivan, C. J., & Latessa, E. J. (2011). The coproduction of outcomes: An integrated assessment of youth and program effects on recidivism. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice,* 9(3), 191-206. doi:10.1177/1541204010393754

Tajima, E. A., Herrenkohl, T. I., Moylan, C. A., & Derr, A. S. (2011). Moderating the effects of childhood exposure to intimate partner violence: The roles of parenting characteristics and adolescent peer support. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *21*(2), 376-394.

Teitelman, R. B., & Linhares, G. J. (2012). Juvenile detention reform in Missouri: improving lives, improving public safety, and saving money. *Albany Law Review,*, *76*, 2011.

Texas System of Care 2011. http://www.txsystemofcare.org/about-us/; retrieved 9/27/14

Trulson, C. R., Marquart, J. W., Mullings, J. L., & Caeti, T. J. (2005). In between adolescence and adulthood recidivism outcomes of a cohort of state delinquents. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 3*(4), 355-387.

Vacca, J. (2008). Crime can be prevented if schools teach juvenile offenders to read. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*(9), 1055-1062.

Vincent, G. M., Guy, L. S., & Grisso, T. (2012). Risk assessment in juvenile justice: A guidebook for implementation. http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1601&context=psychcmhsr

Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A: Interview Instrument

Research Questions

RQ 1:
How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

RQ 2:
What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?

RQ 3:
How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

Interview Questions

1. Describe how education services are offered to incarcerated youth?

2. Explain how these education services are individualized for these youth?

3. What is your perception on how education services address school failure for 10 – 13 year old youth?

4. What is your perception on how education services addresses recidivism for 10 – 13 year old youth?

5. Describe how education services collaborate with other divisions for these services?

6. Describe the behavior modification program offered to youth in placement?

7. Explain how the behavior modification program is individualized for these youth?

8. Describe how you perceive behavior modification addresses school failure for 10-13-year-old youth?

9. Describe how you perceive behavior modification addresses recidivism for 10-to-13-year-old youth?

10. Describe how residential services collaborate with other divisions for these services?

11. What changes, if any, have you perceived in school failure and recidivism for 10-13-year-old youth because of a collaboration of these services?

12. In reviewing your annual reports for 2012 and 2014, the percentage of youth admitted to your detention center by age is as follows:

2012	2014	
10 year olds @ 0.4%	10 year olds @ 0.4%	(same)
11 year olds @ 1.0%	11 year olds @ 0.7%	(-0.3)
12 year olds @ 3.2%	12 year olds @ 2.6%	(-0.6)
13 year olds @ 8.7%	13 year olds @ 7.8%	(-0.9)

How would you explain the percentage differences in those two annual reports?

13. Based on those same reports, in what ways do you perceive that these differences have impacted school failure?

14. What is your perception of how collaboration of services (residential/education) has made a difference in regards to school failure or recidivism?

Appendix B: Consent Form

You are invited to take part in a research study of ***"Addressing School Failure and Recidivism among 10 -13 Year Old Incarcerated Juveniles: A Case Study."*** The researcher is inviting the Administration (Executive Director and/or Assistant Executive Director), Education Services (Deputy Director of Education Services and principals), and Residential Services (Deputy Director of Residential Services, superintendents and behavior specialists) of the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department to be in the study. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named ***Beverly A. Nolan***, who is a doctoral student at Walden University. You may already know the researcher as a staff member, but this study is separate from that role.

Background Information:

This case study will examine how an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalizes educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program.

Procedures:

- If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to participate in a face-to-face interview in a mutually determined space that will last 60-75 minutes.
- If you agree to be in this study, you will be given a false name or pseudonym.
- If you agree to be in this study you, will have an opportunity to review your responses to the interview questions and make changes or revisions.

Here are some sample questions:

1. Describe how education services are offered to incarcerated youth??
2. Explain how the behavior modification program is individualized for these youth?

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you choose to be in the study. No one at Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to join the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as using your personal time or fatigue. Being in this study would not pose risk to your safety or well-being.

The potential benefits of the study:

Identifying effective services and behavior modification program for delinquent youth who are chronic offenders can be critical to their successful return to their home schools, a positive change in behavior, and decreasing the public outcry for safety and public policy concerning these youth.

- Being in this project might result in indicating the advantages and disadvantages of education and behavior intervention programs.
- As staff, you have personal experience with at least one of these programs.
- This project might also help others by providing evidence that some education and behavior intervention programs work better with younger juveniles who are in juvenile placement facilities.
- Being a part of this project allows your input and contribution

Payment:

There is no financial or material compensation involved in this research study.

Privacy:

Any information you provide will be kept confidential. I will not use your personal information for any purposes outside of this research project. In addition, I will not include your name or anything else that could identify you in the study reports. Confidentiality will be maintained for the research participants by not disclosing or releasing any information and exercising properly authorized methods throughout the study, to include keeping all notes and data secure. Additionally, confidentiality will be maintained for the research participants through the following methods: no disclosure or discussion of any confidential information with others, or divulgence, copying, releasing, selling, and destroying of any confidential information except as properly authorized More detailed information can be found in the

confidentiality agreement. The age of the participants is not important because they are adults. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via 409-781-6542. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is 612-312-1210 (for US based participants). Walden University's approval number for this study is **03-01-16-0082763** and it expires on **February 28, 2017.**

I will give you a copy of this form to keep. (Face-to-face interviews)

Obtaining Your Consent:

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. Please indicate your consent by signing below.

Only include the signature section below if using paper consent forms. (Face-to-face interview)

Date of consent   _____

Participant's Signature   _____

Researcher's Signature   _____

Appendix C: Confidentiality Agreement

Name of Signer: _____

During the course of my activity in collecting data for this research:
"Addressing School Failure and Recidivism among 10 -13 Year Old Incarcerated Juveniles: A Case Study."

I will have access to information that is confidential and should not be disclosed. I acknowledge that the information must remain confidential, and that improper disclosure of confidential information can be damaging to the participant.

By signing this Confidentiality Agreement I acknowledge and agree that:

1. I will not disclose or discuss any confidential information with others, including friends or family.
2. I will not in any way divulge, copy, release, sell, loan, alter, or destroy any confidential information except as properly authorized.
3. I will not discuss confidential information where others can overhear the conversation. I understand that it is not acceptable to discuss confidential information even if the participant's name is not used.
4. I will not make any unauthorized transmissions of, inquiries about or modifications to or purge confidential information.
5. I agree that my obligations under this agreement will continue after termination of the job that I will perform.
6. I understand that violation of this agreement will have legal implications.
7. I will access or use only systems or devices that I'm officially authorized to access, and I will not demonstrate the operation or function of systems or devices to unauthorized individuals.

Signing this document, I acknowledge that I have read the agreement and I agree to

comply with all the terms and conditions stated above.

Signature:

_____**Date:**_____

Appendix D: Letter of Cooperation Community Partner

Executive Director
Chief Juvenile Probation Officer

Deputy Director

Assistant Deputy Director

E-Fax

TO: Beverly S. Nolan, Doctoral Candidate
           Walden University

FROM: ████████████████████████
           Research Review Committee

RE: Research Request

DATE: June 30, 2015

This correspondence is to give formal notice that review of the research proposal you submitted entitled *"Addressing School Failure and Recidivism Among 10 -13 Year Old Incarcerated Juveniles: A Case Study"* has been completed. The research proposal was approved through the ████ County Juvenile Probation Research Review Committee and Executive Director. With these approvals along with your agreement to follow ████ research guidelines, you may now commence this research project.

As a member of the ████ staff, it is assumed that you are familiar with administrative structure, personnel, protocol and policy such that you are able to access subjects and data requisite to the research. It is also assumed that the Deputy Director of Education Services is aware and supportive of this research endeavor. I will continue to be the point of contact for any research related questions you may have or issues that may occur. Please note that if during the course of this research there is a need to make significant modifications to the research methodology, the change(s) must be approved prior to implementation. And lastly, ████ respectfully request to review and approve the findings (i.e., or any related reports) of this research project prior to formal dissemination.

I wish you well in conducting this research. Kindly keep me informed as the research progresses. I look forward to receiving copies of any briefs/reports generated from this research on behalf of ███ County Juvenile Probation for review.

A BALANCED APPROACH TO JUVENILE JUSTICE

Appendix E: Letter of Recruitment

WHO I AM?

Hello, my name is Beverly Nolan, and I am doing a research project: "***Addressing School Failure and Recidivism among 10 -13 Year Old Incarcerated Juveniles: A Case Study.***"

The research questions are:

RQ 1:
How does an urban juvenile probation department in Texas personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

RQ 2:
What are the residential, education, and executive staff's perceptions on addressing school failure and recidivism among incarcerated juveniles between the ages of 10 to 13?

RQ 3:
How do division staff collaborate to provide educational services and behavioral modifications to youth at risk of school failure and recidivism?

I am inviting you to join my project. I am a student at Walden University working on my doctoral degree. I work for ███████ County Juvenile Probation Department in the Training and Quality Assurance Unit.

It is important for me to understand how educational services and behavior modification in large juvenile probation departments personalize educational and behavioral services for incarcerated youth between the ages of 10 and 13 who are at risk of school failure and recidivism before and after implementation of the coordinated program. This project will help me to determine this. Your participation will be very important in providing input into the project.

WHAT IS THE PROJECT?

Only principals, superintendents, behavior specialists, and deputy directors over the Education and Residential Services Divisions and the executive director (or assistant executive director) of the Serendipity County Juvenile Probation Department are being selected to take part in the interviews.
- Principals work directly with the education services provided to these youth.
- Behavior Specialists provide the behavior modification.

- Superintendents oversee juvenile staff that supervises the youth and enforce the behavior modification program in the facilities.
- Deputies have oversight of their division's specific programs.
- Executives have oversight over all programs within the juvenile department
- The interviews for the sample group will be face-to-face in a predetermined space and will last 60-75.
- All questions are intended to determine your perception of how the education program and behavior intervention services impact the juveniles incarcerated in the detention center and residential placement campuses.
- Your identity will remain confidential both in the interview instruments.
- Individuals participating in the interview process will be given a false name or pseudonym.
- Individuals participating in the interview process will have an opportunity to review your responses to the interview questions and make changes or revisions.
- Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may decline to participate without harm or penalty.

If you choose to be in this research project, you will ALSO be asked to:

- Answer all questions honestly and to the best of your ability

IT'S YOUR CHOICE:

You do not have to be in this project (interviews) if you don't want to. If you decide now that you want to join the project, you can still change your mind later. If you want to skip some parts of the interview, just tell me.

Being in this project might result in indicating that some aspects of the educational and behavior intervention services are beneficial and some not so beneficial. But this project might help others by providing evidence that some educational and behavioral programs work better with juveniles in detention and placement facilities; especially younger juveniles.

There is no financial or material compensation involved in this research study.

PRIVACY:

Everything you tell me during this project will be kept private. That means that no one else will know your name or what answers you gave. The same is true for the interview participants. The only time I will have to tell someone is if I learn about something that could hurt you or someone else.

BENEFITS OF STUDY:
- Being in this project might result in indicating the advantages and disadvantages of education and behavior intervention programs.

- As staff, you have personal experience with at least one of these programs.

- This project might also help others by providing evidence that some education and behavior intervention programs work better with younger juveniles who are in juvenile placement facilities.

- Being a part of this project allows your input and contribution

PRIVACY:

Everything you tell me during this project will be kept private. That means that no one else will know your name or what answers you gave. The only time I have to tell someone is if I learn about something that could hurt you or someone else.
If you choose to be in this research project, you will ALSO be asked to:

- Answer all questions honestly and to the best of your ability.

HOW TO BE CONSIDERED AS A PARTICIPANT:

Interviews:
A letter of recruitment will be emailed to you. Reply to the email that you are willing to participate in the interview process. You will be contacted about a time to meet and discuss the entire project study. At the conclusion of this meeting you can decide if you want to participate in the study or not. After meeting with potential interview participants, all necessary paperwork will be provided to be signed by the participants. I will provide my contact information for participants with questions, concerns or interest after my visit.

My name is Beverly Nolan and I am a student at Walden University working on my doctoral degree in Administrative Leadership for Teaching and Learning.
You may contact me at 409-781-6542. Email: Beverly.nolan@waldenu.edu
I have read the Letter of Recruitment and I am interested in learning more about the research project described above.

Appendix F: Interview Validation Rubric for Expert Panel

Survey/Interview Validation Rubric for Expert Panel - VREP©
By Marilyn K. Simon with input from Jacquelyn White

Criteria	Operational Definitions	Score 1=Not Acceptable (major modifications needed) 2=Below Expectations (some modifications needed) 3=Meets Expectations (no modifications needed but could be improved with minor changes) 4=Exceeds Expectations (no modifications needed)				Questions NOT meeting standard (List page and question number) and need to be revised. *Please use the comments and suggestions section to recommend revisions.*
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	
Clarity	• The questions are direct and specific. • Only one question is asked at a time. • The participants can understand what is being asked. • There are no *double-barreled* questions (two questions in one).					
Wordiness	• Questions are concise. • There are no unnecessary words					
Negative Wording	• Questions are asked using the affirmative (e.g., Instead of asking, "Which methods					

	are not used?" the researcher asks, "Which methods *are* used?")					
Overlapping Responses	• No response covers more than one choice. • All possibilities are considered. • There are no ambiguous questions.					
Balance	• The questions are unbiased and do not lead the participants to a response. The questions are asked using a neutral tone.					
Use of Jargon	• The terms used are understandable by the target population. • There are no clichés or hyperbole in the wording of the questions.					
Appropriate ness of Responses Listed	• The choices listed allow participants to respond appropriately. • The responses apply to all situations or offer a way for those to respond with unique situations.					
Use of Technical Language	• The use of technical language is minimal and appropriate. • All acronyms are					

	defined.					
Application to Praxis	• The questions asked relate to the daily practices or expertise of the potential participants.					
Relationship to Problem	• The questions are sufficient to resolve the problem in the study • The questions are sufficient to answer the research questions. • The questions are sufficient to obtain the purpose of the study.					

http://dissertationrecipes.com/

* The operational definition should include the domains and constructs that are being investigated. You need to assign meaning to a variable by specifying the activities and operations necessary to measure, categorize, or manipulate the variable For example, to measure the construct *successful aging* the following domains could be included: degree of physical disability (low number); prevalence of physical performance (high number), and degree of cognitive impairment (low number). If you were to measure creativity, this construct is generally recognized to consist of flexibility, originality, elaboration, and other concepts. Prior studies can be helpful in establishing the domains of a construct.

Appendix G: Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs