

**Fiscal Year
2010**

DYS Comprehensive Education Partnership Report:

**A System-wide Approach for Providing
High Quality Education to DYS Clients**

Massachusetts

Department of Youth Services

Massachusetts

Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

December 1, 2010

Executive Summary	3
I. Engaging Teaching and Learning Supported by High Quality Professional Development Initiative	4
DYS Approach To Teaching and Learning	
• DYS Curriculum	
• Effective Instructional Use of Curriculum Materials	
• High Quality Teaching Force	
Professional Development System	
• Professional Development Release Days	
• Instructional Coaching	
II. Student Performance Data	9
High School Diploma	
MCAS	
III. Federal Title 1 Literacy, Numeracy and Transition Services	14
IV. Special Education	15
V. Healthy Opportunities Positive Outcomes (HOPE) — A Physical Education and Leadership Initiative	17
VI. Unlocking the Light Arts Initiative	18
VII. Bridging the Opportunity Gap: Job Readiness and Employability Initiative	21
VIII. Positive Youth Development and Culturally Responsive Practices	24
IX. Education Quality Assurance of DYS Education Program	26
X. Empower Your Future Life Skills, Career Development and Employability Initiative	28
XI. Community Based Mentoring Initiative: Lawrence	30
Appendices	
Appendix A: DYS Comprehensive Education Partnership Vision	32

Executive Summary

Beginning in 2003, the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (DYS) undertook an unprecedented reform of its education programs. This continuous improvement process, originally referred to as the “Education Initiative,” has created access to high quality education and employment opportunities for youth in the care and custody of DHS. Over the last several years, the Department has provided an annual summary of activities related to the Education Initiative to the Massachusetts State Legislature.

This report reflects the growth and breadth of the juvenile justice education system through the Department’s current contract with the Commonwealth Corporation, referred to as the Comprehensive Education Partnership Initiative.

The ***Comprehensive Education Partnership (CEP)*** is the conceptual framework that was designed by the Department to support the development and improvement of educational services in DHS. The mission, vision, and guiding principles of the CEP, which embrace a positive youth development approach that results in multiple effective education and employment pathways for our clients, can be found in Appendix A of this report. Central to this partnership was the awarding of our second phase contract for educational services collaboration with the Commonwealth Corporation (CommCorp) and the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES, formerly known as The Hampshire Educational Collaborative).

The achievements outlined in this report are the result of the combined efforts of CommCorp, the fiscal agent and workforce development partner to the grant, CES), and the other six DHS non-profit education service providers. The Partnership continues to provide multifaceted support and strategic direction for innovative teaching and learning in DHS residential programs and effective services for the community reentry of DHS clients. Our approach is based on a Future Focus model — “Exit upon Entry” — and seeks to guide youth into a variety of education and employment pathways upon their return to their communities.

This year’s report has been organized to present the progress and achievement of a series of initiatives that reflect a vibrant and engaging system — which provide a range of education and workforce pathways for the Commonwealth’s most troubled youth. These initiatives include:

- Engaging Teaching and Learning supported by High Quality Professional Development
- Federal Title 1 Literacy, Numeracy and Transition Services
- Healthy Opportunities Positive Outcomes (HOPE) — A Physical Education and Leadership Initiative
- Unlocking the Light Arts Initiative
- Bridging the Opportunity Gap Career Development and Employability Initiative**

* The Bridging the Opportunity Gap (BOG) Initiative is the recipient of the 2010 Council of State Government Innovations Award. The BOG program was recognized for leveraging resources to develop a state-of-the-art approach to provide access to quality education and support employment opportunities for Department of Youth Services youth.

- Education Quality Assessment of DYS Education Program
- Positive Youth Development and Culturally Responsive Practices for Educators and Staff
- Empower Your Future Life Skills, Career Development and Employability Initiative
- Community Based Mentoring Initiative

This report provides an overview of the many accomplishments and positive outcomes as a result of specific efforts that the Department undertook in fiscal year 2010.

I. Engaging Teaching and Learning Supported by High Quality Professional Development Initiative

DYS Approach to Teaching and Learning

The DYS teaching and learning approach is based on three primary focus areas: Access for All, Student Progress Monitoring, and Curriculum and Instruction.

An explanation for each of these areas as described in the 2009–10 Professional Development Goals sheet is highlighted below.

- **Access for All:** All students have access to the curriculum and a quality education. Providing effective access to the general education curriculum for ALL students requires multiple strategies. Toward that end, we will continue to advance our objectives of providing culturally responsive practices, an educational environment promoting positive youth development, differentiated instruction, and the advancement of learning teams;
- **Student Progress Monitoring:** Multiple assessment strategies used by teachers continuously monitor and adjust instruction to meet students' needs and support academic growth; and
- **Curriculum and Instruction:** What we want students to learn and how we teach them in order to achieve academic growth.

DYS Curriculum

The curriculum in DYS consists of guidance in what to teach as well as the tools to be used in teaching. The scope of what to teach and the sequence in which it should be taught is communicated through the DYS Instructional Guides. There is a guide for mathematics, science, US History I, and English Language Arts (ELA.) This year was the first year in which a U.S. History II guide was created, after being implemented in the fall of 2010. DYS, CommCorp, and CES also worked together to create a Life Skills curriculum which was developed and piloted in select residential treatment programs.

The instructional guides provide the required scope and sequence of curriculum based on standards from the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Analysis of the frequency with which specific state standards were targeted in MCAS and GED test questions informed our selection of standards to be included for each guide. The guides also contain chapters that address specific topics in professional development, including culturally responsive teaching, positive youth development, assessment strategies, and differentiated instruction. Guides include exemplary units of study developed by DYS teachers.

Effective Instructional Use of Curriculum Materials

Resources and materials help to connect the curriculum (what we teach) with the instruction (how we teach). Over the years, DYS has provided programs with a variety of suitable instructional tools in the various content areas. Resources were chosen based on standards, applicability to a diverse student population, cultural responsiveness and relevancy for students. During the 2009–10 school year, teachers received more training on how to use these tools to bring the curriculum alive for their diverse student population.

High Quality Teaching Force

DYS has also devoted considerable attention and resources toward “professionalizing” the workforce. In 2008, DYS’ goal was to have 95% of CES’s Instructional Staff be licensed teachers, or have documentation demonstrating adequate progress in working toward licensure. As of 2010, 98% of CES Instructional Staff maintained a current DESE license. The chart below shows the teacher licensure data from the last five (5) years.

Teacher Licensure					
Fiscal Year	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY 09	FY 10
% Licensed According to DESE	80.6%	92.3%	90%	95.4%	98%
% Not Licensed	19.3%	7.6%	10%	4.6%	2%

Licensure by Subject and Level					
Subject	Preliminary	Initial	Professional	Total	%
English	7	7	8	22	18%
Mathematics	10	9	5	24	19%
Science (Bio, Gen)	2	1	2	5	4%
Social Studies (History, SS,	4	12	10	26	21%

Licensure by Subject and Level					
Subject	Preliminary	Initial	Professional	Total	%
Pol. Science)					
Elementary		4	15	19	15%
Special Ed		6		6	5%
Technology					
Music		1		1	1%
Art		2	3	5	4%
Health / PE	3	2	2	7	6%
Other (Humanities, Business Admin. Principal/Asst. Principal)		3	2	5	4%
Reading			1	1	1%
Early Childhood			1	1	1%
Not Licensed				3	2%
Totals	26	47	49	125	100%

Professional Development System

DYS' professional development approach is to systematically support the goals of the Comprehensive Education Partnership. The professional development program includes system-wide professional development release days; instructional and technology coaching and consultation; technical assistance; and presentations provided to Regional Education Coordinators, Teaching Coordinators and Education Liaisons. There are also work groups to address Education Quality Assurance, employability, progress monitoring, positive youth development, integrated service delivery, and the introduction of various materials and initiatives as requested by the CEP.

In addition to organizing, monitoring and evaluating the on-going 2009–10 professional development activities, the staff at CES, the point agency for all education services provided through the CEP contract, created a Professional Development Team. This team spent considerable time researching and planning for the implementation of the new Learning Teams initiative for the 2010–11 school year. CES staff was also actively involved in workgroups affiliated with various initiatives such as: the production of a U.S. History II Instructional Guide and the Empower Your Future life skills curriculum; development of a teacher evaluation system; the creation of an Effective Pedagogy coaching rubric; and the development of an Education Quality Assurance system.

Professional Development Release Days

This year there were seven (7) professional development release days. Five days were spent in content-focused groups organized by program type. These groups provided practical training in three focus areas: Access for All, Student Progress Monitoring, and Curriculum and Instruction. Embedded in this work were three learning team activities to prepare teachers for the use of structured inquiry processes, a focus of the 2010–11 professional development series.

Each DYS educator was assigned to a five-day module based on their current job responsibilities and licensure status. Sessions for teachers were offered in mathematics, science, social studies, English language arts, arts, and English language learners' category training. Specialized groups for Education Liaisons, Evaluation Team Liaisons (special education), and a pilot group working on Integrated Service Delivery (ISD — combined general education and special education teaming) were also part of the offerings. The goal of the ISD pilot was to develop a model for training, implementation, and support for site-based integrated service delivery to provide access to the general curriculum for all DYS students.

The remaining two days were “menu days”, which gave teachers the opportunity to select offerings that were suited to their specific professional development needs. The topics for the first menu day included offerings in five categories: pedagogical practices, instructional materials and resources, technology, English language learning categories, and training for specialized groups. The second menu day focused on six categories: pedagogical practices, technology (hardware and software), instructional resources and materials, special education practices, English language learning categories, and training for specialized groups.

FY 2010 marked DYS's second year of combined professional development with the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) colleagues. The Department of Mental Health (DMH) teachers attended their own sessions in either math/science or English language arts/social studies. The DYS and SEIS staff continued to work with general educators in the content area groups.

Instructional Coaching

In the 2009 and 2010 school year, DYS continued to utilize four instructional coaches serving 170 DYS teachers. Each coach supported approximately 42 teachers. Coaches averaged 135 program visits during the school year, often visiting several teachers in one day. The visits with teachers included an observation and debrief session, model teaching, co-teaching, or mini-workshops. The type of intervention was based on teacher need and mutually agreed upon goals aligned with ongoing professional development work.

The key to successful coaching was the two-way conversations that took place during the visits. During these discussions the coaches used a reflective questioning model to encourage teachers to examine their practice and plan for modifications. This year, instructional coaches utilized a new tool, Rubric for Effective Pedagogy, a rubric with nine criteria associated with effective practice. Developed by the coaches during the previous year, the tool was used initially as a self-assessment tool by teachers. From this self-assessment data, the coaches and teachers developed coaching goals for the year.

The coaches also worked in their coaching meetings to develop a new version of the “rapid memo”, a document left with teachers after each visit. They analyzed what worked with the current form and what should be added. The result was a memo form that complemented the professional development work and supported the use of the instructional guides. The forms are now being used throughout the coaching system.

Along with the four general instructional coaches, there is one statewide instructional technology coach, who provided services to all programs and all teachers. The main responsibilities included hardware and software training and implementation support. In addition, tutorial sheets were developed for hardware and software to assist teachers with their use in the classroom.

II. Student Performance Data

DYS is encouraged by the completion rate of its students for high school diplomas and GEDs, as well as the MCAS data that is shown in this section. It is important to note that there were fewer DYS students that were eligible for either a diploma or GED due to the overall decrease in the DYS population.

High School Diploma/ GED

In July of 2010, all DYS Education Liaisons gathered data for GED Attainment and High School Diploma figures across the state wide. According to the data provided by Caseworkers during this period, the following information was reported:

As of July 2010	High School Diplomas	GED
West	13	17
Central	17	11
Metro	12	3
Northeast	14	14
Southeast	8	17
Total	64	62

Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS):

General Education Student Academic Performance Goals: Set by DYS in 2008	
Student Academic Goal 1	<p>10th Grade Spring MCAS English Language Arts:</p> <p>The percentage of DYS General Education youth passing the test during the 2008–2011 contract period (three-year average) will increase by 10% over the baseline three-year average (2006–2008).</p>
2010 Results	<p>61 general education students took the 10th grade MCAS in English Language Arts in the spring of 2009. 91.5% of these youth passed, including those who scored in the needs improvement, proficient, and advanced categories*. This reflects a 14.1% increase over the average pass rate for the previous three-year period (2006–2008).</p>

10th Grade ELA MCAS Results: DYS General Education Students (N=61)				
	2009		2010	
	#	%	#	%
Failing	5	9	5	9
Needs Improvement	28	53	27	46
Proficient	18	34	25	42
Advanced	2	4	4	3
TOTAL	53	100	61	100

Percent of DYS General Education Students Passing 10th Grade ELA MCAS*				
	2009		2010	
	#	%	#	%
Passing	48	91	56	91

** includes all students in the needs improvement, proficient, and advanced categories*

General Education Student Academic Performance Goals: Set by DYS in 2008

Student Academic Goal 2	<p>10th Grade Spring MCAS Math:</p> <p>The percentage of DYS General Education youth passing the test during the 2008–2011 contract period (three-year average) will increase by 10% over the baseline three-year average (2006–2008).</p>
2010 Results	<p>57 general education students took the 10th grade MCAS in Math in the spring of 2009. 70.2% of these youth passed, including those who scored in the needs improvement, proficient, and advanced categories. This reflects an 18.3% gain over the average pass rate of the baseline three-year period (2006–2008).</p>

10th Grade Math MCAS Results: DYS General Education Students (N=57)

	2009		2010	
	#	%	#	%
Failing	10	20	17	30
Needs Improvement	26	52	25	44
Proficient	12	24	8	14
Advanced	2	4	7	12
TOTAL	50	100	57	100

Percent of DYS General Education Students Passing 10th Grade Math MCAS*

	2009		2010	
	#	%	#	%
Passing	40	80	40	70

** includes all students in the needs improvement, proficient, and advanced categories*

General Education Student Academic Performance Goals: Set by DYS in 2008

Student Academic Goal 3	<p>10th Grade Spring MCAS Science:</p> <p>The percentage of DYS General Education youth passing the test during the 2008–2011 contract period (three-year average) will increase by 10% over the baseline.</p>
2010 Results	<p>42 general education students took the 10th grade MCAS in Science in the spring of 2010. 61.9% of these youth passed, including those who scored in the needs improvement, proficient, and advanced categories.</p>

10th Grade Science MCAS Results: DYS General Education Students (N=42)

	2009		2010	
	#	%	#	%
Failing	28	52	16	38
Needs Improvement	22	42	21	50
Proficient	3	6	5	12
Advanced	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	53	100	42	100

Percent of DYS General Education Students Passing 10th Grade Science MCAS*

	2009		2010	
	#	%	#	%
Passing	25	48	26	62

** includes all students in the needs improvement, proficient, and advanced categories*

General Education Student Academic Performance Goals: Set by DYS in 2009	
Student Academic Goal 4	<p>10th Grade MCAS English Language Arts Re-Test:</p> <p>Among DYS General Education youth taking the ELA re-test, the average pass rate during the 2008–2011 contract period (three-year average) will increase by 5% over the baseline three-year average (2005–2008).</p>
2010 Results	<p>65 DYS General Education students took the 10th grade ELA MCAS re-test in November 2009 and/or March 2010, and 73.8% of these students passed the test. This is a 25.5% increase from baseline three-year average. These comparisons should be interpreted cautiously due to the small number of students taking the re-test each year.</p>

10th Grade ELA MCAS Performance Data by Re-Test Date								
	November 2008		March 2009		November 2009		March 2010	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Fail	4	40	2	25	7	19	10	36
Pass	6	60	6	75	30	81	18	64

General Education Student Academic Performance Goals: Set by DYS in 2009	
Student Academic Goal 5	<p>10th Grade MCAS Math Re-Test:</p> <p>Among DYS General Education youth taking the Math re-test, the average pass rate during the 2008–2011 contract period (three-year average) will increase by 5% over the baseline three-year average (2005–2008).</p>
2010 Results	<p>82 DYS General Education students took the 10th grade Math MCAS re-test in November 2009 and/or March 2010, and 41.4% of these students passed the test. This is a 2% decrease from the baseline three-year average. These comparisons should be interpreted cautiously due to the small number of students taking the re-test each year.</p>

10th Grade Math MCAS Performance Data by Re-Test Date								
	November 2008		March 2009		November 2009		March 2010	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Fail	9	60	9	41	27	60	21	57
Pass	6	40	13	59	18	40	16	43

General Education Student Academic Performance Goals: Set by DYS in 2008	
Student Academic Goal 6	90% of youth released from a treatment facility who are enrolled in school as part of their transition plan to the community, will be enrolled within 48 hours of discharge.
2010 Results	During the September 2008–June 2009 academic year, 640 students were discharged from DYS programs. Of those 640 students, 432 students were enrolled in high school upon discharge and 391 were enrolled in school within 48 hours of release.

2008–2009 School Enrollment Outcomes		
	2008–09	
	#	%
# Students Discharged	640	
Students enrolled in school upon discharge	432	67.5
Students enrolled in school within 48 hours of discharge (among those with plans to continue)	391	90.5

III. Federal Title 1 Literacy, Numeracy and Transition Services

Each year the Department receives federal Title 1 funds to support literacy and numeracy efforts for DYS clients. In addition, 15% of these funds must be used for transition services to support the effective reentry of clients back to the community. Information in a later section describes the Bridging the Opportunity Gap initiative, which is partially supported with Title 1 funds.

DYS uses the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) to assess literacy and numeracy skills gains. Data used in the 2009–2010 DYS consolidated performance report came from student records collected by Title 1 teachers covering 13 residential treatment programs combined with information from the TABE pre/post test data base. The following charts are based on the demographics and results from the cohort of students who completed both the pre and post TABE tests.

In summary,

- For reading: 383 students were pre and post tested, and 50% showed improvement.
- For math: 382 students were pre and post tested, and 55% showed improvement.

Literacy/Numeracy Skill	Frequency	Percent
Improvement In Reading	190	49.61%
Negative/No Change In Reading	193	50.39%
Improvement In Math	209	54.71%
Negative/No Change In Math	173	45.29%

IV. Special Education

Representatives from the DYS Educational Services Program and the ESE Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Program worked collaboratively throughout 2010 to address issues related to delivery of special education services within DYS’ educational program. As a result, there has been greater consistency and more collaborative approaches to effective delivery of special education services to DYS youth.

Significant and sustained progress has been made towards the mutual goal of DYS and SEIS to promote a culture that supports special education students’ access to the general curriculum. Integrated professional development opportunities for DYS and SEIS staff continue to promote shared understanding and a more inclusive educational program for DYS youth eligible for special education services. A range of such professional development offerings are provided for all SEIS and DYS educators, with more focused offerings provided for educators participating in the implementation of an integrated service delivery model. (See below)

The Agency Coordination Process for special education eligible students committed to DYS, which began last year, has been monitored and refined to support increasingly effective and efficient procedures for communication, service provision planning and inclusion of special education students in the general education program. A similar process was developed and implemented for students in DYS pre-trial detention programs.

Student data sharing, using ESE's Student Information Management System (SIMS) data, contributes valuable information about students. This information enables SEIS staff to identify students eligible for special education services at the earliest stages of pre-trial detention, which supports more effective and efficient provision of services for youth while they are held on bail. Similarly, this information provides DYS general educators with a broad range of student information that enhances individualized planning for the general education setting and future transitions.

A standardized screening process developed last year for students not identified as special education eligible, but who may need to be evaluated for special education eligibility, was implemented in all programs in September 2010. This process was enhanced by professional development related to teacher Learning Teams at each site. Efforts to increase inclusive educational programming for special education students across DYS continues with collaboration at all levels.

An integrated service delivery model was piloted at two sites during the 2009–2010 school year. This model sought to provide greater access to the general curriculum for all special education students through inclusion in the general education classroom and extensive collaboration between general and special education teachers. Assessment of the model has demonstrated the viability of a more holistic approach to students' educational needs. Implementation using a similar approach began in four additional DYS educational programs in September 2010. Implementation across all of DYS's educational programs is anticipated over a two to three year period. Professional development to support such implementation will be ongoing.

DYS and SEIS continue to examine a variety of administrative procedures and processes to benefit students eligible for special education. These efforts include:

- Both agencies continue to work in partnership with ESE's Student Assessment Services Unit to support optimal MCAS administration for special education students and more functional reporting mechanisms to support effectual planning for individual students.
- DYS continues to work together with ESE and districts to improve the quality of data reported by districts for students involved with DYS, in order to ensure greater accuracy of identification of students eligible for special education.
- Enhanced data sharing through access to ESE's Data Warehouse continues to be explored. Once available, access to such a range of data about individual students and groups of students will enable DYS and SEIS staff to improve program development and individualized planning.
- IEP (Individualized Education Program) and service delivery data monitoring and analysis is maintained by both agencies to identify problematic areas in the provision of special education services. Methods to promote more effective ways to address those areas continue to be pursued within SEIS and DYS and in partnership with school districts.

Collaborative efforts will continue in the coming years, with the goal of continuing to promote an educational environment that provides high quality special education services for all eligible students.

V. Healthy Opportunities Positive Outcomes (HOPE) — A Physical Education and Leadership Initiative

Project HOPE (Health Opportunities Positive Effects) is a partnership between the DYS and the Collaborative for Educational Services through a Carol M. White PEP Grant awarded in the fall of 2009. Project HOPE provides health and physical education classes and after school activities to students in DYS programs throughout the Commonwealth utilizing certified health and wellness teachers and trained program staff. Project HOPE was initially launched in 10 program settings in January 2010.

The initiative's goals are to:

- Enable students to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for lifelong health, fitness, and well-being aligned with Massachusetts State health and fitness curriculum frameworks.
- Develop the systemic capacity within DYS to promote and support the attainment of health, fitness and well-being aligned with Massachusetts health and fitness curriculum frameworks.

To accomplish these goals, five health and wellness teachers were hired in the fall of 2009; one in each DYS region throughout the state. The teachers received four days of Project Adventure training in late fall of 2009 and began their teaching assignments in January of 2010. Additional professional development support was provided on the "Come and Get It" nutrition curriculum adopted in DYS. A DYS Health/Program Steering Team consisting of leadership from DYS, CES and the health/wellness teaching coordinator was formed to oversee the project. The Steering Committee holds quarterly meetings to provide joint leadership and oversight to the project.

Equipment was purchased for each of the 10 initial pilot sites. Elliptical trainers and bikes were installed in each site for use during physical education classes and program recreational time. Pilot sites also received mats, resistance bands, and stability balls.

Fitness assessments were developed to collect Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures on each of the students in the pilot sites. The tools and strategy for implementing the fitness evaluation were developed in conjunction with the Institute for Community Health (ICH), our evaluation partner. The GPRA measure is the percentage of secondary school students served by the grant who engage in 225 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week. Baseline data was collected in January of 2010 with four additional measurements collected in February, March, April and June of 2010, the first year of our collection cycle. During the GPRA collection periods listed above, students and teachers reviewed the students' individual fitness and nutrition goals.

The grant's second year focus includes expansion into additional programs and additional training for the direct care staff in Project Adventure and the physical education curriculum employed by health and wellness teachers in programs. In order to achieve this, physical education and health curriculum training will continue to be provided to our health and wellness teachers. A central component of the 2010–2011 focus is for Direct Care Staff to provide physical education activity outside of the school day with the guidance of the health and wellness teachers. The leadership team will meet to develop a strategy for advancing the goals of the grant to enable 100% of our students to have an opportunity to engage in physical activity to meet their health and physical goals. HOPE leadership will work with regional personnel to outline a plan for the development of systemic capacity within DYS to support the attainment of health and fitness of our students. As a result, during the 2010–1011 academic year, more students will be given the opportunity to participate in physical activity at their program sites.

VI. Unlocking the Light Arts Initiative

Another DYS initiative, Unlocking the Light (UTL) is focused on bringing arts integration to the general education curriculum. UTL is an arts based professional development program designed to aid DYS teachers in reaching and teaching students, and to promote the engagement of DYS youth in an alternative learning model and in envisioning their future. One way that UTL has met this goal has been to increase the capacity of DYS teachers to provide high quality, research-based arts education linked to challenging academic standards in the core curriculum.

Provide professional development to all teachers

UTL's basic vehicle for providing sustained and intensive professional development was a multiple-day residency. In this form of job-embedded professional development, a teaching artist served as an artist-in-residence in a DYS residential facility for approximately ten days, over the course of several weeks. Working with one or more teachers and their students, the teaching artist demonstrated lesson planning and models of field-tested instructional and assessment practices. The teaching artist also encouraged teachers to experiment with the lesson plans and practices, and supported teacher experimentation with assistance and constructive feedback. Demonstration and co-taught lessons focused both on studying existing works of art and creating and performing works. When possible, residencies culminated with a final student product, such as an art exhibit, a published collection of student poetry, a mural, or a performance of an original play. The residency's ultimate goal was to develop the hosting teachers' capacity to use these practices in other academic curriculum units (to meet arts and core academic area standards more effectively) when the artist educator was no longer present.

In addition to multiple-day residencies, UTL provided arts-related professional development to DYS teachers in three other formats: one-time workshops, multiple-day workshops or courses, and individualized, on-site coaching.

A major effort of the UTL initiative has been to identify and describe:

- the changes that have been observed in some participating youth and staff; and
- the teacher artist practices that appear to have contributed to promoting and supporting these changes.

From our evaluation of the initiative, systematic impact can be grouped under two category headings: short term and long term changes. The short term changes for both students and teachers had to do with their becoming more deeply engaged in academic activities. The long term changes — again for both youth and DYS teachers — occurred along five developmental dimensions: UTL helped them increase the breadth of their interest, their capacity to express themselves, their concern for others, as well as expand and improve their identities, and improve the functioning of their self-regulation systems.

UTL's second goal was to increase the performance and achievement of DYS students in core subjects through their active involvement in the arts. Below is a description of the extent to which the expected outcomes and performance measures related to this second goal were achieved in 2010.

- *To expose a large number of students in DYS facilities to multiple art forms through standards-based arts projects.* Although it is difficult to get an accurate count due to high turnover among students during residencies, an estimated 1,866 students participated in residencies during the project period.

- *To increase student engagement in learning.* Ninety-eight percent of the teachers who completed the post-residency questionnaires reported that during standards-based arts projects, some of their students were more actively engaged in learning.
- *To help students discover strengths and talents either that they didn't realize that they had or that are not usually called upon in DYS classes.* Eighty-three percent of the teachers who completed the post-residency questionnaires reported that standards-based arts activities engaged strengths of some of their students that had not previously been displayed in the classroom.

This project had some major unanticipated outcomes, including:

- In addition to demonstrating that teaching artists were effective in developing lesson plans that could engage students in arts activities to promote academic learning, the project also demonstrated that teaching artists had a variety of ways of interacting with youth that promoted and supported the engagement of students; these practices cut across art forms and content areas.
- The practices that the teaching artists used had consequences far beyond promoting deeper engagement with content and the achievement of content objectives. They promoted development along five developmental dimensions that are relevant to not only incarcerated youth, but also to a wide range of at-risk youth in the public schools.
- When hosting facilities had a strong developmentally-oriented program philosophy and multiple DYS staff members fully implemented that program philosophy, the DYS staff and the artist educators were mutually reinforcing each other, and the results were powerful.

Perhaps UTL's most important contribution had to do with how arts activities linked to core curriculum standards and how this promoted various kinds of development (as described above). Teachers of English Language Arts, history, math, science, and "life skills" used arts projects as a means to promote academic learning, but also to promote student development along these same five dimensions.

Additionally, UTL infused the elements of Positive Youth Development and Culturally Responsive Practice into its programming through the training of artist educators as well as offering after school workshops at UTL lab sites for participating teachers. This work was done in collaboration with Patty Bode, co-author with Sonia Nieto of *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*. Because of the success of this work, as UTL solicits future funding it will focus on programming that highlights the arts as a means of achieving social justice in education.

UTL's most important contribution to institutional policy was to institutionalize professional development procedures — including on-site coaching — that will support DYS teachers' capacity to combine the philosophy and practices promoted in this project with other educational initiatives.

Federal funding for Unlocking the Light ended in fiscal year 2010. CES will be applying for new funding in January, 2011 so that this very successful initiative can continue to positively impact both the teaching staff and the young people served under this grant.

VII. Bridging the Opportunity Gap: Job Readiness and Employability Initiative

The Bridging the Opportunity Gap (BOG) initiative was initiated in 2006 with funding from the Massachusetts State Legislature and has supported innovative transition and re-entry programming for DYS youth since that time. DYS helped to support this initiative with its own operational funding and federal Title 1 funds. CommCorp served as the administrator for these funds. This past year marked the fourth year of the DYS BOG initiative.

The BOG initiative supports the successful transition and re-entry of DYS clients, with a special focus on those returning to their home communities following residential treatment, by focusing on career development and employment training services that are tailored to their unique strengths and needs. The Initiative provides comprehensive employability services including career readiness, vocational, and entrepreneurship training, industry certifications and subsidized employment experiences.

The initiative is based on a positive youth development model that is asset-based, culturally responsive, and delivered by personnel with experience in operating youth employability programs. Programming addresses a variety of learning styles, is interactive and engaging to youth, and delivered in a “hands-on” manner. Grantee organizations, which include community and faith-based organizations, workforce investment boards and career centers, and vocational technical high schools across the state, work in partnership with CommCorp and DYS to expand program services and resources that result in access to a variety of employment and education pathways for DYS clients.

In Fiscal Year 2010, the BOG initiative served **311** youth, a slight decrease from the 395 youth served in Fiscal Year 2009. The decrease in the number of youth served through BOG was attributed to the decrease in the DYS re-entry caseload. In 2009-2010, the average age of participants was 17 and 58% of youth were placed in subsidized employment, (an increase from 35% in FY09) and 20% were placed in unsubsidized employment by the end of the grant period.

FY10 Distribution of BOG Programs and Participants by DYS Region			
Region	# of BOG Programs	# of Youth Participants	% of Youth Participants
Central	1	31	10%
Metro	1	26	8%
Northeastern	4	107	34%
Southeastern	4	59	19%
Western	4	88	28%
Total	14	311	100%

Youth Outcomes Comparison Data FY07 – FY10: Vocational Training				
Participation in Vocational Training	Grant Period			
	Year 1:	Year 2:	Year 3:	Year 4:
	1/2007 – 6/2007	10/2007 – 6/2008	7/2008 – 6/2009	9/2009 – 6/2010
# of youth starting vocational training	71	124	156	138
% of youth starting vocational training	23%	35%	39%	44%
# of youth who completed vocational training out of those who started it	n/a	55	97	77
% of youth who completed vocational training out of those who started it	n/a	44%	62%	56%
% completions out of all BOG participants	n/a	16%	25%	25%

Youth Outcomes Comparison Data FY07 – FY10: Work Placements				
Subsidized Work Placement	Grant Period			
	Year 1:	Year 2:	Year 3:	Year 4:
	1/2007 – 6/2007	10/2007 – 6/2008	7/2008 – 6/2009	9/2009 – 6/2010
# of youth starting work placement	101	121	138	179
% of youth starting work placement	33%	34%	35%	58%
# of youth who completed placement out of those who started it	n/a	n/a	n/a	109
% of youth who completed placement out of those who started it	n/a	n/a	n/a	61%
% completions out of all BOG participants	n/a	n/a	n/a	35%
Unsubsidized Work				
# of youth finding unsubsidized work	n/a	103	107	63
% of youth finding unsubsidized work		29%	27%	20%

Youth Outcomes Comparison Data FY07 – FY10: Certification, Education Services and Revocation				
	Grant Period			
	Year 1:	Year 2:	Year 3:	Year 4:
	1/2007 – 6/2007	10/2007 – 6/2008	7/2008 – 6/2009	9/2009 – 6/2010
Earned Industry-Recognized Certification # of youth	n/a	n/a	52	99
Earned Industry-Recognized Certification % of youth			13%	32%
Education Services (Direct and by Referral) # of youth	n/a	79	140	140
Education Services (Direct and by Referral) % of youth		22%	35%	45%
DYS Assessment # of youth revoked at least once	60	119	166	61
DYS Assessment % of youth revoked at least once	20%	34%	42%	20%

VIII. Positive Youth Development and Culturally Responsive Practices

As noted above, DYS's Education Initiative (EI), through the Comprehensive Education Partnership (CEP), a collaboration between CommCorp and CES, has focused on providing high quality professional development to teachers and other educational staff working within DYS programs over the past seven years. Recognizing that educators and other professionals who work with juvenile justice involved youth play an important role in "preparing these adolescents for successful integration into the community, school, and the workforce",¹ the EI has responded to the challenges many youth in DYS and the staff who support them face by developing the Positive Youth Development and Culturally Responsive Practice Initiative.

According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, racial minority youth disproportionately comprise approximately two-thirds of the juvenile justice population in the United States. Similarly, though the DYS committed caseload in Massachusetts has decreased substantially over the last ten years, the racial demographics of the youth population in this state has remained relatively constant, with approximately 75% identifying as African-American, Latino, Asian or "other" in 2008.² In addition, young people in DYS reflect high percentages of youth for whom English is a second language, youth with learning disabilities, and young men.³ Like many other school districts in Massachusetts and across the United States, teachers in DYS programs are predominantly dissimilar in race, gender, and class than the students they teach. Research indicates that if left unexamined, these differences can lead to a mismatch between students' prior experiences and the classroom experience and support services offered by teachers and youth workers, respectively, thus limiting student achievement and success. These differences in cultural, racial, and gender-influenced experiences impact the ways in which youth engage or do not engage in learning and are further complicated when considered alongside additional challenges teachers and other staff face working in a juvenile justice setting with youth who often face multiple challenges (such as issues of trauma, substance abuse, etc.).

Aligned with the larger DYS system's efforts to address these challenges through engagement in the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative and the W. Haywood Burns Model for System Change and Leadership,⁴ the EI has dedicated the last four years to addressing issues of race and culture as they relate to education, transition services, and other opportunities made available to DYS-involved youth. Leadership from all three partner agencies — DYS, CommCorp and CES — have examined the need for enhancing this approach and work throughout the DYS system. In the past two years, CEP has begun to both support and collaborate with staff representing other program services delivered in DYS. It is important to note that since the inception of this initiative, DYS has shifted from focusing solely on culturally responsive *teaching* to culturally responsive *practice* to provide greater inclusivity of education, employment, and transition aspects of the Educational Initiative in DYS. Accordingly, the EI formerly adopted the Massachusetts Executive Offices of Health and Human Services (EOHHS)⁵ positive youth development approach to working with youth in system-care and integrated the research and tenets of youth development and culturally responsive practice together to guide the development and implementation of professional development and programming of educational and transitional services in order to better promote positive change in the lives of DYS youth.

The Culturally Responsive Practice (CRP)⁶ and Positive Youth Development (PYD) Theoretical Framework

Building on the last three years of foundational work in DYS around issues of culturally responsive teaching (CRT),⁷ CommCorp has led the Partnership in expanding its understanding of how this area of research and positive youth development (PYD) overlap and can inform improvement of educational and employability services and opportunities for youth committed to the care of DYS. PYD is an approach to working with and educating youth that integrates multiple areas of growth and development — physical, cognitive, social, emotional, cultural, civic, and vocational — with education. This inter-disciplinary approach to working with children and adolescents focuses on building on a young person's assets in order to:

- strengthen their belief in their own abilities,
- support them in developing a stable sense of identity,
- nurture and strengthen their connections with others, and
- build a sense of control over future outcomes in their own lives.

Research has identified these areas of focus as *protective factors* that are integral in helping young people build *resilience* (the ability to cope with negative factors in their lives, including many factors over which they have little or no control.)

At its core, positive youth development (PYD) embraces the understanding that merely preventing “problem” behaviors in youth is not enough to help young people transition to adulthood and become successful in education, career, and life. Relationships are a crucial part of effective work with DYS youth, and learning about students and their lives is critical to building relationships. Similarly, culturally responsive practice and positive youth development both highlight the responsibility of teachers and other youth workers to deepen their knowledge of the youth with whom they work. A critical understanding in both CRP and PYD affirms the perspective of the young person and thus requires adults working with them to take into account their own knowledge and understanding of how the personal and cultural experiences of a young person can be assets in supporting them towards future success. More importantly, it requires adults to deepen their understanding of how their own experiences and assumptions influence the work they do as educators and transition staff.

IX. Education Quality Assurance of DYS Education Program

The Education Quality Assurance (EQA) Initiative evolved from the Education Field Assessment Initiative that was established through the DYS Lead Entity for Education (LEED) contract and was implemented in 2004, 2005, and 2007. These Education Field Assessments provided DYS with baseline information on each of its education programs across the state and identified education program strengths and challenges. The Field Assessment process relied primarily on the collection of self-reported data and a brief on-site program interview with the program’s Teaching Coordinator.

As a result of the Education Field Assessments, DYS established a set of minimum education requirements that shaped a common understanding of certain elements of the educational programs. Prior to the implementation of the field assessment system, there was no formal process in place for monitoring education and program quality. As a first-generation baseline assessment of education program quality in DYS, the field assessments shaped an interest by DYS in expanding and deepening how this quality assurance process could be used to identify and maintain quality educational programming. It also created a foundation for considering the methods that could be used to collect data in a consistent and systematic manner.

The EQA project entered its second year in FY 2010 and helped shape a comprehensive set of standards and indicators to codify and articulate expectations for all DYS education programs. EQA staff coordinated a working group of key DYS education stakeholders to assist with the design of the EQA standards, indicators and accompanying rubric that define terminology. In addition, the working group assisted the program manager in the design of a pilot project that “field tested” four EQA indicators in six DYS educational programs in the spring of 2010.

In this past year, the focus of the EQA Initiative has been to establish, codify and communicate a statewide quality assurance evaluation process consisting of research-based standards and quality indicators that define education program quality in DYS educational programs. Over the next five years, all DYS educational programs throughout the Continuum of Care: Short- and Long-Term Treatment, Assessment, Detention, and Revocation will undergo this process. These EQA standards are informed by state and federal education regulations: DYS minimum education requirements, Massachusetts professional standards for teachers, research-based education practices, education policies and procedures specific to DYS, and ongoing feedback from key DYS stakeholders and education provider practitioners.

The current EQA process is focused on the following goals:

- Codify and define program quality in all DYS educational settings by articulating clear and explicit expectations (i.e., standards, indicators, and benchmarks) for quality educational programming;
- Establish a consistent and statewide quality assurance evaluation process in order to inform continuous improvement efforts;
- Create a transparent and equitable process for communicating system expectations in meeting the established education benchmarks; and
- Provide technical assistance to education programs seeking additional support in meeting the established education benchmarks.

In July 2009, CommCorp formed a working group to focus on education quality assurance, comprised of members representing various education providers, program practitioners, education consultants, and other key DYS stakeholders. This workgroup provided valuable feedback about the design of the EQA Pilot Project. As part of the EQA design process, the workgroup recommended piloting EQA in a small number of DYS programs to “test” a set of draft EQA standards and to seek feedback on the EQA review process. The EQA Pilot Project included six DYS education programs (administered by four different education providers) representing: Detention, Short-Term, and Long-Term Treatment. The pilot project did not include Assessment and Revocation programs, nor did it include a focus on instruction in Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS).

The specific objectives of the pilot included:

- Piloting an EQA review process consisting of research-based standards and quality indicators that define education quality in DYS educational facilities
- Assessing current program implementation of key education initiatives/quality indicators
- Identifying future needs for providing technical assistance to the pilot programs
- Informing further development of the EQA review process

The results of the statewide pilot, as well as individual reports for each of the pilot sites are included in detailed reports available through DYS or CommCorp. The reports provide data on the following:

- An aggregate profile of the six pilot sites
- A summary of pilot results and key observations and findings for the four key EQA initiatives:
 - » Teacher Licensure
 - » Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDPs)
 - » Student Learning Objectives expressed as Know, Understand, and Do (KUDs)
 - » Student Transcripts
- EQA Rubric Benchmark Ratings: For each of the four initiatives (indicators) there are a set of benchmarks for each of the three ratings in the rubric. Programs were rated on their level of progress for the key elements of the indicator. The three rating categories are:
 - » **Exceeding:** surpassing DYS expectations and the proposed EQA standards
 - » **Meeting:** satisfactorily meeting DYS expectations and the proposed EQA standards
 - » **Progressing:** making progress toward DYS expectations and the proposed EQA standards
- Summary of EQA Follow-Up Survey Responses
- EQA Process Recommendations and System Level Considerations

X. Empower Your Future Life Skills, Career Development and Employability Initiative

Through the Education Partnership, Commonwealth Corporation (CommCorp) is responsible for designing a comprehensive approach to life skills, career development and employability for the DYS continuum of care. In 2007, CommCorp organized a workgroup that included DYS Education Initiative personnel from CES, and consultants with practical and academic expertise in school counseling and career development. The purpose of the workgroup, referred to originally as the “Life Skills, Career Development and Employability Workgroup”, has been to:

- Review research and best practice on school counseling models and effective career development curriculum;
- Identify and design curriculum that supports the growth and development of youth education and employment goals;
- Identify curriculum that supports job readiness and employment;

- Train teachers and education personnel on the use of effective career development curriculum;
- Align career development curriculum with other areas of client treatment, including clinical, community and case management.

This past year, the workgroup, through the dedicated efforts of Katie Gray, consultant, finalized a curriculum for treatment programs called “Empower Your Future — Treatment Programs” that will be taught for 45 minutes each day (during the life skills block) at least three times per week. To date, the curriculum has been developed, piloted and is now being used by DYS educators. The purpose of the curriculum is to provide students with a range of personal, life, and employability skills. The curriculum has nine units that cover 46 lessons and include:

- Unit 1: Knowing Yourself: Interest, Values, Skills
- Unit 2: Exploring Careers and Practice Interviews
- Unit 3: Possible Selves Trees
- Unit 4: Creating Long and Short Term Goals
- Unit 5: Getting Where You Want to Go: Transitional Goals
- Unit 6: Reality Check
- Unit 7: How Beliefs Affect Decisions
- Unit 8: Moving Forward: Development Coping Strategies
- Unit 9: Life is a Roller Coaster

An evaluation of the pilot programs, implemented by Dr. Richard Lapan, professor at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, provided data that helped the Workgroup further refine the curriculum. Dr. Lapan’s evaluation strategy was based on data collected from multiple sources:

- Youth Interviews: Youth participating in the Pilot completed the Life Skills Class Survey (Pre/Post) that gathered both quantitative and qualitative information.
- Lead Teacher Interviews: Dr. Lapan interviewed the lead teachers at the four sites at the beginning, middle, and end of the Pilot 2 curriculum intervention.
- EYF Coach Interviews: Dr. Lapan regularly spoke to the consultant (Katie Grey) and DYS staff (Wendy Taylor), who provided coaching and support for teachers at each site.
- Interviews with DYS Clinical Staff: Dr. Lapan also kept in contact with and interviewed 1 DYS clinician, who infused DBT skills into the curriculum.

The major addition to the evaluation of the Year 2 pilot of the curriculum was the use of a structured interview to gather developmental information as DYS youth progressed through the curriculum. Dr. Lapan trained CommCorp staff in interviewing techniques and how to use these questions in one-on-one interviews with youth. CommCorp staff interviewed a total of 24 DYS youth across each of the 4 pilot sites at 3 different points related to the implementation of the curriculum (beginning, middle, and end).

The themes of the evaluation findings by Dr. Lapan included:

- *Integrity of Curriculum* — Empower Your Future is a theoretically sound curriculum that contains a set of activities that students find very engaging.
- *Relevance to Students* — The clearest benefit for students was the building self knowledge (e.g., interests and work values) and knowledge about how to explore careers and do career planning with MASS Career Information System (CIS).
- *Education Logistical/Infrastructure Considerations* — The inclusion of computer use in the curriculum was very motivating for students.

In June 2010, the Life Skills, Career Development and Employability workgroup changed its name to reflect the name of the new treatment curriculum that was ready for roll-out. The new name for the workgroup is Empower Your Future — which also corresponds with the curriculum that has been completed for Treatment and Community Reentry programs.

The findings of Dr. Lapan's evaluation report guided the final revision of the EYF Treatment curriculum. The curriculum was finalized and produced for use by DYS teachers in residential treatment programs in June, 2010.

XI. Community Based Mentoring Initiative: Lawrence

On behalf of DYS, CommCorp partnered with Mass Mentoring Partnership (MMP) in 2008 to deepen its foundational understanding of the field of mentoring research and to help guide the planning and implementation of a mentoring pilot program in DYS. MMP, the only statewide organization dedicated to expanding high quality mentoring services to meet the needs of youth across Massachusetts, has been a strong partner in this work through its provision of technical assistance and consulting services, bringing extensive research-based guidance on designing effective programs and formulating effective practice.

In FY 2010, CommCorp managed a new mentoring pilot program, bringing together DYS and local community-based organization in Lawrence to begin designing a second DYS pilot program in Fiscal Year 2010. Building on lessons learned from the FY 2009 DYS mentoring pilot program in Holyoke, CommCorp established a relationship with MMP to facilitate a planning process which included representatives from regional DYS staff (including the Regional Director and his staff, an Educational Liaison, and two DYS caseworkers), the Greater Lawrence Educational Collaborative (GLEC), Northeast Family Institute (NFI), and Family Service Inc.

It is important to note that this approach was based on a positive youth development model to enable youth, in partnership with the adults working with them, to be active participants in all aspects of their life planning. Accordingly, efforts were made to include DYS youth voices in the design process, and as a result, the DYS-involved youth representative was able to attend one of the last planning meetings.

All collaborating partners in this pilot shared a similar perspective and approach to breaking down institutional barriers to assist DYS-involved youth in gaining the key skills and knowledge they require to be productive in their communities and today's economy. With support from MMP, the partnership reviewed key components of mentoring models and best practices as evidenced by mainstream mentoring research. MMP distributed copies of the National Mentoring Partnership's *Elements of Effective Practice* to each of the partners to further guide them in their planning.⁸

The team established a program goal for the mentoring pilot with three main focus areas. Through mentoring, *youth will develop skills to be successful in career and in life through a caring relationship with an adult mentor*. The three areas of focus that will support achievement of this goal are:

- The promotion of positive youth development in programming,
- The development of skills by youth, broadly defined (i.e., not just life skills), and
- The establishment and strengthening of a caring relationship with an adult mentor.

Structure of Program

A series of planning meetings, with representatives from each partner, helped to mold and define the DYS pilot program in Lawrence, specific to strengths and needs of youth in that area. Planning meetings took place starting in February of 2010 and continued until initial stages of implementation of the program began in July of 2010. All planning meetings were facilitated by experienced MMP staff.

During the planning process, the design team discussed strategies for achieving this goal in DYS, and explored and identified resources that would be needed to successfully implement the pilot. All participating partners then collaborated to further define the following key components of the mentoring pilot program:

- Program model and type,
- Duration of the program and frequency of contact,
- Recruitment, screening, and training of mentors,
- Recruitment and orientation of youth mentees to the program,
- Matching of mentors and mentees,
- Ongoing training and support to mentors, and
- Program activities.

All of the aforementioned components are aligned with the *Elements of Effective Practice*, and the initial design of each was being further refined at the end of the fiscal year and all efforts continue to work toward establishing a program for Fiscal Year 2011.

Appendix A: DYS Comprehensive Education Partnership Vision

Vision:

The *Education Initiative* will provide quality education and workforce skills training combined with a positive youth development approach that enables youth, in partnership with caring adults, to be active participants in all aspects of their life planning. Youth will attain knowledge and skills and access to resources that enable them to engage in positive pathways that will lead to a successful transition into the community.

Mission:

Through a range of coordinated education and employability strategies, program activities and efforts, the Education Initiative will develop youth:

- » proficiency in literacy and numeracy
- » social and emotional skills
- » job readiness, vocational training, work ethics and employment
- » thinking skills for lifelong learning

Guiding Principles:

Youth will participate in classroom and extended learning experiences that have been shaped by the Education Initiative's Guiding Principles that include a focus on:

Positive Youth Development: A strong focus on three aspects of positive youth development will provide effective guidance for the goals and plans for each youth's successful re-entry into the community. These include a focus on each youth's strengths and personal assets, providing opportunities for youth empowerment and leadership, and cultivating community partnerships and supports that assist youth in moving successfully through the continuum of care.

Integrated Services and Supports throughout the Continuum of Care: A continuum of care for youth placed under DYS supervision will provide integration of services and supports from the time they enter the DYS system until they age out.

Quality Teaching and Learning: An emphasis on high quality, research-based teaching and learning will support the whole child and build on students' experiences.

Research-Based: Educational initiatives will be aligned with current research and evidence-based practices that have been shown to be successful with youth in juvenile justice settings.

Data and Outcome-Driven: A data and outcome-driven approach will support use of data to guide student learning and the ability to track long-term outcomes for youth in the DYS system.

Systems Design: The deliberate integration of DYS institutional and community-based systems, services, and opportunities will yield the greatest outcomes for the youth we serve and their communities.

Footnotes

1 Gagnon, J.C. & Richards, C. (2008). *Making the right turn: A guide about improving transition outcomes of youth involved in the juvenile corrections system*. Washington, DC: National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth, Institute for Educational Leadership.

2 From 1998 – 2008, though the DYS committed caseload decreased by 35%, the racial demographics of the youth population has remained relatively constant, with 34% identifying as White, 30% as African-American, 28% as Latino, 3% as Asian, and 5% as “other” in 2008.

3 Massachusetts Department of Youth Services 2007 Annual Report, www.mass.gov/Eeohhs2/docs/dys/annual_report_2007.pdf

4 For more information about the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, see <http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/JuvenileDetentionAlternativesInitiative.aspx>. More information on the W. Haywood Burns Model for System Change and Leadership, an initiative supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, can be found online at <http://www.modelsforchange.net/index.html>.

5 Positive Youth Development (PYD) is an asset-based model of services that involves youth, their families and their communities in their care and development. PYD stresses medical health, behavioral health, personal safety and a sense of well-being, civic involvement, education and employment.

6 The acronym “CRP” is used here to denote *culturally responsive practice* in DYS; however, it is important to note that in the field of multicultural education, “CRP” is an acronym used by researchers to describe *culturally responsive pedagogy*.

7 The acronym “CRT” is used here to denote *culturally responsive teaching* in DYS; however, it is important to note that in the field of multicultural education, “CRT” is an acronym used by researchers to describe *critical race theory*.

8 For further information see MENTOR’s *Elements of Effective Practice* at http://www.mentoring.org/find_resources/elements_of_effective_practice/