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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to develop a model delivery system for education services in the California Youth Authority (CYA). The model included a model administrative organization, a financial model, and a support services model.

Procedures: (1) Related literature was reviewed to establish principles regarding administration and organization, finance, and support services in correctional education. These principles were then compared with existing conditions in the CYA. (2) A questionnaire was administered to CYA staff to determine which of seven proposed administrative models best met thirteen pre-determined criteria. The correctional school district model was selected. (3) A second questionnaire was administered to administrators of seven existing correctional school districts in the country, and to top administrators of their cooperating corrections agencies. This questionnaire elicited information about how correctional school districts should be organized, how they should be financed, and what support services they should provide.

Findings: The correctional school district was determined to be the best administrative organization model tested. It should be a part of the corrections agency, with its Superintendent reporting to the Director of the corrections
agency. Findings and recommendations were made regarding the school board, and how corrections and school district staff should interface. It was determined that special legislation will be necessary to create such a school district, and that legislation should include a financial formula whereby the State Legislature would fund the school district on the basis of average daily attendance with annual increases for inflation. The creation of the school district will make it eligible for all state and federal education funding for which the CYA education program is not now eligible. The school district should offer special services to all students as outlined in Public Law 94-142, Education of All Handicapped Children Act. Staff-student ratios were also recommended.

**Recommendations for Further Study:** Further study should be made to determine:

1. The working relationship between the school principal and the institution superintendent.

2. The amount of annual basic education funding to be provided by the legislature.

3. The numbers of handicapped students in the CYA population, the types of handicaps represented, and the best method of providing required services.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Knezevich has stated that education has a strong influence on the prevention of social problems, including delinquency. Stark has seen education playing an important role in the rehabilitation of delinquents. The American Bar Association has added that education programs are difficult to provide in correctional settings. Based on the statements above, it would appear that education is effective in the prevention of delinquency and in the rehabilitation of delinquents, but it is difficult to provide in a correctional setting.

The California Welfare and Institutions Code has required the California Youth Authority (CYA) to organize and maintain a division of instruction, the "chief" of which must be well trained in modern school administration. The Code has placed the responsibility for all courses of instruction with that division. It has required these courses of instruction to include academic and vocational training and


has made them subject to the approval of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.\textsuperscript{4}

According to a recent study, the CYA education program has had no central authority nor organization.\textsuperscript{5} This study reveals that this lack of central authority has had a number of negative effects upon the education services offered. No educational philosophy, goals, or objectives have been developed to guide the program. No central administrative structure has existed to provide educational leadership to the program. Institution and camp education programs have been controlled by non-educators who have frequently made decisions which have seriously limited the effectiveness of those programs. Administrators of institution and forestry camp education programs have frequently had to compete for funds with representatives of other CYA program components. Education programs at the local level (institutions and camps) have been autonomous, which has resulted in unnecessary program duplication, and a disparity in quality between the various education programs. Educational resources including staff, equipment, and operating funds have been rigidly assigned to specific local programs. This practice has made it impossible to utilize these

\textsuperscript{4}California Welfare and Institutions Code, sections 1120-1122.

resources efficiently. No coordination or articulation of the various education programs has taken place. This deficiency has resulted in students with very special needs being dispersed throughout the general CYA population with no special services available to them.6

The CYA has made no systematic effort to maintain a high quality education program. Although the Superintendent of Public Instruction has been given responsibility for approving the CYA education program, this approval has never been given.7 In 1971-1972 an accreditation study of six CYA institution programs was made as the result of the Child Advocate Committee charge that CYA education programs were inferior. The Accreditation Committee was sponsored by the California State Department of Education (SDE) and was chaired by one of its consultants. The Committee made 16 major recommendations to the CYA, 13 of which have not been implemented.8 Although deficiencies were observed and recommendations made, the CYA has not significantly responded.9

The CYA education program has its legal basis in the California Welfare and Institutions Code (W&I Code). The W&I Code governs the program. Since it is not governed by the California Education Code (Ed. Code) nor the California Administrative Code, Title 5 (Title 5), the CYA education program is not legally a school district. As a result,

---

6Ibid. 7Ibid. 8Ibid. 9Ibid.
there have been many education funding sources for which the CYA has not qualified.\(^{10}\)

Since it has not qualified as a school district, the CYA has been unable to grant high school diplomas. When students have completed the California state high school graduation requirements, the CYA has either appealed to the school of last attendance to issue the diploma, or has obtained a Certificate of Completion from the SDE.\(^{11}\) However, there has been a stigma attached to the Certificate of Completion, since to some it has represented a product of "jail-house" education.\(^{12}\) In addition, not qualifying as a school district has precluded the CYA from qualifying as a General Education Development (GED) testing center.\(^{13}\)

Except for the credentialling of teachers and administrators, maintaining high school graduation standards, and the issuing of credits and transcripts, the CYA education program does not follow the regulations of the Ed. Code or Title 5. This practice has probably adversely affected the quality of instruction in the CYA.\(^{14}\)

\(^{10}\)Ibid.

\(^{11}\)Spencer and Kelly, p. 5.


\(^{13}\)Spencer and Kelly, p. 5.

\(^{14}\)Statement by Mr. Trumbull W. Kelly, Education Program Supervisor, California Youth Authority, at a meeting
Statement of the Problem

The current administrative structure of the CYA education program needs to provide program supervision, leadership, direction, and evaluation. It needs provision for program coordination and articulation. It needs to qualify for much of the same funding which has been available to the public schools of California. The CYA should become authorized to issue high school diplomas, and the program should be required to function according to the education standards set forth in the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5. The purpose of this study is to develop a model educational delivery system for the California Youth Authority.

Objectives

This study will develop a model educational delivery system for the CYA by:

1. Developing a model administrative organization for the CYA education program.
2. Developing a model financial support program for the CYA education program.
3. Developing a model for support services in the CYA education program.

Significance

Several educational delivery systems for correctional education programs have been recommended by writers in the field. Arkansas, Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia have established special non-geographical correctional school districts for their adult prison systems. On July 1, 1977 Illinois added its juvenile correctional system to the existing special correctional school district. Oregon has investigated several systems including the school district, the operation of correctional education programs by the state department of education, the operation of these programs by local school districts, and their operation by the local county offices of education.

A model delivery system for the CYA education program could serve as a model for other youth corrections agencies in other states. Throughout the country this could result in better organized and better supervised education programs, better utilization of resources, utilization of new funding resources, improved standards, and improved services for institutionalized delinquents. It could result


17 Evan, pp. 6-26.
in much more effective education services and programming for young people in youth corrections agencies across the country.

Organization of Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introduction, a statement of the problem, objectives for the study, the significance of the study, and the design and procedures. A review of relevant literature is incorporated into chapter 2. Procedures are presented in detail in chapter 3. Chapter 4 describes the findings of the study. The conclusions, summary, and recommendations constitute chapter 5.

This study investigated three aspects of a model delivery system for education in the CYA. These included a model administrative organization, a model financial support program, and a model for support services.

Seven administrative models were identified and tested against 13 criteria. The criteria represented problems with the existing CYA education program which had been translated into criteria for improvement. In addition, a study was made to determine what relationships should exist between the administration of the selected model and the administration of the CYA.

A study was also made to determine the best way to finance a correctional education program within the structure of the selected model administrative organization.
In addition, many funding sources available to public schools, in California, were studied to determine for which ones the selected model could become eligible.

Finally, a study was made to determine what support services a correctional education program should provide. This data was then used to establish recommended support services for the CYA.

**Terms Used in This Study**

1. CYA - California Youth Authority. A California state department charged with the training and treatment of juvenile delinquents and youthful offenders committed to it by the juvenile and criminal courts of California.

2. Institution or Camp Superintendent. The highest ranking administrator in a California Youth Authority institution or camp.

3. Institutions and Camps Branch. A branch of the California Youth Authority which is responsible for the administration of all institutions and camps operated by the Authority.

4. SDE. California State Department of Education.

5. Superintendent of Public Instruction. The highest ranking educator in California, elected by the people of the state.

6. Warden. The highest ranking administrator in a state prison.
This chapter has reviewed the background of the education program of the California Youth Authority and problems associated with that program. It has also reviewed the purpose, objectives, significance, design, and procedures of this study.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The current administrative structure of the California Youth Authority (CYA) education program lacks over-all program supervision, leadership, direction, and evaluation. It lacks provision for program articulation and coordination. It does not qualify for the same funding which is available to the public schools of California. The CYA is not authorized to issue high school diplomas. It is not required to function according to the education standards set forth in the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5. The purpose of this study is to develop a model education delivery system for the California Youth Authority.

Education and Delinquency

The modern goal of the correctional system is to serve and protect society through deterrence, offender rehabilitation, and reintegration into the community. Education and training have become the foundation of current reintegration efforts.  

---


Stullken stated that schools are related to delinquency in three ways: (1) they may produce delinquency, (2) they may help to prevent delinquency, and (3) they may deal with delinquent behavior which is found within their buildings. Some educators and workers in the field of juvenile corrections believe that the basic causes of delinquency lie with learning problems. A failure pattern begins very early in school. Home problems and conflicts in values interfere with learning. Physical and emotional problems go unrecognized. Teachers develop low expectations for the student. As he grows older, the child's school environment becomes dangerous and his lack of achievement increases the gap between his skills and his grade level. Soon the need for protection, recognition, and status lead him to imitate or join forces with other youth who have turned to gangs and crime. "By the time the youth is in high school, the pattern of failure is well established, and school success seems both impossible and uninteresting." It has been found that

---


6Cohen, p. 115.
an outstanding characteristic of juvenile delinquents is their dislike for school. A characteristic which all institutionalized youth seem to have in common is school failure.

Polk and Schafer stated that the school dominates the life of the adolescent. The experiences which the school provides are generally segregated, passive, and meaningless in nature. This generates special problems and failures for delinquency-prone youngsters.

The Gluecks found that delinquents are more retarded educationally than non-delinquents. Delinquents expressed a "violent" dislike for school, resentment at its restrictions, and lack of interest in school work to a much greater degree than non-delinquents. The school attainment of the delinquent was found to be far below that of the non-delinquent.

The Los Angeles County Grand Jury, in a report on the Los Angeles County Juvenile Justice System, commented:

... some school practices are channeling students into delinquency. ... The schools fail to interest the

---


student in the desire to learn. The schools also fail to create a climate conducive to stimulate this desire. This helps to create the reservoir of candidates for the criminal justice system.\textsuperscript{11}

Thus, it appears that there is a connection between school failure and delinquency.

Tappan stated that the responsibility for delinquency prevention should be given to those social agencies, such as the school, which are designed to handle various social and behavioral problems.\textsuperscript{12} Tunley stated that schools are potentially one of our best weapons against delinquency. However, "they often lack the funds, the imagination, the public backing, or all three, to do the job."\textsuperscript{13} The American Bar Association stated that correctional education programs are difficult to provide and are not of equal quality with public school education.\textsuperscript{14} Thus, it appears that education can be an effective weapon against delinquency but neither public schools nor correctional education programs are doing an effective job.

Generally speaking, it appears that students in correctional education programs do try to take advantage of those programs. A study of Compensatory Education programs

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
in correctional institutions throughout the country revealed that two thirds of the students surveyed had a positive attitude toward the program in which they were enrolled.\textsuperscript{15} A study of a junior college program operated by the CYA found that 73 percent of the students, originally enrolled, remained in the program until paroled. An exit questionnaire, administered to all students paroled from the college program, elicited a 98 percent "very favorable" attitude toward the program. Students in this program earned a median of 39 college credits in a median of 8.8 months in the program, with a median grade point average of 3.3 on a 4 point scale.\textsuperscript{16} Of 3,311 students released from CYA institution academic programs in 1977, CYA teachers rated 86 percent as having applied themselves to their studies at a "good" to "excellent" degree.\textsuperscript{17}

The Right to an "Equal" Education

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court committed itself to the principle that education, "must be made available to all on equal terms." The Court ruled that:

In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied an opportunity to an education. Such an opportunity,

\textsuperscript{15}Compensatory Education and Confined Youth, p. 62.

\textsuperscript{16}California, Youth Authority, Assessment of Junior College Program for Youthful Offenders In an Institution, Research Report No. 65, June, 1973, pp. 15-22.

\textsuperscript{17}California, Youth Authority, A Summary of Institutional Report Forms, January - December, 1977, March 6, 1978.
where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.\textsuperscript{18}

The California Supreme Court stated that:

Unequal education . . . leads to unequal job opportunities, disparate income, and handicapped ability to participate in the social, cultural, and political activity of our society.\textsuperscript{19}

The basic Constitutional assumption that handicapped children, also, "are entitled to the equal protection of the law and may not be treated differently without due process of law was used to successfully challenge the exclusion of the handicapped," from public schools, was successfully argued in two landmark court decisions--Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (334 F. Supp. 1257, E.D. P.A. 1971) and Mills v. Board of Education (348 F. Supp. 866 D.D.C. 1972).\textsuperscript{20}

A 1978 survey of students in California Youth Authority institutions revealed that at least 33 percent are handicapped according to the definitions of the handicapped set forth in Public Law 94-142, of 1977, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act.\textsuperscript{21} Thus, it appears that education can have an effect on delinquency, that all have


\textsuperscript{19}San Francisco Unified School District v. Johnson, 3 Cal. 3d. 937, 92 Cal. Rptr. 309, 479 P. 2d 669.


an equal right to an education, including delinquents, and that "unequal" education leaves the individual at a distinct disadvantage in society.

Education and Success on Parole

According to Martinson, the evidence indicates that institutional education leads to success on parole.22 The California Youth Authority reported that after 15 months on parole students who had been in the Fricot Junior College Program violated at a rate of nine percent as opposed to the CYA-wide rate of 28 percent for the same age group.23

Summary

Based upon the foregoing discussion, it appears that there is a connection between school failure and delinquency. It appears that delinquents in institutions try to take advantage of school programs, that they have a right to an equal opportunity to education with that of their public school counterparts, and that institution education programs do contribute to success on parole.

This chapter reviews three aspects of correctional education programs. It reviews delivery systems, financing, and support services for correctional education programs.


23 Assessment of Junior College Program for Youthful Offenders In an Institution, p. 111.
Education Delivery Systems

This section reviews education delivery systems from three standpoints. It includes general principles of organization, the organization of correctional education programs in general, and education organization in the CYA.

General Principles of Organization

Miller, Madden, and Kincheloe defined an organization as:

... a group of human beings who have banded themselves together to seek particular goals, have assigned tasks to various members, have developed specialized personnel to carry out the tasks, and have granted definite authority to various members to execute the tasks.24

Whenever a group of people have a common task, an organizational structure is required. An unorganized group cannot establish its purposes or accomplish its ultimate objectives. Therefore, in order to survive, the group must organize.25

According to Morphet, Johns, and Reller, the organization must provide the following procedures for making decisions and taking action:

1. A procedure for selecting a leader . . .
2. A procedure for determining the roles to be played by each member of the group.


The authors further stated that, "The ultimate purpose for an organization is to establish conditions which will enhance the effectiveness of the organization in attaining its goals.\textsuperscript{27}

The effectiveness of an organization is improved by having a single leader who must provide central coordination and articulation for all of the organization's activities. If this is not done the organization cannot achieve its purposes, because division of central leadership will prevent the coordination of its activities. The activities of any effective organization must be coordinated, and this can best be achieved through a single executive head.\textsuperscript{28} Coordination does not necessarily mean central control over a myriad of detailed, specific functions. Instead, it should be a wise combination of all the organization's activities in a common thrust toward desired objectives.\textsuperscript{29}

Morphet, Johns, and Reller further stated:

The effectiveness of an organization is enhanced by clear definition of goals and purposes . . . a complex organization such as an educational structure has many purposes and goals. In such an organization these must be carefully determined. Unless this is done, the organization is likely to operate with conflicting objectives. Such an organization will almost inevitably

\textsuperscript{26}\textit{Ibid.}  \textsuperscript{27}\textit{Ibid.}  \textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 94.  
\textsuperscript{29}Miller, Madden, and Kincheloe, p. 102.
end in conflict among members of the group or between the group and the official leadership. 30

One of the rationalizations in evading the problem of organization takes the form of "gang-administration." This argument holds that, "We're all good people here, we're cooperative, and work out all our problems together." However good intentions, or mere cooperativeness, is not enough. To be effective, cooperation must be directed and follow a pattern or a plan. 31

In summary, it appears that in order to be effective, people who are working together to seek common purposes and goals must organize so that the common purposes and goals can be clearly established and can be achieved. This seems to be best enhanced with a single executive head of the organization, who has the job of coordinating the activities of the organization.

The Organization of Correctional Education Programs

The need for a basic education is extremely important in our rapidly changing, complex society. If a person is to be gainfully employed within the non-delinquent society, he must have at least a "survival" reading ability, along with

30Morphet, Johns, and Reller, p. 94.

other skills which are necessary to cope successfully on
the job and within society.\textsuperscript{32}

Educators, and especially correctional educators,
are increasingly faced with the overwhelming task of dealing
with alienated individuals who are school failures.\textsuperscript{33}
Regarding alienated individuals, the American Bar Association
stated that such individuals:

\ldots seek alternative means of achieving what they
feel are the essentials of life. Often these individuals
turn to criminal activity, and in due course, are apprehended, tried, convicted, and sentenced to probation
supervision, or confinement.\textsuperscript{34}

The correctional educator's task is complicated by
the very nature of the individual with whom he must deal, and
the environment in which both must work.\textsuperscript{35} The American Bar
Association further stated:

The offender is often alienated socially, highly hos­
tile, previously unsuccessful in school, a remedial prob­
lem in most academic areas, of average intelligence, and
usually anti-teacher as a result of his previous en­
counters with education. With these "givens" it is at
best a difficult situation for correctional educators
to "get through" to these individuals.\textsuperscript{36}

The problem for the correctional educator is compli­
cated to a great extent by the following conditions:\textsuperscript{37}

1. Slim budgets.
2. Thin staffing.
3. Almost non-existent learning materials budgets
in many cases.

\textsuperscript{32}"Potential of Correctional School District Organi­
\textsuperscript{33}Ibid. \textsuperscript{34}Ibid. \textsuperscript{35}Ibid. \textsuperscript{36}Ibid. \textsuperscript{37}Ibid.
4. Uncooperative wardens.
5. Limited control of the enrollment and termination of students.
6. Institution policies which are detrimental to learning.
7. Inadequate diagnostic techniques.
8. Education takes a low priority in many correctional institutions and agencies.
9. There is a lack of total framework for educational services, as differentiated from piece-meal programs.
10. Many people in the correctional field still feel that custody is the institution's principal function and that education is wasted on the offender population.
11. Inmates not being allowed to participate in vocational programs because their services were needed in institution maintenance or industries.
12. Inadequate equipment and facilities.
13. Classification committees which are insensitive to inmates' educational needs.
14. Counselors who offer inmates little encouragement toward enrolling in education programs.
15. The goals of custody and rehabilitation frequently conflict with one another to the extent that they intrude upon one another.38

38 James E. Bottoms, "What Will it Take To Achieve Excellence in Correctional Education," Journal of Correctional Education, 29, No. 2 (1977), 2; see also Dell'Apa,
These limitations seem to indicate the need to improve the educational services provided to the majority of individuals in our correctional institutions.39

Delivery systems for correctional education programs vary throughout the United States. However, they all seem to fall into one of three basic models: (1) some are part of local public school districts, (2) some are part of special correctional school districts, and (3) others are part of the state correctional systems.40 In recent years there have been four studies of delivery systems for correctional education programs, which relate to the present study. One of these studied the correctional school district and its potential. The other three studied and compared several alternative delivery systems for correctional education as they related to specific situations.


The American Bar Association published a study of the potential of the special correctional school district.41 This study listed the following advantages of the school district:

1. Priorities can be easily established and assigned to educational programs and services in correctional institutions.

2. This legally constituted educational unit has broader access to federal and state sources of funds.

3. Funding, which will permit full programming, encourages long-range planning and staffing continuity.

4. Status of prison education programs can be advanced in relation to other prison programs. Status of teachers, too, is brought to a par with other educators in the state.

5. Certification standards for prison schools and programs can be established and controlled by the Board.

6. Better efficiency can be achieved in providing educational support services to institutions within a state.

7. More flexibility and efficiency is available in encouraging program replication from one site to another.

8. Development of alternative models for education programs can be facilitated.

---

9. The setting can be improved for the implementation of prison industries, work release, and placement services.

10. The special board of education can serve as a powerful intermediary and spokesman with the state legislature and state superintendent of schools.

11. This unit of organization more readily lends itself to accreditation and evaluation.\textsuperscript{42}

This report identified six states which have operational correctional school districts, including Texas, Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, Arkansas, and Ohio.\textsuperscript{43} It also explored some of the advantages and disadvantages of correctional school districts, as compared with the other two commonly used delivery systems (See Table 1). This table implies that the correctional school district is more advantageous than are the other two systems, at least as far as the 11 listed criteria are concerned.\textsuperscript{44}

In late 1976, in response to the mandates of U.S. Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the California State Department of Education (SDE), Office of Special Education, established a task force to determine the best delivery system for special education services in the Department of Health (DOH) and CYA. The purpose of identifying this delivery system was to then

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., pp. 3-4. \textsuperscript{43}Ibid., p. 3. \textsuperscript{44}Ibid., p. 7.
Table 1
Pro's and Con's of Correctional School District Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional Institution Funding</th>
<th>Institution Incorporated in Local School District</th>
<th>Independent Correctional School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to State Education Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent School Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to all USOE Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Other Federal Funds</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to State Support Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality in Bargaining for Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of State Certification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptivity to Correctional Education Needs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Priority Conflict</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferrable Credit, No Correction Label</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

+ Possesses characteristic or possibility.
- Does not possess characteristic or possibility.
+ - May or may not possess characteristic or possibility of being implemented, depending upon other considerations.
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implement it and thereby help bring DOH and CYA education programs into compliance with P.L. 94-142. The task force studied the following alternative delivery systems:

1. Leave special education programs and services in the CYA and DOH (Department of Health), under their current administration, and require all schools and programs to submit "compliance applications" and to submit to annual site audits.

2. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all hospital, CYA, etc., schools to the SDE for direct administration.

3. Through changes in statutes, make DOH and CYA schools "special school districts" entitled to state apportionments and responsible for special education, as any other California school district.

4. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all DOH, CYA, etc., schools to the county superintendent of the counties in which the facilities are located.

5. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all DOH, CYA, etc., schools to the local public school districts, within which the facilities are located.

6. Establish joint powers agreements with agencies involved with the delivery of services to handicapped children.

The task force recommended alternative number 4, county superintendent, as its preference. The choice least preferred was alternative number 1, leave under current administration. The SDE subsequently proposed alternative number 4


to the California State Legislature, as a bill which would have placed education services for the DOH and CYA under the authority of the local county superintendents of schools. (AB 1938, Antonovich). The bill did not pass, largely due to the opposition of the CYA, which was doing a study of its own. The CYA continues to administer its own program.49

A study was made of alternative delivery systems for vocational education in the Oregon correctional system. The study was performed by the staff of the Oregon Corrections Education Commission and was presented as a paper at the National Conference on Vocational Education in Corrections in May, 1977.50 The study identified the following eight criteria for evaluating potential delivery systems:

1. Program Stigma. The ability of the program to avoid negative labels attached to corrections clients, as a sub-group of the general population.

2. Credentialling. The ability of the program to negotiate and deliver a comprehensive breadth and scope of legitimate licensing and credentialing for inmates.

3. Maximize the Use of Existing Education Resources. The ability of the program to maximize the use of the state's existing resources for comprehensiveness and flexibility.

4. Education System Impact. The potential for becoming an established part of the existing education system.

49Statement by Mr. Trumbull W. Kelly, Education Program Supervisor, CYA, in a personal interview, September 19, 1977.

5. Corrections Input. The ability to maximize education opportunity for corrections clients, which is compatible with present and/or future policy.

6. Potential for Community-Based Correction Education. The ability to meet the changing needs of clients, based on trends toward community-based corrections systems.

7. Financial Consideration. The ability to draw upon sources of funding adequate for initiating and maintaining corrections education programs.

8. Evaluation Mechanisms. The ability of the administrative structure to facilitate the evaluation of corrections education programs.51

The following 12 delivery systems were tested against these eight criteria:

1. Operation by an Education Coordinating Council.
2. Operation by the Vocational Rehabilitation Division of the State Department of Education.
3. Assimilation by the Local School District.
5. Assimilation by a Community College District.
6. Creation of an Independent Community College District.
7. Creation of a Special Correctional School District.
8. Operation by the State Board of Higher Education.
9. Operation by the State Board of Education.
11. Operation by the Division of Continuing Education.
12. Continuation of the Existing Structure within the Corrections Division.

51Ibid., pp. 1-6. 52Ibid., p. 7.
Based upon this study, Oregon established a semi-autonomous commission titled the Joint Corrections Education Planning and Development Team. Its members include representatives from Corrections, Department of Education, Higher Education, Employment Division, and the community colleges.\textsuperscript{53}

According to Evan:

The responsibility for planning the corrections education program and delivery system is vested in the State Department of Education. The planning process is carried out by the Commission . . . staffed by Department of Education personnel. The Corrections Division retains operational responsibility.\textsuperscript{54}

In summary, it is to be noted that four studies of alternative delivery systems for correctional education programs recommended systems which have a centralized planning and administrative body. Two of these studies recommended special correctional school districts as the best alternative.

**Education Organization in the CYA**

CYA staff studied the possibility of creating a special correctional school district and presented it to CYA administration in 1977.\textsuperscript{55} The study revealed 20 problems with the CYA education program. These problems were translated into objectives, as follows:

1. Provide a centralized administrative organization for education in the CYA with direct-line authority to all institution education programs.

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., p. 26. \textsuperscript{54}Ibid., pp. 26-7. \textsuperscript{55}Spencer and Kelly, pp. 1-42.
2. Provide centralized coordination, communication, supervision, and direction to an education system in the CYA.

3. Provide technical assistance to local CYA education programs from the central administration, such as curriculum consultants, special program coordinators, pupil personnel specialists, and vocational consultants.

4. Provide a centralized system of quality control and evaluation for the CYA education program.

5. Qualify for new and additional funding resources.

6. Reduce, or eliminate, the problem of education competing for funding with other CYA program components.

7. Make more efficient use of existing resources.

8. Require the CYA to follow selected sections of the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5.

9. Provide extensive in-service training to new and established teachers and education administrators.

10. Establish pupil/teacher ratios for the general CYA education program which reflect the needs and characteristics of the students and the workload which is required of teachers.

11. Provide teacher/administrator ratios which reflect CYA program requirements and allow sufficient administrator time to supervise teachers in the classroom.

12. Provide professional educational psychology services to all CYA students.

13. Provide professional pupil-personnel services to all CYA students.

14. Provide a professionally developed CYA education program-wide testing program.

15. Provide a professionally developed, CYA-wide educational diagnostic/evaluative program.

16. Become (CYA) sanctioned to grant high school diplomas without a "jail-house" stigma.

17. Become (CYA) sanctioned as a GED Testing Center.
18. Facilitate interagency activities and agreements between the CYA and public school districts.

19. Take advantage of (CYA) and utilize community education programs and facilities.

20. Retain and promote the team approach to treatment.  

These 20 objectives were used to test each of the following six alternative delivery systems:

1. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all CYA education programs to the SDE for direct administration.

2. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all CYA education programs to the local school district in which the local CYA program is located.

3. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all CYA education programs to the county superintendent of schools of the counties in which the CYA programs are located.

4. Leave the responsibility and authority for education in the CYA within the CYA, upgrade its status to Branch level, and establish direct lines of supervision to all education programs within the CYA.

5. Enter into joint powers agreements with county offices of education, local school districts, and local community college districts.

6. Through legislation, create a special correctional school district, within the CYA, which would be eligible for state entitlements and federal funding.

It should be noted here that alternatives numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 are the same as five of the six alternatives studied by the SDE task force.

56 Ibid., pp. 15-16. 57 Ibid., pp. 17-33.
This study concluded that the special correctional school district best met the requirements of the 20 objectives. It was, therefore, recommended that the CYA proceed with a more in-depth study of the ramifications of becoming a correctional school district and develop an implementation plan for establishing its education program as a school district.58

Five studies of the CYA education program were made between 1970 and 1978. Each of these studies recommended that the CYA either centralize the administration of its education program or consider becoming a school district.

In 1970, a CYA multi-disciplinary task force studied the CYA education program and then submitted a "Five Year Strategy for Change." The task force stated:

The Youth Authority should recognize that all of the facilities are part of a single integrated system, and that their varying functions are determined by the major educational needs of the wards referred to them. . . . It does, however, require educational program decisions coming from a centralized body.59

In 1971-1972, as a result of a complaint by the Child Advocate Committee about the quality of education in the CYA, an evaluation was made of six CYA institution education programs. The evaluation followed a modified accreditation format for public high schools as utilized by the Western

58 Ibid., p. 33.

Association of Schools and Colleges. The evaluation provided
the CYA with a series of major recommendations (see Appen-
dix A). 60 Thirteen of these 16 recommendations have not
been implemented. 61 Among those not implemented are:

2.0 The education program should be emphasized as a
major component in the Youth Authority rehabilitation
effort. . . .

9.0 Procedures should be developed for a coordi-
nation of the education programs among the institu-
tions. . . .

16.0 The CYA should review the publication, The
Education Program in the California Youth Authority:
Five Year Strategy for Change. 62

In August 1976, the California State Department of
Finance released a report on the CYA vocational education
program. In this report it was recommended that the CYA
consider the establishment of a school district. 63

In mid 1978, the CYA contracted with Carvell Edu-
cation Management Planning to study the CYA vocational edu-
cation program. In its report dated November, 1978, Carvell
stated that the CYA education program has no system-wide
mechanism for planning, providing technical or professional

60 California, Department of Education, "Visiting Com-
p. 4-13.

61 Spencer and Kelly, p. 1


63 California, Department of Finance, "Vocational
Education in the California Youth Authority," Staff Service
assistance to local institution programs or for assessing the effectiveness of the education program. Carvell reported that the CYA education program has no commonly accepted goals or objectives and that there is little uniformity or consistency among programs. It was recommended that efforts be made to centralize administration of the CYA education program.64

In 1978 the Joint Legislative Audit Committee of the State of California, Office of the Auditor General, published a study of the CYA education program. The report noted that there is no centralized administrative structure for education in the CYA which has authority over the program such that it can require mandatory use of state-wide standards and objectives and participation in evaluation activities. The report recommended that such a centralized administrative structure be established.65

In summary, five studies of the CYA education program recommended that the CYA establish a centralized education administration. One of these studies specifically recommended the special correctional school district.

---

Financing Correctional Education Programs

This section demonstrates that the vast majority of correctional education programs throughout the U.S. are poorly financed. It also points out that although the CYA correctional education program is fairly well financed, it should receive even more funding.

The Situation in the U.S.

Correctional education programs usually have very limited budgets. Carsetti stated:

Ninety-five cents out of every dollar is spent on keeping a prisoner "in"; five cents out of every dollar is spent on preparing a prisoner to get "out." Is it any wonder that rehabilitation equals failure with odds like 19 to 1 against success... Money is spent for counselors, diagnosticians, free time programs, vocational training, recreation, and sometimes academic education.66

Carsetti went on to state that since only part of the five cents for rehabilitation goes to education, those offenders whose educational backgrounds are extremely neglected stand little chance of improving their educational skills while in an institution. Similarly, the average educated offender seeking enrichment courses is thwarted.67 Illiterate offenders, upon release, find themselves unable to perform "survival tasks," such as filling out job applications, completing food stamp applications, reading rental

---

67 Ibid.
agreements, road signs, magazines, directions, labels, and many more everyday tasks. Many of these illiterate parolees find that the problem of coping with a literate society is overwhelming, and many return to institutions. 

Correctional educators frequently have to lobby and compete with other correctional program components for funding. In many instances, the education program does not fare well in this competition for funds.

Adequate equipment, facilities, materials, and staff are a necessary part of any correctional education program. In a report to the U.S. Department of Labor, the authors stated that they had surveyed all correctional institutions in the U.S. Forty-five percent of these institutions reported their facilities to be inadequate. Institutions with vocational training programs spend less, on the average, than seven percent of their total budget on vocational training. This level of expenditure is inadequate and results in many program deficiencies.

In 1969, the Texas State Legislature passed legislation creating the Windham School District within the Texas

68 Ibid. 69 Ibid.


72 Ibid., p. ii. 73 Ibid., p. 70. 74 Ibid.
Department of Corrections (TDC), the first school district of its kind in the country.\textsuperscript{75} At the time of this legislation a very meager amount of money was being spent for education in TDC. Today, Windham School District receives $3.6 million in state education aid, $400,000 in federal grants, and one million in state-adopted textbooks.\textsuperscript{76}

The Situation in the CYA

The California Youth Authority (CYA) education programs are funded by the state's General Fund, as a part of the CYA budget. Each local program is funded separately, and competes for funds with other CYA programs.\textsuperscript{77} Requests for education funding must be reviewed by non-educators and must compete with other CYA funding requests.\textsuperscript{78}

Although the CYA has received substantial funding through ESEA, Title I, ESEA, Title II, and the Vocational Education Act, there are many education funding sources, state and federal, for which the CYA does not qualify because it is not a local education agency (or school district).\textsuperscript{79} Some of these funding sources included Adult Basic Education, Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Education for the Handicapped, Educationally Disadvantaged Youth Programs, California Master


\textsuperscript{76}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{77}Spencer and Kelly, p. 10. \textsuperscript{78}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{79}Ibid., p. 11.
Plan for Special Education, P.L. 94-142, certain sub-parts of the Federal Vocational Education Act, and others.\textsuperscript{80}

Disadvantaged and handicapped students who attend public schools are eligible to receive special services through special funding programs administered by SDE.\textsuperscript{81} Special funding for these services ranges from $870 to $2,000 per student, per year. This support is above and beyond the regular state apportionments and local tax money which public schools receive.\textsuperscript{82} However, the Legal Counsel for SDE has ruled that CYA students are not eligible to receive these special funds because the CYA is not a public school district even though many CYA students meet the criteria for inclusion in these programs.\textsuperscript{83}

A major educational effort in corrections requires attention to costs, which are higher than in the regular public education system. These costs are higher because of the staff expertise required, additional needed training, the use of learning laboratories, the use of skill centers,\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{80}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{81}California, Youth Authority, "Remedial Education in the California Youth Authority," (unpublished report, 1977), p. 7.
\textsuperscript{82}Ibid., p. 8
\textsuperscript{83}"Remedial Education in the California Youth Authority," p. 8.
and the characteristics of the inmate-students.\textsuperscript{85}

The education budget for the CYA for fiscal year 1977-1978 was $9,762,874. This was all state (CYA) funding. In addition, the CYA received $1,932,033 from federal funding sources. This totalled $11,694,907 and amounted to $2,197 per unit of average daily attendance (ADA) for a 249 day school year.\textsuperscript{86} The $9,762,874 which represented the state effort, through the CYA budget, represented 8.5\% of the CYA's rehabilitation services funds and 6.3\% of the CYA's total budget.\textsuperscript{87}

The high schools in California, comparable to the CYA population, age-wise, spent $1,467 per unit of average daily attendance (ADA) during fiscal year 1975-1976 (most recent figures available). This was for a total of 220 days of instruction (180 plus 30 days of summer school).\textsuperscript{88}

When comparing these two different years, the CYA spent $730 more per ADA than the average California high school and conducted classes 29 days (or 18\%) longer. If the average expenditure for the public schools was increased by 18 percent, the comparison would change to $1,731 per unit.


\textsuperscript{86}California, Youth Authority, 1977-1978 Education Budget.

\textsuperscript{87}Auditor General's Report, p. 6.

ADA for public schools to $2,197 per ADA for the CYA. However, in order to get an accurate comparison, one more computation must be performed.

In 1973-1974, the public high schools in California spent $1,271 per ADA. Thus, between fiscal years 1973-1974 and 1975-1976 (2 years) their expenditure per ADA increased $196. If that increase were applied to the two-year period between 1975-1976 and 1977-1978, then the expenditure per ADA for public high schools in California would be $1,962, and the comparison with CYA school expenditures would be $1,962 to $2,197—a difference of $235 per ADA, or 11 percent.

As previously stated, the costs of correctional education will be considerably higher than in the regular public education system because of the staff preparation which is required and the characteristics of the students. Therefore, it would appear that CYA education funding should be considerably higher than that of the public high schools of California. In addition, CYA students receive no funding for Special Education or other specialized educational needs even though it is available to their public school counterparts.

---
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educational opportunity equal to that available to students in the California public schools. The CYA should be enabled to provide educational services including, but not limited to, Bilingual/Bicultural Education, Special Education, and Vocational Education. Therefore, it appears that the funding for CYA education programs should be richer than it is.

Support Services

Knezevich listed the following as support services in the public schools:

1. Guidance Services—including counseling and vocational guidance.
5. Speech and Hearing Services.
7. Medical Services.
8. Services for Exceptional Pupils—including services for gifted and handicapped students.

Authority,” p. 7.

92 Unpublished draft of legislation, which the CYA is developing for presentation to the California State Legislature.
93 Ibid.
94 Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public
This section discusses the need for education support services, the need for education support services in correctional education programs, and the extent to which these services are provided in the CYA education program.

The Need for Education Support Services

According to Knezevich:

The number and variety of specialists in guidance, social work, speech and hearing, health and psychological services are growing. These specialists serve pupils with learning, adjustment, and self-image problems, and their mission is to improve the pupils' learning and adjustment.95

Guidance and counseling. Studies have shown that students benefit from guidance programs. Those who avail themselves of these programs tend to learn more, better learn how to solve their own problems, make more realistic vocational choices, stay in college longer, are more successful in the vocational world, and are better adjusted from the standpoint of expressed behavior.96

Guidance counselors are concerned with understanding the potentials and limitations of each individual in order to help him to reach realistic goals. Guidance is a cluster of services and many different types of personnel have a role in it.97

---

95 Ibid.
96 Ibid. 97 Ibid.
Melbo stated that the school's guidance program should function to help the pupil:

1. to understand himself, his abilities and interests, and his personal characteristics.

2. to adjust himself satisfactorily to situations, problems, and pressures of his environment.

3. to develop the ability to make his own decisions wisely and solve his problems independently.

4. to make the most effective use of his capacities.

5. to learn about the educational, occupational, and social opportunities available to him, when he has reached the age or level of maturity at which these knowledges become important in order to make the appropriate choices.98

A school guidance program should be continuous and should complement the instructional program. All students need some guidance whether they have problems or not.99

Counseling is the central service of guidance and is so important to the guidance program that the two are frequently thought to be the same.100 According to Morphet, Johns, and Reller:

Educators generally agree . . . on the following:

1. Good counseling is needed and should be available to all students beginning in the elementary grades and extending through the colleges. . . .


100 Knezevich, p. 478.
4. Professionally trained counselors should be available. . . . These counselors should assume a major responsibility for leadership in planning and directing the counseling program. . . .

9. A major objective of counseling at all times should be to help students become increasingly able to think through their own problems and work out their own solutions.\textsuperscript{101}

Counseling should be school-based but coordinated from the district office.\textsuperscript{102} Counselors must be trained in psychology, sociology, test administration, and test interpretation.\textsuperscript{103} The recommended counselor/student ratio at the secondary level is 1:250 or 1:300.\textsuperscript{104}

Social work services. School social workers work with disadvantaged youngsters from socially and economically deprived areas. They also work with students from high socio-economic backgrounds who suffer from the stress of high social and academic expectations and develop maladjustments.\textsuperscript{105}

Psychological services. Some students have learning problems or emotional difficulties which require more expert help than most teachers or counselors are trained to handle. Learning can be impeded unless adequate counseling is provided. The specialized background of the school psychologist

\textsuperscript{100}Knezevich, p. 478.
\textsuperscript{101}Morphet, Johns, and Reller, pp. 389-90.
\textsuperscript{102}Stoops, Rafferty, and Johnson, p. 565. \textsuperscript{103}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{104}Knezevich, p. 438. \textsuperscript{105}Ibid., p. 430.
can supply this help. Some of the functions which the school psychologists can perform are:

1. Helping to remedy students' emotional problems.
2. Helping students with educational maladjustments.
3. Performing most of the school's individual testing.
4. Advising teachers in the interpretation of group test scores.
5. Analyzing statistical test results.
6. Assisting in curriculum development and the improvement of the learning environment.
7. Having a concern for the students' mental health.

**Psychiatric services.** Psychiatric services are usually limited to examination and consultation in schools. The psychiatrist can serve as a consultant to teachers and administrators as they work with disturbed students.

**Speech and hearing services.** It is estimated that more than three million students have speech or hearing defects so severe that it interferes with their educational, social, or emotional adjustment. Therefore, speech and hearing services need to be provided. It is estimated that

a child with a significant communication handicap should be seen by a therapist at least twice a week for 20-25 minutes. A total of 12 of these pupils would require a full time speech therapist.\textsuperscript{110}

\textbf{Nursing and medical services.} These services are designed to give students an understanding of good health principles so that they will not be deprived of an effective education due to poor health. In addition, physicians provide diagnoses, refer students to special services, provide immunization, and consult with school administration on a variety of health problems in the school.\textsuperscript{111}

\textbf{Services for exceptional pupils.} Knezevich stated, "It is consistent with democratic traditions that everybody be given an opportunity to develop to his or her fullest capacities."\textsuperscript{112} Students differ from each other in a variety of ways. When those differences exist to the extent that they interfere with learning, special programs should be developed.\textsuperscript{113} Special education programs require specially trained teachers.\textsuperscript{114}

Depending upon the size and organization of the school

\textsuperscript{110}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{111}\textit{Ibid.; see also Robert E. Wilson, Educational Administration (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966), 597-98.}

\textsuperscript{112}Knezevich, p. 433.

\textsuperscript{113}\textit{Stoops, Rafferty, and Johnson, p. 489.}

\textsuperscript{114}\textit{Ibid.}
system, several individuals will be the major source of help for the special education teacher. The director of special education should be a member of the district office staff and it should be his task to coordinate the program, provide necessary materials, equipment, and facilities, provide appropriate staffing, place pupils, and provide in-service training for teachers.115

Conclusion. As Knezevich pointed out, "Improvement of the quality of instruction depends not only upon the time and talents of individual teachers, but also on the availability . . . of a host of special services."116

The Need for Education Support Services in Correctional Education Programs

In 1973, the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, in discussing correctional education programs, recommended that:

Each education department should have a guidance counselor (preferably a certificated school psychologist) and a student personnel worker. School records of juveniles should be available to these persons at the time of commitment.117

In a study of the state juvenile corrections systems in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Texas, and Virginia, the General Accounting Office (GAO) found that twenty-five percent of the institution populations in these states had
primary learning problems, and that 76 percent of these institutionalized juvenile offenders had either primary or secondary learning problems.\textsuperscript{118}

Banchara and Zaba stated:

It should be emphasized that there is a percentage of juvenile delinquents who fall within a category of having primary learning disabilities who possibly are fostering poor self-concepts and depression. They seem to turn to acting-out behavior which is exhibited in school, as a means of dealing with this internal frustration. It is this juvenile delinquent which makes up a good percentage of the overall delinquent population, and who, if not dealt with in an appropriate fashion immediately, will return to the court for possibly a more serious offense.\textsuperscript{119}

Banchara and Zaba went on to state:

... programs incorporating appropriate academic therapy and, along with traditional means of dealing with delinquent youths, have greatly reduced recidivism and have aided many learning disabled children. Although the delinquent child with a learning disability presents a formidable challenge, this challenge can be met with a multidisciplinary approach in diagnosis and remediation.\textsuperscript{120}

Dell'Apa collected data from 40 correctional institutions in the West, including over 7,500 youths, and found that large percentages of these youths had handicaps which interfered with their learning in one way or another (see


\textsuperscript{119}Gary H. Banchara and Joel N. Zaba, "Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency: Beyond the Correlation," (Pre-edited draft copy of an article accepted for publication by the Journal of Learning Disabilities, April 4, 1978), p. 5.

\textsuperscript{120}Ibid.
Table 2 describes the percentage of students with various problems interfering with learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Handicap</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Handicap</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Difficulty</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Remedial Problem</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Disadvantaged</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral and Social Problems</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Motivated to Learn</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appears Mentally Retarded</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students With One or More Special Problems</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students With Two or More Special Problems</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students With Three or More Special Problems</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears, therefore, that a large percentage of delinquents have learning problems which require special support services.

The Situation in the CYA

Some of the support services listed by Knezevich are provided by the CYA outside of the education program.

---

121 Dell'Apa, p. 3.
Other support services are provided by the education program, and still others are not provided at all.\textsuperscript{122}

\textbf{Guidance services.} In CYA institutions, virtually all educational counseling, guidance services, vocational counseling, support counseling, and crisis intervention counseling is performed by classroom teachers.\textsuperscript{123} These teachers are not trained as counselors.\textsuperscript{124} There are no full time, professionally-trained educational counselors in CYA institutions.\textsuperscript{125} Therefore, CYA students are not receiving adequate educational counseling services.\textsuperscript{126} In Morales v. Turman, the U.S. District Court set a standard of one academic and one vocational counselor for every 100 juveniles in Texas state juvenile correctional institutions.\textsuperscript{127}

\textbf{Social work services.} It is the experience of the researcher that the CYA provides a trained caseworker for each 50 institutionalized students. These caseworkers are either Social Workers with Master's Degrees in Social Work or Institution Parole Agents. In addition, when a student is released from an institution, he has the services of a Parole Agent available to him. These caseworkers help the student adjust to his environment, solve his problems,

\textsuperscript{122}Spencer and Kelly, p. 10. \textsuperscript{123}Ibid. \textsuperscript{124}Ibid. \textsuperscript{125}Ibid. \textsuperscript{126}Ibid.

become a productive citizen, and a non-delinquent.

School psychological services. There are no adequate educational diagnostic services available at CYA institutions. Some CYA institutions do have School Psychologists, but they are half-funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I, and are required to devote one half of their time to ESEA participants (one fourth of a given institution's population). The remainder of their time may be devoted to serving the remaining three fourths of the population. In most institutions, this amounts to a ratio of about 1 to 400. In Morales v. Turman, the Court established a standard of one educational diagnostician per 200 juveniles.

Psychiatric services. These services are available to all students in CYA institutions. The equivalent of one psychiatrist is available to each 400 bed institution. Psychiatric services are primarily diagnostic. In addition, psychiatrists consult with institution staff regarding treatment strategies for individual students.

Speech and hearing services. The CYA provides no

128 Spencer and Kelly, p. 10.

129 Morales v. Turman.

130 Statement by W. Lloyd Bennett, Supervisor of Treatment, Karl Holton School, California Youth Authority, in an interview on September 18, 1978, Stockton, Calif.
speech services. It provides only those hearing examinations and services which attempt to detect and correct gross hearing problems.131

Nursing and medical services. It is the experience of the researcher that each CYA institution has complete medical facilities and services available. Each institution has its own hospital and at least one full time Physician. In addition, Nurses and Medical Technical Assistants are employed. Contracts are negotiated with local county hospitals to provide medical services beyond the scope of the CYA medical program.

Services for exceptional pupils. The CYA estimates that of the students it serves, 1,300 (of 4,000) are handicapped in one way or another (see Table 3).132 In spite of these figures, the CYA has no programs specifically designed to meet the needs of these students.133

The visiting committee, which studied the CYA education program in 1971-1972, recommended that each CYA school employ a staff school psychologist (recommendation 7.0). It recommended that the CYA establish educational personnel policies which provide staff qualified to provide the edu-

131Spencer and Kelly, p. 7


133Spencer and Kelly, p. 7.
cational program especially designed to meet the unique and special needs of the CYA wards (recommendation 11.0). It recommended that, "A pupil-personnel counselor position should be established at each institution" (recommendation 11.9). It also recommended, "That a program of individual and personal ward counseling be implemented which provides for complete confidentiality," (recommendation 13.0).\textsuperscript{134} See Appendix A. None of these recommendations were implemented by the CYA.\textsuperscript{135}

Table 3

Estimated Educationally-Related Handicaps in CYA Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicap</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavior Disorders</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seriously Emotionally Disturbed</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Disorders</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educable Mentally Retarded</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Remaining categories defined in P.L. 94-142 (e.g., Pregnant Minors, Drug Dependent, Orthopedically Handicapped)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1970, the CYA's task force which wrote the "Five Year Strategy for Change," noted, "The Youth Authority

\textsuperscript{134} "Visiting Committee Report," p. 11.
\textsuperscript{135} Spencer and Kelly, p. 10.
schools are without the many support services . . . commonly present in public education."136

The Auditor General's report on the CYA education program, in 1978, stated:

CYA's educational diagnostic . . . process does not adequately address special ward educational needs such as learning handicaps. . . . CYA's academic program does not address the particular needs of the educationally handicapped. . . . In addition, staff are not trained to meet ward's specialized needs.137

It, therefore, appears that educational support services are important to correctional education programs and their clients. It also appears that the CYA's support services are inadequate and need to be improved.

Summary

This chapter has discussed three aspects of correctional education programs. It has reviewed administrative organization from a general theoretical standpoint, the administrative organization of correctional education programs in general, and the administrative organization of the CYA education program. Secondly, the chapter has reviewed the financing of correctional education programs throughout the country and in the CYA in particular. Finally, the chapter has reviewed the need for education support services in general, the need for these services in correctional education


137Auditor General's Report, pp. 22-34.
programs, and the extent to which these services are provided by the CYA education program.
Chapter 3

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to develop a model education delivery system for the California Youth Authority. The procedures employed in conducting this study are presented in detail in this chapter.

The study investigated three aspects of a model delivery system for education in the California Youth Authority (CYA). These included a model administrative organization, a model financial support program, and a model for support services.

Model Administrative Organization

Two sources were utilized to obtain information and data regarding a model administrative organization for the CYA education program. A review of related literature was conducted and a research project conducted.

Review of Related Literature

A review of related literature was made to determine general principles of organization, to determine what organizational principles should be applied in correctional education programs, and to compare these data with the current organization of the CYA education program. The readings indicated that correctional education programs should have
centralized leadership and administration which the CYA lacks.

Research Project

Seven administrative organization models were studied to determine which one could provide a structure within which the problems existing in the CYA education program could be best resolved. The models studied were seven of those suggested by various writers as viable administrative models for delivering educational services in correctional agencies.\(^1\)

The models studied included:

1. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all CYA education programs to the California State Department of Education (SDE).

2. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all CYA education programs to the local school districts in which the various CYA programs are located.

3. Transfer the authority and responsibility for all CYA education programs to the county superintendents of schools in the counties in which the various CYA programs are located.

4. Authorize the CYA to enter into joint powers agreements with county offices of education, local school

---

\(^1\)Evan, pp. 6-26; see also "Potential of Correctional School District Organizations," p. 3; see also California State Department of Education Task Force for Special Education in the CYA and Department of Health. April, 1977 minutes.
districts, and local community college districts as a means of providing improved services.

5. Through legislation, create a special correctional school district which would be responsible for all CYA education programs.

6. Leave the responsibility and authority for education in the CYA within the CYA and establish a special branch for education with direct lines of authority to all local education programs.

7. Make no organizational changes in the CYA education program and encourage the CYA administration to give education a higher priority.

Each of these models was evaluated in terms of the extent to which it could provide for the resolution of the problems which existed in the CYA education program.

Twelve problems were identified in the CYA education program. These problems were selected on the basis of a 1977 study of the CYA education program.\(^2\) These 12 problems were then translated into criteria against which each model was tested. The 12 criteria were as follows:

1. Provides a centralized administrative organization for education in the CYA with direct-line authority to all local education programs.

2. Provides for centralized communication,

\(^2\)Spencer and Kelly, pp. 15-16.
coordination, and supervision systems within the CYA education program.

3. Provides the ability for the administrative organization to give technical assistance to local CYA education programs.

4. Provides a centralized system of quality control and evaluation to the CYA education program.

5. Provides the ability for the CYA education program to qualify for the same special state and federal funding resources for which public schools are eligible.

6. Provides for the reduction, or elimination, of CYA education programs having to compete for funding with other CYA program components.

7. Provides the administrative organization with the ability to use resources in a flexible manner.

8. Provides the necessity for the CYA education program to meet many, or all, of the regulations and standards established in the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5.

9. Provides the ability for the CYA education administration to establish support services to the local education programs.

10. Provides the authority for the CYA education program to issue high school diplomas.

11. Provides the authority for the CYA education program to qualify as a GED testing center.

12. Provides for the CYA education program to be
controlled by educators.

The CYA has been using a treatment team approach to the rehabilitation of delinquents. This approach includes the membership of teachers on treatment teams. This procedure has been a successful approach to the treatment of the "whole" delinquent. Because of the success of this approach another criterion was added:

13. Provides the opportunity for teachers to be members of treatment teams.

A questionnaire was developed to determine the extent to which each model met each criterion. The questionnaire covered all criteria except numbers five, ten, and eleven concerning the CYA qualifying for new funding resources, high school diplomas, and GED testing centers.

The questionnaire was constructed in the form of a matrix (see Appendix B) and each respondent was asked to rate each of the seven models against each of the ten criteria. Each person was asked to rate the extent to which each model met each criterion (model/criterion item) on a five-point Likert Scale (from 1, for poorly, to 5, for very well).

To ensure clarity of instruction, the questionnaire was field-tested with five CYA education staff who were not included as participants in the final administration of the

---

3Spencer and Kelly, p. 12.
questionnaire. A description of each of the seven models was included at the suggestion of this group. To ensure that the questionnaire was properly constructed, it was reviewed by Dr. Bobby Hopkins, Associate Professor of Education, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California. Dr. Hopkins had no suggestions for further change.

The questionnaire was sent to 109 CYA employees. These included 10 institution Superintendents, 10 Assistant Superintendents, eight Supervisors of Education, 14 Supervisors of Academic Instruction, three Supervisors of Vocational Instruction, five camp teachers, six administrative staff from the CYA Education Services Unit, and five top-level administrators in the Institutions and Camps Branch of the CYA, which administers all CYA treatment programs in institutions. These people represent all staff in these various capacities, in the CYA. In addition, the questionnaire was sent to six randomly selected teachers from each of the CYA's eight institutions.

The questionnaire was mailed to each respondent along with a stamped, addressed envelope in which to return the completed questionnaire. Also included with the questionnaire was a stamped, addressed post card, which the respondent was asked to sign and return to the researcher once he had completed and mailed the questionnaire. This ensured anonymity for the respondents and still kept the researcher informed as to who had returned questionnaires. Respondents were asked to return the questionnaire within seven days.
A 70 percent return of the questionnaire was determined adequate for this study. Follow-up telephone calls to those who had not returned post cards was required before a 70 percent return was achieved.

In order to collect data regarding criterion number five, concerning the CYA education program's qualifying for additional state and federal funding, interviews were held. The researcher interviewed an administrator, or consultant, involved in the administration of each of 48 of the 82 funding programs listed in the 1976 publication of the SDE titled, Outline of Selected Funding Sources for California Schools (see Appendix C). This was done to determine which models could qualify for which funding sources. Certain of the sources listed in the publication were eliminated for purposes of this study as described in the Financial Model section of this chapter.

In order to collect data regarding criteria numbers ten and eleven, letters were written. A letter was written to Mr. Joseph R. Hoffman, Consultant, SDE, describing the seven models and asking for a written response as to which of the models could be authorized to grant high school diplomas (see Appendix D for his response). A letter was written to Mr. Harry Bigelow, GED Coordinator, SDE, describing the seven models and asking for a written statement as to

---

4Discussion with Dr. William Theimer, University of the Pacific, December, 1977.
which models could become GED testing centers (see Appendix E for the response).

After all of the data had been gathered for criteria items number five, ten, and eleven, those model/criterion items involved with these three criteria were given weighted scores according to the response received. For the purpose of this study, those models qualifying for 90 percent, or more, of the funding sources studied were awarded a score of 5 (meets criterion very well), on the Likert Scale. Those models qualifying for 75%-89% were awarded a score of 4. Those qualifying for 60%-74% scored 3, 45%-59% scored 2, and less than 45% scored 1. Those models qualifying to be GED testing centers scored 5, and those not qualifying scored 1.

After a 70 percent questionnaire return had been achieved, a statistical mean was calculated for each model/criterion item. The model best meeting a given criterion was determined by observing which model had the highest mean for that criterion (highest criterion mean). The number of highest criterion means was counted for each model. A Chi Square Goodness of Fit was then calculated to determine the significance of these data. The Special Correctional School District was selected as the model best meeting the 13 criteria on the basis of these procedures.

A second questionnaire was then developed (see Appendix F). Different sections of the questionnaire were sent to the following staff members of each of the seven existing
correctional school districts in the United States including Arkansas, Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia:

1. Superintendent of the District--all sections.
2. Assistant Superintendent--all sections.
3. All school Principals--sections I through IIIA.

Sections I and II of the questionnaire were sent to the following staff members of each of the seven corrections agencies cooperating with correctional school districts:

1. Agency Director.
2. Assistant Director in charge of Treatment Services.
3. All institution Wardens representing institutions in which the correctional school district conducts classes.

The questionnaire contained three sections. Section I dealt with the relationships between the school district and the correctional agency and between their respective staffs. Section II was concerned with finances. Section III was concerned with Support Services and specific information regarding each correctional school district. Since the questionnaire was sent to an entire population--all district Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents and Principals of all seven correctional school districts in the U.S., and all Directors, Assistant Directors in charge of Treatment Services, and Wardens in their cooperating corrections agencies--
a 40 percent return of the questionnaires was determined as adequate for purposes of this study.

In order to ensure content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by Dr. T. C. Coleman and Dr. Roger Reimer of the School of Education, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California. It was also reviewed by Dr. John Phillips, Sociology Department, College of the Pacific, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California. The suggestions of these professors were incorporated into the final questionnaire.

Financial Model

Two sources were utilized to obtain data regarding a financial model for the CYA education program. The literature was reviewed. In addition, interviews and a research project were conducted.

Review of Related Literature.

A review of related literature was made to identify principles of financing correctional education programs and to compare those principles with how the CYA education program is financed. This review revealed that the CYA education program is ineligible for many state and federal funding sources. It also revealed that the CYA education program is not well funded.

Interviews.

Interviews were conducted with an administrator,
or consultant, involved in the administration of 48 of the 82 state and federal education funding programs described in the 1976 SDE publication, Outline of Selected Funding Sources for California Schools. Thirty-four of these funding sources were deleted from the study because they dealt with programs not applicable to the CYA population, required taxes to be levied (which the CYA is not empowered to do), were funded through apportionment (based upon taxes), they no longer existed, or the funding does not go directly to the schools. These interviews were conducted to determine which of the seven administrative organization models, discussed previously, could qualify for the largest number of these funding sources.

An interview was also conducted with Mr. Stephen Parodi, Chief, Bureau of School Apportionment and Reports, SDE. Mr. Parodi made suggestions regarding the financing of the CYA education program.

Research Project

Section II of the questionnaire, sent to the seven correctional school districts and their cooperating corrections agencies, concerned financing correctional school districts. The items were mainly concerned with which agency (corrections or school district) should be responsible for certain financing tasks. Some of the responses provided valuable information, additional to the data requested in the questionnaire.
Support Services Model

Two sources of information were used to collect data regarding a Support Services Model for the CYA education program. The literature was reviewed, and a research project was conducted.

Review of Related Literature

A review of related literature was conducted to identify principles and standards for support services in correctional education programs. These principles and standards were then compared with the support services existing in the CYA education program.

Research Project

Section III of the questionnaire sent to the seven correctional school districts was concerned with support services. It requested information as to what services staff felt should be included in a Support Services program for a correctional education program.

Statistical Design

Statistical procedures were used to determine the significance of the data gathered by the two questionnaires. The Chi Square was used for both questionnaires. In the first questionnaire, the Chi Square Goodness of Fit was used to determine whether the frequency distribution of number one rankings, obtained from the sample group, was signifi-
cantly different than the hypothesized frequency distribution of number one rankings of the models. In the second questionnaire, the Chi Square test of independence was used to determine whether or not the responses received were independent of the employment of the respondents. Although the second questionnaire was sent to an entire population, as opposed to a sample, it was anticipated that the return would be small. Therefore, the Chi Square test of independence was used to verify the data collected.

**First Questionnaire**

The first questionnaire was administered to CYA staff and was used to determine which of seven administrative organization models best met each of the ten criteria. Additional data was gathered through individual letters and interviews to determine which of the seven models best met each of the three additional criteria. Statistical means were calculated for each model/criterion item. The number of highest criterion/means was counted for each model. One model received no highest criterion means and was eliminated. The Chi Square formula utilized was as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$$

**Second Questionnaire**

The second questionnaire was designed to gather data regarding an administrative model, a financial model, and a support services model for the CYA education program. The
questionnaire was administered to education staff of the seven existing correctional school districts in the U.S., and to staff of their respective cooperating corrections agencies. The questionnaire was divided into three sections.

Section I. Part A of Section I asked eight questions which respondents were asked to answer on a five point Likert Scale, from 1 for strongly disagree, to 5 for strongly agree. The data obtained from each question was treated as follows:

1. The number of responses for each rating on the Likert Scale was counted.
2. A Chi Square test of independence was calculated to determine whether or not responses were dependent upon the agency for which the respondent worked.
3. The Chi Square formula used was:

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} \]

4. A statistical mean was calculated for each question for responses from corrections agency staff.
5. A statistical mean was calculated for each question for responses from correctional school district staff.
6. A statistical mean was calculated for each question for all respondents.
7. The final answer to each question was based upon the highest percent of responses on either side of the middle
score, 3.

For example, the data collected for one questionnaire item might have been:

- Rating 1 (strongly disagree) -- 20 percent of the responses.
- Rating 2 (agree) -- 40 percent of the responses.
- Rating 3 (no opinion) -- 10 percent of the responses.
- Rating 4 (agree) -- 20 percent of the responses.
- Rating 5 (strongly agree) -- 10 percent of the responses.

The combination of ratings 1 and 2 (strongly disagree and disagree) equalled 60 percent of the responses. The responses for ratings 4 and 5 (agree and strongly agree) totaled 30 percent of the responses. Therefore, the final answer to the question was negative.

Part B of Section I requested respondents to list the people who they felt should be on a correctional school district board, should one be established. Since the optimum size of a school board is seven members, the seven most frequently listed suggestions were adopted.5

Part C of Section I requested a list of up to ten of the most important criteria, or principles, which each respondent felt should serve as guidelines in establishing a

5Knezevich, p. 330.
correctional school district. Respondents were asked to list these principles in order of importance. Each response received was given a score of 1 for a first ranking, 2 for a second ranking, and so on to 10 for a tenth ranking. Similar responses were grouped together. A statistical mean was calculated for each group of responses. However, no group was included which had received less than nine responses. The ten groups of responses with the lowest statistical means were adopted as principles for the establishment of a correctional school district. No group of responses was accepted if it conflicted with the 10 criteria used in the first questionnaire.

Part D of Section I asked the respondents to state whether the correctional school district, the state, or other agency should employ correctional school district staff. The data collected were treated as follows:

1. The number of responses was counted for each of the three selections.

2. The Chi Square test of independence was used to determine whether or not the responses were dependent upon the agency for which the respondent worked. The Chi Square formula used was:

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} \]

3. The final answer to the question was based upon the choice receiving the greatest percent of responses, if
the responses were found to be independent of employment.

For example, the data collected might have shown that 60 percent of the corrections employees and 58 percent of the school district employees favored the state as the employer for the correctional school district employees. The Chi Square test of independence indicated that the responses of both groups were independent of their employment. Fifty-nine percent of all respondents indicated that the state should be the employer. Therefore, the state was selected as the employer for all correctional school district employees.

Section II. Part A of this section listed 12 finance activities and asked the respondents to select whether the correctional school district or corrections agency should be responsible for each activity, or whether it should be a cooperative effort between the two. The data received was treated as follows:

1. The Chi Square test of independence was used to determine whether or not the responses were dependent upon the agency for which the respondent was employed. The Chi Square formula used was:

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} \]

2. The final answer to each question was determined by selecting the choice which received the highest percent
of all responses.

Part B of Section II asked how a correctional school district should be funded and provided four choices. The Chi Square test of independence \( \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} \) was used to determine whether or not the responses were dependent upon the agency for which the respondent was employed. The final answer to the question was determined by selecting the choice with the highest percentage of the total responses.

Section III. Part A of this section listed 18 different support services which could be offered by a correctional school district. Respondents were asked to indicate which of these services they felt should be offered by a correctional school district. For purposes of this study, it was decided that those services selected by at least 50 percent of the respondents would be included in the final list. In addition, those services required by federal Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, were included in the final list.

Part B of Section III requested respondents to list the professional staff positions which they felt should be assigned to the district office of a correctional school district of about 4,000 students. For purposes of this study, it was decided that all positions listed by at least 50 percent of the respondents would be included in the final list.

Part C of Section III requested respondents to describe the working relationship which they felt should exist
between the superintendent of the correctional school district and the superintendent/warden of an institution. For purposes of this study it was decided that the six most frequently cited points would be adopted.

Part D of Section III requested each respondent to describe the working relationship which he felt should exist between the school district principal (in the institution) and the institution's superintendent/warden. For purposes of this study it was decided that the six most frequently cited points would be adopted.

Parts E, F, and G of Section III requested specific demographic information about each correctional school district. This data was used to compare school districts and was utilized in the final description of the model delivery system for the CYA education program.

Questions Investigated

Two questions were investigated. One question was investigated with the first questionnaire and another with the second questionnaire.

First Questionnaire

With the first questionnaire, the possibility that the number of categories ranked number one is equally distributed across all seven models was tested using the Chi Square test of independence, as follows:

1. $H_0$: The number of categories ranked number 1
is equally distributed across all seven models.

A: The number of categories ranked number 1 is not equally distributed across all seven models.

2. Chi Square goodness of fit, N = 13, 1 x 6 table.
3. .001 level, df = 5.
R: $\chi^2 \geq 20.515$

The results of these analyses appear in Chapter 4.

Second Questionnaire

With the second questionnaire, the possibility that the responses of the respondents were independent of their employment was tested using the Chi Square test of independence as follows:

1. H$_0$: The employment of the respondent and his responses are independent of one another.
A: The responses are dependent upon the employment of the respondent.

2. Chi Square test of independence, N varied (78-86), 2 x 5 table.
3. .05 level, df = 4.
R: $\chi^2 \geq 9.488$.

The results of these analyses are discussed in Chapter 4.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to develop a model education delivery system for the California Youth Authority. The study questioned CYA staff to determine which of seven
administrative models they felt could best meet ten criteria. California State Department of Education staff were inter­viewed, or contacted by mail, to determine which of the seven models could best meet three additional criteria. A Chi Square goodness of fit was calculated to determine the statistical significance of the data received. The correctional school district was the model selected.

A second questionnaire was sent to staff of the seven existing correctional school districts in the United States and to staff of their cooperating corrections agencies. This questionnaire asked questions about their views on correctional school district boards of education, organization of the correctional school district, financing of the correctional school district, the support services which it should provide, and the relationships which should exist between the correctional school district and its cooperating corrections agency. The data and results of the study are described in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to develop a model delivery system for education services in the California Youth Authority (CYA). The model delivery system was to consist of a model administrative organization, a financial model, and a support services model.

The study consisted of two parts. The first part of the study was concerned with selecting a model administrative organization. The second part of the study was concerned with how the selected model administrative organization should be organized, how the financial model should be established and what it should include, and what the support services model should include.

In this chapter the results of the data gathered by the two parts of the study will be reported. This chapter is organized into three sections: (1) results of the first part of the study, (2) results of the second part of the study, and (3) a summary of chapter 4.

Selection of an Administrative Model

The first part of the study included three sections: (1) a questionnaire, (2) a series of interviews, and (3) correspondence by mail. The discussion of the findings of this
part of the study will include these three sections.

**Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was administered to CYA staff. The results of the questionnaire revealed that CYA staff were of the opinion that the special correctional school district met eight of ten predetermined criteria better than any of the other six models tested. The highest mean scores for eight of the ten criteria were in the special correctional school district column (see Table 4). Operation of CYA education programs by the California State Department of Education (SDE) and up-grading education in the CYA to Division or Branch level each received one highest criterion mean.

The special correctional school district received the highest criterion mean score for each of the following criteria:

1. Can provide a centralized administration.
2. Can provide centralized communication.
3. Can provide centralized technical assistance.
4. Can provide centralized quality control of education.
5. Can reduce competition for funding.
6. Can provide flexible use of educational resources.
8. Can provide support services to local education programs.
9. Can ensure CYA education's control by educators.
Table 4
Results of First Questionnaire as Distributed to CYA Staff

On this questionnaire, please rate the extent to which you think that each administrative model meets each of the criteria listed in the column at the left. Please rate each model against each criterion by placing a number in the appropriate squares below, according to the following rating system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by SDE</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by Local Districts</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by County Schools</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by Joint Powers</th>
<th>Special Correctional School District</th>
<th>Education Up-Graded to Division or Branch Level within CYA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can Provide Centralized Education Administration</td>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>4.013*</td>
<td>3.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can Provide Centralized Education Communication</td>
<td>2.911</td>
<td>2.114</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>4.089*</td>
<td>3.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can Reduce Competition for Funding</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>2.127</td>
<td>3.620*</td>
<td>3.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ensures Teachers Participation on Treatment Teams</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>1.544</td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>3.468</td>
<td>3.532*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The model which proposed to have the SDE operate CYA education programs received the highest mean score for the criterion which would require the CYA to follow the rules and regulations of the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5. The model which would upgrade education in the CYA to Division or Branch level received the highest mean score for the criterion requiring teachers to participate on treatment teams. In both cases the special correctional school district received high scores from the respondents.

Interviews

The interviews with SDE staff regarding which of the seven models could qualify for specific special funding programs resulted in scores of 1 to 5, on the Likert Scale and were added to the scores developed by the questionnaire. The model which would have CYA education programs operated by local school districts received the highest score for the number of special funding sources for which it would qualify. Table 5 indicates which of the seven models could qualify for each of 48 special state and federal funding sources.

An interview was held with Mr. Steven Parodi, Chief, Bureau of School Apportionment and Reports, on December 29, 1977. In this interview Mr. Parodi stated that the CYA could qualify as a school district through state legislation. He stated that for purposes of funding, the CYA could qualify for the Foundation Program amount available to public schools.
if this were written into the legislation. However, he suggested that in so doing the CYA would most likely lose funds. He suggested that any legislation creating a CYA school district should include a basic amount of funding per unit of average daily attendance (ADA) plus a six percent annual increase for inflation. This would constitute a funding guarantee by the California Legislature.

**Correspondence by Mail**

Correspondence with an SDE official revealed that all of the seven models could qualify to issue high school diplomas except the county superintendent of schools and the two models which would leave CYA education programs under the jurisdiction of the CYA (see Appendix D). All qualifying models received scores of 5, and the models not qualifying received scores of 1.

Correspondence with an SDE official revealed that the first four models (SDE, Local School District, County Superintendent, and Joint Powers) could qualify to be General Education Development (GED) testing centers. The other three models probably would not qualify (see Appendix E). The four qualifying models received scores of 5, and the three non-qualifying models received scores of 1. The Correctional School District Model was the model selected as best meeting the 13 criteria.

**Analysis of Data**

The Correctional School District model received nine
Table 5
Elibility of Seven Administrative Models
For Special State and Federal Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Fund</th>
<th>Administrative Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adult Education</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. American Indian Education Centers</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bilingual Bicultural Education</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Child Care Food Program</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conservation Education/ Environmental Education</td>
<td>E/NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
1 - CYA education program operated by SDE.
2 - CYA education program operated by local districts.
3 - CYA education program operated by county schools.
4 - CYA education program operated by joint powers.
5 - CYA education program operated by a special correctional school district.
6 - Education up-graded to Division or Branch level within CYA.
7 - Continue with current organization.
E - Eligible.
NE - Not eligible.
E/NE - May or may not be eligible.
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Funds</th>
<th>Administrative Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. County School Service Fund--Direct Service</td>
<td>NE E NE NE NE NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. County School Service Fund--Other Purpose</td>
<td>NE E NE NE NE NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. County School Service Fund--Special Schools and Classes</td>
<td>NE E NE NE NE NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Demonstration Programs in Intensive Instruction in Reading and Math.</td>
<td>E E E E E NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Development Centers for Handicapped Minors</td>
<td>E E E E E NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Education Innovation and Support</td>
<td>E E E E E E E E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Educationally Disadvantaged Youth Program</td>
<td>NE E NE NE E NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Educationally Handicapped Minor Program</td>
<td>E E E E E NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title 1</td>
<td>E E E E E E E E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Experimental Education Programs in Special Education</td>
<td>E E E E E E NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Gifted and Talented Ed.</td>
<td>NE E E E E NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Improvement of Pupil Personnel Services, ESEA, Title III, IV-B</td>
<td>E E E E E E E E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Instructional Materials Program</td>
<td>E E E E E NE NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Funds</td>
<td>Administrative Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Leadership In Community Education</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Master Plan for Special Education</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Migrant Education</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. National School Lunch Program</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. New Careers in Education Act</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Nonfood Assistance for School Food Programs</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Physically Exceptional Children</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Preschool and School Programs for Handicapped</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Principal Apportionment (Basic and Equalization Aid), Grades K-12</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Professional Development and Programs Improvement Centers</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. School Breakfast Program</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Special Education for Autistic Children</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Special Milk Program for Children</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. State Child Nutrition Programs</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Funds</td>
<td>Administrative Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Surplus Property Utilization</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Teacher Corps</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Vocational Education: Basic Grants to States</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Vocational Education: Research</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Vocational Education: Exemplary Programs &amp; Projects</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Vocational Education: Consumer &amp; Homemaking Educa-</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Vocational Education: Cooperative Education</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Vocational Education: Program Improvement and Supp-</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portive Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Vocational Education: Work Study</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Vocational Education: Special Programs for the Dis-</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Development Centers for Handicapped Pupils Fund</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number one rankings. The SDE model received three number one rankings. The Local School District and Joint Powers models each received two number one rankings. The County Superintendent model, and the model which would Up-Grade Education in the CYA, each received one number one ranking. The model which would leave things as they are within the CYA received no number one rankings.

A Chi Square goodness of fit test revealed that the rankings were not evenly distributed. Therefore the Correctional School District model was selected as the model best meeting the 13 criteria.

Existing School District/Corrections Staff Views

The second part of the study consisted of a questionnaire which was sent to administrators of existing correctional school districts and to administrators of their cooperating corrections agencies. The questionnaire consisted of an introductory explanation and three sections (see Appendix F).

Administrative Organization

Section I consisted of four parts. These parts are discussed separately.

School District Autonomy. This part of the questionnaire presented eight statements. Respondents were asked to rate each statement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
A Chi Square test of independence was calculated for each item using the data received. This was done to determine whether or not the responses received were independent of the respondents' employment.

The respondents to the first statement concluded that a correctional school district should not be completely autonomous from the corrections agency with which it works. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with autonomy for the district.

The following statistical analysis was performed on the data obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 7.9$$

$$X_{corr} = 1.8 \quad 1 \text{ and } 2 = 77\%$$

$$X_{ed} = 2.6 \quad 4 \text{ and } 5 = 23\%$$

$$X_{all} = 2.2$$

The responses seem to be independent of the employment of the respondents. Therefore, since the responses seem to be independent of the respondents' employment and since 77% of the responses were in the disagree or strongly disagree categories, the concept that the correctional school district
should be completely independent of the corrections agency was rejected.

The respondents to the second statement concluded that a correctional school district should be a part of the corrections agency. Eighty-three percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The following statistical analysis was performed:

Analysis for the School District as Part of the Corrections Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 8.9 \]

- \( \chi_{corr} = 4.3 \) 1 and 2 = 17%
- \( \chi_{ed} = 3.7 \) 4 and 5 = 83%
- \( \chi_{all} = 4.0 \)

The responses seem to be independent of employment. Therefore, since the responses seem to be independent of the employment of the respondents, the over-all mean is 4.0 (agree), and 83 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, the concept that the correctional school district should be a part of the corrections agency is adopted for purposes of this study.

The respondents to the third statement concluded that
the superintendent of a correctional school district should report to (be responsible to) the director of the corrections agency. Sixty-six percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The following statistical analysis of the data was performed:

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 11.94 \]

Xcorr = 3.91 1 and 2 = 34%
Xed = 3.07 4 and 5 = 66%
Xall = 3.58

There seems to be a relationship between the responses of the respondents and their employment. The corrections agency employees were predominantly (80%) in agreement with having the school district superintendent report to the corrections agency director. The school district staff was 54 percent in agreement with that arrangement. Therefore, because 66 percent of all respondents, and a majority of both groups, either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, the concept that the correctional school district superintendent should report to the corrections agency director was adopted for
purposes of this study.

The respondents to the fourth statement concluded that the superintendent of a correctional school district should not report to the deputy director of the corrections agency. Sixty-two percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The following statistical analysis of the data was performed:

Analysis for School District Superintendent Reporting to Corrections Agency Deputy Director

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Corrections} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
14 & 14.3 & 3.2 & 10.1 & 3.7 \\
12.2 & 12.7 & 2.8 & 8.9 & 3.3 \\
12 & 15 & 1 & 10 & 2 \\
26 & 27 & 6 & 19 & 7 \\
45 & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 4.1965 \quad \chi_{corr} = 2.5 \quad 1 \text{ and } 2 = 62\%
\]

\[
\chi_{ed} = 2.4 \quad 4 \text{ and } 5 = 30\%
\]

\[
\chi_{all} = 2.4 \quad 3 = 7\%
\]

The responses seem to be independent of the employment of the respondents. Therefore, since 62 percent of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, the concept that the superintendent of the correctional school district should report to a deputy director of the corrections agency is rejected for purposes of this study.

The respondents to the fifth statement (5a) concluded that the correctional school district should have a
school board if the district is part of the corrections agency. Sixty-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The following statistical analysis of the data was performed:

Analysis for School District Within Corrections Agency Having a School Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 4.6716 \]

- \( \chi^2_{corr} = 3.7 \) 1 and 2 = 33%
- \( \chi^2_{ed} = 3.4 \) 4 and 5 = 65%
- \( \chi^2_{all} = 3.5 \) 3 = 1%

The responses seem to be independent of the respondent's employment. Therefore, since 65 percent of the respondents favored the concept that a correctional school district should have a school board, if the district is a part of the corrections agency that concept was adopted for purposes of this study.

The respondents to the sixth statement (5b) concluded that an autonomous correctional school district should have a school board. Eighty-one percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. However, since the respondents had already concluded that a correctional
school district should not be autonomous (statement number one) no further analyses of these data were conducted.

The respondents to the seventh statement (6) concluded that the superintendent of a correctional school district should not report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Since the respondents had already concluded that the superintendent of the correctional school district should report to the director of the corrections agency no further analyses of these data were conducted.

The respondents to the eighth statement (7) concluded that the superintendent of a correctional school district should not report to a school board alone. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Since the respondents had already concluded that the school district superintendent should report to the director of the corrections agency no further analyses of these data were conducted.

**School Board Membership.** This part of Section I asked respondents to list the people who should be represented on the school board of a correctional school district. The following is a list of those nominations in descending order of frequency of nomination:

1. Representative of the State Department of Education, 49 nominations.
2. Deputy Director for Treatment, corrections agency, 45 nominations.

3. Director of the corrections agency, 35 nominations.

4. A local citizen, 30 nominations.

5. A member of the Parole Board, 26 nominations.

6. A representative from the local public schools, 20 nominations.

7. A representative from higher education, 16 nominations.

8. A representative of the business community, 15 nominations.

9. A representative from Parole Services, 14 nominations.

10. A member of the State Board of Education, 11 nominations.

11. A representative of the wardens/superintendents, 10 nominations.

No proposed member of this board was included in this list who did not receive at least 10 nominations.

It was interesting to note in the analysis of these data that corrections agency staff nominated predominantly corrections people. They also nominated representatives from the local citizenry, local school district personnel, representatives from business and labor, representatives of other state agencies, representatives of the governor, politicians,
parents, and offenders. On the other hand, correctional school district personnel nominated only educators: from the state department of education (in the areas of vocational education, continuing education, adult education, and special education), higher education, and correctional school district staff.

Only the seven most frequently nominated people were selected. These included the first seven nominees on the list above.

**Principles for Establishing Working Relationships.**

This part of the questionnaire asked respondents to list, in order of importance, up to ten of the most important criteria, or principles, which they thought should serve as guidelines in establishing the organizational and working relationships between a correctional school district and a corrections agency. Ten criteria, or principles, were suggested. It should be noted that some of these suggestions were correctional in nature rather than educational. In the suggested list of criteria which follows, N = the number of respondents who listed that item, X = the mean ranking of that item by those who mentioned it:

1. Security and custody must be the first concern of school district personnel working in an institution. (N =12, X = 1.8).

2. The correctional school district should be organized as a part of the corrections agency. (N = 11,
3. A philosophy and a set of goals and objectives should be developed for the correctional school district with cooperation and input from the corrections agency. (N = 12, X = 2.4).

4. A written statement must be drafted which clearly defines the relationships (roles, duties, responsibilities, authority) of corrections agency and school district staff. (N = 35, X = 2.5).

5. Both agencies must work in complete cooperation with an open, honest communication system established between them. (N = 24, X = 2.6).

6. A relevant curriculum must be provided for students, which will help them succeed in the community. (N = 18, X = 2.7).

7. The correctional school district budget and all other fiscal activities of the school district should be kept separate from the budget and fiscal activities of the corrections agency. (N = 18, X = 3.3).

8. An in-service training program should be provided to both school district and corrections agency staff to help each understand the roles, duties, responsibilities, and problems of the other. (N = 12, X = 3.4).

9. The school facilities and physical plant for the correctional school district program should be provided and maintained by the corrections agency. (N = 10, X = 4.5).

10. Professional school district personnel should be
fully certificated. \( N = 9, X = 4.8 \). It is interesting to note that only nine respondents indicated that school district personnel should be fully certificated and that this item placed tenth in the rankings.

These ten criteria were adopted for purposes of this study.

Entity to Employ School District Staff. This part of the questionnaire asked the respondents to determine whether the teachers, school administrators, and other education staff of a correctional school district should be employees of (1) the state, (2) the school district, or (3) some other entity. It is to be noted that the legislation creating a correctional school district could conceivably make school district personnel employees of the state; or school district employees whose salaries, working conditions, etc., are established by the school board, and who belong to the State Teachers' Retirement System. In either case, they would be responsible to the school district. The respondents concluded that the correctional school district staff should be employees of the state, further indicating a preference for a state organized correctional school district.

A Chi Square test of independence was used to determine whether or not the responses were dependent upon the employment of the respondents. The statistical treatment of the data was as follows:
Analysis of What Entity Should Employ School District Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 4.0678 \]

\[ x_{corr-1} = 58\% \quad x_{corr-2} = 35.2\% \quad x_{corr-3} = 6.8\% \]
\[ x_{ed-1} = 41.5\% \quad x_{ed-2} = 56.1\% \quad x_{ed-3} = 2.4\% \]
\[ x_{all-1} = 50\% \quad x_{all-2} = 45\% \quad x_{all-3} = 4.7\% \]

The responses of the respondents seem to be independent of their employment. Fifty percent of all respondents indicated that the staff of the correctional school district should be employees of the state, and 45 percent felt that they should be employees of the school district. Even though 56 percent of the school district respondents indicated that they should be employees of the school district, the Chi Square indicated no relationship between employment and response, and for purposes of this study, the correctional school district staff are seen as employees of the state.

Financial Organization

This section consisted of two parts. Part A dealt with fiscal responsibilities of the correctional school
district and corrections agency. Part B was concerned with how a correctional school district should be funded.

**Fiscal Activities.** In this part, respondents were asked to determine whether each of 12 fiscal activities should be (1) a cooperative effort between the correctional school district and the corrections agency, (2) a school district responsibility, or (3) a corrections agency responsibility. A Chi Square test of independence was calculated for each of the 12 activities to determine whether or not the responses were independent of the respondents' employment.

The first activity had to do with school budgeting activities. The data were treated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 7.6270 \]

Cooperative          | School District | Corrections Agency |
----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
\( X_{\text{corr}} \) | 52.3%           | 36.4%              |
\( X_{\text{ed}} \)   | 33.3%           | 64.3%              |
\( X_{\text{all}} \)  | 43.0%           | 50.0%              | 7.0%
The responses seem to be dependent upon the employment of the respondent. Even though it appears that the respondents made their responses according to the agency for which they worked, 50 percent of the respondents indicated that school district budgeting activities should be the responsibility of the school district. In addition, in Section I, Part C, of this questionnaire, respondents expressed the need for the school district budget to be separate from that of the corrections agency. Therefore, for purposes of this study, the concept that the correctional school district should be responsible for its own budget is adopted.

The second function was school accounting. The data received were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for School Accounting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 7.0897 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xcorr</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xed</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xall</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses seem to be dependent upon the employment of the respondents. Even though it appears that the responses may have been dependent upon the employment of the respondents, the largest percent of both groups indicated that the school district should be responsible for school district accounting activities. Sixty-four percent of all respondents so indicated. In addition, in Section I, Part C, of this questionnaire, respondents expressed the need for all correctional school district fiscal activities to be separated from those of the corrections agency. Therefore, for purposes of this study, the concept that all school district accounting activities should be the responsibility of the correctional school district is adopted.

The third function was school district purchasing procedures. The data received were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for School District Purchasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 7.77
\]
The responses seem to be dependent upon the employment of the respondents. Although the responses may be dependent upon the employment of the respondents, the majority of both groups indicated that school district purchasing activities should be the responsibility of the school district. Sixty-three percent of all respondents so indicated. In addition, in Section I, Part C, respondents concluded that all fiscal activities of the correctional school district should be separated from those of the corrections agency. Therefore, for purposes of this study, the concept that all school district purchasing activities should be the responsibility of the correctional school district is adopted.

The fourth function was school warehousing activities. The data received were treated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xcorr</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xed</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xall</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for School Warehousing Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears that there is no relationship between the respondents' employment and their responses. Fifty percent or more of each group and 53 percent of all respondents indicated that school warehousing activities should be the responsibility of the school district. Therefore, that concept was adopted for purposes of this study.

The fifth function was the financing of educational materials and supplies. The data received were treated as follows:

\[
\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 6.8472
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr 29.6%</td>
<td>50% 20.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 41.5%</td>
<td>56.1% 2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All 35.3%</td>
<td>52.9% 11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for Financing Educational Materials and Supplies

\[
\chi^2 = \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 3.2979
\]
Cooperative       School District       Corrections Agency
Corr              31.8%            54.6%            13.6%
Ed                23.8%            71.4%            4.8%
% All             27.9%            62.8%            9.3%

It appears that the respondents' employment and responses are independent. The majority of both groups and 63 percent of all respondents indicated that the financing of educational materials and supplies should be the responsibility of the school district. The responses to Section I, Part C, agree with this conclusion. Therefore, for purposes of this study, the concept that the financing of educational materials and supplies is the responsibility of the correctional school district is adopted.

The sixth function was financing the purchasing of educational equipment. The data received were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for Financing the Purchasing of Educational Equipment

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
13.6 & 25.7 & 4.7 \\
13 & 25 & 6 \\
12.4 & 23.3 & 4.3 \\
10 & 30 & 2 \\
23 & 55 & 8 & 86 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = .8372
\]
It appears that the respondents' responses are independent of their employment. The majority of each group and 58 percent of all respondents indicated that financing the purchase of educational equipment should be the responsibility of the correctional school district. Therefore, for purposes of this study, that concept was adopted.

The seventh function was the payment of education staff salaries. The data received were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for the Payment of Education Staff Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 2.9701 \]

Cooperative School District Corrections Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>19.5%</th>
<th>58.5%</th>
<th>22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears that the respondents' employment and responses are independent. The majority of each group and 67 percent of all respondents indicated that this should be the responsibility of the school district. The responses to Section I, Part C, agree with this conclusion. Therefore, for purposes of this study, the concept that the payment of staff salaries should be the responsibility of the correctional school district is adopted.

The eighth function was the payment of non-certificated staff salaries. The data received were treated as follows:

| Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for the Payment of Non-Certificated Staff Salaries |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1       | 2         | 3         |
| Corrections |           |           |
| 6       | 27.5      | 8.5       |
| 6       | 24        | 12        |
| Education |           |           |
| 6       | 31        | 5         |
| 12      | 55        | 17        | 84       |

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 3.7733 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr 14.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 14.3%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All 14.3%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the respondents' employment and responses are
independent. The majority of each group and 66 percent of all respondents indicated that this should be the responsibility of the school district. Therefore, for purposes of this study, the concept that the payment of non-certificated staff salaries should be the responsibility of the correctional school district is adopted.

The ninth function was the payment of school light, heat, water, and power bills. The data were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should be Responsible for the Payment of School Light, Heat, Water, and Power Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 1.8550 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the respondents' employment and responses are independent. The majority of both groups and 72 percent of
all respondents indicated that the payment of school heat, light, water, and power bills should be the responsibility of the corrections agency. Therefore, this concept is adopted for purposes of this study.

The tenth function was school building and grounds maintenance. The data were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should Be Responsible for School Building and Grounds Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 1.0257 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the respondents' employment and responses are independent. The majority of each group and 74 percent of all respondents indicated that school building and grounds maintenance should be the responsibility of the corrections agency. Therefore, for purposes of this study, that concept is adopted.
The eleventh function was the maintenance of school equipment. The data were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should Be Responsible for Maintenance of School Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 2.1986
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the respondents' employment and responses are independent. Fifty percent or more of each group and 56 percent of all respondents indicated that the maintenance of school equipment should be the responsibility of the correctional school district. Therefore, that concept is adopted for purposes of this study.
The twelfth function was construction of school facilities. The data were treated as follows:

Analysis of Which Agency Should Be Responsible for Construction of School District Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = 2.4758 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Corrections Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the respondents' employment and responses are independent. The majority of corrections agency staff indicated that this should be a responsibility of the corrections agency. The majority of correctional school district staff indicated that it should be a cooperative function. However, a large percent of the correctional school district staff (45.2%) and 52.4 percent of all respondents indicated that this should be the responsibility of the corrections agency. Therefore, the concept that construction of school facilities should be the responsibility of the corrections agency was
adopted.

Funding. This part of the questionnaire asked respondents how a correctional school district should be funded. Four choices were offered:

1. By the state department of education at the rate of so many dollars per unit of average daily attendance.

2. As a part of the budget of the corrections agency.

3. By the state department of education at the rate of so many dollars per unit of average daily attendance plus eligibility for all state and federal funding for which public schools are eligible.

4. As part of the budget of the corrections agency plus eligibility for all state and federal funding for which public schools are eligible.

The data were treated as follows:

Analysis of How a Correctional School District Should Be Funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = \frac{(o-e)^2}{e} = .7655 \]
The respondents' employment and responses seem to be independent. The largest percent of each group and the largest percent of all respondents indicated that the correctional school district should be funded by the state department of education at the rate of so many dollars per unit of average daily attendance plus eligibility for all state and federal funding for which public schools are eligible. Therefore, this concept was adopted for purposes of this study.

**Support Services, Staffing, Working Relationships**

This section of the questionnaire was divided into five parts. The respondents were educators only.

**Support Services.** This part of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate which of a list of 18 support services they believed should be offered by a correctional school district. Only those services selected by 50 percent (21) or more of the respondents were selected for purposes of this study. These services included:

1. Educational Counseling Services (31 responses).
2. Educational Guidance Services (29 responses).
3. Services for students with specific learning disabilities (26 responses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Services for the speech impaired (25 responses).
5. Services for the mentally retarded (24 responses).
6. Services for the visually handicapped (23 responses).
7. Speech and hearing services (22 responses).
8. Services for the mentally gifted (21 responses).

These services were adopted for purposes of this study as required support services for a correctional school district.

In addition, to the list, above, the following services required by federal Public Law 94-142 were included in the adopted list of required support services:143

1. Audiology
2. Counseling Services.
3. Early Identification.
4. Medical Services (diagnostic only).
5. Occupational Therapy.
6. Parent Counseling and Training.
7. Physical Therapy.
9. Recreation.
10. School Health Services.
13. Transportation.

---

143Public Law 94-142, Section 121a.13.
14. Other required developmental, corrective, and supportive services.

**District Office Staffing.** This part of the questionnaire asked respondents to list the professional staff positions which they believed should be assigned to the district office of a correctional school district of about 4,000 students (the approximate size of the CYA school population). Only those positions listed by 50 percent (15) or more of the respondents were included in the final list. The final, adopted, list is as follows:

1. Superintendent (21 responses).
2. Business Manager (18 responses).
3. Assistant Superintendent (16 responses).
4. Director of Vocational Education (16 responses).
5. Director of Academic Education (15 responses).
6. Director of Special Education (15 responses).
7. Director of Federal Programs (15 responses).

**Working Relationships--Superintendent/Warden.** This part of the questionnaire asked respondents to describe the working relationship which they felt should exist between the superintendent of a correctional school district and the superintendent/warden of an institution. The six most frequently cited points were to have been adopted. They were:

1. There should be an open, honest, cooperative relationship between these two administrators. This rela-
relationship should include understanding, acceptance, and coordination with each supporting the other. (13 responses).

2. The school district superintendent should be a consultant and the warden operates the institution. (3 responses).

3. There should be a common dedication toward the needs of the students, and a determination to strive toward that goal together. (2 citations).

4. There should be no direct relationship between the school district superintendent and the warden. The school district superintendent should work through the hierarchy of the corrections agency. (2 responses).

5. The warden and the school district superintendent must be peers under the direction of the director or deputy director of the corrections agency. (2 responses).

6. The school district superintendent should be responsible for curriculum, staff, and program implementation. The warden should have jurisdiction with regard to security, operations, and controlling ancillary services. (2 responses).

Although the six most frequently cited points are listed above, only the first one was adopted for purposes of this study. The first point had 13 responses, whereas the remaining points had too few responses to be important.

Working Relationships--Principal/Warden. This part of the questionnaire asked respondents to describe the working relationship which they believed should exist between the
school district principal (in the institution) and the institution's superintendent/warden. The six most frequently cited points were to have been adopted for purposes of this study. They were:

1. The two should share an open, sympathetic understanding and working relationship with joint responsibility for each inmate's rehabilitative program. (9 responses).

2. The warden should operate the institution with the principal as part of his staff. (6 responses).

3. Cooperation is the key to the relationship. Neither one should be boss. (8 responses).

4. They should have a mutual dedication toward the needs of students and a determination to strive toward common goals. (4 responses).

5. The principal must have complete authority to control the school and the students within the institution. (3 responses).

6. School employees must be made to feel that they are a part of the institution program and that the school program has the institution's support. (2 responses).

Several conflicting views were reported by this section of the questionnaire. On the one hand, it was indicated that the principal should work cooperatively with the warden on a peer basis. On the other hand, it was indicated by some that the principal should be on the warden's staff and actually report to him. Thirdly, some respondents indicated that
the principal should have complete authority over the school program. None of these views received much support (3 or 4 responses). No points can be drawn from these data for purposes of this study since the responses were too limited.

**Demographic Data.** Parts E through G of the questionnaire asked correctional school district superintendents to provide certain demographic data regarding their districts. Not all superintendents responded to all questions. The superintendent of Windham School District (Texas) did not respond nor did the Superintendent of the Connecticut Correctional School District.

The following data were collected from these sections of the questionnaire:

1. That the mean ratio for all reporting correctional school districts of staff to student and staff to staff were:
   a. Students to teachers - 13 to 1.
   b. Special Education teachers to regular teachers - 1 to 11.
   c. Administrators to teachers - 1 to 11.
   d. Students to School Psychologists - 2,299 to 1.
   e. Students to School Counselors - 373 to 1.

2. That the mean ratio for reporting correctional school districts, actually employing the staff classifications listed, were:
   a. Special Education teachers to regular teachers
1 to 10.

b. Students to School Psychologists - 1,120 to 1, considerably above the standard of 200 to 1 established in Morales v. Turman.

c. Students to School Counselors - 363 to 1, considerably above the ratio of 100 to 1 established in Morales v. Turman.

3. There are not sufficient data received to draw any conclusions regarding average expenditure per unit of average daily attendance.

These data are provided in Tables 6, 7, and 8.

Additional Data

Editorial comments received from several respondents to the questionnaire indicated that school district/corrections agency relationships are extremely important to the success of a correctional school district. Poor relationships seem to doom the program to failure, according to these respondents. The two statements discussed below sum up these comments quite well.

One principal commented that the relationship between the institution superintendent/warden and the school district principal:

... is the key, the very heart of the operation. Without the respect and cooperation of the warden for that principal the program is doomed. ... The principal must understand security and be ready to help in any possible way. ... The principal on the unit is the strength or weakness of the school district.
Table 6
Number of Students Served by Existing Correctional School Districts, and Type of Corrections Agency Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Served by District</th>
<th>Type of Corrections Agency Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time (20 hrs+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7
Demographic Data From Existing Correctional School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Teachers and Instructors Other than Special Ed.</th>
<th>Number of Special Ed. Teachers</th>
<th>Number of School Administrators</th>
<th>Number of School Psychologists</th>
<th>Number of Education Counselors</th>
<th>Number of Other Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6 Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50 Aides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Correctional School District Expenditures Per Unit of Average Daily Attendance 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$2,486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Declined to provide the requested information.
One superintendent of a correctional school district stated:

I am convinced that an external agency operating a unit within the institutional system will have some difficulties. ... I have little faith in any of the institutional groups running their own program in a fragmented, decentralized, and unmanaged fashion, and that is really what takes place in many institutional settings.

These comments confirm the researcher's experience:

The researcher has done consulting work for four large counties in California in which juvenile halls are administered by county probation departments, and the education programs within these halls are administered by the county offices of education. In all four cases the relationships between school personnel and juvenile hall personnel were poor. In all four cases these poor relationships seemed due largely to the conflicting objectives of the two agencies. In all four cases these poor relationships had negative effects on the education programs. According to Trumbull W. Kelly, Administrator, Education Services, CYA, it is the exceptional county in California which has established a close, effective working relationship between juvenile hall staff and education staff working within that juvenile hall.144

It appears, therefore, that a completely separate entity attempting to operate an education program within an

---

144 Interview with Trumbull W. Kelly, Administrator, Education Services, California Youth Authority, January 2, 1979. Sacramento, California.
institution will experience considerable difficulty. It also appears that a school district operating within the corrections structure but receiving its authority from the top level of that structure would have a good chance for success.

Summary

The study was conducted in two parts. The first part consisted of a questionnaire, a series of interviews, and correspondence by mail. The second part consisted of a questionnaire.

The first part of the study was designed to determine which of seven administrative models best met 13 pre-established criteria. The 13 criteria were:

1. Can provide a centralized administration.
2. Can provide centralized communication.
3. Can provide centralized technical assistance.
4. Can provide centralized quality control of education.
5. Provides the ability for the CYA education program to qualify for the same special state and federal funding resources for which public schools are eligible.
6. Can reduce competition for funding.
7. Can provide flexible use of educational resources.
8. Can require the CYA to follow the California Education Code and Administrative Code, Title 5.
9. Can provide support services to local education
programs.

10. Provides the authority for the CYA education program to issue high school diplomas.

11. Provides the authority for the CYA education program to qualify as a GED testing center.

12. Can ensure CYA education's control by educators.

13. Ensures teachers' participation on treatment teams.

Seven administrative models were tested against the 13 criteria. These models were:

1. CYA education programs operated by the state department of education.

2. CYA education program operated by local school districts.

3. CYA education programs operated by county offices of education.

4. Special correctional school district.

5. CYA education programs operated by joint powers.

6. Education up-graded to Division or Branch level within the CYA.

7. Continue with current organization.

The special correctional school district met nine of the 13 criteria better than any of the other models. The special correctional school district was, therefore, selected as the best model for purposes of this study.
The second part of the study was concerned with how the correctional school district should be organized. This part of the study determined the following:

1. That a correctional school district should not be completely autonomous from the corrections agency with which it works.

2. That the correctional school district should be a part of the corrections agency with which it works.

3. That the superintendent of a correctional school district should report (be responsible to) to the director of the corrections agency.

4. That the superintendent of the correctional school district should not report to a deputy director of the corrections agency.

5. That the correctional school district should have a school board if the district is a part of the corrections agency.

6. That the superintendent of a correctional school district should not report only to a school board.

7. That the following people should be members of the school board of a correctional school district:

   a. Representative of the state department of education.

   b. Deputy Director for Treatment, corrections agency.

   c. Director of the corrections agency.
d. A local citizen.
e. A member of the parole board.
f. A representative from the local public schools.
g. A representative from higher education.

8. That the following criteria, or principles, should serve as guidelines in establishing the organizational and working relationships between a correctional school district and a corrections agency:

   a. Security and custody must be the first concern.

   b. The correctional school district should be organized as a part of the corrections agency.

   c. A philosophy and a set of goals and objectives should be developed for the correctional school district, with cooperation and input from the corrections agency.

   d. A written statement must be drafted, which clearly defines the relationships (roles, duties, responsibilities, authority) of corrections agency and school district staff.

   e. Both agencies must work in complete cooperation, with an open, honest communication system established between them.

   f. A relevant curriculum must be provided for students, which will help them succeed in the community.

   g. The correctional school district budget and
all other fiscal activities of the school district should be kept separate from the budget and fiscal activities of the corrections agency.

h. An in-service training program should be provided to both corrections agency staff and school district staff to help each understand the roles, duties, responsibilities, and problems of the other.

i. The school district facilities and physical plant for the correctional school district program should be provided and maintained by the corrections agency.

j. Professional school district personnel should be fully certificated.

9. That correctional school district staff should be employees of the state.

10. That the following fiscal activities should be the responsibility of the correctional school district:

a. School budgeting.
b. School district accounting activities.
c. School district purchasing.
d. School warehousing.
e. Financing of educational materials.
f. Financing the purchase of educational equipment.
g. Payment of education staff salaries.
h. Payment of non-certificated staff salaries.
i. Maintenance of school equipment.
11. That the following fiscal activities should be the responsibility of the corrections agency:

a. Payment of school heat, light, water, and power bills.
b. School building and grounds maintenance.
c. Construction of school facilities.

12. That a correctional school district should be funded by the state department of education at the rate of so many dollars per unit of average daily attendance plus eligibility for all state and federal funding for which public schools are eligible.

13. That the following support services should be provided by a correctional school district:

a. Educational counseling services.
b. Educational guidance services.
c. Services for students with specific learning disabilities.
d. Services for the speech impaired.
e. Services for the mentally retarded.
f. Services for the visually handicapped.
g. Speech and hearing services, including audiology.
h. Services for the mentally gifted.
i. Early identification of the handicapped.
j. Medical services (diagnostic).
k. Occupational therapy.
l. Parent counseling and training.
m. Physical therapy.
n. Psychological services.
o. Recreation.
p. School health services.
q. Social work services.
r. Speech pathology.
s. Transportation.
t. Other required developmental, corrective, and supportive services.

14. That the following professional staff should be assigned to the district office of a correctional school district of about 4,000 students:

a. Superintendent.
b. Assistant Superintendent.
c. Business Manager.
d. Director of Vocational Education.
e. Director of Academic Education.
f. Director of Special Education.
g. Director of Federal Programs.

15. That the working relationship between the superintendent of a correctional school district and the superintendent/warden of an institution should include:

a. An open, honest, cooperative relationship.
It should include understanding, acceptance, and coordination with each supporting the other.

16. That the mean ratio for all existing correctional school districts of students to staff and staff to staff were:

   a. Student to teachers - 13 to 1.
   b. Special Education Teachers to regular teachers - 1 to 11.
   c. Administrators to teachers - 1 to 11.
   d. Students to School Psychologists - 2,299 to 1.
   e. Students to School Counselors - 373 to 1.

17. That the mean ratio for correctional school districts actually using the staff classifications listed were:

   a. Special Education Teachers to regular teachers - 1 to 10.
   b. Students to School Psychologists - 1,120 to 1.
   c. Students to School Counselors - 363 to 1.

Chapter 5 presents the conclusions and recommendations from the study. These emphasize a model administrative organization, a financial model, and a model for support services.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to develop a model delivery system for education services in the California Youth Authority (CYA). The model would include a model administrative organization, a financial model, and a model for support services.

The study consisted of two sections. The first section included a questionnaire which was administered to selected CYA staff members such as teachers, education administrators, institution superintendents and assistant superintendents, and top-level administrators in the Institutions and Camps Branch of the CYA (see Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire). The questionnaire asked respondents to rate seven model administrative organizations against ten criteria which were previously identified as problems with the existing CYA education program and had been translated into criteria for the selection of a new model (see pages 57-59). In addition, the first section included interviews with State Department of Education (SDE) staff members to determine the eligibility of the seven models for various state and federal funding resources (11th criterion). The first section also included written correspondence with SDE officials to determine which of the seven models would be
eligible to issue high school diplomas (12th criterion), and which of them could qualify to be General Education Development testing centers (13th criterion). The special correctional school district met nine of these criteria better than all other models and was, therefore, selected as the model for this study. The special correctional school district is an alternative which would have to be created by special legislation and would be responsible for the education of all wards confined in CYA institutions.

The second section of the study consisted of a questionnaire which was administered to selected correctional school district administrators in the seven existing correctional school districts in the United States. In addition, part of the questionnaire was administered to selected corrections administrators of the corrections agencies working with the seven aforementioned correctional school districts. The parts of the questionnaire administered to both corrections agency and correctional school district staff members dealt with the organization of the school district and relationships between corrections and school district staff. The remainder of the questionnaire dealt entirely with educational issues and school district demographic data, and was administered to school district staff members only (see Appendix F for a copy of the questionnaire).

Special Legislation

In order to carry out the conclusion of this study
to develop a special correctional school district within the CYA, special legislation would be required. This special correctional school district should be responsible for the delivery of all education services to wards in CYA institutions and camps.

The legislation should specify that the correctional school district is to be funded by the Legislature at a given number of dollars per unit of average daily attendance per year, and that this amount should be increased in order to keep up with inflation at the same inflation rate which the state increases its financial assistance to public schools. The legislation should also specify that the correctional school district shall be eligible for all special state and federal funding for which the public schools of California are eligible.

This legislation will bring the school district under the provisions of the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5. The legislation will make the school district eligible to issue high school diplomas, but will not make it eligible to become a GED testing center.

Administrative Organization Model

The special correctional school district should be a part of the CYA. It should have a school board, a superintendent, and a district-level staff. In addition, there are specific principles which should be observed, and working
relationships established as soon as the school district is organized.

The Correctional School District as Part of the CYA

The special correctional school district should be organized within the CYA rather than as a separate entity. This will eliminate, or reduce, the problems experienced elsewhere when two separate agencies, with conflicting objectives, attempt to operate an education program in a correctional institution. The Superintendent of the correctional school district should report directly to the Director of the CYA, and should also answer to the school board (see Figure 1).

As Morphet, Johns, and Reller stated it, the ultimate purpose for an organization is to establish conditions which will enhance the effectiveness of the organization in attaining its goals.¹ They also stated that the effectiveness of an organization is improved by having a single leader who must provide central coordination and articulation for all of the organization’s activities.² Therefore, there should be a superintendent of the correctional school district, who is the executive head of the school district. All school district staff members should be employees of the State of California and should be under the direction of the Superintendent of the school district. This will provide a centralized education administration within the CYA. It will

¹Morphet, Johns, and Reller, p. 88. ²Ibid.
also place control of education in the CYA with educators and allow for a centralized program of evaluation and quality control of the program by educators.

The District School Board

The correctional school district should be governed by a school board. The board should be composed of the following members:

1. Director of the CYA.
2. Deputy Director of Institutions and Camps, CYA.
3. A representative of the State Department of Education, preferably with expertise in Vocational Education and appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
4. A local citizen. Nominations should be made by the institution superintendents. The Director of the CYA would make the final selection and appointment.
5. A member of the Youth Authority Board appointed by the Chairman of that Board.
6. A representative of public schools appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
7. A representative of higher education appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The school board will serve as an over-all guiding body for the correctional school district. It will serve to maintain an educational perspective in the correctional school district. With the Director of the CYA, the Deputy Director
Figure 1
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of Institutions and Camps, and a Youth Authority Board member on the school board, it will function as a liaison, or bridge, between the school district and the remainder of the CYA. This organization will also make it easier for the school district to function within the institutions and camps, as the executive head of these institutions will be a member of the school board and will be in a position to make the program work. He will be in a position to overcome the following problems for correctional educators cited by the American Bar Association:3

1. Uncooperative wardens.
2. Institution policies which are detrimental to learning.
3. Education taking a low priority in many correctional institutions and agencies.
4. The lack of total framework for education services.
5. The feeling among corrections staff members that custody is the principle function of the institution and that education is wasted on offenders.

The fact that the majority of school board members will not be CYA personnel will help to ensure that a purely "corrections" perspective does not dominate the school district. The fact that the correctional school district will

come under the provisions of the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5, will contribute to the maintenance of an education perspective as the school district functions within the CYA. In addition, this make-up of the school board will contribute to the accomplishment of the recommendations cited in the five recent studies of the CYA education program (see pages 32-34).

Superintendent and District Staff of the Correctional School District

Since an organization needs a single leader,\textsuperscript{4} the school district should have a superintendent. The superintendent should be responsible for providing central coordination and articulation of the activities of the district. He must also provide a clear definition of the purposes, goals, and objectives of the district.

As Miller, Madden, and Kincheloe stated, "Whenever a group of people have a common task, an organizational structure is required."\textsuperscript{5} Therefore, the Superintendent of the school district should have a district-level (district office) staff. The top-level professional staff of the district office should include:

1. Superintendent
2. Assistant Superintendent
3. Business Manager

\textsuperscript{4}Morphet, Johns, and Reller, p. 94.
\textsuperscript{5}Miller, Madden, and Kincheloe, p. 102.
4. Director of Vocational Education  
5. Director of Academic Education  
6. Director of Special Education  
7. Director of Federal Programs

This staff will be able to provide technical assistance and direction to local school programs. The district-level staff should be organized as shown in Figure 2.

The district Superintendent and his district office staff will provide the centralized education administration recommended in five studies of the CYA education program (see pages 32-34). This organization will also provide the common thrust toward desired educational objectives, which the CYA education program has lacked in the past.

Principles for Establishing a Correctional School District Within the CYA

The following principles should be followed in establishing the correctional school district within the CYA:

1. Security and custody must be the first concern in institutions.

2. A statement of philosophy, along with goals and objectives, should be developed for the school district with the cooperation and input of other CYA staff.

3. A written statement should be developed clearly defining the relationships (roles, duties, responsibilities,

5Ibid.
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authority) of the school district and other interfacing staff. An in-service training program should be developed for both school district staff, and other CYA staff, to help each group understand the roles, duties, responsibilities, and authority of the other.

4. The school district and other CYA staff must work in complete cooperation, with an open, honest, communication system established between them.

5. A relevant curriculum should be established which will help students succeed in the community.

6. All professional school district personnel should be fully credentialled.

7. All school district staff should be employees of the State.

8. Teachers should be members of treatment teams.

Working Relationships Between School District and Other CYA Staff

An open, honest, cooperative relationship should be established between the Superintendent of the school district and each of the CYA institution and camp superintendents. This relationship should include cooperative understanding, acceptance, and coordination of programs with each supporting the other.

The working relationship between the local school district principals and the local CYA institution superintendents should be much the same as that between the school district Superintendent and the institution superintendents.
The local school principal should be responsible to the school district. However, the actual working relationship, the responsibilities, role, and authority of the principal within the institution is an area which requires further study. Based upon the comments of some respondents, it appears that this is a critical area in the development of a cooperative effort between school district and institution staff.

Financial Model

As Carsetti stated, "Correctional education programs are usually very poorly financed." Therefore, a sound financial base should be established for the correctional school district.

The special correctional school district should be financed by the California State Legislature at a given annual rate per unit of average daily attendance. This amount should be increased at the same rate that the State increases its financial assistance to public schools in order to keep up with inflation. In addition, the school district should be made eligible for all special state and federal funding for which California public schools are eligible. These components of the financial model must be established by legislation as previously discussed.

The special correctional school district should establish its own business services, headed by a business manager.

---
7Carsetti, p. 1.
These business services should be kept separate from those of the remainder of the CYA. All financial, and other resources, of the district should be kept under the supervision and direction of the district office of the school district. This will allow the district to control its own resources and to be flexible in their utilization.

The following school district business activities should be conducted by the school district:

1. Budgeting.
2. Accounting.
3. Purchasing.
4. Warehousing.
5. Financing education equipment and supplies.
6. Paying the salaries of certificated and non-certificated staff.
7. Maintaining school equipment.

The CYA should be responsible for the following:

1. Providing and maintaining school plants, facilities, and grounds.
2. Providing all heat, water, light, and power for the school facilities.
3. Construction of all new education facilities.

By establishing its own business services and keeping them separate from those of the CYA, in general, the school district will eliminate the necessity to compete for funding
and resources as described by the American Bar Association. The American Bar Association stated that correctional education is more expensive than public school education because of the expertise required by staff, and because of the characteristics of the students. Therefore, the school district should be funded at a rate considerably higher than that of the public high schools of California.

**Support Services Model**

A large percentage of delinquents have learning problems which require special support services. Therefore, a well-organized, comprehensive support services program should be provided by the correctional school district.

As Knezevich emphasized, "Improvement of the quality of instruction depends not only upon the time and talents of individual teachers, but also on the availability ... of a host of special services." However, the Auditor General reported that the CYA's educational diagnostic process does not adequately address special ward educational needs, its academic program does not address the particular needs of the

---


9 Ibid.

10 U.S. General Accounting Office; see also Banchara and Zaba, p. 5; see also Dell'Apa, p. 3; see also Spencer and Kelly, p. 10.

11 Knezevich, p. 436.
educationally handicapped, and, "Staff are not trained to meet wards' specialized needs."12

The Director of Special Education should be in charge of support services and should be a member of the district office.13 It should be his task to coordinate the support services program, provide necessary materials, equipment and facilities, provide appropriate staffing, place pupils, and provide in-service training for teachers.14

The support services provided by the school district should include:

1. Educational counseling services. Counseling should be school-based but coordinated from the district office.15 There should be one academic counselor for every 100 juveniles.16

2. Educational guidance services. The guidance program should be continuous and should complement the instructional program. There should be one vocational counselor for every 100 students.17

3. School psychological services. There should be one school psychologist for every 200 students.18

12Auditor General's Report, pp. 22-34.
13Stoops, Rafferty, and Johnson, p. 489.
14Ibid., p. 565. 15Ibid.
16Morales v. Turman.
17Ibid. 18Ibid.
4. Services for students with specific learning disabilities. There should be at least one teacher who is trained in working with learning disabled students at each institution. In addition, the district should provide the funding required to provide these students with the needed diagnostic and therapeutic services which their disabilities require.

5. The district should provide funding which will buy the special services required by students meeting the State criteria for the speech impaired, mentally retarded, and visually handicapped.

6. The district should provide funding to contract the following services for students requiring them:
   a. Speech and hearing services.
   b. Occupational therapy.
   c. Parent counseling and training for the handicapped.
   d. Physical therapy for the handicapped.
   e. Recreation for the handicapped.
   f. Psychological services for the handicapped.
   g. Other required developmental, corrective, and supportive services for the handicapped.

7. The following support services should also be available to CYA students and are already provided by the CYA:

---

19Spencer and Kelly, p. 10.
a. Medical services.
b. School health services.
c. Social work services.
d. Transportation for the handicapped.

It is not known how many CYA students are in need of these support services. However, it is known that there are a large number of learning disabled students in the CYA. Therefore, it is recommended that one teacher trained in teaching the learning disabled be available to each 400 bed institution program. In addition, it is recommended that sufficient funds be made available to contract for other services for the handicapped.

Recommendations for Further Study

It is recommended that there be further study in three areas prior to implementation of the correctional school district in the CYA. These areas include school principal/institution superintendent relationships, funding, and special service needs for the handicapped in CYA institutions.

School Principal/Institution Superintendent Relationships

It appears that the working relationship established between the school principal and the institution superintendent is one of the most critical aspects of the school district organization. If these two individuals work together harmoniously the education program should run smoothly
according to several respondents to the second questionnaire. On the other hand, if they do not work together harmoniously, the education program at that institution can be seriously impaired. It is recommended that the working relationship between the school principal and the institution superintendent be given careful study before the implementation of the correctional school district.

Funding

The study determined that the basic education funding currently received by the CYA is inadequate. A further study of the 1977-78 CYA education budget revealed that 92 percent of that budget was for certificated salaries. A further review of public high school budgets in California for 1975-76 revealed that certificated salaries took only 59 percent of the average budget and that certificated and non-certificated salaries totalled 86 percent of the average budget.

If the correctional school district is to assume the responsibility for the fiscal activities discussed in this study considerable study will be required to determine their costs. The current CYA education budget does not include non-certificated salaries nor does it include budgeting, accounting, purchasing, warehousing, or maintenance of equipment. Therefore, it is recommended that further study be made to determine the amount of annual basic education funding to be provided by the legislature.

Special Service Needs
Before a determination can be made as to what are the specific special service needs of the CYA population, the CYA needs to have a more definitive description of its population. At present the CYA has only a very general idea as to the specific education needs of its students. It is recommended that the CYA conduct a thorough study of its population to determine how many students are handicapped as defined by Public Law 94-142, The Educational Rights of All Handicapped Children Act; the extent to which these handicaps require special services; and, whether these special services should be provided in the form of school district specialists or through contracting with outside agencies.

Summary

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court committed itself to the principle that education, "Must be made available to all on equal terms."20 The California Supreme Court stated that unequal education leads to unequal job opportunities, disparate income, and handicapped ability to participate effectively in our society.21

An effective education program is one of the best weapons against delinquency.22 Institution education programs


22 Tunley, p. 130.
can lead to success on parole and can reduce recidivism. However, the California Youth Authority education program has inadequately addressed the educational needs of wards.

The purpose of this study was to develop a model educational delivery system for the California Youth Authority. This model educational delivery system will provide better educational services to students and thereby make education available to California Youth Authority (CYA) students on more equal terms with their public school counterparts. In addition, lower rates of recidivism should result.

The recommendations of the study were presented in this chapter. It was determined that the correctional school district was the model which best met 13 pre-determined criteria, which had been translated from 13 weaknesses in the existing CYA education program. Recommendations concerning the organization of the school district, a financial model, and a support services model were presented.

Three areas were recommended for further study. These included the school principal/institution superintendent relationship, the cost of financing the correctional school district, and the identification of special student needs and required services.
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APPENDIX A

Visiting Committee Report
Recommendations

1.0 THE YOUTH AUTHORITY SHOULD DEVELOP A PROCESS TO FOLLOW THROUGH ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED TO EACH SCHOOL.

1.1 The CYA should make an analysis of the individual school recommendations and evaluate those recommendations having a high frequency of mention.

1.2 The CYA should develop a process to assist each school to implement the recommendations of the visiting committee.

1.3 The CYA should revise the present evaluation form.

1.4 A study should be made with WASC to determine whether the Youth Authority could profitably participate in WASC accreditation in the future.

2.0 THE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD BE EMPHASIZED AS A MAJOR COMPONENT IN THE YOUTH AUTHORITY REHABILITATIVE EFFORT.

2.1 The organization of the CYA central administrative staff should reflect education as a major administrative component, since education is the largest component in both time and staff.

2.2 The CYA should study the administrative staffing of the institutions to assure that education administration is not submerged by protective custody, treatment and other concerns of institution management.

2.3 Rehabilitation and education must be combined into a totally integrated program that is conducted throughout the entire awake hours of the ward's day. The use and hours of the school program and plant should be extended for development of special interests, student government and recreation.

2.4 Counseling and guidance should be added to the school program.
3.0 THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM SHOULD BE COMPREHENSIVE AND PROVIDE FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL A PROGRAM DIRECTLY RELATED TO HIS MOST URGENT EDUCATIONAL NEEDS FOR SUCCESSFUL RETURN TO HIS COMMUNITY.

3.1 There should be a program to develop self-understanding, self-identity and basic skills of living and career education. This program includes remedial education such as reading and mathematics laboratories and survival skills instruction in combination with counseling and treatment approaches.

3.2 There should be an academic program that provides an instructional program tailored to each individual's interests and goals. Depth and diversity must include a range of offerings and a continuum to studies, and offer an off-campus academic opportunity.

3.3 There should be a vocational program to develop skills that lead to meaningful employment or desired personal skills for economical community living, such as auto mechanics, carpentry, sewing, cosmetology, etc.

3.4 The CYA should continue to develop schools which emphasize a particular curriculum, provided that assignments are made primarily on educational needs.

4.0 ASSIGNMENT OF WARDS TO SCHOOLS SHOULD BE ON THE BASIS OF THE WARD'S CHARACTERISTICS IN TOTAL AND NOT ON AGE ALONE.

4.1 Assignments should be made on the basis of educational and rehabilitative needs.

4.2 Clinic diagnosis should be conducted on an individual basis. The use of group test scores from tests given during the early days of incarceration should be discontinued.

4.3 Clinic educational assessment should be sufficient for school assignment, but individual diagnostic assessment for prescriptive education should be the responsibility of the school to which the ward is assigned.

4.4 Wards with special needs (handicapped students) should be assigned to schools with operational
special programs.

4.5 The exploration of vocational choice should begin at the clinic including assessment and interviews regarding career aspirations.

4.6 All students should be given an interpretation of the diagnostic findings as they relate to their personal goals and over-all educational program. This orientation should permit the student to see, as concretely as possible, a continuity between his past experience, present situation, and future aspiration.

5.0 EACH SCHOOL SHOULD PROVIDE FOR A COMPLETE EDUCATIONAL DIAGNOSIS OF EACH STUDENT.

5.1 Diagnostic procedures should delineate strengths and weaknesses relative to the learning process.

5.2 Educational prescriptions should be written in objective language and modified as progress indicates.

5.3 Pre- and post-test data on student achievement should be collected to diagnose strengths and weaknesses in instructional modalities.

5.4 All students who have not completed high school graduation requirements should be encouraged to do so or to pass the GED tests.

6.0 EACH SCHOOL SHOULD PROVIDE A VOCATIONAL EVALUATION AND CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM.

6.1 The exploration of vocations should include aptitude and interest batteries combined with interviews and career education programs.

6.2 Information should be provided on a planned basis about vocational programs, higher education, and employment available to the student after he leaves the school.

6.3 Services should be offered which enable a student to apply for training or education in community schools before he leaves the institution.
7.0 EACH SCHOOL SHOULD EMPLOY A STAFF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST.

7.1 The school psychologist should help implement diagnostic and vocational evaluations and develop prescriptive approaches to program planning.

7.2 The school psychologist should be a staff position and not restricted by Federal funding or project goals. The school psychologist should be in addition to those psychologists providing specific project related services.

7.3 The school psychologist should assist both students and staff in areas of learning and behavior. Any student counseling must be protected by confidentiality.

8.0 THE CYA SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE A "MINIMAL EDUCATIONAL OFFERING" AS AN INSEPARABLE AND UNCOMPROMISABLE PART OF THE RIGHT TO TREATMENT POSSESSED BY CYA WARDS, AND THAT CYA ACKNOWLEDGEMENT SHOULD BE REFLECTED IN ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT SATISFY THE NEEDS OF ITS WARDS.

8.1 A "minimum educational offering" consists of a curricular structure so designed and implemented that each ward entering a CYA institution may enroll and continue in a program of education enabling him to satisfy:

8.1.1 the minimum State Education Code requirements;

8.1.2 the minimum requirements for graduation (at the appropriate level) as established by the State Department of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction;

8.1.3 the minimum entrance requirements of the University of California;

8.1.4 the minimum requirements to pursue a vocational training or apprenticeship program.

8.1.5 Such additional programs, facilities and resources as are necessary in view of the particular sociological, pathological and institutional needs of CYA wards.
8.2 The over-all educational criteria, programs and requirements should be approved and supervised by the State Department of Education.

8.3 Courses and units of credit for work completed should be articulable for and transferrable to public schools throughout the State. The CYA should obtain, annually, certification or approval from the State Department of Education or the Superintendent of Public Instruction that CYA courses of study are in compliance with all provisions of the Education Code.

8.4 The CYA should develop appropriate educational certification and equivalency criteria procedures and enter into arrangements with local school districts in order that graduation diplomas shall be issued by the wards' resident school district upon certification of the CYA that the ward has complied with State requirements for graduation.

8.5 The CYA should adopt an affirmative action program for contracting with existing local school districts, and otherwise avail itself of outside community resources, for educational, rehabilitative, vocational and treatment resources, similar to the contracts and other arrangements provided in Education Code SS 5030 and 6651 et seq., and Welfare and Institutions Code SS 856, 858 et seq. and 889. For example, the CYA should explore the feasibility of contracting with County Superintendents of Schools and/or local school districts for provision of educational services, as an alternative method of discharging the educational responsibilities owed by the CYA to its institutionalized wards.

9.0 PROCEDURES SHOULD BE DEVELOPED FOR CO-ORDINATION OF THE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AMONG THE INSTITUTIONS.

9.1 The CYA staffing should be reviewed for its capability and responsibility for co-ordination and supervision of educational programs.

9.2 Co-ordination of academic programs, basic or remedial programs, vocational training-career education, and college programs should be the responsibility of education consultants. Education consultants could be a part of the regional or central administrative structure of the CYA, but have State-wide responsibilities.
9.3 All schools should have a curriculum committee, including administrators and teachers, to continually study the needs of the wards and to change the curriculum to meet these needs. Procedures should be devised for sharing of developed materials with all schools.

9.4 The Youth Authority has attempted to meet vocational needs in several institutions through vocationally oriented educational programs. The Department should now secure such legislation as is necessary to qualify for Federal funds from the Department of Rehabilitation and the Department of Education to further enrich the vocational educational programs.

9.5 Compensatory Education funds should not be utilized to supplant basic State responsibilities but rather to supplement a State program that is in and of itself capable of meeting basic student needs.

10.0 THE CURRICULUM SHOULD REFLECT THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS AND BE RELATED TO THE LIFE STYLE AND NEEDS OF THE STUDENT UPON RELEASE.

10.1 The curriculum should be evaluated with particular reference to post high school education for graduates, more relevant education for non-graduating wards, expanded career and vocational education, more stress on survival skills (areas such as health and personal hygiene, drug abuse, family life, consumer economics, basic government and law), and extended learning laboratory offerings for low achievers.

10.2 The possibility of utilizing modular scheduling, mini courses, independent study, correspondence courses and the like to promote greater flexibility in the curriculum should be considered.

10.3 Methods of teaching should provide for more group interchange where appropriate, thus promoting the development of language and oral communication skills.

10.4 Efforts should be made to provide a greater flexibility in the course offerings which can be used to meet State graduation requirements.
10.5 Remedial reading and remedial mathematics programs should be made available at all schools so that wards who are assessed at below 8.0 grade level in either or both subjects can meet the in-lieu requirement provided for in California Administrative Code Section 1601 and thus be graduated.

10.6 Vocational programs currently operating should be carefully reviewed so that methods taught are relative to real world working conditions. In addition, all vocational programs must include vocational counseling and training in the behaviors necessary to find and retain employment.

10.7 Physical education programs should also stress prescriptive individual growth and physical development including adaptive Physical Education.

11.0 THE CYA SHOULD ESTABLISH EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL POLICIES THAT PROVIDE STAFF QUALIFIED TO PROVIDE THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM ESPECIALLY DESIGNED TO MEET THE UNIQUE AND SPECIAL NEEDS OF THE CYA WARDS.

11.1 All institutions should go into delegated testing for teacher personnel. When a given institution has a need for an academic teacher with a specific background, i.e., Science, that institution should be allowed to hire from the first 3 eligibles on the list who have the necessary preparation and experience.

11.2 Clear-cut performance objectives should be established for all teachers and they should be evaluated in terms of the degree to which these objectives are achieved. A definite system should be developed which would make it possible to release tenured teachers who are not achieving their educational performance objectives. (See Stull Bill AB 293, 1971 Session)

11.3 Education Administrators and Teacher salary schedules should be established which are no less than the average of the better public school districts in the State.

11.4 A Civil Service position titled Lead Teacher or Department Chairman be established which
provides an extra pay step to compensate for the extra work and responsibility.

11.5 A system should be established that would allow specific education positions to be eliminated when they are no longer relevant to the needs of students and would allow the incumbent teachers to be retrained by the CYA if their skills are no longer relevant to student needs.

11.6 A State-funded School Psychologist should be employed at each institution in order to provide better diagnostic and pupil-personnel services. It should be noted that this recommendation is in addition to any School Psychologist positions currently funded through ESEA.

11.7 The duties and responsibilities of all Supervisors of Education, Supervisors of Academic Instruction and Supervisors of Vocational Instruction should be reviewed and revised in such a manner as to allow them to better fulfill their intended roles and obligations within the education program. Special attention should be given to those duties which are non-educational in nature and yet take the administrator away from his major responsibilities to the education program; and those duties which are clerical in nature and should really be performed by clerical staff.

11.8 In the smaller institutions, population 400 and below, an additional position of School Registrar should be established at the Steno II level to handle all transcript transactions.

11.9 A pupil-personnel counselor position should be established at each institution.

11.10 The janitorial services available to all CYA education plants should be upgraded both quantitatively and qualitatively.

11.11 The clerical staffs in all education programs should include a minimum of 2 full-time State-funded positions.

11.12 The CYA should budget funds annually specifically for on-going in-service training of education staff at all institutions. Continuing In-service training programs should be instituted for teachers in order to keep them
abreast of theories, methodologies and trends current in the fields of education and juvenile rehabilitation.

11.13 All teachers should be given in-depth training in the use of individualized and prescriptive teaching techniques.

11.14 All new teachers should be given 40 hours of orientation during the first two months and substitute funds for this period budgeted.

11.15 A system should be developed requiring teachers to take additional relevant preparation or training as a condition of continued employment.

12.0 THE CURRENT ADA ACCOUNTING SYSTEM SHOULD BE REVISED TO PROVIDE FOR ADEQUATE PROGRAM SCHEDULING IN A DIVERSIFIED CURRICULUM.

12.1 Greater flexibility in scheduling of students cannot be implemented under the present restrictions.

12.2 A broader capability is needed to meet the wide variety of educational needs of students.

12.3 The CYA should take steps to assure that staffing under ADA restraints optimize curricular planning.

12.4 The current student-teacher ratio of 15 to 1 be reviewed to meet the needs of a diverse and special student population.

12.5 The staffing pattern should be reviewed to determine what additional staff are required to extend the educational program and activities for a greater proportion of the student's day without removing essential preparation time.

13.0 THAT A PROGRAM OF INDIVIDUAL AND PERSONAL WARD COUNSELING BE IMPLEMENTED WHICH PROVIDES FOR COMPLETE CONFIDENTIALITY.

13.1 Valid concepts of confidentiality include independence, and hence counseling should be
provided by a person other than one who has supervisory responsibility over the ward seeking counseling services and who is otherwise divorced from the care and treatment of the particular ward.

13.2 In no circumstance should any communication, or any information divulged, in the course of such counseling, or any part thereof or reference thereto, to be utilized in conjunction with any other process not directly and solely related to and in furtherance of counseling processes. This prohibition includes non-use of information divulged in the course of counseling, in any disciplinary matter.

13.3 Individual and group counseling services should be provided for students in the domain of social-emotional functioning by specially trained personnel.

13.4 See also Appendix A.

14.0 THE PROPER PARTICIPATORY FUNCTION OF WARD-STUDENTS IN ALL ASPECTS OF INSTITUTIONAL LIFE SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED BY FORMATION OF STUDENT BODY GOVERNMENTS AND OTHER APPROPRIATE WARD-STUDENT COMMITTEES.

14.1 Wards at each institution should be granted an affirmative role in determining school curricula and other educational policies and programs as well as in matters of institutional governance generally.

14.2 Provision should be made for availing wards 18 years of age and older of opportunity to vote by absentee ballot in elections affecting their resident districts.

14.3 Institutional student activities should encompass utilization of outside vocational and educational resources, as well as other off-ground experiences, and, generally, greater interaction with the outside community.

15.0 THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM SHOULD BE MORE CLOSELY RELATED TO THE HOME COMMUNITIES OF THE WARDS. (See Appendix B)

15.1 CYA staff in general should be given a better
basic understanding of the communities, lifestyle, and family life in which the ward lives and functions.

15.2 Communities need to develop positive attitudes toward the rehabilitative experiences provided by the CYA. Community involvement of citizens' organizations, labor unions and peers is a responsibility of the CYA.

15.3 The CYA schools should seek trainees from colleges and universities as interns and student teachers.

15.4 The CYA should expand the employment of former wards capable of relating positively with students.

15.5 Cooperative programs should be developed for providing opportunities for learning and vocational work-study in the community.

16.0 THE CYA SHOULD REVIEW THE PUBLICATION THE EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY: FIVE-YEAR STRATEGY FOR CHANGE.

16.1 The visiting committee agrees with many of the recommendations and finds others of importance, but would place a different emphasis on the implementation.

16.2 The visiting committee is concerned that so little effort toward evaluation or implementation of these recommendations was in evidence during our visits.

16.3 The visiting committee suggests a review of this document be made in light of the recommendations of the present study and an evaluation and statement be made of the Youth Authority's position with respect to selective implementation.
Dear Fellow Youth Authority Employee,

I am doing a study, for my dissertation, with the objective of developing an administrative model for the Youth Authority education program which will make it possible to provide better education services to wards in institutions and camps. In order to accomplish this I need your help in filling out the attached questionnaire.

In this questionnaire you are asked to rate, on a scale of one to five, the extent to which you feel each of seven administrative models satisfy each of ten criteria. The models are ones which have been discussed in various writings in the field. The following is a short description of each of the models:

1. **CYA Education Programs Operated by SDE.** In this model the total Youth Authority education program would be taken over and operated by the California State Department of Education.

2. **CYA Education Programs Operated by Local Districts.** In this model each institution and camp education program would be totally operated by the local public school district in which the institution or camp is located.

3. **CYA Education Programs Operated by County Schools.** In this model each Youth Authority institution and camp education program would be operated by the county office of education of the county in which the camp or institution is located.
4. **CYA education Program Operated by Joint Powers.**

In this model, the Youth Authority would enter into agreements with local districts, county offices of education, community college districts, and regional occupation centers, to provide all of the education services required by each institution or camp, located within the confines of those districts.

5. **Special Correctional School District.** In this model a special non-geographical school district would be created to operate the Youth Authority education program. The district would have total responsibility for the program. It would probably be organized within the Youth Authority in order to provide organizational and program continuity.

6. **Education Up-Graded to Branch Level.** In this model education would be reorganized as the Education Branch of the Youth Authority, on the same level as the Institutions and Camps Branch.

7. **Continue With Current Organization.** In this model no organizational changes would be made in the Youth Authority education program.

For your convenience a short description of the agencies involved in the various models is presented on page five.

The criteria result from a recent study of the Youth Authority education program. Those problems have been translated into criteria for purposes of the present study. The ten criteria developed are:

1. **Can Provide a Centralized Education Administration.**
Please rate the extent to which you think each model could provide a centralized education administration for the CYA.

2. **Can Provide Centralized Education Communication.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could provide a centralized communication system, which could keep all elements of the education program well-informed about what is going on in education, in the Youth Authority.

3. **Can Provide Centralized Education Technical Assistance.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could provide assistance to institution and camp programs, such as curriculum expertise.

4. **Can Provide Centralized Quality Control of Education.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could provide a centralized system which could achieve and maintain a high level of educational service throughout the Youth Authority.

5. **Can Reduce Competition for Funding.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could reduce the problem of education having to compete for funding with other Youth Authority program components.

6. **Can Provide Flexible Use of Education Resources.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could allow education resources to be utilized, flexibly, throughout the total Youth Authority education program.

7. **Can Require the CYA to Follow the Ed. Code and Title 5.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could require the Y.A. education program to follow the minimum
standards set forth in the California Education Code and California Administrative Code, Title 5.

8. **Can Provide Support Services to Local Education Programs.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could provide support services such as educational psychological services, speech therapy, etc., to local institution and camp programs.

9. **Can Ensure CYA Education's Control by Educators.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could ensure that the YA's education program would be controlled by educators.

10. **Ensures Teachers on Treatment Teams.** Please rate the extent to which you think each model could ensure that teachers would continue to be members of treatment teams.

As you fill out the questionnaire, please try to be as objective as you can in rating the extent to which you think each model satisfies each criterion. Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope, by May 30, 1978. At the same time please sign and return the enclosed post card. The post card will tell me that you have completed and returned the questionnaire. All responses will remain completely anonymous.

Your assistance in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gordon L. Spencer
Supervisor of Education
Karl Holton School
(209) 944-6164
DESCRIPTION OF AGENCIES

1. California State Department of Education. Is responsible for implementing the laws relating to education which are passed by the Legislature, and sometimes the U. S. Congress. It operates a small number of special schools such as those for the deaf and blind.

2. California Youth Authority. Was established by the Youth Authority Act, which is part of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The authority and charge for education programs in Youth Authority institutions is in the Welfare and Institutions Code. Therefore, its education programs are not governed by either the California Education Code, or the California Administrative Code, Title 5.

3. County Schools. Serve as a liaison between the State and local districts. They operate as service districts providing services such as A-V materials and teacher credentialing services. Some county school districts operate special education programs for qualified students from all local districts within the county.

4. Joint Powers. Occasionally, county school districts, local school districts, and/or community college districts enter into agreements wherein they join together to provide special services to meet special needs.

5. Local School Districts. These include elementary, high school, unified, union, and joint union districts. They have specific boundaries, and are governed by an elected
school board, and administered by a superintendent and his staff.

6. **Special Correctional School District.** Several states throughout the country have created special correctional school districts, through state legislation. These districts are responsible for the education programs in the correctional institutions in those states. They range from totally independent (from the correctional agency) districts to districts which have been created within the correctional agency, and are responsible to that agency.
On this questionnaire, please rate the extent to which you think that each administrative model meets each of the criteria listed in the column at the left. Please rate each model against each criterion by placing a number in the appropriate squares below, according to the following rating system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by SDE</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by Local Districts</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by County Schools</th>
<th>CYA Education Programs Operated by Joint Powers</th>
<th>Special Correctional School District</th>
<th>Continue with Current Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can Provide a Centralized Education Administration</td>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>4.013*</td>
<td>3.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can Provide Centralized Education Communication</td>
<td>2.911</td>
<td>2.114</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>4.089*</td>
<td>3.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can Reduce Competition for Funding</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>2.127</td>
<td>3.620*</td>
<td>3.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ensures Teachers Participation on Treatment Teams</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>1.544</td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>3.468</td>
<td>3.532*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Outline of Funding Sources for California Schools
Outline of Funding Sources for California Schools

Part I - Selected Local Assistance Programs

Program (Listed alphabetically)

Adult Basic Education
Adult Education (Defined)
American Indian Early Childhood Education
American Indian Education Centers
Bilingual-Bicultural Education
Bilingual Teacher Corps
Child Care Food Program (Year-Round Special Food Service Program for Children)
Child Care Services
Commodity Distribution Program
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA)
Conservation Education/Environmental Education
Continuation High School Education
County School Service Fund - Direct Service
County School Service Fund - Other Purpose
County School Service Fund - Special Schools and Classes
Demonstration Programs in Intensive Instruction in Reading and Mathematics
Development Centers for Handicapped Minors
Driver Training
Early Childhood Education
Educational Improvement for the Handicapped
Educational Innovation and Support
Educational Technology and Instructional Television
Educationally Disadvantaged Youth Program
Educationally Handicapped Minor Program
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I
Experimental Education Programs in Special Education
Gifted and Talented Education
Improvement of Pupil Personnel Services, ESEA, Title III, and ESEA, Title IV-B
Instructional Materials Program
Leadership in Community Education
Libraries and Learning Resources, ESEA II, and ESEA, IV-B
Master Plan for Special Education
Migrant Education
Miller-Unruh Basic Reading Act of 1965
National Defense Education Act (NDEA), Title III
National School Lunch Program
New Careers in Education Act
Nonfood Assistance for School Food Programs
Physically Exceptional Children
Preschool and School Programs for Handicapped
Preschool Education Programs
Principal Apportionment (Basic and Equalization Aid), Grades K-12
Professional Development and Programs Improvement Centers
Regional Occupational Centers or Programs
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation
School Breakfast Program
Southeast Asian Refugee Education Program
Special Education Program for Autistic Children
Special Education Programs for the Mentally Retarded
Special Education Transportation Allowance
Special Milk Program for Children
Special Summer Food Service Program for Children
State Child Nutrition Programs
Summer School
Surplus Property Utilization
Teacher Corps
Transportation Allowance
Vocational Education: Special Needs
Vocational Education: Basic Grants to States
Vocational Education: Research
Vocational Education: Exemplary Programs and Projects (Part D)
Vocational Education: Consumer and Homemaking Education
Vocational Education: Cooperative Education
Vocational Education: Work Study

Part II - Summary Analysis of Other Selected Funding Sources for California Schools

Meals for Needy Pupils
Community Services
Child Development Fund
Development Center for Handicapped Pupils Fund
Bond Interest and Redemption Fund
Repayment of State School Building Loan
Earthquake Safety Correction Measures
Repayment of Public School Building Loan
Regional Occupational Center and Program
Bond and Interest Charges to Component Districts
Assessments for Utilities Installation
Repayment of State School Loan (Compensatory Education)
Leasing School Facilities
Repayment of State Loan (Exceptional Children)
Leasing School Facilities
Repayment of State Loan (Exceptional Children)
Repayment of State School Loan (Exceptional Children)
Repayment of State School Loan (Exceptional Children)
Areawide Aid
APPENDIX D

Response From State Department of Education Regarding Eligibility to Issue High School Diplomas
June 14, 1978

Mr. Gordon L. Spencer
1828 Meadow Avenue
Stockton, CA 95207

Dear Mr. Spencer:

My response to your questionnaire is attached.

You should understand that my responses are based on the present Education Code which does not grant CYA the authorization to issue diplomas. However, if any of your seven proposed models were adopted, it is conceivable authorization could be given for issuance of diplomas by the State Board or by state legislation.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Joseph R. Hoffmann
Mathematics Consultant
(916) 322-3284

Enclosure
**HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please check, in the appropriate space, whether or not each of the administrative models described could be authorized to issue high school diplomas. Note: CYA stands for California Youth Authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Could issue diplomas</th>
<th>Could not issue diplomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The State Department of Education would have the responsibility and authority to operate all CYA education programs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The local school district in which the various CYA programs are located would have the responsibility and authority to operate all CYA education programs located within those districts.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The county superintendents of schools, would have the responsibility and authority to operate all CYA education programs located within their counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The CYA would enter into joint powers agreement with county offices of education, local school districts, and community college districts, to provide education services.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A special correctional school district created by legislation, would be responsible for the operation of all CYA education programs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The responsibility and authority for all education programs within the CYA would remain with the CYA, but a special branch would be established for education, with direct lines of authority to all CYA education programs.

7. The responsibility and authority for all education programs within the CYA would remain with the CYA, and education would remain as part of the Institutions and Camps Branch. No organizational changes would be made.

Signature:  
Dr. Joseph Hoffmann  
Curriculum Services  
State Department of Education
APPENDIX E

Response From State Department of Education
Regarding Eligibility to Become
General Education Development
Testing Centers
July 31, 1978

Mr. Gordon L. Spencer
1828 Meadow Ave.
Stockton, CA 95207

Dear Mr. Spencer:

This is in response to your July 18, 1978, letter to Mr. Harry Bigelow.

Enclosed are copies of pages of the GED Manual that include references to establishing GED Centers and the limitations on correctional institutions. Using these guidelines, a GED Center might be approved for Models 1-4. Final approval would depend on the contracting agency (school district, community college, county office of education) and the personnel structure. A GED Chief Examiner cannot be in the employment of the correctional institution. It is difficult to generalize these policies to models; each case must be considered on its own merit.

I hope this will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Connie Bourne
GED Coordinator

Enc.

CB:jj
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Establishment of centers

2.1 The policy of the Commission on Educational Credit stipulates the following agencies, institutions, and school systems may be approved as locations for Official GED Centers:

The GED Testing Service shall establish by annual contract an Official GED Center at:
(1) high schools and institutions of higher education accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting association or by the state department of education, and (2) at adult schools, boards of education community colleges, and adult education centers authorized by appropriate state education agencies and operating under the jurisdiction of state or local school authorities.

Within the parameters of this policy, the State Administrator of the GED Testing Program determines where Official GED Centers are to be located within the state.
2.2 When the State Administrator has determined the need for an Official GED Center and if the proposed site meets all state and national requirements, the completed GEDTS Form 75 (Authorization for Establishment of an Official GED Center) is forwarded to the GED Testing Service. It is essential that all information requested on Form 75 be provided since this document will serve as the basis for creation of the contract agreement. (State Administrators may request additional quantities of Form 75 from the GED Testing Service.)

2.3 Upon receipt of the authorization by the GED Testing Service, a contract will be executed if the proposed location meets the requirements of the Commission as outlined in par. 2.1. A $10.00 establishment fee is assessed and payable with the first order for testing materials.

Establishment of centers on military installations

2.4 At large bases or where facilities of the civilian Official GED Center are inadequate to meet the demand for testing, testing centers may be opened on the premises of the military installation upon authorization of the state department of education. Where small military bases are conveniently located near an existing Official GED Center, it may be more feasible to arrange for military testing at the established civilian center. It is the exclusive prerogative of the state-level department of education to authorize establishment of Official GED Centers on military bases.

2.5 In accordance with the Commission's policies and to insure continuing security and integrity of the program, the guidelines outlined in pars. 2.6-18 must be observed in establishing testing centers on military installations to accommodate military personnel.

Contracts

2.6 Contracts establishing testing centers on military installations must be with a (1) state department of education, (2) local school system, or (3) college or university.

Testing in Federal, state, and local correctional and health institutions
Federal

5.3 Through special arrangements with the U. S. Department of Justice, GED testing services are provided to inmates of Federal health and correctional facilities. The GED Tests are administered by authorized educational officials at the institutions. The GED Testing Service scores and reports the test results and maintains permanent records. Official reports of results on tests administered in Federal health and correctional facilities are issued only by the GED Testing Service.

State, county, and municipal

5.4 The GED Tests may be administered to persons confined to state, county, and municipal correctional and health facilities in accordance with the policies and procedures outlined in pars. 5.5-12.

5.5 The contractual agreement between the GED Testing Service and Official GED Centers which requires that secure forms of the GED Tests be maintained on the premises of the Official GED Center may be modified so as to permit their administration in state, county, and municipal correctional and health facilities. The GED Tests may be administered by chief examiners of Official GED Centers to inmates and patients in these institutions upon appropriate authorization by the respective state department of education and the GED Testing Service. When GED Tests are transported from local Official GED Centers for administration at institutions of this nature, they must be administered only by the chief examiner or officially appointed and approved proctor, who must be an employee of the school system or educational institution that has responsibility for the Official GED Center; the tests must be stored securely on the premises of the Official GED Center except for actual administration, and all scoring and reporting must be by the chief examiner or state department of education.

5.6 The policy does not authorize all chief examiners to test in these institutions. The State Administrator and the GED Testing Service must approve testing in each specific institution. GEDTS Form 75, with appropriate supporting information, must be submitted to the GED Testing Service. Upon receipt of authorization from the State Administrator, an addendum to the contract is executed between the GED Testing Service and the local...
5.7 Each state should formalize its own requirements for approving testing in these facilities. As a minimum, each correctional or health institution should have a formal educational, vocational, or rehabilitation program, with at least one professional staff member working with these programs. In determining the need for testing in these facilities, factors to be considered may include the characteristics of the inmate or patient population at the facility, length of incarceration or confinement of candidates, impact of the testing program on potential rehabilitation of examinees, physical facilities for adequate testing environment, and willingness of local educational officials to assume responsibility for the routine supervision and administration of the program. The state department of education should require the chief examiners of Official GED Centers to establish and follow rigid controls and adequate security measures for transporting and administering the examinations under these conditions.

5.8 Only the chief examiner or officially appointed and approved proctor may transport and administer the tests. Examiners and proctors must be employees of the state department of education, local school system, college, or university. Employees of health and correction facilities may not have access to the restricted testing materials, but they may be in attendance at testing sessions when their presence is required by the institution or requested by the chief examiner.

5.9 The tests must be securely stored at all times at the physical location of the Official GED Center except for transporting and actual administration. Restricted materials, including completed answer sheets, must never be stored at the institutions. The restricted testing materials must be returned to the secure storage area at the Official GED Center following each day's testing session.

5.10 All scoring and reporting of test results must be done by the chief examiner of the Official GED Center or by the state department of education where scoring is centralized at the state level.

5.11 Financial arrangements for testing in local institutions are to be developed in cooperation with the state department of education, the local school system or educational institution, and the correc-
tional or health facility officials.

5.12 Testing of candidates in correctional and health facilities is limited to incarcerated persons or confined patients. (Employees of the institution are not to be tested on the premises of the facilities). Except in extreme, justifiable cases, approved by the State Administrator, examinees must be able to record their responses on the answer sheet.

5.13 Authorizations are also granted by the Commission to state departments of education to administer the GED Tests under this policy provided the Education Department agrees to the conditions outlined in pars. 5.14-17.

5.14 The Education Department must establish and Official GED Center within the department to stock the restricted test materials.

5.15 The Education Department must be responsible for administration of the tests to qualified individuals at state, county, and municipal institutions.

5.16 The Education Department must send the tests and answer sheets to appropriate officials of these facilities by registered mail or insured parcel post, with return receipt requested in either case, or by official state messenger, and upon completion of testing, require the return of the materials in the same manner.

5.17 The Education Department must score the tests in the department, report results of the tests, and maintain permanent records of scores achieved by the individuals.

5.18 In those states where the hospitals or prisons operate an accredited high school, Official GED Centers may be established under the same procedures outlined in pars. 2.1-3.

Testing in the armed services

5.19 From 1943 to 1974, the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) made the GED Tests available to qualified active-duty military personnel. When services provided by USAFI were terminated in May 1974, the Department of Defense and each military department realized a continuing need for the GED Testing Program for members of the Armed Forces.
Service personnel stationed overseas are tested through contractual arrangements with the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) and the GED Testing Service.
APPENDIX F

Second Questionnaire
Dear Fellow Corrections Administrator,

I am writing a doctoral dissertation titled, "A Model Delivery System for Education in the California Youth Authority." The first part of this study concluded that a correctional school district would be the best system for the California Youth Authority. Since your state already has an operational correctional school district, this section of the study is designed to get your ideas about the organization of such a school district, based upon your experience.

The current part of the study is concerned with two questions:

1. What relationships should exist between the correctional school district and the corrections agency with which it works?

2. What should be the financial responsibilities of the correctional school district and the corrections agency, in such an arrangement, and how should the school district be financed?

The attached questionnaire is presented in 2 sections, each relating to one of these questions. Since only a few individuals possess a working knowledge of this subject, your participation in this study will be greatly appreciated. Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope by 12/20/78. All responses will remain strictly confidential.

yours truly

Gordon L. Spencer
Supervisor of Education
Karl Holton School
California Youth Authority

Would you like a synopsis of the findings of this study?

No  Yes

Name ________________________________

Address ________________________________
QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I

In this section of the questionnaire, you are asked to provide your ideas and observations concerning the organizational and working relationships which should exist between a correctional school district and the corrections agency with which it works.

A. Please circle the number following each of the statements below which best represents your views regarding that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A correctional school district should be completely autonomous from the corrections agency with which it works.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A correctional school district should be a part of the corrections agency with which it works.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The superintendent of a correctional school district should report (be responsible to) the director of the corrections agency.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The superintendent of a correctional school district should report to a deputy director of the corrections agency.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A correctional school district should have a school board:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If the district is part of the corrections agency.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If the district is autonomous.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The superintendent of a correctional school district should report to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

7. The superintendent of a correctional school district should report only to a school board.

B. If a school board should be established, for a correctional school district, who should be represented on that board? (e.g., member of the board of corrections, director of the corrections agency, state education agency, etc.)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.

C. Please list below, in order of importance, up to ten of the most important criteria, or principles, which you think should serve as guidelines in establishing the organizational and working relationships between a correctional school district and the corrections agency. Use the back of this and the next page, if necessary.

1.
2.
D. The teachers, school administrators and other education staff of a correctional school district, should be employees of:

Check one.
1. The state ___
2. The school district ___
3. Other ___ (Please explain)

Section II

A. In this section, please indicate which agency, assuming a correctional school district exists, you feel should be responsible for each of the functions listed. Please write an X in the appropriate box following each item.
1. School budgeting activities.
2. School accounting activities.
3. School purchasing procedures.
4. School warehousing activities.
5. Financing educational materials and supplies.
6. Financing the purchasing of educational equipment.
7. Payment of education staff salaries.
8. Payment of non-certificated staff salaries.
9. Payment of school light, heat, water, and power bills.
10. School building and grounds maintenance.
11. Maintenance of school equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. How should a correctional school district be funded? Please check one.

_____ 1. By the state department of education, at the rate of so many dollars per unit of average daily attendance.

_____ 2. As part of the budget of the corrections agency.

_____ 3. By the state department of education, at the rate of so many dollars per unit of average daily attendance, plus eligibility for all state and federal funding for which public schools are eligible.

_____ 4. As part of the budget of the corrections agency, plus eligibility for all special state and federal funding for which public schools are eligible.
Section III

This section is being completed by school administrators, only. In this section, please describe the support services which you think a correctional school district should provide.

A. In your opinion, which support services should a correctional school district provide? Please circle the appropriate numbers on the following list which you feel a correctional school district should provide.

1. Educational guidance services.
2. Educational counseling services.
3. School psychological services.
4. Speech and hearing services.
5. Health services.
6. Psychiatric services.
7. Services for exceptional pupils:
   a. Visually handicapped.
   b. Mentally retarded.
   c. Speech impaired.
   d. Seriously emotionally disturbed.
   e. Orthopedically handicapped.
   f. Hard of hearing.
   g. Deaf.
   h. Deaf-blind.
   i. Multi-handicapped.
   j. Specific learning disabilities.
   k. Other health impaired.
1. Mentally gifted.
   m. Other. (Please list).

B. Please list below the professional staff positions which you feel should be assigned to the district office of a correctional school district of about 4,000 students.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. 
11. 
12. 
13. 
14. 
15. 

C. Please describe the working relationship which you feel should exist between the superintendent of a correctional school district and the superintendent/warden of an institution.
D. Please describe the working relationship which you feel should exist between the school district principal (in the institution) and the institution's superintendent/warden.

E. Now, some questions about your district.

1. About how many students does your district serve?
   a. Full time (over 20 hours per week) __________.
   b. Half time (10-19 hours per week) __________.
   c. Part time (less than 10 hours per week) ________.

2. Does your school district serve (check one).
   a. An adult corrections agency? _____.
   b. A juvenile corrections agency? _____.
   c. Both the adult and juvenile corrections agency? ____.
   d. Other _____. Please describe.

F. About how many of the following professional staff positions does your district employ?

1. Teachers and instructors (other than Special Ed.) ____.
2. Special education teachers ____.
3. School administrators ____.
4. School psychologists ____.
5. Educational counselors ____.
6. Others. Please list.
G. What was your district's approximate expenditure per unit of average daily attendance, during fiscal year 1977-78?

1. State funds only. $____________.

2. Federal funds only. $____________.

Thank you very much for participating in this questionnaire. Your help is greatly appreciated.