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Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of the design and implementation of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Juvenile Justice Services’ (BJJS) new model of aftercare. Understanding how aftercare services are delivered and how the program actually operates is essential for decisionmaking about program planning and for improvement.

In January 2005, BJJS decided to shift from a treatment model of aftercare service delivery to a case management model of service delivery. BJJS provides aftercare services to about 2 out of every 3 youth released from placements with the State’s Youth Development Center/Youth Forestry Center (YDC/YFC) system. At current levels of use, the aftercare program enrolls over 500 youth per year. Based on screener results, the great majority of youth enrolled in the program are classified as high risk—they are also older, with greater needs, and more serious offending histories than the average adjudicated youth in Pennsylvania.

The BJJS program is one of six major aftercare initiatives active in Pennsylvania, all of which are funded by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. The other five programs, all associated with the MacArthur Foundation’s Models for Change initiative, are specific to the single county where they operate: Allegheny, Cambria, Lycoming, Philadelphia, and York counties. In contrast, the BJJS program operates in a group of counties that contain more than 70% of Pennsylvania’s population. Like the Philadelphia program, and like many other serious and violent offender re-entry programs in operation across the nation, the BJJS aftercare program employs a case management model that features extensive assessment, individualized planning, a focus on the transition from life in the placement facility to life in the community, and efforts to assist the youth in building durable, supportive relationships in the community (reintegration).

The goals of the BJJS Aftercare Services Project are based on the Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) model developed by David Altschuler and Troy Armstrong (1994). Instead of starting aftercare services after the youth is released, the planning, assessments, and client contact begins when the youth is placed in the facility.

The new BJJS approach begins at disposition, continues while the youth is in placement and on probation in the community, and endures afterwards through connections with services in the community.

BJJS contracted with a private provider, Cornell, to implement the community component of the aftercare services model. In the old model, the youth went through the program in phases (could not move to Phase 2 until successfully completing Phase 1). In the new model, the youth completes steps in their own individualized service plan rather than completing a “one size fits all” program. Each youth’s plan is developed based on his/her strengths and needs, family assessments, and resources that will be available in their home community when they are released.
Changes in the program model required new resources be put into place both in the facilities and the communities. BJJS made many changes in the program infrastructure, including adding new staff, training staff on the new way of doing business, and using new assessment instruments.

The goals of the BJJS aftercare program are to reduce delinquency and improve the life chances for high-risk youth released from state placements. To reach its goals, the program relies on effective collaboration across agencies that traditionally have been independent. The BJJS program requires collaboration among BJJS staff within the YDC/YFC system, contracted case managers active at the facility and in the communities, juvenile court and juvenile probation, families, and community-based service providers. In large measure, success of the aftercare program depends on BJJS success at achieving and sustaining collaboration in a set of state, local, public, private, and non-profit agencies and organizations.

**Evaluation Method**

This program was evaluated using a participatory model of evaluation. This method is well suited to evaluating ongoing programs while using the evaluation process as a learning process. Program stakeholders were involved in all steps of the evaluation process and the focus of the evaluation was on the development of lessons learned, which were subsequently translated into an action plan by BJJS. The BJJS aftercare program operates in a socially, economically, and politically dynamic environment. While the program model establishes a uniform approach to community reintegration and aftercare, differences materialized across the participating counties because of resource constraints, complexities associated with participant characteristics, and unanticipated organizational and staffing difficulties.

The evaluation was concerned both with the extent to which the planned activities were carried out and with how they were carried out. Based upon the information collected, "lessons learned" were formulated and fed back into the program plan. The evaluation led to the development of knowledge that will continue to help program staff improve program implementation in the future. Therefore, the evaluation provided information both for accountability and for generating lessons in the future. Procedures were developed on an ongoing basis to help program staff learn from successes and problems encountered in implementing the model of service delivery. Modifications were made and strategies were continuously developed during the entire period of program implementation. All levels of program staff were involved in program monitoring and evaluation. Program field staff played a particularly important role in providing their observations regarding the activities being implemented. BJJS management used lessons that were developed by staff to make decisions concerning modifications, strategy, activities, and budget.

Particular attention was paid to differences between the program as it was designed and the program as it actually operated. The private provider responsible for implementing the aftercare services in the community prior to the change (treatment) in the service delivery model was the same provider chosen to implement the new model of
aftercare service delivery (case management). Therefore it was important to evaluate whether or not the new philosophy was actually translated into practice.

The new model represents a major philosophical shift:

- From a program oriented model to an individual centered model
- From youth adapting to a program to a program designed for individual youth
- From youth as client to be served to serving three clients: youth, community and victim
- From a treatment model to a case management model
- From focusing on client problems to focusing on client strengths

The evaluation examined the extent to which the five discrete components of the IAP case management system are actually used in practice. These components are:

1. Assessment, classification, and client selection criteria
2. Individualized case planning that incorporates family and community perspectives
3. A combination of intensive surveillance and services
4. Incentives and graduated consequences
5. Service brokerage with community resources and linkage with social networks

The evaluation tracked the design and implementation issues pertinent to the effective operation of the BJJS aftercare program. The evaluation paid particular attention to the following aspects of the BJJS aftercare program:

- Whether the program is being implemented as designed
- The extent to which the program adheres to the standards found in Pennsylvania’s Joint Position on Aftercare
- The fit of the program to the county-level context in which the program operates
- The information management procedures and measures of program performance used by BJJS

The assumption that there is wide variability among counties and the resources available, the aftercare services they provide, and the extent to which county probation departments and Cornell provide aftercare services was investigated by documenting the extent to which implementation of the Aftercare Services Project has taken place, and the degree to which the Aftercare Services Project operated as expected for each of the counties. To accomplish this:
• Interviews were conducted with BJJS management staff in Harrisburg that discussed the history of the program as well as their expectations with regard to the changes that were made in the model of service delivery.

• Meetings were held with management staff of the service provider contracted to provide aftercare services after the youth is released from the facilities.

• Site visits were made to public facilities across the state where social workers, caseworkers, cottage counselors, and clinical staff were interviewed.

• Screening and risk assessment instruments were examined, as well as the protocol for contact between the youth and the case manager.

• Visits were made to all juvenile probation departments in participating counties to discuss their knowledge of the program, how aftercare works in each one of their counties, and their relationships with the aftercare workers.

• Case managers from each of the individual nonresidential care (NRC) offices were interviewed about their role in the aftercare service delivery and their relationships with the individual probation departments.

• Individual Service Plans being written were observed, reviewed, and discussed with case managers concerning their implementation when the youth are released.

• Evaluators observed and sometimes participated in the training provided to BJJS staff and NRC staff on the new model of service delivery.

• Survey questionnaires were sent to probation officers, case managers, facility staff, and aftercare service case managers to gather information on their perceptions of how things were working with the new model.

• Information being collected was documented, including when it was being collected, who was collecting it, and how to obtain it to measure program outcomes in the future.

**Major Findings, Recommendations, and Policy Implications**

The evidence reviewed indicates that the BJJS aftercare program largely adheres to the case management model and that aftercare program staff has been able to implement a majority of the aftercare program’s features. BJJS has closely monitored implementation and has acted to correct problems as they have been discovered. BJJS aftercare program management is continually engaged in data collection and program monitoring efforts in order to improve program implementation and performance. Program strengths identified by the evaluation include:

• The aftercare program is research driven, mission-based, and guided by a case management model.

• The aftercare program clearly relates to the Balanced and Restorative Justice goals of competency development, community protection and accountability.
• The aftercare program effectively builds a working team composed of BJJS (responsible for program activity in placement) and contract staff (responsible for program activity in the community).

• The aftercare program organizes the youth’s transition from facility to community and assures continuity of contact between the aftercare program and the resident/client. It also accomplishes continuity of service delivery across the transition.

• The aftercare program constitutes an outreach from the institution to the community. It has established a framework for interagency collaboration across facility-based BJJS staff, aftercare case managers, juvenile probation officers, and community-based service providers.

• The aftercare program has strong institutional support within BJJS. Specifically, it features a dedicated manager, dedicated staff in facilities (social workers), and dedicated reintegration workers in the community.

• The program is client centered. Through assessment and individualized planning, with periodic revisions and a team-based approach, the program adapts itself to the client. It builds on the youth’s strengths, instead of requiring the client to conform to a program that is focused entirely on clients’ problems.

The program establishes a uniform approach to community reintegration and aftercare across the participating counties regardless of the aftercare effort made by any individual county. The uniformity provides a valuable program strength as all participating counties’ probation departments can rely on a certain level of monitoring and service delivery for program enrollees. This is especially important because the population of youth enrolled in the BJJS aftercare program requires a high level of individualized attention for each youth. However, uniformity also represents a program need in that the program does not adapt itself to focus on the areas of greatest aftercare need within individual counties. Other program needs include:

• The aftercare program would benefit from an increased level of coordination between the program itself and juvenile probation.

• To the fullest extent possible, referrals should be made to state-licensed, community-based organizations so that the existing program design is fully implemented.

• The program needs a comprehensive, real-time case management information system accessible by BJJS.

• The information reporting should be modified to reflect the new service delivery model that delivers aftercare services on an individualized basis; reporting should be client-focused rather than program-focused.
Program Performance

The performance of the BJJS aftercare program for youth placed at state facilities is fundamentally solid due to strong leadership, commitment to service excellence, and a reliance on the best available information to guide decisions. These strengths make it likely that the program will continue to adapt itself to the needs of its clients and to the dynamics of the community context in which it operates. Overall, the recommendations for program enhancement made by this evaluation involve issues of procedure and design that can be addressed without conflict with the case management model. In response to informal reports made by the evaluators, and in response to its own quality assurance process, BJJS has already modified or begun to modify the program in many ways.

When major changes were made to the aftercare services delivery model, BJJS management took the opportunity to address previously identified deficiencies, to make major changes in the oversight of its aftercare services program, to enhance its ability to monitor the contractor’s implementation of the program, and to improve the contractor’s accountability to BJJS.

Additionally, a great deal of work has been done with regard to the identification of program objectives and outcome measures. This is demonstrated by the commitment of senior BJJS management to collaborate with the contractor to ensure that accountability across the organizational boundaries is driven by the development of strategies to identify individual client strengths and ensure the clients access to services that use these strengths to meet his/her needs. Given that this model of aftercare services spans several agencies/organizations, and that the service is determined on an individualized basis, much of the success in putting the overall program process in place is due to the collaboration of BJJS and the contractor in focusing on linkages and efficiencies in addressing program improvements.

Major Constraints

Once we began work with this project, we found that there was no documented, overall plan to guide the data collection and, ultimately, the evaluation efforts. We found the data collection systems to be fragmented and not in an electronic format that is easily processed. There was no “map” available of what data were being collected, by whom, at what site, etc. Identifying and documenting the evaluation process and data collection systems, as they now exist, has been a significant task. The case managers used a mixture of manual and computerized record keeping to track their ongoing work with the youth. In effect, this translated into difficulties in accessing all the information needed about individual participants and sometimes caseloads as a whole. Information about participants was entered into a number of separate databases and the information entered into these databases was sometimes incomplete, partial, and redundant.

Increasing collaboration with individual county probation departments would enhance the BJJS aftercare program. It is important to keep in mind that, in the state of Pennsylvania, a juvenile who is released from an institution continues to be subject to juvenile court jurisdiction and juvenile probation supervision. Local courts maintain
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Our nation's schools should be safe havens for teaching and learning, free of crime and violence. Any instance of crime or violence at school not only affects the individuals involved but also may disrupt the educational process and affect bystanders, the school itself, and the surrounding community (Henry 2000).

Ensuring safer schools requires establishing good indicators of the current state of school crime and safety across the nation and regularly updating and monitoring these indicators. This is the aim of Indicators of School Crime and Safety.

This report is the tenth in a series of annual publications produced jointly by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Institute of Education Sciences (IES), in the U.S. Department of Education, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) in the U.S. Department of Justice. This report presents the most recent data available on school crime and student safety. The indicators in this report are based on information drawn from a variety of data sources, including national surveys of students, teachers, and principals. Such sources include results from a study of violent deaths in schools, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; the National Crime Victimization Survey and School Crime Supplement to the survey, sponsored by the BJS and NCES, respectively; the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and the Schools and Staffing Survey and School Survey on Crime and Safety, both sponsored by NCES. The most recent data collection for each indicator varied by survey, from 2003–04 to 2005–06. Each data source has an independent sample design, data collection method, and questionnaire design or is the result of a universe data collection. All comparisons described in this report are statistically significant at the .05 level. In 2005, the final response rate for students age 12 to 18 for the School Crime Supplement (56 percent),\(^1\) fell below the NCES statistical standards; therefore, interpret the 2005 data from Indicators 3, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, and 21 with caution. Additional information about methodology and the datasets analyzed in this report may be found in appendix A.

This report covers topics such as victimization, fights, bullying, classroom disorder, weapons, student perceptions of school safety, teacher injury, and availability and student use of drugs and alcohol. Indicators of crime and safety are compared across different population subgroups and over time. Data on crimes that occur outside of school grounds are offered as a point of comparison where available.

\(^1\) Analysis of unit nonresponse found evidence that for some demographic groups, there may be a response bias in that the nonrespondents have different characteristics than those who responded. Weighting adjustments, which corrected for differential response rates, should have reduced the problem. Therefore, while the results are valid, in interpreting the data from Indicators 3, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, and 21, a reader should understand that these estimates may have larger and unmeasured sources of survey error than other estimates.
KEY FINDINGS

In the 2005–06 school year, an estimated 54.8 million students were enrolled in prekindergarten through grade 12 (U.S. Department of Education 2007). Preliminary data show that among youth ages 5–18, there were 17 school-associated violent deaths from July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006 (14 homicides and 3 suicides) (Indicator 1). In 2005, among students ages 12–18, there were about 1.5 million victims of nonfatal crimes at school, including 868,100 thefts and 628,200 violent crimes (simple assault and serious violent crime) (Indicator 2). There is some evidence that student safety has improved. The victimization rate of students ages 12–18 at school declined between 1992 and 2005 (Indicator 2). However, violence, theft, drugs, and weapons continue to pose problems in schools. During the 2005–06 school year, 86 percent of public schools reported that at least one violent crime, theft, or other crime occurred at their school (Indicator 6). In 2005, 8 percent of students in grades 9–12 reported being threatened or injured with a weapon in the previous 12 months, and 25 percent reported that drugs were made available to them on school property (Indicators 4 and 9). In the same year, 28 percent of students ages 12–18 reported having been bullied at school during the previous 6 months (Indicator 11). The following section presents key findings from each section of the report.

Violent Deaths

- From July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006, there were 14 homicides and 3 suicides of school-age youth (ages 5–18) at school (Indicator 1), or about 1 homicide or suicide of a school-age youth at school per 3.2 million students enrolled during the 2005–06 school year.

Nonfatal Student and Teacher Victimization

- In 2005, students ages 12–18 were victims of about 1.5 million nonfatal crimes at school, including thefts and violent crimes (Indicator 2).

- Students ages 12–18 were generally more likely to be victims of theft at school than away from school (Indicator 2). In 2005, 33 thefts per 1,000 students occurred at school and 23 thefts per 1,000 students occurred away from school.

- In 2005, 4 percent of students ages 12–18 reported being victimized at school during the previous 6 months: 3 percent reported theft, and 1 percent reported violent victimization (Indicator 3). Less than half of a percent of students reported serious violent victimization.6

---

2 School-associated violent death is defined as "a homicide, suicide, legal intervention (involving a law enforcement officer), or unintentional firearm-related death in which the fatal injury occurred on the campus of a functioning elementary or secondary school in the United States." Victims of school-associated violent deaths included students, staff members, and others who are not students.

3 See appendix B for a detailed definition of "at school."

4 Theft includes purse snatching, pick pocketing, and all attempted and completed thefts except motor vehicle thefts. Theft does not include robbery in which threat or use of force is involved.

5 Violent crimes include serious violent crimes and simple assault.

6 Serious violent crimes include rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault.
• Between 2003 and 2005, the percentage of students ages 12–18 reporting victimization declined (from 5 to 4 percent), as did the percentage reporting theft (from 4 to 3 percent); there were no measurable changes in the percentages reporting violent and serious violent crime during the same period (Indicator 3).

• In 2005, 10 percent of male students in grades 9–12 reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property in the past year, compared to 6 percent of female students (Indicator 4).

• Hispanic students were more likely than White students to report being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property in 2005 (10 vs. 7 percent) (Indicator 4). However, no measurable differences were found in the percentages of Black and White students, or Black and Hispanic students who reported being threatened or injured in this way.

• In the 2003–04 school year, a greater percentage of teachers in city schools reported being threatened with injury or physically attacked in 2003–04 than teachers in suburban, town, or rural schools (Indicator 5). For example, in 2003–04, 10 percent of teachers in city schools were threatened with injury by students, compared to 6 percent of teachers in suburban schools, 5 percent of teachers in town schools, and 5 percent of teachers in rural schools.

• A greater percentage of secondary school teachers (8 percent) reported being threatened with injury by a student than elementary school teachers (6 percent) (Indicator 5). However, a greater percentage of elementary school teachers (4 percent) reported having been physically attacked than secondary school teachers (2 percent).

• A greater percentage of public than private school teachers reported being threatened with injury (7 vs. 2 percent) or physically attacked (4 vs. 2 percent) by students in school (Indicator 5). Among teachers in city schools, those in public schools were at least five times more likely to be threatened with injury than their colleagues in private schools (12 vs. 2 percent) and at least four times more likely to be physically attacked (5 vs. 1 percent).

School Environment

• In 2005–06, 86 percent of public schools reported one or more serious violent incidents,7 violent incidents,8 thefts of items valued at $10 or greater, or other crimes had occurred at their school, amounting to an estimated 2.2 million crimes (Indicator 6). This figure translates into a rate of 46 crimes per 1,000 students enrolled in 2005–06.

• The percentage of public schools experiencing incidents of crime was lower in 2005–06 than in 2003–04 (Indicator 6). However, the percentage of schools experiencing crimes in 2005–06 was not measurably different from the percentage of schools experiencing crimes in 1999–2000.

---

7 Serious violent incidents include rape or attempted rape, sexual battery other than rape, physical attack or fight with a weapon, threat of physical attack with a weapon, and robbery with or without a weapon. Serious violent incidents are a subset of violent incidents.

8 Violent incidents include serious violent incidents plus physical attacks or fights without a weapon and threats of physical attacks without a weapon. Violent incidents are a subset of violent incidents.
• In 2005–06, 24 percent of public schools reported that student bullying was a daily or weekly problem (Indicator 7). With regard to other discipline problems occurring at least once a week, 18 percent of public school principals reported student acts of disrespect for teachers, 9 percent reported student verbal abuse of teachers, 3 percent reported daily or weekly occurrences of racial/ethnic tensions among students, and 2 percent reported widespread disorder in classrooms. With regard to other discipline problems occurring at least once per school year, 17 percent of principals reported undesirable gang activities and 4 percent reported undesirable cult or extremist activities during 2005–06.

• In 2005–06, a higher percentage of middle schools than primary schools reported various types of discipline problems (Indicator 7). Also, a higher percentage of middle schools than high schools reported daily or weekly occurrences of student bullying and student sexual harassment of other students.

• In 2005, 24 percent of students ages 12–18 reported that there were gangs at their schools (Indicator 8). Students in urban schools (36 percent) were more likely to report the presence of gangs at their school than suburban students (21 percent) and rural students (16 percent).

• The percentage of students reporting the presence of gangs increased from 21 to 24 percent between 2003 and 2005 (Indicator 8). The percentage of students at urban schools reporting the presence of gangs at school increased from 31 to 36 percent during this period.

• In 2005, one-quarter of all students in grades 9–12 reported that someone had offered, sold, or given them an illegal drug on school property in the past 12 months (Indicator 9).

• Eleven percent of students ages 12–18 reported that someone at school had used hate-related words against them, and more than one-third (38 percent) reported seeing hate-related graffiti at school in 2005 (Indicator 10).

• In 2005, 28 percent of students ages 12–18 reported having been bullied at school during the previous 6 months (Indicator 11). Of these students, 53 percent said that the bullying had happened once or twice during that period, 25 percent had experienced bullying once or twice a month, 11 percent reported having been bullied once or twice a week, and 8 percent said they had been bullied almost daily.

• Of those students who reported bullying incidents that involved being pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on (9 percent), 24 percent reported that they had sustained an injury\(^9\) during the previous 6 months as a result (Indicator 11). While no measurable differences were found by sex in students’ likelihood of reporting a bullying incident in 2005, among students who reported being bullied, males were more likely than females to report being injured during such an incident (31 vs. 18 percent).

---

\(^9\) Injury includes bruises or swelling; cuts, scratches, or scrapes; black eye or bloody nose; teeth chipped or knocked out; broken bones or internal injuries; knocked unconscious; or other injuries.
• In 2003–04, 35 percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that student misbehavior interfered with their teaching and 31 percent reported that student tardiness and class cutting interfered with their teaching (Indicator 12). Seventy-two percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that other teachers at their school enforced the school rules, and 88 percent reported that the principal enforced the school rules in 2003–04.

• A higher percentage of elementary school teachers than secondary school teachers agreed that school rules were enforced by teachers in their school, even for students not in their class (Indicator 12). In 2003–04, 79 percent of elementary teachers reported that school rules were enforced by other teachers, compared to 56 percent of secondary teachers.

**Fights, Weapons, and Illegal Substances**

• In 2005, 36 percent of students in grades 9–12 reported they had been in a fight anywhere, and 14 percent said they had been in a fight on school property during the previous 12 months (Indicator 13). In the same year, 43 percent of males said they had been in a fight anywhere, compared to 28 percent of females, and 18 percent of males said they had been in a fight on school property, compared to 9 percent of females.

• Nineteen percent of students in grades 9–12 in 2005 reported they had carried a weapon anywhere, and 6 percent reported they had carried a weapon on school property during the previous 30 days (Indicator 14). Males were more than two times more likely than females to carry a weapon—either anywhere or on school property—in all survey years. In 2005, for example, 10 percent of males carried a weapon on school property, compared to 3 percent of females, and 30 percent of males carried a weapon anywhere, compared to 7 percent of females.

• In 2005, 43 percent of students in grades 9–12 reported having consumed at least one drink of alcohol anywhere, and 4 percent reported having consumed at least one drink on school property during the previous 30 days (Indicator 15). Hispanic students (8 percent) were more likely to report using alcohol on school property than White, Black, or Asian students (4, 3, and 1 percent, respectively).

• Twenty percent of students in grades 9–12 in 2005 reported using marijuana anywhere during the past 30 days, and 5 percent reported using marijuana on school property during this period (Indicator 16). At school, Hispanic students (8 percent) and American Indian students (9 percent) were more likely to report using marijuana than White or Black students (4 and 5 percent, respectively).

**Fear and Avoidance**

• In 2005, approximately 6 percent of students ages 12–18 reported that they were afraid of attack or harm at school, and 5 percent reported that they were afraid of attack or harm away from school (Indicator 17). The percentage of students who reported that they were afraid of being attacked at school (including on the way to and from school) decreased from 12 to 6 percent between 1995 and 2005.
• Black and Hispanic students were more likely than White students to fear for their safety regardless of location in 2005 (Indicator 17). Nine percent of Black students and 10 percent of Hispanic students reported that they were afraid of being attacked at school (including on the way to and from school), compared to 4 percent of White students. Away from school, 7 percent of Black students, 6 percent of Hispanic students, and 4 percent of White students reported that they were afraid of an attack.

• In 2005, 6 percent of students ages 12–18 reported that they had avoided a school activity or one or more places in school in the previous 6 months because of fear of attack or harm; 2 percent of students avoided a school activity, and 4 percent avoided one or more places in school (Indicator 18). Consistent with most previous years, students in urban areas in 2005 were the most likely to avoid places in school: 6 percent of urban students reported that they had done so, compared to 4 percent of suburban and rural students.

**Discipline, Safety, and Security Measures**

• Forty-eight percent of public schools reported taking at least one serious disciplinary action against a student—including suspensions lasting 5 days or more, removals with no services (i.e., expulsions), and transfers to specialized schools—for specific offenses during the 2005–06 school year (Indicator 19). Of those serious disciplinary actions, 74 percent were suspensions for 5 days or more, 5 percent were expulsions, and 20 percent were transfers to specialized schools.

• The largest percentage of schools that reported taking a disciplinary action in 2005–06 did so in response to a physical attack or fight: 32 percent of schools reported taking a serious disciplinary action for physical attacks or fights (Indicator 19).

• In the 2005–06 school year, 5 percent of public schools reported performing drug testing on athletes and 3 percent reported doing so for students in other extracurricular activities (Indicator 20). A higher percentage of public high schools than middle or primary schools reported performing drug tests on students: 13 percent of high schools reported performing drug tests on athletes, compared to 7 percent of middle schools and 1 percent of primary schools.

• The vast majority of students ages 12–18 reported that their school had a student code of conduct (95 percent) and a requirement that visitors sign in (93 percent) in 2005 (Indicator 21). Metal detectors were the least commonly observed security measure, with 11 percent of students reporting their use at their school.
FOREWORD

Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2007 provides the most recent national indicators on school crime and safety. Some of these indicators document that student safety has improved. The victimization rate of students ages 12–18 at school declined between 1992 and 2005. However, reports of violence, theft, drugs, and weapons did not decline during this same period. During the 2005–06 school year, 86 percent of public schools reported that at least one violent crime, theft, or other crime occurred at their school. In 2005, 8 percent of students in grades 9–12 reported being threatened or injured with a weapon in the previous 12 months, and 25 percent reported that drugs were made available to them on school property.

The information presented in this report is intended to serve as a reference for policymakers and practitioners so that they can develop effective programs and policies aimed at violence and school crime prevention. Accurate information about the nature, extent, and scope of the problem being addressed is essential for developing effective programs and policies.

This is the tenth edition of Indicators of School Crime and Safety, a joint publication of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This report provides detailed statistics to inform the nation about current aspects of crime and safety in schools.

The 2007 edition of Indicators includes the most recent available data, compiled from a number of statistical data sources supported by the federal government. Such sources include results from a study of violent deaths in schools, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; the National Crime Victimization Survey and School Crime Supplement to the survey, sponsored by the BJS and NCES, respectively; the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and the Schools and Staffing Survey and School Survey on Crime and Safety, both sponsored by NCES.

The entire report is available on the Internet. The Bureau of Justice Statistics and the National Center for Education Statistics continue to work together in order to provide timely and complete data on the issues of school-related violence and safety.

Mark Schneider  
Commissioner  
National Center for Education Statistics

Jeffrey L. Sedwick  
Director  
Bureau of Justice Statistics
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This study evaluated the intended and unintended consequences of the Missouri Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1995, which was intended to have a twofold effect on juvenile case processing: the elimination of racial and sex discrimination in sentencing and expanded eligibility for the transfer of juvenile offenders to criminal court.

The current study focused only on whether gender and racial bias in sentencing was eliminated after the Reform Act. The findings show that gender and racial biases were not eliminated from sentencing decisions as a result of the Missouri Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1995. In fact, there is some evidence that these biases became more prevalent under certain conditions. The data strongly indicate that when making sentencing decisions, especially when deciding between out-of-home placements (OHPs) and community placements or OHP and in-home placement with services (IHWS), sex and race interacted with several legal variables. Boys were more likely to receive a community placement in both 1994 and 2000; however, although girls were more likely to receive IHWS sentences in 1994, boys were more likely to receive IHWS sentences in 2000, after the passage of the Reform Act. White juveniles were more likely than non-White juveniles to receive a community sentence in 1994 and in 2000. There were indications that when legal variables did not clearly indicate the appropriate sentence, judges sometimes gave more weight to race/ethnicity and gender. Study data were obtained from the Missouri Department of Social Services. There were 11,479 cases formally processed in 1994 and 12,583 cases formally processed in 2000. Formal sanctions involved OHPs (placement with Division of Youth Services, foster care, or a relative) and two forms of community placement (IHWS and in-home placement without
services). These sanctions served as the dependent variable. 6 tables and 24 references
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Summary

"When I die, that's when they'll send me home."

Approximately 227 youth have been sentenced to die in California's prisons. They have not been sentenced to death; the death penalty was found unconstitutional for juveniles by the United States Supreme Court in 2005. Instead, these young people have been sentenced to prison for the rest of their lives, with no opportunity for parole and no chance for release. Their crimes were committed when they were teenagers, yet they will die in prison. Remarkably, many of the adults who were codefendants and took part in their crimes received lower sentences and will one day be released from prison.

In the United States at least 2,380 people are serving life without parole for crimes they committed when they were under the age of 18. In the rest of the world, just seven people are known to be serving this sentence for crimes committed when they were juveniles. Although ten other countries have laws permitting life without parole, in practice most do not use the sentence for those under age 18. International law prohibits the use of life without parole for those who are not yet 18 years old. The United States is in violation of those laws and out of step with the rest of the world.

Human Rights Watch conducted research in California on the sentencing of youth offenders to life without parole. Our data includes records obtained from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and independent research using court and media sources. We conducted a survey that garnered 130 responses, more than half of all youth offenders serving life without parole in California. Finally, we conducted in-person interviews of about 10 percent of those serving life without parole for crimes committed as youth. We have basic information on every person serving the sentence in the state, and we have a range of additional information in over 170 of all known cases. This research paints a detailed picture of Californians serving life without parole for crimes committed as youth.

1 In this report the words "youth," "teen," "juvenile," "youth offender," and "child" are used to mean someone under the age of 18.
In California, the vast majority of those 17 years old and younger sentenced to life without the possibility of parole were convicted of murder. This general category for individuals’ crimes, however, does not tell the whole story. It is likely that the average Californian believes this harsh sentence is reserved for the worst of the worst: the worst crimes committed by the most unredeemable criminals. This, however, is not always the case. Human Rights Watch’s research in California and across the country has found that youth are sentenced to life without parole for a wide range of crimes and culpability. In 2005 Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch published a report showing that nationally 59 percent of youth sentenced to life without parole are first-time offenders, without a single juvenile court adjudication on their records.

In 2007, Human Rights Watch surveyed youth offenders serving life without parole in California. In 45 percent of cases surveyed, youth who had been sentenced to life without parole had not actually committed the murder. Cases include that of a youth who stood by the garage door as a look-out during a car theft, a youth who sat in the get-away car during a burglary, and a youth who participated in a robbery in which murder was not part of the plan. Forty-five percent of youth reported that they were held legally responsible for a murder committed by someone else. He or she may have participated in a felony, such as robbery, but had no idea a murder would happen. She or he may have aided and abetted a crime, but not been the trigger person. While they are criminally culpable, their actions certainly do not fall into the category of the worst crimes.

Murder is a horrible crime, causing a ripple-effect of pain and suffering well beyond that of the victim. Families, friends, and communities all suffer. The fact that the perpetrator is legally a child does nothing to alleviate the loss. But societies make decisions about what to weigh when determining culpability. California’s law as it stands now fails to take into consideration a person’s legal status as a child at the time of the crime. Those who cannot buy cigarettes or alcohol, sign a rental agreement, or vote are nevertheless considered culpable to the same degree as an adult when they commit certain crimes and face adult penalties. Many feel life without parole is the equivalent of a death sentence. “They said a kid can’t get the death penalty, but life without, it’s the same thing. I’m condemned...I don’t