If you have issues viewing or accessing this file, please contact us at NCJRS.gov.

PLANNING THE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT SURVEY OF YOUTH IN RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT (EASYRP)

Technical Report

FINAL

Deliverable 7B
Under Cooperative Agreement Award No. 98-JB-VX-K002

July 31, 2002

Submitted to

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Submitted by

Westat
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

And

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD)
1970 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612

199119

199119

PLANNING THE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT SURVEY OF YOUTH IN RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT (EASYRP)

Technical Report

FINAL

Deliverable 7B
Under Cooperative Agreement Award No. 98-JB-VX-K002

July 31, 2002

Submitted to

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Submitted by

Westat
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

And

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD)
1970 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612

Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. Introduction 1

   1.1 Background 1
   1.2 The Purpose of the EASYRP Planning Project 2
   1.3 Research Questions 2
   1.4 Content of This Report 3

2. Identify Instruments to Assess Math and Reading Skills 5

   2.1 Selection of the STAR Reading and Math Assessments 5
   2.2 Summary of Reviews of the Two Assessments 6
   2.3 Structural Changes to the STAR Computer Programs 8

3. Develop the EASYRP Interview 11

   3.1 The Development Process 11
   3.2 The Current Interview 15

4. Linking the EASYRP and SYRP 19

   4.1 Linkage Options 19
   4.2 Decision To Use The No Linkage Option 22

5. Design the EASYRP Sample 23

   5.1 Oversampling of Females and Hispanic Males 23
   5.2 Universe of Facilities 24
   5.3 Facility Sampling 26
   5.4 Youth Eligible for EASYRP 28
   5.5 Youth Sampling 30
   5.6 Data Collection Period and Response Rates 31

6. Formulate Methodology for a National EASYRP 33

   6.1 State Recruitment 33
   6.2 Facility Recruitment 34
   6.3 Data Collection Activities 35
   6.4 Data Analysis 37

7. Conduct the Feasibility Test 39

   7.1 Logistics for the Feasibility Test 39
   7.2 Participation Rates for the Feasibility Test 40
   7.3 Findings from the Feasibility Test 41

Contents (continued)

Page

8. Summary and Next Steps 47

8.1 Similarities Between SYRP and EASYRP 48
8.2 Differences Between SYRP and EASYRP 49
8.3 Recommendations for a Large-Scale Field Test for the EASYRP 51

Appendix A. Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria A-1

Appendix B. Revised EASYRP Interview B-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Summary of the Revised Interview 17

Table 4.1 Advantages and Disadvantages of Five Options for Coordinating SYRP and EASYRP 20

Table 5.1 Percentage Distribution for Several Variables of Facilities and Youths for the SYRP Sampling Frame 29

Table 7.1 Sample Tabulation Table for STAR Math and Reading Assessments 43

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the steps followed in conducting the Planning Project for the Educational Assessment Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (EASYRP). This project, funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevent (OJJDP), was conducted under a cooperative agreement with Westat and its subcontractor, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD). The report details key activities that were undertaken, characterizes the experiences and lessons learned during the project, and outlines the next steps needed before undertaking a national survey.

1.1 Background

OJJDP has engaged in an ongoing effort to establish a complementary system of national surveys on youth in placement in juvenile residential facilities. The Educational Assessment Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (EASYRP) is the most recent addition to this system, which also includes the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP), the Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC), and the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (SYRP). The central goal of the EASYRP is to collect and disseminate information that will assist OJJDP, other juvenile justice policymakers, and juvenile justice program administrators in their mission to provide appropriate, safe, and accountability-based programming for youth in custody. The effort complements these other data collection efforts by providing a comprehensive picture of these youth, the settings in which they are placed, their educational experiences prior to coming into custody, their current educational functioning level, and their experiences in custody.

The integrated assemblage of OJJDP's data systems provides information from a variety of perspectives. The CJRP and JRFC gather information from the facility administrators, while the SYRP and EASYRP obtain information from the youth themselves through self-administered interviews. These surveys are conducted on different schedules. The CJRP is conducted biannually in odd years; the JRFC is also conducted biannually in even years. Thus, the CJRP and JRFC, taken together, provide annual population size data for juvenile residential facilities. The SYRP interviews will first be conducted in March/April 2003 and it is proposed that this survey be repeated on a 4-year cycle. EASYRP is also proposed to be repeated on a 4-year cycle, with the first administration conducted in Spring 2004.

In addition to the individual descriptive and analytic potential of each of these surveys, they have been (are being designed) to complement each other and provide explicit linkages. All these surveys

share a common facility universe, ensuring that the data collected will be complementary. Further, both the SYRP and EASYRP designs include updating the CJRP and JRFC information at the time of data collection, permitting clear interpretation of the youth-level survey information against the context of the census surveys. SYRP and EASYRP also share the same sampling design, and the interview section of the EASYRP includes some of the same questions from SYRP to enhance the linkage between the two surveys.

1.2 The Purpose of the EASYRP Planning Project

The purpose of the EASYRP Planning Project was to develop a detailed plan for the national EASYRP design and assess its workability in small group administration in the residential facilities. This entailed six tasks:

1. Identify appropriate instruments to assess math and reading skills of the youth in residential placement;
2. Develop a brief interview concerning the youths' educational status and background;
3. Develop a plan for the possible linkage of the EASYRP and the SYRP;
4. Develop the sample design for a national EASYRP administration;
5. Formulate the methodology for a national EASYRP administration; and
6. Test the feasibility of the EASYRP instrument and methodology.

1.3 Research Questions

One of the first achievements of the Planning Project was the development of research questions that were deemed critical to the information needs of policymakers and service providers and that were answerable through self-report data collected from the youth themselves. The draft research questions were developed through consultation with OJJDP and were reviewed by the advisory group. Six key research questions guided the design of the EASYRP:

1. What are the educational backgrounds and educational attainments of youths in residential placement?
2. Do youths in residential placement exhibit deficits in reading/math skills in comparison to a general youth population?

- Are the gaps in academic skills between the YRP and the general youth population wider for males versus females?

- Are the gaps wider for minority populations?

3. Are academic deficits greater for youths with past disciplinary actions, a language history other than English, negative attitudes toward school, and/or special education background?

4. Are youths with greater academic deficits less optimistic about their future?

5. Do math/reading skills vary by the type of facility in which the youth is placed or by the length of time in residence (i.e., for the serious, habitual offender)?

6. Are additional educational resources indicated for this population?

1.4 Content of This Report

The chapters that follow detail each of the six tasks undertaken taken in the Planning Project. Chapter 2 outlines the efforts conducted to identify appropriate instruments to assess math and reading skills. The assessments will be central to successfully implementing the EASYRP and responding to all the research questions. The chapter also presents information on both the strengths and weakness of the assessments chosen. Appendix A provides detailed information on the qualifications of each instrument reviewed on five key criteria. Chapter 3 presents details about developing and testing the interview. The interview addresses research Questions 2, 3, and 4. A final instrument is provided in the Appendix B. Chapter 4 describes the possible linkages for joint administration of both the SYRP and EASYRP surveys. Chapter 5 highlights the sample design proposed for the survey. Chapter 6 presents the methodology proposed for the national EASYRP administration. In Chapter 7, findings from the EASYRP feasibility test are presented as well as recommendations resulting from that test. Lastly, in Chapter 8, the potential value of the EASYRP as a part of the current constellation of OJJDP data collections is assessed in light of the findings from the six tasks that were conducted. This chapter also recommends a national field test for the EASYRP.

2. IDENTIFY INSTRUMENTS TO ASSESS MATH AND READING SKILLS

2.1 Selection of the STAR Reading and Math Assessments

Westat conducted an extensive review of 47 tests identified through a variety of sources, including the *Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook*,[1] *Tests in Print V*,[2] a number of Internet sites relating to educational assessment,[3] and the hard-copy catalogues of test publishers, including Harcourt-Brace; Harcourt Educational Measurement; Hazelden; Hawthorne Educational Services, Inc.; MetriTech, Inc.; Pro-Ed; Psychological and Educational Publications, Inc.; Educational Testing Services; Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.; and Renaissance Learning (a.k.a. Psychological Corporation and Advantage Learning Systems, Inc.).

The 47 tests were reviewed to determine whether they could meet five key criteria that are important for any reading or math assessments to be used in the EASYRP. These criteria included:

1. The applicable age ranges—10 through 20 (17 tests met this criterion),
2. The time—45 minutes—needed to administer the test[4] (10 tests met this criterion),
3. The feasibility of administering the test in a group context (22 tests met this criterion),
4. The ability to administer the test without prior knowledge of a youth's ability level (32 tests met this criterion), and
5. The availability of the test in a computerized format[5] (4 tests met this criterion).

Only the STAR Reading and STAR Math assessments met all five criteria. Just 4 tests met the computerized requirement. The EASYRP project team rejected the idea of programming existing

---

[1] The Buros Institute for Mental Measurements. (1998). *Mental Measurements Yearbook* (13th edition). Lincoln, NE: Author.

[2] The Buros Institute for Mental Measurements. (1999). *Tests in Print* (5th edition). Lincoln, NE: Author.

[3] American Guidance Service [URL: http://www.agsnet.com/], Buros Institute of Mental Measurements [URL: http://www.unl.edu/buros/], CTB/McGraw-Hill [URL: http://www.ctb.com], the Educational Testing Service Network [URL: http://www.ets.org/], ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation [URL: http://ericae.net/], Harcourt Educational Measurement [URL: http://www.hemweb.com/], JIST Works, Inc. [URL: http://www.jist.com], Pro-ed Online [URL: http://www.proedinc.com/], the Psychological Corporation [URL: http://www.psychcorp.com], Psychological Resources Inc [URL: http://www.parinc.com/], Renaissance Learning [URL: http://www.renlearn.com/], Riverside Publishing [URL: http://www.riverpub.com/], Touchstone Applied Science Associates, Inc. [URL: www.tasa.com], and Wide Range, Inc. [URL: http://www.widerange.com].

[4] Based on planning work done on the SYRP instrument, it was determined that the tests and any associated interview would need to be conducted within approximately 45 minutes.

[5] This last condition was considered desirable but not strictly required.

paper-and-pencil assessment instruments for computer administration, because that approach would undermine their comparability to existing test norms. The methodology used and results derived from this examination were presented to the EASYRP Advisory Board, and the Board concurred that the STAR assessments were the most appropriate. Appendix A contains a table that outlines how each test scored on the five criteria.

The STAR assessments use a method called "adaptive branching" to tailor the level of difficulty of each question to the student's ability level as the test progresses. Both tests require the administrator to identify the student's grade at the outset, but this is only used to set the beginning test time—unlike the case for other assessments, where the grade level selects the test form, dictating the entire spectrum of questions on the test. Depending on the student's performance on the initial item, the subsequent item is selected from harder or easier item set. Then, performance on this second item drives the selection of the subsequent item, and so on, progressively "homing in" on the student's functional ability level. The items themselves are rated for difficulty level based on the norming information and identifying items as typical of a grade level to yield a grade equivalence score. Other individual scores provided by the STAR tests are the

- Scaled Score (SS), which is computed on the number of correct answers and question difficulty;
- Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE), which is based on an equal interval scale; and
- Percentile Rank (PR), which indicates the percentage that the youth's skills are equal to or better than, based on the original grade level entered.

The Reading assessment provides two additional scores: (1) Instructional Reading Level (IRL), which indicates the grade level at which the youth is 80 percent proficient in comprehension; and (2) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) that provides a reading-level range for reading growth. Test-retest reliabilities are very high and correlations between scores on the STAR tests and scores on other key recognized instruments are similar in magnitude to the validity coefficients typical of traditional paper-and-pencil assessment measures taking far longer to administer.

2.2 Summary of Reviews of the Two Assessments

Westat contracted with two independent experts in reading and math assessments to examine and review the STAR tests. The expert reviews were shared with Renaissance Learning and they were

asked to respond. The strengths and limitations of the STAR Reading and Math assessments identified by the two independent experts, along with Renaissance Learning's comments, are summarized below.

STAR Reading. The expert who reviewed the STAR Reading test considered the test to be technically sound, easy to use, and allows the user to examine how youths in residential placement perform relative to a norming population. The expert noted that in comparison to other reading assessments STAR Reading is easy to score and takes very little time to administer. She also thought the use of the computer to administer the test may increase student motivation.

In addition to the positive features of STAR, the reading expert identified several limitations of the STAR Reading test including the brevity of the test, a possible cultural bias, the independence from the teacher, and the purpose of the assessment. The reviewer was concerned that the test does not assess whether students can sustain the attention needed to read longer passages and focuses too heavily on vocabulary. Renaissance Learning responded to this critique by stating that STAR reading does contain extended passages that range up to 107 words. They contend that this is sufficient to identify any attention span problems. Vocabulary is emphasized because it is highly correlated with the ability to comprehend written material.

The reading expert also pointed out that the STAR Reading test may have some problems with cultural bias, which would make some subpopulations appear to be worse readers than they actually are. Renaissance Learning has stated that they made every effort to address issues of inclusion and diversity. Test items were derived from the Educational Development Laboratory's vocabulary list and strict sensitivity reviews were conducted to ensure gender and ethnic group balance.

The expert felt the interpretability of test scores would be confounded by respondents' low motivation. Renaissance Learning emphasizes that qualified professionals should interpret scores and that faulty scores resulting from low motivation would be inconsistent with the teacher's knowledge of the student's level of achievement in the typical classroom setting for which the STAR was designed.

STAR Math. An independent expert also reviewed the STAR Math assessment. The math expert recommended the Star Math assessment tool for its clear, well-organized, user-friendly format. She felt the items reviewed were free of cultural, ethnic, and gender stereotype. She liked the adaptive branching feature of the Star Math test and said the reporting system communicates clear information about the student's general skills in mathematics and addresses strengths as well as problems.

The reviewer identified the following limitations of the STAR Math assessment, including a focus on low-level mathematical tasks, the inability to use calculators, an emphasis on computation and estimation, and the multiple choice format. The main limitation identified by the reviewer was that the majority of the test items focus on lower-level mathematical instructional tasks, such as memorization of previously learned facts, rules, formulas and algorithmic use of procedures. These types of problems require limited cognitive demand for successful completion.

The Advisory Board felt that the selection criteria used by the EASYRP team were appropriate for determining assessments for the purposes stated by OJJDP. The Board also felt both the STAR Reading and Math assessments, particularly because of the adaptive branching methodology, were good tools for assessing youths at various levels and circumvented the problem of "dumbing down" tests to accommodate lower functioning youth. Note that the Advisory Board concurred with the rebuttal provided by Renaissance Learning and did not believe the criticisms from the expert reviewers were sufficient to curtail their use for EASYRP.[6]

2.3 Structural Changes to the STAR Computer Programs

During the EASYRP feasibility test several structural limitations were identified with the STAR computer programs. It is anticipated that these limitations can be overcome by building a number of computer interfaces for the STAR Reading and Math computer programs through negotiations with Renaissance Learning. Westat recommends the following structural modifications to the STAR computer program.

- Embed the STAR assessments in a computer program that allows a youth to flow uninterrupted from the EASYRP interview to the STAR Reading test and then to the STAR Math test.
- Computerize the STAR Math and Reading verbal tutorials and cue cards that are to be administered before each test.
- Alter the STAR program so it accepts numeric identifiers rather than student names.
- Create a computer interface between the EASYRP interview and the STAR program that automatically pulls the youth's current grade from the interview data. Alternatively, the STAR program could be altered to allow the youth to enter his or her own grade rather than having a monitor enter this information manually for each student.

---

[6] One board member disclosed that he had participated in creating the STAR Reading test but that he had no personal or financial stake in the product.

- Store the test data and formulas for calculating the test scores in a more accessible non-proprietary format so test data can be combined with interview data and data from the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) and the Juvenile Residential Facilities Census (JRFC).

- Produce an easily understandable score that provides feedback to the youth on how they performed on the tests. For example, provide a score that indicates the number of responses the youth got correct on the Math and Reading tests.

- Explore the possibility of using a touchscreen methodology for students to record their answer in the STAR assessments, rather than a keyboard.

3. DEVELOP THE EASYRP INTERVIEW

Developing the EASYRP interview was an iterative process covering the entire period of the Planning Project. This section discusses the steps used in that process and describes the current instrument, its strengths, and further revisions that should be considered.

3.1 The Development Process

Drafting the instrument. A number of steps were required to develop the EASYRP interview, which will provide context for the assessments and provide data on educational background and experiences for youth in residential placement. (For a complete discussion of the item selection process for the interview, see *Briefing Papers for the Advisory Board.*)[7] First, 61 existing survey instruments that had been reviewed in the SYRP Planning Project were revisited. These reflected a broad range of existing surveys that were conducted using respondents who were juveniles, inmates of correctional facilities, or with facilities serving the juvenile justice residential population. Four additional surveys of high school students were reviewed and added to this set, so a total of 65 surveys were reviewed for EASYRP.

Of the surveys reviewed, 32 included educational questions. All items pertaining to education were extracted from these survey instruments and categorized into 11 different topic areas:

- Enrollment in school (current status, dropout experience, transfers),
- Last grade completed,
- Educational programs (special education, other)
- Academic performance (grades, productivity, remedial classes, repeating a grade),
- Truancy/absenteeism (frequency, reasons),
- Youth attitudes (on schooling, dropping out, teachers),
- Bilingualism (history, English competency, ESL classes)
- Discipline or behavior problems,
- Capabilities and academic problems,
- Expectations and goals, and
- Other school factors (safety, teacher practices, peer group, family attitudes)

---

[7] Westat & National Council on Crime and Delinquency. (2001). *Briefing Papers for the Advisory Board.* Rockville, MD: Author.

These questions were then distilled by the EASYRP project team, composed of OJJDP, NCCD, and Westat staff. Team members flagged questions in this listing that they considered to be key, taking account of both the informational value of the general topic and the specific substance of the questions. Duplicative questions were eliminated, selecting from among questions with duplicative content by considering the specific information that the question would gather as well as the clarity and simplicity of the question wording. Also, nearly all the items from the SYRP interview that pertained to education were included to provide an explicit linkage between the substantive findings of the two surveys.

Review by the Advisory Board. Questions were formatted to approximate questions in an ACASI instrument. In October 2001, a draft listing of 71 interview items was presented to an Advisory Board, comprised of representatives from Federal agencies, residential placement centers, State juvenile corrections personnel, and educational (general and special) researchers. The Advisory Board was asked to review the items, prioritize topics and questions, eliminate non-critical questions, and identify gaps in questions.

The Advisory Board input touched on a number of areas (cf. *Minutes from the EASYRP Advisory Board Meeting*):[8]

- Targeting questions to youth by age and graduation status. Advisory Board members felt that not all questions were appropriate for the age range targeted for EASYRP. They recommended a branching system for questions based on age and graduation status. Three categories were established: (1) youths 13 years or younger, (2) youths 14 years to 20 years old who had not graduated from high school or received a GED, and (3) youths 14 and older who had received either a high school diploma or GED.

- Deleting questions of lesser importance. The Board recommended that a number of items be eliminated because they were tangential to the goals of the EASYRP, provided little information for this population, or were of lesser importance than other items.

- Revising existing questions. Board members expressed concern over the wording of several of the items—special education programs, bilingualism, other educational programs (job training, English as a second language, tutoring), and they recommended wording changes. The Board also emphasized keeping the wording simple, for all students as well as special education students, and avoiding questions that would naturally evoke "socially desirable" answers.

Based on input from the Advisory Board, the interview was cut down to 51 items, branching was added to identify three groups of youth (13 years or younger, 14 years or older who had not received

[8] Westat & National Council on Crime and Delinquency. (2001). *Minutes from the EASYRP Advisory Board Meeting*. Rockville, MD: Author.

a diploma or GED, 14 years or older who had received a diploma or GED), and questions were revised to improve clarity and minimize the impact of social desirability.

Changes to the Interview Following Cognitive Testing. The purpose of cognitive testing was to ensure that the questions were understandable and flowed logically, to see if vocabulary was a problem, and to get feedback from the youth on how they felt about individual items and the overall administration of the interviews.

The methodology used for the cognitive test was straightforward. In-depth one-on-one interviews were conducted in which the youth were asked detailed questions about the cognitive processing involved in answering each question. Youth were given a description of the study, asked to give verbal consent for the participating, and verbal consent for taping the interview. Testing was done individually in private rooms. No facility personnel were present. Youths were asked to answer the questions from the interview and also to think out loud while answering the questions, telling the interviewer what was going through his/her mind while answering the questions. Once the EASYRP interview was completed, youths were asked for additional feedback on the interview.

The cognitive test was administered to 13 youth in two facilities, one in the mid-Atlantic region and one in the Midwest. Three survey forms were developed, one for each of the major skip patterns reflecting the three age categories discussed above. Three youths 13 or younger participated on the youngest survey form; nine youths 14 and older who had not graduated participated on the second form, and one student who had received his GED participated on the most advanced form. The majority of respondents were male (85%) and the age range was 12 to 19 years old. Only two respondents reported being of Hispanic ethnicity. The last grade completed by respondents ranged from 6^{th} to 11^{th} grades.

Westat revised the forms based on the comments provided by youths during the cognitive test. Changes included reordering questions and response categories, adding definitions to the form (such as "disciplinary reasons"), revising wording on questions and response categories, revising skip patterns, and adding a few new questions to improve the quality of information the interview will obtain. The most substantial changes occurred on the questions concerning educational programs. Significant changes were made to this series of questions to make the questions more direct, to simplify the language, and to determine when the youth participated in these programs—before coming to their present facility and/or since coming to the facility.

In addition to these revisions, two additional questions were added to the interview. The first inquires about the educational program in the youth's current facility, such as teacher support, availability of college programs, and options available other than school.

The last question on the interview asks "Would your parents be upset if you left school before you completed high school?" One of the respondents commented that he had not seen his parents in years, so why should he care what his parents think. Consequently, the EASYRP team felt that it would be valuable to ask youth "How much do you care what your parents think about school work and completing school?" and added that question to the interview.

The revised interview included 57 items; it eliminated some questions for the younger respondents and simplified many of the questions.

Changes to the Interview Following the Feasibility Test. A feasibility test of the interview was conducted in concert with the STAR Reading and Math assessments. Logistics and participation rates for the test are discussed in Chapter 7. Following this test, some relatively minor additional changes were recommended, including adjusting response categories, clarifying the wording in several questions, adding a definition, adjusting time references, revising skip patterns, and allowing youth to specify when their school day began and ended rather than requiring them to give total hours in school.

Also as a result of the feasibility test, Westat recommended adding several questions to the interview. The survey has two different reference periods—the date the youth came into the facility and the date the youth was taken into custody for his or her present offense. These times may or may not coincide. In some facilities, particularly shelters, halfway houses, and probation settings, the youth may have served time in another facility for the same offense before being remanded to their current facility. Westat added another question, taken from SYRP, to get at this issue: Were you in a facility before coming here? <IF YES>. When were you first taken into custody for the crime(s) that led to your stay here?

Another question was added also to address timing, specifically when the youth was last enrolled in school not as part of the juvenile justice system. One youth stated that he/she had not been in school for the last 2 years. Consequently, for those youth who reported that they were not enrolled in school (for reasons other than school not in session) at the time they were taken into custody, the following was added: When were you last enrolled in school? These two additional questions, along with time in current facility, provides a timeline for the most recent school involvement and identifies any recent gap.

The last additions were the result of one youth during the feasibility test noting that he was home schooled. The emerging configuration of schools across states introduces another factor on which to examine youth in residential placement. Home schooling is only one option; charter schools are another. The EASYRP team felt that it was important to capture how this population of youth are distributed on the basis of school type. Therefore the following question was added: The last time you were enrolled in school, what type of school were you in? Response categories include: public school, private school, charter school, and home schooling. Given the variation in schooling options, this question becomes particularly interesting to examine across time.

Home schooling also creates a problem for identifying current grade levels, which is required to initiate the Reading and Math assessments. Youths being home schooled may achieve different grade levels according to subject. Consequently, the team added a followup questions for those indicating home schooling to indicate their grade level for both Math and Reading.

3.2 The Revised Interview

The EASYRP interview, as revised following the feasibility test, consists of 63 items, one-third of those items (n=21) are followup questions. The interview is structured to target three groups of youth in residential placement:

- Youth age 13 years or younger,
- Youth age 14 years or older who have not received a diploma or GED, and
- Youth age 14 years or older who have received a diploma or GED.

During the feasibility test, in which the interview was administered individually by pen and paper, the interview was found to take between 8 and 25 minutes, with most administrations taking 15 minutes or less. The longest interview was with a youth who had limited English language skills.

It is recommended that the survey developed through this Planning Project (both interview and assessments) be implemented only in English. The Advisory Board felt that, for analyzing the reading and math abilities of youth in residential placement, only an English version should be used. Consequently, the interview was developed under this premise as well. Facilities will be asked to flag youth with limited English skills. Questions in the interview which ask youth with potentially limited English proficiency to rate his/her ability to read and write in English will also be used to screen

respondents, collecting limited information from them and exempting them from the survey. The methodology for screening will be developed as part of a broad-based field test.

Strengths. During the feasibility test, the interview portion of the EASYRP went fairly smoothly. The adjustments made to the interview following the test should also improve its flow. The current version of the interview scores at the 3.1 grade level on the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Scale.

Table 3.1 summarizes the questions from the current interview. (A complete copy of the current interview is provided in Appendix B.) The interview captures information about the youth's status when he/she was taken into custody, background educational experiences, self rankings on abilities, youth's attitude about school and performing well in school, English background, expectations on how far he/she will go, and perceptions on school supports received. Taken together with information about the placements in which the youths reside, these variables will provide a rich context for analyzing the Reading and Math assessment scores. Also, during the feasibility test, these questions elicited a range of responses which differentiated respondents.

Issues for further investigation. Westat recommends that, before implementing the national EASYRP, a large-scale field test be conducted to examine several issues that arose during the cognitive and feasibility tests. First, following a more extensive field test, Westat recommends eliminating low variation questions that provide little information about distributional differences across the population of youth in residential placement. Second, the interview does not identify youth who have been in and out of juvenile facilities on an ongoing basis, which may affect the continuity of their educational program. Consideration should be given in how this information might most reliably be captured.

Third, additional consideration should be given to increasing the number of questions that address the youths' motivation for good school performance and for continuing education. These were suggestions made by youths participating in the cognitive test. However, at that time the team was unsure if the survey could be expanded and still be completed in the targeted 15 minutes. While there are limits to the time available for the interview, a field test as proposed in the last chapter could determine if additional time is available to include such questions or if other questions might be eliminated (due to lack of variation in response categories) in favor of such questions.

Table 3.1: Summary of the Revised Interview

Topic Areas	Lead Questions	Followup Questions
Demographics	Sex	
	Age	
	Ethnicity	Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
	Race	Specific Asian type: Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese , Other
	Length of stay in current facility	
	Length of time in custody	
Enrollment in school	Graduated or received a GED	
	Enrolled in school when taken into custody	If no, why not? When were you last enrolled?
	Type of school enrolled in (public, private, charter, or home schooling)	
	Grade when last enrolled	
	Hours required to spend in school when last enrolled	
	Ever dropped out of school	If yes, why?
	Ever suspended or expelled	
	Ever transferred for disciplinary reasons	
Education program	Types of educational programs (advanced placement, dropout prevention, English as a second language, math and grammar tutoring, gifted or talented program, GED preparation and testing, college courses)	When taken (before coming to this facility, while in this facility)?
	Special education for behavior problems	What problems were targeted? When taken (before coming to this facility, while in this facility)?
	Special education for learning or physical problems	What problems were targeted? When taken (before coming to this facility, while in this facility)? How were the services provided?
	Attending school while in the facility?	If no, why not? If yes, what are the reasons you miss class? How many hours do you spend in school? What are some characteristics of school in this facility?

Table 3.1: Summary of the Revised Interview (continued)

Topic Areas	Lead Questions	Followup Questions
Academic Performance, Capabilities, and Problems	Average course grades in the last semester you were enrolled in school	
	Rate your ability to do math	
	Rate your reading ability	
	Ever repeat a grade	Reasons for repeating a grade
Truancy/ Absenteeism	Number of times skipped school in last semester	Number of times skipped because you felt unsafe?
Youth Attitudes	Importance of things you are learning in school	
	Importance of good grades personally	
	Most important thing you can get out of school?	
Bilingualism	Was English the first language you spoke while growing up?	Rate your ability to speak English. Rate your ability to read and write in English.
	Is English the main language spoken in your home	
Expectations and Goals	If you could go as far as you wanted in school, how far would you go?	
	How far do you think you will actually go?	
	What might stop you from completing more school?	
Other School Factors	How many teachers have liked you?	
	How many teachers seem to care about how well you do in school?	
	Have your teachers ever told you that you are smart enough to go to college?	
	Have you ever been picked on for being a goodie goodie?	
	How much do you care what your parents think about your school work and completing school?	
	Would your parents be upset if you left school before you completed high school or got you GED?	

4. LINKING THE EASYRP AND SYRP

Task 3 for the EASYRP Planning Project was to examine the degree to which the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (SYRP) and EASYRP should be linked. Both EASYRP and SYRP will represent the same population of youth and draw their samples from the same universe of residential facilities. Westat presented the pros and cons of five linkage possibilities to the Advisory Board and recommended that the no linkage option be adopted. The Advisory Board agreed that, for the first administration of SYRP and EASYRP, the no linkage plan should be followed. In part, this decision was reached because there was no time to prepare the EASYRP for a 2003 administration. Reducing costs and the heightened data comparability of integrating certain aspects of the EASYRP & SYRP argue for considering other linkage options after the initial administration.

4.1 Linkage Options

Five different linkage possibilities were considered. The advantages and disadvantages of these different schemes are summarized in Table 4.1.

Complete linkage. Under a complete linkage plan the surveys would be conducted in unison and the same youths would be interviewed for both surveys. Although this approach would produce a rich data source and considerable cost savings it was not recommended due to the potential for a significantly heightened non-response at both the facility and youth levels. Combining the two surveys would place too great a burden on facilities and youth. Facilities would have to contend with a data collection period that is twice as long as in a single survey and youth would have to sit through a very long interview session (1.5 hours or more). The SYRP Field Test showed that facilities often could only provide a 1-hour time window for the survey administration. Combining the surveys would also create a double burden for field staff and complicate their procedures, which may increase errors and reduce data quality.

Single sample of facilities. Under this plan, one sample of facilities would be selected for both surveys and they would be conducted at the same time, but different youths would be selected for each survey. This approach has the slight analytic advantage of having the two surveys collected from the same facilities and perhaps some cost savings. However these slight advantages did not seem sufficient to outweigh the disadvantages of reduced facility cooperation and survey response rates. Facility recruitment would require negotiating two kinds of survey arrangements. Facilities would have to review and approve

Table 4.1: Advantages and Disadvantages of Five Options for Coordinating SYRP and EASYRP

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
A. **Complete linkage.** SYRP and EASYRP fielded at the *same time* in the *same facilities* with *the same* youths.	1. Option with maximum cost savings. 2. Facilitates joint analysis of SYRP and EASYRP youth-level data. 3. Potential to minimize perceived burden if presented as a single survey.	1. Maximum demands on youth, leading to higher youth refusal rates. 2. High demand on facilities, reducing cooperation and lowering response. 3. Difficult to have different sampling schemes for SYRP and EASYRP. 4. Anonymity requirements of SYRP prevent sharing reading and math scores with facilities. 5. Complicated field procedures will increase potential for error and reduced data quality.
B. **Single sample of facilities.** SYRP and EASYRP fielded at the *same time* in the *same facilities* to *two distinct samples* of youths.	1. Some reduction in costs associated with recruitment, field, and supervision activities. 2. Some analytic benefits in that data from both surveys can be linked at the facility level. 3. If youth consent to it, reading and math scores can be shared with the facilities.	1. Increased burden on all facilities to support two kinds of arrangements. 2. Double burden on facilities where double samples are collected. 3. Complicated field procedures will increase potential for error and reduced data quality. 4. Cost savings reduced by the need to go to more facilities.
C. **Different times, overlapping facility samples.** SYRP and EASYRP fielded during *different time periods* but in *mostly the same facilities.*	1. Would permit field staff to focus on one survey at a time, simplifying their tasks and enhancing accuracy. 2. Burden on facilities reduced to a single survey during a given time period. 3. Some analytic benefits in that data from both surveys can be linked at the facility level. 4. If youth consent to it, reading and math scores can be shared with the facilities.	1. Selected facilities may resent being repeatedly singled out for surveys and thus refuse to participate. 2. Difficult to have different sampling schemes for SYRP and EASYRP. 3. Cost savings negligible.
D. **Same time, different samples.** SYRP and EASYRP fielded at the *same time* in *independent samples of facilities and youths.*	1. Easy to have different sampling schemes for SYRP and EASYRP. 2. Burden on most facilities would be limited to a single survey. 3. Some economies in costs for recruiters & field staff training & supervision. 4. If field staff are different, tasks could be simplified and accuracy enhanced. 5. If youth consent to it, reading and math scores can be shared with the facilities.	1. Does not facilitate joint analysis of SYRP and EASYRP data. 2. Double burden on those facilities (and youths) that are selected into both samples independently.

Table 4.1: Advantages and Disadvantages of Five Options for Coordinating SYRP and EASYRP (continued)

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
E. **No linkage.** SYRP and EASYRP fielded at *different times* in *independent samples of facilities and youths.*	1. Would permit field staff to focus on one survey at a time, simplifying their tasks and enhancing accuracy. 2. Easy to have different sampling schemes for SYRP and EASYRP. 3. Minimizes burden on facilities and youths—both at a given time and across time periods. 4. The small number of facilities selected into both surveys will not be doubly burdened during the same time period. 5. If youth consent to it, reading and math scores can be shared with the facilities.	1. Least cost-effective option. 2. Does not facilitate joint analysis of SYRP and EASYRP data.

both surveys, coordinate efforts to obtain parental consent (if applicable) for both surveys, and support the survey field staff in convening separate samples of youth in separate testing sessions.

Different times, overlapping samples. The surveys would be conducted during different time periods, but they would use the same facility sample insofar as possible. This approach was not recommended due to the extra burden this would place of on facilities and the associated higher nonresponse rates. Cost savings would be negligible in that the two surveys would involve independent recruitment and implementation efforts.

Same time, different samples. The two surveys would be conducted during the same time period, but with different facility samples insofar as possible. This strategy would gain some economies from the two surveys sharing some costs (hiring and training recruiters, hiring and some overlapping of field staff training and home office supervision of field staff activities). However, this approach would be more expensive than the full linkage scheme in that it would require that more facilities be recruited and more youths be interviewed—sufficient to support the two independent surveys. Although the interpretation of findings from the two surveys would be facilitated by both being conducted at the same time, the design would not allow for any joint analyses of the two surveys. The economies resulting from shared staffing and training would be offset by the increases in the number of facilities and youth required to be recruited.

No linkage. Two completely independent surveys would be conducted in different years. Westat recommended this no linkage option for the first administration of EASYRP, and the Advisory Board concurred with this recommendation. It will minimize burden and hence maximize participation

rates. Moreover, it will permit survey staff to focus on one survey and one set of procedures during an implementation, thereby enhancing data quality. These benefits were thought to be well worth foregoing the cost savings that might be realized under an alternative approach.

4.2 Decision To Use The No Linkage Option

From a research perspective, the Advisory Board acknowledged an interest in the rich data source that would exist as a result of complete linkage. However, they also believed that, given the length of the two surveys and the expanded burden to facilities, there was little utility in linking the two surveys. The Board also emphasized that cost considerations should be made while planning for the first administration of both surveys and the decision about jointly conducting subsequent surveys, or using the same facilities, should be re-examined for future administrations, when more information is available from the first implementation experiences. For the first administration of SYRP, March 2003, there was insufficient time to prepare both surveys to carry out the complete linkage plan. Westat, NCCD, and OJJDP staff met to discuss this issue and concurred that, for the first administration, the no linkage approach would be followed.

5. DESIGN THE EASYRP SAMPLE

The sampling design developed for EASYRP parallels the design for the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (SYRP). This design was informed by the SYRP Field Test; a series of Advisory Board meetings for both the SYRP and EASYRP Planning Projects; and input from OJJDP, NCCD, and Westat staff. Parameters considered when developing the design included cost; adequate representation of the gender and ethnic groups of interest; the frequency of survey administration; linkages between EASYRP, SYRP, Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP), and Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC); and the reliability of resulting estimates.

The EASYRP, as is typical of such surveys, will be conducted as a two-stage cluster sample. Facilities will be sampled at the first stage and clusters of youth will be sampled from each selected facility in the second stage.

A key element of the SYRP design, and the design proposed for EASYRP, is the oversampling of certain gender/ethnic groups. This topic is discussed in section 5.1. The other key elements of the sampling design are discussed in subsequent sections. (For a more detailed discussion of the sampling plan, see *Advisory Board Briefing Papers*[9] and the SYRP sampling design, *Sampling Design Report.*[10])

5.1 Oversampling of Females and Hispanic Males

Females, Hispanic males, and Native Americans are small but important populations of interest for both EASYRP and SYRP. When there are small subpopulations for which it is important to obtain reliable results, then it may be worthwhile to oversample those subpopulations even though this will cause the reliability for other subpopulations and for estimates for the whole population to become less reliable. According to the 1997 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP), only 1.5 percent of the entire population of youth in residence is Native American. Thus, to achieve good reliability for this group, a high level of oversampling would be necessary. Since few facilities have large numbers of Native Americans, it did not appear feasible to oversample Native Americans to the extent necessary for reliable estimates on this subpopulation. However, oversampling was pursued in SYRP for

---

[9] Westat & National Council on Crime and Delinquency. (2001). *Advisory Board Briefing Papers.* Rockville, MD: Author.

[10] Westat (1999). *Sampling Design Report.* Rockville, MD: Author.

females (about 14% of the population) and Hispanic males (about 17% of the population) and will be implemented in the EASYRP as well.

As in the SYRP, two methods of oversampling females and Hispanic males will be used for the EASYRP. One method selects facilities with high percentages of female youths and Hispanic males at higher sampling rates than would be used if they were sampled based only on the number of total youths in the facility. The second method samples females and Hispanic males at higher rates than other males when youth are selected within participating facilities.

In planning the SYRP, a test sample was selected in which both methods of oversampling were used for females and Hispanic males. The test sample demonstrated the feasibility and effectiveness of this dual procedure for both EASYRP and SYRP. The stability over time of female and Hispanic male populations within facilities was examined in advance of drawing the sample for the national SYRP, since data from two implementations of the CJRP were available at that time to explore within-facility changes. Very poor stability would indicate that oversampling a facility with a high percentage of females or/and Hispanics on the basis of information from the last CJRP would not be advantageous, since the facility may not be that likely to have a high female/Hispanic percentage when the national SYRP data are collected. The study concluded that, although there were some changes in facility youth type composition, the changes were not substantial. Thus, the within-facility populations were considered relatively stable over the time period.

The effect of oversampling females and Hispanic males in this way, assuming a fixed overall sample size, was to reduce the sample size for other demographic groups by about 20 percent. Although this is not a trivial reduction, it results in only about a 12 percent increase in sampling error for characteristics restricted to other demographic groups. This seemed a reasonable loss when weighed against the achieved gain in reliability for female and Hispanic male characteristics.

5.2 Universe of Facilities

The Sampling Frame. The facility sampling frame for the first stage of sample selection will initially be a listing of all juvenile residential facilities in the United States maintained by the Census Bureau as the respondent universe for the administration of the CJRP. It will be updated using data from the more recent JRFC conducted by the Census Bureau. Using the CJRP facility listing as the facility sampling frame for the EASYRP ensures that the data collected through the EASYRP will be complementary to those collected in the CJRP, the JRFC, and the SYRP. Explicit linkages between the

data collected in the EASYRP and the other censuses and surveys will be feasible to the extent that the overall designs of the two studies are substantially compatible, including reliance on the same sampling universe. Operationally, using the same frame will also save time, as it is already being updated regularly by Census Bureau personnel, and will facilitate implementation of the study, because the institutions contacted will be familiar with this series of data collection efforts (as all of them participate in the CJRP).

Because the EASYRP sampling plan requires information about the number and gender/ethnic characteristics of the offender youth residing in each facility, the most recent CJRP data will be required. However, the sample design anticipates using the youth data from the 2001 CJRP, which translates into a 2½-year lag between the reference date of the 2001 CJRP universe (October 2001) and the first EASYRP data collection (expected to be in Spring 2004). Based on the experience of the SYRP Field Test, it is clear that this delay means a number of facilities will have come into existence after the CJRP reference date and these will have no chance of being included in the EASYRP unless an additional effort is made to include them. In the SYRP, this problem was addressed by identifying new facilities in the JRFC data and in the facility listing updated by the Census Bureau. For the EASYRP, this will similarly be done. Using the information from the 2002 JRFC will provide some measure of size information (albeit not youth-level characteristics). For the other new facilities identified from the Census Bureau facility listing, staff will contact newly added facilities, which will be asked to provide the number of offender youth in residence at the time of the call. This information will permit these new facilities some probability of selection into EASYRP. Similarly, facilities that have been closed will be identified and removed from the sampling list.

Exclusions. Adult facilities, which house juvenile offenders, and facilities that provide only mental health services will be excluded from this sample, as they were for SYRP and the CJRP. Westat examined the effect these exclusions had on the population of juveniles in residential placement for SYRP. On June 30, 1997, there were 6,542 juveniles held as adults and 1,548 juveniles held as juveniles in local jails.[11] There were 5,309 inmates younger than the age of 18 in state and federal correctional facilities on June 30, 1995.[12] The American Correctional Association estimated that there were 14,658 juveniles held as adults in the adult correctional system in 1996.[13] Considered in relation to the size of the

[11] U.S. Department of Justice. (1999). *Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 1998.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs.

[12] U.S. Department of Justice. (1997). *Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1995.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs.

[13] Glick, B., Sturgeon, W. & Venator-Santiago, C. (1998). *No Time to Play: Youthful Offenders in Adult Correctional Systems.* Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.

youth population that *is* covered by the Census frame—a total of 105,781 offender youths in 1997—these figures suggest that about 12 percent of offender youths are held in adult facilities. No estimate is available for the number of offender youth held in facilities that provide only mental health services or only substance abuse treatment, but these offender youth increment the percentage of the offender youth population that is not covered in the Census facilities frame.

The benefits of the increased representativeness that could be obtained by expanding the facility sampling frame to include adult facilities housing juveniles and mental health institutions were considered to be outweighed by the costs of identifying these institutions for the sampling process and collecting data from the juveniles within them. Also, the survey estimates concerning the unique characteristics of these small populations would have very low precision. Moreover, using the same facility frame for the EASYRP as used in the other OJJDP surveys provides a coordinated set of databases, permitting the findings from each to be understood in light of the findings of the others.

5.3 Facility Sampling

Primary Sampling Unit Formation. Before facilities are sampled, the facility universe will be organized into primary sampling units (PSU's), each reflecting facilities or groups of facilities from which we expect to obtain a cluster size of 60 completed youth interviews. This cluster size was determined to be approximately optimal, considering both cost and the level of intraclass correlation (a measure of the similarity of youths within a facility). Intraclass correlations were estimated for a number of characteristics in the SYRP Field Test. Considering which SYRP characteristics might have similar intraclass correlations as EASYRP characteristics, Westat statisticians estimate an average intraclass correlation for EASYRP of about .03. The combination of this level of intraclass correlations and high relative costs for interviewing in a facility led to a cluster size of 60.

In creating the PSUs for facility sampling, each large facility will correspond to one PSU. The planned youth sample size for each large facility will be 75, to yield an expected 60 interviews (see response rate section 5.7). Medium-sized facilities will be combined into groups of 2-3 facilities, to obtain groups that average 75 youths. Small facilities will similarly be combined into groups containing about 75 youth. Thus, the final EASYRP sampling frame will consist of large facility PSUs, PSUs consisting of small facility groups, and PSUs consisting of medium facility groups.

To minimize travel costs, it is desirable to have the sample clustered geographically. This is particularly true for smaller facilities, where there may only be a few interviews conducted and where it

may be possible to complete work in a couple of hours. Thus, as with SYRP, PSUs consisting of small facility groups and PSUs consisting of medium sized facility groups will be as geographically concentrated as possible. Although this tends to lead to a *less* representative sample than if the same number of smaller facilities were *not* geographically clustered, this disadvantage is outweighed by the resulting gain in operational efficiency and the substantial reduction of data collection costs.

Differential Facility Sampling Rates. Facilities will be sampled at different rates depending on both facility size and youth gender/ethnicity composition. Sampling at this first stage of selection will be done using probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling. The measure of size (MOS) for PPS sampling reflects both the facility size and youth composition. The number of youths in each gender/ethnic category will be based on the numbers in the previous CJRP.

Regarding the youth composition, as noted in section 5.1, females and Hispanic males will be oversampled. This will occur mostly in the large facility PSUs because in smaller facilities where all youths will be selected into the sample, such high oversampling rates are not possible. One method of oversampling is to count females as having values of 3, to count Hispanic males as having values of 1.5, and to count other males in each facility as having values of 1. Adding these values over all youths creates a weighted size measure for each facility. For large facility PSUs, this weighted measure of size is the PSU MOS value. (See the next paragraph for the MOS values for small and medium PSUs.) Thus, a large all-female facility will have three times the MOS (and thus three times the probability of selection) as a facility of the same size that consists of all white males.

Concerning size, smaller facilities will be undersampled in order to contain costs and to render the data collection as efficient as possible. Small facilities, those with weighted size measures of less than 38, will be sampled at about one third the rate of large facilities. To accomplish this the small facility PSUs will each have a MOS value of 25, even though they have an average initial MOS of about 75. Medium-sized facilities, those with weighted size measures of between 38 and 60, will also be slightly undersampled by assigning the PSUs containing them, a MOS value of 45.

The SYRP Field Test documented the very high costs per facility of recruitment and data collection. Due to what was learned there, the sampling design includes a method for reducing further the sample size of small facilities in both the EASYRP and the SYRP. This method would first sample facilities according to the original plan. Then, all sampled facilities with fewer than six offender youth according to the CJRP would receive a preliminary telephone call to determine the number of offender youths they have in residence. Any facilities that fulfill the following three criteria would be dropped from the sample: (1) current population of fewer than three offender youths, (2) over the previous month a

population that never exceeded three offender youth simultaneously in residence, and (3) no changes expected to substantially increase the number of their offender youth residents in the near future. By this method, only the very smallest facilities would be unrepresented among the facilities that participate in the EASYRP. Note that the proposed procedure will also provide information about the number and type of facilities that were dropped from the sample.

The impact of undersampling the smaller facilities and excluding facilities with fewer than three youth was investigated for SYRP. The study did not show any intolerable results. For SYRP, this procedure resulted in twenty-five facilities fitting the phone call criteria (less than six offenders). Of these, fifteen did not meet the criteria to be retained in the sample (fewer than three offenders).

The SYRP has implemented all these aspects in its sample design and the resulting facility sample distribution by size was as follows (cf. Table 5.1):

- Large facilities (weighted size > 60) composed 54 percent of the sample (as expected, more than their percentage of the facility frame);
- Medium facilities (weighted size between 39 and 60) composed 12 percent of the sample (about the same as the percentage of these facilities on the facility frame); and
- Small facilities (weighted size of 38 or less) composed 34 percent of the sample, which is a bit more than one third of the percentage of these facilities on the frame.

Stratification. Before selecting PSUs, facilities will be grouped into strata to better control the sample for important known characteristics of the facilities and to reduce sampling errors. Table 5.1 shows the distribution of several stratification factors for the SYRP sampling frame. The EASYRP sample is expected to distribute similarly. There were 3,744 facilities on the sampling frame, of which about 280 were selected for the SYRP sample.

5.4 Youth Eligible for EASYRP

For the purposes of this study, juveniles will be defined as individuals between the ages of 10 and 20 years old. The lower age of 10 has precedence in research, as the National Center for Juvenile Justice often defines juveniles as youth between 10-17 in their reports. For these reasons, a cutoff at 10 was chosen for the SYRP. The same lower bound is proposed for the EASYRP for the same reasons and to ensure consistency between the two surveys.

Table 5.1: Percentage Distribution for Several Variables of Facilities and Youths for the SYRP Sampling Frame

Selected Variables	Youth	Facilities
Facility Size:		
Large (> 60)	70%	16%
Medium (39 through 60)	10	9
Small (≤ 38)	20	75
Total	100	100
Facility Type:		
Public	71%	38%
Private	29	62
Total	100	100
Gender:		
Male	87%	NA
Female	13	NA
Total	100	
Race/ethnicity:		
White, not Hispanic	38%	NA
Black, not Hispanic	39	NA
Hispanic	18	NA
American Indian	2	NA
Asian	2	NA
Pacific Islander	0	NA
All combinations/missing	1	NA
Total	100	
Adjudication status:		
Adjudicated	81%	NA
Not Adjudicated	19	NA
Total	100	
No. of Locked Doors in Facility:		
1	4%	NA
2	11	NA
3	13	NA
4	15	NA
5	28	NA
Other/missing	29	NA
Total	100	
Detention Center:		
Yes	32%	NA
No	68	NA
Total	100	

The SYRP uses an upper bound of 20 primarily because of the precedent established in the CJRP of collecting data on all offenders in residential placement who are under 21 years of age. For the EASYRP, an upper age limit of 18 instead of 20 was considered, because youths usually complete high school at age 17 or 18. However, in these facilities, many 19- and 20-year-olds have serious educational

deficiencies, and a number still do not have high school diplomas. Thus, the upper age limit will be 20 for the EASYRP, continuing the parallel with the SYRP design.

The youth universe will include all youths in residence at the sampled facilities, both adjudicated and pre-adjudicated offenders. Non-offending youth placed by child welfare agencies will be excluded. The sample from a particular facility will be selected from all youths that reside in the facility at a given point in time. This approach uses a listing of all youths in residence at a specific point in time (e.g., as of the time the data collectors arrive on a specific day), and draws a sample from that listing. This approach minimizes the listing burden on facilities and will require only a very time-delimited disruption of normal facility schedules and procedures, helping to minimize facility refusal rates. Also, this sample provides information that can be meaningfully related to findings from the three extant OJJDP surveys—CJRP, JRFC, and SYRP.

5.5 Youth Sampling

As noted in section 5.1, the second method for oversampling females and Hispanic males is at the youth sampling level. This is accomplished by giving females a MOS value of 3, Hispanic males a MOS value of 1.5, and other males MOS values of 1 and then using PPS sampling in connection with these MOS values.

The SYRP test sample showed that, by using both these methods for oversampling these special populations, the resulting sample of youth would be comprised of about 21 percent females, 23 percent Hispanic males, and 57 percent other males. From Table 5.1, the increase of 8% over the frame female percentage indicates that the oversampling methods were effective in the test sample.

The recommended size for the total youth sample was determined by three factors. The first was the issue of cost. The second was the frequency of survey administration. It is currently planned that the EASYRP will be conducted once every four years. A larger sample size is desirable for this frequency than for a survey conducted annually or every two years.

A final factor was the reliability of estimates to be obtained from various sample sizes. Since the EASYRP sample design will be essentially the same sample design as that used for the SYRP, statisticians are able to use some variance estimates obtained from the education items included in the SYRP Field Test. In particular, the statisticians use the variance estimates to examine the reliability that we would obtain from a sample size of 10,000 observed youths. In summary, we have concluded that this

sample size will provide reasonably reliable estimates for two-way breakdowns and many three-way breakdowns for educational issues.

5.6 Data Collection Period and Response Rates

Interviews will be conducted over a two-month period in the spring. This will allow the field period to overlap with the what facility administrators report to be their spring peak facility population season (mid-February to late March). This plan will also avoid the EASYRP being in the field at the same time as the CJRP or the JRFC, which administers in the same facility universe during the fall.

It is estimated that approximately 95 percent of all facilities contacted will agree to participate in the survey. During the EASYRP feasibility test, two youths (out of 77) chose not to take the assessments. On the youth-level, we anticipate conservatively that 85% of all youth sampled will actually participate in the survey. Together, these estimates yield an expected overall response rate of approximately 80 percent.

6. FORMULATE METHODOLOGY FOR A NATIONAL EASYRP

In many respects the methodology designed for the SYRP can be applied directly to the EASYRP. State recruitment and facility recruitment for the EASYRP will closely match that of the SYRP, with a few exceptions. The key activities involved in data collection will require some departures from the SYRP. The discussion in this section outlines the areas the EASYRP can draw on the methodology used in the SYRP and identifies areas where modifications will be necessary. The last section briefly touches on data analysis for the survey.

6.1 State Recruitment

We recommend using a very similar approach to that used in the SYRP for obtaining the necessary administrative clearances from the state authorities.

Contacting States. Following the SYRP model, recruitment should begin with the state juvenile justice departments. The most senior administrator within each state juvenile justice office should be identified, first through the most recent *Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies, and Paroling Authorities Directory*, and then confirmed by consulting the state government webpage. A contact person would be established and sent an introductory package asking for their cooperation and support for the study. Because the EASYRP deals specifically with educational issues, we anticipate that senior administrators may want negotiations to be handled through their education department. This was the case for one state that participated in the EASYRP feasibility test.

Like the SYRP, we recommended that considerable time be allotted to accomplish state-level recruitment in a national EASYRP. Compared to the SYRP, the interview items in the EASYRP are low-risk in nature. The EASYRP interview does not include questions about offenses, victimization experiences, mental health or any of the other sensitive areas covered by the SYRP. This should help to expedite the state-level approval process. Nonetheless, education departments may raise other concerns about the interview or the assessments and adequate time should be built into the schedule to address any problems that arise. In addition, state juvenile justice agencies that have their own Human Subjects Review Board are likely to require that the EASYRP go through a full review, just as they do for the SYRP, which is often a lengthy process. As with the SYRP we recommend that state-level recruitment commence at least one year in advance of data collection.

6.2 Facility Recruitment

Facility recruitment for a national EASYRP can parallel the national SYRP procedures in many ways. Like the SYRP, recruitment of facilities for the EASYRP will require complex negotiations, including arrangements for obtaining parent-guardian consent, gathering the roster listing of residents to enable youth-level sampling, obtaining the information needed to complete the CJRP and JRFC data forms, and working out specific logistics for the data collection visit.

Two significant deviations from the SYRP facility recruitment procedures are necessary for the EASYRP. The first is to involve each sampled facility's educational staff (if the facility has such) in the recruitment negotiations and logistical arrangements that are carried out with the facility prior to the field teams visit. The second is the potential to follow less stringent anonymity procedures, which would allow project staff to become involved in obtaining parent/guardian consent for the sampled youth.

Contacting Facilities. The initial contact to the state can follow the same procedures designed for the SYRP. Contact information can be gathered from the most current CJRP database and cross-checked against the information in the most recent version of two directories: the *Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies, and Paroling Authorities Directory* and the *National Directory of Children, Youth, and Family Services.*

In the SYRP, the facility administrator generally serves as the liaison through which the Westat recruiter explains the study and obtains agreement to participate. Often this individual also serves as the person through which logistics are discussed once approval is obtained. Based on the findings from the EASYRP feasibility test, Westat recommends that the educational staff at the facility be involved in the logistical arrangements once approval is obtained from the facility administrator. The education staff in the facilities included in the EASYRP feasibility test all expressed an interest in the assessments and the study itself. By involving the educational staff early in the negotiations, Westat hopes to secure their endorsement and cooperation during the study. The educational staff can play an important role in fostering student motivation to take the assessments seriously and to do their best during the tests.

As learned in the EASYRP feasibility test, incentives for good performance on the assessments may be necessary. In working with the educational staff in the facilities, Westat will identify incentives that might help ensure that youth take the assessment seriously. First, Westat plans to make the assessment scores available to both facility staff and the youth themselves. The EASYRP team will also examine variations in wording of instructions to motivate youth to try harder on the assessment.

Additional incentives might include point(s) toward completion of youth plans, recognition for community service, using facility staff to encourage youth to take the test seriously, or other ways local facilities might recognize youth participation beyond required activities.

Determining Consent Arrangements. The EASYRP may be able to follow less stringent consent procedures than those designed for the SYRP. In the SYRP, strict anonymity has to be maintained and project staff are never aware of the youths' names, due to the sensitive nature of the questions in the interview. This means that obtaining parental consents is entirely the responsibility of the facility staff. Because the EASYRP does not include sensitive items, the study should not have to maintain such strict anonymity procedures. The decision not to follow strict anonymity procedures would have to be made by the Institutional Review Board. If the study were allowed to obtain youth names, the project team could assist in obtaining parent consents, which would considerably reduce the burden on the facility and increase study response rates.

Negotiating Data Collection Logistics and Finalizing Arrangements. The EASYRP can follow the same procedures used in the SYRP for obtaining the roster of youth in residence and collecting CJRP and JRFC administrative data. In addition, most of the procedures designed for the SYRP in planning the data collection visit can remain the same. These steps include: (1) scheduling the data collection visit; (2) arranging for an appropriate space within the facility to administer the survey instruments to small groups; (3) ascertaining the facility guidelines for visitors; and (4) identifying the facility staff person(s) who will provide support for the field team during the data collection visit (preferably an educational staff member for the EASYRP).

6.3 Data Collection Activities

Unlike the SYRP, recruiters and field staff involved in the EASYRP will need to form a partnership with the facility's educational staff. This partnership will become important in successfully negotiating a number of important data collection activities specific to the EASYRP.

Prior to the scheduled data collection period, we recommend that a member of the facility's education staff discuss the upcoming assessments with the youth. Just prior to the assessments, the educational staff should encourage youth to take the test seriously and to try hard to do their best. This, along with other instructions and/or incentives to increase the perceived stakes of the assessments, should be examined in the large-scale field test.

We also recommend that educational staff at the facility identify youth who have limited English proficiency. These students may have a particularly difficult time with the Reading and Math assessments. Staff identification of these students along with the interview data, which asks students to rate their ability to read and write in English, would then be used to determine whether the assessment data are valid measures of their reading and math abilities.

With the exception of administering the ACASI interview and assessments, the remaining data collection activities necessary for the EASYRP can draw directly from the SYRP procedures. These remaining activities include: selecting the youth sample, setting up for survey administration, documenting the participation status of sampled youths, ensuring that the CJRP-II information is obtained, entering youth status codes, and transmitting data to the home office.

Administering the ACASI Interview and Assessments. If the EASYRP interview and the STAR Reading and Math assessments are combined into a unified computerized administration system, the youth will be able to move uninterrupted from the interview to the Reading assessment and then to the Math assessment. If the three are not combined, the field staff must monitor and facilitate all the sessions and assist youth in transitioning between the different survey instruments.

In the EASYRP, one of the most critical responsibilities of the field staff will be to ensure that they maintain a testing environment while youth complete the assessments. It is important to recognize that conducting the EASYRP assessments requires a very different environment than that needed to conduct an interview. Special attention must be paid to ensuring a very quiet room with no interruptions from other youth or staff. Youth will need to think about their responses to the reading questions and work through multi-step math problems in a quiet environment to perform their best on the tests. One disruptive student can negatively impact the test scores of the entire group, particularly because the STAR assessments are timed. Arranging for a member of the educational staff (or other facility staff member) to remain in the testing room during the data collection period can have a very positive impact on the field staff's ability to maintain a quiet environment.

During the EASYRP feasibility test, youth were much less talkative and disruptive when a facility staff person was in the room. Without the presence of a facility staff member, youth tended to act-out in a manner similar to what you would expect when placing a substitute teacher in a classroom. In some facilities, youth simply did not view field staff as authority figures. For the SYRP, there is a concern that having facility staff present in the room may interfere with valid responses to the interview questions, by not allowing the youth sufficient privacy in answering the sensitive questions that are asked. For the

EASYRP, however, which does not ask such sensitive questions, the presence of facility staff may actually be positive by enforcing a quiet, non-disruptive testing environment.

Because of the nature of the EASYRP assessments, some additional procedures would need to be developed for data collection. For example, the STAR Math assessment requires the use of a pencil and scratch paper to work through the problems. Because of security precautions in the facilities, special procedures for the handling of pencils should be developed, tracking which youth receive and return pencils. In addition, it is likely that a small portion of youth in secure facilities will be prohibited from using pencils (particularly in a group setting) due to disciplinary or safety concerns. For these youth, the assessment could be administered individually with a less dangerous writing tool, like a crayon.

6.4 Data Analysis

The EASYRP will provide a rich source of both descriptive and analytical data on youth in residential placement and how their math and reading skills compare to the general population of school-aged youth. Analyses will be conducted that examine variations in educational attainment based on security level of current placement. The predictive value of demographic factors (age, race, sex) and educational background (ever dropped out of school, in school at time of arrest, truancy history, disciplinary history, attitudes toward school) on educational attainment will also be examined. Multivariate analysis will be used to examine the strength and statistical significance of the independent relationships between the youth's' current placement, educational assessment, his/her educational history, and current offense. Such analysis will also tell if these factors contribute to the predictive power of the model, and if so, the extent each factor contributes.

OJJDP will publish these analyses and findings in research reports and articles. OJJDP will also develop researched-based policy recommendations applicable to policy makers and front-line staff. Public use data tapes will be available to researchers to conduct additional analyses.

Finally, at the individual level, the EASYRP will provide facilities with current assessments for youth in the facility to inform individual educational programs.

7. CONDUCT THE FEASIBILITY TEST

The final task of the Planning Project was to test the feasibility of the overall EASYRP instrument and methodology. The purpose of the feasibility test was fourfold: (1) to assess the feasibility of administering all *three* EASYRP instruments (the interview, STAR Reading, and STAR Math) in a single session; (2) to refine the wording and formatting of interview questions to ensure that they are understood and that an adequate array of answer alternatives is provided for the national implementation; (3) to examine issues of conducting school assessments in residential settings in small groups; and (4) to identify recruitment issues associated with conducting such assessments, both from the perspective of the facilities and of the youths in these facilities. A brief description of the experience and findings from the feasibility test follows; however, a more detailed description of this test can be found in the *Report of the Feasibility Test.*[14]

7.1 Logistics for the Feasibility Test

The feasibility test was conducted in six different facilities in two states between April 19 and May 10, 2002. The EASYRP was administered to small groups ranging from 5 to 10 youths. In three facilities, two testing sessions were conducted. Field teams consisted of three to four staff. A fourth staff person was added to the team to expedite conducting the one-on-one interviews.

The sequence of activities during the feasibility test was similar in all facilities:

- Room/computer setup to maximize privacy,
- Introduction to the study and reading of the consent form,
- Instructions to youths for the first assessment,
- Administration of the first assessment,
- Instructions to youths for the second assessment,
- Administration of the second assessment,
- Group discussion/feedback on experience of taking the assessments, and

[14] Westat. (2002). *Planning the Educational Assessment Survey of Youth in Residential Placement: Report on the Feasibility Test.* Rockville, MD. Author.

- One-on-one interviews with a subset of youth.

The only variation in the sequence of events was in which assessment was given first. The STAR Math assessment was given first in four facilities; the STAR Reading assessment was administered first in two facilities.

7.2 Participation Rates for the Feasibility Test

The original plan for the feasibility test was to collect assessments for 60 youths and to conduct interviews with 27 youths (nine in each of the three categories that trigger the major skip patterns in the interview). The final complement of assessments and interviews was as follows:

- Seventy-five completed assessments,[15] and
- Sixteen completed interviews (two youths age 13 or younger, nine youths age 14 or older who had not received their diploma or GED, and five youths who had received their GED).

During the feasibility test, field staff attempted to interview all youths in the facilities who were 13 years old or younger and all youths who had received their diploma or GED. Even so, because these groups were relatively rare among the residents, it was not possible to attain the full complement of nine interviews within these categories.

Just over two-thirds (68%) of the participating youth were male. Additionally, 53 percent were white, 47 percent black.[16] Youth ranged in age from 12 to 18. Most sessions had a mixture of different ages. One session included youth from the full age range, while another session only included youths age 16 and 17 years old. Not surprisingly, youths tended to cluster in the high school grades, although grade levels ranged from 6 to 12. Ninth and tenth graders were most prevalent among participating youth. Twenty-one youths stated they were in each of those grades.

Participation rates for the subset of youths completing the interview portion of the survey were comparable to those for the assessments. Youths ranged in age from 12 to 18, with slightly over one-third (37.5%) of the interview respondents being age 17. Grade levels ranged from 8th to 12th grade.

[15] Two additional youths, who came to the test sessions, opted not to complete the assessments. No reason was given.

[16] Race determinations were based on observation from the field staff.

Respondents to the interview were more likely to be male than female (73% vs. 37%, respectively) and white rather than black (53% vs. 47%, respectively).

7.3 Findings from the Feasibility Test

To determine the feasibility of administering a three-tiered survey—an interview, a Reading assessment, and Math assessment—staff examined the timing required to setup the room and administer the survey, downloading and analyzing data, and feedback from the test groups. The feasibility test for the EASYRP showed that a survey, which included both Math and Reading assessments, could be conducted with youth in residential placement through a small group administration. The findings are discussed below.

Timing for Administering the EASYRP. To administer the EASYRP in group sessions in residential facilities, it was necessary to consider the timing of several factors: setting up the room with computers, getting the youth in place at the test stations, describing the study and answering questions, reading the consent form and getting the youths' consents, presenting instructions, administering the assessments, conducting the interview, and asking youth for feedback on their experiences in participating in the survey. At each facility, the field staff recorded the times for these various aspects of the study.

The STAR Reading and Math assessments allow youth to go at their own speed; however, each question has a maximum allowable time, depending on the difficulty of the question. The STAR Reading assessment allows a maximum of 15 minutes to complete the 25 questions; the STAR Math assessment allows a maximum of 30 minutes to complete 24 questions. The literature on the STAR assessments noted that timing variations were not particularly large in classrooms. However, it is important to recognize that the youth in a given test session in the EASYRP context reflect a very broad range of class grades and capabilities.

During the feasibility test, the average time for the full testing session was 73 minutes. This included the introduction to the study, reading the first assessment instructions (15 minutes), conducting the STAR Reading assessment (11 minutes), setting up the computers for the next assessment and reading instructions for the second assessment (15 minutes), conducting the Math assessment (17 minutes), and conducting the interview (15 minutes). During a national administration, if a unified computer administration could be developed to implement all the components after the initial start-up, there would be little need for one-on-one interaction after the initial set up and the sessions may be able to go more quickly. It is estimated that these adjustments could reduce the administration by 15 to 20 minutes. Those

youth who require the maximum amount of time for the assessments may still run over the allotted hour time period. This issue should be investigated in a large-scale field test.

Downloading and Analyzing Data. The STAR produces a series of scores based on the responses to the individual assessment items. For both the Math and Reading assessments, STAR produces grade equivalency, normal curve equivalent scores, percentile ranks, and scaled scores. Additionally, the STAR Reading test produces an instructional reading level and zone of proximal development.

The STAR Reading and Math databases store the test data in a proprietary format, which made it inconvenient to access the raw data in the feasibility test. The databases could not be opened, but could be viewed by importing the data into Excel. Each database includes the student's current grade, school year start and end dates, test date, and student answers for each test question. For the feasibility test, both the Math and Reading databases were backed up onto a disk. The disks were then used to print a Math and Reading summary report using the STAR Reading and Math management programs. For a national administration, it would be necessary to find a method for electronically combining and transmitting data to a single data file in the home office.

For the feasibility test, the interviews were conducted individually in face-to-face sessions, using a paper and pencil format. In a national administration of the EASYRP, the interviews would be conducted using an audio-computer-assisted-self-interview (ACASI) methodology, similar to that used for SYRP. The same procedures used in the SYRP to download and combine data could be used for the EASYRP interview data. The interview data, the youth-level data from the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP Part II), and the youths' Reading and Math assessment data would then be linked for analysis.

The analysis plan for the EASYRP data is described in detail in a separate report [17] and will not be discussed in detail here. A sample table was produced using the feasibility test data to provide an example of the type of data generated from the STAR Reading and Math assessments. Table 7.1 below presents the STAR Math and Reading percentile rank scores for the 75 youth who completed assessments conducted during the feasibility test. The percentile rank score compares a youth's test score with that of students nationally in the same grade. For the reading test, 40 percent of youth in the EASYRP feasibility

[17] Westat. (2002). *Planning the Educational Assessment Survey for Youth in Residential Placement: Data Analysis Plan.* Rockville, MD: Author.

Table 7.1: Sample Tabulation Table for STAR Math and Reading Assessments

National Percentile Ranks	Reading		Math	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below 25th	30	40.0%	49	65.3%
25th to 49th	24	32.0%	19	25.3%
50th to 74th	13	17.3%	5	6.7%
75th & Above	8	10.7%	2	2.7%
Total	**75**	**100%**	**75**	**100%**

test scored below the 25th percentile, 32 percent scored in the 25th to 49th percentile, 17 percent scored in the 50th to 74th percentile, and 11 percent scored in the 75th percentile or above. The Math assessment scores were slightly lower, 65 percent of youth in the feasibility test scored below the 25th percentile, 25 percent scored in the 25th to 49th percentile, 7 percent in the 50th to 74th percentile, and 3 percent in the 75th percentile or above.

Problems during administration. The testing sessions ran relatively smoothly. Computers could be set up to allow privacy in even small settings. Plugs for the computers were sufficiently available, when used with extension cords and multi-plug extensions. However, several problems occurred which suggested a need to revise the procedures for administering the survey nationally. First, in one test session, it took 30 minutes to get all the youth into the test session. In the feasibility test, because instructions for the assessments were given verbally and were slightly different for the Math and Reading, all youth had to begin at the same time. The delay in getting all the youth into the test session created a very restless atmosphere, with some youths even making changes to the configurations on the computers as they waited. While this did not interfere with their ability to take the test, it could have ramifications for any data stored on the laptops from previous testing sessions in the national survey. During a national administration, the computers would be configured such that youth would only have access to limited aspects of the computer, possibly activating only those keys needed for the assessments and interview. Also in a national administration, youths could begin the survey upon entry.

The second problem was with a disruptive individual, who was then supported by others in the session. Because of a desire to keep all youth in the feasibility test, the disruptive youth was not removed from the session. As a result of these activities, however, this session had the fastest response time and used little to no scratch paper for the Math assessment. These findings suggest that the respondents in this session failed to take the test seriously, therefore undercutting the validity of their test

results. Consequently, Westat recommends removing disruptive respondents during a national administration.

A third problem occurred in another session in which one of the pencils handed out was not returned. The facilities required that field staff count the number of pencils before and after distribution. However, staff were not required to identify who had returned pencils. After the pencil was lost, Westat changed procedures to track who was given and returned pencils.

Feedback from the test groups. After taking the assessments, youths were asked in a group session why they decided to participate, reasons why other youths might or might not participate, what they felt about taking the assessments on the computer, and their opinion on test logistics (room set-up, presence of facility staff and project field staff in the room). The youths were also asked how they felt about the assessments in general—difficulty, time allotted, and preferences on which assessment to take first. A final question asked the youths if they had other recommendations for administering the assessments.

The reasons the youths gave for choosing to participate varied. One of the most common responses was because they did not want to stay in their rooms and had nothing else interesting to do. Other participants took the test for curiosity reasons, such as finding out how they would do on the test ("test intelligence"), to see what the test was like since it sounded interesting, and, for some, simply to experience a new test. Other reasons the youths gave for participating were fear of repercussions for not taking the tests. Several youth said they had volunteered only after they learned that computers were involved. A common question youth asked upon entering the test area was whether the computers were connected to the Internet.

Asked whether other youths (like them) would want to participate in the assessments, the youth focussed on reasons others might not participate, reporting that others might:

- Be lazy or feel it is a waste of time,
- Lack knowledge,
- Be impatient, not be able to concentrate and focus,
- Not like school, and
- Be uncomfortable using computers.

Logistics—room set-up, presence of field staff and facility staff in the room, taking a test on a computer—did not seem to create any problems for the respondents. In fact, they reported that taking a test on the computer was easier than taking a paper-and-pencil test.

The youths were also asked what they thought about the Reading and Math assessments. The majority of the youths reported that they liked the Reading assessment and thought that it was easy while only a few thought it was hard and challenging. The youths also reported that they had enough time to answer the reading questions. Reports on the Math assessment were mixed. While some youth said that the Math was easy, some indicated that it was hard and that they did not recognize some of the word problems, which were not at their grade level. Asked whether they had enough time on the Math assessment, most youths reported that they did, while a few said that they ran out of time on some of the questions. Note that because feedback was given in a group, youth who had taken more time to complete the assessments were hesitant about saying the assessments were difficult. In some instances, youth initially commented on the difficulty but then backed off after others in the group said it was easy.

It is interesting to note that overwhelmingly youth expressed an interest in having the scores to the assessment provided to them. As mentioned earlier, facility staff also expressed strong interest in getting the scores as well as information on the assessments.

8. SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

The EASYRP is an important element in the complement of surveys currently undertaken by OJJDP. Research has shown that poor academic performance is a predictor of later violent delinquent behavior[18,19,20] and that bonding to school reduces the likelihood of criminal behavior. [18,21,22,23,24] Youth with high truancy rates have been found more likely to be involved in violent crimes,[20] as have youth who have experienced frequent school transitions.[18] Despite the apparent importance of school performance and involvement as predictors of delinquency, little is known nationally about the academic capabilities or educational backgrounds of the overall population in juvenile residential facilities.

Data on youths' reading and math capabilities vary widely on juveniles in residential placement both between and within facilities. Many facilities use an assessment tool to assess youths' reading and math capabilities. However, a wide assortment of tools are used, selected by the facility, the local school district, or a consultant to the facility. Some facilities rely on assessments administered by the local school when youth entered the facility, so the assessments on record for long-staying youth may be seriously outdated. Comparability of existing assessments is unknown, as no one has compiled statistics on the tools used in different facilities or States—the specific tests in use or their differing reliability, validity, and norming procedures.

The EASYRP will correct this deficit by using a single assessment for youth across the nation and collecting data on youths' educational backgrounds from their perspective. The EASYRP Planning Project has identified instruments for the assessments, drafted an interview to ascertain educational backgrounds and attitudes, and conducted an initial feasibility test to determine whether this survey can be conducted and yield reliable information. The feasibility test did determine that the

---

[18] Maguin, E., Hawkins, J.D., Catalano, R.F., Hill, K., Abbott, R., & Herrenkohl, T. (1995). *Risk Factors Measured at Three Ages for Violence at Age 17-18.* Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Boston, MA.

[19] Denno, D.W. (1990). *Biology and Violence: From Birth to Adulthood.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[20] Farrington, D.P. (1989). Early predictors of adolescent aggression and adult violence. *Violence and Victims, 4*: 49-100.

[21] Catalano, R.F., & Hawkins, J.D. (1996). The social development model: A theory of antisocial behavior. In J.D. Hawkins (Ed.), *Delinquency and Crime: Current Theories.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 149-197.

[22] Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

[23] Williams, J.H. (1994). *Understanding Substance Use, Delinquency Involvement, and Juvenile Justice System Involvement Among African-American and European-American Adolescents.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

[24] Ereth, J.L. (1979). *An empirical examination of the school, self-esteem and activity dimensions in relation to the conforming and non-conforming behaviors of junior and senior high school students.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI.

assessments and the interview could be administered in small-group sessions. The youths experienced no problems using the computers and the interview elicited a distribution of responses to describe this population of youth and provide a context for analyzing the assessment data. The test also pointed out additional areas that should be refined prior to a national administration. It also highlighted differences between the SYRP and the EASYRP.

In this chapter, Westat outlines how the EASYRP and SYRP complement each other, as well as ways in which they differ. Next, recommendations for a broad-based field test will be outlined based on the lessons learned from the Planning Project.

8.1 Similarities Between SYRP and EASYRP

The EASYRP Planning Team and Advisory Board has examined the two surveys, the efforts required to administer them, and recommends using similar efforts and methodologies wherever possible to reduce costs and facility and state burden, as well as increase comparability of data. Using similar methodologies between the two makes sense. First, both surveys are targeted to juveniles in residential placement. Consequently, using the same universe of facilities, the same sampling design, and the same definitions of youth ensures a comparability of data across collections, without imposing too great a burden for a single collection. The decision to separately collect the SYRP and EASYRP, as discussed in Chapter 4, is also related to the issue of minimizing the burden on facilities, although some facilities will be "tapped" in both studies, though in different years.

Second, nothing in the Planning Project suggested that separate sampling designs are necessary for the two studies. Consequently, the same design is recommended for both. This approach also allows the use of the ongoing data collection for both the JRFC and the CJRP to update the sampling frame, using existing efforts within the Census Bureau. Using these different surveys to update data on the universe of facilities has the added benefit of providing OJJDP with very current information on facilities operating within the United States.

Third, many of the activities required for collecting data are also comparable. Differences between them are outlined in the next section. Similarities include recruiting states, hiring and training teams to implement the surveys, the use of computers, addressing logistics of data collection with the facilities, collecting and transmitting survey data, updating CJRP and JRFC data, and completing the sampling frame. By keeping these activities similar across the surveys, economies will be realized and training guides can more quickly be adapted between the two. Facilities that are sampled into both

surveys will not have to be burdened with significantly different routines. Further, keeping these approaches the same enhances the comparability of the data in the two collections.

8.2 Differences Between SYRP and EASYRP

There are, however, significant differences between the two surveys that, in turn, require differences in handling data confidentiality, facility recruitment, and data collection. The SYRP is a self-administered interview that assesses the characteristics and service needs of youths living in residential placement—the services they have received in custody; their offense history; general level of physical and mental health, safety, and security in the residential setting; the sanctions they have received for their offenses; and their expectations for the future. To obtain this information, the SYRP includes a number of sensitive questions that youth must answer. Consequently, as a part of the SYRP's design, every effort was used to minimize the risk to participating youths by ensuring privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity of responses. Data from the SYRP cannot be tracked to a participating youth, facility, or state. The confidentiality procedures are designed to protect the identification of sampled youth and to help persuade youths to provide sensitive data honestly.

Against this standard, the EASYRP is a much lower risk study. The assessments themselves are typical of assessments given by schools and facilities throughout the states. The information on the interview tracks characteristics of their behavior and experiences when in regular school—type of educational program, skipping habits, disciplinary actions, performance levels, and educational goals. Most of these questions have low risks associated with any given responses. However, the EASYRP asks youths to do more than give their experiences, it asks them to take tests to measure their math and reading levels. The introduction of the tests or assessments changes the nature of the two surveys. In the EASYRP anonymity works against the validity of the data by reducing the youths' stakes in the assessments, which in turn permits them to limit their efforts, since no one will connect their scores with them and there can be no consequences of poor performance. By contrast, in the SYRP, anonymity is critical to the validity and honesty of the responses.

The EASYRP is no different from other assessments in schools around the nation. Consequently, it faces the same problems as those assessments (low-stakes tests) that are used to gauge the current status of education, rather than score an individual youth's performance. Those problems include low motivation on tests, which can result in underestimating the skills and knowledge of these

youths.[25] Experiences from national education assessments, like the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), find that younger respondents are more likely to take the assessments more seriously than older students, particularly those in the 12th grade population. A 1991 study of the NAEP mathematics test takers found that when asked how hard they tried on the test, 28 percent of 8th graders responded "somewhat hard" or "not at all hard;" 12th graders were almost twice as likely (51%) to respond in that fashion.[26] In response to these findings, the NAEP has examined a variety of incentives to improve effort (and consequently results).

Informal feedback from several facility staff during the feasibility test suggested that getting youth in custody to take assessments more seriously may be easier than in the schools. Youth understand that behaving well and doing what they are told can affect the timing of their release and the opportunities they have available while in the facility. Youth may perceive that their performance on the EASYRP is a way to exhibit good behavior. Consequently, it will be important to ensure that the education staff within the facility endorse the importance of the EASYRP, and efforts to obtain their support should be a critical aspect of the EASYRP facility recruitment process. Also, providing individual-level assessment data to the facilities may provide additional motivation to the youths, who may then perceive their performance on these assessments as a way to "prove" themselves to the facility and to themselves.

During the EASYRP feasibility test, Westat used the procedures adopted for the SYRP that ensured that the assessment takers were anonymous and that the facilities were not provided any information from the interview or the assessments. Further, the youth who took the test were not provided any feedback on how they performed on the assessments. This anonymity probably potentiated the low-stakes aspect of the assessments, undermining the validity of the Reading and Math scores. Further, nearly all facilities expressed an interest in the scores and all youths wanted feedback on how well they did. Consequently, Westat believes it is important to recognize the differences between the two surveys in this regard and recommends providing individual-level assessment data to both facilities and youth. Interview data would not be made available at the individual-, facility-, or state-level. Ways to implement this change in procedure for the EASYRP are discussed in the next section.

---

[25] O'Neil, H.F., Abedi, J., Lee, C., Miyosi, J., & Mastergeorge, A. (2001). *Monetary incentives for low-stakes tests.* Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), p.vii.

[26] Educational Testing Service (1991) as reported in O'Neil et al. (2001).

8.3 Recommendations for a Large-Scale Field Test for the EASYRP

Given the findings from the Planning Project, a large-scale field test is indicated for the EASYRP. The purposes of such a field test would be

- To test an integrated computer program, which combines the interview, assessments, instructions, and consents and allows youth to proceed through the entire survey at an individualized pace;
- To conduct experiments on the differential effects of research-based approaches for improving performance on low-stakes tests, with particular attention to how these may be modified by factors such as length of stay that are unique to this population;
- To test the length of time to complete the integrated survey;
- To determine best practices for engaging the education staff in the assessments;
- To examine differences associated with which assessment is given first;
- To examine differences in how tests are administered (sessions that begin all youth simultaneously versus round-robin sessions, where each new participant is allowed to begin as soon as he or she is seated in the session and subsequent youth are permitted to enter the testing session as soon as an earlier participant is finished) and the impact of the differences on creating an appropriate test environment;
- To refine the interview instrument, removing questions with little or no differences in responses across this population and improving clarity; and
- To refine survey administration procedures, particularly in terms of identifying youth with limited English proficiency and youth incentives.

Again, because the SYRP and the EASYRP will use similar procedures in many ways, the findings from the SYRP can inform the procedures in the EASYRP field test, such as updating CJRP and JRFC data, contacting States, and working with facilities. However, before the EASYRP field test can be undertaken, a number of issues will need to be resolved in order to develop an integrated survey. These involve negotiations with Renaissance Learning, the STAR developer.

Issues To Be Negotiated with Renaissance Learning. As mentioned in Chapter 2, seven structural changes will be needed in an integrated computer program for the EASYRP. Westat believes that these changes could be accommodated or adjustments made to develop a unified survey. However, there are several ramifications of the changes that would have to be investigated.

First, the effects these changes might have on comparisons with the norming data produced by STAR, which were collected following the testing procedures designed specifically for STAR. Specifically, the changes in the way the assessments are administered—using an ACASI introduction and tutorial rather than the teacher-administered introduction, conducting the two assessments back-to-back, and using touchscreen technology—could affect comparisons with the norming population.

Westat would consider other alternatives to these changes. For example, Westat was concerned that using touchscreen technology for the interview and not the assessments may cause some confusion for the youth. It may not be possible to modify the STAR program in this regard and such a modification may affect comparability of the EASYRP test scores to the STAR norming data. If Renaissance Learning indicates that the assessments cannot be revised to accommodate a touchscreen, or if they advise against using a touchscreen for the STAR assessments, there are two alternatives. One possibility is to program the ACASI interview so that youth record their answers using the keyboard (with the number keys), rather than a touchscreen. This approach will introduce concerns about the comparability of the SYRP and the EASYRP, since the SYRP uses a touchscreen methodology. It also introduces a more complex cognitive process into the answering methodology, which may interfere with the ease-of-use for many youths and may, in turn, have consequences for their willingness to continue with the lengthy interview-and-testing session. The preferred alternative would be to switch from using the ACASI touchscreen for the interview to using the keyboard for the assessments, introducing this switch to the youths through the ACASI STAR tutorial itself. However, both alternatives should be explored with the national EASYRP Advisory Board, and the recommended selection should be systematically assessed as part of the field test.

Second, the overall feasibility of conducting a national EASYRP will depend on the reasonableness of the costs of using the assessment tools and establishing a workable computer interface with the STAR systems. No negotiations have been undertaken to date, but there are no obvious barriers to resolving these issues. Several factors should be considered as part of any discussions with Renaissance Learning. First, the assessments, as retailed, are designed for repeated use throughout a school year to track students' progress with a test-retest-retest process. As part of the EASYRP, the assessments would be used only for a single test per respondent and only during a 2-month data collection period. Second, in order to facilitate recruitment of states and facilities and to enhance youths' investment in their performance, it would be helpful to make the scores available to the facilities for use by their educational programs. To encourage involvement in the assessment by the educational staff, information on the assessments will be provided to the facilities. They will be encouraged to examine the information and use the results. In turn, it would be expected that a subset of participating facilities will purchase the STAR assessments for their own use, recognizing that they would find the tests useful on an ongoing

- Including facility staff in all testing sessions, and
- Protecting the computer settings.

Task 7 would reconvene the EASYRP Advisory Board to solicit input into the field test design. The Advisory Board will be asked to review the protocol developed for administering the survey, the EASYRP itself, and the analysis plan. It will then be asked to provide recommendations on each and discuss policy issues associated with administering the survey and the subsequent findings.

Task 8 would be to implement the field test, using the protocol established as a result of the preceding tasks. Note that some adjustments to the national sampling design would be made to permit the field tests results to be generalized to the selected geographical region.

Task 9 involves analysis of the field test results. Analyzing the data from the field test, would allow the EASYRP team to (1) examine the distribution of responses for interview questions, (2) review scores in relation to current grade-level and percentile rankings, responses on English reading ability, field staff observation, and self-reports on motivation, and (3) consider the utility of the data as measured against a general population of youth.

Findings from this field test would be used to do final revisions on the instrument, instructions, and protocols prior to the national administration of the EASYRP. Findings from the test will also inform the literature on low-stakes testing.

basis. Even during the EASYRP Planning Project tests at a handful of facilities, one facility expressed considerable interest in obtaining the STAR assessments. The extensive exposure that the national EASYRP will provide for the STAR assessments, with the associated opportunity for Renaissance Learning to expand its market, should be an incentive for Renaissance Learning to mitigate the costs of the tests for the EASYRP.

Design of a Field Test. Following negotiations with Renaissance Learning, Westat recommends designing and conducting a broad-based field test prior to finalizing the EASYRP. Based on the lessons learned during the Planning Project, Westat recommends nine tasks for conducting a field test.

Task 1 would involve identifying and developing strategies to improve performance on low-stake tests. Actions taken under this task would include:

- Conduct a literature review to identify such strategies and design the field test to systematically assess their impact. The research-based approaches identified through the literature review should be incorporated into experiments within the field test to determine the differential effects of these approaches/incentives on the performance of youth in residential facilities.

- Conduct three roundtable meetings (approximately 1 day each) with residential facility administrators and education staff and other educators. These meetings could be used to identify incentives available within their facility (e.g., leadership points, recognition awards) to motivate youths to perform well on the assessments and to suggest strategies to ensure buy-in from educational staff. Westat recommends convening these roundtable meetings around the country to maximize the states and facilities providing input, yet keeping the groups small enough to encourage information sharing.

In Task 2, the EASYRP team would develop confidentiality procedures and human subjects protections that ensure the confidentiality of the information provided by the youths through the interview, while at the same time permitting feedback on individual-level scores for the Math and Reading assessments. The team would review procedures used by national educational assessment programs and work with the Institutional Review Board to ensure that the best procedures are developed and tested during the field study.

Task 3 requires identifying the geographic area for the test. For cost purposes, Westat recommends following the model of the SYRP Field Test and recruiting facilities from a compact geographical area. However, candidate areas would need to provide a broad range of circumstances that would be encountered on the national level. Distributions of the youth samples would need to be

examined for their types of facilities and gender and Hispanic ethnicity status. (For more information on the SYRP field test, see *Report on the Field Test.*)[27]

In Task 4 an integrated survey, using computer-assisted technology, would be developed. Based on the negotiations with Renaissance Learning an integrated survey for use during the field test would be developed, using touchscreen or keyboard entry or a combination of both. ACASI programs would be developed for the interview and the assessment instructions. Additionally, as part of the test, questions would be developed to gauge how hard youth tried during the assessment and what influenced their efforts. Factors unique to residential placement will be examined in relation to the approaches. For example, does length of stay impact how hard youth try? Do youth who have been in the facility for less than 48 hours have difficulty taking the assessments at the same time that they are getting used to their new environment?

Task 5 would develop procedures, again using experiences from both the SYRP and national educational assessment programs, to identify youth with limited English proficiency. Findings from both the first national administration of SYRP will provide some guidance for screening youth with significantly limited English proficiency. The EASYRP should also include procedures for asking facilities to identify youth unable to take an English version test similar to those used in NAEP and other national educational tests. Criteria will be provided for facilities to use in making these judgments. The field test will evaluate these procedures and will include screening questions to identify youth with poor English skills. These youths would still be sampled for the EASYRP, but then, based on the screening questions, the excluded youths would be asked a limited number of the EASYRP interview questions to ensure that they can be accurately described in the context of the overall EASYRP sample.

Task 6 requires establishing a complete protocol through which to conduct the field test, incorporating results from the other five tasks as well as procedural changes indicated during the feasibility test to ensure their workability across a larger test group. These additional procedures include:

- Tracking pencils by individuals,
- Tracking interest levels on assessments based on field staff observation (use of scratch paper on the Math assessments, comments during the testing session, questions about the assessments),
- Removing disruptive youth,

---

[27] Westat & National Council on Crime and Delinquency. (2000). *Planning for the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement: Report on the Field Test.* Rockville, MD: Author.

Appendix A

Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria

Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria

Test	Type*	Appropriate Age/Grade Range	Length	Group Administration	Pre-Knowledge of Performance Level	Computerized
STAR Math	M	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	15 mins	Yes	Not needed	Yes
STAR Reading	R	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	10 mins	Yes	Not needed	Yes
Basic Skills Locator Test	B	No, only ages 15+	Possible if no interview (45 mins)	Yes	Not needed	Yes
Test of Academic Performance [TOAP]	B	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	Possible, if very brief interview (20-45 mins)	Yes	Not needed	No
Multilevel Academic Survey Tests [MAST]	B	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	22-30 mins	Yes	Not needed	No
Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement [K-TEA/NU]	B	Yes Ages 6-22	20-30 mins (brief form)	No	Not needed	No
Mini-Battery of Achievement [MBA]	B	Yes Ages 4-90+	30 mins	No	Not needed	No
Test of Word Reading Efficiency [TOWRE]	R	Yes Ages 6-24	5-10 mins	No	Not needed	No
Wide Range Achievement Test-Expanded Edition [WRAT-EXPANDED]	B	Yes Ages 4-24	Too long (80 mins for Reading and Math)	Yes, group administered format available	Not needed	No

* M=Math, R=Reading, B=Both

Meets criterion

Given condition(s), would meet criterion

Fails criterion

Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria (continued)

Test	Type*	Appropriate Age/Grade Range	Length	Group Administration	Pre-Knowledge of Performance Level	Computerized
Reading-Level Indicator	R	No, only through 6th grade reading ability	3-15 mins	Yes	Not needed	No
Gray Silent Reading Tests [GSRT]	R	Yes Ages 7-25	Possible, if very brief math test and no interview (15-30 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Reading Inventory for the Classroom [RIC]	R	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	15-30 mins	No	Not needed	No
Test of Mathematical Abilities-2 [TOMA-2]	M	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (90 mins)	Yes	Not needed	No
Woodcock Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-R [WJ-R]	B	Yes Ages 2-90+	Possible, if no interview (50 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Test of Reading Comprehension 3rd Ed. [TORC-3]	R	No, only age 17 =	Possible, if very brief interview (30 mins)	Yes	Not needed	No
Diagnostic Assessments of Reading [DAR]	R	Yes Ages 6-adult	Possible, if very brief math test and no interview (20-30 minutes)	No	Not needed	No
Assess2Learn	B	No, only grades 1-8	Unknown	Possible, with multiple internet ports	Not needed	Yes, via internet
Gray Oral Reading Test-4th edition [GORT-4]	R	If age 18 norms are applied to older youth	Possible, if very brief math test and no interview (15-30 mins)	No	Not needed	No

* M=Math, R=Reading, B=Both

Meets criterion

Given condition(s), would meet criterion

Fails criterion

Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria (continued)

Test	Type*	Appropriate Age/Grade Range	Length	Group Administration	Pre-Knowledge of Performance Level	Computerized
Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation [GRADE]	R	Yes Ages prek-adult	Too long (45-90 mins)	Yes	Required 11 levels pre-K, K, 1-2, 3, 4-6, middle school, high school and adult	No
Peabody Individual Achievement Test-R [PIAT-R]	B	Yes Ages 5-22	Too long (60 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Slosson Oral Reading Test-Revised [SORT-R]	R	Yes Ages 5-adult	Too long (< 60 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Terra Nova–2	B	Yes Ages 5-25	Too long (1-3 hrs)	Yes	Required different levels for different grades	No
Degrees of Reading Power [DRP]		Yes Grades 1-12+	Too long (< 60 mins)	Yes	Required different levels for different grades	No
Wechsler Individual Achievement Test, 2nd edition (WIAT-II)	B	Yes Ages 6-24	Too long (90-120 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Wide Range Achievement Test-3 [WRAT-3]	B	Yes Ages 7-75	Too long (30-60 mins for reading and sentence subtests)	No, reading subtest is individually administered	Not needed	No
Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery [WDRB]	R	Yes Ages 4-90+	Too long (30-60 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised [WRMT-R]	R	Yes Ages 5-75+	Too long (10-30 mins each for 5 tests)	No	Not needed	No

* M=Math, R=Reading, B=Both

Meets criterion

Given condition(s), would meet criterion

Fails criterion

Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria (continued)

Test	Type*	Appropriate Age/Grade Range	Length	Group Administration	Pre-Knowledge of Performance Level	Computerized
Comprehensive Scales of Student Abilities [CSSA]	B	No; only grades 1-11 (ages 6-16)	5-10 mins per checklist (reading & math)	No	Not needed	No
Kaufman Functional Academic Skills Test [K-FAST]	B	No; only age 15 +	15-25 mins	No	Not needed	No
California Achievement Tests-5th edition [CAT/5] [See Terra Nova-2 for CAT-6]	B	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (600 mins)	Yes	Required: 13 overlapping levels relate to grade ranges	No
Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills [CTBS] [See Terra Nova-2]	B	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (1200 mins)	Yes	Required: 11 levels for the different grades	No
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills [ITBS]	B	Possible in combination with ITED or TAP	Too long (90 mins for Reading, Language and Math subtests)	Yes	Required: 10 levels, vertically scaled	No
Iowa Tests of Educational Development [ITED]	B	Possible in combination with ITBS	Too long (154 mins for Math, Reading, Vocabulary, and Computation)	Yes	Required: 4 levels for grades 9, 10, 11, and 12	No
Metropolitan Achievement Tests-8th Ed.	B	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (600 mins for short form, math & reading only)	Yes	Required: 13 levels for grades K- 12	No
Stanford Achievement Test Series-9th Ed. [SAT 9]	B	If grade 13 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (120 mins)	Yes	Required: Grades 1-8 use 8 SAT levels; grades 9-12 use 3 TASK levels	No

* M=Math, R=Reading, B=Both

Meets criterion

Given condition(s), would meet criterion

Fails criterion

Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria (continued)

Test	Type*	Appropriate Age/Grade Range	Length	Group Administration	Pre-Knowledge of Performance Level	Computerized
Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test, 4th Ed. [SDMT 4]	M	If grade 13 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (85-90 mins)	Yes	Required: Grades 1-13 use 6 levels	No
Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, 4th Ed. [SDRT 4]	R	If grade 13 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (85-90 mins)	Yes	Required: Grades 1-13 use 6 levels	No
Tests of Achievement and Proficiency [TAP]	B	Possible in combination with ITBS	Too long (100 mins)	Yes	Required: different levels for different grades	No
Hammill Multiability Achievement Test [HAMAT]	B	Yes only through age 17	Possible if no interview (30-60 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Progressive Achievement Test of Mathematics-Revised	M	Yes only through age 14	Unknown	Yes	For very broad ranges: Primary, Intermediate, and Secondary class levels	No
Basic Achievement Skills Individual Screener [BASIS]	B	Yes: Grades 1-12 and post high school	Too long (<60 mins)	No	Required: Material grouped by grade-referenced clusters	No
Diagnostic Achievement Battery [DAB3]	B	Yes only through age 14	Too long (120 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Diagnostic Achievement Test for Adolescents [DATA-2]	B	Yes only grade 7 - (ages 12-14)	Too long (60-120 mins)	No	Not needed	No
Educational Development Series	B	Yes only grade 9 - (age 14)	Unknown	Unknown	Not needed	No

* M=Math, R=Reading, B=Both

Meets criterion

Given condition(s), would meet criterion

Fails criterion

Evaluation of Educational Assessment Instruments Against EASYRP Criteria (continued)

Test	Type*	Appropriate Age/Grade Range	Length	Group Administration	Pre-Knowledge of Performance Level	Computerized
SRA Reading and Arithmetic Levels [RAI]	B	No, only age 15+	Unknown	Unknown	Not needed	No
Standardized Reading Inventory-2nd edition [SRI-2]	R	No, only through 8th grade	Unknown	No	Not needed	No
GOALS: Language	B	If grade 12 norms are applied to older youth	Too long (60+ mins)	No	Unknown	No

* M=Math, R=Reading, B=Both

Meets criterion

Given condition(s), would meet criterion

Fails criterion

Appendix B

Revised EASYRP Interview

EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT SURVEY OF YOUTH IN RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT (EASYRP)

REVISED INTERVIEW BASED ON TH E FEASIBILITY TEST

Prepared Under
Cooperative Agreement Award No. 98-JB-VX-K002

Submitted

By

Westat
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

And

National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD)
1970 Broadway, #500
Oakland, CA 94612

June 28, 2002

A. Demographics

A1. Are you male or female? (SYRP, A1)

Male 1
Female 2

A2. What is your date of birth?

_____/_____/_____
Month/ Day / Year

A3. Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino? (SYRP, A2)

Yes 1
No 2

IF A3=1, GO TO A3a. ELSE GO TO A4.

A3a. You said you are Spanish, Hispanic or Latino. Which of the following are you? You may choose more than one answer. (SYRP)

Mexican, Mexican American or Chicano 1
Puerto Rican 2
Cuban 3
Other 4

A4. What is your race? You may choose more than one answer. (SYRP, A3)

White 1
Black or African American 2
American Indian or Alaska Native 3
Asian 4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander 5
Other 6

IF A4=4, GO TO A4a. ELSE GO TO A5.

A4a. You said you are Asian. Which of the following are you? You may choose more than one answer. (SYRP)

Asian Indian	1
Chinese	2
Filipino	3
Japanese	4
Korean	5
Vietnamese	6
Other	7

IF A7=1, GO TO A7a. IF A7=2 AND A2≤15, GO TO B2. ELSE GO TO B1.

A5. When did you come to this facility for your present stay? Please enter the month and year. (SYRP, A5)

_____ / _____
Month Year

IF A5 IS SKIPPED, AND REASON IS "DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER", GO TO A6. IF A5 IS ANSWERED AND A2 ≤ 15, GO TO B2. IF A5 IS ANSWERED AND A >15, GO TO B1.

A6. Please make your best guess as to the month and year that you came here. (SYRP, A6)

_____ / _____
Month Year

A7. Were you in a facility before coming here? (SYRP, C31)

Yes	1
No	2

A7a. When were you first taken into custody for the crime(s) that led to your stay here? Please enter the month and year. (SYRP, CE0320)

_____ / _____
Month Year

IF A2 ≤ 15, GO TO B2, ELSE GO TO B1.

B. Enrollment in School

B1. At the time you were taken into custody for your present stay had you graduated from high school or gotten your GED?[27] (NEW)

Yes 1
No 2

IF B1=2, GO TO B1a, ELSE GO TO B2.

B1a. Since you were taken into custody,[28] have you graduated from high school or received your GED? (SYRP, G3)

Yes 1
No 2

IF B1=1 OR B1a=1, GO TO B3, ELSE GO TO B2.

B2. At the time you were taken into custody for your present stay were you enrolled[29] in school? (SYRP, C47 [revised = new C33])

Yes 1
No 2

IF B2=2, GO TO B2a, ELSE GO TO B2f.

B2a. Why weren't you enrolled in school? You may choose more than one answer. (SYRP, C48 [new C34])

School was not in session (summer, holidays)..... 1
I dropped out of school 2
I was expelled 3
I was suspended 4
Other 5

---

[27] GED (General Education Diploma) is a diploma similar to a high school diploma. You get it by passing a test on high school work. Usually people take this test because they dropped out of school and didn't graduate.

[28] Facility means the place where you are living right now.

[29] Enrolled means signed up to go to school.

B2b. The last time you were enrolled in school, w hat type of school were you in?

Public school..... 1
Private school 2
Charter school..... 3
Home schooling 4

IF B2b=4, GO TO B2c, ELSE GO TO B2d.

B2c. Please enter your grade level for math and reading.

Math |__|__| Reading |__|__|

GO TO B2e.

B2d. The last time you were enrolled in school, what grade were you in? Please enter a number. (SYRP, new C35)

|__|__|

B2e. When were you last enrolled in school? Please enter the month and year.

_____ / _____
Month Year

IF B2=2 AND A2 ≥14, GO TO B4. IF B2=2 AND A2 ≤ 13, GO TO B5.

B2f. What type of school were you in?

Public school..... 1
Private school 2
Charter school..... 3
Home schooling 4

IF B2f=4, GO TO B2g, ELSE GO TO B2h.

B2g. Please enter your grade level for math and reading.

Math |__|__| Reading |__|__|

GO TO B2i.

B2h. What grade were you in? Please enter a number. (SYRP, C35)

|__|__|

B2i. How many hours per day were you required to spend in school when you were last enrolled in school? (SYRP, G2a)

From ___:___ am/pm To ___:___ am/pm

IF B2=2 AND A2 ≥14, GO TO B4. IF B2=2 AND A2 ≤ 13, GO TO B5.

B3. At the time you were taken into custody for your present stay were you enrolled in college classes or a technical or vocational school? (SYRP, C47 [revised = new C33])

Yes	1
No	2

IF B3=2, GO TO B3a, ELSE GO TO B3b.

B3a. Why weren't you enrolled in school? You may choose more than one answer. (SYRP, C48 [new C34])

Not interested in additional schooling	1
Couldn't get into school	2
School was not in session	3
I had a job	4
I was married	5
I had children	6
(FOR FEMALES) I was pregnant	7
Health reasons	8
Other	9

B3b. At that time when taken into custody for present stay how many years of college or technical school had you completed? (NEW)

None	1
Less than 1 year	2
1 year	3
More than 1 year	4

B4. Have you EVER dropped out of school? (Gang, I-7a)

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	3
No response	4

IF B4=1, GO TO B4a, ELSE GO TO B5.

B4a. Here are some reasons other people have given for dropping out of school. Which of these, would you say, applied to you? (HSB, FD12) Please mark all that apply.

I was expelled or suspended	1
I got married (or planned to get married)	2
(FOR FEMALES ONLY) I was pregnant	3
I had children	4
I got a job	5
School was not for me, I did not like school	6
School grounds were too dangerous	7
My friends were dropping out	8
I was sick or have a disability	9
I couldn't get along with teachers or other students	10
I ran away from home/on the run	11
None of the above	12

B5. Were you EVER suspended or expelled from school? (NCCD, 28)

Yes	1
No	2

B6. Were you EVER transferred to another school for disciplinary reasons?[30] (Revised NELS-88)

Yes	1
No	2

C. Education Program

C1. Have you EVER been in any of the following kinds of courses or programs in school? (Revised NELS-88, 13) Please mark all that apply.

College courses given in high school	1	Exclude for A2≤13
Program to get students to stay-in-school/to prevent dropouts	2	
Job training program	3	Exclude for A2≤13
Program for students who grew up speaking another language besides English (ESL, ESOL)	4	
Special help classes or tutoring in reading, grammar, and writing	5	
Special help classes or tutoring in math	6	
Gifted or talented programs for students who do well in school	7	
GED[31] preparation	8	Exclude for A2≤13
GED[5] testing	9	Exclude for A2≤13
College course given in college	10	Exclude for A2≤13
None of the above programs	11	

[30] For disciplinary reasons means as punishment for your misbehavior, such as for acting up in school, or for doing something against the rules.

[31] GED (General Education Diploma) is a diploma similar to a high school diploma. You get it by passing a test on high school work. Usually people take this test because they dropped out of school and didn't graduate.

IF C1=11, GO TO C3, ELSE GO TO C2.

C2. When did you take [ask only of C1 programs marked]? Please mark all that apply. (NEW)

	Before coming to this facility	While in this facility
College courses given in high school	1	2
Program to get students to stay-in-school/to prevent dropouts	1	2
Job training program	1	2
Program for students who grew up speaking another language besides English (ESL, ESOL)	1	2
Special help classes or tutoring in reading, grammar, and writing	1	2
Special help classes or tutoring in math	1	2
Gifted or talented programs for students who do well in school	1	2
GED[5] preparation	1	2
GED[5] testing	1	2
College course given in college	1	2
None of the above programs	1	2

C3. Did you EVER participate in any special educational programs for behavior problems? (NEW)

Yes	1
No	2

IF C3=1, GO TO C3a, ELSE GO TO C4.

C3a. What problems were targeted by these programs? Please mark all that apply.

Behavior or emotional problems (anger, bad attitude)	1
Drug or alcohol abuse	2
Gang activity	3
Other	4

C3b. When did you receive special education programs for behavior problems? Please mark all that apply.

Before coming to this facility	1
While in this facility	2

[5] GED (General Education Diploma) is a diploma similar to a high school diploma. You get it by passing a test on high school work. Usually people take this test because they dropped out of school and didn't graduate.

C4. Did you EVER participate in any special education programs for learning or physical problems (such as speech therapy)? (Revised NCCD, 26)

Yes	1
No	2

IF C4=1, GO TO C4a, ELSE GO TO C5.

C4a. What problems were targeted by these programs? Please mark all that apply.

Speech problems/difficulties	1
Learning problems/difficulties	2
Hearing or seeing problems	3
Physical problems	4
Other problems	5

C4b. How were the services provided? Please mark all that apply. (Revised NCCD, 25)

Taught in a separate class	1
Taught in a separate school	2
Given accommodations[32] (or special arrangements) on tests	3
Given individual instruction in a regular class	4
Tutored in individual sessions outside of my regular class	5
Given therapy[33] in individual sessions outside of my regular class	6
Given other special help	7

C4c. When did you receive special education programs for learning or physical problems? Please mark all that apply.

Before coming to this facility	1
While in this facility	2

Now we want to ask you some questions about your educational program since you came to this facility for your current stay.

C5. Since coming to this facility, have you been attending school? (SYRP, G1)

Yes	1
No	2

IF C5=1 AND B1 OR B1a=1, GO TO C5c
IF C5=1 AND B1 AND B1a=2, GO TO C5b
IF C5=2, GO TO C5a

[32] Accommodations include given extra time on tests, given oral instructions, and/or having questions read aloud to you.

[33] Therapy includes treatment programs with teachers or specialists to work on individual problems, such as sessions to improve speech or physical movement, anger management, etc.

C5a. Why have you not been attending school during your stay here? (NEW)

I have only been here a short while	1	
School conflicts with facility requirements (court appearances, lock up, counseling)	2	
I'm not interested in additional schooling	3	
They don't offer any college programs	4	Not for B1=2 or B1a=2
They don't offer any vocational programs	5	
Some other reason	6	

IF C5=2, GO TO D1.

C5b. What grade are you in? |___|___|

C5c. Since coming to this facility, circle the reasons that have caused you to miss class (Revised NorD, 12b) Indicate all that apply.

I never missed class	1
Sick, doctor visit	2
Court appearance	3
Lock-up	4
Counseling	5
Work program/community service	6
No reason	7
Other	8

C5d. How many hours per day do you normally spend in school since coming to this facility? (SYRP, G2a)

From ___:___ am/pm To ___:___ am/pm

IFA5 OR A6 ≥30 days, GO TO C5d, ELSE GO TO D1.

C5e. Which of the following is true about this facility? You may choose more than one answer.

School in facility is better than outside	1	
Teachers here care about how the student is doing	2	
Teachers here help you learn	3	
Teachers here check your work	4	
There are no college-level classes	5	Not for B1=2 or B1a=2
They give you no choice but to go to school or stay in room	6	
School here is worse than my regular school	7	
None of the above	8	

IF B1=1, GO TO D2, ELSE GO TO D1.

D. Academic Performance, Capabilities, and Problems

Now, I would like to ask you about before you came to this facility,

D1. During the last semester[34] you attended school before coming to this facility, were your course grades mostly: (NIESS, STDQ51)

High (mostly A's)	1
About average (mostly B's)	2
Average (mostly C's)	3
Below average (mostly D's)	4
Low (mostly E's or F's)	5

D2. How would you rate your ability to do math? (NCCD, 21)

Well above average	1
Slightly above average	2
Average	3
Slightly below average	4
Well below average	5

D3. How would you rate your reading ability? (NIESS, STDQ53)

Well above average	1
Slightly above average	2
Average	3
Slightly below average	4
Well below average	5

D4. Have you ever had to repeat a grade in school? (MTF, C22)

No	1
Yes, one time	2
Yes, two or more times	3

IF D4=2 OR 3, GO TO D4a, ELSE GO TO E1.

D4a. What are the reasons you repeated a grade? (Revised CASI-J, 5) Please mark all that apply.

Poor grades	1
Poor attendance	2
Other	3

[34] The school session you were in when you were taken into custody. If taken into custody during the summer, the last school session in which you attended school.

IF B1 OR B1a=1, GO TO F1, ELSE GO TO E1.

E. Truancy/Absenteeism

Please answer the next questions about problems you may have had in the LAST SEMESTER[35] you attended school before coming to this facility.

E1. How many times did you skip school in the last semester? (At-Risk, 32)

Never	1
1-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-15 times	4
16 times or more	5

IF E1=1, GO TO F1, ELSE GO TO E2.

E2. How many of these times were because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school? (MTF, A16)

0 times	1
1 time	2
2 or 3 times	3
4 or more times	4

F. Youth Attitudes

F1. How important do you think the things you are learning in school are going to be after you leave school? (KYIP, 16)

Very important	1
Somewhat important	2
Fairly unimportant	3
Completely unimportant	4

[35] The school session you were in when you were taken into custody. If taken into custody during the summer, the last school session in which you attended school.

F2. How important is getting good grades to you personally? (RYS, Sec A: I-14)

Very important	1
Somewhat important	2
Fairly unimportant	3
Completely unimportant	4

F3. Which of these things do you think is the MOST important thing that you can get out of school? Choose one response only. (Revised RYS, Sec A: I-11)

Job training	1
Skills in subjects like English and Math	2
Ability to think clearly	3
A diploma	4
Skills needed to succeed after high school	5
Social skills	6
None of the above	7

G. Bilingualism

G1. Was English the first language you spoke while growing up? (HSB, FY12)

Yes	1
No	2

G2. Is English the main language spoken in your home? (NEW)

Yes	1
No	2

IF G1 OR G2=2, GO TO G2a, ELSE GO TO H1.

G2a How would you rate your ability to speak English? (New)

Strong	1
Fair	2
Poor	3

G2b. How would you rate your ability to read and write in English? (NEW)

Strong	1
Fair	2
Poor	3

H. Expectations and Goals

H1. If you could go as far as you wanted to in school, how far would you go? (SYRP, L2)

8th grade or less	1	Not for B1=1 or B1a=1
Grade 9-11	2	Not for B1=1 or B1a=1
Graduate from high school	3	Not for B1=1 or B1a=1
Technical school	4	
Some college	5	
Graduate from College	6	
Graduate school, medical school, or law school	7	
Other	8	

H2. How far do you think you actually will go? (SYRP, L3)

8th grade or less	1	Not for B1=1 or B1a=1
Grade 9-11	2	Not for B1=1 or B1a=1
Graduate from high school	3	Not for B1=1 or B1a=1
Technical school	4	
Some college	5	
Graduate from College	6	
Graduate school, medical school, or law school	7	
Other	8	

H3. What might stop you from completing more school? You may select more than one reason. (SYRP, L4)

Not interested in school	1
Financial problems	2
Transportation problems	3
Must work full time	4
Schoolwork is too difficult	5
Can't get into school	6
Health reasons	7
Family responsibilities	8
Problems with drugs or the law	9
Other	10
None of the above	95

I. Other School Factors

I1. Of all the teachers you have known, how many have you liked? Would you, say.... (Revised COMM-Albany, 12(18))

Almost all	1
Many	2
A few	3
None	4

I2. How many of your teachers seem to care about how well you do in school? (RYS, Sec A: II-21)

Almost all	1
Many	2
A few	3
None	4

I3. Have your teachers ever told you that you are smart enough to go on to college or university? (Revised FCQ, 33)

Yes	1
No	2

I4. Have you ever been picked on for being a "goodie goodie," for doing well in school? (Revised FCQ, 13)

Yes	1
No	2

I5. How much do you care what your parents think about your school work and completing school?

A lot	1
Some	2
Very little	3

IF B1=1 OR B1A=1, GO TO I7, ELSE GO TO I6.

I6. Would your parents be upset if you left school before you completed high school or got your GED? (Revised FCQ, 16-17)

Yes	1
No	2

END OF INTERVIEW

I7. Would your parents have been upset if you had left school before you completed high school or got your GED? (Revised FCQ, 16-17)

Yes 1
No 2

END OF INTERVIEW