

Institutional Education Structure & Accountability Advisory Group Meeting

9 am – 10:30 am
February 10, 2022
Zoom

Meeting Participants

Institutional Education Planning and Facilitation Team Members Present:

Ada Daniels, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, (OSPI), Cara Patrick, Emmelia Wargacki (OSPI), Haley Lowe (Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF), Mary Sprute (DCYF), Elizabeth Thorkildsen (DCYF), Mary Kay Dugan (American Institutes for Research (AIR), Simon Gonsoulin (AIR), Juliet Wu (AIR), Iliana Brodziak de los Reyes (AIR), Scott Houghton (AIR) Shoshana Rabinovsky (AIR), and Deanna Hoskins (JustLeadershipUSA)

Washington State Legislature Present:

Zach Hall, Legislative Aide to Representative Callan

Advisory Group Members Present:

Jinju Park (Senior Education Ombud)*
James Miles (Executive Director MENTOR WA)*
Neaners aka Jose Garcia (Second Chance Outreach, Hope for Homes)* Linda Drake (Director of Career and College Readiness Initiatives)*
Kristi Sigafos (Quality Improvement Director, Child Study & Treatment Center)* Matt Zuvich (Washington Federation of State Employees)*
Jennie Marshall (Detention Manager of Spokane County Juvenile Court)*
Jeff Allen (Director of Youth Services, Olympic ESD 114 Bremerton)
Cal Brodie (Deputy Superintendent ESD 113)
Alice Coil (Deputy Director of Office of Juvenile Justice) Arthur Dennis (Education Advocate Director)
Karen Pillar (Director of Policy and Advocacy, Team Child)
Kristin Schutte (Executive Director of Student Services and Support ESD 114)
Chris Simonsmeier (Clark County Juvenile Court Administrator)
Tim Touhey (Principal of Green Hill School in Chehalis Carolyn Watkins (Principal of Oakridge Community Facility)

**Indicates Legislatively Appointed Advisory Group Members*

Additional Participants Present:

Felice Upton, Becky McLean, Larry Gardner, Barret Daniels, Andrea Downs, Alice Palosaari, Seema Bahl, Liza Hartlyn, Lyn Ray, Laura Mendoza, Gerdon Jones, Terry Ellis-Manning

Public Attendees Present:

Cynthia Hollimon, Peggy Carlson

Meeting Agenda

Time	Activity	Speaker/Facilitator
9:00 AM – 9:10 AM	Review of Agenda & Ice Breaker	Mary Kay Dugan, AIR
9:10 AM – 9:15 AM	Advisory Group Update	Mary Kay Dugan, AIR
9:15 AM – 9:20 AM	Youth Advisory Group	DeAnna Hoskins, Just Leadership
9:20 AM – 9:25 AM	TWG 1 Report Out & Discussion	Simon Gonsoulin, AIR
9:25 AM – 9:35 AM	Topic: State Models for Institutional Education	Simon Gonsoulin, AIR
9:35 AM – 10:15 AM	Group Discussion Models for IE TWG 1 Comments Youth Advisory Group Feedback	Simon Gonsoulin & Mary Kay Dugan, AIR
10:15 AM – 10:20	Public Comment	Mary Kay Dugan, AIR
10:20 AM – 10:30	Wrap Up & Next Steps	Mary Kay Dugan, AIR

Meeting Notes

Review of Agenda & Ice Breaker – Mary Kay Dugan (AIR)

- Welcome and Review of Agenda
- Meeting Guidelines
- Trial Land Acknowledgement
- Icebreaker Activity

Advisory Group Update – Mary Kay Dugan (AIR)

- Two Advisory Group Meetings have been held (October and November 2021)
- Launched the Technical Working Groups (November for all three TWGs and TWG 1 in January 2022)
- Submitted the Interim Report to the Legislature in December 2021
<https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/communications/2021docs/12-21-Improving-Institutional-Education-Outcomes-Interim-Status-Report.pdf>
- Begun working on coordination with Echo Glen and Green Hill on a Youth Advisory Group
- Working closely with Representative Callan to brief her on the work

Youth Advisory Group Update – Deanna Hoskins (JustLeadershipUSA)

- Purpose of Youth Advisory Group is to incorporate their voice in the work of House Bill 1295. We do not want youth to feel like they are a token participant in this important work.
- What is important to JustLeadershipUSA is that individuals come in with different types of traumas and we want to make sure there is a very diverse set of voices at the table.
- Focusing on youth that have not had a chance to participate in leadership work. We want to allow the youth to become advocates for themselves.
- We will select 8 youth total (4 from Echo Glen and 4 from Green Hill) girls and boys.
- Youth will work with Just Leadership USA and the work will be coordinated as part of a class.
- Youth will receive a certificate of completion from Just Leadership USA.
- Youth will participate for the first time in the April Advisory Group Meeting and continue with monthly activities until December 2022.
- Youth will contribute to the final report to the legislature.

TWG 1 Report Out and Discussion – Simon Gonsoulin (AIR)

- TWG 1 met In January
- Mastery-Based Learning (ALL Members Positive on MBL Approach)
- Key themes discussed:
 - Individual student competency-based/standards-based
 - Instructor supports/instructor as facilitator
 - Measurable
 - Timebound by student/student-centered
 - Values student experience/culture
 - Recognizes/credits experiential learning (e.g., WBL)
- Implementation Recommendations for Mastery-Based Learning:
 - Assessments
 - Timely Data/records
 - Student Plan
 - Teacher PD/staff to support
 - Engage youth/positive
 - Credit/transcript analysis
 - Quality Monitoring
- Organizational Structure
 - Build collective culture of valuing education in facilities (co-training of staff, buy- in, organizational change management)
 - Shift entire state to mastery-based learning
 - Recognize different facility types (LT/ST and different resources available and possibility to share resources across institutions)

State Models for Institutional Education – Simon Gonsoulin (AIR)

- AIR conducted some research and spoke to people from 5 different states to ask: administratively how is Institutional Education organized? How is it funded? All of these states received Title I part D.
- Massachusetts
 - State operated secure, detention, and community-based education is under one line item in the DYS budget and contracted out to the Collaborative for Educational Services based in Northampton, MA
 - Approximately 120 teachers and 60 teacher coordinators
 - Integrated student information system (ASPEN)
 - Education and Career Cluster staff (like your EAs but focus across all disciplines for reentry)
 - Education is contracted out to a third party that works cooperatively

with DYS and LEA

- Utah
 - Funding line item in the state legislature that is sent on to Utah DJJ as a set aside for institutional education--includes state operated secure, detention and community-based education
 - Delivery of educational services is by LEA—total of 26 LEAs provide education for IE—funding flows to LEA from DJJ (paid twice per year)
 - 26 LEAs must submit a budget each year and the allocation is based on their submitted budgets with justification.
 - Post-secondary education funded out of DJJ's budget
- Arizona
 - Trifurcated system—JJ secure state operated under the state JJ system; detention education under the AZ Supreme Court; community based operated by the LEA in which the facility is located
 - All detention education schools are accredited like all public schools in the state; all credits and grades must be accepted by LEAs
- Nebraska
 - Trifurcated like AZ
 - Rule 10—state law that addresses educational needs of long-term state operated institutional education
 - Rule 18—state law that addresses education in detention
 - Funding all based on child count. Detention can justify the need for more money and typically does receive it
- Kentucky
 - Majority of educational services are provided through a contract between KDJJ and the local school district (36 in number)
 - Contracts have no monetary components--based on child count submitted by LEA
 - KDJJ has 5 educational staff members at central office who provide PD and monitoring
 - Seems to be a true partnership across KDJJ, KDOE, and LEAs involved (monitoring, PD, integration of supports and services—agencies all see children as their students
 - Kentucky Education Collaborative for State Agency Children (many non-profits) provide funding for one month of school during summer months
- AIR noted that we are happy to take a look at other states as well.

Advisory Group Discussion - All

- *Question:* AG Member asked if the question of “How do states measure educational outcomes of the students they serve” was asked? Elements of 1295 also include how administrative model is tailored across different populations.
Response: This question was not asked in detail.
- *Comment:* It would be interesting to look at outcomes in relation to these models. Are there some of these models delivering that are delivering better outcomes for youth? How are their outcomes looking like in terms of education progress or recidivism? *Response:* Massachusetts publishes an annual education report to the legislature and to the public. The report is accessible here: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/dys-fy20-comprehensive-education-partnership-report/download>
- *Question:* Were there any trends or differences between long-term secure facilities vs detention centers in educational model. Differences in funding?
Response: Yes, learned about this primarily from that states that have trifurcated systems. For example, detention centers run by the Arizona Supreme Court, part of this is dealing with leadership of the school. All schools accredited by AZ department of education. A difference between long term secure education and detention education is you don’t know how long that you will have the youth. Detention education’s major focus is to get students involved in the 4 core areas of instruction and get them reengaged in school. So many youths who enter detention have been suspended, expelled, or simply stopped attending school at time of arrest – critical to get them committed to school again. And to get educational background of kids. Wherever youngster goes to next, if you can pull together educational history for them, it will improve outcomes at next level of justice involvement.
- *Comment:* Noted that the most comparable state in terms of organizational structure is Utah. Massachusetts is fairly comparable, but their JR has more reach. Arizona and Kentucky are different than WA in size/structure/culture.
- *Comment:* Interested in examining the funding and looking at a new formula, maybe similar to Massachusetts. WA should consider safety net funding. Current model in WA is based on count and there are shortfalls. Having a safety net would lift the burden off of any one agency and make sure funding is available when needed. Hope we consider this piece.
- *Comment:* Utah and Massachusetts both said they had adequate funding for educational programming. The have a line item and know it’s there and that it

won't be tampered with.

- *Comment:* Utah talks a lot about their approach to education and how much they have brought in trauma-informed care into the model.
- *Comment:* Suggested that we look at the point/place that needs the most help so that everything else in the system is set. As we go forward, we should look at how detention centers work. This is the most critical point. Often time we need to strike when iron is hot to get kids engaged. Difference between JR and detention is that it's not even the same game – so different.
- *Comment:* Every student in JR had a path through a detention center.
- *Comment:* A participant wanted to shed some light on Utah as it relates to detention. They were really limiting the number of young people that qualify to be at a detention center for any amount of time. They were also really limiting length of stay. It had to be a pretty severe violent charge for them to stay longer than a couple of days. The populations at the detention centers were declining pretty rapidly because of this emphasis/policy. Therefore, the education piece was really tricky. The amount of time that they were in detention center with a teacher was very limited. Seeing kids for a couple days at a time only.
- *Comment:* It was noted that nationally that's the trend. Oklahoma has zero young women in secure care right now.
- *Comment:* It was noted that additional information that would be helpful to have from other states is what changes in IE are they considering? What are they doing moving forward?
- *Comment:* Sometimes when we compare states, many of these states work on one budget/one system for everyone rather than "every detention in every district." So, this is a difficult comparison. Utah is the most similarly situated in terms of separation. Oregon has an interesting relationship that is mutually beneficial and similar to how we are structured with counties being part of their own system as well as own JR. Child welfare under umbrella as well. *Comment:* It was noted that transitioning from Echo Glen to schools in communities is a challenge. Difficult to get the kid to school because of paperwork not being processed. In the time that the youth are released from the facility and waiting for school, the kid may relapse. Important to communicate to schools that they need to prioritize the children involved in justice system. Transitions are very important to success of the student.
- *Comment:* A lot of times, the school districts don't want the Institutional Education kids back in their districts. OSPI is doing a lot of work on this. Working on section 9 transition. Ada gets to work with other 49 states in the US and Washington is one of the top-ranking ones. We will improve but we're not the

worst state. Even though we need to get better, people look to our state. Need more resources

- *Comment/Question:* Should we consider doing journey mapping for students transitioning from local detention and state confinement?" Many members thought this was a great idea.
- *Comment:* Since the relationship with institutional staff and faculty in our institutions is so dependent on one another, I am wondering if there are any funding models which recognize that in other states." *Response:* The funding buckets for staff are in different
- places, not one place. When there aren't enough staff and teachers, it affects the students. One big bucket of money vs. different buckets is how the systems are set up.
- *Comment:* It was noted that maybe only one TWG meeting for funding is not enough time. If this group recommends a different funding model than what we currently have, legislature will expect examples of other states.
- *Comment* The Institutional Education team is working on funding, and we will be working closely with those groups. Will make sure that the information gets distributed. We have been talking to Rep. Callan about funding already. We will set up additional meetings if we feel we need more time.
- *Comment:* We in WA are working with an old funding model but we are doing a lot of behind-the-scenes work. Rep. Callan knows it's an old funding model. Working to make sure Advisory Group agrees with the work being done.

Public Comment – Mary Kay Dugan (AIR)

- Noted that members of the public may join the Advisory Group Meetings. The OSPI website has a form to complete if you wish to join as a member of the public. Two individuals from the public joined the call.

Next Steps – Mary Kay Dugan (AIR)

- A survey and comment form will be sent out after this meeting, along with notes and slides.
- We have a Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting scheduled for 11am today to talk about special education.
- The next TWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 10th, 9am–12pm. This will focus on the topic of System Performance and Education Outcomes.
- The next Advisory Group meeting is April 14, 2022, 9am–12pm PT. Youth Advisory Group Members will join this meeting.