

2001-2002 SANTA CLARA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

REVIEW INTO AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH THE 1997 COURT ORDER CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF STUDENTS IN COURT SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

For several years, prior to a 1997 court order, there were serious concerns expressed by local leaders and agencies about the quality of educational services provided to children in Santa Clara County Juvenile Hall, the ranch schools and the children's shelter.

The Santa Clara County Probation Department is required by law (WIC 850 et seq.) to manage and control the juvenile hall and ranch facilities, which house detained wards of the court. The Santa Clara County Office of Education (COE) is required by law (Ed. Code 48645.2) to provide academic services for all students in these county institutions.

In 1997, Judges Thomas Edwards and Leonard Edwards issued a court order regarding the needs of students in court schools. Subsequently the 1999-2000 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury investigated the status of compliance to the court order and issued a report titled An Investigation Into Agency Compliance With A Court Order Concerning Educational Needs of Students In Court Schools. This report described the Grand Jury's investigation of the agencies whose operations are relevant to the 1997 court order (Attachment 1):

The court finds that there is an urgent need for the Juvenile Court, the Probation Department and the schools within Santa Clara County to confer and collaborate for the purpose of assessing the educational needs of children placed under the care of the court and for ensuring that those children's educational needs are effectively addressed.

The report described the two-year effort of the agencies to comply with the order. It concluded with 15 recommendations to the various agencies and departments.

In 1998 a joint task force (JTF) convened by court order to address critical educational needs of students in court schools. From September 2001 through February 2002 the 2001-2002 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury conducted an inquiry to determine if the COE, in cooperation with its partner agencies, had made any progress in achieving the goals established by the JTF. In addition the Grand Jury sought to determine the current status of the actions described in the responses to the 1999-2000 report.

Penal Codes 925 and 933.5 give the Grand Jury the authority to conduct an inquiry in this area.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of the JTF, made up of representatives from the participating agencies, was to establish goals, objectives and timelines, so that the court wards receive an appropriate education. A three-level joint governance structure was established: site teams, system-wide teams and an executive team. This joint governance structure continues to convene and work on a system-wide, comprehensive action plan with dates extending out to September of 2002.

The Grand Jury visited each court school twice:

- Osborne School (Juvenile Hall)
- McKenna School (Children's Shelter)
- Ranch schools (Muriel Wright, Harold Holden and William F. James Boy's Ranch)

The Grand Jury spoke with the presiding judge of the juvenile court and interviewed the county superintendent of schools, an assistant superintendent, the director of alternative programs, court school principals, and many of the teachers. The Grand Jury met separately with two members of the county board of supervisors, the deputy chief of probation, the director of the children's

shelter and also with the juvenile justice commission. Additionally, the Grand Jury observed three site team meetings that were an outgrowth of the JTF.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (Attachment 2) was developed between the COE and the county. The purpose of the MOU is to delineate the roles of the participating parties to promote effective working relationships and enhance services provided to youth in court schools.

FACTS and FINDINGS

The 2001-2002 Grand Jury reviewed responses to the 1999-2000 Grand Jury report to ascertain the progress being made toward meeting the educational needs of children placed under the care of the court. In a letter, dated September 20, 2000, four agencies submitted the responses to the 1999-2000 report: COE, juvenile probation department; department of family and children's services, which is under the auspices of the social services agency; and the mental health department. Each 1999-2000 Grand Jury recommendation and agency response is quoted in the box. It is then followed with supporting facts collected by the 2001-2002 Grand Jury and the jury's finding.

That the Board of Education and the Board of Supervisors: Require the Joint Task Force on Educational Programs in Institutional Schools to report more frequently and at pre-defined intervals.

RESPONSE:

We agree that regular and frequent communication is important and that the Task Force will comply with the reporting schedule identified in the Memorandum of Understanding as adopted by both Boards.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Acquired Facts:

Interviews with two county supervisors, COE staff and probation staff confirmed that the JTF had delegated its role to a 12-member governance subcommittee. The MOU between the COE and county describes the current three-level governance structure used to accomplish the goals of the court order:

1. Site team at each location

The site teams have responsibility for overseeing the services delivered at a particular site, including the resolution of any issue that may arise. Members of a site team are selected by the staff at each site, along with the system-wide team. Site teams meet monthly, or more frequently if necessary.

2. System-wide team

The system-wide team provides operational direction and program accountability for the various sites, services, disciplines and agencies providing programs in juvenile hall and the ranches. The system-wide team includes the director of the alternative schools department, director of special education, deputy chiefs of probation for juvenile services and juvenile detention, deputy director of mental health, and deputy director of the department of drug and alcohol services. Members meet bimonthly at a minimum, or more frequently if needed.

3. Executive team

The executive team provides policy direction for institutional programs and monitors the implementation of the MOU, as well as a multi-year action plan. The executive team consists of the assistant superintendent of student services, chief probation officer and a deputy county executive. The executive team meets quarterly, or more frequently as necessary.

The current reporting process and schedule referenced in the response are defined on page five of the MOU: “The Site Teams shall provide periodic status reports to the System-Wide Teams. The Executive Team shall also prepare quarterly reports to the Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Juvenile Court and/or appropriate standing committees.”

The three-level governance structure meetings provide the boards with status reports.

The executive team has developed an attitude of collaboration and cooperation among the major agencies after nearly two years of contentious meetings, including agency territorial disputes and personal verbal attacks. As an example, for several years the students in the ranch schools attended school every other day. The COE had argued since

1997 that this is an educationally unsound practice and the dialogue between COE and probation on this point has been described by all parties as contentious. This concern was eventually resolved. As of November 2001, all students at the ranch schools attend school on a daily basis.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #1:

The reporting requirements to the boards are satisfied through the three-level governance structure meeting status reports. The JTF no longer functions as an entity.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 2

Appropriately inform responsible parties of performance evaluation consequences for delays in meeting strategies.

RESPONSE:

We agree that the appropriate staff will be held accountable for meeting the strategies. Responsible parties are informed negative delays impact their annual performance evaluations.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

Each site has developed a work plan that identifies specific action items, person(s) responsible, and a completion date. These work plans are reviewed at each site team's monthly meeting, progress reports are made, and solutions to problems are discussed. Within COE, job performance ratings for teachers, site administrators and county administrators include accountability goals stated in the work plan.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #2:

Although this recommendation was addressed to the board of education and board of supervisors, the responsible parties held accountable appear to be staff-level individuals. Individual teachers, site administrators and county administrators are evaluated for their efforts to assist in the development and implementation of site-specific strategies during their annual performance evaluations.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 3:

Collaboratively identify and provide additional resources adequate to maintain timelines should such action be deemed necessary in their view to comply with the “urgent need” qualifier of the Court Order.

RESPONSE:

Both Boards have responded to the “urgent need” qualifier of the Court Order and have allocated additional resources to meet the critical needs of youth in institutions.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Acquired Facts:

Schools located at juvenile hall, the ranches and the children’s shelter have developed goals, strategies and timelines to meet the unique educational needs of children placed under their care. Among the five sites, 83 strategies have been developed. Information from the system-wide team indicates 61 strategies were completed by March 31, 2001. Other strategies are in progress and expect to be completed by September 2002. The board of education and the board of supervisors are working in a collaborative manner to provide needed

staff, instructional materials and other support necessary to implement the new strategies at court schools. Funding for staff training was approved by the board of supervisors in its 2001 budget; the COE provided \$50,000 as matching funds. The COE also funds ongoing educational programs in court schools.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #3:

As stated in the response, the two boards did find a need for additional support resources. These resources are being funded and provided. Resources included funding for additional staff and instructional materials.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 4:

Include in the definition of core services to be identified in the governance agreement Age-appropriate and meaningful work experience that meets the criteria of school credit.

RESPONSE:

We agree with the importance of work experience within a comprehensive program. Based on the needs of the youth, the governance structure will evaluate the best means of incorporating such experience.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

The governance committee concluded in a May 2000 report that vocational training is a core service and would be improved through school credit.

As of the writing of this report, there is still no work experience credit available for the court school students. Instead of a work experience program, a teacher is assigned to provide the students with an

introduction to work experience choices, testing, preference for jobs, pro-social skills and role-playing.

(a) The Grand Jury was told there is no school credit earned nor outside contract for work experience available with any agency.

(b) Students who are on work crews with the Santa Clara County Water District do not receive school credit for this experience.

The vocational programs currently operating are construction and auto shop.

The auto shop program is limited to skills needed for work at an oil change type of business.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #4:

Although the governance committee concluded its evaluation and considers credit for work experience beneficial, no school credit is currently given.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 5.
Continue to financially support an ongoing program of literacy workshops for teachers and other support staff directly involved with children in institutional schools; and that funding be allocated for training to facilitate the transition to the new model of collaborative decision making.

RESPONSE: *Funding has been allocated to provide literacy workshops for teachers and other staff, as well as to facilitate the transition to a collaborative decision-making model.*

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

Teachers are now receiving both literacy and numeracy training. The COE provides funding and substitute teacher replacement for two days of training offered on a Saturday or during the week. Three additional training days are funded through the State of California. Under the direction of experienced personnel, the training takes place at Santa Clara University.

A workshop for administrators is also available. Santa Clara County school administrators attend training with other

alternative school administrators from surrounding counties.

The COE estimates it will need an additional \$400,000 to maintain current programs. The COE is in the process of reducing the number of instructional aides, teachers, and administrators at its court schools. The student-to-teacher ratio has already been raised from 12:1 to 15:1.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #5:

Funding continues to be provided for both literacy and numeracy training. Due

to reduced funding levels, the literacy training and other programs could be negatively affected.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Recommendation 6.

Include in the Governance Agreement a provision that will address the maintenance of school staffing stability in view of the declining or fluctuating enrollment levels at the court schools.

RESPONSE:

We agree that staffing stability is important and plans are being developed to address staffing in view of declining or fluctuating enrollment.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

An MOU delineates the governance structure in place between the COE and the county. Many provisions are understood and agreed upon by the parties; however, stability and maintenance of staffing are not mentioned as a separate provision.

The COE expects the following will negatively impact the maintenance of school staffing stability beginning in the summer of 2002:

(1) Starting in the summer of 2002, the COE has dictated that the teacher student ratio in classes will be 20:1.

(2) With a ratio of 20:1, staff feels safety will become a greater issue.

(3) Site administrators (principals) will be reduced from five to three for the 2002-2003 school year.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #6:

Even though COE agrees staffing stability is important, reductions in funding levels will affect staffing at all levels. The increased teacher-student ratio causes both safety and educational concerns to COE and probation staff.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 7.

Develop a timeline for the implementation of an assessment center at Osborne School. Results should be included in the Joint Task Force report to the Boards.

RESPONSE:

The Probation Department, Osborne School and the Mental Health Department have designed an interim assessment center. The center is operational.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

It was reported by staff that on any given day an average of thirteen students enter

and leave juvenile hall where Osborne School is located. Fifty percent of the students who enter do not stay longer

than three days. The board of supervisors has provided funds to refurbish a juvenile hall living unit for use as an assessment center. Within the first three days of entering juvenile hall, students are assigned to the assessment center where they are tested in reading and mathematics. A career inventory is also administered. Students requiring additional assessment are referred to the student study team coordinator.

One-third of the student population enters with a special education diagnosis and with an expired individualized

education program (IEP). An updated IEP is created for students identified as needing special education.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #7:

The assessment center continues to operate and appears to provide the necessary evaluation services. There has been a marked improvement in the number of students leaving the institutional facilities with up-to-date individual assessments results. These results are then available for a student's next educational experience.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 8.

Collect and evaluate data and best practices for grouping students by age or living unit (performance) learning levels and consider implementing functional (ability) groupings at Osborne School.

RESPONSE:

We agree with the need to group students in order to maximize learning opportunities without compromising safety and security. Each site team will evaluate data and best practices and make recommendations related to class assignment procedures.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

At McKenna School the children have not been convicted for illegal activity and are more easily grouped for academic reasons. At Osborne School such grouping is difficult because many of the students have a history of violence, and safety issues must be addressed for the academic program to be effective. Architectural planning for the remodeling at juvenile hall includes the concept of bringing teachers into the living areas. At the ranches, limited

classroom facilities make grouping by academic level challenging but not impossible. There have been discussions among COE, probation, and the courts about assigning all special education students to one of the ranch schools in order to centralize services.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #8:

The site teams continue to deal with the student grouping issue, but it remains a complex and unresolved issue.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 9.

Collect information to measure the effectiveness of the alternative school department's program. Also, redesign and identify program elements that may need further refinement.

RESPONSE:

We agree with the need to collaboratively evaluate all aspects of the program and are committed to utilizing evaluation results for continuous improvement. Site teams will have the responsibility for this effort and will report as appropriate.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

Efforts towards continuous improvement and collaborative evaluation of programs have been realized through the creation of site teams, a system-wide team, and an executive team. The site team oversees the services delivered at a particular site and resolves issues as they arise. The site team also receives and provides input from the system-wide team related to gaps in core services, program needs, site priorities, policy modifications and budget recommendations. The executive team monitors the implementation of the MOU, as well as a multi-year action plan that was developed by the JTF.

The COE has redesigned its academic program to focus on literacy and numeracy

and at four of the schools the probation department has added a character development component to its program. The COE contract with Santa Clara University to provide teacher training in literacy has resulted in improved reading levels. The contract with Santa Clara University also includes numeracy training but it is still too soon to have collected reliable data in this area.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #9:

Site teams currently in operation continue to evaluate their programs. Reports are made by the site teams to the system-wide team. Both the COE and county executive's office make regular reports to the children and families committee. (See Glossary)

1999-2000 Grand Jury Recommendation 10.

Collect and evaluate relevant literature to address the issue of how educational services and the work programs may best be delivered to meet the critical educational needs of wards and dependents.

RESPONSE: *We agree that relevant literature needs to be reviewed to ensure that educational services and the work progress best meet the critical needs of youth in institutional settings. The site teams are developing a proposal based on relevant best practices.*

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:
According to California law "...the Governing Board of each school district shall prepare and keep on file for periodic inspection the courses of study prescribed for the schools under its jurisdiction." (Ed. Code 51040) The court schools have updated and revised all courses of study in the past three years to meet California State Department of Education framework and standards.

(a) Site teams have contributed to the development and implementation of a core program based on state guidelines and best practices developed through staff training sessions with a consultant from Santa Clara University. Osborne

School staff showed the Grand Jury new learning packets and materials for improving the educational program.

(b) Students have an opportunity to participate in various character development program options, such as anger management, drug and alcohol counseling and sports programs.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #10:
Site team evaluation and recommendations for improving student educational needs are being implemented as funding is available. In addition to educational programs, character development classes support the critical needs of the students.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Recommendation 11.
Provide additional resource specialist support at Osborne School so that caseloads do not exceed the maximum allowable.

RESPONSE:
We agree and an additional Resource Specialist has been assigned to Osborne School.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:
At Osborne School, the Grand Jury found the following:

(a) An additional resource specialist was hired to serve students and to support general education teachers. Special education students receive direct services at a teacher-to-student ratio from 1:1 to 8:1.

(b) A full-time student study team coordinator is available Monday through Friday.

(c) Once the IEP's are completed, placement and services are delivered in accordance with a student's plan.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #11:
The recommended resource specialist was hired as stated in the response. Placement and identified services are being delivered in accordance with the students' updated educational plans.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 12.

Develop a tool to evaluate progress of Court school students and establish expectations for student achievement to be realized in six month intervals.

RESPONSE:

We agree and an assessment instrument has been selected, field tested and will be operational in all Court schools by September 1, 2000.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

The STAR-AL (STAR) was selected as the instrument used to assess all students in reading and math. The scores represent how students performed on the test compared with the performance of a nationally representative sample of students. The scores present a snapshot of achievement at a specific point in time. Based on the student's performance on the STAR reading and math tests, a diagnostic report is produced by

computer. This information assists in tracking a student's achievements and expectations. Court school students are re-tested every sixty days.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #12:

STAR was the assessment instrument initially selected. This instrument is routinely used and it is providing information for tracking student achievement and expectations.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Recommendation 13.

Require each Court school teacher to attend a specific number of literacy workshops and follow-up sessions each year so all teachers may be considered initially "trained" by September 2002.

RESPONSE:

We agree with the recommendation and the new contract agreement requires all teachers to attend three additional days of training for a total of five days.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

A contract between COE and Santa Clara University's Markula Center for Applied Ethics was negotiated and signed in 2000. A new contract was recently signed to continue this training service.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #13:

Literacy training is available and all staff is completing the required five days of training.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 14.

Collaboratively establish appropriate policies and procedures for the exchange of information under the Integrated Children's Services Program. The results of their efforts should be included in the JTF report to the Board of Education and the Board of Supervisors.

RESPONSE:

We agree with the recommendation, protocols for sharing are in place.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

The governance structure allows for a site-based, system-wide form of management to address collaborative program development, exchange of information, resource allocation, budget decisions, problem solving, program evaluation and accountability.

The integrated children's services team includes the director of special education, deputy chiefs of probation for juvenile services and juvenile detention, deputy director of mental health and the deputy director of the department of drug

and alcohol services. Members meet bimonthly, or more frequently as needed.

At the site level, the site team is responsible for working with site staff to oversee the services delivered and resolve issues that may develop.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #14:

Use of the governance committee structure provides the mechanism for informational exchanges and program status sought by the 1999-2000 Grand Jury recommendation.

1999-2000 Grand Jury Report Recommendation 15.

Continue to seek an appropriate facility for the purpose of establishing a sub-acute residential treatment program as a continuum of care for children and adolescents of Santa Clara County. Once an appropriate facility is secured, it should be renovated as may be necessary and opened as soon as possible.

RESPONSE:

We are pleased that this long-standing need is being met. We project that the facility will be open in October 2000.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

The board of supervisors authorized the purchase of the Charter Hospital located at 455 Silicon Valley Boulevard in May of 2000. The facility opened in September 2001. The Starlight Program

for youth between the ages of 12 through 17 provides a secure residential and out-patient treatment program for severely emotionally disturbed youth.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #15:

The county finalized the purchase of a facility, although it took longer than originally anticipated.

NOTE: After the interviews, observing site teams in action, reading the documentation provided, listening to speakers at various committee meetings and evaluating the current status for compliance with the court order, the 2001-2002 Grand Jury also finds the following:

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

In order that children placed under the care of the court are ensured their educational needs are effectively addressed, community schools remain a realistic option. The COE will need financial assistance from local school districts to maintain the current level of service. This concept has not been embraced by the local districts facing financial problems of their own. Many local districts are developing their own programs for returning students.

The COE and county have recognized the expected reductions in funding from state and federal sources. In a proactive manner, both have invested staff time and effort to identify potential strategies to absorb the impact of these cuts. Increased class size, reduction of personnel and increased financial support from local school districts have all been implemented to some degree, yet the anticipated shortfall has not been covered.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #16:

Reductions in available funding will severely threaten the progress made since the court order was issued.

2001-2002 Grand Jury acquired facts:

In addition to community schools, there is a transition process that has been developed by COE, probation and social services using state After Care Grant funds. The agencies continue to work cooperatively to provide this transition service for students returning to their home school.

Up to three weeks prior to a student's release a transition counselor meets with the student to develop an individualized plan for returning to the home school, community school, continuation school or a job training program.

Each school district has a designated contact person for the transition. The transition counselor and district contact person review the student's educational status and other information necessary to make final preparation for a student's return.

During the transition process the school district representative is responsible for making parental contact.

Upon return to the home school, the juvenile's probation counselor is responsible for student follow up for as 10 weeks. After 10 weeks, an After Care probation officer or California outreach officer continues the follow-up process.

2001-2002 Grand Jury Finding #17:

Students returning to their regular school setting require cooperative support between local schools and county agencies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001-2002 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the County Office of Education:

1. Continue to provide training and in-service programs for teachers, administrators, and support staff, thereby maintaining focus on literacy and numeracy skills for the students. (Ref. Findings #5 & 13)
2. Reverse the trend of increasing class size by reducing the proposed student- to-teacher ratio of 20:1 to a safer and more educationally sound number. (Ref. Finding # 6)
3. Continue operation of the assessment center at Osborne and McKenna Schools to assure students are properly identified and appropriate educational plans are current. (Ref. Findings # 7 & 12)

The 2001-2002 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the County Office of Education and the Probation Department:

4. Continue to provide character development as a part of the court

schools' curriculum. (Ref. Finding #10)

5. Provide work experience classes and credit for those students at the Wright, Holden, and James Ranches. (Ref. Finding #4)
6. Provide meaningful vocational training, with school credit, as a part of the curriculum at the Wright, Holden, and James Ranches. (Ref. Finding #4)
7. Expand partnerships with local school districts to provide support services for the transition of students from the court schools to the local home school setting. (Ref. Finding #17)

The 2001-2002 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the County Office of Education and the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors:

8. Mutually agree to reduce the rental and maintenance cost paid by COE to the county for school facilities at the various institutions. The monies saved should be applied to the operation of the alternative court schools in those institutions. (Reference Finding #16)

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Children and Families Committee (CFC) is currently chaired by Supervisors Alvarado and Beall. In May 1999, the CFC established the Children and Families Leadership Team that provides leadership for an integrated system of children and family services. It includes all county departments serving children and the Deputy County Executive. A common vision statement was adopted to address the observation that county agencies serving children and families did not have a single unifying vision for children. Without a common vision and shared goals, agency affiliations and professional disciplines presented barriers to client-focused service delivery and effective collaboration. The team reports through the CFC and other committees as appropriate to the Board of Supervisors.

Community School may be established pursuant to Education Code Section 1980 et seq. The County Board of Education may enroll pupils who are any of the following students: expelled from a school district; referred by school district as a result of a recommendation from the School Attendance Review Board (SARB); probation referred; on probation or parole and not in attendance in any school.

Individual Education Plan (IEP) is a plan for the education of a child qualifying for special education services. It describes the child's current abilities, sets annual goals and instructional objectives, and describes the education services needed to meet those goals and objectives.

Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is developed for each minor within five school days after admission to a court school facility. A typical plan will include instructional strategies designed to respond to a student's unique learning style and ability.

Resource Specialist is a person with additional certification in special education. Depending on the local plan, the resource specialist may provide the following: educational assessment of pupils, individual and small group instruction; instructional materials and teaching techniques for the classroom teacher; assessment of pupil progress; and coordination of recommendations in the child's IEP with parents and teachers.

Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) is a consortium of districts that coordinates the delivery of special education services within a geographical area.

Special Day Class provides instruction to students requiring intensive educational services in a structured environment for greater than half the school day.

Special Education is specially designated instruction provided at no cost to parents. The service is available to meet the unique needs of individuals when their educational needs cannot be met with modification of the general education program. It also includes related services.

Student Study Team (SST) also called the Student Success Team is a general education function. It is a process of reviewing individual student problems and planning alternative instructional strategies to be implemented in the classroom. In court schools the SST consists of the principal, teachers, counselor, parents and resources such as mental health and probation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1999-2000 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury, Final Report Investigation Into Agency Compliance With a Court Order Concerning Educational Needs of Students in Court Schools, June 2000.

1999-2000 Strategies and Timelines, Revised April 2001.

Annual School Report Evaluation—Board of Corrections, Osborne School, July 31, 2001.

Assembly Bill (AB 1200) Legislation for School District Fiscal Solvency, Adopted in 1992.

Children and Families Committee (Agenda and Reports), December 6, 2001.

Court Order, Superior Court For The State of California, County of Santa Clara, Juvenile Division, December 3, 1997.

Elimination and Establishment of Positions, Memo From Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources, May 16, 2001.

Governance Structure for Juvenile Hall and the Ranches, June 16, 2000.

Individual Education Plans (Imps) Obtained But Not Current, November 15, 2001.

Issues in Institutional Litigation: Special Education, S. Burrell Youth Law Center, May 2001.

Joint Task Force on Education Programs; Report on Status of Action Plans, September 1, 2000.

Joint Task Force on Institutional Schools Report Back, Memo From Assistant Superintendent, County Office of Education, October 11, 2001.

Lease Agreement Between the Santa Clara County Office of Education and the County of Santa Clara Probation Department, October 10, 2001.

Memorandum of Understanding, Santa Clara County Office of Education and County of Santa Clara, May 16, 2000.

Parental Rights and Procedural Safeguards for Special Education; South East Consortium for Special Education, Revised November 1999.

Reduction of Certificated Services, Memo From County Superintendent of Schools, February 20, 2002.

Resolution of County Superintendent of Schools to Reduce or Discontinue Particular Kinds of Services, February 21, 2002.

Response to “Final Report”, Investigation Into Agency Compliance With a Court Order Concerning Educational Needs of Students in Court Schools, September 20, 2000.

Student Diagnostic Report, STAR-AL Reading and Mathematics, November 16, 2001.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation Website, <http://www.aecf.org/initiatives/juvenile/contents.htm> Last Updated, April 25, 2000.

PASSED and **ADOPTED** by the Santa Clara
County Civil Grand Jury this 9th day of May
2002.

Bruce E. Capron
Foreperson

Norman N. Abrahams, DDS
Foreperson Pro Tem

Joyce S. Byrne
Secretary