



THE EDUCATION OF D.C.:

How Washington D.C.'s investments in education can help increase public safety.

Improving public safety in D.C. depends on a comprehensive approach that includes multiple strategies spanning all City agencies. One facet of such a comprehensive approach is to improve outcomes for youth so fewer are either caught up in the justice system, a victim of crime, or both. This is the first in a series of briefs addressing ways that improving youth outcomes can also result in better public safety outcomes for the District as a whole.

INTRODUCTION

As education is correlated with crime rates and incarceration, addressing shortcomings in the D.C. education system should be part of a comprehensive public safety strategy. Higher levels of education increase access to well-paying jobs, build stronger community ties and

positive social skills and decrease risk-taking behavior, all of which decrease the chances that a person will be involved in criminal activity.¹ People who experience barriers to educational achievement are also disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system. Sixty-eight percent of people in U.S. state prisons have

2 JUSTICE POLICY INSTITUTE

not received a high school diploma.² The Alliance for Excellent Education estimates that a five percent increase in graduation rates for young men would produce an annual savings of \$66.5 million in crime-related expenses for Washington, D.C.³

Although the city has made strides in improving its public education system, youth in D.C. continue to face significant challenges. Fourth and eighth grade students in D.C. public schools were ranked the lowest in the nation in math and reading proficiency,⁴ according to the U.S. Department of Education's "National Assessment of Educational Progress in 2011." This report also showed a significant performance gap between black and white students. For example, the fourth grade reading gap between white and black students in 2011 was 62 percentage points: 92 and 37 percent of white and African American students, respectively, read at or above basic 4th grade level. This value remains unchanged from 1992.⁵


IMPROVING EDUCATION HAS POSITIVE OUTCOMES BOTH FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FOR PUBLIC SAFETY.


While no single strategy will guarantee reductions in delinquent behavior, criminal activity, or crime rates, increased investments in quality education can have a positive public safety benefit.

- States whose populations have higher levels of educational attainment¹ also have crime rates lower than the national average.⁶

¹ Educational attainment refers to the amount of education a person has completed.

- States with more investments in higher education have better public safety outcomes. According to a JPI analysis, of the 10 states that saw the biggest increases in higher education expenditure, eight saw violent crime rates decline and five saw violent crime decline more than the national average. Of the 10 states that saw the smallest change in higher education expenditure, the violent crime rate rose in five states.⁷
- A study reported in the *American Economic Review* on the effects of education on crime found that a one year increase in the average years of schooling completed reduces violent crime by almost 30 percent, motor vehicle theft by 20 percent, arson by 13 percent and burglary and larceny by about 6 percent.⁸
- Completing high school helps set youth on a positive path towards adulthood. According to research conducted by the American Sociological Association, life course transitions such as finishing high school make people feel part of the social mainstream. They develop community ties through pro-social networks and employment, which in turn act as an informal source of social control, moderating behavior and creating aversion to crime.⁹
- Education increases patience and cultivates





an aversion to risk-taking. This may in part be due to the heightened social bonds and responsibilities, as well as an increased awareness of opportunities that might potentially be damaged by a criminal conviction.¹⁰

In recent years Washington, D.C. has experienced an increase in educational attainment alongside a decrease in crime. Between 2000 and 2009, the percent of Washingtonians that had a high school diploma or higher increased 9.3 percentage points, while the percent of Washingtonians that held a bachelor's degree or higher increased 9.4 percentage points.

At the same time that educational attainment increased, violent crime fell 10.7 percent and property crime fell 17.7 percent across Washington, D.C.¹¹ Although a number of factors likely contributed to the decrease in crime in D.C. – including an influx of new people to the area to access the job market¹² -


research shows a relationship between crime and education.

THE WARDS THAT CONTINUE TO EXPERIENCE MORE CRIME ALSO HAVE A LOWER EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT.

While on the whole D.C. has experienced a decline in violent and property crime over the last decade, a closer examination by ward shows that not all areas of the city are a part of this trend. Ward 7 and Ward 8 continue to experience challenges with crime and public safety, showing the lowest decrease throughout the city and the only increase in property crime. Additionally, Ward 4 experienced the only percent increase in violent crime in the last decade.

4 JUSTICE POLICY INSTITUTE

Wards 7 and 8 continue to have crime challenges.



Rates of Property and Violent Crime Vary Significantly By Ward


(Rate per 1,000)	Ward 1	Ward 2	Ward 3	Ward 4	Ward 5	Ward 6	Ward 7	Ward 8	District Total
Violent Crime 2010	13	10	1.6	9.6	13	10	18	20	12
Property Crime 2010	44	60	22	30	43	41	42	41	40

Source: Neighborhood Info D.C., "Neighborhood Profiles: Council Wards," accessed December 2011. www.neighborhoodinfodc.org/wards/wards.html

Examining the educational attainment in D.C. from 2005-2009 by ward shows that Wards 7 and 8 have significantly lower educational attainment levels than the District as a whole. Specifically, the percentage of residents of

Wards 7 and 8 who have a Bachelor's degree or higher is 30 and 37 percentage points lower respectively than the total educational attainment for the District.

Wards 7 and 8 have the lowest level of educational attainment in D.C.



Source: Joy Phillips, 2005-2009 American Community Survey – Key Demographic Indicators (Washington, D.C.: D.C. State Data Center, 2011).

The percent of residents in Ward 8 that have a Bachelor's degree or higher is **37 points** lower than D.C.'s total educational attainment.



counter parts in the District. From 2006-2008, nearly all adult Whites (99 percent) 25 years and older had completed a high school education; comparatively, 80 percent of Blacks and 57 percent of Hispanics had received a high school degree. The disparity is even more pronounced when comparing those who have received a Bachelor's degree or higher: 87 percent of Whites compared to only 21 percent of Blacks

and 32 percent of Hispanics completing a Bachelor's degree or higher.


These statistics suggest that how the city chooses to make investments in Wards 7 and 8 is reflected by the area's concentrated impacts related to educational attainment, crime and public safety. Given Wards 7 and 8 have a greater percentage of the population aged 0-17, there is a serious need to ensure that an infusion of resources increases educational outcomes for students and residents now and in the future.


and 32 percent of Hispanics completing a Bachelor's degree or higher.

THERE IS A CONCENTRATED JUSTICE IMPACT ON PEOPLE OF COLOR IN THE DISTRICT.

Additionally, the highest percentages of people of color are found in Wards 7 and 8, thus indicating significant, disproportionate disadvantage for this segment of the population. People of color, specifically African Americans and Hispanics, have disproportionately lower educational attainment levels than their White

Justice system involvement is not only concentrated among communities of color, but also among people with less education.¹³ One in 10 young, white high school drop outs (age 22-30) were in prison or jail in 1999. Among white men in their early thirties (age 30-34), 13 percent





of high school drop outs had prison records by 1999. An astonishing 52 percent of African American male high school dropouts had prison records by their early thirties (age 30-34). Although African American men are more likely to go to prison than white men, increasing educational attainment for both groups is likely to reduce the chances that a person will go to prison.¹⁴

At the same time that communities of color face the greatest barriers to education in Washington, D.C., they are also disproportionately held in D.C.’s jails and under the supervision of the Department of Youth and Rehabilitative Services (DYRS). In FY 2011, 50 percent of youth under DYRS supervision were from Wards 7 and 8. The concentrated impact on these communities is also reflected in the disproportionate representation of youth of color under DYRS supervision. Ninety-six percent of youth under DYRS supervision in FY 2011 were black, with the remaining 4 percent being Hispanic.¹⁵


The disproportionate impact of educational attainment and justice system involvement is also mirrored in the adult corrections system. While blacks comprised 91 percent of the over 3,000 people incarcerated daily in D.C. in 2010, they only make up 55 percent of the D.C.

population.¹⁶ Comparatively, in 2010, five percent of the people held in D.C. corrections were Hispanic and two percent white, while Hispanics and whites make up 8.5 and 36 percent of the D.C. population, respectively.¹⁷

Educational investments increase access to employment and desired job markets and help to create positive social bonds and investments in communities, which can create an environment where public safety and community well being are better realized.¹⁸

INVESTING IN EDUCATION CAN HELP INCREASE PUBLIC SAFETY AND PROMOTE POSITIVE SOCIAL OUTCOMES FOR D.C. YOUTH.

Despite evidence that investing in education and other positive social institutions can improve public safety and save money, policymakers continue to invest in incarceration.¹⁹ Over the past 38 years, corrections spending nationally has increased three times faster than state spending on education.²⁰



out of trouble, promote positive, healthy communities and increases public safety.

INVESTING IN EARLY EDUCATION HELPS PROMOTE POSITIVE LIFE

OUTCOMES FOR YOUTH AND SAFE COMMUNITIES.

From birth to age five, a child’s brain is rapidly developing with emotional, social, regulatory and moral capacities.²¹ Receiving high-quality early childhood education has been linked to greater positive cognitive, educational, social and behavior development over the life course.²² In addition to positive developmental outcomes, numerous longitudinal research studies have shown that early childhood education can reduce the chances of future justice system involvement.

- **HighScope Perry Preschool Study:** A study examining the lives of 123 African Americans born from 1962-1967 into poverty and at high risk of failing in school. The subjects were randomly divided into two program groups at ages 3 and 4, one

This national trend is seen in D.C. as the funding for the justice system continues to increase at the expense of public education. D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) funding decreased 25 percent between 2007 and the proposed budget for 2012, while both the Department of Youth and Rehabilitative Services and the Metropolitan Police Department both saw an increase of 45 and 2 percent, respectively. Because the federal government is responsible for incarcerating adults in D.C., figures are unavailable on the change in the cost of locking up adult District residents.

The D.C. Department of Parks and Recreation also saw a 30 percent decrease in funding between 2007 and the proposed 2012 budget. Parks and Recreation are an important piece of youth development, providing youth programming and maintaining safe spaces for children to play. The services provided by Parks and Recreation are particularly valuable to


children and teens whose families cannot afford private camps, classes or after school programs. By choosing to invest in the criminal justice system rather than educating youth, D.C. is choosing to spend less money on education, schools and after school programs – proven investments that keep youth



There are **32,613** youth under the age of five living in the District.

that received a high-quality preschool program and one that received no preschool program. The majority of those who received the preschool program had higher wages, were more likely to hold a job, committed fewer crimes and were more likely to have graduated from high school than those who did not attend preschool.²³


- **The Abecedarian Project:** Four North Carolina cohorts born between 1972 and 1977 were randomly assigned as infants to either receive early educational intervention or not. Follow-up analysis later in life found that the children who participated in the early education intervention program had higher levels of academic achievement, completed more years of education, and were more likely to attend a four-year college.²⁴ Higher levels of educational attainment are related to a decreased likelihood of imprisonment.²⁵
- **Chicago Child-Parent Centers:** A federally-funded program established in 1967 created the Child-Parent Centers which are part of the Chicago Public Schools system and generally housed in preschool facilities located near elementary schools. These Centers provide educational and family support services to economically disadvantaged youth in Chicago, through a school-based, stable learning environment during preschool where parents are active with their child's education. In a 15 year follow-up of the 1980 cohort, researchers found that youth who received preschool intervention services had higher rates of



high school graduation, more years of education completed and lower rates of juvenile arrests, violent arrests and school dropout than those who did not receive the preschool educational services.²⁶

In Washington D.C. preschool educational services are provided by public schools, public charter schools and community-based organizations. D.C. has funded preschool education through the Public School Preschool (PSP) program since the 1960s.²⁷ While youth in the District are not required to attend preschool or pre-kindergarten, all 3- and 4-year-olds are eligible to attend the PSP program; however, the actual number of available slots limits enrollment.²⁸ As a result both preschool and pre-kindergarten programs are allocated using a lottery system with remaining seats distributed on a first-come, first-serve basis.²⁹

Over the last eight years D.C. has seen an increase in the percent of the District's 3- and 4-year-olds enrolled in early childhood education programs. However, according to the 2010 Census, D.C. had an estimated 32,613 children under the age of five living in the city.³⁰ According to DCPS there are approximately 6,000 seats across the District for its PSP program.³¹ Although there is no way to know the exact number of 3- and 4- year-olds eligible



for early childhood education or the total number of preschool seats available and maintained by both public charter schools and private institutions, the current public school program alone only has space for approximately 18.4 percent of youth living in the District under the age of five.


There is a significant presence of the available public schools and public charter schools that offer early education programs in the wards with the highest concentration of the District’s children. In 2010 the total number of youth enrolled in early education programs in the District was 8,867, with 5,227 in D.C. Public Schools and an additional 3,640 in public charter schools.³² Even though early education programs are concentrated in wards with the most children, it is likely that many children in these wards are still not receiving early childhood education services because of the lack of such services across the city. Allocating resources to the places in the city where most children live and continuing to invest in areas that already have the foundation for early education is important.

Although nearly 9,000 3- and 4- year-olds are enrolled in an early childhood education program, more investments are needed to ensure that every child in D.C. can afford and take part in preschool and pre-kindergarten. Continued investments in early childhood education can help to increase positive life outcomes for D.C.’s youth. Enacting policies and programs and allocating available resources to further increase the number of 3- and 4- year-olds enrolled in preschool and pre-kindergarten can increase overall levels of educational attainment, community investment and reduce justice system involvement.

INVESTING IN EDUCATION INCLUDES POLICIES FOCUSED ON KEEPING KIDS IN SCHOOL.

Investing in education to ensure the best educational outcomes for students includes policies focused on keeping kids in schools.

Ward 8 has the lowest average daily attendance rate of 92.9 percent.




While the overall truancy rate for D.C. public schools has declined 40 percent over the past three years,³³ some areas of the city continue to have lower attendance rates than others. Truancy rates by ward were not available, but average daily attendance rates, which include both excused and unexcused absences, are indicators of the number of youth that are going to school every day. The DCPS average daily attendance for school year 2010-2011 was 95 percent. Five out of the eight wards were at or above the city wide

When youth stay in school they are more likely to graduate and less likely to become involved in the justice system. Addressing the root causes of truancy and reducing suspensions and expulsions are two important ways to keep youth connected to school. In the District, low rates of attendance and high rates of suspensions and expulsions are disproportionately in wards with larger communities of color and higher levels of concentrated disadvantage.

attendance average, with Ward 8 seeing the lowest average daily attendance of 92.9 percent.³⁴

Encouraging daily attendance improves student outcomes and public safety

Truancy, defined as unexcused absences from school, can have significant negative effects on youth and has been linked to delinquent activity.³⁵ Regular attendance is an important part of effective education and truancy can often lead to youth having lower achievement, needing to repeat grades, dropping out of school, being expelled from school or simply just not graduating at rates as high as students with fewer unexcused absences.³⁶



The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention found that family, school, economic and individual student factors can lead to truancy.³⁷ Truancy reduction programs that encourage consistent attendance by addressing factors associated with truancy can also improve academic achievement and reduce delinquency.³⁸ Conversely, the threat of sanctions, sanctions themselves and placing youth in detention have not been shown to reduce truancy.³⁹ For instance, in an analysis of the “Becca Bill,” which requires school districts to file truancy petitions in juvenile court after the accumulation of a certain number of unexcused absences, the Washington State Institute for Public Policy found that compared with their non-petitioned peers students receiving a petition were more likely to have higher dropout rates, lower on-time graduation rates, lower rates of graduation and more justice system involvement.⁴⁰

A broader public safety strategy through investing in education

D.C. should continue to reduce truancy rates through programming that places emphasis on community and school-based interventions and not justice system involvement, which brings its own set of collateral consequences for youth. According to the National Center for School Engagement the following are key components of any effective truancy reduction program:⁴¹

- Parent/guardian involvement, or whole family involvement
- A continuum of supports, including meaningful incentives for good attendance and subsequent consequences for poor attendance
- Collaboration among community actors such as law enforcement, mental health workers, mentors, social service providers and educators
- Concrete and measurable goals for program performance and student performance, including good record keeping and on-going evaluation of progress toward goals

The most effective truancy prevention programs are those focused on addressing the multifaceted and diverse causes of truancy. Schools that punish chronically truant students with out-of-school suspensions or juvenile detention placements only decrease school engagement and make it more difficult for students to succeed when they return.⁴² Truancy policies in schools that include punishment, sanctions, court referrals and juvenile justice system involvement have not been shown to reduce truancy in schools.⁴³ In fact, the most successful truancy intervention programs are those that are tailored to the individual student and target risk and protective factors at the individual, family, school and community levels.⁴⁴

The following are some examples of successful school truancy programs with a multifaceted approach that does not rely on the justice system. These programs utilize methods such as incentives for attendance, increased community awareness, role-models and mentoring, community coordination, personalized and targeted interventions and early identification to focus on promoting attendance and engaging students in the learning process.

- Truancy Intervention Project (TIP) is a Georgia-based program focused on early intervention, mentoring, community involvement and using role models to combat truancy. Through the utilization of “guardians” who act as role-models and mentors, volunteers coordinate with social workers, counselors, teachers, school administrators, school nurses, doctors and other service professions to develop a relationship between the child, the child’s family and the TIP guardian. The program has served 6,000 children in Fulton County, GA since 1992 and has had an 82.1 percent success rate helping those receiving interventions.⁴⁵
- Truancy Assessment and Service Center (TASC) founded in 1999 is a Louisiana-based program that uses personalized and


targeted interventions and easily accessible resources focused on K-5 children. It acts as a referral network, linking families to resources within the community that address areas of risk within the family, including providing an in-home therapist to address any concerns. Since 2001, TASC has seen an average of a 33 percent decrease in unexcused absences from youth in the program, from an average of 7.7 unexcused absences in a year upon referral to an average of 5.2 unexcused absences after referral. Only one percent of the youth in the program were petitioned to juvenile court.⁴⁶

Limiting suspensions and expulsions reduces justice contacts and improves student outcomes, without harming school safety.

School sanctions such as suspension and expulsion can also have a detrimental impact on a child’s education and increase the likelihood of future justice system involvement. Students that miss school also miss out on developing strong ties to adults and institutions that promote pro-social development and positive life outcomes.⁴⁷ Suspensions and expulsions on their own

increase the chances that a student will be involved in the justice system in the future.⁴⁸ Additionally, school suspensions can create a sense of alienation from school⁴⁹ and can be linked to an increased likelihood of dropping out of school.

In D.C., school suspensions and expulsions are concentrated in two wards. Wards 7 and 8 account for over half the students suspended or expelled for more than 11 days in the 2010-2011 school year. Investing in education includes working to find programs and policies that reduce the use of suspensions and expulsions and keep youth in classrooms and actively engaged in the learning process. D.C. should target resources, programming and policy changes to help reduce the large number or suspensions and expulsions occurring in Wards 7 and 8. Research also points to a correlation between law enforcement in schools and increased juvenile justice involvement, which often also involves suspension or expulsion;⁵⁰ education officials should also look at best practices for improving school environment without relying on police officers.



Reducing suspensions and expulsions may also improve school safety. For example, Denver, Colorado implemented a graduated system of responses to student behavior in which out of school suspensions and expulsions are a last resort. The result is not only a reduction in suspensions and expulsions, but also overall improvement in student behavior and satisfaction with the discipline process.⁵¹ Just as positive social investments rather than incarceration are a way to make communities healthy and safe, investments in education and improving achievement also make schools safe.⁵²

Educating all youth and keeping them in school has significant community benefits. Youth that are in schools are engaged during the day, preventing them from engaging in delinquent behavior.⁵³ High school graduation increases social bonds and community ties which promote responsibility in young adults.⁵⁴ In addition, keeping students in school means a better educated populace that earns more and contributes more to the community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A necessary component of an effective public safety strategy is long term investments in education. Although Washington, D.C. has made strides to improve its public education system over the last decade, the continued spending cuts to DCPS and the Department of Parks and Recreation suggest an unwillingness by D.C. public officials to implement an effective and holistic public safety campaign or to make long term investments in the city's youth and communities. The following are six recommendations that could improve public safety, promote healthy and safe communities and provide youth with a better chance at positive life outcomes:

1. **Invest more money into education instead of the criminal justice system.** States with higher levels of educational attainment also have crime rates lower than the national

average.⁵⁵ By choosing to invest in providing more resources for education, Washington, D.C. could implement a long term public safety strategy to reduce justice system involvement and costs, invest in youth and further strengthen communities.

2. **Invest more in parks and recreation, after school care and mentoring programs.** Providing children with safe spaces to play and programming to enhance their education and further build community ties can help to reduce justice system involvement promote positive life outcomes.
3. **Target District resources to combat low levels of educational attainment in the city.** Emphasis should be placed on providing increased investments and resources to Wards 7 and 8. These wards have the greatest percentage of D.C.'s children, the lowest incomes and the least educational attainment. Through increased educational investments in these communities, D.C. can begin to close the educational attainment gap between wards and communities. These investments would care for D.C.'s youth and provide youth the opportunity to avoid justice system involvement and engage city officials in creating communities focused on education and public safety.
4. **Implement policies that keep youth in school.** Use evidence-based strategies to address root causes of truancy, and review school policies and procedures to ensure students are not being suspended or expelled unnecessarily.
5. **Invest in early educational programs.** Continued investments in early childhood education can help to increase positive life outcomes for D.C.'s youth. Enacting policies and programs and allocating available resources to further increase the number of 3- and 4- year-olds enrolled in preschool and pre-kindergarten can increase overall levels of educational attainment, community

14 JUSTICE POLICY INSTITUTE

investment and reduce justice system involvement.

6. Collect more and better data. Improving both educational and justice system data

collection can help to further understand the impact and effectiveness of current programs and to better understand where further investment in resources is needed.

¹ Lance Lochner and Enrico Moretti, "The effect of education on crime: Evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports." *American Economic Review*. 94, no. 1 (2004).

² Caroline H. Harlow, *Education and Correctional Populations* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003) www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/ecp.htm

³ Alliance for Excellent Education. *Saving Futures, Saving Dollars: The Impact of Education on Crime Reduction and Earnings*. (Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education, 2006) www.all4ed.org/publications/SavingFutures.pdf

⁴ National Center for Education Statistics, "That Nations Report Card 2011 State Snapshot Report," accessed December 2011. <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/>

⁵ National Center for Education Statistics, "That Nations Report Card 2011 State Snapshot Report," 2011.

⁶ Justice Policy Institute, *Education and Public Safety* (Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute, 2007). www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/07-08_REP_EducationAndPublicSafety_PS-AC.pdf

⁷ Justice Policy Institute, *Education and Public Safety*, 2007.

⁸ Serious violent crime includes murder and aggravated assault. Lochner, Lance and Enrico Moretti. 2004. The effect of education on crime: Evidence from prison inmates, arrests, and self-reports." *American Economic Review* 94(1).

⁹ Pettit, Becky and Bruce Western. 2004. Mass imprisonment and the life course: Race and class inequality in U.S. incarceration. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 69(2). pp. 153-4.

¹⁰ Lochner, Lance and Enrico Moretti, 2004.

¹¹ Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Report, Crime in the United States, www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm

¹² Carol Morello and Teresa Tomassoni, "Census: D.C. area gains young adults in recession," *Washington Post*, October 27, 2011. www.washingtonpost.com/local/census-dc-area-gains-young-adults-in-recession/2011/10/26/gIQA8gijKM_story.html

¹³ Bruce Western, Vincent Schiraldi, and Jason Ziedenberg, *Education and Incarceration* (Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute, 2003). www.justicepolicy.org

¹⁴ Bruce Western, Vincent Schiraldi, and Jason Ziedenberg, 2003.

¹⁵ D.C. Department of Youth and Rehabilitative Services, 2011.

¹⁶ D.C. Department of Corrections, *DC Department of Corrections Facts and Figures* (Washington, D.C.: 2011). <http://doc.dc.gov/doc/frames.asp?doc=/doc/lib/doc/populationstats/DCDepartmentofCorrectionsFactsnFiguresOct11corrected.pdf>

¹⁷ D.C. Department of Corrections, *DC Department of Corrections Facts and Figures*, 2011.

¹⁸ Lochner, Lance and Enrico Moretti, 2004.

¹⁹ Nastassia Walsh, Amanda Petteruti, and Ava Page, *Education and Public Safety* (Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute, 2007).

²⁰ National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, Table 30: Amount and percentage distribution of direct general expenditures of state and local governments, by function: Selected years, 1970-71 through 2007-08, August 2010*. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_030.asp

²¹ Jack Skonkoff and Deborah Phillips, eds., *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000).

²² Public Policy Forum, "Research on Early Childhood Education Outcomes," accessed February 2012. www.publicpolicyforum.org/Matrix.htm

²³ HighScope, "HighScope Perry Preschool Study," accessed February 2012. www.highscope.org/Content.asp?ContentId=219

²⁴ University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, "The Carolina Abecedarian Project," accessed February 2012. <http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~abc/#home>

²⁵ Justice Policy Institute, *Education and Public Safety*, 2007.

- ²⁶ Arthur J. Reynolds and others, "Long-term Effects of an Early Childhood Intervention on Educational Achievement and Juvenile Arrest," *American Medical Association* 285, no. 18 (2001): 2339-2346. www.cfc.ca.gov/pdf/help/chicago_cpc_jama.pdf; Stephanie Schaefer, Soren Messner-Zidell and Jeff Kirsch. *Early Education from Birth to Five: Virginia's Investment in Crime Prevention* (Washington, D.C.: Fight Crime: Invest in Kids, 2008). www.fightcrime.org/sites/default/files/reports/VA%200-5%20Report.pdf; Promising Practices Network, "Child-Parent Centers," accessed February 2012. www.promisingpractices.net/program.asp?programid=98#overview
- ²⁷ National Institute for Early Education Research, *The State of Preschool 2010 Yearbook – District of Columbia* (New Brunswick, NJ: 2010). http://nieer.org/yearbook/pdf/yearbook_DC.pdf
- ²⁸ District of Columbia Public Schools, "The Preschool and Pre-Kindergarten Lottery," accessed February 2012. <http://dc.gov/DCPS/Learn+About+Schools/Preschool,+Pre-Kindergarten+and+Out-of-Boundary+Lottery/Preschool+and+Pre-Kindergarten+Lottery>
- ²⁹ District of Columbia Public Schools, "The Preschool and Pre-Kindergarten Lottery," 2012.
- ³⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, "Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010," accessed February 2012. http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DP_DPDP1&prodType=table
- ³¹ District of Columbia Public Schools, "The Preschool and Pre-Kindergarten Lottery," 2012.
- ³² National Institute for Early Education Research, *The State of Preschool 2010 Yearbook – District of Columbia*, 2010.
- ³³ District of Columbia Public Schools, "Facts and Statistics: 2010-2011," accessed January 2012. www.dc.gov/DCPS/About+DCPS/Who+We+Are/Facts+and+Statistics
- ³⁴ D.C. Office of the State Superintendent of Education, "District of Columbia Assessment and Accountability Reports, Average Daily Attendance 2010," accessed January 2012. <http://nclb.osse.dc.gov/schoolsSummaryReports.asp>
- ³⁵ Myriam Baker, Jane Nady Sigmon and M. Elaine Nugent. *Truancy Reduction: Keeping Students in Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001).
- ³⁶ National Center for Mental Health and Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, "Truancy Prevention," accessed January 2012. www.promoteprevent.org/publications/prevention-briefs/truancy-prevention
- ³⁷ Myriam Baker, Jane Nady Sigmon and M. Elaine Nugent, 2001.
- ³⁸ National Center for Mental Health and Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, "Truancy Prevention," accessed January 2012. www.promoteprevent.org/publications/prevention-briefs/truancy-prevention
- ³⁹ National Center for Mental Health and Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, "Truancy Prevention," 2012; Charles Wall, "New Approaches to Truancy Prevention in Urban Schools," *Educational Resources Information Center Digest*, 2003. http://iume.tc.columbia.edu/i/a/document/15758_Digest_186.pdf; Jay Smink and Joanna Zorn Heilbrunn, *Legal and Economic Implications of Truancy* (Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center/Network, 2005). www.ccsu.edu/uploaded/websites/ISCJ/Clemson_Study_on_TRP.pdf
- ⁴⁰ Washington State Institute for Public Policy, *Washington's Truancy Laws: Does the Petition Process Influence School and Crime Outcomes?* (Olympia, WA: 2010). www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/10-02-2201.pdf
- ⁴¹ National Center for School Engagement, "Truancy Factsheet," accessed January 2012. www.schoolengagement.org/TruancyPreventionRegistry/Admin/Resources/Resources/40.pdf
- ⁴² Siobhan M. Cooney and Gary Eastman, *What Research tells us about effective truancy prevention and intervention programs* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008). http://whatworks.uwex.edu/attachment/factsheet_5truancy.pdf
- ⁴³ National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, "Truancy Prevention," 2012.
- ⁴⁴ Siobhan M. Cooney and Gary Eastman, 2008.
- ⁴⁵ Truancy Intervention Project, "Success Stories and Statistics," accessed February 2012. www.truancyproject.org/subpages/learn_successes.html
- ⁴⁶ National Dropout Prevention Center/Network, "Model Program: Truancy Assessment and Service Centers," accessed February 2012. www.dropoutprevention.org/modelprograms/show_program.php?pid=163; Youth Service Bureau, "TASC Program," accessed February 2012. www.ysbworks.com/tasc.php
- ⁴⁷ Advancement Project, *Opportunities Suspended: The Devastating Consequences of Zero Tolerance and School Suspensions* (Washington, DC: Advancement Project, 2000). www.advancementproject.org/digital-library/publications/opportunities-suspended-the-devastating-consequences-of-zero-tolerance-

⁴⁸ Council of State Governments, *Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement*. (Lexington, KY: Council of State Governments, 2011).

⁴⁹ Advancement Project, *Opportunities Suspended*, 2000.

⁵⁰ Amanda Petteruti, *Education Under Arrest: The Case Against Police in Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Justice Policy Institute, 2011). www.justicepolicy.org/research/3177

⁵¹ Stop the Schoolhouse to Jailhouse Track, "Padres y Jovenes, Denver, Colorado," January 27, 2012. www.stopschoolstojails.org/padres-jovenes-unidos-denver.html

⁵² Matthew P. Steinberg, Elaine Allensworth, and David W. Johnson, *Student and Teacher Safety in Chicago Public Schools: The Roles of Community Context and School Social Organization* (Chicago:IL: University of Chicago, May 2011).

⁵³ D. Mark Anderson, *In School and Out of Trouble? The Minimum Dropout Age and Juvenile Crime*, (University of Washington, 2009).

⁵⁴ Becky Pettit and Bruce Western. "Mass imprisonment and the life course: Race and class inequality in U.S. incarceration." *American Sociological Review* 69(2), 2004.

⁵⁵ Justice Policy Institute, *Education and Public Safety*, 2007.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report would not have been possible without the generous support of the Public Welfare Foundation.

The Justice Policy Institute (JPI) would like to express gratitude to Eduardo Ferrer of DC Lawyers for Youth for his insight into the operations and institutions of the District of Columbia.

JPI would also like to thank Amanda Petteruti, Austin Siegel, and Benjamin Laman-Maharg for their significant research support.

JPI staff includes Paul Ashton, Jason Fenster, Zerline Hughes, Amanda Petteruti, Kellie Shaw, Tracy Velázquez, and Keith Wallington.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

PAUL ASHTON, RESEARCH ASSISTANT

Prior to joining JPI, Paul spent time as a sexual assault victim advocate and conducting research examining intimate partner violence in the LGBT community. Paul's experience with victim issues led him to author JPI's white paper: *Moving Toward a Public Safety Paradigm: A Roundtable Discussion on Victims and Criminal Justice Reform*. He is also the author of *Gaming the System: How the Political Strategies of Private Prison Companies Promote Ineffective Incarceration Policies*. Paul has also served on the policy committee of the Delaware HIV Consortium – working to educate the Delaware State Legislature on the need for increased funding to address homelessness and HIV. Paul received his Bachelor's Degree in Criminology from The Ohio State University and a Master's Degree in Criminology from the University of Delaware.



Reducing the use of incarceration and the justice system and promoting policies that improve the well-being of all people and communities.

**1012 14th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
TEL (202) 558-7974
FAX (202) 558-7978**

WWW.JUSTICEPOLICY.ORG