



# **MAJOR AND MINOR PROGRAM DEFICIENCIES**

FOR

# **JAG AFFILIATES PREPARING FOR THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS**

PREPARED BY

## **JOBS FOR AMERICA'S GRADUATES**

JAG FIELD SERVICES

6021 MORRISS ROAD, SUITE 111 • FLOWER MOUND, TX 75028

TELEPHONE: 972.874.8044 • FAX: 972.874.0063

MAY 1, 2001

**OVERSIGHT BOARD**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #1**

MAJOR	MINOR
OB-1. No "outside" Board of Directors.	OB-1. Oversight body not dedicated to JAG.
OB-2. The oversight body is not comprised of "key leaders." While there may be good people serving, the Board must be comprised of those key leaders that can solve any issue that is brought to the Board because of their influence and reach in the community.	OB-2. Failure to meet on a regular basis. What is good is a high-powered Board of Directors if it does not meet and transact on a regular basis.
OB-3. Board composition does not reflect the community or state's diversity. The board should mirror the ethnic diversity that is in the community.	OB-3. Failure to maintain adequate minutes of meetings.
OB-4. The Board is not fully committed to the implementation of the full JAG Model.	OB-4. Poorly informed oversight body; lack of familiarity with the DM System.
OB-5. The Board is not fully aware of what is happening within the program.	OB-5. Management reviews are not conducted on a regular basis.
	OB-6. No response to the accreditation report.
	OB-7. The Board does not request management to design an "Action Plan" that will overcome the major and minor deficiencies identified in JAG's ACCREDITATION REPORT.

**PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #2**

MAJOR	MINOR
<p>PM-1. There are no strategic planning or program operations documents that give directions to management and/or staff. Planning documents should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Strategic/Annual Plan</li> <li>1.2 Management and Finance Plan</li> <li>1.3 Staff Development Plan</li> <li>1.4 Employer Marketing and Job Development Plan</li> <li>1.5 Technology Plan</li> </ul> <p>Management may produce a comprehensive publication or a series</p>	PM-1. The planning documents are not relevant to the operation of the program nor are descriptive of what is happening within the program.

<p>of publications that contain the type of information required in accredited JAG programs (Refer to 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 for the recommended contents of the plans listed above.</p>	
--	--

MAJOR	MINOR
<p>PM-2. Program staff is not aware of the contents of the planning documents and there is no operational plan to implement the contents of the planning documents.</p> <p>PM-3. There is no system of accountability in place as outlined throughout the JAG Model.</p> <p>PM-4. Management is not operating the not-for-profit organization in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements nor are the 501(c)(3) tax exemption guidelines being enforced.</p>	<p>PM-2. The planning documents are poorly written.</p> <p>PM-3. There are no public and community relations programs in which all program staff is involved.</p> <p>PM-4. Program outcomes do not exceed JAG's minimum performance standards (which should only be expected of a mature program).</p> <p>PM-5. There are no informational/promotional brochures or news publications.</p> <p>PM-6: The incentive program is poorly conceived.</p>

**PROGRAM STAFF**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #3**

MAJOR	MINOR
PS-1. The Management Team is inadequate to lead a fully accredited JAG Model Program	PS-1. The Management Team has deficiencies that training and program consultation can overcome.
PS-2. Program Specialists are inadequate to deliver the services of a fully accredited JAG Model Program	PS-2. Program Specialists have deficiencies that training and oversight can overcome.
PS-3. Staffing Patterns do not reflect the diversity of the community/state and there does not appear to be a resolve to have a diversified staffing pattern.	PS-3. Targeted hiring can overcome any staff deficiencies that exist.
PS-4. The staff does not operate with high ethical standards and there is no evidence of personal or programmatic integrity.	PS-4. Supervisory staff is unable to provide adequate supervision due to the number of staff assigned and/or the geographic spread is too great for meaningful supervision.
PS-5. There is no accountability system in which program staff are responsible for program or individual performance.	PS-5. Performance appraisals are not provided on a regular basis and/or do not reflect the program standards of a JAG Model Program.
PS-6. Program staff is unable or unwilling to guarantee the integrity of the data that is reported using JAG's Data Management System.	PS-6. The reporting of data is flawed, however, the problems can be alleviated with proper training and supervision.
	PS-7. There is no employee handbook that outlines company policy and guidelines.

**STUDENT SELECTION**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #4**

MAJOR	MINOR
SS-1. Advisory committees are not functioning in the schools as prescribed in the JAG Model.	SS-1. The selection of students is not the result of a process that is influenced by the Advisory committee.
SS-2. No selection process is used; students are placed in the JAG program by school and/or counselors.	SS-2. Composition of advisory committee does not include the "right" mix of members.
SS-3. There are no signed Student-Parent Commitment Forms nor does it appear that a meeting was held with parents to discuss the support needed by the Specialist to impact their son or daughter.	SS-3. Income becomes the only criteria for the targeting of students in a JAG Model Program.
SS-4. The program is not using the NATIONAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM to track the students selected by the Advisory Committee to receive JAG Model services.	SS-4. Too large a percentage of students come from the top half of the class.
SS-5. There is no effort expended to contact and/or involve the parents in the program.	SS-5. There is inadequate contact with parents.
	SS-6. No assessment tool used to better understand the students' interests, capabilities, or academic achievement.
	SS-7. JAG graduates have no Individualized Graduation Plans nor were they involved in the design of the IGP's.

**STUDENT LOAD**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #5**

<b>MAJOR</b>	<b>MINOR</b>
<p>SL-1. The student load is too low which results in the cost per participant being too high. JAG's preferred cost per participant is between \$1,000 and \$1,500.</p>	<p>SL-1. Specialists are assigned more than on school to establish JAG accredited programs.</p>
<p>SL-2. The student load is too high and results in inadequate services delivered to program participants. JAG's preferred range is between 35 and 45 students. The range may vary depending upon the number of barriers in the target group.</p>	<p>SL-2. Students in different grades are being combined in the same class period.</p>

**CAREER ASSOCIATION**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #6**

MAJOR	MINOR
CA-1. There is no tangible evidence that the Career Association is used to deliver program services or recognize student achievement.	CA-1. There are no elected Career Association Officers. Officers should be elected by the membership and not appointed by the program staff.
CA-2. The Career Association is not student-led, rather the chapter appears to be dominated and/or directed by the Specialist.	CA-2. The chapter's Program of Work does not address the five (5) areas of service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership Development</li> <li>• Career Development</li> <li>• Social Activities</li> <li>• Civic Activities</li> <li>• Fundraising Activities</li> </ul>
CA-3. The Specialist does not serve as the Chapter Advisor.	CA-3. A low percentage of students are involved in Career Association activities outside the classroom.
CA-4. The state nor the local program provides students with an opportunity to demonstrate their competency in a competitive events program and participate in career and leadership development workshops.	CA-4. Students are not aware they are involved in a student-led organization like a Career Association Chapter.
CA-5. An Initiation and Installation Ceremony is not conducted at the beginning of the program year.	CA-5. Students are unable to contribute a minimum of two (2) hours of community service during a school year.
	CA-6. The Competitive Events Program is used for competition's sake and not as a tool for encouraging competency attainment and recognition of student achievement.

**COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT**  
JAG MODEL COMPONENT #7

MAJOR	MINOR
COM-1. There is inadequate classroom contact with targeted students.	COM-1. Contact hours are not properly documented.
COM-2. Targeted students are unable to attain JAG's 37 core competencies.	COM-2. JAG curriculum modules not being used properly or effectively.
COM-3. There is no systematic approach to documenting competency attainment. The new JAG curriculum does provide pre- and post-test instruments to verify content attainment.	COM-3. Specialists are not documenting the attainment of competencies.
COM-4. The program does not encourage the use of Individualized Development Plans (IDPs).	COM-4. Too high a percentage of participants' IDPs are not available for review.
COM-5. There is no tracking of progress using JAG's National Data Management System nor the ability to print the NS-24 Report: Academic Performance, Attendance, School Behavior Progress Report.	COM-5. There is no consistent tracking of student progress, i.e. academic performance, attendance, school behavior, etc.
COM-6. Specialists are not using Competency Plans from JAG's curriculum modules nor have they developed their own plans to guide their classroom activities.	COM-6. Specialists are not using JAG's new curriculum modules whenever replacement modules are available.
COM-7. High school diplomas are not the preferred education outcome. While GED attainment is a positive outcome, Specialists are encouraged to help their students complete requirements for a high school diploma whenever possible.	COM-7. Classroom contact and services are not properly recorded or tracked.



**EMPLOYER MARKETING & JOB DEVELOPMENT**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #8**

<b>MAJOR</b>	<b>MINOR</b>
<p>EM-1. The program does not emphasize the placement of graduates in “quality jobs” — provide full-time work, competitive salaries, safe working conditions, adequate job training, effective supervision, periodic performance appraisals, employment benefits (health insurance, employer financed education, etc.) and advancement opportunities.</p>	<p>EM-1. Employers are not encouraged or invited to participate in program activities, including: classroom visits, speaking engagements, mock interviewers, job shadowing, judging competitive events, workshop presenting, etc.</p>
<p>EM-2. Leading employers in the community are not aware of the JAG Model Program nor do they realize that some of their employees are involved in the program</p>	<p>EM-2. Specialists do not have an employer marketing and job development plan tailored to their assigned territories.</p>
<p>EM-3. No plan exists for recruiting employers who can deliver quality jobs to JAG Program Graduates.</p>	<p>EM-3. Non-seniors are not provided opportunities for work-based experiences during the summer months between grades.</p>

**FOLLOW-UP SERVICES**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #9**

MAJOR	MINOR
FS-1. The Specialist who delivered classroom instruction is not responsible for conducting follow-up services.	FS-1. Students are not placed in quality jobs, rather, graduates are told that they are totally responsible for finding employment after graduation.
FS-2. Non-graduates do not receive the prescribed services during the follow-up period.	FS-2. Specialists take credit for placement outcomes when the JAG graduate was the one who found the employment opportunity and got hired.
FS-3. Non-graduates are not assisted by Specialists in completing requirements for a high school diploma or GED	FS-3. Specialists (nor the program) are achieving the minimum performance standards expected of JAG accredited programs.
FS-4. Placements are claimed before the students received their high school diploma or GED.	FS-4. Graduates are placed in part-time jobs with fewer than 10 hours per week and there is no effort to upgrade the number of hours of work on a weekly basis.
FS-5. Specialists are not tracking services delivered during the follow-up period using the JAG Data Management System.	FS-5. Specialists have incomplete tracking data in JAG's National Data Management System.
FS-6. Specialists fail to make monthly contact with graduates and non-graduates, however, graduates are not reported as Unable to Contact.	FS-6. Specialists are not encouraging employers to make a positive change in status of the graduate during the Follow-up period.
FS-7. Specialists fail to make five (5) contacts with employers during the Follow-up Period.	FS-7. Summer work experiences are not being used to maintain contact with students between grades.
FS-8. Placement outcomes are being claimed for graduates that are working with the same employer and work conditions (number of hours, wage, etc.) as they had upon entry into the program.	FS-8. Part-time work placements during the school year put graduation at risk.

## NATIONAL DATA BASE PARTICIPATION

### JAG Model Component #10

MAJOR	MINOR
DB-1. The Program is not using JAG's National Data Management System.	DB-1. The Program is not taking full advantage of the National Data Management System.
DB-2. The Program did not submit its export file for all program participants by the following dates:  2.1 January 15 2.2 April 15 2.3 July 15 2.4 October 15	DB-2. The program has not adapted the JAG National Data Management System, however, it does submit paper-based reports that include the same data bits.
DB-3. There is no confidence in the data that is captured in the JAG Data Management System.	DB-3. Program staff has not been properly trained to use the JAG National Data Management System.
DB-4. Program staff has not taken the greatest advantage of JAG's Accreditation Process.	DB-4. Program staff does not support the Accreditation Process as requested by the national organization.

**PROGRAM AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT**  
**JAG MODEL COMPONENT #11**

<b>MAJOR</b>	<b>MINOR</b>
<p>PS1. There is no staff development plan for new and/or experienced staff members.</p> <p>PS-2. The JAG Model Program does not have an internal quality assurance program that validates the implementation of the JAG Model in all schools.</p> <p>PS-3. Program staff does not respond to JAG surveys and information requests in a timely basis.</p>	<p>PS-1. There is limited participation in the National Training Seminar.</p> <p>PS-2. There is no internal capacity building for trainers or internal program reviewers.</p> <p>PS-3. Program Management has not participated in the Management Development Institute.</p>