Committee letter of products
I submit each of these products for approval to candidacy as they are professional experiences that have helped me to grow in being a leader in the field of juvenile justice and education. I consider them the starting blocks of my career in academia. I present them for approval.

Multiple authored research paper: Learning what research and writing is in academia.


The experience of doing this research and writing for publication was the start of my transition to an academia thought process. I designed the survey and went through the IRB approval process. I included Heather Baltodano and Chris Robert as they were my research assistant peers in EDJJ and to gather the data quicker. Having worked in the facility for over 10 years I had access to the youth. I went through the necessary processes to get permissions to do the study.

What I did not know was how far off I was from understanding what academic research is. When we started the data collection, Heather asked me what my research question was. I said what? She probably asked several other questions but looking back, I had no idea what she was talking about. After taking research classes, I now know why she asked and I have a better idea of how to do academic research. Being a long time practitioner in the facility, research consisted of asking many questions and getting percentages to make decisions. When I did the survey my perspective was to see what the youth thought worked to help in their transition. I did not go into this with a specific research design but a shot gun approach. This was the first of many differences I leaned
about academic language and perspective differences from being a practitioner and academia.

Heather’s strength for research and academic writing was well above ours so she took lead in paper. I am very thankful to her and what she taught me. We divided up the paper and I wrote the methods section, Chris Roberts wrote the literature review, and Heather did the results section. The rest of the paper consisted of our perspectives and ideas which expanded as we each edited the paper. When we were negotiating first author I ignorantly thought my name should be first as I had designed the survey and put most of the study together. I discussed this professionally with Heather and she said she should be lead as she was main researcher and writer. After understanding again what academic life is, I was able to learn ethic of authorship. This paper was a great first experience in learning about academic writing and research and working in a collaborative team.

This paper was submitted to the Tara Reilly Memorial Scholarship with the Behavioral Institute for Children and Adolescents and won in 2004. We were awarded five hundred dollars and were the guests of the conference in Minnesota to present our findings. In 2005 it was published in Journal of Correctional Education.

**EDJJ & CLN Professional Development series: What it takes to write and present a professional development series nationally.**


I was accepted into the ASU PhD program the last few years of the National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice Grant. This was a collaborative
project with many organizations in focusing on research; provide technical assistance, disseminating information, providing consultation and professional development services.

EDJJ decided to tape six of their eight professional development series to broadcast on the CLN network and have DVD’s for dissemination in correctional facilities. I was part of the “Curriculum for Individuals with Disabilities in the Juvenile Justice System” series. Jeffrey Johnston prepared most of this series which can be found on the EDJJ web site http://www.edjj.org/training/pdf/index.html.

As Jeff was not able to do the CLN part, I was asked if I would do it because of my experience as a teacher in corrections. I took the training and content modules (76 pages) and altered its form to being a script. I felt the information was excellent and wanted the focus on practical knowledge that teachers could use in designing their curriculum. I wanted to show examples of programs throughout the country to give teachers a look at what other facilities are doing and new ideas they could try. With teachers as the audience, I wanted to make it exciting and interesting with a hint of fun.

Writing in script form is different as we write for the prompter in how you will say it. Writing in visual cues and backgrounds help to give a overall view of what the audience will see when it is all put together. Writing the script line by line was very tedious but I felt the national examples used were excellent to help teacher view others experiences to help them think outside the box in designing their curriculum. It was also very time consuming to editing footage of experts in the field but important to have their voice in helping define appropriate ways to teach in correctional facilities.
I went twice to the CLN headquarters in Spokane WA. The first trip I met the producer and production team. We went through a practice run on camera and went over the developing script. The second trip was full of taping with a very strict time line. The days were full of script editing, taping, and negotiating what should be adding to the tape when we left. The production of media was a great experience and a lot of hard work.

**Grant Writing: First experience of taking the grant ball and running with it.**

Platt, D.E. Co-Investigator & Main grant writer, Mathur, S. R. Principle Investigator & Griller-Clark, H. Co-Investigator High Risk Youth and Transition. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention ($1,000,000). The grant was reported as not being funded 11/07. A request for comments was submitted and I hope to have them by 1/08.

Mid May 2007 the OJJDP FY 2007 High-Risk Youth Offender Reentry and Family Strengthening Initiatives grant was discover and I decided I wanted to apply for it. There was about three weeks before it was due on June 8th. I knew it was going to be a challenge but I went for it. First, I asked the necessary participating organization if they would be willing to be part of this and give letters of support. This being the critical part, I knew I would not be able to go forward without the support. They accepted and I was on my way. I read the grant several times and started to put it together. I asked several people if they could help and if not what suggestions do they have as this is the first major grant I applied for.

It was very helpful that in January 2005 I participated in a 3 day grant workshop and I also work on grants with Elizabeth last semester. One of the main things I learned was to go out and apply. I reviewed my notes and used them as a guide throughout. I knew with the short time frame I could not write it from scratch so I considered it an
extension and expansion of the Arizona Detention Transition Projects grant. I extracted parts and molded it from being about special education youth and transition to high risk youth and reentry. Many of the proposed suggestions in the grant were thoughts I had in making system changes to the work I had been doing in detention. The main focus is a final product of a system sustained reentry model with a clear “one view” defining of a youths risk, a collaborative communication mechanism (portfolio and dashboard), with a streamlined view of services and support (resource database) to help justice systems make data driven decisions on dealing with high risk youth on re-entry.

To get this accomplished I pulled in many favors and asked for help from others to give just a little time in gathering critical information that should be in the grant. I was impressed that I was able to get it in on time and I look forward to the comments from the grant reviewers to help me with my future proposals. The Office for Research & Sponsored Programs did a great job in assisting with the budget and completing it based on the structure of the project. Putting a grant together was a good experience and even though it was not funded is a foundation of the future as I see it critical in the work I would like to do in furthering the field.

**Single authored research paper**

**Platt, D. E. Language: Critical Components in Readers with Criminal Referral History.**

The data for this project was collected in 2005 and the paper was started in 2006. I have counted more then 2 dozen edits to this paper. I have sent it to at least seven different people to get their views of my content and writing. This last year has had many challenges in going forward with my research and writing but it has also given me different perspective in my work. When I had a first edit of the paper with Rob I counted
each edit to see what I need to watch to improve my writing. I feel that I need to practice more getting the academia language down. 40% of the changes he made were with 1-4 words and 23% were with formation (APA, spacing, etc). Peter Leone was the last to edit the paper and I received it back on 12/4. I believe my writing has changed drastically when I finishing the books about writing we read this semester (“The work of writing”- Rankin, “On Writing- King, & “The elements of style”- Strunk). I need to practice and read more to improve my writing.

I consider this paper my first major attempt to get my voice out in a new way. I struggle with knowing when the paper is done as I believe we can edit forever so I ask for your help in bringing me to the level of writing that is acceptable in the field. The research was in an analysis of multi agency data between educational and the behavioral recorded in juvenile justice. My main findings are that criminal referral history and language are significant factors when looking at youth in the detention center. The paper adds to the discussion of incarcerated youth having lower reading level then those not in the justice system. This is part of my bigger dissertation proposal of including many factors in understanding the youth in the justice system including education, mental health, and justice information. I plan to submit this to the Journal of Correctional Education.

Thank you for your time and effort in taking me to the next level and furthering me in candidacy in the PhD process. I look forward to our interaction this next year.

Derrick