

PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

The Florida Legislature mandates in statute, s. 985.632 (4)(a)(b), the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) to evaluate the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs that provide care, custody, and treatment for committed youth. To meet this requirement, the Department, in collaboration with the independent Justice Research Center (JRC), developed the annual Program Accountability Measures (PAM) scores. The PAM evaluation is critical given that DJJ processes more than 138,000 intake referrals annually, with approximately 10,000 youth entering one of more than 140 residential programs. To ensure independent and objective evaluation, PAM analyses strictly adheres to the methodology determined at the Department's Common Definitions Meeting.

The desired outcome of juvenile justice programs is to reduce future offending in a cost-effective manner. However, by legislative mandate and program design, programs serve youth whose risk to re-offend varies widely. These factors affect the likelihood that youth will recidivate. A simple comparison of program success rates does not take these factors into account. In fact, such a method would unfairly penalize programs that serve the most challenging youth. It is therefore important that outcome measurement take into consideration the risk factors that influence the likelihood of re-offending for the youth released from each program.

The Program Accountability Measures model takes into account the risk factors of the youth completing each program and estimates the probability of those youth recidivating. Before doing so, it is possible to calculate how well a program is expected to perform based on the risk of re-offending of the youth completing the program, and to compare this to how well those youth actually performed after release. This ensures that programs serving more difficult youth are not held to inequitable standards due to the higher risk of re-offending of the youth they serve, and provides a realistic measure of program effectiveness for those programs serving less challenging youth.

By implementing an evaluation tool that assesses the effectiveness of programs in reducing recidivism while including a cost effectiveness measure, the PAM analysis promotes accountability in the delivery of juvenile residential services. The PAM methodology has been highlighted as a best practice in the use of juvenile justice data by the National Center for Juvenile Justice and selected as a semifinalist in the prestigious Innovations in American Government Awards, sponsored by the Harvard University, Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation. The PAM is not an indicator of conditions of confinement or overall quality of care within a program.

Basic comparisons of program recidivism rates are often used to assess effectiveness. However, beginning in 1996, DJJ sought a more equitable, objective means of quantitatively evaluating programs that would examine differences in program costs as well as account for the fact that facilities serve youth whose risk for re-

offending varies widely. The PAM model does this through two core measures: 1) recidivism effectiveness, which is measured as the difference between how well a program is expected to do given the risk for re-offending attributed to each youth completing the program (expected recidivism), and how well the program youth actually performed (observed recidivism); and 2) cost effectiveness, which is measured as the program's average cost per youth completing the program compared to the statewide program average cost per completion. Recidivism effectiveness is further broken down into five categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Average, Below Average, and Least Effective. Cost effectiveness is categorized into: Low, Medium, and High costs. The two measures are combined into a PAM score for each residential facility that can range from 1 to 100. Recidivism (subsequent adjudication/conviction) is tracked for one year following program completion.

Data for the PAM analysis were compiled from the DJJ Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Florida Criminal Information Center (FCIC), the Florida Department of Corrections (DC), the DJJ Office of Finance and Accounting, and the DJJ Bureau of Quality Assurance. The JJIS system was used to identify the youth who completed residential commitment programs during the one-year period from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. Demographic data for these youth, as well as their offense histories, were obtained from JJIS. Youth who subsequently re-offended were identified through both juvenile offense records in JJIS and, for those who reached 18 years of age during the follow-up period or had a case handled in adult court, through adult records in FCIC and DC. For a number of years, many stakeholders have noted the need to incorporate additional risk factors in controlling for program differences in the relative risk of offenders served. To that end, the Department and the Justice Research Center have been committed to incorporating other variables and determined that such data could be extracted from JJIS risk assessment instruments. For the fifth year, risk assessment data were included in the PAM calculations. The Juvenile Justice Information System was used to extract individual youth risk factor data from Supervision Risk Classification Instrument (SRCI) and the Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT). Data from SRCI and PACT administrations completed prior to program admission were controlled for in comparing youth recidivism outcomes by program.

This year's PAM scores present recidivism and cost effectiveness results for the programs that completed at least 15 youth during the one-year period between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008. A PAM score is calculated for each program to provide a program rank based on its effectiveness and cost relative to other commitment programs. The following tables provide PAM scores by gender, restrictiveness level, and effectiveness based upon youth completing residential programming during FY 2007-08, and followed for success through June 30, 2009. All PAM tables and outputs can be found at: www.djj.state.fl.us/

The Department also wants to thank members of the Justice Research Center, Dr. Kristin Winokur, Julia Blankenship, and Greg Hand for their assistance in the production of the Program Accountability Measures reported in the CAR. Their research expertise and passion for improving the juvenile justice system make them perfect partners in this endeavor.

Determining significant predictors of subsequent offending and calculating program expected success is a multi-stage process. Initially, risk factors are correlated at the bivariate level. All available legal, socio-demographic, and risk variables in the JJIS data are included at this stage. Those factors significantly related to re-offending at the bivariate level are then entered into multivariate logistic regression analyses. Logistic regression is the proper statistical technique to use when the outcome variable, in this instance whether youth recidivated (yes/no), is a dichotomous or binary measure. The multivariate analyses revealed the following factors as statistically significant predictors of re-offending for the 7,688 youth released from residential programs in Florida during fiscal year 2007-08:

| Risk Factors Identified in the Logistic Regression Analyses |
|--|
| 1. Age at release |
| 2. Significant trauma traumatic event witnessed and or flashbacks |
| 3. Gender |
| 4. Number of prior juvenile referrals |
| 5. Prior misdemeanor adjudications |
| 6. Race |
| 7. Youth assessed risk level |
| 8. Prior escapes |
| 9. Sex offender program |

Highlights from this year's report include:

- Sixteen residential commitment programs (13%), achieved PAM scores of 80 or higher, representing a 20% decrease over the number of programs scoring at this level last year.
- Almost one-third of all residential programs in the state were rated as Effective or Highly Effective (n=37, 31%).
- 15 programs were categorized as Highly Effective. Three of these residential facilities were Low Cost programs, while five were Moderate Cost and the remaining 8 were High Cost facilities.
- 12 programs were categorized as Least Effective. Of these residential facilities, seven were Low Cost programs, which means their low scores were primarily due to their higher than expected recidivism rates. Two of the Least Effective programs were Moderate Cost and four were High Cost facilities.

The table below lists the highest and lowest PAM scores for the male and female programs.

**PAM Outcomes (FY 2007-08):
Six Highest and Lowest PAM Scores by Gender**

| Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference ¹ | Expected Success Range | Cost per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| <i>Six Highest PAM Scores - Female</i> | | | | | | | | |
| YMCA Character Halfway House ² | 22 | 95% | 14.4% | 75.9% - 81.1% | \$54,506 | Highly Effective | High | 97 |
| Dove Academy | 52 | 90% | 8.3% | 79.4% - 82.1% | \$53,458 | Highly Effective | High | 89 |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy - New Beginnings ² | 23 | 83% | 4.6% | 72.4% - 78.0% | \$19,302 | Highly Effective | Low | 86 |
| Francis Walker Halfway House | 53 | 81% | 2.7% | 75.5% - 78.4% | \$27,125 | Effective | Low | 80 |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF ² | 44 | 73% | 0.0% | 71.0% - 74.6% | \$16,128 | Average | Low | 75 |
| Sawmill Academy For Girls ² | 33 | 70% | 0.0% | 69.0% - 73.7% | \$23,681 | Average | Low | 74 |
| <i>Six Highest PAM Scores - Male</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Forestry Youth Academy ² | 28 | 75% | 12.3% | 56.7% - 62.7% | \$49,696 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 98 |
| Orange Youth Academy ² | 24 | 71% | 10.2% | 53.9% - 60.7% | \$37,008 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 96 |
| Price Halfway House ² | 25 | 68% | 8.1% | 53.2% - 59.9% | \$39,529 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 91 |
| Dade Juvenile Residential Facility | 66 | 76% | 8.5% | 64.3% - 67.2% | \$66,448 | Highly Effective | High | 87 |
| San Antonio Boys Village ² | 29 | 66% | 6.2% | 53.3% - 59.3% | \$34,641 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 87 |
| Blackwater Stop ² | 28 | 64% | 5.6% | 52.5% - 58.6% | \$25,000 | Highly Effective | Low | 87 |
| <i>Six Lowest PAM Scores - Female</i> | | | | | | | | |
| HOPE ² | 32 | 66% | -1.8% | 67.4% - 72.3% | \$58,179 | Below Average | High | 63 |
| Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility ² | 31 | 65% | -2.4% | 67.0% - 71.9% | \$49,970 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| Lake Academy ² | 77 | 62% | -3.2% | 65.5% - 68.1% | \$41,177 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 56 | 66% | -1.9% | 67.9% - 71.2% | \$62,382 | Below Average | High | 62 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 26 | 65% | -1.9% | 67.3% - 72.9% | \$86,130 | Below Average | High | 58 |
| Joann Bridges Academy | 41 | 56% | -7.2% | 63.3% - 67.6% | \$37,964 | Least Effective | Moderate | 54 |
| <i>Six Lowest PAM Scores - Male</i> | | | | | | | | |
| South Pines - Moderate ² | 20 | 30% | -9.8% | 39.8% - 47.7% | \$24,289 | Least Effective | Low | 50 |
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP | 25 | 76% | -2.5% | 78.5% - 83.0% | \$144,935 | Below Average | High | 49 |
| Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program ² | 38 | 76% | -2.6% | 78.9% - 82.3% | \$127,393 | Below Average | High | 49 |
| NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program ² | 29 | 31% | -8.4% | 39.4% - 45.3% | \$50,884 | Least Effective | High | 49 |
| MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility ² | 32 | 69% | -7.4% | 76.2% - 80.2% | \$69,448 | Least Effective | High | 48 |
| St Johns Correctional Facility ² | 25 | 68% | -7.9% | 75.9% - 80.7% | \$108,119 | Least Effective | High | 40 |

¹ Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

² Program either closed, changed names, changed providers or had a structural programmatic change.

**Low Risk Residential: Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Performance
Youth Completions FY 2007-08 by PAM Score and Effectiveness Category**

| Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference ¹ | Expected Success Range | Cost per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Female Low Risk Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Vision Quest - Low | 68 | 68% | -1.1% | 68.8% - 71.5% | \$19,863 | Below Average | Low | 72 |
| STEP II - Female | 63 | 62% | -3.7% | 65.6% - 68.6% | \$6,250 | Below Average | Low | 68 |
| Male Low Risk Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Forestry Youth Academy ² | 28 | 75% | 12.3% | 56.7% - 62.7% | \$49,696 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 98 |
| STEP I - Male | 152 | 43% | -0.4% | 43.8% - 45.3% | \$6,342 | Below Average | Low | 76 |
| Peace River Outward Bound ² | 144 | 45% | -0.2% | 45.3% - 46.9% | \$8,601 | Below Average | Low | 76 |
| Dade Group Treatment Home ² | 17 | 53% | 0.0% | 46.4% - 55.5% | \$20,153 | Average | Low | 74 |
| Seminole Work and Learn Center ² | 43 | 44% | -0.6% | 44.8% - 49.3% | \$13,782 | Below Average | Low | 74 |
| Eckerd Academy ² | 59 | 41% | -2.1% | 42.8% - 46.3% | \$30,269 | Below Average | Moderate | 67 |
| Brevard Group Treatment Home | 60 | 35% | -4.6% | 39.6% - 42.9% | \$23,740 | Least Effective | Low | 63 |
| White Foundation Family Homes - Male ² | 28 | 36% | -5.6% | 41.3% - 47.4% | \$23,499 | Least Effective | Low | 60 |
| South Pines - Low ² | 27 | 30% | -9.4% | 39.1% - 45.3% | \$23,037 | Least Effective | Low | 51 |

¹ Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

² Program either closed, changed names, changed providers or had a structural programmatic change.

**Moderate Risk Residential: Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Performance
Youth Completions FY 2007-08 by PAM Score and Effectiveness Category**

| Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference ¹ | Expected Success Range | Cost per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Female Moderate Risk Residential | | | | | | | | |
| YMCA Character Halfway House ² | 22 | 95% | 14.4% | 75.9% - 81.1% | \$54,506 | Highly Effective | High | 97 |
| Dove Academy | 52 | 90% | 8.3% | 79.4% - 82.1% | \$53,458 | Highly Effective | High | 89 |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy - New Beginnings ² | 23 | 83% | 4.6% | 72.4% - 78.0% | \$19,302 | Highly Effective | Low | 86 |
| Francis Walker Halfway House | 53 | 81% | 2.7% | 75.5% - 78.4% | \$27,125 | Effective | Low | 80 |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF ² | 44 | 73% | 0.0% | 71.0% - 74.6% | \$16,128 | Average | Low | 75 |
| Sawmill Academy For Girls ² | 33 | 70% | 0.0% | 69.0% - 73.7% | \$23,681 | Average | Low | 74 |
| WINGS | 15 | 80% | 2.5% | 69.7% - 77.5% | \$67,896 | Effective | High | 72 |
| Vision Quest - Moderate | 72 | 74% | 0.0% | 72.3% - 74.8% | \$46,271 | Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Pines Juvenile Residential Facility ² | 85 | 65% | -2.4% | 67.1% - 69.5% | \$28,950 | Below Average | Moderate | 67 |
| Wilson Youth Academy ² | 33 | 64% | -3.0% | 66.6% - 71.4% | \$33,777 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 31 | 74% | 0.0% | 70.7% - 75.4% | \$78,149 | Average | High | 64 |
| Lake Academy ² | 77 | 62% | -3.2% | 65.5% - 68.1% | \$41,177 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility ² | 31 | 65% | -2.4% | 67.0% - 71.9% | \$49,970 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| HOPE ² | 32 | 66% | -1.8% | 67.4% - 72.3% | \$58,179 | Below Average | High | 63 |
| Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 56 | 66% | -1.9% | 67.9% - 71.2% | \$62,382 | Below Average | High | 62 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 26 | 65% | -1.9% | 67.3% - 72.9% | \$86,130 | Below Average | High | 58 |
| Joann Bridges Academy | 41 | 56% | -7.2% | 63.3% - 67.6% | \$37,964 | Least Effective | Moderate | 54 |

¹ Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

² Program either closed, changed names, changed providers or had a structural programmatic change.

Moderate Risk Residential: Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Performance (continued)
Youth Completions FY 2007-08 by PAM Score and Effectiveness Category

| Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference ¹ | Expected Success Range | Cost per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Male Moderate Risk Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Price Halfway House ² | 25 | 68% | 8.1% | 53.2% - 59.9% | \$39,529 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 91 |
| Blackwater Stop ² | 28 | 64% | 5.6% | 52.5% - 58.6% | \$25,000 | Highly Effective | Low | 87 |
| San Antonio Boys Village ² | 29 | 66% | 6.2% | 53.3% - 59.3% | \$34,641 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 87 |
| Dade Juvenile Residential Facility | 66 | 76% | 8.5% | 64.3% - 67.2% | \$66,448 | Highly Effective | High | 87 |
| Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 30 | 63% | 5.0% | 52.5% - 58.3% | \$39,927 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 83 |
| Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 62% | 3.6% | 53.8% - 58.3% | \$26,323 | Effective | Low | 82 |
| Miami Halfway House | 31 | 61% | 3.7% | 51.9% - 57.5% | \$26,788 | Effective | Low | 82 |
| Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS) ² | 15 | 60% | 2.6% | 47.5% - 57.4% | \$20,637 | Effective | Low | 81 |
| Red Road Academy | 69 | 61% | 2.6% | 55.3% - 58.3% | \$26,192 | Effective | Low | 80 |
| Polk STAR ² | 61 | 64% | 4.1% | 56.5% - 59.8% | \$51,038 | Highly Effective | High | 79 |
| Space Coast Marine Institute | 42 | 60% | 2.5% | 52.5% - 57.0% | \$28,600 | Effective | Low | 79 |
| Impact Halfway House | 34 | 56% | 0.6% | 49.9% - 55.2% | \$21,505 | Effective | Low | 76 |
| Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility ² | 20 | 50% | 0.0% | 46.0% - 53.9% | \$12,055 | Average | Low | 76 |
| Duval Juvenile Residential Facility | 50 | 56% | 0.7% | 51.3% - 55.3% | \$24,412 | Effective | Low | 75 |
| Falkenberg Academy | 132 | 60% | 1.3% | 56.9% - 58.6% | \$35,614 | Effective | Moderate | 75 |
| Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy ² | 135 | 61% | 1.4% | 57.7% - 59.3% | \$36,490 | Effective | Moderate | 75 |
| Eckerd Intensive Halfway House ² | 25 | 60% | 3.1% | 50.2% - 56.9% | \$59,425 | Effective | High | 75 |
| Avon Park Youth Academy | 196 | 59% | 0.8% | 57.2% - 58.4% | \$32,577 | Effective | Moderate | 74 |
| Volusia Halfway House | 39 | 54% | 0.0% | 49.5% - 54.3% | \$23,822 | Average | Low | 74 |
| Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program | 71 | 51% | 0.0% | 49.0% - 51.9% | \$24,457 | Average | Low | 74 |
| Panther Success Center - White Foundation | 98 | 46% | -0.1% | 46.0% - 48.3% | \$19,749 | Below Average | Low | 74 |
| Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility | 34 | 47% | 0.0% | 45.9% - 51.2% | \$26,097 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate | 144 | 48% | 0.0% | 47.6% - 49.2% | \$27,157 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Youth Environmental Services | 44 | 52% | 0.0% | 49.0% - 53.4% | \$28,560 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Pensacola Boys Base | 44 | 45% | 0.0% | 45.5% - 49.9% | \$28,967 | Average | Moderate | 73 |
| Collier Academy ² | 55 | 44% | -0.9% | 44.5% - 48.2% | \$17,849 | Below Average | Low | 73 |
| Eckerd Youth Challenge Program | 57 | 56% | 0.8% | 51.8% - 55.4% | \$45,682 | Effective | Moderate | 72 |
| Riverside Academy ² | 230 | 52% | 0.0% | 51.4% - 52.5% | \$33,125 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Thompson Academy | 119 | 50% | 0.0% | 48.7% - 50.7% | \$33,270 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 46 | 52% | 0.0% | 49.0% - 53.3% | \$33,543 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Gulf Coast Youth Academy | 135 | 48% | 0.0% | 47.8% - 49.5% | \$33,576 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy | 145 | 50% | 0.0% | 49.5% - 51.1% | \$33,988 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Britt Halfway House | 38 | 47% | 0.0% | 46.3% - 51.3% | \$35,033 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Okaloosa Halfway House ² | 36 | 53% | 0.0% | 48.8% - 54.0% | \$38,314 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Vocational Youth Center ² | 33 | 52% | 0.0% | 47.9% - 53.4% | \$38,981 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Bay Point Schools-North | 22 | 45% | 0.0% | 44.8% - 52.3% | \$41,484 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Thompson Academy Choices | 47 | 49% | 0.0% | 47.4% - 51.6% | \$41,490 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Bristol Youth Academy | 64 | 55% | 0.2% | 51.2% - 54.5% | \$47,885 | Effective | Moderate | 70 |
| Les Peters Halfway House | 49 | 43% | -1.3% | 44.2% - 48.2% | \$28,490 | Below Average | Low | 70 |
| Hastings Specialized & Intensive MH Treatment | 26 | 62% | 3.9% | 51.1% - 57.6% | \$105,109 | Effective | High | 69 |

¹ Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

² Program either closed, changed names, changed providers or had a structural programmatic change.

Moderate Risk Residential: Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Performance (continued)
Youth Completions FY 2007-08 by PAM Score and Effectiveness Category

| Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference ¹ | Expected Success Range | Cost per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Male Moderate Risk Residential (continued) | | | | | | | | |
| Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility | 53 | 42% | -1.8% | 43.3% - 47.1% | \$28,176 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility ² | 46 | 80% | 0.0% | 80.3% - 83.1% | \$55,433 | Average | High | 68 |
| Okaloosa Youth Academy | 121 | 40% | -1.7% | 41.3% - 43.1% | \$35,674 | Below Average | Moderate | 68 |
| Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged | 42 | 45% | -0.1% | 45.4% - 49.9% | \$57,379 | Below Average | High | 68 |
| Florida Environmental Institute | 34 | 41% | -2.2% | 43.4% - 48.8% | \$33,760 | Below Average | Moderate | 67 |
| Big Cypress Wilderness Institute | 36 | 42% | -1.9% | 43.5% - 48.7% | \$37,791 | Below Average | Moderate | 67 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male | 113 | 58% | 0.9% | 54.6% - 56.6% | \$80,531 | Effective | High | 66 |
| West Florida Wilderness Institute | 64 | 38% | -3.2% | 40.7% - 43.9% | \$20,732 | Below Average | Low | 66 |
| MATS - Halfway House ² | 65 | 38% | -2.7% | 41.2% - 44.4% | \$32,886 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Gulf Academy - Mental Health ² | 52 | 42% | -1.5% | 43.8% - 47.7% | \$50,393 | Below Average | High | 65 |
| Camp E-Kel-Etu | 45 | 42% | -1.6% | 43.8% - 48.1% | \$52,410 | Below Average | High | 65 |
| Polk Halfway House ² | 30 | 40% | -3.0% | 43.0% - 48.8% | \$37,213 | Below Average | Moderate | 64 |
| Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment | 20 | 50% | 0.0% | 45.9% - 54.0% | \$86,845 | Average | High | 63 |
| ARC Halfway House | 92 | 37% | -2.8% | 39.7% - 42.1% | \$46,371 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| Camp E-Ma-Chamee | 21 | 57% | 1.1% | 48.4% - 56.1% | \$104,135 | Effective | High | 62 |
| GOALS ² | 25 | 36% | -5.5% | 41.5% - 48.2% | \$18,154 | Least Effective | Low | 61 |
| Camp E-Tu-Makee ² | 24 | 38% | -4.6% | 42.1% - 49.0% | \$39,525 | Least Effective | Moderate | 60 |
| Greenville Combined_Bassin MERIT Jefferson Taylor Madison | 43 | 30% | -7.5% | 37.7% - 42.1% | \$8,374 | Least Effective | Low | 58 |
| South Pines - Moderate ² | 20 | 30% | -9.8% | 39.8% - 47.7% | \$24,289 | Least Effective | Low | 50 |
| MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility ² | 32 | 69% | -7.4% | 76.2% - 80.2% | \$69,448 | Least Effective | High | 48 |

¹ Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

² Program either closed, changed names, changed providers or had a structural programmatic change.

**High Risk Residential: Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Performance
Youth Completions FY 2007-08 by PAM Score and Effectiveness Category**

| Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference ¹ | Expected Success Range | Cost per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Female High Risk Residential | | | | | | | | |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 22 | 82% | 4.1% | 71.9% - 77.7% | \$110,749 | Highly Effective | High | 69 |
| Monticello New Life | 37 | 70% | 0.0% | 69.4% - 73.6% | \$50,016 | Average | High | 69 |
| Desoto - Female | 24 | 79% | 2.2% | 71.5% - 77.0% | \$97,129 | Effective | High | 66 |
| Male High Risk Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Orange Youth Academy ² | 24 | 71% | 10.2% | 53.9% - 60.7% | \$37,008 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 96 |
| Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services ² | 42 | 62% | 3.7% | 53.8% - 58.2% | \$26,756 | Effective | Low | 82 |
| Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility | 41 | 93% | 5.5% | 84.6% - 87.2% | \$70,796 | Highly Effective | High | 79 |
| Sago Palm - Trailblazers ² | 53 | 55% | 0.2% | 50.7% - 54.6% | \$21,717 | Effective | Low | 75 |
| Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment ² | 16 | 63% | 4.5% | 48.7% - 58.0% | \$84,006 | Highly Effective | High | 74 |
| Sago Palm - Youth Development Center ² | 60 | 45% | -0.4% | 45.4% - 48.8% | \$18,415 | Below Average | Low | 74 |
| Three Springs Sex Offender Program | 22 | 91% | 4.7% | 81.9% - 86.2% | \$99,871 | Highly Effective | High | 72 |
| Sago Palm - Pathfinders ² | 58 | 50% | 0.0% | 48.3% - 51.8% | \$31,932 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| NAFI Intensive Halfway House ² | 23 | 48% | 0.0% | 45.7% - 52.8% | \$32,044 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility | 45 | 49% | 0.0% | 47.3% - 51.6% | \$39,014 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility | 116 | 49% | 0.0% | 48.4% - 50.4% | \$39,602 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program | 24 | 46% | 0.0% | 45.1% - 52.0% | \$44,202 | Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House ² | 32 | 53% | 0.0% | 48.6% - 54.2% | \$60,304 | Average | High | 67 |
| Dozier & JJOC Sex Offender Programs | 59 | 83% | 0.0% | 81.9% - 84.1% | \$69,764 | Average | High | 66 |
| Dozier School and Jackson JOCC | 103 | 44% | -0.7% | 44.3% - 46.5% | \$59,252 | Below Average | High | 66 |
| Brow ard Intensive Halfway House ² | 24 | 46% | 0.0% | 45.0% - 52.0% | \$74,661 | Average | High | 65 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 34 | 53% | 0.0% | 48.6% - 54.0% | \$76,585 | Average | High | 64 |
| Eckerd Youth Development Center ² | 119 | 48% | 0.0% | 47.5% - 49.5% | \$78,119 | Average | High | 64 |
| Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility ² | 138 | 38% | -1.7% | 40.1% - 41.7% | \$55,609 | Below Average | High | 64 |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male | 65 | 46% | 0.0% | 46.0% - 49.2% | \$103,911 | Average | High | 60 |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - High | 45 | 36% | -4.9% | 40.5% - 44.7% | \$54,091 | Least Effective | High | 56 |
| Hastings Youth Academy - High ² | 19 | 32% | -8.8% | 40.4% - 48.5% | \$20,441 | Least Effective | Low | 53 |
| Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program ² | 38 | 76% | -2.6% | 78.9% - 82.3% | \$127,393 | Below Average | High | 49 |
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP | 25 | 76% | -2.5% | 78.5% - 83.0% | \$144,935 | Below Average | High | 49 |
| NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program ² | 29 | 31% | -8.4% | 39.4% - 45.3% | \$50,884 | Least Effective | High | 49 |
| St Johns Correctional Facility ² | 25 | 68% | -7.9% | 75.9% - 80.7% | \$108,119 | Least Effective | High | 40 |

¹ Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

² Program either closed, changed names, changed providers or had a structural programmatic change.

**Maximum Risk Residential: Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Performance
Youth Completions FY 2007-08 by PAM Score and Effectiveness Category**

| Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference ¹ | Expected Success Range | Cost per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Male Maximum Risk Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - Max | 37 | 62% | 3.9% | 53.2% - 58.2% | \$74,363 | Effective | High | 75 |
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 15 | 53% | 0.0% | 45.8% - 55.7% | \$111,740 | Average | High | 58 |

¹ Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

² Program either closed, changed names, changed providers or had a structural programmatic change.