

Department of Juvenile Justice's
Program Accountability Measures:

The 2003 PAM Report
A Two-Year Analysis

December 2002



A Research Report Submitted to the:
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Jeb Bush, Governor
W.G. "Bill" Bankhead, Secretary

Presented by:
The Justice Research Center
443 East College Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32301

**The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice's
Program Accountability Measures:**

The 2003 PAM Report

A Two-Year Analysis

December 2002

A Research Report Submitted to the



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Jeb Bush, Governor

W.G. "Bill" Bankhead, Secretary

DJJ Management Report Number 03-01
Electronic copies of this document are available on the Web at
<http://www.djj.state.fl.us/statsnresearch>

Produced by

Justice Research Center, Inc.
443 East College Avenue
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
850-521-9900

Kristin Parsons Winokur, Ph.D.
Julia Blankenship, MSW
Elizabeth Cass, Ph.D.
Gregory Hand
Amie Schuck, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Data and Methodology	2
Data Sources.....	2
Calculating the PAM Score.....	1
Program Effectiveness Measure.....	1
Program Cost Measure.....	2
The PAM Score: Combining Cost and Effectiveness Measures.....	2
Limitations.....	3
Findings.....	4
Program Effectiveness Categories.....	4
Cost Categories.....	4
PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level	5
PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level and Effectiveness Categories	11
PAM Scores by Cost Categories	18
Appendix 1	24
Program Risk Factors by Restrictiveness Levels, Tables 1A through 1E	24
Appendix 2	32
Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations	32
Appendix 3	35
Definitions of Terms.....	35
Appendix 4	37
Calculating the Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score.....	37
Acknowledgements	39

Introduction

The Program Accountability Measure (PAM) Report details Florida's annual assessment and ranking of non-residential and residential juvenile justice programs based on client outcomes and program costs. Mandated by Florida Statute 985.412(4)(a)(b), the PAM Report has been under development since 1986 to evaluate the performance of juvenile justice programs that provide care, custody, and treatment for youth committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). The methodology employed in the PAM has been recognized by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) as a best practice in the use of juvenile justice data. The Justice Research Center (JRC), Inc., was contracted in 2001 by the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice to produce the PAM Report.

The purpose of this report is to evaluate juvenile justice programs serving youth in Florida in terms of recidivism outcomes and cost effectiveness. The juvenile court has the discretion to commit a youth who is adjudicated delinquent to the Department under Section 985.231 Florida Statutes. The court designates a restrictiveness level to which the youth will be committed based on the nature of the offense, security concerns, and treatment issues. Subsection 985.03 (45) Florida Statutes, defines residential commitment level as "...the level of custody provided by programs that service the custody and care needs of committed children." The levels include, in ascending order of restrictiveness: Low-risk, moderate-risk, high-risk and maximum-risk residential programs. At the time youth in this study were committed to the Department, non-residential programs were still considered commitment programs. During the 2000 session, the Legislature received a report from a committee composed of legislative staff, state attorneys, public defenders, judges and providers recommending that non-residential programs be moved to the Probation and Community Corrections branch of the Department. On October 1, 2000, legislation reclassifying non-residential programs as Probation and Community Corrections programs went into effect.

The desired outcome of juvenile justice programs is to reduce the likelihood of future offending and to accomplish this in a cost-effective manner. However, by legislative and program design, programs serve youth with widely varying risk factors. These factors affect the likelihood that youth will recidivate. A simple comparison of recidivism 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 measures take into consideration the risk factors that influence the likelihood of re-offending for the youth committed to each program.

The PAM model takes into account the risk factors of the youth served by programs and estimates the probability of those youth recidivating. In so doing, it is possible to calculate how well a program is *expected* to do based on the risk of re-offending (expected success) of the youth in their care, and to compare this to how well those youth actually performed (observed success) 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.

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 PAM score is derived from a formula based on: (1) effectiveness as measured by reduced re-offending, and (2) cost per youth who completed the program.

Two major changes were made from previous reports. First, PAM scores are calculated separately for residential and non-residential programs. Second, all government expenditures associated with program operation over the two-year period are included in the average cost calculations. The

current report presents results for programs that released at least 15 youth during the two-year period between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001. Excluding programs that released fewer than 15 youth ensures that small sample sizes do not threaten the reliability of results. (For a listing of programs that released less than 15 youth during the two-year period, see Appendix 2, Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations).

The 2003 PAM Report: A Two-Year Analysis is available on the Department of Juvenile Justice website at <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/statsnresearch>.

Data and Methodology

Data Sources

Data were compiled from the Department of Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Florida Criminal Information Center (FCIC), and the Florida Department of Corrections (DC). The JJIS system was used to identify 2,315 youth who successfully completed non-residential facilities and 15,535 youth who successfully completed residential programs during the two-year period between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001. 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. Recidivism is defined here as *a subsequent juvenile adjudication, adjudication withheld or adult conviction for an offense that occurred within one year of a youth's release to the community or a conditional release program*. A success rate was calculated for each program based on the number of youth who did *not* recidivate.

Program results are presented for the 32 non-residential and 155 residential programs that released at least 15 youth during the two-year period. Scores are reported on s

ome programs that are now closed because PAM scores are now incorporated in past performance criteria used in contracting new programs. Programs that did not release any youth in FY 2000-2001 are not included. For a listing of closed programs that were not included see Appendix 2, Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations.

Calculating the PAM Score

Program Effectiveness Measure

Program effectiveness is defined as the difference between an estimation of the program’s success based on the characteristics of the youth in the program, and its actual success. An estimate of expected success is calculated for each program based on the risk factors of youth released, plus or minus a margin of error (99% confidence interval). A 99% confidence interval is defined as the range of values that, 99 times out of 100, can be expected to contain the number being estimated (expected success). This interval, referred to here as the *expected success range*, is then compared to how well the program actually performed, or the *observed success rate*. The size of a confidence interval is related to the number of youth released by a program. Smaller programs have larger confidence intervals and larger programs have smaller intervals. The difference between a program’s expected success range and its actual success rate provides a measure of the crime reduction effect the program achieved.

Logistic regression analyses were used to determine whether various risk factors available in the JJIS data were associated with recidivism. The following factors were identified as statistically significant predictors of re-offending for youth released from non-residential and residential programs in Florida in order of their predictive strength:

Risk Factors Identified by the Predictive Model – Non-Residential Programs
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gender 2. Race 3. Number of prior felony referrals 4. Age at release from program 5. Number of prior adjudications

Risk Factors Identified by the Predictive Model – Residential Programs
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gender 2. Race 3. Region of state where youth resides 4. Number of prior felony referrals 5. Number of prior adjudications 6. Age at release from program

Gender was the most powerful single predictor of the likelihood that a youth would recidivate for both the non-residential and residential releases. Males and non-white offenders were much more

likely than females and white youth to recidivate. Age at release from the program was also related to recidivism. Younger offenders were more likely to be re-adjudicated/convicted than older youth when controlling for the other variables in the model. Offense history was also a strong predictor. The more adjudications a youth had, the more likely he/she was to recidivate. Furthermore, having multiple prior felony referrals significantly impacted the likelihood that a youth would recidivate following program release.

Among the youth released from residential programs, the region of the state where the youth resides was determined to be a significant predictor of their likelihood to be re-adjudicated/re-convicted. Specifically, youth residing in the northwest, northeast, and west were significantly more likely than youth who resided in the south or east to recidivate. It is not clear why these geographic variations exist. Although arrest practices, the local legal cultures, or rural/urban differences may account for some of the differences, the underlying reasons behind the differences remain an area for further study.

Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) was used to calculate the probability of success (no subsequent adjudications or convictions) for the 32 non-residential and 155 residential programs that released 15 or more youth in FY 1999-2000 and FY 2000-2001. HLM is the appropriate statistical technique for effectively predicting recidivism at the program level while controlling for the individual characteristics of the youth in each program.

Continuing the approach taken last year, a confidence interval for expected success (expected success range) was used to answer the following question: “How large a difference between the expected rate and actual success rate is necessary to be 99 percent confident that the difference is not due to random error?”

The expected success range allows a comparison between expected and observed success taking into account an estimate of random error in the measure of expected success. Subtracting a program’s observed success rate from the upper or lower limits of the confidence interval for expected success allows an assessment of the effect of each program in reducing re-offending. Given that programs vary in the number of youth released, the corresponding confidence intervals will likewise vary in range.

For definitions of all terms used in the analyses, see Appendix 3. In addition, for a breakdown of identified risk factors of the youth released for each program, see Appendix 1.

Program Cost Measure

Program cost per completion is calculated by dividing total expenditures for each program by the number of youth completing the program during the two-year period. In addition to the DJJ expenditures that were used in previous years, all other sources of government funding including all state, local school board and federal monies were included in this year’s analyses. Total expenditures equal each program’s combined costs for fiscal years 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. In calculating the PAM score, each program’s cost per completion is compared to the average cost per completion of \$35,146 for residential programs and \$16,775 for non-residential programs.

The PAM Score: Combining Cost and Effectiveness Measures

As in previous reports, the program accountability score combines the cost and effectiveness measures, as defined above. This year they were standardized separately for non-residential and residential programs. The PAM score is the sum of the program effectiveness measure weighted by a

factor of two-thirds and the program cost measure weighted by a factor of one-third.¹ This year's scores range from 20 to 100 for residential programs and from 36 to 87 for non-residential programs. By standardizing the scores on a scale from 1 to 100, the PAM scores are comparable to academic grades. A score between 90 and 100, for example, could be considered an "A," below 60, an "F" and so forth. For more information on PAM calculations including a step-by-step computation of the PAM score, refer to Appendix 4.

Limitations

The expected success measure developed in this study explains only a portion of the variation in recidivism for both non-residential and residential programs. While the predictive accuracy of this year's models has improved over last year, the remainder of the difference between observed success and expected success is due to program effects and to the effects of unmeasured factors. In addition to the predictors identified in this year's model, other factors were examined but failed to remain statistically significant in the final models. These factors include the percentage of youth transferred into the program from another program and prior referrals for felony sex offenses. Two measures were used to gauge the relative seriousness of youths' prior referrals and adjudications. One was an additive index of offense seriousness and the other was the number of prior felony adjudications. The number of prior felony adjudications remained statistically significant, but the index did not. Age was also a factor measured two ways: age at first referral and age at release. Age at release proved to be statistically significant, while age at first referral dropped out of the analysis. In the future, data on additional risk factors will be available in JJIS and will be examined to determine whether they further improve the predictive accuracy of the model. History of abuse, mental health problems, and substance abuse are among the factors identified in the research literature as being predictive of recidivism.

Expected success measures are designed to assist in evaluating past program outcomes and not for predicting future outcomes for individuals. They explain only a portion of the variation in recidivism rates among individuals and are not valid for that purpose.

¹ This methodology was developed by DJJ and the Juvenile Justice Advisory Board in consultation with the Legislature, the Governor's Office, OPPAGA, the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, contracted providers and other juvenile justice stakeholders.

Findings

The Program Accountability Measures scores derived for the 32 non-residential and 155 residential programs are presented here in three ways:

- 1) By restrictiveness level in descending order of PAM score;
- 2) By restrictiveness level in descending order of program effectiveness; and,
- 3) By program effectiveness categories in ascending order of cost (with separate tables for non-residential and residential programs).

Program Effectiveness Categories

Residential and non-residential programs are divided into one of five categories based on the standardized difference between their expected success range and their observed success rates as follows:

- **Highly Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are greater than the upper limit of the expected success range by more than one standard deviation. Eleven percent (n=17) of the residential programs and six percent (n=2) of the non-residential programs fall in to this category.
- **Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that exceed the upper limit of the expected success range by up to one standard deviation. Eight percent (n=12) of the residential programs and 18% (n=6) of the non-residential programs fall in to this category.
- **Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having actual observed success rates that are within the expected success range. Fifty-nine percent (n=91) of the residential programs and 43% (n=14) of the non-residential programs fall in to this category.
- **Below Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are up to one standard deviation below the lower limit of the expected success range. Seventeen percent (n=27) of the residential programs and 21% (n=7) of the non-residential programs fall in to this category.
- **Least Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are more than one standard deviation below the lower limit of the expected success range. Five percent (n=8) of the residential programs and 12% (n=4) of the non-residential programs fall in to this category.

Cost Categories

Three cost categories were computed separately for the non-residential and residential programs in terms of their cost per successful completion. Each program's cost per completion is compared to the average cost per completion of \$16,775 for non-residential and \$35,146 for residential programs. Programs are divided into one of the following cost per completion categories.

Non-Residential Programs:

- **Low Cost Programs:** One-third (n=10) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these non-residential programs is less than \$14,700.

- Moderate Cost Programs: One-third (n=11) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these non-residential programs is between \$14,700 and \$22,165.
- High Cost Programs: One-third (n=11) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these non-residential programs is \$22,166 or greater.

Residential Programs:

- Low Cost Programs: One-third (n=51) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these residential programs is less than \$26,581.
- Moderate Cost Programs: One-third (n=51) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these residential programs is between \$26,581 and \$42,342.
- High Cost Programs: One-third (n=52) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these residential programs is \$42,343 or greater.

PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level

Tables 1 through 5 provide a summary of the PAM scores for the 32 non-residential, and the 155 residential programs within the four restrictiveness levels. PAM scores are presented in descending order within commitment level, along with the percent difference (i.e., percent above or below expected success range) and program cost per completion.

Table 1. Non-Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Jacksonville Youth Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	25	18%	\$55,924	87
Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	16	1%	\$6,212	81
Central Florida Marine Institute	23	1%	\$6,833	80
Clay Behavioral Health	24	0%	\$4,770	79
The Bridge Special Intensive Group	148	0%	\$5,107	79
DATA SIG	24	0%	\$5,381	79
Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	17	8%	\$38,322	79
Sutton Place of Nassau County	20	2%	\$14,700	78
Intensive Community Services-Bay Area Youth Services	190	0%	\$8,191	78
JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	91	0%	\$9,097	77
Palm Beach Marine Institute	70	0%	\$14,916	74
Panama City Marine Institute	20	2%	\$23,742	74
Eckerd Leadership Program	46	1%	\$22,085	73
Dade South Marine Institute	54	0%	\$20,138	72
Tampa Marine Institute	26	0%	\$21,319	71
Gulf Coast Marine Institute	24	0%	\$22,130	71
Tallahassee Marine Institute	27	0%	\$22,866	71
DATA Day Treatment	44	0%	\$23,668	70
Silver River Marine Institute	70	-2%	\$16,423	70
Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	59	0%	\$24,812	70
Manatee Palms	99	-3%	\$13,230	70
Jacksonville East Marine Institute	60	0%	\$22,166	69
Jacksonville West Marine Institute	50	1%	\$32,768	68
Escambia Bay Marine Institute	47	-4%	\$16,483	66
Gainesville Marine Institute	30	-4%	\$21,394	64
Oriando Marine Institute	53	-3%	\$27,057	63
Friends of Children, Youth and Families Intensive Day Treatment	44	-6%	\$16,248	62
Oaks Day Treatment	72	-4%	\$24,920	62
Dade North Marine Institute	59	-7%	\$16,686	60
New Port Richey Marine Institute	21	-12%	\$5,866	56
Emerald Coast Marine Institute	19	-13%	\$11,159	51
Pinellas Marine Institute	20	-14%	\$39,229	36

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 2. Low-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	21	8%	\$35,287	98
Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	31	8%	\$37,683	98
Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	26	7%	\$29,100	96
AMI Host Homes (Closed)	15	5%	\$8,673	92
CATS Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	40	4%	\$19,288	87
Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	237	0%	\$6,292	75
Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	193	0%	\$8,174	75
Withlacoochee Short-Term Offender Camp (Closed)	120	0%	\$12,512	74
Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	104	0%	\$12,644	74
Visionary Adolescent Services Group Treatment Home-Female	50	0%	\$14,811	73
Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	80	0%	\$22,009	72
Space Coast Residential	90	0%	\$24,188	72
STEP (North and South)	529	-1%	\$4,854	72
Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	42	0%	\$24,842	72
Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home (Closed)	70	-1%	\$7,659	71
Myakka Short-Term Offender Program (Closed)	143	-1%	\$11,106	71
Florida Youth Academy-Female	21	0%	\$32,221	70
Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	49	0%	\$32,239	70
Dade Group Treatment Home	17	0%	\$32,912	70
Manatee Wilderness Camp	150	-1%	\$15,742	70
Camp E-Kel-Etu-Mental Health	48	0%	\$42,342	69
Peace River Outward Bound	101	-1%	\$24,150	68
UMOJA Group Treatment Home (Closed)	23	0%	\$44,724	68
Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	116	-1%	\$27,775	68
Sankofa Group Treatment Home (Closed)	37	-1%	\$30,925	67
Palm Beach Group Treatment Home (Closed)	17	0%	\$51,168	67
Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	132	-1%	\$33,919	66
Escambia River Outward Bound	97	-1%	\$41,632	65
Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	41	-3%	\$28,771	60
Boys Ranch Group Treatment Home (Closed)	20	-3%	\$33,015	60
Brevard Group Treatment Home	43	-4%	\$49,254	53
Hillsborough Group Treatment Homes	54	-6%	\$29,483	49

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 3. Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Agape Cove Halfway House-Female (Closed)	17	14%	\$49,171	100
Florida Youth Academy-Female	19	7%	\$40,060	94
Deborahs Way-Female	27	9%	\$93,419	92
Florida Environmental Institute	37	7%	\$57,320	91
YMCA Character Halfway House-Female-Pregnancy	46	5%	\$30,806	88
Alachua Halfway House-Female	69	2%	\$29,456	78
Bay Behavioral Hope-Mental Health	17	7%	\$132,382	77
West Florida Wilderness Institute	87	1%	\$24,508	75
Palm Beach Work Release (Closed)	77	0%	\$8,693	75
Kelly Hall Halfway House	75	2%	\$48,710	75
Dade Intensive Control (Closed)	85	0%	\$10,803	74
Polk Halfway House	93	0%	\$16,962	73
Pines Halfway House-Female	91	0%	\$17,127	73
Duval Halfway House	110	0%	\$18,181	73
Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	166	0%	\$18,972	73
Seminole Work and Learn Center	92	0%	\$19,937	73
Nassau Halfway House	92	0%	\$20,121	73
Leon Drill Academy (Closed)	162	0%	\$20,179	73
Collier Drill Academy	111	0%	\$20,335	72
Okeechobee Redirection Camp	163	0%	\$20,354	72
Pensacola Boys Base	99	0%	\$20,951	72
Hendry Halfway House	119	0%	\$21,030	72
Leslie Peters Halfway House	110	0%	\$21,689	72
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	35	0%	\$21,910	72
Greenville Hills Academy	436	0%	\$22,409	72
Youth Development Academy	108	0%	\$22,434	72
Miami Halfway House	92	0%	\$22,569	72
Bridges Academy-Female	87	0%	\$23,818	72
Leaf Halfway House-Female	103	0%	\$24,442	72
Crossroads Wilderness	99	0%	\$24,814	72
Duval START Center	89	0%	\$25,497	72
San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	81	0%	\$25,869	71
Manatee Boot Camp	78	0%	\$26,381	71
Falkenburg Academy	247	0%	\$26,579	71
Marion Youth Development Center (Career Systems)	189	0%	\$27,434	71
Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	79	0%	\$27,447	71
Wilson Academy-Female	80	0%	\$27,767	71
Gulf Coast Youth Academy (Ramsey)	192	0%	\$27,933	71
Okaloosa Youth Academy	242	0%	\$28,859	71
Bay Point Schools-North	69	0%	\$28,901	71
Choices Halfway House-Female	75	0%	\$29,863	71
Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	64	0%	\$30,460	71
Hastings Youth Academy	253	0%	\$31,014	71

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 3, Continued. Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference*	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
First Step II Halfway House	29	1%	\$51,564	70
Bay Point Schools-West	202	0%	\$32,957	70
Martin Boot Camp	82	1%	\$52,984	70
Youth Environmental Services	72	0%	\$33,039	70
ATC Boys Halfway House-Dual Diagnosis	146	0%	\$33,223	70
Kingsley Center-Female	79	0%	\$33,257	70
Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female (Closed)	99	0%	\$33,396	70
Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	148	0%	\$33,880	70
Polk Boot Camp-Male	163	0%	\$36,130	70
ARC Halfway House	213	0%	\$36,197	70
Polk Boot Camp-Female	50	0%	\$36,465	70
Avon Park Youth Academy	363	0%	\$36,911	70
MATS Halfway House-Charter Behavioral	44	0%	\$37,150	69
Britt Halfway House	93	-1%	\$18,530	69
Pinellas Boot Camp	103	0%	\$38,747	69
Okaloosa Halfway House	53	0%	\$38,757	69
Volusia Halfway House	101	-1%	\$19,605	69
Bristol Youth Academy	40	1%	\$59,658	69
Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)-Mental Health-Substance Abuse	62	0%	\$39,763	69
Terrace Halfway House	82	-1%	\$19,853	69
Panther Success Center Halfway House	111	-1%	\$20,069	69
CSC Halfway House-Bartow (Closed)	80	-1%	\$20,326	69
Southern Glades Youth Camp	78	0%	\$41,608	69
Pompano Learning Academy (Closed)	116	-1%	\$22,710	68
Price Halfway House	99	-1%	\$24,187	68
Bay Boot Camp	81	-1%	\$25,773	68
Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	80	0%	\$46,636	68
Blackwater Career Development Center	37	0%	\$51,989	67
Eckerd Halfway House	62	0%	\$56,466	66
Cannon Point Youth Academy	80	-1%	\$37,924	66
Forestry Youth Academy	61	0%	\$61,420	65
Robert E. Lee, Jr Hall Halfway House	76	-2%	\$21,662	65
Impact Halfway House	98	-2%	\$23,946	65
ATC Substance Abuse Halfway House	51	0%	\$70,295	64
LEAF Recovery-Female	22	0%	\$74,005	63
Mandala ATC Halfway House	62	-2%	\$36,443	62
Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	61	-2%	\$41,411	62
MATS Halfway House (Ramsey)	33	-1%	\$69,671	60
NAFI Halfway House	37	-4%	\$38,375	55
Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program-Mental Health	23	0%	\$120,452	55
RAMC Mentally Challenged	24	-1%	\$126,294	50
Palm Beach Halfway House	55	-6%	\$45,010	47

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 4. High-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference**	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Jackson JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	17	14%	\$75,007	99
South Florida Intensive Halfway House-Female	26	7%	\$66,973	89
Manatee Adolescent Treatment (Ramsey)-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	21	9%	\$107,673	89
Orange Intensive Halfway House-Female	52	4%	\$45,081	82
Elaine Gordon Treatment Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	40	8%	\$157,218	79
Sago Palms Pathfinders-Substance Abuse	34	2%	\$45,251	75
Dozier Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	3%	\$72,870	74
ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	44	2%	\$64,068	72
Manatee Youth Academy	65	0%	\$32,054	70
Polk Youth Development Center	646	0%	\$34,579	70
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	117	0%	\$34,611	70
Broward Intensive Halfway House	68	0%	\$42,010	69
Monticello New Life-Female	34	2%	\$82,839	68
Okeechobee JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	4%	\$124,020	68
Kingsley Center-Female	90	0%	\$45,060	68
CSC Intensive Halfway House-Bartow	62	-1%	\$26,569	68
Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	85	0%	\$47,068	68
Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House	58	0%	\$49,103	67
Hastings Youth Academy	145	-1%	\$29,585	67
NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	48	0%	\$54,584	66
Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	87	0%	\$54,865	66
Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	0%	\$57,123	66
Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	73	-1%	\$37,515	66
Vernon Place-Female	69	0%	\$69,692	64
Jackson JOCC*	132	0%	\$70,860	63
Eckerd Youth Development Center	252	0%	\$71,119	63
Florida Youth Academy-Female	61	0%	\$72,619	63
Three Springs Sex Offender Program	21	3%	\$184,803	62
Sago Palms Youth Development Center	215	0%	\$84,597	61
Dozier Training School	201	0%	\$95,558	59
Florida Institute For Girls-Mental Health	24	2%	\$158,739	58
Sago Palms Sex Offender Program	18	0%	\$102,668	58
CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	-3%	\$45,435	57
Palm Beach Youth Center	27	0%	\$108,118	57
Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	19	-19%	\$130,084	20

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

**Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 5. Maximum-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference**	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Cypress Creek JOCC*	98	0%	\$86,005	61
Okeechobee JOCC*	53	0%	\$97,752	59
Omega JOCC*	38	0%	\$140,701	51

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

**Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level and Effectiveness Categories

Tables 6 through 10 present the non-residential and residential programs classified under the five effectiveness categories by program restrictiveness levels. For each program, the tables provide the observed success rate, expected success range, percent above or below expected success rate, two-year program expenditures, program cost per completion, and PAM score for each program. This allows a comparison of program success rates within program restrictiveness levels. Some restrictiveness levels had no programs within a given effectiveness category.

Table 6. Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Jacksonville Youth Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	25	96%	74% - 78%	18%	\$1,398,112	\$55,924	87
Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	17	82%	68% - 75%	8%	\$651,469	\$38,322	79
Effective Programs							
Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	16	75%	66% - 74%	1%	\$99,392	\$6,212	81
Central Florida Marine Institute	23	74%	67% - 73%	1%	\$157,161	\$6,833	80
Sutton Place of Nassau County	20	75%	67% - 73%	2%	\$294,000	\$14,700	78
Panama City Marine Institute	20	75%	67% - 73%	2%	\$474,839	\$23,742	74
Eckerd Leadership Program	46	74%	69% - 73%	1%	\$1,015,919	\$22,085	73
Jacksonville West Marine Institute	50	74%	70% - 73%	1%	\$1,638,403	\$32,768	68
Average Programs							
Clay Behavioral Health	24	71%	67% - 72%	0%	\$114,480	\$4,770	79
The Bridge Special Intensive Group	148	71%	70% - 72%	0%	\$755,828	\$5,107	79
DATA SIG	24	71%	67% - 72%	0%	\$129,146	\$5,381	79
Intensive Community Services-Bay Area Youth Services	190	72%	72% - 73%	0%	\$1,556,316	\$8,191	78
JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	91	69%	69% - 71%	0%	\$827,820	\$9,097	77
Palm Beach Marine Institute	70	73%	70% - 73%	0%	\$1,044,097	\$14,916	74
Dade South Marine Institute	54	69%	67% - 70%	0%	\$1,087,428	\$20,138	72
Tampa Marine Institute	26	69%	66% - 72%	0%	\$554,304	\$21,319	71
Gulf Coast Marine Institute	24	67%	65% - 71%	0%	\$531,119	\$22,130	71
Tallahassee Marine Institute	27	67%	66% - 71%	0%	\$617,375	\$22,866	71
DATA Day Treatment	44	70%	68% - 72%	0%	\$1,041,404	\$23,668	70
Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	59	71%	69% - 72%	0%	\$1,463,928	\$24,812	70
Jacksonville East Marine Institute	60	65%	66% - 69%	0%	\$1,329,988	\$22,166	69
Below Average Programs							
Silver River Marine Institute	70	61%	64% - 66%	-2%	\$1,149,582	\$16,423	70
Manatee Palms	99	61%	63% - 65%	-3%	\$1,309,736	\$13,230	70
Escambia Bay Marine Institute	47	60%	63% - 67%	-4%	\$774,699	\$16,483	66
Gainesville Marine Institute	30	60%	64% - 68%	-4%	\$641,815	\$21,394	64
Orlando Marine Institute	53	60%	64% - 67%	-3%	\$1,434,044	\$27,057	63
Friends of Children, Youth and Families Intensive Day Treatment	44	55%	61% - 65%	-6%	\$714,927	\$16,248	62
Oaks Day Treatment	72	58%	62% - 65%	-4%	\$1,794,274	\$24,920	62
Least Effective Programs							
Dade North Marine Institute	59	53%	59% - 63%	-7%	\$984,491	\$16,686	60
New Port Richey Marine Institute	21	48%	60% - 67%	-12%	\$123,184	\$5,866	56
Emerald Coast Marine Institute	19	47%	60% - 67%	-13%	\$212,027	\$11,159	51
Pinellas Marine Institute	20	45%	59% - 66%	-14%	\$784,581	\$39,229	36

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 7. Low-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	21	86%	69% - 77%	8%	\$741,025	\$35,287	98
Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	31	87%	74% - 79%	8%	\$1,168,187	\$37,683	98
Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	26	85%	71% - 78%	7%	\$756,587	\$29,100	96
AMI Host Homes (Closed)	15	80%	63% - 75%	5%	\$130,091	\$8,673	92
CATS Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	40	80%	71% - 76%	4%	\$771,529	\$19,288	87
Average Programs							
Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	237	56%	56% - 57%	0%	\$1,491,254	\$6,292	75
Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	193	50%	51% - 52%	0%	\$1,577,669	\$8,174	75
Withlacoochee Short-Term Offender Camp (Closed)	120	54%	55% - 57%	0%	\$1,501,486	\$12,512	74
Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	104	63%	62% - 64%	0%	\$1,314,988	\$12,644	74
Visionary Adolescent Services Group Treatment Home-Female	50	56%	56% - 60%	0%	\$740,559	\$14,811	73
Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	80	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$1,760,710	\$22,009	72
Space Coast Residential	90	58%	57% - 60%	0%	\$2,176,928	\$24,188	72
Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	42	55%	55% - 60%	0%	\$1,043,382	\$24,842	72
Florida Youth Academy-Female	21	57%	55% - 64%	0%	\$676,633	\$32,221	70
Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	49	57%	57% - 61%	0%	\$1,579,716	\$32,239	70
Dade Group Treatment Home	17	65%	58% - 68%	0%	\$559,506	\$32,912	70
Camp E-Kel-Etu-Mental Health	48	54%	54% - 59%	0%	\$2,032,403	\$42,342	69
UMOJA Group Treatment Home (Closed)	23	57%	55% - 63%	0%	\$1,028,661	\$44,724	68
Palm Beach Group Treatment Home (Closed)	17	71%	60% - 71%	0%	\$869,848	\$51,168	67
Below Average Programs							
STEP (North and South)	529	63%	64% - 64%	-1%	\$2,567,723	\$4,854	72
Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home (Closed)	70	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$536,139	\$7,659	71
Myakka Short-Term Offender Program (Closed)	143	45%	46% - 48%	-1%	\$1,588,106	\$11,106	71
Manatee Wilderness Camp	150	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$2,361,233	\$15,742	70
Peace River Outward Bound	101	47%	48% - 50%	-1%	\$2,439,146	\$24,150	68
Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	116	63%	64% - 66%	-1%	\$3,221,846	\$27,775	68
Sankofa Group Treatment Home (Closed)	37	51%	52% - 58%	-1%	\$1,144,236	\$30,925	67
Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	132	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$4,477,252	\$33,919	66
Escambia River Outward Bound	97	48%	50% - 52%	-1%	\$4,038,280	\$41,632	65
Least Effective Programs							
Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	41	44%	47% - 52%	-3%	\$1,179,608	\$28,771	60
Boys Ranch Group Treatment Home (Closed)	20	45%	48% - 59%	-3%	\$660,294	\$33,015	60
Brevard Group Treatment Home	43	42%	46% - 51%	-4%	\$2,117,920	\$49,254	53
Hillsborough Group Treatment Homes	54	30%	36% - 40%	-6%	\$1,592,105	\$29,483	49

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 8. Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Agape Cove Halfway House-Female (Closed)	17	94%	71% - 80%	14%	\$835,902	\$49,171	100
Florida Youth Academy-Female	19	84%	68% - 77%	7%	\$761,145	\$40,060	94
Deborahs Way-Female	27	89%	74% - 80%	9%	\$2,522,319	\$93,419	92
Florida Environmental Institute	37	86%	75% - 79%	7%	\$2,120,843	\$57,320	91
YMCA Character Halfway House-Female-Pregnancy	46	85%	76% - 79%	5%	\$1,417,064	\$30,806	88
Bay Behavioral Hope-Mental Health	17	82%	66% - 76%	7%	\$2,250,488	\$132,382	77
Effective Programs							
Alachua Halfway House-Female	69	78%	73% - 76%	2%	\$2,032,456	\$29,456	78
West Florida Wilderness Institute	87	75%	71% - 74%	1%	\$2,132,213	\$24,508	75
Kelly Hall Halfway House	75	76%	72% - 74%	2%	\$3,653,272	\$48,710	75
First Step II Halfway House	29	72%	65% - 71%	1%	\$1,495,354	\$51,564	70
Martin Boot Camp	82	73%	70% - 73%	1%	\$4,344,670	\$52,984	70
Bristol Youth Academy	40	73%	67% - 72%	1%	\$2,386,321	\$59,658	69
Average Programs							
Palm Beach Work Release (Closed)	77	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$669,329	\$8,693	75
Dade Intensive Control (Closed)	85	58%	57% - 60%	0%	\$918,248	\$10,803	74
Polk Halfway House	93	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$1,577,433	\$16,962	73
Pines Halfway House-Female	91	70%	68% - 70%	0%	\$1,558,553	\$17,127	73
Duval Halfway House	110	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$1,999,876	\$18,181	73
Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	166	69%	68% - 70%	0%	\$3,149,282	\$18,972	73
Seminole Work and Learn Center	92	55%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,834,159	\$19,937	73
Nassau Halfway House	92	63%	62% - 65%	0%	\$1,851,151	\$20,121	73
Leon Drill Academy (Closed)	162	52%	52% - 54%	0%	\$3,268,917	\$20,179	73
Collier Drill Academy	111	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$2,257,188	\$20,335	72
Okeechobee Redirection Camp	163	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$3,317,681	\$20,354	72
Pensacola Boys Base	99	53%	53% - 55%	0%	\$2,074,117	\$20,951	72
Hendry Halfway House	119	53%	53% - 56%	0%	\$2,502,611	\$21,030	72
Leslie Peters Halfway House	110	55%	55% - 57%	0%	\$2,385,751	\$21,689	72
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	35	71%	66% - 71%	0%	\$766,843	\$21,910	72
Greenville Hills Academy	436	48%	48% - 49%	0%	\$9,770,513	\$22,409	72
Youth Development Academy	108	54%	54% - 56%	0%	\$2,422,871	\$22,434	72
Miami Halfway House	92	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$2,076,356	\$22,569	72
Bridges Academy-Female	87	64%	63% - 66%	0%	\$2,072,171	\$23,818	72
Leaf Halfway House-Female	103	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$2,517,512	\$24,442	72
Crossroads Wilderness	99	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$2,456,548	\$24,814	72
Duval START Center	89	63%	61% - 64%	0%	\$2,269,227	\$25,497	72
San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	81	54%	55% - 58%	0%	\$2,095,423	\$25,869	71
Manatee Boot Camp	78	55%	55% - 59%	0%	\$2,057,745	\$26,381	71
Falkenburg Academy	247	52%	53% - 54%	0%	\$6,565,110	\$26,579	71
Marion Youth Development Center (Career Systems)	189	58%	58% - 59%	0%	\$5,185,082	\$27,434	71
Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	79	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$2,168,310	\$27,447	71
Wilson Academy-Female	80	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$2,221,390	\$27,767	71
Gulf Coast Youth Academy (Ramsey)	192	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$5,363,064	\$27,933	71
Okaloosa Youth Academy	242	53%	54% - 55%	0%	\$6,983,985	\$28,859	71
Bay Point Schools-North	69	61%	60% - 63%	0%	\$1,994,173	\$28,901	71
Choices Halfway House-Female	75	67%	65% - 68%	0%	\$2,239,761	\$29,863	71

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 8, Continued. Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Average Programs, Continued							
Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	64	72%	68% - 71%	0%	\$1,949,445	\$30,460	71
Hastings Youth Academy	253	52%	52% - 53%	0%	\$7,846,476	\$31,014	71
Bay Point Schools-West	202	70%	70% - 71%	0%	\$6,657,326	\$32,957	70
Youth Environmental Services	72	68%	65% - 68%	0%	\$2,378,795	\$33,039	70
ATC Boys Halfway House-Dual Diagnosis	146	56%	56% - 58%	0%	\$4,850,608	\$33,223	70
Kingsley Center-Female	79	65%	63% - 66%	0%	\$2,627,288	\$33,257	70
Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female (Closed)	99	68%	66% - 69%	0%	\$3,306,218	\$33,396	70
Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	148	57%	57% - 58%	0%	\$5,014,255	\$33,880	70
Polk Boot Camp-Male	163	61%	61% - 63%	0%	\$5,889,136	\$36,130	70
ARC Halfway House	213	62%	61% - 63%	0%	\$7,709,855	\$36,197	70
Polk Boot Camp-Female	50	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$1,823,268	\$36,465	70
Avon Park Youth Academy	363	68%	68% - 69%	0%	\$13,398,649	\$36,911	70
MATS Halfway House-Charter Behavioral	44	61%	59% - 64%	0%	\$1,634,614	\$37,150	69
Pinellas Boot Camp	103	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$3,990,971	\$38,747	69
Okaloosa Halfway House	53	53%	53% - 58%	0%	\$2,054,122	\$38,757	69
Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)-Mental Health-Substance Abuse	62	61%	60% - 64%	0%	\$2,465,320	\$39,763	69
Southern Glades Youth Camp	78	63%	62% - 65%	0%	\$3,245,414	\$41,608	69
Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	80	69%	67% - 69%	0%	\$3,730,910	\$46,636	68
Blackwater Career Development Center	37	54%	54% - 60%	0%	\$1,923,598	\$51,989	67
Eckerd Halfway House	62	61%	60% - 64%	0%	\$3,500,903	\$56,466	66
Forestry Youth Academy	61	57%	57% - 61%	0%	\$3,746,630	\$61,420	65
ATC Substance Abuse Halfway House	51	61%	59% - 64%	0%	\$3,585,021	\$70,295	64
LEAF Recovery-Female	22	68%	61% - 69%	0%	\$1,628,105	\$74,005	63
Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program-Mental Health	23	65%	59% - 68%	0%	\$2,770,389	\$120,452	55
Below Average Programs							
Britt Halfway House	93	52%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,723,247	\$18,530	69
Volusia Halfway House	101	52%	53% - 55%	-1%	\$1,980,101	\$19,605	69
Terrace Halfway House	82	52%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,627,967	\$19,853	69
Panther Success Center Halfway House	111	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$2,227,608	\$20,069	69
CSC Halfway House-Bartow (Closed)	80	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,626,058	\$20,326	69
Pompano Learning Academy (Closed)	116	53%	53% - 55%	-1%	\$2,634,332	\$22,710	68
Price Halfway House	99	51%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$2,394,523	\$24,187	68
Bay Boot Camp	81	49%	50% - 53%	-1%	\$2,087,578	\$25,773	68
Cannon Point Youth Academy	80	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$3,033,892	\$37,924	66
Robert E. Lee, Jr Hall Halfway House	76	45%	47% - 50%	-2%	\$1,646,330	\$21,662	65
Impact Halfway House	98	44%	46% - 48%	-2%	\$2,346,669	\$23,946	65
Mandala ATC Halfway House	62	45%	47% - 51%	-2%	\$2,259,487	\$36,443	62
Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	61	46%	48% - 52%	-2%	\$2,526,078	\$41,411	62
MATS Halfway House (Ramsey)	33	52%	52% - 59%	-1%	\$2,299,150	\$69,671	60
RAMC Mentally Challenged	24	50%	51% - 60%	-1%	\$3,031,045	\$126,294	50
Least Effective Programs							
NAFI Halfway House	37	43%	47% - 53%	-4%	\$1,419,875	\$38,375	55
Palm Beach Halfway House	55	33%	38% - 42%	-6%	\$2,475,555	\$45,010	47

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 9. High-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference**	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Jackson JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	17	94%	71% - 80%	14%	\$1,275,119	\$75,007	99
South Florida Intensive Halfway House-Female	26	85%	71% - 77%	7%	\$1,741,306	\$66,973	89
Manatee Adolescent Treatment (Ramsey)-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	21	86%	69% - 77%	9%	\$2,261,124	\$107,673	89
Orange Intensive Halfway House-Female	52	83%	75% - 79%	4%	\$2,344,197	\$45,081	82
Elaine Gordon Treatment Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	40	90%	78% - 82%	8%	\$6,288,717	\$157,218	79
Okeechobee JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	82%	74% - 78%	4%	\$5,580,913	\$124,020	68
Effective Programs							
Sago Palms Pathfinders-Substance Abuse	34	74%	66% - 72%	2%	\$1,538,548	\$45,251	75
Dozier Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	80%	72% - 77%	3%	\$3,279,171	\$72,870	74
ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	44	75%	69% - 73%	2%	\$2,818,985	\$64,068	72
Monticello New Life-Female	34	74%	66% - 72%	2%	\$2,816,533	\$82,839	68
Three Springs Sex Offender Program	21	76%	65% - 73%	3%	\$3,880,861	\$184,803	62
Florida Institute For Girls-Mental Health	24	75%	65% - 73%	2%	\$3,809,738	\$158,739	58
Average Programs							
Manatee Youth Academy	65	54%	54% - 58%	0%	\$2,083,500	\$32,054	70
Polk Youth Development Center	646	56%	56% - 56%	0%	\$22,338,037	\$34,579	70
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	117	69%	68% - 70%	0%	\$4,049,479	\$34,611	70
Broward Intensive Halfway House	68	59%	58% - 62%	0%	\$2,856,672	\$42,010	69
Kingsley Center-Female	90	61%	60% - 63%	0%	\$4,055,411	\$45,060	68
Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	85	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$4,000,808	\$47,068	68
Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House	58	53%	54% - 58%	0%	\$2,847,980	\$49,103	67
NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	48	56%	56% - 60%	0%	\$2,620,028	\$54,584	66
Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	87	62%	61% - 64%	0%	\$4,773,283	\$54,865	66
Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	56%	55% - 60%	0%	\$2,456,289	\$57,123	66
Vernon Place-Female	69	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$4,808,716	\$69,692	64
Jackson JOCC*	132	57%	57% - 59%	0%	\$9,353,529	\$70,860	63
Eckerd Youth Development Center	252	58%	58% - 59%	0%	\$17,922,092	\$71,119	63
Florida Youth Academy-Female	61	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$4,429,736	\$72,619	63
Sago Palms Youth Development Center	215	57%	57% - 58%	0%	\$18,188,259	\$84,597	61
Dozier Training School	201	53%	54% - 55%	0%	\$19,207,065	\$95,558	59
Sago Palms Sex Offender Program	18	56%	53% - 64%	0%	\$1,848,027	\$102,668	58
Palm Beach Youth Center	27	70%	63% - 71%	0%	\$2,919,188	\$108,118	57
Below Average Programs							
CSC Intensive Halfway House-Bartow	62	52%	52% - 56%	-1%	\$1,647,250	\$26,569	68
Hastings Youth Academy	145	45%	46% - 48%	-1%	\$4,289,855	\$29,585	67
Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	73	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$2,738,608	\$37,515	66
Least Effective Programs							
CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	43%	45% - 49%	-3%	\$2,771,510	\$45,435	57
Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	19	16%	34% - 45%	-19%	\$2,471,596	\$130,084	20

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

**Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 10. Maximum-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference**	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Average Programs							
Cypress Creek JOCC*	98	69%	67% - 70%	0%	\$8,428,473	\$86,005	61
Okeechobee JOCC*	53	64%	62% - 66%	0%	\$5,180,857	\$97,752	59
Omega JOCC*	38	71%	66% - 71%	0%	\$5,346,624	\$140,701	51

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

**Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

PAM Scores by Cost Categories

Tables 11 through 16, compare program PAM scores and effectiveness groupings in relation to the three cost categories. This allows for a comparison of program success rates relative to cost effectiveness. Non-residential programs are presented in tables separate from residential commitment programs.

Table 11. Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
High Cost								
NR	Jacksonville Youth Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	25	96%	74% - 78%	18%	\$1,398,112	\$55,924	87
NR	Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	17	82%	68% - 75%	8%	\$651,469	\$38,322	79
EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
NR	Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	16	75%	66% - 74%	1%	\$99,392	\$6,212	81
NR	Central Florida Marine Institute	23	74%	67% - 73%	1%	\$157,161	\$6,833	80
Moderate Cost								
NR	Sutton Place of Nassau County	20	75%	67% - 73%	2%	\$294,000	\$14,700	78
NR	Eckerd Leadership Program	46	74%	69% - 73%	1%	\$1,015,919	\$22,085	73
High Cost								
NR	Panama City Marine Institute	20	75%	67% - 73%	2%	\$474,839	\$23,742	74
NR	Jacksonville West Marine Institute	50	74%	70% - 73%	1%	\$1,638,403	\$32,768	68
AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
NR	Clay Behavioral Health	24	71%	67% - 72%	0%	\$114,480	\$4,770	79
NR	The Bridge Special Intensive Group	148	71%	70% - 72%	0%	\$755,828	\$5,107	79
NR	DATA SIG	24	71%	67% - 72%	0%	\$129,146	\$5,381	79
NR	Intensive Community Services-Bay Area Youth Services	190	72%	72% - 73%	0%	\$1,556,316	\$8,191	78
NR	JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	91	69%	69% - 71%	0%	\$827,820	\$9,097	77
Moderate Cost								
NR	Palm Beach Marine Institute	70	73%	70% - 73%	0%	\$1,044,097	\$14,916	74
NR	Dade South Marine Institute	54	69%	67% - 70%	0%	\$1,087,428	\$20,138	72
NR	Tampa Marine Institute	26	69%	66% - 72%	0%	\$554,304	\$21,319	71
NR	Gulf Coast Marine Institute	24	67%	65% - 71%	0%	\$531,119	\$22,130	71
High Cost								
NR	Tallahassee Marine Institute	27	67%	66% - 71%	0%	\$617,375	\$22,866	71
NR	DATA Day Treatment	44	70%	68% - 72%	0%	\$1,041,404	\$23,668	70
NR	Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	59	71%	69% - 72%	0%	\$1,463,928	\$24,812	70
NR	Jacksonville East Marine Institute	60	65%	66% - 69%	0%	\$1,329,988	\$22,166	69
BELOW AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
NR	Manatee Palms	99	61%	63% - 65%	-3%	\$1,309,736	\$13,230	70
Moderate Cost								
NR	Silver River Marine Institute	70	61%	64% - 66%	-2%	\$1,149,582	\$16,423	70
NR	Escambia Bay Marine Institute	47	60%	63% - 67%	-4%	\$774,699	\$16,483	66
NR	Gainesville Marine Institute	30	60%	64% - 68%	-4%	\$641,815	\$21,394	64
NR	Friends of Children, Youth and Families Intensive Day Treatment	44	55%	61% - 65%	-6%	\$714,927	\$16,248	62
High Cost								
NR	Orlando Marine Institute	53	60%	64% - 67%	-3%	\$1,434,044	\$27,057	63
NR	Oaks Day Treatment	72	58%	62% - 65%	-4%	\$1,794,274	\$24,920	62
LEAST EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
NR	New Port Richey Marine Institute	21	48%	60% - 67%	-12%	\$123,184	\$5,866	56
NR	Emerald Coast Marine Institute	19	47%	60% - 67%	-13%	\$212,027	\$11,159	51
Moderate Cost								
NR	Dade North Marine Institute	59	53%	59% - 63%	-7%	\$984,491	\$16,686	60
High Cost								
NR	Pinellas Marine Institute	20	45%	59% - 66%	-14%	\$784,581	\$39,229	36

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 12. Highly Effective Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference**	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Low Cost								
Low	AMI Host Homes (Closed)	15	80%	63% - 75%	5%	\$130,091	\$8,673	92
Low	CATS Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	40	80%	71% - 76%	4%	\$771,529	\$19,288	87
Moderate Cost								
Low	Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	21	86%	69% - 77%	8%	\$741,025	\$35,287	98
Low	Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	31	87%	74% - 79%	8%	\$1,168,187	\$37,683	98
Low	Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	26	85%	71% - 78%	7%	\$756,587	\$29,100	96
Mod	Florida Youth Academy-Female	19	84%	68% - 77%	7%	\$761,145	\$40,060	94
Mod	YMCA Character Halfway House-Female-Pregnancy	46	85%	76% - 79%	5%	\$1,417,064	\$30,806	88
High Cost								
Mod	Agape Cove Halfway House-Female (Closed)	17	94%	71% - 80%	14%	\$835,902	\$49,171	100
High	Jackson JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	17	94%	71% - 80%	14%	\$1,275,119	\$75,007	99
Mod	Deborahs Way-Female	27	89%	74% - 80%	9%	\$2,522,319	\$93,419	92
Mod	Florida Environmental Institute	37	86%	75% - 79%	7%	\$2,120,843	\$57,320	91
High	South Florida Intensive Halfway House-Female	26	85%	71% - 77%	7%	\$1,741,306	\$66,973	89
High	Manatee Adolescent Treatment (Ramsey)-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	21	86%	69% - 77%	9%	\$2,261,124	\$107,673	89
High	Orange Intensive Halfway House-Female	52	83%	75% - 79%	4%	\$2,344,197	\$45,081	82
High	Elaine Gordon Treatment Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	40	90%	78% - 82%	8%	\$6,288,717	\$157,218	79
Mod	Bay Behavioral Hope-Mental Health	17	82%	66% - 76%	7%	\$2,250,488	\$132,382	77
High	Okeechobee JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	82%	74% - 78%	4%	\$5,580,913	\$124,020	68

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

**Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 13. Effective Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Low Cost								
Mod	West Florida Wilderness Institute	87	75%	71% - 74%	1%	\$2,132,213	\$24,508	75
Moderate Cost								
Mod	Alachua Halfway House-Female	69	78%	73% - 76%	2%	\$2,032,456	\$29,456	78
High Cost								
High	Sago Palms Pathfinders-Substance Abuse	34	74%	66% - 72%	2%	\$1,538,548	\$45,251	75
Mod	Kelly Hall Halfway House	75	76%	72% - 74%	2%	\$3,653,272	\$48,710	75
High	Dozier Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	80%	72% - 77%	3%	\$3,279,171	\$72,870	74
High	ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	44	75%	69% - 73%	2%	\$2,818,985	\$64,068	72
Mod	First Step II Halfway House	29	72%	65% - 71%	1%	\$1,495,354	\$51,564	70
Mod	Martin Boot Camp	82	73%	70% - 73%	1%	\$4,344,670	\$52,984	70
Mod	Bristol Youth Academy	40	73%	67% - 72%	1%	\$2,386,321	\$59,658	69
High	Monticello New Life-Female	34	74%	66% - 72%	2%	\$2,816,533	\$82,839	68
High	Three Springs Sex Offender Program	21	76%	65% - 73%	3%	\$3,880,861	\$184,803	62
High	Florida Institute For Girls-Mental Health	24	75%	65% - 73%	2%	\$3,809,738	\$158,739	58

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 14. Average Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Rate	Percent Difference**	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Low Cost								
Low	Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	237	56%	56% - 57%	0%	\$1,491,254	\$6,292	75
Low	Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	193	50%	51% - 52%	0%	\$1,577,669	\$8,174	75
Mod	Palm Beach Work Release (Closed)	77	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$669,329	\$8,693	75
Mod	Dade Intensive Control (Closed)	85	58%	57% - 60%	0%	\$918,248	\$10,803	74
Low	Withlacoochee Short-Term Offender Camp (Closed)	120	54%	55% - 57%	0%	\$1,501,486	\$12,512	74
Low	Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	104	63%	62% - 64%	0%	\$1,314,988	\$12,644	74
Low	Visionary Adolescent Services Group Treatment Home-Female	50	56%	56% - 60%	0%	\$740,559	\$14,811	73
Mod	Polk Halfway House	93	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$1,577,433	\$16,962	73
Mod	Pines Halfway House-Female	91	70%	68% - 70%	0%	\$1,558,553	\$17,127	73
Mod	Duval Halfway House	110	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$1,999,876	\$18,181	73
Mod	Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	166	69%	68% - 70%	0%	\$3,149,282	\$18,972	73
Mod	Seminole Work and Learn Center	92	55%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,834,159	\$19,937	73
Mod	Nassau Halfway House	92	63%	62% - 65%	0%	\$1,851,151	\$20,121	73
Mod	Leon Drill Academy (Closed)	162	52%	52% - 54%	0%	\$3,268,917	\$20,179	73
Mod	Collier Drill Academy	111	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$2,257,188	\$20,335	72
Mod	Okeechobee Redirection Camp	163	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$3,317,681	\$20,354	72
Mod	Pensacola Boys Base	99	53%	53% - 55%	0%	\$2,074,117	\$20,951	72
Mod	Hendry Halfway House	119	53%	53% - 56%	0%	\$2,502,611	\$21,030	72
Mod	Leslie Peters Halfway House	110	55%	55% - 57%	0%	\$2,385,751	\$21,689	72
Mod	Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	35	71%	66% - 71%	0%	\$766,843	\$21,910	72
Low	Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	80	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$1,760,710	\$22,009	72
Mod	Greenville Hills Academy	436	48%	48% - 49%	0%	\$9,770,513	\$22,409	72
Mod	Youth Development Academy	108	54%	54% - 56%	0%	\$2,422,871	\$22,434	72
Mod	Miami Halfway House	92	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$2,076,356	\$22,569	72
Mod	Bridges Academy-Female	87	64%	63% - 66%	0%	\$2,072,171	\$23,818	72
Low	Space Coast Residential	90	58%	57% - 60%	0%	\$2,176,928	\$24,188	72
Mod	Leaf Halfway House-Female	103	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$2,517,512	\$24,442	72
Mod	Crossroads Wilderness	99	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$2,456,548	\$24,814	72
Low	Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	42	55%	55% - 60%	0%	\$1,043,382	\$24,842	72
Mod	Duval START Center	89	63%	61% - 64%	0%	\$2,269,227	\$25,497	72
Mod	San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	81	54%	55% - 58%	0%	\$2,095,423	\$25,869	71
Mod	Manatee Boot Camp	78	55%	55% - 59%	0%	\$2,057,745	\$26,381	71
Mod	Falkenburg Academy	247	52%	53% - 54%	0%	\$6,565,110	\$26,579	71
Moderate Cost								
Mod	Marion Youth Development Center (Career Systems)	189	58%	58% - 59%	0%	\$5,185,082	\$27,434	71
Mod	Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	79	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$2,168,310	\$27,447	71
Mod	Wilson Academy-Female	80	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$2,221,390	\$27,767	71
Mod	Gulf Coast Youth Academy (Ramsey)	192	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$5,363,064	\$27,933	71
Mod	Okaloosa Youth Academy	242	53%	54% - 55%	0%	\$6,983,985	\$28,859	71
Mod	Bay Point Schools-North	69	61%	60% - 63%	0%	\$1,994,173	\$28,901	71
Mod	Choices Halfway House-Female	75	67%	65% - 68%	0%	\$2,239,761	\$29,863	71
Mod	Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	64	72%	68% - 71%	0%	\$1,949,445	\$30,460	71
Mod	Hastings Youth Academy	253	52%	52% - 53%	0%	\$7,846,476	\$31,014	71
High	Manatee Youth Academy	65	54%	54% - 58%	0%	\$2,083,500	\$32,054	70
Low	Florida Youth Academy-Female	21	57%	55% - 64%	0%	\$676,633	\$32,221	70
Low	Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	49	57%	57% - 61%	0%	\$1,579,716	\$32,239	70
Low	Dade Group Treatment Home	17	65%	58% - 68%	0%	\$559,506	\$32,912	70
Mod	Bay Point Schools-West	202	70%	70% - 71%	0%	\$6,657,326	\$33,957	70
Mod	Youth Environmental Services	72	68%	65% - 68%	0%	\$2,378,795	\$33,039	70
Mod	ATC Boys Halfway House-Dual Diagnosis	146	56%	56% - 58%	0%	\$4,850,608	\$33,223	70
Mod	Kingsley Center-Female	79	65%	63% - 66%	0%	\$2,627,288	\$33,257	70

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

**Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 14, Continued. Average Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Rate	Percent Difference**	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Moderate Cost, Continued								
Mod	Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female (Closed)	99	68%	66% - 69%	0%	\$3,306,218	\$33,396	70
Mod	Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	148	57%	57% - 58%	0%	\$5,014,255	\$33,880	70
High	Polk Youth Development Center	646	56%	56% - 56%	0%	\$22,338,037	\$34,579	70
High	Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	117	69%	68% - 70%	0%	\$4,049,479	\$34,611	70
Mod	Polk Boot Camp-Male	163	61%	61% - 63%	0%	\$5,889,136	\$36,130	70
Mod	ARC Halfway House	213	62%	61% - 63%	0%	\$7,709,855	\$36,197	70
Mod	Polk Boot Camp-Female	50	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$1,823,268	\$36,465	70
Mod	Avon Park Youth Academy	363	68%	68% - 69%	0%	\$13,398,649	\$36,911	70
Mod	MATS Halfway House-Charter Behavioral	44	61%	59% - 64%	0%	\$1,634,614	\$37,150	69
Mod	Pinellas Boot Camp	103	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$3,990,971	\$38,747	69
Mod	Okaloosa Halfway House	53	53%	53% - 58%	0%	\$2,054,122	\$38,757	69
Mod	Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)-Mental Health-Substance Abuse	62	61%	60% - 64%	0%	\$2,465,320	\$39,763	69
Mod	Southern Glades Youth Camp	78	63%	62% - 65%	0%	\$3,245,414	\$41,608	69
High	Broward Intensive Halfway House	68	59%	58% - 62%	0%	\$2,856,672	\$42,010	69
Low	Camp E-Kel-Etu-Mental Health	48	54%	54% - 59%	0%	\$2,032,403	\$42,342	69
High Cost								
Low	UMOJA Group Treatment Home (Closed)	23	57%	55% - 63%	0%	\$1,028,661	\$44,724	68
High	Kingsley Center-Female	90	61%	60% - 63%	0%	\$4,055,411	\$45,060	68
Mod	Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	80	69%	67% - 69%	0%	\$3,730,910	\$46,636	68
High	Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	85	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$4,000,808	\$47,068	68
High	Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House	58	53%	54% - 58%	0%	\$2,847,980	\$49,103	67
Low	Palm Beach Group Treatment Home (Closed)	17	71%	60% - 71%	0%	\$869,848	\$51,168	67
Mod	Blackwater Career Development Center	37	54%	54% - 60%	0%	\$1,923,598	\$51,989	67
High	NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	48	56%	56% - 60%	0%	\$2,620,028	\$54,584	66
High	Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	87	62%	61% - 64%	0%	\$4,773,283	\$54,865	66
Mod	Eckerd Halfway House	62	61%	60% - 64%	0%	\$3,500,903	\$56,466	66
High	Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	56%	55% - 60%	0%	\$2,456,289	\$57,123	66
Mod	Forestry Youth Academy	61	57%	57% - 61%	0%	\$3,746,630	\$61,420	65
High	Vernon Place-Female	69	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$4,808,716	\$69,692	64
Mod	ATC Substance Abuse Halfway House	51	61%	59% - 64%	0%	\$3,585,021	\$70,295	64
High	Jackson JOCC*	132	57%	57% - 59%	0%	\$9,353,529	\$70,860	63
High	Eckerd Youth Development Center	252	58%	58% - 59%	0%	\$17,922,092	\$71,119	63
High	Florida Youth Academy-Female	61	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$4,429,736	\$72,619	63
Mod	LEAF Recovery-Female	22	68%	61% - 69%	0%	\$1,628,105	\$74,005	63
High	Sago Palms Youth Development Center	215	57%	57% - 58%	0%	\$18,188,259	\$84,597	61
Max	Cypress Creek JOCC*	98	69%	67% - 70%	0%	\$8,428,473	\$86,005	61
High	Dozier Training School	201	53%	54% - 55%	0%	\$19,207,065	\$95,558	59
Max	Okeechobee JOCC*	53	64%	62% - 66%	0%	\$5,180,857	\$97,752	59
High	Sago Palms Sex Offender Program	18	56%	53% - 64%	0%	\$1,848,027	\$102,668	58
High	Palm Beach Youth Center	27	70%	63% - 71%	0%	\$2,919,188	\$108,118	57
Mod	Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program-Mental Health	23	65%	59% - 68%	0%	\$2,770,389	\$120,452	55
Max	Omega JOCC*	38	71%	66% - 71%	0%	\$5,346,624	\$140,701	51

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

**Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 15. Below Average Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Low Cost								
Low	STEP (North and South)	529	63%	64% - 64%	-1%	\$2,567,723	\$4,854	72
Low	Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home (Closed)	70	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$536,139	\$7,659	71
Low	Myakka Short-Term Offender Program (Closed)	143	45%	46% - 48%	-1%	\$1,588,106	\$11,106	71
Low	Manatee Wilderness Camp	150	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$2,361,233	\$15,742	70
Mod	Britt Halfway House	93	52%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,723,247	\$18,530	69
Mod	Volusia Halfway House	101	52%	53% - 55%	-1%	\$1,980,101	\$19,605	69
Mod	Terrace Halfway House	82	52%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,627,967	\$19,853	69
Mod	Panther Success Center Halfway House	111	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$2,227,608	\$20,069	69
Mod	CSC Halfway House-Bartow (Closed)	80	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,626,058	\$20,326	69
Mod	Pompano Learning Academy (Closed)	116	53%	53% - 55%	-1%	\$2,634,332	\$22,710	68
Low	Peace River Outward Bound	101	47%	48% - 50%	-1%	\$2,439,146	\$24,150	68
Mod	Price Halfway House	99	51%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$2,394,523	\$24,187	68
Mod	Bay Boot Camp	81	49%	50% - 53%	-1%	\$2,087,578	\$25,773	68
High	CSC Intensive Halfway House-Bartow	62	52%	52% - 56%	-1%	\$1,647,250	\$26,569	68
Mod	Robert E. Lee, Jr Hall Halfway House	76	45%	47% - 50%	-2%	\$1,646,330	\$21,662	65
Mod	Impact Halfway House	98	44%	46% - 48%	-2%	\$2,346,669	\$23,946	65
Moderate Cost								
Low	Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	116	63%	64% - 66%	-1%	\$3,221,846	\$27,775	68
High	Hastings Youth Academy	145	45%	46% - 48%	-1%	\$4,289,855	\$29,585	67
Low	Sankofa Group Treatment Home (Closed)	37	51%	52% - 58%	-1%	\$1,144,236	\$30,925	67
Low	Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	132	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$4,477,252	\$33,919	66
High	Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	73	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$2,738,608	\$37,515	66
Mod	Cannon Point Youth Academy	80	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$3,033,892	\$37,924	66
Low	Escambia River Outward Bound	97	48%	50% - 52%	-1%	\$4,038,280	\$41,632	65
Mod	Mandala ATC Halfway House	62	45%	47% - 51%	-2%	\$2,259,487	\$36,443	62
Mod	Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	61	46%	48% - 52%	-2%	\$2,526,078	\$41,411	62
High Cost								
Mod	MATS Halfway House (Ramsey)	33	52%	52% - 59%	-1%	\$2,299,150	\$69,671	60
Mod	RAMC Mentally Challenged	24	50%	51% - 60%	-1%	\$3,031,045	\$126,294	50

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Table 16. Least Effective Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference*	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Moderate Cost								
Low	Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	41	44%	47% - 52%	-3%	\$1,179,608	\$28,771	60
Low	Boys Ranch Group Treatment Home (Closed)	20	45%	48% - 59%	-3%	\$660,294	\$33,015	60
Mod	NAFI Halfway House	37	43%	47% - 53%	-4%	\$1,419,875	\$38,375	55
Low	Hillsborough Group Treatment Homes	54	30%	36% - 40%	-6%	\$1,592,105	\$29,483	49
High Cost								
High	CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	43%	45% - 49%	-3%	\$2,771,510	\$45,435	57
Low	Brevard Group Treatment Home	43	42%	46% - 51%	-4%	\$2,117,920	\$49,254	53
Mod	Palm Beach Halfway House	55	33%	38% - 42%	-6%	\$2,475,555	\$45,010	47
High	Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	19	16%	34% - 45%	-19%	\$2,471,596	\$130,084	20

*Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range, rounded to the nearest whole percent.

Appendix 1

Program Risk Factors by Restrictiveness Levels, Tables 1A through 1E

**Table 1A. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range
for Non-Residential Programs**

Non-Residential Programs	Risk Factors						Expected Success Range	Success Rate
	Recidivism Pool	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	% of Youth with Multiple Felonies	Average Age at Release	% Male	% Non-White		
Central Florida Marine Institute	23	4.3	39.1%	16.6	83%	57%	67% - 73%	74%
Clay Behavioral Health	24	2.2	33.3%	16.7	79%	13%	67% - 72%	71%
Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	17	3.4	23.5%	16.5	0%	24%	68% - 75%	82%
Dade North Marine Institute	59	2.7	69.5%	16.8	97%	69%	59% - 63%	53%
Dade South Marine Institute	54	2.6	64.8%	16.7	93%	26%	67% - 70%	69%
DATA Day Treatment	44	3.8	65.9%	15.8	73%	64%	68% - 72%	70%
DATA SIG	24	3.6	62.5%	17.5	71%	38%	67% - 72%	71%
Eckerd Leadership Program	46	2.8	32.6%	16.4	54%	50%	69% - 73%	74%
Emerald Coast Marine Institute	19	3.2	68.4%	16.6	79%	26%	60% - 67%	47%
Escambia Bay Marine Institute	47	3.4	34.0%	17.4	81%	49%	63% - 67%	60%
Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	16	3.8	75.0%	16.7	94%	6%	66% - 74%	75%
Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	59	3.5	64.4%	16.8	80%	37%	69% - 72%	71%
Friends of Children, Youth and Families Intensive Day Treatment	44	4.8	90.9%	16.6	100%	95%	61% - 65%	55%
Gainesville Marine Institute	30	4.4	63.3%	16.8	80%	73%	64% - 68%	60%
Gulf Coast Marine Institute	24	3.3	66.7%	16.8	75%	25%	65% - 71%	67%
Intensive Community Services-Bay Area Youth Services	190	4.1	47.9%	16.7	71%	38%	72% - 73%	72%
Jacksonville East Marine Institute	60	2.2	45.0%	16.6	80%	57%	66% - 69%	65%
Jacksonville West Marine Institute	50	2.4	56.0%	16.7	94%	60%	70% - 73%	74%
Jacksonville Youth Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	25	1.2	24.0%	16.0	100%	60%	74% - 78%	96%
JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	91	3.0	85.7%	17.0	87%	66%	69% - 71%	69%
Manatee Palms	99	3.5	60.6%	17.1	82%	38%	63% - 65%	61%
New Port Richey Marine Institute	21	4.2	61.9%	16.2	86%	10%	60% - 67%	48%
Oaks Day Treatment	72	2.8	48.6%	16.0	72%	53%	62% - 65%	58%
Orlando Marine Institute	53	3.3	56.6%	17.2	83%	58%	64% - 67%	60%
Palm Beach Marine Institute	70	3.1	61.4%	17.0	83%	31%	70% - 73%	73%
Panama City Marine Institute	20	2.1	10.0%	16.2	65%	30%	67% - 73%	75%
Pinellas Marine Institute	20	4.6	85.0%	16.4	80%	60%	59% - 66%	45%
Silver River Marine Institute	70	3.3	52.9%	16.6	84%	24%	64% - 66%	61%
Sutton Place of Nassau County	20	2.6	35.0%	16.6	85%	20%	67% - 73%	75%
Tallahassee Marine Institute	27	3.6	48.1%	16.5	81%	93%	66% - 71%	67%
Tampa Marine Institute	26	4.2	80.8%	17.6	81%	54%	66% - 72%	69%
The Bridge Special Intensive Group	148	2.9	48.0%	16.5	72%	62%	70% - 72%	71%

Table 1B. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Low-Risk Residential Programs

Low Risk Programs	Risk Factors											Expected Success Range	Success Rate
	Recidivism Pool	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	% of Youth with Multiple Felonies	Average Age at Release	% Non-		Region						
					% Male	White	NW	NE	W	E	S		
Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	26	4.2	46%	15.8	0%	42%	0%	0%	19%	23%	58%	71% - 78%	85%
Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	193	3.4	63%	16.4	100%	50%	3%	96%	1%	1%	1%	51% - 52%	50%
AMI Host Homes (Closed)	15	2.8	7%	16.6	20%	27%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	63% - 75%	80%
Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	237	3.6	35%	16.3	100%	49%	99%	0%	1%	0%	0%	56% - 57%	56%
Boys Ranch Group Treatment Home (Closed)	20	4.9	90%	13.8	100%	70%	0%	0%	5%	0%	95%	48% - 59%	45%
Brevard Group Treatment Home	43	4.1	60%	13.6	100%	42%	0%	9%	2%	86%	2%	46% - 51%	42%
Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	42	4.0	69%	15.4	100%	5%	0%	55%	29%	7%	10%	55% - 60%	55%
Camp E-Kel-Etu-Mental Health	48	4.4	73%	15.5	100%	19%	6%	56%	2%	31%	4%	54% - 59%	54%
Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	49	4.1	82%	14.8	100%	24%	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%	57% - 61%	57%
Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	21	4.4	52%	16.5	0%	10%	0%	43%	14%	19%	24%	69% - 77%	86%
Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	41	3.9	78%	15.7	100%	17%	0%	0%	44%	0%	56%	47% - 52%	44%
CATS Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	40	3.8	28%	15.4	0%	43%	5%	5%	0%	70%	20%	71% - 76%	80%
Dade Group Treatment Home	17	3.4	76%	13.9	100%	59%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	58% - 68%	65%
Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	132	4.7	68%	16.0	100%	56%	0%	2%	0%	60%	38%	51% - 53%	50%
Escambia River Outward Bound	97	4.3	63%	16.0	100%	42%	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%	50% - 52%	48%
Florida Youth Academy-Female	21	7.1	76%	13.4	100%	33%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	55% - 64%	57%
Hillsborough Group Treatment Homes	54	5.6	89%	13.3	100%	65%	0%	2%	98%	0%	0%	36% - 40%	30%
Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	104	3.5	49%	16.5	100%	45%	1%	8%	1%	83%	8%	62% - 64%	63%
Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	31	3.2	32%	17.1	0%	58%	3%	0%	0%	61%	35%	74% - 79%	87%
Manatee Wilderness Camp	150	4.9	62%	16.4	100%	45%	1%	0%	70%	15%	14%	52% - 54%	51%
Myakka Short-Term Offender Program (Closed)	143	4.9	69%	16.5	100%	42%	1%	0%	98%	1%	0%	46% - 48%	45%
Palm Beach Group Treatment Home (Closed)	17	4.1	82%	13.9	100%	65%	0%	0%	0%	18%	82%	60% - 71%	71%
Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home (Closed)	70	5.5	69%	16.3	100%	27%	0%	3%	97%	0%	0%	51% - 54%	50%
Peace River Outward Bound	101	5.1	72%	14.7	100%	44%	0%	0%	99%	0%	1%	48% - 50%	47%
Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female (Closed)	80	3.6	31%	15.5	0%	34%	10%	65%	23%	1%	1%	66% - 69%	69%
Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	116	3.6	59%	15.5	65%	53%	1%	98%	0%	1%	0%	64% - 66%	63%
Sankofa Group Treatment Home (Closed)	37	5.0	81%	15.8	100%	73%	0%	0%	3%	0%	97%	52% - 58%	51%
Space Coast Residential	90	5.2	82%	17.1	100%	37%	0%	1%	3%	96%	0%	57% - 60%	58%
STEP (North and South)	527	3.3	45%	16.5	75%	43%	19%	69%	6%	2%	4%	64% - 64%	63%
UMOJA Group Treatment Home (Closed)	23	5.7	91%	15.4	100%	83%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	55% - 63%	57%
Visionary Adolescent Services Group Treatment Home-Female	50	4.0	46%	15.3	0%	54%	4%	0%	2%	48%	46%	56% - 60%	56%
Withlacoochee Short-Term Offender Camp (Closed)	120	4.5	68%	16.7	100%	45%	4%	79%	11%	3%	3%	55% - 57%	54%

Table 1C. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Moderate-Risk Residential Programs

Moderate Risk Programs	Risk Factors											Expected Success Range	Success Rate
	Recidivism Pool	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	% of Youth with Multiple Felonies	Average Age at Release	% Non-		Region						
					% Male	White	NW	NE	W	E	S		
Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	80	5.9	78%	16.9	0%	35%	3%	23%	18%	51%	6%	67% - 69%	69%
Agape Cove Halfway House-Female (Closed)	17	2.9	76%	16.6	0%	59%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	71% - 80%	94%
Alachua Halfway House-Female	69	4.3	61%	16.7	0%	46%	23%	46%	6%	22%	3%	73% - 76%	78%
ARC Halfway House	213	5.7	80%	17.1	100%	47%	0%	3%	0%	95%	1%	61% - 63%	62%
ATC Boys Halfway House-Dual Diagnosis	146	5.5	75%	16.9	100%	33%	1%	1%	1%	82%	16%	56% - 58%	56%
ATC Substance Abuse Halfway House	51	4.5	69%	17.6	100%	25%	12%	25%	14%	24%	25%	59% - 64%	61%
Avon Park Youth Academy	363	5.7	81%	18.0	100%	42%	0%	1%	88%	11%	1%	68% - 69%	68%
Bay Behavioral Hope-Mental Health	17	3.1	41%	16.2	0%	35%	76%	24%	0%	0%	0%	66% - 76%	82%
Bay Boot Camp	79	3.6	58%	16.8	100%	38%	97%	0%	3%	0%	0%	50% - 53%	49%
Bay Point Schools-North	69	4.1	87%	17.2	100%	48%	0%	0%	1%	0%	99%	60% - 63%	61%
Bay Point Schools-West	202	4.4	90%	17.5	100%	47%	0%	0%	1%	0%	98%	70% - 71%	70%
Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	61	6.7	97%	17.1	100%	34%	2%	0%	93%	2%	3%	48% - 52%	46%
Blackwater Career Development Center	37	4.6	54%	17.8	100%	35%	97%	3%	0%	0%	0%	54% - 60%	54%
Bridges Academy-Female	87	4.4	51%	16.5	0%	41%	98%	2%	0%	0%	0%	63% - 66%	64%
Bristol Youth Academy	40	3.8	75%	17.1	100%	50%	25%	65%	8%	3%	0%	67% - 72%	73%
Britt Halfway House	93	7.1	84%	16.8	100%	44%	0%	1%	98%	1%	0%	52% - 55%	52%
Cannon Point Youth Academy	80	5.8	90%	16.9	100%	53%	0%	3%	1%	1%	95%	51% - 54%	50%
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	35	5.4	66%	16.8	0%	43%	3%	3%	31%	34%	29%	66% - 71%	71%
Choices Halfway House-Female	75	4.9	64%	16.9	0%	64%	0%	0%	1%	75%	24%	65% - 68%	67%
Collier Drill Academy	110	3.3	49%	16.5	100%	20%	1%	0%	97%	0%	2%	64% - 66%	65%
Crossroads Wilderness	99	4.4	82%	17.0	100%	40%	0%	0%	98%	1%	1%	58% - 61%	59%
CSC Halfway House-Bartow (Closed)	80	5.9	69%	16.1	100%	51%	0%	1%	96%	1%	1%	52% - 55%	51%
Dade Intensive Control (Closed)	85	4.2	86%	16.2	100%	62%	0%	0%	1%	0%	99%	57% - 60%	58%
Deborahs Way-Female	27	3.4	67%	16.4	0%	41%	11%	0%	7%	0%	81%	74% - 80%	89%
Duval Halfway House	110	3.3	79%	16.6	100%	67%	3%	95%	1%	0%	1%	59% - 61%	59%
Duval START Center	88	3.8	70%	14.0	100%	55%	5%	84%	0%	10%	1%	61% - 64%	63%
Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program-Mental Health	23	3.1	70%	16.0	100%	13%	0%	96%	0%	4%	0%	59% - 68%	65%
Eckerd Halfway House	62	5.6	90%	16.8	100%	53%	0%	0%	2%	65%	34%	60% - 64%	61%
Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	148	4.7	70%	16.7	100%	30%	1%	98%	0%	1%	0%	57% - 58%	57%
Falkenburg Academy	237	6.5	86%	16.7	100%	53%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	53% - 54%	52%
First Step II Halfway House	29	4.5	45%	16.3	0%	38%	0%	0%	0%	97%	3%	65% - 71%	72%
Florida Environmental Institute	37	5.1	86%	18.2	100%	70%	5%	0%	5%	0%	89%	75% - 79%	86%
Florida Youth Academy-Female	19	3.7	63%	16.6	0%	53%	0%	26%	26%	26%	21%	68% - 77%	84%
Forestry Youth Academy	61	6.0	84%	17.5	100%	41%	31%	13%	52%	2%	2%	57% - 61%	57%
Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	64	4.2	47%	16.4	0%	45%	8%	2%	3%	73%	14%	68% - 71%	72%

Table 1C, Continued. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Moderate-Risk Residential Programs

Moderate Risk Programs	Risk Factors											Expected Success Range	Success Rate
	Recidivism Pool	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	% of Youth with Multiple Felonies	Average Age at Release	% Non-		Region						
					% Male	White	NW	NE	W	E	S		
Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female (Closed)	99	5.1	60%	16.1	0%	46%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	66% - 69%	68%
Greenville Hills Academy	436	4.8	72%	15.4	100%	52%	41%	39%	2%	18%	1%	48% - 49%	48%
Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)-Mental Health-Substance Abuse	62	4.6	63%	17.1	100%	34%	0%	2%	0%	97%	2%	60% - 64%	61%
Gulf Coast Youth Academy (Ramsey)	192	5.1	76%	16.9	100%	43%	24%	29%	5%	17%	24%	58% - 60%	58%
Hastings Youth Academy	252	5.5	82%	16.9	100%	52%	4%	66%	17%	11%	2%	52% - 53%	52%
Hendry Halfway House	119	4.7	73%	15.9	100%	34%	0%	3%	93%	0%	4%	53% - 56%	53%
Impact Halfway House	98	4.1	73%	16.7	100%	58%	3%	96%	1%	0%	0%	46% - 48%	44%
Kelly Hall Halfway House	75	4.9	77%	17.4	100%	12%	0%	0%	99%	1%	0%	72% - 74%	76%
Kingsley Center-Female	79	5.1	68%	16.5	0%	44%	11%	3%	46%	13%	28%	63% - 66%	65%
Leaf Halfway House-Female	103	4.9	59%	16.2	0%	51%	0%	2%	97%	0%	1%	64% - 66%	65%
LEAF Recovery-Female	22	5.3	64%	16.8	0%	14%	9%	23%	59%	0%	9%	61% - 69%	68%
Leon Drill Academy (Closed)	149	4.7	72%	16.9	100%	55%	56%	42%	0%	1%	0%	52% - 54%	52%
Leslie Peters Halfway House	110	5.6	83%	16.9	100%	62%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	55% - 57%	55%
Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	79	3.9	70%	17.1	100%	47%	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	68% - 71%	71%
Manatee Boot Camp	64	4.6	89%	17.0	100%	52%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	55% - 59%	55%
Mandala ATC Halfway House	62	7.0	76%	15.8	100%	21%	0%	2%	94%	3%	2%	47% - 51%	45%
Marion Youth Development Center (Career Systems)	189	5.5	80%	16.7	100%	54%	11%	23%	22%	16%	28%	58% - 59%	58%
Martin Boot Camp	82	4.7	80%	17.2	100%	52%	0%	0%	1%	60%	39%	70% - 73%	73%
MATS Halfway House (Ramsey)	33	4.7	88%	16.8	100%	24%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	52% - 59%	52%
MATS Halfway House-Charter Behavioral	44	4.5	73%	16.7	100%	20%	0%	0%	98%	2%	0%	59% - 64%	61%
Miami Halfway House	92	3.5	83%	16.9	100%	43%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	64% - 66%	65%
NAFI Halfway House	37	6.4	81%	17.2	100%	41%	97%	0%	3%	0%	0%	47% - 53%	43%
Nassau Halfway House	92	3.6	73%	16.9	100%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	62% - 65%	63%
Okaloosa Halfway House	53	5.1	64%	16.8	100%	51%	72%	11%	0%	17%	0%	53% - 58%	53%
Okaloosa Youth Academy	242	4.7	76%	17.0	100%	55%	61%	11%	5%	12%	12%	54% - 55%	53%
Okeechobee Redirection Camp	163	4.5	69%	16.9	100%	56%	1%	2%	3%	85%	9%	63% - 65%	64%
Palm Beach Halfway House	55	5.1	82%	15.3	100%	69%	0%	0%	4%	0%	96%	38% - 42%	33%
Palm Beach Work Release (Closed)	77	4.5	84%	17.6	100%	68%	0%	1%	0%	1%	97%	56% - 59%	56%
Panther Success Center Halfway House	111	4.8	83%	16.5	100%	52%	21%	78%	1%	0%	0%	52% - 54%	51%
Pensacola Boys Base	99	3.8	53%	17.0	100%	49%	98%	2%	0%	0%	0%	53% - 55%	53%
Pinellas Boot Camp	93	7.6	89%	16.8	100%	32%	0%	0%	99%	1%	0%	59% - 61%	59%
Pines Halfway House-Female	91	3.9	57%	16.2	0%	44%	2%	96%	1%	0%	1%	68% - 70%	70%
Polk Boot Camp-Female	50	4.8	60%	17.0	0%	44%	26%	0%	74%	0%	0%	61% - 66%	64%
Polk Boot Camp-Male	163	5.3	75%	17.1	100%	53%	1%	0%	98%	1%	1%	61% - 63%	61%

**Table 1C, Continued. Risk Factors Used to Calculate
Expected Success Range for Moderate-Risk Residential Programs**

Moderate Risk Programs	Risk Factors											Expected Success Range	Success Rate
	Recidivism Pool	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	% of Youth with Multiple Felonies	Average Age at Release	% Non-		Region						
					% Male	White	NW	NE	W	E	S		
Polk Halfway House	93	6.0	65%	16.5	100%	35%	0%	0%	98%	2%	0%	58% - 60%	58%
Pompano Learning Academy (Closed)	116	6.6	92%	16.7	100%	75%	0%	0%	0%	1%	99%	53% - 55%	53%
Price Halfway House	99	4.9	69%	17.6	100%	39%	0%	1%	96%	1%	2%	51% - 54%	51%
RAMC Mentally Challenged	24	7.0	83%	17.1	100%	75%	50%	13%	21%	13%	4%	51% - 60%	50%
Robert E. Lee, Jr Hall Halfway House	75	4.9	60%	16.6	100%	35%	0%	99%	0%	1%	0%	47% - 50%	45%
San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	81	6.1	69%	15.8	100%	23%	0%	5%	94%	0%	1%	55% - 58%	54%
Seminole Work and Learn Center	92	4.7	59%	17.0	100%	52%	90%	9%	1%	0%	0%	56% - 58%	55%
Southern Glades Youth Camp	78	4.5	86%	16.7	100%	60%	0%	0%	1%	4%	95%	62% - 65%	63%
Terrace Halfway House	81	4.2	53%	16.8	100%	36%	1%	94%	2%	2%	0%	52% - 55%	52%
Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	166	4.3	60%	16.3	0%	40%	5%	92%	0%	2%	0%	68% - 70%	69%
Volusia Halfway House	101	5.0	77%	16.9	100%	34%	0%	99%	0%	1%	0%	53% - 55%	52%
West Florida Wilderness Institute	87	3.4	54%	16.8	100%	34%	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	71% - 74%	75%
Wilson Academy-Female	80	5.0	55%	16.8	0%	34%	0%	3%	96%	1%	0%	68% - 71%	71%
YMCA Character Halfway House-Female-Pregnancy	46	4.3	61%	17.1	0%	41%	28%	7%	46%	11%	9%	76% - 79%	85%
Youth Development Academy	108	4.3	69%	16.6	100%	41%	0%	0%	99%	0%	1%	54% - 56%	54%
Youth Environmental Services	71	5.7	80%	17.2	100%	56%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	65% - 68%	68%

Table 1D. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for High-Risk Residential Programs

High Risk Programs	Risk Factors										Expected Success Range	Success Rate	
	Recidivism Pool	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	% of Youth with Multiple Felonies	Average Age at Release	% Male	% Non-White	Region						
							NW	NE	W	E			S
ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	44	7.6	98%	17.8	100%	70%	0%	7%	2%	91%	0%	69% - 73%	75%
Broward Intensive Halfway House	68	8.7	96%	17.0	100%	76%	0%	0%	0%	1%	99%	58% - 62%	59%
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-(Charter)-Female (Closed)	117	6.0	82%	16.8	0%	44%	2%	30%	32%	21%	15%	68% - 70%	69%
CSC Intensive Halfway House-Bartow	62	8.1	85%	17.2	100%	48%	0%	5%	94%	0%	2%	52% - 56%	52%
CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	7.7	98%	17.8	100%	38%	0%	21%	70%	8%	0%	45% - 49%	43%
Dozier Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	3.8	62%	17.7	100%	33%	27%	33%	13%	27%	0%	72% - 77%	80%
Dozier Training School	201	6.9	89%	17.6	100%	53%	23%	36%	12%	28%	0%	54% - 55%	53%
Eckerd Youth Development Center	252	6.0	91%	17.5	100%	63%	0%	0%	33%	10%	57%	58% - 59%	58%
Elaine Gordon Treatment Center-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	40	2.4	70%	16.9	100%	40%	0%	20%	5%	18%	58%	78% - 82%	90%
Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	87	6.7	97%	17.6	100%	71%	0%	3%	8%	13%	76%	61% - 64%	62%
Florida Institute For Girls-Mental Health	24	5.2	79%	16.8	0%	38%	17%	13%	42%	8%	21%	65% - 73%	75%
Florida Youth Academy-Female	61	5.6	75%	17.0	0%	46%	0%	34%	46%	5%	15%	66% - 69%	69%
Hastings Youth Academy	144	6.5	93%	17.3	100%	58%	15%	61%	11%	13%	0%	46% - 48%	45%
Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	19	7.1	89%	13.5	100%	79%	11%	5%	21%	16%	47%	34% - 45%	16%
Jackson JOCC*	132	7.0	93%	17.6	100%	56%	33%	29%	8%	29%	1%	57% - 59%	57%
Jackson JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	17	2.9	41%	17.3	100%	6%	12%	53%	35%	0%	0%	71% - 80%	94%
Kingsley Center-Female	90	5.9	84%	16.7	0%	50%	7%	14%	54%	9%	16%	60% - 63%	61%
Manatee Adolescent Treatment (Ramsey)-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	21	2.5	62%	16.9	100%	33%	24%	10%	67%	0%	0%	69% - 77%	86%
Manatee Youth Academy	63	6.9	90%	17.1	100%	46%	0%	2%	98%	0%	0%	54% - 58%	54%
Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	85	7.2	94%	17.4	100%	47%	2%	92%	2%	2%	1%	58% - 61%	59%
Monticello New Life-Female	34	4.9	76%	17.1	0%	38%	65%	32%	3%	0%	0%	66% - 72%	74%
NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	48	6.4	83%	17.4	100%	56%	83%	10%	4%	2%	0%	56% - 60%	56%
Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House	58	6.3	86%	17.4	100%	62%	55%	31%	2%	12%	0%	54% - 58%	53%
Okeechobee JOCC*-Sex Offender Program (SOP)	45	3.2	64%	17.0	100%	49%	2%	13%	33%	24%	27%	74% - 78%	82%
Orange Intensive Halfway House-Female	52	5.2	73%	16.3	0%	56%	2%	19%	23%	25%	31%	75% - 79%	83%
Palm Beach Youth Center	27	5.9	85%	17.1	100%	78%	0%	15%	4%	7%	74%	63% - 71%	70%
Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	73	5.1	88%	16.5	100%	59%	3%	97%	0%	0%	0%	52% - 55%	51%
Polk Youth Development Center	645	7.2	92%	17.6	100%	55%	6%	16%	43%	29%	6%	56% - 56%	56%
Sago Palms Pathfinders-Substance Abuse	34	6.7	100%	18.0	100%	26%	0%	38%	29%	29%	3%	66% - 72%	74%
Sago Palms Sex Offender Program	18	3.4	72%	17.2	100%	33%	0%	61%	17%	6%	17%	53% - 64%	56%
Sago Palms Youth Development Center	215	7.2	95%	17.4	100%	63%	3%	25%	19%	24%	30%	57% - 58%	57%
South Florida Intensive Halfway House-Female	26	6.1	77%	17.1	0%	77%	0%	0%	23%	27%	50%	71% - 77%	85%
Three Springs Sex Offender Program	21	3.7	62%	17.4	100%	38%	10%	90%	0%	0%	0%	65% - 73%	76%
Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	5.0	95%	17.3	100%	60%	0%	98%	2%	0%	0%	55% - 60%	56%
Vernon Place-Female	69	6.1	88%	17.2	0%	41%	42%	22%	20%	9%	7%	68% - 71%	71%

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

Table 1E. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Expected Success Range for Maximum-Risk Residential Programs

Maximum Risk Programs	Risk Factors										Expected Success Range	Success Rate	
	Recidivism Pool	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	% of Youth with Multiple Felonies	Average Age at Release	% Male	% Non-White	Region						
							NW	NE	W	E			S
Cypress Creek JOCC*	98	6.5	90%	18.3	100%	57%	13%	24%	37%	16%	9%	67% - 70%	69%
Okeechobee JOCC*	53	6.8	89%	18.2	100%	70%	9%	23%	19%	30%	19%	62% - 66%	64%
Omega JOCC*	38	6.8	87%	18.6	100%	50%	5%	21%	37%	26%	11%	66% - 71%	71%

*JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

Appendix 2

Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations

Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations

Name of Program	1999-2000 Releases	2000-2001 Releases	Total Releases	Reasons Excluded from PAM Calculations
Adolescent Offender Sex Offender Program	2	0	2	Released less than 15 youth.
Catalyst Sex Offender Program	0	2	2	Released less than 15 youth.
Choices Independent Living	0	5	5	Released less than 15 youth.
Cove Halfway House-Female	2	0	2	Released less than 15 youth.
Dade Marine Institute South	1	0	1	Released less than 15 youth.
Eagles Vision Day Treatment	6	2	8	Released less than 15 youth.
Eckerd Comprehensive Youth Treatment (ECYT)	4	8	12	Released less than 15 youth.
Elaine Gordon Non-Residential Sex Offender Program	1	2	3	Released less than 15 youth.
Family Continuity Program	2	0	2	Released less than 15 youth.
GOALS Program	0	11	11	Released less than 15 youth.
Golden Gate Excel Day Treatment	4	3	7	Released less than 15 youth.
Gulf Academy-Female	0	5	5	Released less than 15 youth.
Gulf Academy-Male	0	9	9	Released less than 15 youth.
Gulfcoast Marine Institute	8	6	14	Released less than 15 youth.
HARP	9	0	9	Released less than 15 youth.
Hernando Sumpter Intensive Work Program	5	0	5	Released less than 15 youth.
ICSP	10	4	14	Released less than 15 youth.
JUST Program	0	13	13	Released less than 15 youth.
Liberty Independent Living	2	8	10	Released less than 15 youth.
Miami River of Life Independent Living-Low Risk	1	4	5	Released less than 15 youth.
Miami River of Life Independent Living-Moderate Risk	3	4	7	Released less than 15 youth.
Miami River Of Life Independent Living-Female	0	1	1	Released less than 15 youth.
Perpective GTH	2	11	13	Released less than 15 youth.
Project Craft	1	0	1	Released less than 15 youth.
Sawmill Academy For Girls	0	1	1	Released less than 15 youth.
Seminole Success	1	9	10	Released less than 15 youth.
South Broward GTH	13	0	13	Released less than 15 youth.
Southwest Florida Marine Institute	9	5	14	Released less than 15 youth.
Special Intensive Group (SIG) West, Circuit 15	0	12	12	Released less than 15 youth.
Special Intensive Group (SIG), Circuit 18	3	1	4	Released less than 15 youth.
Special Intensive Group (SIG), Circuit 9	0	13	13	Released less than 15 youth.
Visions	8	0	8	Released less than 15 youth.
WINGS Associated Marine Institute-Female	0	6	6	Released less than 15 youth.
Youth Achievement Academy (Formerly SIMS TLC)	1	1	2	Released less than 15 youth.

Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations, Continued

Name of Program	1999-2000 Releases	2000-2001 Releases	Total Releases	Reasons Excluded from PAM Calculations
Atlantic Coast Marine Institute	22	-	22	Closed or contract discontinued.
Charter Pasco Treatment Center-Female	25	-	25	Closed or contract discontinued.
Everglades Youth Development Center (YSI)	62	-	62	Closed or contract discontinued.
Ft. Pierce SIG	59	-	59	Closed or contract discontinued.
Glen Mills School	37	-	37	Closed or contract discontinued.
Hurricane Conservation Corp	66	-	66	Closed or contract discontinued.
Marion Youth Development Center-Securicor	84	-	84	Closed or contract discontinued.
MATS Sex Offender Program (Charter Behavioral)	21	-	21	Closed or contract discontinued.
Orange Boot Camp	19	-	19	Closed or contract discontinued.
Orange County Correctional Program	60	-	60	Closed or contract discontinued.
Pahokee Youth Development Center	248	-	248	Closed or contract discontinued.
Crossroads Independent Living GTH	4	-	4	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
Ft. Pierce GTH-Female	0	3	3	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
Hillsborough SHOP	4	-	4	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
La Amistad GTH	5	-	5	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
Lakeview Center-Female	13	-	13	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
Pace Center West Palm-Female	0	5	5	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
Path Intensive Halfway House	6	-	6	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
Special Intensive Group (SIG) Lake County	12	2	14	Closed, contract discontinued, released less than 15 youth.
Local Non-Residential	123	105	228	Various local non-residential services.
Low Risk Local Residential	20	10	30	Various local residential services.
Moderate Risk Local Residential	215	238	453	Various local residential services.
High Risk Local Residential	4	14	18	Various local residential services.
Special Intensive Group (SIG), Circuit 10	35	10	45	State operated non-residential.
Special Intensive Group (SIG), Circuit 17	75	38	113	State operated non-residential.
Special Intensive Group (SIG), Circuit 6	39	0	39	State operated non-residential.
Special Intensive Group (SIG), Circuit 7	36	0	36	State operated non-residential.
Special Intensive Group (SIG), Circuit 8	32	8	40	State operated non-residential.

Appendix 3

Definitions of Terms

Cost minimization index: The value of the standardized measure for cost per completion, inverted (multiplied by -1) to allow lower costs to contribute positively in the PAM score. Cost is standardized by dividing the program cost per completion by the standard deviation of program cost per completion among all programs included in the report.

Expected success range: The expected success rate plus or minus the margin of error (the 99% confidence interval for the measure of expected success). If the observed success rate falls below the lower limit or exceeds the upper limit of the expected success range, the probability that the difference is due to random error is less than 1%.

Expected success rate: The average probability of success for youth released from a program, based on the risk factors for recidivism. Separate predictive models for residential and non-residential programs were developed. For residential programs the risk factors identified in available data as significant predictors of recidivism include the number of prior adjudications, whether a youth has multiple prior felony referrals, age at release, gender, race, and region in which they youth resides. For non-residential programs the risk factors identified in available data as significant predictors of recidivism include the number of prior adjudications, whether a youth has multiple prior felony referrals, age at release, gender, and race.

Included programs: Residential and non-residential programs (excluding conditional release programs) with at least 15 youth released between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001. Programs with no releases in 2000-2001 are excluded from PAM calculations.

Percentage above expected success range: The difference between the observed success rate for a program and the upper limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percentage below expected success range: The difference between the observed success rate for a program and the lower limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percent difference: The percent above or below the expected success range.

Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score: The PAM score is calculated by summing the program cost measure (weighted by a factor of one-third) and the program effectiveness measure (weighted by a factor of two-thirds). The combined measure is then standardized and transformed into a PAM score similar to the typical grading scale where 70 is considered average.

Program completions: Youth in the recidivism pool plus the 61 youth who volunteered for the Forestry Youth Academy. While these youth are not included in the recidivism pool, programs are given credit for these youth in the calculations of cost per completion. The programs affected include Leon and Collier Drill Academies; Manatee, Pinellas and Bay Boot Camps; STEP-North and South; Duval Start Center; Falkenburg Academy; Hastings Youth Academy-Moderate and High Risk; Youth Environmental Services; Terrace Halfway House; Robert E. Lee Hall Halfway House; Manatee Youth Academy; and Polk Youth Development Center.

Program cost per completion: Total expenditures for each program divided by the number of program completions for the two-year period between FY 1999-2000 and FY 2000-2001 (see definition of *program completions* above and *total expenditures* below)

Recidivism: A subsequent juvenile adjudication, adjudication withheld or adult conviction for an offense that occurred within one year of a youth's release from a Department of Juvenile Justice commitment program to the community or a conditional release program.

Recidivism pool: A pool of 15,535 youth released from residential programs and 2,315 youth released from non-residential programs to the community or a conditional release program between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001. Recidivism is tracked for one year after each youth's release. Therefore, a youth released on June 29, 2001 is tracked till June 28, 2002. Details of the selection of the recidivism pool can be found in the *2003 Outcome Evaluation Report* available at <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/statsnresearch>.

Recidivism reduction effect, or program effectiveness index: The difference between the observed success rate and the upper limit (for positive differences) or lower limit (for negative differences) of the expected success range. The difference is standardized by dividing it by the standard deviation of those differences among all programs in the report.

Region: One of five regions into which the youth's residing judicial circuit is categorized. The northeast region includes: Circuits 4, 5, 7, and 8. The northwest region includes: Circuits 1, 2, 3, and 14. The west region includes: Circuits 6, 10, 12, 13, and 20. The east region includes: Circuits 9, 18, and 19. The south region includes: Circuits 11, 15, 16, and 17.

Standardization: Conversion of the separate accountability measures to a uniform scale in order to combined them into a single measure; a process similar to converting academic grades to a scale of 100. Cost and effectiveness measures are standardized by dividing each program's value on each of the two measures by the standard deviation for the distribution of values for all included programs.

Success rate: The percentage of youth released from a program that do not recidivate (as defined above) within one year after release.

Total Expenditures (Two-Year Expenditures): DJJ expenditures plus all other sources of government funding including all state, local school board and federal monies for fiscal years 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

Appendix 4

Calculating the Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score

1. **Calculate the program effect on recidivism.** For each program, calculate the difference between the program's success rate and the upper limit of its expected success range (if observed success is higher than expected) or the lower limit of its expected success range (if observed success is lower than expected). If the observed success rate is within the confidence interval, the difference is not statistically significant and is counted as 0. This value is referred to as the percent difference.

Program: Leaf Group Treatment Home
 Success Rate: 87%
 Expected success range: 74%-79%
 Percent Difference: $87\% - 79\% = 8\%$

2. **Calculate the program cost per successful completion** by dividing total expenditures² by the total number of successful completions during the period being tracked.

Cost Per Successful Completion: $\$1,168,187 / 31 = \$37,683$

3. **Standardize.** To standardize the program percent differences, calculate the average percent difference for all the programs. Then, for each program, subtract this average percent difference from the program's percent difference, and divide by the standard deviation of the percent difference.

$$Z_{\text{success}} = (8\% - 0.452\%) / 3.26 = 2.32$$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Mean: } 0.452\% \\ \text{Standard deviation: } 3.26 \end{array} \right.$

Note: The top-scoring program had a program effect that was more than three standard deviations above the mean and was given a maximum z-score of 3.

To calculate the cost difference for each program, subtract the program's cost per successful completion (in this example, \$37,683) from the mean program cost per successful completion (in this example, \$35,146).

$$\text{Cost Difference} = \$35,146 - \$37,683 = -\$2,537$$

Standardize this difference by subtracting the mean cost difference for all programs from the program's cost difference, and divide by the standard deviation.

$$Z_{\text{cost}} = (-\$2,537 - (-\$8,856)) / \$32,520 = 0.19$$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Mean: } -\$8,856 \\ \text{Standard deviation: } \$32,520 \end{array} \right.$

Note: Any program having a cost per successful completion that was 3 standard deviations or more above/below the mean cost per youth was given a standardized cost score of +/-3.

4. **Add the z-scores together** with a factor of 2/3 for the recidivism component and 1/3 for the cost.

$$\text{PAM Index} = 2/3 \times Z_{\text{success}} + 1/3 \times (Z_{\text{cost}}) = 1.54 + (0.06) = 1.60$$

² Total expenditures are defined as DJJ program expenditures and all other sources of government funding including all state, local school board, and federal monies received during the two-year period between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2001.

5. **Standardize sum of component z-scores.** For standardization, subtract the mean PAM Index value from the program PAM Index value, and divide by the standard deviation.

$$Z = (1.60 - 0.008) / 0.57 = 2.80$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{PAM Index average: } 0.008 \\ \text{PAM Index standard deviation: } 0.57 \end{array} \right.$$

6. **Translate** into a distribution with an average of 70 and a standard deviation of 10, modeled after academic "A"- "F" grades.

$$\text{PAM Score} = (2.80 * 10) + 70 = 98$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{PAM Score average: } 70 \\ \text{PAM Score standard deviation: } 10 \end{array} \right.$$

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the consultation and assistance of the DJJ Bureau of Data and Research. In particular, we would like to thank Bureau Chief Ted Tollett, and staff including Dr. Steven Chapman, Sherry Jackson, and Kevin Wang. We also extend our appreciation to Dr. Amie Schuck, Assistant Professor of Criminology at the University of South Florida, for consultation and review of the analyses. Our thanks go to the DJJ Bureaus of Quality Assurance, Budget, Finance and Accounting and Contracts specifically John Criswell, Eleese Davis, Makisha Davis, Mike Mauterer and Chuck Sanders for their assistance with obtaining the program expenditures used in the PAM analyses. Our thanks also go to the Division of Residential Commitment specifically Charles Chervanik, Richard Kline, Dave Douglass, Gene McMahon and Mary Mills. Finally and most importantly, we would like to thank Secretary Bankhead and Deputy Secretary Alarcon for their continued support and commitment to outcome evaluation, effective performance measurement and cost accountability.