

Residential and Correctional Facilities

Juvenile offenders in Florida can be ordered by courts to serve time in a residential treatment or correctional facility. Circuit judges determine the level of confinement appropriate for each youth; the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) is responsible for placement of each youth in an appropriate program based on the youth's identified risk and needs.

Youth in residential programs must receive educational and vocational services. Youth are committed to residential programs for an indeterminate length of time and must complete individual treatment plan goals based on their rehabilitative needs, as one of the requirements for release. The Residential and Correctional Facilities Branch of the Department oversees all residential commitment programs. The Branch is divided into three regions:

- North Region: comprised of Judicial Circuits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 14.
- Central Region: comprised of Judicial Circuits 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 18.
- South Region: comprised of Judicial Circuits 11, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20.

Within each of the three regions, DJJ operates or contracts for the operation of a variety of residential programs to serve committed youth. Programs vary by restrictiveness level, defined in section 985.03 (44), Florida Statutes (2006) as "...the level of programming and security provided by programs that service the supervision, custody, care, and treatment needs of committed children." Higher restrictiveness levels are characterized by increased security, closer supervision, more intensive treatment and longer lengths of stay. The statute designates four restrictiveness levels of residential commitment:

- Low-risk residential;
- Moderate-risk residential;
- High-risk residential, and;
- Maximum-risk residential.

Section 985.441 of the Florida Statutes (2006) directs the juvenile courts to commit an adjudicated youth to one of the four restrictiveness levels based on the nature of the offense, security concerns and treatment issues. Within the restrictiveness level chosen by the juvenile court, DJJ personnel choose a specific program to best meet the treatment and security needs of the youth. Program types include but are not limited to: mental health programs, substance abuse programs, dual diagnosis programs, sex offender programs, and STAR programs. Residential programs with specialized beds receive funding from one or more of the following five sources:

- *Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT)*: Funding for RSAT Programs is provided by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) through a U.S. Department of Justice

Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners grant. Programs receive \$25.00 per day, per bed in addition to the DJJ contracted per diem rate.

- *Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Overlay Services (RSAT Overlay)*: Funding for RSAT Overlay Services is provided by state general revenue. Programs receive \$30.00 per day, per bed in addition to the DJJ contracted per diem rate.
- *Intensive Mental Health Services*: Funding for Intensive Mental Health Services is provided by state general revenue. Programs receive a higher daily per diem rate, ranging from \$130-\$150 per day, per bed. These programs are designed for youth with serious to severe symptoms of mental health disorders, developmental disorders, and for juvenile sex offenders who are in need of a more intensive specialized treatment regimen.
- *Mental Health Overlay Services (MHOS)*: Funding for Mental Health Overlay Services in programs is provided by state general revenue. Programs receive \$35.00 per day, per bed in addition to the DJJ contracted per diem rate.
- *Behavioral Health Overlay Services (BHOS)*: Funding for Behavioral Health Overlay Services is provided by Medicaid and the Agency for Health Care Administration. Eligible moderate-risk residential programs receive \$35.00 per day, per bed in addition to the DJJ contracted per diem rate.

Program Evaluation

Quality Assurance Performance

Any Department program, contracted or operated by the DJJ and governed by quality assurance standards that fails to meet the minimum levels of performance of any standard in the quality assurance process, is placed on Conditional Status. Conditional Status triggers corrective action plans, intensive monitoring, and technical assistance until the program's performance is improved. Corrective action plans must be completed within thirty calendar days of publication of a Quality Assurance (QA) report and must include, at a minimum, the following:

- Identification of the deficiency documented in the QA report.
- Identification of tasks necessary to correct the deficiency.

- Identification of persons responsible for completing the tasks.
- Periodic progress reports.
- Target dates for completion.

The following table provides a listing, by judicial circuit, of all residential programs placed on Conditional Status in 2006.

Residential Programs on Conditional Status in 2006

Name	Provider	Program Type
Adolescent Residential Campus (ARC) Halfway House	Center for Drug Free Living, Inc.	Moderate Risk Male
Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility	First Step Adolescent Services, Inc.	Moderate Risk Female
Bay Point Schools - Kennedy Campus West	ICARE Bay Point Schools, Inc.	Moderate Risk Male
Camp E-Tu-Makee	Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc.	Moderate Risk Male
Crossroads Wilderness Institute	Associated Marine Institute	Moderate Risk Male
Dade Group Treatment Home	Miami River of Life	Low Risk Male
Duval Halfway House	State Operated Residential - North Region	Moderate Risk Male
Eckerd Academy	Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc.	Low Risk Male
Eckerd Youth Development Center	Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc.	High Risk Male
First Step (III) Girls Juvenile Residential Facility	First Step Adolescent Services, Inc.	Moderate Risk Female
Grove Opportunities To Achieve Lasting Success (GOALS) JRF	The Grove Counseling Center, Inc.	Moderate Risk Male
Helping Ourselves Progress Effectively (Hope)	Universal Health Services	Mental Health Female
Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility Sex Offender Program	Three Springs, Inc.	Sex Offender High Risk Male
Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center	Harbor Behavioral Health Care Institute	Moderate Risk Male
Monticello New Life	North American Family Institute	High Risk Female
Orange Halfway House	State Operated Residential - Central Region	High Risk Female
Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility	G4S	High Risk Male
Price Halfway House	State Operated Residential - Central Region	Moderate Risk Male
San Antonio Boys Village	San Antonio Boys Village, Inc.	Moderate Risk Male
Seminole Work & Learn	YouthTrack, Inc.	Low Risk Male
Short Term Education Program (STEP)	Outward Bound Discovery	Low Risk Male/Female
Space Coast Marine Institute	Associated Marine Institute	Moderate Risk Male
St. Johns Juvenile Correctional Facility	Three Springs, Inc.	Sex Offender High Risk Male
Thompson Academy	Youth Services International Southeastern, Inc.	Moderate Risk Male
Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program (SHOP)	Correction Services of Florida, Inc.	High Risk Male
White Foundation Family Homes	Henry & Rilla White Foundation, Inc.	Low Risk Male/Female
Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility	Three Springs, Inc.	Low Risk Male

Table 8-1

Outcome Evaluation Performance

Program outputs and outcomes, including total releases, the percentage of youth adjudicated for offenses committed during placement (ODP), number of completions and completion rates, demographic characteristics, average length of stay, post-commitment services and recidivism rates, are presented for each commitment program that released youth in FY 2004-05. FY 2004-05 data are presented so that it is possible to track recidivism for one year ending June 30, 2006. Summary data are presented in this chapter by individual program organized by program type and region.

During FY 2004-05, there were a total of 9,456 releases from residential commitment programs. The rate of offenses during placement was 6%, indicating approximately 1 in 17 youth are convicted for an offense that occurred while in a commitment program.

Characteristics of the youth served in residential commitment varied by program and by restrictiveness level. For example, the average age at admission for youth increases as the restrictiveness level increases: 16.0 years for low-risk programs, 16.3 years for moderate-risk programs, 16.7 years for high-risk programs, and 17.1 years for maximum-risk programs. The extent and seriousness of youth's delinquency histories (as measured by the Average Prior Seriousness Index) also varied by restrictiveness level from 12.3, for youth completing low-risk restrictiveness programs, to 43.6 for youth released from maximum-risk programs

Overall, 40% of youth who completed their residential program recidivated within one year after their return to the community. The recidivism rate varied little by restrictiveness level, from 40% for low- and moderate-risk programs to 37% for maximum-risk programs. Statewide, recidivism rates for residential commitment programs have remained virtually unchanged over the past five years.

The data reflected that youth who recidivated had more extensive delinquency histories than non-recidivists. Male youth recidivated at higher rate than females, and black youth recidivated at higher rates than white youth. Recidivism rates declined steadily with age which explains, in part, the lower recidivism rates for maximum-risk programs.

In examining the time it takes for re-offending to occur, a consistent pattern has been observed over the last decade. The data demonstrate that if youth are going to recidivate within the first year, more than half will be rearrested within the first four months following program release. Among committed youth who recidivated in FY 04-05, the majority (54%) were re-arrested by the end of the fourth month and 80% were re-arrested by the end of the seventh month.

Youth completing commitment programs spent between 4 and 17 months in a program, depending on restrictiveness level. The average length of stay increased by approximately four months with each increase in restrictiveness level. There was no difference in the average length of stay between recidivists and non-recidivists.

Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Performance

The *2007 Program Accountability Measures (PAM)* presents program recidivism and cost effectiveness rankings for all residential facilities in Florida with 15 or more releases during the one-year period between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 (recidivism is then tracked through June 30, 2006). Results of this year's PAM analyses illustrate that PAM scores, comparing expected recidivism to actual recidivism performance, generally improved. Nearly one-quarter of all residential commitment programs evaluated attained a PAM score of 80 or higher, representing a 26% increase over the number of programs scoring at this level last year.

Examining PAM outcomes by residential restrictiveness level, a general pattern emerges whereby program PAM scores decrease for both male and female facilities as the restrictiveness level increases. This finding is in keeping with the increasingly more serious, higher-risk youth committed to higher restrictiveness level programs.

On average, PAM scores were somewhat higher for programs serving girls than those serving male youths. Low-risk female residential facilities had an average PAM score of 78, compared to 73 for similar restrictiveness level programs serving boys. Fifty percent of the female low-risk residential programs were rated as Effective or Highly Effective relative to recidivism effectiveness, while 33% of the male low-risk facilities ranked at this level. Most low-risk residential programs were classified as Low Cost (100% of the girls' programs and 75% of the boys' low-risk facilities).

Among youth released from moderate-risk and high-risk residential programs, recidivism rates averaged approximately 26% for the facilities serving girls and 41% for those serving male youths. Similar proportions of male and female moderate-risk programs ranked as Effective or Highly Effective (37% of boys' programs, 45% of girls' programs). This finding compares to 40% of female high-risk programs scoring in the Effective or Highly Effective range, and 18% of the high-risk facilities serving boys rating in one of these two categories. Moderate-risk and high-risk programs were generally more expensive than low-risk residential facilities.

Maximum-risk residential programs serve only a male population. The average recidivism rate among youth released from these programs was 40.7, with one of the three maximum-risk programs in the state ranking in the Effective range. Given the necessary security measures and longer lengths of stay for these programs, it is not surprising to find that all three maximum-risk facilities were rated as High Cost.

What Works Initiative Residential Pilot Project

The DJJ *What Works* Initiative Residential Pilot Project focuses on the principles of effective programming. The long-term goal of the project is to reduce recidivism among youth released from the pilot sites. This is accomplished by providing training and implementing evidence-based practices, i.e., interventions based upon the delinquency research literature on treatments that have a record of proven effectiveness and are directly associated with reducing the risk of re-offending.

The initiative commenced in the fall of 2004, following the State Advisory Group's (SAG) grant award of \$380,000 to the DJJ Residential and Correctional Facilities branch to fund the pilot project. Ten pilot sites were chosen from among 25 programs that applied to be part of the pilot and on the basis of restrictiveness level, geographic region, funding type (private provider versus state-operated), and population served.

In February of 2005, the Department sought and was awarded additional funding from the SAG to continue and expand the pilot project. In addition to adding six new programs, a logical expansion strategy incorporated the Department's Faith- and Community-Based Delinquency Treatment Initiative (FCBDTI). In 2006, there were 20 residential programs involved in this *What Works* Initiative Project.

What Work Initiative Residential Pilot Project Sites

Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility - 1st STEP	Liberty Wilderness Academy
Bay Point Schools North	Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center
Bowling Green Youth Academy	Moniticello New Life
Duval Juvenile Residential Facility	Polk STAR Program (soon to be added)
Eckerd Youth Development Center	Price Halfway House
Falkenburg Academy	Riverside Academy
GOALS Halfway House	Sago Palm Academy
Greenville Hills Academy	Wilson Youth Academy
GUYS Halfway House	YMCA Character House
Hastings Academy	Youth Environmental Services

Table 8-2

The third year of the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) What Works Residential Pilot Project (WWIRPP) kicked off in August 2006, with an emphasis on implementation, fidelity and capacity

building. Five new programs were added to the project in year three, increasing the number to 20 pilot sites representing moderate-and high-risk residential programs for boys and girls located throughout Florida (see site notations to left). Preliminary outcomes for year 1 and 2 demonstrate:

- 75% of pilot sites reported a reduction in youth-on-youth infractions,
- 50% of pilot sites reported a reduction in youth-on-staff infractions, while one-third reported no change,
- 50% reported a decline in management turnover and line staff turnover, and
- Among Year One sites, 67% had a decline in juvenile recidivism between fiscal year 2002-03 and 2004-05.

In addition to the above there are numerous highlights and accomplishments from the WWIRPP that includes:

- Capacity Building:
 - 22,202 hours of training to 1,355 juvenile justice staff in: Thinking for a Change (T4C), Motivational Interviewing, Cognitive Behavioral Interventions, Cognitive Reflective Communication, Implementation Drivers, PACT Assessment, What Works Overview, Action Plan Training, and Anti-social Logic,
 - Delivery of training designed specifically for direct care line staff, ASSISST-FL and Communicating for Change (C4C) - 96 staff trained,
 - Train-the-trainer instruction delivered in T4C and C4C, with Motivational Interviewing Master Training to be delivered in December 2006, and
 - Institutionalization of effective interventions for DJJ programs/providers was furthered by JRC's development of Tier II, Evidence-Based Quality Assurance Standards in August 2006.
- Implementation:
 - Implementation teams consisting of management staff, line staff and training coaches are in all 20 pilot sites,
 - Majority (62%) of teams meet monthly, 31% meet weekly, and 7% meet semi-monthly, and
 - All sites are required to maintain action plans setting forth implementation objectives and tasks, as well as timelines.