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Discussion Topics

• Delinquency Trends (National, Florida & Local)

• Overview of JJSIP

• The Disposition Matrix

• Continuum of Services Mapping

• Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
Delinquency Arrests:
National, Florida and Circuit 19 Trends
National Arrest Trends

Delinquency Arrests (Statewide)

FY 2010-11: 110,515
FY 2011-12: 97,152
FY 2012-13: 85,453
FY 2013-14: 78,330
FY 2014-15: 75,066

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
# Delinquency Arrests (Circuit 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>3,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>3,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>2,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>2,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>2,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>2,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity. Data for FY 2015-16 is PRELIMINARY and subject to change.
Delinquency Arrests (Indian River)

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity. Data for FY 2015-16 is PRELIMINARY and subject to change.
Delinquency Arrests (Martin)

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity. Data for FY 2015-16 is PRELIMINARY and subject to change.
Delinquency Arrests (Okeechobee)

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity. Data for FY 2015-16 is PRELIMINARY and subject to change.
Delinquency Arrests (St. Lucie)

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity. Data for FY 2015-16 is PRELIMINARY and subject to change.
Transfer to Adult Court and Residential Commitment Trends
(Statewide) Transfers to Adult Court

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
(Circuit 19) Transfers to Adult Court

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2014-15 Transfer to Adult Rates

Source: Delinquency Profile, Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Statewide Residential Commitments

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Circuit 19 Residential Commitments

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2014-15 Commitment Rates

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Racial and Ethnic Disparities: (RED)
Arrests by Race (National)

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity (Florida)

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth at Various Stages of Florida’s Juvenile Justice System

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth: FY2014-15 Statewide & Circuit 19 Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Circuit 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 10-17</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Detention</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Adult</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP): Application in Florida
Matching Services...
Making Informed Decisions

- Quality Research
- “Consensus” in the Research
- Process, Output & Outcome Evaluation
- Valid Assessment Tools
Understanding Tiers of Evidence

- The lowest form is anecdotal evidence; stories, opinions, testimonials, case studies, etc.

- The highest form is empirical evidence; research, data, results from controlled studies, etc.

- We do not want to norm an entire system on anecdotes or unusual outliers…

Dr. Ed Latessa, University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice. "Criminogenic Risk and Mental Health: What Works and What Doesn’t in Reducing Recidivism".
Overview of JJSIP

- Grant sponsored by Georgetown University: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform

- 4 sites chosen out of over 150 applications:
  - Florida
    - Initial pilot site: Pinellas County
  - Arizona
  - Pennsylvania
  - Connecticut
JJSIP Components

- A Comprehensive Strategy
- Structured Decision Making
- Evaluation
  - Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
The Comprehensive Strategy
Why a Comprehensive Strategy?

- Unbalanced emphasis on “deep end” graduated sanctions v. prevention and early intervention
- Overreliance on detention and residential placement
- Poor targeting of SVC youth
- Poor matching of youth to appropriate services and levels of supervision
- Use of ineffective programs
- Poor program planning
A Graduated Sanctions Model
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5 Principles of Effective Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk:</td>
<td>Target high-risk offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need:</td>
<td>Treat risk factors associated with offending behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment:</td>
<td>Employ evidence-based and research-proven treatment approaches and interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsivity:</td>
<td>Tailor treatments to meet special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity:</td>
<td>Monitor implementation quality and treatment fidelity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Risk Factors Predict Delinquency (The Big Eight)

1. Antisocial Attitudes
2. Antisocial Peers
3. Antisocial Personality Patterns (impulsivity, low self-control, risk taking)
4. History of Antisocial Behavior
5. Problems at School/Work
6. Problematic Family Circumstances
7. Problematic Leisure Activities/use of free time
8. Substance Abuse
Lipsey’s 2009 Meta-analysis

“Interventions applied to high-risk delinquents...produced larger recidivism reductions than when those interventions were applied to low-risk delinquents” (p.23)

“There was no indication that there were juveniles whose risk level was so high that they did not respond to effective interventions” (p.23)

Importance of Matching Youth to the Appropriate Level of Supervision
Need Principle: Why Dynamic Priority Domains?

- Research shows a 38% reduction in recidivism when case plans contained interventions matched to assessed criminogenic needs for high risk youth. (Luong, D., & Wormith, J.S. (2011).

- The absence of interventions to address a domain that was ranked medium risk or higher was associated with an 82% increase in likelihood of recidivism. (Luong, D., & Wormith, J.S. (2011).
# Targeting High-Risk Offenders

## Risk Level and Treatment Recidivism Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Rate for all Low Risk to Re-offend Youth by Placement Type

Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
Recidivism rate for IDDS significantly lower than all other placement types for the low risk sample. Diversion and IDDS significantly lower than Probation Supervision. Probation Supervision, CBIS, Probation Enhancement rates statistically equivalent. Probation, CBIS, and Probation Enhancement rates significantly lower than Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP. Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP recidivism rates are statistically equivalent.

Source: Michael T. Baglivio (2013). The Risk Principle. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
"High Needs" defined as youth greater than 1 standard deviation above the mean on the Social History Score subcomponent of the PACT. Statistically significant differences found in the recidivism rates for low risk "high needs" youth versus youth not identified as such for the following Placement Types: Diversion, IDDS, Probation Supervision, with low risk "high needs" youth having significantly higher recidivism rates. Differences in recidivism rates for Probation Enhancement, Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and Post Commitment Probation were not significant.
Bench / Direct Commitments:
Implications for Public Safety Outcomes
Direct Commitments
FY 2006 to FY 2015

Direct Commitments 2006 - 2015

Statewide Youth (2015)

Hover over map for Direct Commitment data by County. Click for Print view. Click map again to return.

PACT Risk Level 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACT Risk Level</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>% Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select a Year to Filter Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>% Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9,018</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,985</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5,973</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,862</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Statewide) Direct Commitments
CY 2006 to CY 2015

Source: Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
(Circuit 19) Direct Commitments CY 2006 to CY 2015

8% Direct Commitments in CY 2006

43% Direct Commitments in CY 2015

Source: Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Statistical Matching Techniques: Propensity Score Matching Example

Commitment
Probation

STUDY COHORT

See Also: Guo, S. and M. W. Fraser (2015). Propensity score analysis: statistical methods and applications. Los Angeles, SAGE.
Recidivism and Direct Commitment

- Direct commitments were 2.25 times more likely to involve youth who were:
  - Low-Risk to Reoffend
  - Male
  - Black

- Recidivism rates for direct committed youth were 8% higher than the recidivism rates of statistically identical youth placed on probation.

Source: Briefing Report: Direct Commitments. 2014. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Statewide Assessment of Recidivism and Direct Commitments

Recidivism Rates Pre- and Post-Matching

- Full Sample Probation Supervision: 17.4%
- All Direct Commitments: 40.8%
- Matched Probation Supervision: 32.0%
- Matched Direct Commitments: 40.7%

Source: Briefing Report: Direct Commitments. 2014. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Prevalence of Serious, Violent & Chronic Juvenile Offenders
Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

What is the definition of a serious, violent and chronic offender?

- **Serious** = (1) or more felony offenses
- **Violent** = (1) or more “violent” felony offenses
- **Chronic** = (4) or more separate arrest events
Serious, Violent, Chronic Youth

**SERIOUS** = 55%

**VIOLENT** = 29%

**CHRONIC** = 15%

**SVC** = 8.9%

**NOT SVC** = 43%

## Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Chronic</th>
<th>SVC (N)</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007-08</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.2% (N=7,747)</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.0% (N=7,253)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.9% (N=6,464)</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.7% (N=5,701)</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.7% (N=5,203)</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.6% (N=4,651)</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>9.2% (N=4,441)</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Mark A. Greenwald, and Michael T. Baglivio (2015). *Analysis of Serious, Violent and Chronic Delinquency in Florida*. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Planning.
### SVC Youth (Statewide & Circuit 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Chronic</th>
<th>SVC</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circuit 19</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Average</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SVC Youth: Why does it Matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Youth</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
<th>Not SVC</th>
<th>SVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism Rates</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Association</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Over 50% of SVC youth were 12 or under at age of first referral

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Key Implications

- Most youth enter the system with minor offenses and low recidivism risk. Few are on pathways to serious, violent, or chronic offending.
- Risk assessment instruments (PACT) measure risk accurately enough to guide the allocation of resources.
- Needs assessment (PACT Full) identify criminogenic needs well enough to guide selection of appropriate services.
- To be effective, evidence-based services should address priority criminogenic needs.
- Matching of youth to appropriate levels of service targeted to prioritized needs is critical.
Structured Decision Making:

Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice
Disposition Recommendation Matrix

- Is a structured decision making tool that assists with matching youth to the appropriate level of service/supervision
- Is based on a matrix of risk to reoffend (PACT) and the presenting offense
- Consists of graduated sanctions – The intensity of services increases as the risk level and offense severity increases
Key Points of the Disposition Matrix

- Low-risk offenders remain in the community with minimal supervision.

- Moderate-risk offenders typically placed in more structured community programs, with intensive probation supervision for higher risk youth.

- Residential placement reserved for the highest risk offenders after community-based alternatives have been exhausted.
# Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Disposition Recommendation Matrix

(Staff should begin with the least restrictive setting within a particular disposition category. See Structured Decision-Making guidelines.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Serious Presenting Offense</th>
<th>PACT Risk Level to Reoffend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Risk to Reoffend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Citation Eligible¹</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor²</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious³</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent⁴</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ – Eligibility for civil citation is outlined in F.S. 985.12. Youth deemed ineligible for civil citation (based on community standards) should be reviewed under the “Minor” offense category based on the PACT risk level to reoffend.

² – All misdemeanor offenses.

³ – Felony offenses that do not include violence.

⁴ – Violent felony offenses (do not include misdemeanor assault and battery which are captured under “Minor”).

---

**Level 1 – Alternatives to Arrest**

**Level 2 – Diversion & Non-DJJ Probation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3 – Community Supervision</th>
<th>Level 4 – Non-Secure Residential Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3a) Probation Supervision</td>
<td>Level 5 – Secure Residential Commitment (High &amp; Maximum Risk Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3b) Probation Enhancement Services (ART, EPICS, LifeSkills, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3c) Day Treatment, MST, FFT, Minimum Risk Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Updated January 2016**
On-Going Disposition Outcomes Analysis

Source: Monthly Dispositional Matrix Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
On-Going Disposition Analyses – by Type

Placement Levels - St Lucie County
July 2015 - Jun 2016

Click on Counties to Filter Results
Click Again to Clear

Select Heat Map Parameter
Optimum Placement

Number of Youth Disposed by Race/Ethnicity & Optimum Placement Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optimum Placements: 426
Appropriate Placement: 111
Above Guidelines: 50
Below Guidelines: 5
Total Dispositions: 592

*Excluding Transfers to Adult Court

Source: Monthly Dispositional Matrix Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Disposition Matrix Validation

- 38,117 youth released in FY10-11.
- Below ($n=691$)
  - Optimum ($n=27,916$)
  - Appropriate ($n=7,322$)
  - Above ($n=2,188$)
- Holds true for males, females, across race/ethnicity, and for all risk levels of youth.

Again... Tiers of Evidence

- The lowest form is anecdotal evidence; stories, opinions, testimonials, case studies, etc.

- The highest form is empirical evidence; research, data, results from controlled studies, etc.

- We do not want to norm an entire system on anecdotes or unusual outliers…
Continuum of Service Mapping

Paul Hatcher
Assistant Secretary for Probation & Community Intervention
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Continuum Mapping

- Identify the available services within each county
- Map the identified available services according to service category within each county
- Identify the target population for each categorized service according to levels of the Disposition Recommendation Matrix

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 4, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Interactive Reports

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/reports/research-reports/service-continuum-analysis/service-continuum-analysis-2015

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 4, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
County & Program Level Reports

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 4, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Circuit 19 Community Service Mapping: Example Results (2015)...

Indian River County

(Circuit 19)

Resources in sufficient supply
- Cognitive-behavioral interventions
- Individual counseling services
- Specialized clinical treatment

Top Needs Identified
- Mental health court
- Programs to assist with paying court fees/restitution
- Residential substance abuse facility

Additional Needs
- Sex offender housing and jobs
- Transportation

Populations with specific needs
- Sex offenders
- Youth in need of mental health services

Transportation-related comments
- Youth in need of residential substance abuse treatment must travel to other counties for services. Sex offenders cannot ride public transportation which inhibits their access to services.

St. Lucie County

(Circuit 19)

Resources in sufficient supply
- Transportation
- Individual and specialized clinical treatment

Top Needs Identified
- Consequence unit/violation of probation program
- Residential substance abuse programs
- Outpatient substance abuse programs
- Life coaching

Additional Needs
- Skills training/job placement
- Job opportunities
- Housing and counseling for 18 and older
- Programs tailored for youth 12 and under

Populations with specific needs
- Gang-involved youth
- Youth in need of substance abuse services

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 4, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
On-Going Monitoring Quality & Availability

- Solutions for transportation issues
- Community services come and go...
- Waiting Lists
- Routine updates will be necessary
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)

Laura Moneyham
Assistant Secretary for Residential Services
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
EBP Mantra

- The right service
- For the right kid
- At the right time
- In the correct dosage
### Service Documentation Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Name:</th>
<th>Program Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Type:</td>
<td>Program Monitor Completing Template:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Program Monitor Submitted:</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Staff Template Submitted To:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Components of Service Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Name/Duration</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Expected - What youth received the service for their needs</th>
<th>What specifically occurred during the service</th>
<th>Program/Subject</th>
<th>Program/Subject</th>
<th>Duration of Service/Training/Implementation (Timing)</th>
<th>Duration (Months per Part of Service Provided)</th>
<th>Total No. of Youth Receiving the Service (Number of Youth per Group)</th>
<th>Number of Youth Receiving the Service (Number of Youth per Group)</th>
<th>Who Provides Service</th>
<th>Facilitator Service/Trainee Qualifications</th>
<th>Facilitator: Used the Services Provided (Yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 11</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service 13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service Evaluation Protocol (SEP) for Services to Juvenile Offenders

**Recalibrated version, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary and Supplemental Service Types</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Service Type for Program Being Rated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 services (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 services (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 services (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 services (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Service Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating supplemental service used. Yes = 15 points. No = 0 points.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quality of Service Delivery

(Determined from a systematic assessment of the relevant features of the provider and provider organization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated Quality of Services Delivered</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (5 points)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (20 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amount of Service

(Determined from data for the qualifying group of service recipients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% (0 points)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% (2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% (4 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% (6 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% (8 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Risk Level of Youth Served

(Determined from risk ratings on a valid instrument for the qualifying group of service recipients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of youth with at least the target risk score for the JJ system:</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% (0 points)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% (20 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (25 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Provider’s Total SEP Score

100 (Insert Score)

---

*Source: Dr. Mark Lipsey, Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University*
Evidence-Based Practices

- Approaches to determine if a program is “evidence-based”
  - Evaluate existing program
  - Model/Brand name program
  - Meta-analysis/synthesis of research on effective programs
What is the SPEP?

- Evaluation tool
- Identifies shortcomings in programs or services
- Determines the strength of programs and services in relation to existing research
- Determines where programs or services fall in terms of effectiveness

Source: Dr. Mark Lipsey, Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University
SPEP Evaluation Categories

- **Service Type**: “Therapeutic” programs, with some types more effective than others
- **Service Quality**: Treatment protocol; monitoring and staff training
- **Service Quantity/Dosage**: Duration, intensity, and total number of contact hours
- **Juvenile Characteristics**: Risk to re-offend level of youth served
Changes to Residential

Laura Moneyham
Assistant Secretary for Residential Services
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Operational Capacity for Residential Services at Onset of Fiscal Year

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
PACT Risk to Reoffend for Youth Disposed to Commitment by Percentage of Youth Committed (FY 2010-11 through 2014-15)

84% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.

72% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.

**Source:** Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity.
January-December 2015 there were 146 low risk to re-offend youth committed statewide. This represents a 70% decrease from the same time period during 2011.

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
There were 215 moderate risk to re-offend youth committed statewide from January – December 2015. This represents a 62% reduction from 2011.

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
Next Steps

- Monitoring implementation of Disposition Matrix
- On-going mapping Continuum of Services
- Case Studies Follow-Up
• Closing Thoughts
Discussion & Feedback

Please visit the Department’s Website for more information:
www.djj.state.fl.us