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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 9 Trends
National Arrest Trends

Delinquency Arrests (Statewide)

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests (Circuit 9)

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests (Orange County)

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests (Osceola County)

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

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity.
Transfers to Adult Court (Circuit 9)

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2015-16 Transfer to Adult Rates

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Residential Commitments (Statewide)

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Residential Commitments (Circuit 9)

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2015-16 Commitment Rates

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Bench Commitments (Statewide)

Statewide Commitments

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Bench Commitments (Circuit 9)

Circuit 9 Commitments

Preliminary Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select Circuit</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>305</th>
<th>229</th>
<th>298</th>
<th>277</th>
<th>367</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Bench</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2015-16 Youth Under 12 Arrested

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2015-16 Youth Under 12 Arrested: Rate

FY 2015-16 Youth 12 and Under Arrested Rate by Circuit

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) 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 (Statewide)

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2015-16) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2014-15 Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth at Various Stages of Florida’s Juvenile Justice System (Statewide)

Source: Disproportionate Minority Contact / Racial Ethnic Disparity Benchmark Report FY 2014-15. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2014-15 Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth at Various Stages of Florida’s Juvenile Justice System (Statewide and Circuit 9)

Source: Disproportionate Minority Contact / Racial Ethnic Disparity Benchmark Report FY 2014-15. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
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…
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

Residential Placement

Redirection

Day Treatment

Intensive PS

Probation

Teen Court

Diversion

Increasing Sanctions

C/R Day Treatment

Redirection

Intensive PS

Probation

Decreasing Sanctions
## 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>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</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
Recidivism Rate for Low Risk Youth by "Needs" Level by Placement Type

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.

Source: Michael T. Baglivio (2013). The Risk Principle. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
**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 S, V, or C = 43%

## Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year (FY)</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>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>

## SVC Youth (Statewide & Circuit 9)

<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 9</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>46%</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
  - Level 3 – Community Supervision
    - (3a) – Probation Supervision
    - (3b) – Probation Enhancement Services (ART, EPICS, LifeSkills, etc.)
    - (3c) – Day Treatment, MST, FFT, Minimum Risk Commitment
- Level 4 – Non-Secure Residential Commitment
- Level 5 – Secure Residential Commitment (High & Maximum Risk Programs)

*Updated January 2016*

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

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
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

Community Programs Statewide

Step 1 - Select county

Step 2 - Select a program type
Select Service type name below (click on text not the bar)

- Mental Health
- Education
- Life Skills
- Substance Abuse Treatment
- Attitudes and Behaviors
- Crisis
- Monitoring
- Health
- Trauma
- Job Skills
- Substance Abuse (Victim)
- Sex Abuse (Abuser)

*Some community programs serve all youth. Others have restrictions on serving youth under DJJ supervision or with prior adjudications. Use this file to identify programs which serve youth in various stages of the Juvenile Justice Continuum.

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 9 Community Service Mapping: Example Results (2015)

Orange County

Resources in sufficient supply
- Targeted Case Management
- Substance abuse services

Top Needs Identified
- Skills training/job placement
- Shelter for homeless youth and families
- Residential mental health programs

Additional Needs
- Counseling services for homeless youth
- Job opportunities

Populations with specific needs
- Homeless youth and families
- Youth returning from residential commitment

Osceola County

Resources in sufficient supply
- Targeted Case Management
- Academic institutions

Top Needs Identified
- Day Treatment programs
- Skills training/job placement
- Mentoring programs (one-on-one)

Additional Needs
- Transportation

Populations with specific needs
- Youth in rural areas
- Hispanic population

Transportation-related comments
- Osceola County is a very rural county. It’s one of the largest and fastest growing in Florida. The current contract language with its day treatment provider restricts travel time to and from the program to 90 minutes or less. Because of this, the day treatment program cannot serve the youth that reside in Poinciana or St. Cloud.
Ongoing 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>Provider completing template:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Program Monitor Completed:</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Staff Template submitted to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Component Service Documentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Name</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Specific activities and resources (see below)</th>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th># participants</th>
<th># youth served</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Amount of Service</th>
<th>Quality of Service Delivery</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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
84% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.
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