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Discussion Topics

- Overview of JJSIP
- Overview of the Comprehensive Strategy
- The Disposition Matrix
- Continuum of Services Mapping
- Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP): Application in Florida
Matching Services...
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

- Comprehensive Strategy

- Evaluation
  - Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)

- Structured Decision Making
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 anecdotal outliers…
Research Basis

- Key features of juvenile offender careers
- We understand how offender careers develop
- Early intervention is a top priority for maximum system effectiveness
- 5 Principles of Effective Intervention
- Structured Decision Making Tools
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%

Note: FY= fiscal year; SVC= Serious, Violent, and Chronic; Not S, V, or C are youth that do not meet any of the three categories; For ANOVA, F-statistic reported with p-value in parenthesis.
## 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>

### (SVC) Rate Comparison (FY 2013-14)

<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 2</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10.1%*</td>
<td>43%</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

*Note: Data from the FY 2009-10 sample*
A Larger Percentage of Very Young Offenders Have SVC Careers

**First Offense 13 or Over**

- Violent: 22%
- Serious: 45%
- SVC: 4%
- Chronic: 8%

245,726 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

**First Offense 12 or Under**

- Violent: 42%
- Serious: 66%
- SVC: 21%
- Chronic: 32%

51,928 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

Source: Analysis of 297,654 juveniles in Florida’s Juvenile Justice system who have turned 18
The Comprehensive Strategy
A goal within reach: Bend the age-crime curve

Age-Crime Curve of Self-Reported Delinquency Before and After Simulated Intervention on High-Risk Participants (Loeber, Farrington, Howell, Hoeve, 2012)

% Self-reported Serious Delinquents
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no intervention intervention on high-risk only
Developmental Pathways to Serious and Violent Behavior

AGE OF ONSET: LATE

OVERT PATHWAY

VIOLENCE (rape, attack, strong-arm, homicide)

MINOR AGGRESSION (bullying, annoying others)

PHYSICAL FIGHTING (physical fighting, gang fighting)

EARLY

AUTHORITY CONFLICT PATHWAY (before age 12)

Defiance/Disobedience

Stubborn Behavior

AUTHORITY AVOIDANCE (truancy, running away, staying out late)

PROPERTY DAMAGE (vandalism, fire-setting)

MODERATELY SERIOUS DELINQUENCY (fraud, pick-pocketing)

MINOR COVERT BEHAVIOR (shoplifting, frequent lying)

SERIOUS DELINQUENCY (auto theft, burglary)

PROPERTY DAMAGE (vandalism, fire-setting)

SERIOUS DELINQUENCY (auto theft, burglary)

%BOYS/GIRLS: FEW

MANY

© R. Loeber: Pittsburgh Youth Study
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
What is a Comprehensive Strategy?

- A *continuum* of services from universal prevention through residential and aftercare

- Ensures the appropriate *allocation of resources* to each level of services along the continuum

- Ensures the matching of youth to the level of services based on *assessed* risk and needs (C-PACT, R-PACT, Prevention Assessment Tool)

- Promotes prevention: Targets *at-risk youth*; prevents youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth

- Incorporates Interventions and Graduated Sanctions: Target *delinquent youth*; Improve the juvenile justice system’s response to delinquent offenders within a continuum of treatment and service options and a system of graduated sanctions
Comprehensive Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Behavior &gt; Noncriminal Misbehavior &gt; Delinquency &gt; Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Target Population: At-Risk Youth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for All Youth  &gt; Programs for Youth at Greatest Risk  &gt; Immediate Intervention  &gt; Intermediate Sanctions  &gt; Community Confinement  &gt; Training Schools  &gt; Aftercare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduated Sanctions**  
*Target Population: Delinquent Youth*

Preventing youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth

Improving the juvenile justice system response to delinquent offenders through a system of graduated sanctions and a continuum of treatment alternatives

A Graduated Sanctions Model

- Diversion
- Teen Court

Increasing Sanctions:
- Probation
- Intensive PS
- Day Treatment
- Redirection
- Residential Placement

Decreasing Sanctions:
- Probation
- Intensive PS
- Redirection
- Day Treatment
- Probation
- Diversion
The Comprehensive Strategy

- Research-Based
- Data Driven
- Service Matching
- Outcome-Focused Framework
Two-Tiered Approach

- Prevent youth from becoming delinquent:
  - Focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth

- Improve the response to offenders through a system of graduated sanctions

Both goals can be accomplished with a “seamless” continuum of prevention, early intervention, and treatment options linked with graduated 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>
Risk Principle

1. Treating high-risk youth gives the greatest reduction in re-offending behavior.


3. Matching levels of treatment services—intensity and duration—to the risk level of the offender.

4. Utilize intensive community-based treatment for lower-risk, high-needs youth.
### 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></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews &amp; Kiessling</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1980)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></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.

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.

# Matched Low-Risk Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism</td>
<td>Pre-matching</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-matching</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **28,681** Probation youth (low-risk)
- **1,726** Residential youth (low-risk)

**Matched on:**
- Age at 1st arrest
- Current drug/alcohol use
- Expulsion/drop out
- Violent felony
- Felony
- Antisocial peers/gang association
- County
- Race/ethnicity
- Gender

*Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Planning*
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)

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
Need Principle: Why Dynamic PriorityDomains?

- 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).
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 must always begin with the least restrictive setting within a particular disposition category. See SDM guidelines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Serious Presenting Offense</th>
<th>PACT Risk Level to Re-Offend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Risk to Re-offend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st TIME MISDEMEANOR¹</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 - First time misdemeanor offenders with no history of arrest or participation in alternatives to arrest. Under Section 985.12, Florida Statutes, all first time misdemeanants are eligible for civil citation. Youth deemed ineligible for civil citation (based on community standards) should be reviewed under the “Misdemeanor” category based on their PACT Risk Level to Reoffend.

² - All misdemeanor offenses.

³ - Felony offenses that do not include violence.

⁴ - Violent felony offenses (does not include misdemeanor assault/battery, which is 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, LifeSkills, etc.)  
(3c) - FFT, MST, Day Treatment, Minimum-Risk Residential, etc.

**Level 4** - Non Secure Residential Commitment (Low & Moderate-Risk Programs)  
**Level 5** - Secure Residential Commitment (High & Maximum-Risk Programs)
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.

• Racial and Ethnic Disparities: (RED)
Addressing Racial & Ethnic Disparities (RED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-17 Population</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Detention</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Adult</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addressing Racial & Ethnic Disparities (RED)
• Longitudinal Variations in Juvenile Arrests in Florida
Delinquency Arrests - Statewide

Delinquency Arrests – Circuit 2

Delinquency Arrests – Leon

Delinquency Arrests – Gadsden

Delinquency Arrests – Franklin

Franklin County – Delinquency Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delinquency Arrests – Wakulla

Delinquency Arrests – Liberty

Delinquency Arrests – Jefferson

Remember...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 anecdotal outliers...
Intermission

Break Time!!
Continuum of Service Mapping

Tim Niermann
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
# Data Collection

## Continuum of Services - At a Glance

### County: Leon  
Last Updated: 7/21/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Services &amp; Structures Categories</th>
<th>Available Program/Services</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Graduated Delinquency Sanctions</th>
<th>Capacity /Slots</th>
<th>Waiting List? Y/N</th>
<th>Average Wait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth at Greatest Risk</td>
<td>Alternatives to Arrest</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>Probation Supervision</td>
<td>Non-Secure Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camelot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Bend Hospice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethel Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healing Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magellan Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Marie Guilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISC Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Camelot: N/A, N/A, N/A
- Big Bend Hospice: N/A, N/A, N/A
- Bethel Family: N/A, N/A, N/A
- Healing Transitions: Varies, N/A, N/A
- Magellan Behavioral Health: N/A, N/A, N/A
- DS Connections: N/A, N/A, N/A
- Dr. Marie Guilford: N/A, N/A, N/A
- DISC Village: Varies by program, Yes, Varies
County Service Mapping Report

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/delinquency-data/services-continuum-report/
Monitoring Quality & Availability

- 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

#### Program Name: The Second JJSIP Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type:</th>
<th>Program Monitor Completing Template:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Program Monor Completed:</th>
<th>Technical Assistance Staff Template Submitted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Components: Service Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Name, Curriculum, or Intervention</th>
<th>What typically occurs during the service</th>
<th>Topics or Subjects</th>
<th>Individualized Needs Analysis Provided</th>
<th>When is the service provided (type of the service)</th>
<th>Duration of Service (Length per Quarter Session, Intensive)</th>
<th>Number of Youth Achieving (Intensive)</th>
<th>Number of Youth Receiving (Non-intensive)</th>
<th>Facilitator Trained in the Specialty Practice (Intensive)</th>
<th>Risk to Self-Physical (Intensive)</th>
<th>Age (Intensive)</th>
<th>Gender Served</th>
<th>Program Capacity (Intensive)</th>
<th>Geographical Reach (Intensive)</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Service Type (Intensive)</th>
<th>Group Qualification (Intensive)</th>
<th>Group Sub-Category</th>
<th>Group Sub-Category Name</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>All youth who have relapsed in the process of leaving SRA.</td>
<td>Parenting Skills</td>
<td>Monday, Wednesday, and Friday afternoons 0-6:00pm</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>5678</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1234567890</td>
<td>1234567890</td>
<td>1234567890</td>
<td>1234567890</td>
<td>1234567890</td>
<td>1234567890</td>
<td>1234567890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) 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>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 services (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 services (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Service Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying services used: Yes (5 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quality of Service Delivery

- Determined by systematic assessment of the relevant features of the provider and provider organization.

- Points: 20

#### Amount of Service

- Duration [Target number of weeks specified for each service type]
  - % of youth who received at least the target weeks of service:
    - 0% (0 points)
    - 20% (2 points)
    - 40% (4 points)
    - 60% (6 points)
    - 80% (8 points)
  - Content Hours [Target number of hours specified for each service type]
    - % of youth who received at least the target hours of service:
      - 0% (0 points)
      - 20% (2 points)
      - 40% (4 points)
  - Points: 10

#### Risk Level of Youth Served

- Determined by risk ratings on a valid instrument for the qualifying group of service recipients.

- Points: 25

#### Provider’s Total SPEP Score

- Points: 100
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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
SPEP 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
Why Therapeutic Program Types?

- Discipline
- Deterrence
- Surveillance
- Restorative
- Skill building
- Counseling
- Multiple services

Therapeutic approaches

Control approaches

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline
Further Sorting by Intervention Type within, e.g., Counseling Approaches

- Individual
- Mentoring
- Family
- Family crisis
- Group
- Peer
- Mixed
- Mixed w/referrals

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline

Graph shows the percentage reduction in recidivism for different intervention types, with Mentoring and Group interventions showing the highest reduction.
Further Sorting by Intervention Type within, e.g., Skill-building Approaches

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline

- Behavioral
- Cognitive-behavioral
- Social skills
- Challenge
- Academic
- Job related
SPEP Quality

- Facilitator Training
- Treatment Manual/Protocol
- Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol
- Facilitator Turnover
- Internal Fidelity Monitoring
- Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring
- Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention
Meta-Analysis: Dosage

- **Group 5 Service (Score=30)**
  - Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy
    - Target Weeks=15; Target Hours=45
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)

- **Group 4 Service (Score=25)**
  - Group Counseling
    - Target Weeks=24; Target Hours=40
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - Mentoring
    - Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=78
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Behavioral Contracting/Management
  - Behavioral Contracting; Contingency Management
    - Target Weeks=24; Target Hours=72
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Mentoring, Mixed Counseling (individual, group, family, and/or vocational), Remedial Academic Program
Dosage (cont.)

- **Group 3 Service (Score=15)**
  - **Family Counseling**
    - **Target Weeks=20; Target Hours=30**
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - **Family Crisis Counseling**
    - **Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=8**
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - **Mixed Counseling**
    - **Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=25**
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Behavioral Contracting/Management
  - **Social Skills Training**
    - **Target Weeks=16; Target Hours=24**
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - **Challenge Programs**
    - **Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=60**
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Group Counseling
  - **Mediation**
    - **Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=8**
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Restitution/Community Service
Dosage (cont. 2)

- **Group 2 Service (Score=10)**
  - Restitution; Community Service
    - Target Weeks=12; Target Hours=60
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - Remedial Academic Program
    - Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=100
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Job-Related Services (work experience, job preparation, and/or job training)

- **Group 1 Service (Score=5)**
  - Individual Counseling
    - Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=30
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - Job-Related Training
    - Vocational Counseling
      - Target Weeks=20; Target Hours=40
      - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
    - Job Training
      - Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=400
      - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
    - Work Experience
      - Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=520
      - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
Changes to Residential

Laura Moneyham
Assistant Secretary for Residential Services
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
January-October 2014 there were 85 low risk to re-offend youth committed statewide. This represents a 78% decrease from the same time period during 2011.
There were 154 moderate risk to re-offend youth committed statewide from January-October 2014. This represents a 68% reduction from 2011.
• In 2008-09 Low + Moderate risk to re-offend youth constituted 27% of all commitments. During 2013-14, Low & Moderate made up 16%.

• Mod-High & High risk to re-offend youth went from 73% of all commitments in 2008-09 to 84% in 2013-14.
Non-Secure:
Low & Moderate risk youth
• 2008-09 = 27%
• 2013-14 = 16%

Mod-High & High
• 2008-09 = 73%
• 2013-14 = 84%

Secure:
Low & Moderate risk youth
• 2008-09 = 15%
• 2013-14 = 16%

Mod-High & High
• 2008-09 = 85%
• 2013-14 = 84%
Snapshot of youth in residential program types on June 30, 2014 by PACT risk to re-offend.
Low & moderate risk breakdown: Behavioral=17%; DD=6%; SA=15%; Other spec.=8%; (Sex Offender=45%)
Next Steps

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

Please visit the Department’s Website for a copy of the presentation and more information:
www.djj.state.fl.us