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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 14 Trends
Delinquency Arrests (Statewide)

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests (Circuit 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>1,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Bay

FY 2010-11: 1,341
FY 2011-12: 1,344
FY 2012-13: 1,278
FY 2013-14: 989
FY 2014-15: 1,100

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Calhoun

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Gulf

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Holmes

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Jackson

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Washington

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

Statewide

- 10-17 Population: 21%
- Arrests: 50%
- Diversion: 38%
- Probation: 51%
- Secure Detention: 60%
- Commitment: 62%
- Transfers to Adult: 63%

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth: Statewide & Circuit 14 Comparison

- 10-17 Population: 21% Statewide, 16% Circuit 14
- Arrests: 50% Statewide, 39% Circuit 14
- Diversion: 38% Statewide, 32% Circuit 14
- Probation: 51% Statewide, 32% Circuit 14
- Secure Detention: 60% Statewide, 44% Circuit 14
- Commitment: 62% Statewide, 43% Circuit 14
- Transfers to Adult: 63% Statewide, 66% Circuit 14
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
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

Age

- no intervention
- intervention on high-risk only
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
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>
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)

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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.51</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, Direction, 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
# Matched Low-Risk Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism</strong></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: Ad-Hoc Analysis. 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.
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></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><strong>FY 2007-08</strong></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><strong>FY 2008-09</strong></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><strong>FY 2009-10</strong></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><strong>FY 2010-11</strong></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><strong>FY 2011-12</strong></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><strong>FY 2012-13</strong></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><strong>FY 2013-14</strong></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>55.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>43.2%</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 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 14</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5.5%</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*
A Larger Percentage of Very Young Offenders Have SVC Careers

**First Offense 13 or Over**
- Serious: 45%
- Violent: 22%
- SVC: 4%
- Chronic: 8%
- 245,726 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

**First Offense 12 or Under**
- Serious: 66%
- Violent: 42%
- 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
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. 965.12. 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”).

**PACT Risk Levels**
- **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) – Day Treatment, MST, FFT, Minimum Risk Commitment
- **Level 4** – Non-Secure Residential Commitment
- **Level 5** – Secure Residential Commitment (High & Maximum Risk Programs)

*Updated August 2015*
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 Outcomes Analysis

#### Placements by Month January 2015 - December 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Above Guidelines</th>
<th>Appropriate Placement</th>
<th>Optimum Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-16.3%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source

*Monthly Dispositional Matrix Dashboard Report.* Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
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…
Intermission
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
Interactive Reports

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/reports/research-reports/service-continuum-analysis/service-continuum-analysis-2015
County & Program Level Reports

Community Programs Bay County

Step 1 - Select county

Step 2 - Select a program type

Select Service type name below

- Life Skills: 26 Programs
- Education: 25 Programs
- Mental Health: 23 Programs
- Health: 23 Programs
- Attitudes and Behaviors: 17 Programs
- Mentoring: 17 Programs
- Substance Abuse Treatment: 16 Programs
- Job Skills: 16 Programs
- Crisis: 16 Programs
- Trauma: 14 Programs
- Special: 10 Programs

Click on the same county or in the white space to clear the county selection.

Youth Served*

- Life Skills
- Education
- Mental Health
- Health
- Attitudes and Behaviors
- Mentoring
- Substance Abuse Treatment
- Job Skills
- Crisis
- Trauma
- Special

Age of Youth

- 6 to 8
- 9 to 11
- 12 to 14
- 15 to 17
- 18 to 21

Community Programs Bay County

Step 3 - Select a program to view details & contact information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Treatment</td>
<td>Access Recovery Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Bend Community Based Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging the Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical Addictions and Recovery Effort (CARE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Action Team (CAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Outpatient Program Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Service Planning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacey Allen Waldens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectrum Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting Over Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Life Coaching Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titles 2 Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment Centers of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access Recovery Solutions

Bay County

Attitudes and Behaviors

Confidential, effective, evidence-based solutions for addiction and related behavioral health issues. Group counseling for loved ones impacted by another's drug or alcohol abuse. Certified by DCF to provide adolescent substance abuse treatment.

Contact Christine Hurst

Phone: (850)522-1516

Email: info@accessrecoverysolutions.com

Website: www.accessrecoverysolutions.com

Age Restriction Min - 11 Max - 17
Admission Requirements: Insurance and self pay
Admission Restrictions: None
Circuit 14 Community Service Mapping: Example Results (2015)...

Bay County

(Circuit 14)

Resources in sufficient supply
- Diversion programs
- Family counseling for youth on supervision
- Mental health counseling

Top Needs Identified
- Truancy prevention and intervention (resource center)
- Independent living/transitional housing for youth not meeting criteria for existing programs
- Family therapy (FFT) for youth on diversion
- Skills training/job placement

Additional Needs
- Programs to assist youth in paying court costs/restitution (such as Project Payback)
- Additional community service worksites for youth under age 18
- Civil Citation for youth not eligible for existing pre-arrest diversion programs

Populations with specific needs
- Youth who are suspended or expelled from school
- Youth on supervision who have been adjudicated with felonies
- Youth with lack of parental involvement and/or transportation issues being able to utilize existing pre-arrest diversion option

Gulf County

(Circuit 14)

Resources in sufficient supply
- Family counseling
- Education resources
- Faith-based after-school activities

Top Needs Identified
- Substance abuse counseling
- Mental health services
- Transportation

Additional Needs
- Civil Citation options for youth

Populations with specific needs
- Youth in need of substance abuse services
- Youth in need of mental health services
- Youth with limited or no access to transportation

Transportation-related comments
- There is no public transportation in Gulf County

“We have youth who have extensive length of stays on supervision due to not being able to pay restitution and/or court cost.”

“No substance abuse counseling is available in this county. No mental health services are available in this area. Youth must travel to Bay County for services”
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
The Second JJSIP Component

SERVICE DOCUMENTATION TEMPLATE

Program Name: ____________________________
Program Type: ____________________________
Program Monitor Completing template: _________________
Date Program Monitor Completed: _________________
Technical Assistance Staff template submitted by: _________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Monitor Data Collection</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>Accomplishment of the Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Name, Curriculum, or Intervention</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What specifically occurred during the service</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Youth Served</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Youth served weekly</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Youth served monthly</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Youth served yearly</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Times the Service was Offered</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Service (in weeks)</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Service (in hours)</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time of Service (in hours)</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Participants</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Staff</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Volunteers</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Parents</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Community Members</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Agencies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Businesses</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Organizations</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Individuals</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Groups</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Communities</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other States</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Countries</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Universes</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Galaxies</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Stars</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Other Planets</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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
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?

Control approaches

Therapeutic approaches

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

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

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

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

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline
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. 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
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)\(^1\)

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

\[^1\text{Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity.}\]
January-October 2015 there were 104 low risk to re-offend youth committed statewide. This represents a 72% decrease from the same time period during 2011.

Monthly Comparison of Low Risk to Reoffend Youth
2011 vs. 2012 vs. 2013 vs. 2014 vs. 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 165 moderate risk to re-offend youth committed statewide from January – September 2015. This represents a 63% reduction from 2011.
• Closing Thoughts
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 more information:
www.djj.state.fl.us
• Case Studies