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Discussion Topics

• Risk Assessment

• Importance of Service Matching

• The Disposition Matrix

• Continuum of Services Mapping

• Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
Risk Assessment – Then and Now

- Intuitive
  - 1st Generation
- Actuarial & Static
  - 2nd Generation
  - 3rd Generation
  - 4th Generation
- Dynamic
  - 3rd Generation
  - 4th Generation
- Case Management
  - 4th Generation
- Protective & Responsivity
  - 4th Generation

5th Generation: In Development
Using Predictive Analytics to Improve Risk Assessment
Risk Assessment at the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

- Prevention Assessment Tool (PAT)
- Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT)
- Residential Positive Achievement Change Tool (R-PACT)
Sample PACT Overview Report

### PACT - Overview Report

- **Name:** Chopper Test
- **DOB:** 5/1/1990
- **DJJID:** 804266
- **Created By:** FL State Acct Administrator
- **Created Date:** Aug 9 2006 1:23PM
- **Last Modified By:** FL State Acct Administrator
- **Last Modified Date:** Aug 10 2006 1:49PM

**Overall Level of Risk to Re-Offend:** Low
- Record of Referrals Risk Score: 3
- Social History Risk Score: 4

### Risk Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Static and Dynamic Combined</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A: History of Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A: Employment History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A: Family History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Attitudes/Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A: School History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B: Current Living Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A: Alcohol and Drug History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Record of Referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B: Current School Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A: Historic Use of Free Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B: Current Use of Free Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B: Current Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B: Current Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B: Current Alcohol and Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A: Mental Health History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B: Current Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PACT Validation Studies


Importance of Service Matching
Matching Services...
A Graduated Sanctions Model

Residential Placement

Redirection

Day Treatment

Intensive PS

Probation

Teen Court

Diversion

Increasing Sanctions

Decreasing Sanctions

C/R Day Treatment

Redirection

Intensive PS

Probation
EBP Mantra

- The right service
- For the right kid
- At the right time
- In the correct dosage
JJSIP Components

- Comprehensive Strategy
- Structured Decision Making
- Evaluation
  - Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
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...
## 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>
## 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>Source</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>Andrews &amp; Kiessling</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1980)</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, 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><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: Analysis conducted by the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity*
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 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).
• 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 | Level 4 – Non-Secure Residential Commitment |
| (3a) – Probation Supervision | Level 5 – Secure Residential Commitment (High & Maximum Risk Programs) |
| (3b) – Probation Enhancement Services (ART, LifeSkills, etc.) | |
| (3c) – Day Treatment, MST, FFT, Minimum Risk Commitment |

*Updated August 2015*
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.

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
<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?</th>
<th>Average Wait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County: Leon</td>
<td>Last Updated: 7/21/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelot</td>
<td>All Youth</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>Big Bend Hospice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magellan Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Must have Magellan insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS Connections</td>
<td>Medicaid and Transitional Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Marie Guilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

- Camoelot capacity: N/A; waiting list: N/A; average wait: N/A
- Big Bend Hospice capacity: N/A; waiting list: N/A; average wait: N/A
- Bethel Family capacity: N/A; waiting list: N/A; average wait: N/A
- Healing Transitions capacity: Varies; waiting list: N/A; average wait: N/A
- Magellan Behavioral Health capacity: N/A; waiting list: N/A; average wait: N/A
- DS Connections capacity: N/A; waiting list: N/A; average wait: N/A
- Dr. Marie Guilford capacity: N/A; waiting list: N/A; average wait: N/A
- DISC Village capacity: Varies by program; waiting list: Yes; average wait: Varies
County Service Mapping Report

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/delinquency-data/services-continuum-report/
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
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
Impacts of Improved Service Matching
Delinquency Arrests in Florida¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Arrest Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>110,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>97,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>85,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>78,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>74,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity; FY 2014-15 data is preliminary. Official delinquency arrest figures will be released in the 2015 Delinquency Profile Report (October, 2015).
### Changes in Delinquency Arrests by Offense Seriousness, FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Sum of Offenses FY 2013-14</th>
<th>Sum of Offenses FY 2014-15</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>25,775</td>
<td>25,542</td>
<td>-233</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>34,786</td>
<td>31,809</td>
<td>-2,977</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>17,784</td>
<td>17,520</td>
<td>-264</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,871</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity; FY 2014-15 data is preliminary. Official delinquency arrest figures will be released in the 2015 Delinquency Profile Report (October, 2015).
84% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.

72% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.
Operational Capacity for Residential Services at Onset of Fiscal Year

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
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Other Department Resources

The Office of Research and Data Integrity:
http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research

The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP) in Florida:
http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/latest-initiatives/juvenile-justice-system-improvement-project-(jjsip)

Delinquency Profile Report:
http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/delinquency-data/delinquency-profile

Delinquency Briefings / Special Topics Research:
http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/fast-facts/delinquency-briefings

Delinquency in Florida’s Schools Research:
http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/reports/research-reports/delinquency-in-schools
Discussion & Feedback

Please visit the Department’s Website for a copy of the presentation and more information:

www.djj.state.fl.us