
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Charles Britt Academy
Youth Services International, Inc.
(Contract Provider)
3001 26th Avenue South
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33712

Primary Service: Thinking for a Change
SPEP Review Date(s): May 3-6, 2016



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 5/1/2017

Introduction

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) is an assessment tool derived from meta-analytic research on the effectiveness of juvenile justice interventions. The tool is designed to compare existing intervention services, as implemented in the field, to the characteristics of the most effective intervention services found in the research.

The SPEP scoring system allows service providers to identify specific areas in which program improvements can be made to their existing Primary Services. These improvements can be expected to increase the effectiveness of those Primary Services in the reduction of recidivism for youth receiving the Primary Service. A separate SPEP evaluation is conducted, at the time of the program's Quality Improvement Review, for each Primary Service provided by the program.

This report provides two types of SPEP scores: a **Basic Score**, equivalent to the number of points received, and a **Program Optimization Score (POS)** that is equivalent to the maximum number of possible points that could be received based on the SPEP domains under the control of the program. The Basic Score compares the Primary Service being evaluated to other intervention services found in the research to be effective, regardless of service type. It is meant as a reference to the expected overall recidivism reduction when compared to other Primary Services of any Type.

A **Program Optimization Percentage (POP)** rate is derived from the Basic Score and Program Optimization Score. The POP rate is a percentage score that indicates where the rate of effectiveness of the Primary Service is when compared to its potential effectiveness if optimized to match the characteristics of similar Primary Services found to be most effective in the research. The POP rate is likely more meaningful to service providers as it represents how close the program's Primary Service is to its potential for that Primary Service Type. For example, a POP rate of 55% would indicate that the program's Primary Service is operating at 55% of its potential effectiveness for recidivism reduction that has been found for a similar Primary Service Type with research evidence of effectiveness.

Program Name: Charles Britt Academy
Provider Name: Youth Services International, Inc.
Location: Pinellas County / Circuit: 6
Review Date(s): May 3-6, 2016

QI Program Code: 1279
Contract Number: 10092
Number of Beds: 28
Lead Reviewer Code: 146

Persons Interviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff	<u>2</u> # Program Supervisors
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor	<u>1</u> # Case Managers	<u>5</u> # Youth
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee	<u>3</u> # Clinical Staff	<u>3</u> # Other (listed by title): <u>Regional</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee	<u>2</u> # Healthcare Staff	<u>Operations</u>

Documents Reviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks	<u>5</u> # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	<u>5</u> # Training Records/CORE
<input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts	<u>3</u> # Youth Records (Closed)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization	<u>5</u> # Youth Records (Open)
<input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook	_____ # Other: _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports	<u>5</u> # Health Records	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Scope of Services	<u>5</u> # MH/SA Records	

Observations During Review

☐ Group/Session of Primary Service(s)
☒ Program Activities
☒ Recreation
☒ Social Skill Modeling by Staff
☒ Staff Interactions with Youth
☒ Staff Supervision of Youth
☐ Transition/Exit Conferences
☐ Treatment Team Meetings

1. Primary Service and Supplemental Service Types

Basic Score: 35 Points
POS: 35 Points
POP: 100%

There are five Primary Service Types that have been classified into Groups with a maximum number of points possible for rating purposes. Some Primary Service Types may also have qualifying Supplemental Service Types that could earn a program an additional 5 points.

The Primary Service for this program is Thinking for a Change. The program was awarded 30 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 5 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Cognitive Behavioral Therapy. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it is intended to correct faulty cognitions and perceptions and provides skills individuals can use to monitor thought patterns and correct behaviors.

An additional 5 points was awarded based on a Qualifying Supplemental Service. The Qualifying Supplemental Service was identified as None (automatic 5 points added to score), which was not demonstrated to have been implemented.

The Primary and Supplemental Service Raw Score is equal to the sum of the Primary Service points plus the Qualifying Supplemental Service points.

Note: Quality information is evaluated by the Bureau of Monitoring and Quality Improvement while on-site during the annual compliance review.

2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score	Basic Score: 20 Points POS: 20 Points POP: 100%
<i>The Quality of Service Delivery Score is the sum of the scores for the seven treatment quality indicators. The Program Optimization Percentage Rating determines the Overall Quality of Service Level: Indicator Sum Score 0-3 = Low; Sum Score 4-7 = Medium; Sum Score 8-10 = High.</i>	

Sum of all Indicator Scores (a – g below): 8 Points

Overall Quality of Service Delivery Level:

- ☐ Low (Raw Score = 5)
☐ Medium (Raw Score = 10)
☒ High (Raw Score = 20 Points)

a. Facilitator Training	Basic Score: 1 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
<i>All facilitator(s) of the Primary Service must have received formal training specific to the intervention or model/protocol.</i>	

The program currently has two staff trained to provide Thinking for a Change (T4C). There was documentation in the T4C binder to support both staff received facilitator training. All of the training was provided by a qualified trainer. All of the T4C groups were facilitated by one staff for the past twelve months. Several of the groups were co-facilitated by another staff who was not working at the program at the time of the annual compliance review.

b. Treatment Manual/Protocol	Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points
<i>There is a specific written manual/protocol detailing delivery of the Primary Service.</i>	

The program uses the Thinking for a Change (T4C) curriculum which includes facilitator and student guides. The curriculum is manualized, providing the frequency and duration for the service, with specific topics to be covered in each lesson. The facilitator guide contains lesson plans with instructions for conducting each group session.

c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol	Basic Score: N/A Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
<i>Upon observation of the Primary Service by the Quality Improvement reviewer, the facilitator of that service adhered to the written protocol/manual.</i>	

This curriculum was not able to be observed; therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points
--------------------------------	---

Measures the extent to which facilitators of the specific intervention/service have changed as well as gaps in service of that Primary Service.

There has been consistency in the facilitator and there were no gaps in service during this review period. The program's designated mental health clinician authority (DMHCA) is also trained to facilitate T4C groups. There was one staff who co-facilitated groups who no longer works at the program. The program conducts T4C groups on a twelve-month cycle. In the past year, there were T4C groups provided from February 6 to May 2, 2015, May 9 to August 8, 2015, September 4 to December 12, 2015 and January 22 to April 30 2016. There were gaps in service, however they were planned.

e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring

Basic Score: 2 Point(s)

Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points

The program has a process to monitor the delivery of the intervention to examine how closely actual implementation matches the model protocol.

The program has documented fidelity monitoring using a monitoring tool specific to the primary service. The fidelity monitoring was completed by the program's designated mental health clinician authority (DMHCA), who has been trained in the T4C curriculum. The fidelity monitoring was completed each month the primary service was provided during the review period.

f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring

Basic Score: 0 Point

Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point

The program has a process by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the delinquency intervention/therapeutic service.

The program provides fidelity monitoring, which includes coaching and supervision by a qualified facilitator in the primary service. The fidelity monitoring sheets completed for the past year were reviewed. There were notes of encouragement and suggestions on the fidelity sheets. The fidelity sheet completed for February 2, 2016, documented the need for corrective action regarding the reassignment of some youth to another T4C group. There was no documentation to support this corrective action was applied and demonstrated.

The program can earn 1 point if all corrective actions are applied and demonstrated.

At the time of the review, the program did not meet criteria to earn a score of 1.

g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention

Basic Score: 1 Point

Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point

Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.

There are two staff trained to provide Thinking for a Change (T4C). There was an annual performance evaluation completed on both staff. The evaluation forms contained specific information regarding the staff's delivery of this primary service.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 0 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 12 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 12) reached at least the indicated target duration. Further explanation is detailed in the Summary and Recommendations below.

Note: Dosage information (duration) is calculated from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Evidence-Based Services module. Duration is included for the youth in the SPEP sample.

4. Amount of Service – Contact Hours

Basic Score: 0 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates a target of 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 12 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 12) reached the indicated target contact hours. Further explanation is detailed in the Summary and Recommendations below.

Note: Dosage information (contact hours) is calculated from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Evidence-Based Services module. Contact hours are included for the youth in the SPEP sample.

5. Risk Level of Youth Served:

Basic Score: 22 Points

Program Optimization Score: 25 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 88%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 100%

Moderate to High Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	7 youth
High	=	4 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>12 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 33%

High Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 77%

Table 2		
High	=	4 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	12 youth

The risk level score is compiled by calculating the total percent of the SPEP sample that score Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend and also the total percent of the SPEP sample that score High-Risk to reoffend.

Of the SPEP sample, 100% (12 of 12) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 33% (4 of 12) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 points.

Note: The latest Community Positive Achievement Change Tool (C-PACT) prior to the placement date was used in the derivation of the risk level score. This C-PACT provides the best indication of the risk to re-offend level of the youth when the youth was first placed in the program.

Summary and Recommendations

Category	Basic Score	Program Optimization Score	Program Optimization Percentage
Primary and Supplemental Service Type	35	35	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	0	10	0%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	22	25	25%
Totals	77	100	77%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking for a Change, an intervention delivered at Charles Britt Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 12 total youth sampled, none received at least the recommended weeks of service. There were no end dates available in the EBS Module, therefore it was impossible to calculate an accurate number of weeks.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 12 total youth sampled, none received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 31 and 38 hours of service, with an average of 35 hours.

The program was awarded 22 available points for Risk Level of Youth Served. This is calculated using data from the Community - Positive Achievement Change Tool (C-PACT) assessment. This score reflects youths' most recent C-PACT score prior to placement at the program. The program itself has no control over youths' C-PACT risk level because the scored assessment was administered prior to the youths' admission.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Charles Britt Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring any corrective actions are applied, demonstrated, and documented in the subsequent monitoring.

Charles Britt Academy can optimize their SPEP Amount of Service score by ensuring that dosage for all youth is recorded accurately in EBS and by ensuring that youth receive the full targeted dosage of service.