

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

**Bartow Youth Academy**  
***G4S Youth Services, LLC***  
(Contract Provider)  
2145 Bob Phillips Road  
Bartow, Florida 33830

***Primary Service: Skillstreaming the Adolescent***  
*SPEP Review Date(s): October 4-5 & 10-11, 2016*



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 6/8/2017*

## 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: **Bartow Youth Academy**  
Provider Name: **G4S, Youth Services, LLC**  
Location: **Polk** County / Circuit: **10**  
Review Date(s): **October 4-5 & October 10-11, 2016**

MQI Program Code: **1268**  
Contract Number: **R2118**  
Number of Beds: **28**  
Lead Reviewer Code: **132**

### 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>2</u> # Case Managers                                  | <u>5</u> # Youth                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee   | <u>2</u> # Clinical Staff                                 | _____ # Other (listed by title): _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee | <u>1</u> # Healthcare Staff                               |  |

### Documents Reviewed

|   |  |                                   |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks               | <u>10</u> # Personnel Records     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules      | <u>15</u> # Training Records/CORE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts | <u>5</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: 20 Points  
POS: 20 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 Skillstreaming the Adolescent. The program was awarded 15 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 3 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Social Skills Training. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it focuses on developing social skills required for an individual to interact in a positive way with others.

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.*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score</b>   | <b>Basic Score: 20 Points</b><br><b>POS: 20 Points</b><br><b>POP: 100%</b> |
| <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:<br/>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)

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

During the past year, four therapists facilitated Skillstreaming groups. A review of their training files contained documentation each facilitator was trained by a qualified trainer in the Skillstreaming curriculum.

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

The program uses the Skillstreaming in Early Childhood Manual due to the borderline functioning of the youth population. The manual includes the order of lessons to be presented and also contains lesson plans with instructions for providing each lesson. The curriculum also includes separate skills cards specifying the individual components for each new skill.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</b>   | <b>Basic Score: N/A Point(s)</b><br><b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b> |
| <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 primary service was not able to be observed during the review week; therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable.

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b> | <b>Basic Score: 1 Point(s)</b><br><b>Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b> |
|--------------------------------|---|

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

The current cohort of this service was primarily provided by a facilitator who left the program in August 2016. Another trained facilitator assumed this group with no gaps in service. There was no documentation to support a transition of the group from the departing therapist to the new one. Two other therapist facilitated individual groups when the primary facilitator was not available.

The program can earn 2 points by minimizing facilitator turnover.

At the time of the review, the program did not meet criteria to earn a score of 2.

**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 provided documentation of monthly fidelity monitoring for each facilitator of this primary service. The program uses an internal fidelity monitoring checklist for this curriculum. Those individuals conducting fidelity monitoring completed formal training in the primary service.

**f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring**

**Basic Score: 1 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 has a process for corrective action, if required. Based on a review of fidelity monitoring documentation, and an interview with the facility administrator, no corrective action was required.

**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.*

The program's policy requires a probationary evaluation following ninety days of employment and an annual evaluation of each staff occurring in October. Neither of the primary facilitators providing this service had been employed long enough to receive an annual evaluation. The probationary evaluations for both employees did not address their skill in providing this primary service. Two other trained facilitators conducted individual sessions of the intervention when the primary facilitator was unavailable. The annual performance appraisal of these staff did address their skill and competency in delivering the intervention.

### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 6 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 60%

Research indicates the target duration of 16 weeks for this type of service. Of the 19 youth in the sample, 74% (14 of 19) 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: 8 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates a target of 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 19 youth in the sample, 95% (18 of 19) 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: 25 Points

Program Optimization Score: 25 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 95%

Moderate to High Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

| Table 1                      |   |                 |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Moderate                     | = | 0 youth         |
| Moderate-High                | = | 6 youth         |
| High                         | = | 12 youth        |
| <u>Total Youth in Sample</u> | = | <u>19 youth</u> |

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 63%

High Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

| Table 2               |   |          |
|-----------------------|---|----------|
| High                  | = | 12 youth |
| Total Youth in Sample | = | 19 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, 95% (18 of 19) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 63% (12 of 19) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 13 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 | 20          | 20                         | 100%                            |
| Quality of Service Delivery           | 20          | 20                         | 100%                            |
| Amount of Service: Duration           | 6           | 10                         | 60%                             |
| Amount of Service: Contact Hours      | 8           | 10                         | 80%                             |
| Risk Level of Youth Served            | 25          | 25                         | 100%                            |
| Totals                                | 79          | 85                         | 93%                             |

This SPEP report evaluates Skillstreaming the Adolescent, an intervention delivered at Bartow Youth Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing facilitator turnover.

The program earned 6 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 19 total youth sampled, 18 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 14 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 0 and 49 weeks of service, with an average of 23 weeks.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 19 total youth sampled, all included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 18 received



at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 23 and 45 hours of service, with an average of 30 hours.

The program was awarded 25 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):

Bartow Youth Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by minimizing facilitator turnover.

Bartow Youth 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.