
Crestview Sex Offender Treatment Program
Gulf Coast Youth Services, Inc.
(Contract Provider)
4445 Straightline Road
Crestview, Florida 32539

Primary Service: Anger Control
SPEP Review Date(s): July 19-22, 2016

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 5/16/2017
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.
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Persons Interviewed

- Program Director
- DJJ Monitor
- DHA or designee
- DMHCA or designee
- Corporate QI/QA staff
- Case Managers
- Clinical Staff
- Healthcare Staff
- Program Supervisors
- Youth
- Other (listed by title): 

Documents Reviewed

- Written Protocol/Manual
- Fidelity Monitoring Documents
- Internal Corrective Action Reports
- Staff Evaluations
- Accreditation Reports
- Contract Monitoring Reports
- Contract Scope of Services
- Logbooks
- Program Schedules
- Supplemental Contracts
- Table of Organization
- Youth Handbook
- Health Records
- MH/SA Records
- Personnel Records
- Training Records/CORE
- Youth Records (Closed)
- Youth Records (Open)
- Other:

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
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 Anger Control. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Score: 10 Points</th>
<th>POS: 20 Points</th>
<th>POP: 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*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.*

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.

Sum of all Indicator Scores (a – g below): 6 Points

Overall Quality of Service Delivery Level:

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

a. Facilitator Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Score: 0 Point(s)</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All facilitator(s) of the Primary Service must have received formal training specific to the intervention or model/protocol.

Anger Control is a curriculum developed by the designated mental health clinical authority (DMHCA) for Gulf Coast Youth Services. The facility utilizes the videos, workbooks, and manual for Aggression Replacement Training (ART) for this group and training purposes. None of the staff are formally trained in ART ART DVDs and manuals are used to train the staff in Anger Control across Gulf Coast-operated programs. The facilitators of Anger Control receive ART materials to use in their groups.

The program can earn 1 point if all facilitators are trained in the specific curriculum for Anger Control instead of Aggression Replacement Training.

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

b. Treatment Manual/Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Score: 0 Point(s)</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*There is a specific written manual/protocol detailing delivery of the Primary Service.*

There are general lesson plans which have been developed for various anger control group topics. Observation of the group found they were on a scheduled lesson and the facilitator followed the lesson plan with additional outside information and questioning to highlight the focus of the group. Informal interviews with facilitators indicate they meet weekly to decide what topics they will cover for the week.

Anger Control does not have a specific manual. The facility utilizes the Aggression Replacement Training (ART) worksheets and DVDs. The staff are not formally trained in ART, although the groups and sessions are run as ART groups are designed.
The program can earn 2 points if there was a detailed manual for the delivery of Anger Control instead of Aggression Replacement Training.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</th>
<th>Basic Score: 0 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon observation of the Primary Service by the Quality Improvement reviewer, the facilitator of that service adhered to the written protocol/manual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The facilitator adhered to an ART lesson plan used for the observed session. ART is not Anger Control. Interview with the lead mental health therapist found documentation on monthly fidelity monitoring of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. Facilitator Turnover</th>
<th>Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures the extent to which facilitators of the specific intervention/service have changed as well as gaps in service of that Primary Service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no facilitator turnover within the past year for Anger Control and no documented gaps in service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring</th>
<th>Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program has a process to monitor the delivery of the intervention to examine how closely actual implementation matches the model protocol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program has an internal monitoring process for fidelity. The Clinical Coordinator and the Licensed Social Worker supervises facilitators and observes groups monthly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</th>
<th>Basic Score: 1 Point Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program has a process by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the delinquency intervention/therapeutic service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No corrective action has been required according to reviewed fidelity monitoring forms. The program has a process in place to address corrective action should corrections be required based on fidelity monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention</th>
<th>Basic Score: 1 Point Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.

The program addresses the facilitator skill in delivery of the primary service as a part of their performance evaluation.
3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 5 youth in the sample, 100% (5 of 5) 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: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Research indicates a target of 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 5 youth in the sample, 100% (5 of 5) 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: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 40%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 60%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate to High Score: 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Optimization Score: 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Optimization Percentage: 42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Youth in Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 20%
  High Score: 5 Points
  Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
  Program Optimization Percentage: 38%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Youth in Sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, 60% (3 of 5) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 5 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 20% (1 of 5) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 5 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Basic Score</th>
<th>Program Optimization Score</th>
<th>Program Optimization Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary and Supplemental Service Type</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Service Delivery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Service: Duration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Service: Contact Hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level of Youth Served</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This SPEP report evaluates Anger Control, an intervention delivered at Crestview Sex Offender Treatment Program.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 5 total youth sampled, all received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 29 and 37 weeks of service, with an average of 31 weeks.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 5 total youth sampled, all received at least the recommended hours of service. All youth completed 52 hours of service.
The program was awarded 10 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.

Based on the risk level of the youth placed at the program (40% Program Optimization Percentage), the Department should work to ensure a larger proportion of higher risk youth are recommended. As the program serves youth with a history of sexual behavior problems, this includes a multitier strategy of working with stakeholders to achieve that practice, as well as ensuring appropriate treatment services are available in the community to reduce the reliance on residential commitment for lower risk youth presenting with sexually-related offenses.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Crestview Sex Offender Treatment Program can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by developing a specific protocol and quality controls for Anger Control, as opposed to utilizing curricula materials for Aggression Replacement Training (ART).