
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Dade Juvenile Residential Facility
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
18500 SW 424th Street
Florida City, Florida 33034

Primary Service: Individual Counseling
SPEP Review Date(s): May 2 - 5, 2017



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 1/16/2018

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: Dade Juvenile Residential Facility
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Miami-Dade County / Circuit: 11
Review Date(s): May 2 - 5, 2017

MQI Program Code: 1113
Contract Number: 10080
Number of Beds: 32
Lead Reviewer Code: 149

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
1 # Other (listed by title): Licensed Psychologist

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
0 # Training Records/CORE
_____ # Youth Records (Closed)
_____ # Youth Records (Open)
5 # Other: Weekly progress notes

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: 10 Points
POS: 10 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 Individual Counseling. The program was awarded 5 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 1 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Individual Counseling. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it includes any range of treatment techniques that focus on psychological or interpersonal problems or issues faced by an individual that involves a one-on-one relationship with a therapist or counselor.

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): 9 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 individual counseling was conducted by a qualified mental health and/or substance abuse professional. These professionals are under the supervision of a licensed psychologist. The professionals reviewed are all master level counselors.

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 has developed a written protocol for the delivery of services in an individual setting. The protocol includes: defining what therapeutic methods are being utilized during the individual session, explaining the need for documentation of the session in weekly progress notes, and knowing the objective, materials, activities and discussion points for the session based on the individual treatment plan of the youth. The protocol also stated the structure of an individual session, including the introduction of objectives at beginning of session, the fit within the treatment plan and summary and closing of the session. The protocol also contained instructions for following the youth's behavior to see if they had integrated new skills into daily activities and decision making processes. The protocol also allows for the counselor to deviate from the plan topic if youth arrives intrinsically motivated to discuss other issues or stressors.

| | |
|---|--|
| c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol | Basic Score: 1 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> | |

An individual counseling session was not observed during the review period. However, five youth's progress notes were reviewed from different weeks, and all had individual counseling sessions that outlined the issues addressed, and therapeutic skill to be practiced to address therapeutic need.

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

Due to the nature of the program and need for on-site counselors, no turnover had occurred during the twelve-month review period. Based on interview with licensed psychologist, in event of staff leaving the program, she would step in to provide the counseling until new staff could be hired.

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

The program has an electronic case notes system that tracks each youth 's progress for both individual and group counseling. A review of the documentation found that all youth 's progress notes reviewed had at least one individual counseling session. The Clinical Director will conduct monitoring for each facilitator once per month. This monitoring takes place by reviewing individual treatment plans, therapy notes and plan reviews. Monitoring is also done by weekly clinical supervision.

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

The licensed psychologist reviews all case notes for the youth, and provides individual corrective actions to the counselors where required. The psychologist must electronically approve all notes, which serves as the fidelity tool showing youth are receiving individual counseling services based on treatment plans. The protocol dictates the psychologist would provide corrective action on an as needed schedule to counselors.

| | |
|---|---|
| g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention | Basic Score: N/A 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.

An individual counseling session was not observed during the review period. However, five youth's progress notes were reviewed from different weeks, and all had individual counseling sessions that outlined the issues addressed, and therapeutic skill to be practiced to address therapeutic need.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 8 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates the target duration of 25 weeks for this type of service. Of the 27 youth in the sample, 89% (24 of 27) 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: 2 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 20%

Research indicates a target of 30 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 27 youth in the sample, 37% (10 of 27) 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: 100%

Moderate to High Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 1

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Moderate | = | 5 youth |
| Moderate-High | = | 2 youth |
| High | = | 20 youth |
| <u>Total Youth in Sample</u> | = | <u>27 youth</u> |

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 74%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

| Table 2 | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------|
| High | = | 20 youth |
| Total Youth in Sample | = | 27 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% (27 of 27) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 74% (20 of 27) 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 | 10 | 10 | 100% |
| Quality of Service Delivery | 20 | 20 | 100% |
| Amount of Service: Duration | 8 | 10 | 80% |
| Amount of Service: Contact Hours | 2 | 10 | 20% |
| Risk Level of Youth Served | 25 | 25 | 100% |
| Totals | 65 | 75 | 87% |

This SPEP report evaluates Individual Counseling, an intervention delivered at Dade Juvenile Residential Facility.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 27 total youth sampled, all but one included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 24 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 9 and 54 weeks of service, with an average of 32 weeks.

The program earned 2 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 27 total youth sampled, 10 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 12 and 48 hours of service, with an average of 28 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 just prior to the youths' admission.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Dade Juvenile Residential Facility can optimize their SPEP Amount of Service score by ensuring that all youth receive the full targeted dosage of service.