
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

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

Primary Service: Thinking for a Change (T4C)
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 Youth Academy
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Miami-Dade County / Circuit: 11
Review Date(s): May 2- 5, 2017

MQI Program Code: 1418
Contract Number: 10080
Number of Beds: 24
Lead Reviewer Code: 123

Persons Interviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff	_____ # Program Supervisors
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor	<u>1</u> # Case Managers	<u>12</u> # Youth
<input type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee	<u>1</u> # Clinical Staff	<u>1</u> # Other (listed by title): Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee	_____ # Healthcare Staff	Therapist

Documents Reviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual	<input type="checkbox"/> Logbooks	_____ # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	<u>12</u> # Training Records/CORE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts	_____ # Youth Records (Closed)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization	_____ # Youth Records (Open)
<input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook	_____ # Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports	_____ # Health Records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Contract Scope of Services	_____ # 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 (T4C). 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): 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 program’s documentation reflected the program has a training protocol and three staff were identified and received formal training from a qualified trainer to become group facilitators in the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C). One case manager was trained on August 5, 2016, the director of case management and the director of clinical services were trained on January 22, 2016. The trained case manager facilitated groups during the review period. The director of clinical services and director of case management conducted fidelity monitoring reviews.

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 administers/facilitates the evidenced-based curriculum Thinking for a Change (T4C) 3.1 to qualifying youth admitted to the program. T4C is comprised of twenty-five lessons built upon each other, and contains appendices which can be used to craft an aftercare program to meet ongoing cognitive behavioral needs of the group participants. Not all lessons can be completed in one session, so a typical delivery cycle may take thirty sessions. Sessions should last between one and two hours. Ideally, the curriculum is delivered two times a week, with a minimum recommended dosage of once a week and a maximum of three times a week. Participants must be granted time to complete mandatory homework assignments between each lesson. T4C is intended for groups of eight to twelve participants and should be delivered only by trained facilitators. Due to its integrated structure, T4C is a closed group, meaning once a cycle starts, additional participants may not join the group mid-stream. The curriculum provides a script and instructions for twenty-five lessons. The curriculum includes implementation guidelines, identifies the order the lessons are to be delivered, and detailed instructions for each lesson.

c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol	Basic Score: 0 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 observation was made during the annual compliance review. The lesson preparation was adequate but could have been improved. The youth handouts were not printed because of printer problems. Youth were provided blank paper to fill out their answers. It is recommended the facilitator is allowed a minimum of one-hour preparation time before each session in order to adequately and sufficiently facilitate and present the materials during group. The facilitator followed the lesson according to the manual and used a mixture of reading from the manual and using his own words to convey the information in the lesson. The group was held in the living area which is an open-bay dorm. During the primary service T4C group presentation occurred another group was being conducted on the opposite side of the room. The room was not conducive to learning because, there were loud noises, foot lockers slamming and youth having the ability to get up and walk away from group. It was difficult for this observer to hear the dialogue in group because of the distractions and loud noises. Most youth were sitting around a metal spider table and were able to engage in group, but there were not enough seats, therefore some youth sat further away and had a difficult time participating. Most youth participated with the role play activity and responded well to the lesson except for one youth who chose not to participate. The facilitator used affirmations during group and did his best with attempts to keep youth focused on the lesson despite all of the distractions occurring in the dorm/room.

The program can earn 1 point by ensuring the group proceeds as designed.

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

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>	

Reviewed documentation confirmed there have been no gaps in service delivery during the review period. In the event of turnover another trained facilitator will assume the role of the facilitator and complete the primary service T4C group.

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>	

Internal fidelity monitoring reports for the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C) started in the July 2016. A review of the documentation confirmed staff members performing fidelity monitoring were trained by a qualified trainer to teach the primary service T4C. The program internal fidelity monitoring was conducted for the facilitator once a month except for the month of

March 2017. Fidelity monitoring was conducted on February 22, 2017, but the wrong fidelity monitoring form was used. Internal fidelity checklists are utilized to capture specifics of the primary service. On the checklist, there is a corrective action follow-up component which incorporated any applicable recommendations identified during fidelity monitoring. There were no identified corrective actions follow-up required.

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>	

Reviewed documentation for July 2016 verified the program has a process for the application of corrective actions based on the results of the fidelity monitoring conducted. The program has not had any applicable issues requiring corrective actions. The completed fidelity monitoring forms recorded the observer’s feedback and recommendations, and ideas for improvement in the delivery of the primary service Thinking for a Chance (T4C).

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

A review of three performance evaluation documents confirmed staff was acknowledged and rated on the annual performance evaluations in delivering the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C) or conducting fidelity monitoring reviews. The performance evaluations included feedback and recommendations of the facilitator’s proficiency in delivering the primary service T4C.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 8 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 7 youth in the sample, 86% (6 of 7) 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 7 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 7) 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%

Moderate	=	0 youth
Moderate-High	=	4 youth
High	=	3 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>7 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 43%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 3 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 7 youth</u>

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% (7 of 7) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 43% (3 of 7) 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	35	35	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	8	10	80%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	88	100	88%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking for a Change (T4C) and T4C Aftercare, an intervention delivered at Dade Youth Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 7 total youth sampled, 6 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 13 and 17 weeks of service, with an average of 16.5 weeks.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 7 total youth sampled, none received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 21 and 27 hours of service, with an average of 25 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 Youth Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring group sessions proceed according to the curriculum design.

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