
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Duval Youth Academy
Sequel Youth Services
(Contract Provider)
7500 Ricker Road
Jacksonville, Florida 32244

Primary Service: Impact for Change (IOC)
SPEP Review Date(s): March 21-24, 2017



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 8/3/2017

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: Duval Academy
Provider Name: Sequel Youth services
Location: Jacksonville County / Circuit: 4
Review Date(s): March 21-24, 2017

MQI Program Code: 1280
Contract Number: 10094
Number of Beds: 28
Lead Reviewer Code: 129

Persons Interviewed

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

Documents Reviewed

- | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks | <u>2</u> # Personnel Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | <u>2</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 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: 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 Impact for Change (IOC). 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.

2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score	Basic Score: 10 Points POS: 20 Points POP: 50%
<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): 7 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 documentation reviewed showed evidence that the program has a formal training protocol that is provided through DJJ from a qualified trainer. The program has two staff that are trained in Impact of Crime and they are actively conducting groups. The Clinical Director has noted that two new hires are presently scheduled to attend the next IOC training.

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>	

Each facilitator has a copy of the manual for Impact of Crime and the MQI reviewer was provided a copy during this review. There are no separate workbooks for the youth. The manual contains lessons plans with basic instructions for implementation and discussions.

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>	

The MQI reviewer observed a session of Impact of Crime during the review. The facilitators provided the MQI staff with a copy of the lesson. Eight youth were in attendance for this session. The session included a highlight from the previous discussion and dialogue about how it feels to be robbed. The youth were attentive and participated without being prompted. The facilitator was in compliance with the goal and purpose of the lesson.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 1 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>	

There is no evidence of facilitator turnover. There are several gaps in service from March 2016 – November 2016. The two trained facilitators were ready and available to conduct this intervention, but the clinical director, at that time, did not prioritize this on the schedule. The new clinical director has reorganized group interventions and will maintain better documentation and facilitator accountability.

The program can earn 2 points by minimizing gaps in service.

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

e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring	Basic Score: 1 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 provided documentation of three months of internal fidelity checks in support of the program’s reorganization for internal fidelity. The checks are being performed by curriculum trained staff with accountability from the clinical director.

The program can earn 2 points by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators.

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

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>	

An interview with the clinical director provided a clear plan for corrective action based on fidelity monitoring. There were no corrective actions needed during the last three months.

g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention	Basic Score: 0 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>	

This MQI reviewer examined the staff evaluations for the trained facilitators of this intervention. There is no mention of or evaluation of facilitator skills. This was discussed with the clinical director who will adjust the forms to include facilitator skills for the upcoming evaluation period.

The program can earn 1 point by ensuring that facilitators' performance evaluations include an assessment of the delivery of IOC.

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

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 0 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates the target duration of 16 weeks for this type of service. Of the 4 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 4) 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: 4 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 40%

Research indicates a target of 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 4 youth in the sample, 50% (2 of 4) 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	=	0 youth
High	=	4 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>4 youth</u>

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

Table 2	
High	= 4 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 4 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% (4 of 4) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 100% (4 of 4) 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	10	20	50%
Amount of Service: Duration	0	10	0%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	4	10	40%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	59	85	69%

This SPEP report evaluates Impact for Crime (IOC), an intervention delivered at Duval Youth Academy.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing gaps in service, by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators, and by ensuring that facilitators' performance evaluations include an assessment of the delivery of IOC.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 4 total youth sampled, none received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 2 and 12 weeks of service, with an average of 8 weeks.

The program earned 4 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 4 total youth sampled, 2 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 4 and 26 hours of service, with an average of 16 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):

Duval Youth Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by minimizing gaps in service, by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators, and by ensuring that facilitators' performance evaluations include an assessment of the delivery of IOC

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