

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

**Okeechobee Youth Correctional Center/  
Okeechobee Youth Development Center**

***G4S Youth Services, LLC***

(Contract Provider)

7200 Highway 441 North  
Okeechobee, Florida 34972

***Primary Service: Thinking for a Change (T4C)***

*SPEP Review Date(s): March 7-10, 2017*



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 1/29/2018*

## 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: Okeechobee Youth Correctional Center/Okeechobee Youth Development Center

QI Program Code: 1288/1160

Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC

Contract Number: 10188

Location: Okeechobee County / Circuit: 19

Number of Beds: 20/30

Review Date(s): March 7-10, 2017

Lead Reviewer Code: 125/142

### Persons Interviewed

- Program Director
- DJJ Monitor
- DHA or designee
- DMHCA or designee

- Corporate QI/QA staff
- 1** # Case Managers
- 1** # Clinical Staff
- 1** # Healthcare Staff

- 1** # Program Supervisors
- 5** # 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
- 5** # Health Records
- 5** # MH/SA Records

- 5** # Personnel Records
- 5** # Training Records/CORE
- 3** # Youth Records (Closed)
- 5** # 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

## 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.*

<b>2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score</b>	<b>Basic Score: 20 Points POS: 20 Points 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: 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): 10 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) 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>	

The program’s documentation reflected the program had a training protocol and there were three case managers for which have received formal training from a qualified trainer to become group facilitators in Thinking for a Change (T4C). One case manager was trained on September 3, 2015, and two were trained on November 13, 2015. All three staff facilitated groups during the last twelve months. Two of the three staff conducted fidelity monitoring on each other. One facilitator is no longer employed by the program at the time of this review period.

<b>b. Treatment Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s) 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 evidenced-based curriculum of Thinking for a Change (T4C) 3.1 to qualifying youth admitted to the program. Youth are chosen for participation in the T4C group based on their needs and level of motivation to change. Facilitators will determine which youth would best benefit from the curriculum. The curriculum provides a script and instructions for twenty-five lessons. There is also an optional aftercare portion in the T4C curriculum which the program can implement. The curriculum includes implementation guidelines, identifies the order the lessons are to be delivered, and detailed instructions for each lesson. The program completed one cycle and was running a second cycle of Thinking for a Change (T4C) during the review period. The first cycle started on June 14, 2016 and the twenty-five lessons were completed on October 10, 2016. The second cycle T4C group started on November 01, 2016, and is expected to be completed in March 2017. The program is going to hold a graduation ceremony to acknowledge the youth completion of the T4C group. Staff is utilizing the T4C 3.1 curriculum. This is a closed group, meaning once the group begins, no new youth can be added to the group. Sessions occur on Tuesdays and Thursdays for one hour each day.

<b>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 Point(s)</b> <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>	

Observed a Thinking for a Change (T4C) session during the annual compliance review. The facilitator was well prepared for the lesson. All the required visual aids were available, such as an overhead projector, chart paper and markers, and were utilized during the lesson. The facilitator demonstrated knowledge of the material and was able to keep the participants interested. All youth participated with the role-play activities and the facilitator provided constructive feedback to the youth. Affirmations were given to the youth throughout the session and there were no behavior management issues.

<b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s)</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
<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 and an interview with the regional compliance manager confirmed there have been no gaps in service delivery and no turnover of facilitators since the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C) during the last twelve months. In the event of facilitator turnover, the co-facilitator or another trained facilitator will assume the role of the facilitator for the group. One facilitator left the program during a Thinking for a Change cycle, but the co-facilitator completed the group.

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

Reviewed twelve months of internal fidelity monitoring reports. Documentation confirmed staff members who performed fidelity monitoring were trained by a qualified trainer to teach the primary service. The program internal fidelity monitoring was conducted for both facilitators once a month within the last twelve months, with the exception for July, 2016 and November, 2016. It should be noted fidelity monitoring checks were conducted twice in August 2016. 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. These documents were maintained in a Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) binder along with the T4C sign-in sheets.

<b>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 Point</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
--	---

*The program has a process by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the delinquency intervention/therapeutic service.*

Reviewed documentation for the last twelve months, 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**

*Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.*

A review of two facilitator performance evaluation documents confirmed the facilitators were acknowledged on the annual performance evaluation in delivering the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C). This included feedback and recommendations of the facilitator's proficiency in delivering the primary service.

### 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 12 youth in the sample, 92% (11 of 12) 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: 6 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 60%

Research indicates a target of 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 12 youth in the sample, 75% (9 of 12) 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: 20 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 83%  
Moderate to High Score: 7 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 58%

Moderate	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	4 youth
High	=	5 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>12 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 42%  
 High Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 5 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 12 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, 83% (10 of 12) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 7 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 42% (5 of 12) 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	6	10	60%
Risk Level of Youth Served	20	25	80%
Totals	89	100	<b>89%</b>

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking for a Change (T4C), an intervention delivered at Okeechobee Youth Correctional Center/Okeechobee Youth Development Center. This report combines scores for both programs.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 12 total youth sampled, 11 included data with an end date. Of the 11 youth with an end date, all 11 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 16 and 19 weeks of service, with an average of 17 weeks.

The program earned 6 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 12 total youth sampled, 9 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 30 and 45.5 hours of service, with an average of 44 hours.

The program was awarded 20 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):**

Okeechobee Youth Correctional Center/Okeechobee Youth Development Center 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.