

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

## **Challenge Youth Academy**

### ***Eckerd Connects***

(Contract Provider)

201 Culbreath Road

Brooksville, Florida 34602

### ***Primary Service: Seven Challenges***

*SPEP Review Date(s): April 25, 2018*



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 09/06/18*

## 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: Challenge Youth Academy  
Provider Name: Eckerd Connects  
Location: Hernando County / Circuit: 5  
Review Date(s): April 25, 2018

MQI Program Code: 76  
Contract Number: 10208  
Number of Beds: 60  
Lead Reviewer Code: 143

### Persons Interviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director	<input type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff	_____ # Program Supervisors
<input type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor	_____ # Case Managers	_____ # Youth
<input type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee	<u>1</u> # 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 type="checkbox"/> Logbooks	_____ # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	<u>5</u> # Training Records/CORE
<input 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: 30 Points  
POS: 30 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 Seven Challenges. The program was awarded 25 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 4 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Group Counseling. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it focuses on psychological or interpersonal problems or issues faced by an individual and involves a group of youths interacting with each other.

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: 10 Points</b> <b>POS: 20 Points</b> <b>POP: 50%</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): 7 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)</b> <b>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 documentation reviewed showed evidence the program has a formal training protocol which is provided through a qualified trainer. The program has five staff who are trained to conduct this intervention. Two staff serve as regular facilitators. One staff serves as the fidelity monitor and the two other staff are available as needed to assist.

<b>b. Treatment Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s)</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
<i>There is a specific written manual/protocol detailing delivery of the Primary Service.</i>	

Each facilitator has a copy of the manual for Seven Challenges. The manual is titled The Seven Challenges Manual, Second Edition. A copy of the manual was reviewed. There are workbooks for the youth to use for reading during group sessions. The manual contains lesson plans with detailed instructions for implementation and discussion.

<b>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: N/A 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>	

This curriculum was not able to be observed; therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable.

<b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 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>	

There have been no gap in service delivery of this intervention. There was turnover when one facilitator left until another facilitator was hired and trained. During the transition, the other regular facilitator filled in. This intervention is an open, ongoing group and the groups were conducted as scheduled.

The program can earn 2 points if facilitator turnover does not impact groups.

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

<b>e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 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>	

Twelve months of internal fidelity monitoring reports were reviewed. The program has an internal process to perform internal fidelity monitoring. During the last twelve months, twenty-two instances of internal fidelity monitoring were required and only nine instances were conducted.

The program can earn 2 points if fidelity monitoring is completed every month for each facilitator.

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

<b>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 Point</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
<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 program has a process for corrective action based on internal fidelity monitoring. Each fidelity monitoring checklist includes a section for feedback and recommendations for facilitator improvement. There were no corrective actions noted during the last twelve months.

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

The program has two regular facilitators for this intervention. One facilitator was eligible for an annual performance evaluation and one facilitator has been at the program for less than one year; not yet due for an annual evaluation. The annual performance evaluation included a review specific interventions and facilitator delivery skills.

### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 6 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 60%

Research indicates the target duration of 24 weeks for this type of service. Of the 9 youth in the sample, 78% (7 of 9) 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 40 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 9 youth in the sample, 100% (9 of 9) 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: 89%

Moderate to High Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 83%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	4 youth
High	=	3 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>9 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 33%

High Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 77%

Table 2		
High	=	3 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	9 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, 89% (8 of 9) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 33% (3 of 9) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 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	30	30	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	10	20	50%
Amount of Service: Duration	6	10	60%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	10	10	100%
Risk Level of Youth Served	20	25	80%
Totals	76	95	80%

This SPEP report evaluates Seven Challenges, an intervention delivered at Challenge Youth Academy.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 6 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 9 total youth sampled, only 8 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 7 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 19 and 41 weeks of service, with an average of 29 weeks.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 9 total youth sampled, all 9 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth, all 9 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 135 and 278 hours of service, with an average of 194 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 just prior to the youths' admission.

#### RECOMMENDATION(S):

Challenge Youth Academy can improve their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by minimizing turnover and completing monthly fidelity monitoring.

Challenge Youth Academy 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.