

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

## **Challenge Youth Academy**

### ***Eckerd Connects***

(Contract Provider)

201 Culbreath Road

Brooksville, Florida 34602

### ***Primary Service: Impact of Crime***

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



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 09/06/2018*

## 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: 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: 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 of Crime. 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.*

<b>2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score</b>	<b>Basic Score: 5 Points</b> <b>POS: 20 Points</b> <b>POP: 25%</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): 3 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 provided through a qualified trainer from the Department. The program has five staff who are trained to conduct this intervention, but only one facilitator who is presently assigned to do so as a regular facilitator.

<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>	

The facilitator has a copy of the manual for Impact of Crime which was reviewed. The manual contains the order of the lessons to be delivered, lesson plans for each session, and implementation guidelines. The youth are provided copies of worksheets from the student workbooks.

<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: 0 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>	

A review of sign in sheets for the past twelve months indicated the regular facilitator was on leave for two months. During the time the regular facilitator was out, two other facilitators conducted the groups. Although there was no gap in this intervention being conducted, it was not conducted with the lessons in order and the groups were not closed.

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: 0 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>	

For the past twelve months, there was no documentation any internal fidelity monitoring was conducted for this intervention.

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: 0 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>	

There was no indication of corrective action since there was no documentation of internal fidelity monitoring being conducted.

The program can earn 1 point if any corrective action needed is identified, applied, and demonstrated.

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

<b>g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 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 one regular facilitator for this intervention. The facilitator was eligible for an annual performance evaluation. The annual performance evaluation did not include a review of specific interventions and facilitator delivery skills.

The program can earn 1 point if each facilitator's performance evaluation includes discussion of their skill in delivering this primary service.

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: 10 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Research indicates the target duration of 16 weeks for this type of service. Of the 15 youth in the sample, 100% (15 of 15) 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: 8 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates a target of 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 15 youth in the sample, 93% (14 of 15) 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: 23 Points

Program Optimization Score: 25 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 92%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 93%

Moderate to High Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 83%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	2 youth
Moderate-High	=	6 youth
High	=	6 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>15 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 40%  
 High Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2		
High	=	6 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	15 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, 93% (14 of 15) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 40% (6 of 15) 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	5	20	25%
Amount of Service: Duration	10	10	100%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	8	10	80%
Risk Level of Youth Served	23	25	92%
Totals	66	85	78%

This SPEP report evaluates Impact of Crime, an intervention delivered at Challenge Youth Academy.

The program scored Low for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 15 total youth sampled, all 15 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth, all 15 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 19 and 54 weeks of service, with an average of 33 weeks.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 15 total youth sampled, all 15 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth, only 14 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 18 and 90 hours of service, with an average of 42 hours.



The program was awarded 23 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 optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring facilitator turnover does not impact groups, by ensuring fidelity monitoring is completed every month for each facilitator, by ensuring any corrective action needed is identified, applied, and demonstrated, and by ensuring each facilitator's performance evaluation includes discussion of their skill in delivering this primary service

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.