
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Dade Juvenile Residential Facility
TrueCore Behavioral Solutions, LLC
(Contract Provider)
18500 Southwest 424th Street
Florida City, Florida 33304

Primary Service: Impact of Crime
SPEP Review Date(s): May 15-18, 2018



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): May 21, 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 Juvenile Residential Facility**
Provider Name: **TrueCore**
Location: **Miami-Dade** County / Circuit: **11**
Review Date(s): **May 15-18, 2018**

MQI Program Code:
Contract Number: **10080**
Number of Beds: **32**
Lead Reviewer Code:

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	_____ # 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 type="checkbox"/> Logbooks	<u>4</u> # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	<u>4</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 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 checked="" 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.

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): 8 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>	

According to training records maintained in SkillPro, all facilitators and all staff providing internal fidelity monitoring were trained in the primary service. Three case managers facilitated groups during the review period and the director of case management was providing internal fidelity monitoring.

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 utilizes the curriculum Impact of Crime: Addressing the Harm to Victims and the Community. It is highly detailed providing a facilitator's manual, and student workbook. The facilitator's manual provides lessons plans, classroom management ideas, and tips for engaging youth discussions. The student manual provides reproducible worksheets to help facilitate group discussions, and review concepts learned during the group sessions. Impact of Crime is a closed group meaning once a group commences, new youth cannot be added to the group. Facilitators are encouraged to bring in victim impact speakers throughout the course of the curriculum.

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>	

During the review, a group session was observed. Group was conducted in the case manager's office, and was facilitated by the case manager. The group consisted of seven youth. The facilitator kept the youth engaged and on task. All youth within the group participated in both individual and group work. There were no behavioral issues observed during the group. The facilitator used her own words to explain important concepts of the lesson, and the review activity

utilized at the end of the group showed the youth had a good understanding of the terms newly presented.

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>	

The program completed four cohorts during the previous twelve months. Additionally, a fifth cohort was ongoing at the time of the review. The program did have facilitator turnover during one cohort. When this occurred, another trained facilitator assumed the group, and there was not gap in delivery of service. No other facilitator turnover occurred during the reviewed time period. A cohort should run a minimum of 32 hours. In reviewing the documentation provided by the program, the primary service was delivered in one-hour group sessions and contained twenty to twenty-four sessions.

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.

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 completed four cohorts of the primary service. Each cohort had fidelity monitoring provided by trained on-site staff. The first cohort had two completed during the three-month period. The second cohort had three internal during three-month period. The third cohort had one fidelity monitoring during four-month period. It should also be noted that the program was evacuated for hurricane for three weeks during this cohort. The fourth cohort also had two during a four-month time period, also including three weeks for hurricane evacuation.

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.

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>	

In reviewing the internal fidelity monitoring forms, there were no corrective actions noted. An informal interview with director of case management confirmed that if a facilitator had issues in delivery of the primary service, the program has a policy in place to initiate corrective actions to improve the delivery skills of the facilitator.

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>	

The annual performance evaluations of the facilitators in the primary service were reviewed. The evaluations noted the employees facilitating a primary service, and measured the facilitator's skill in delivery of the primary service.

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 13 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 13) 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 13 youth in the sample, 92% (12 of 13) 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%

Table 1

Moderate	=	0 youth
Moderate-High	=	6 youth
High	=	7 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>13 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 54%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2		
High	=	7 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	13 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, 100% (13 of 13) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 54% (7 of 13) 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	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	0	10	0%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	8	10	80%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	73	85	86%

This SPEP report evaluates Impact of Crime, an intervention delivered at Dade Juvenile Residential Facility.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 13 total youth sampled, all 13 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 0 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 10 and 14 weeks of service, with an average of 12 weeks.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 13 total youth sampled, all 13 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 12 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 22 and 26 hours of service, with an average of 24 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 Juvenile Residential Facility can maintain their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by continuing the practices in place at the time of this review.

Dade Juvenile Residential Facility 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.