

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

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

***Primary Service: Individual Counseling***  
***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: 10 Points  
POS: 10 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 Individual Counseling. The program was awarded 5 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 1 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Individual Counseling. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it includes any range of treatment techniques that focus on psychological or interpersonal problems or issues faced by an individual that involves a one-on-one relationship with a therapist or counselor.

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</b> <b>POS: 20 Points</b> <b>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): 9 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 SPEP evaluation process encompasses twelve months of records review. The program is utilizing individual counseling which is being held on a weekly basis. The counseling sessions are being facilitated by masters-level counselors.

<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 program has developed a written protocol for delivery of services in the individual setting. This includes: defining what therapeutic methods are being utilized during the individual sessions, how to document the session, and a plan for objective, materials, activities and discussions. These discussions are based on the youth's individual treatment plan. Protocol also stated the structure of individual session, introduction of objectives, the fit within the overall treatment plan, and closing of session. The protocol delineates how to follow the youth's behavior to see if they had integrated new skills learned into daily decisions and actions. The protocol also allows for the counselor to change topics if the youth arrives in crisis or is motivated in addressing another issue.

<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>	

Individual counseling sessions cannot be observed.

<b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s)</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
--------------------------------	---

*Measures the extent to which facilitators of the specific intervention/service have changed as well as gaps in service of that Primary Service.*

As turnover occurs, the licensed psychologist would step in and continue individual treatment until a new therapist is hired. No turnover had occurred during the twelve-month period reviewed.

**e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring**

**Basic Score: 2 Point(s)**  
**Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points**

*The program has a process to monitor the delivery of the intervention to examine how closely actual implementation matches the model protocol.*

The program utilizes an electronic case notes system that logs both individual and group counseling sessions. A review of the documentation found that all youth's progress notes had individual counseling sessions. The regional clinical director conducts monitoring for each therapist monthly.

**f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring**

**Basic Score: 1 Point**  
**Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point**

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

The psychologist must electronically approve all notes, which serves as documentation of the notes being reviewed. Any issues discovered by the supervising psychologist would be addressed with the therapist in question.

**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 the therapists' last performance evaluations documented the facilitation of individual counseling being provided to the youth. The evaluations also graded the skill in which the therapists provided the individual counseling sessions.

### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Research indicates the target duration of 25 weeks for this type of service. Of the 25 youth in the sample, 100% (25 of 25) 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: 2 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 20%

Research indicates a target of 30 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 25 youth in the sample, 28% (7 of 25) 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	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	9 youth
High	=	15 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>25 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 60%  
 High Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2		
High	=	15 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	<b>25 youth</b>

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% (25 of 25) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 60% (15 of 25) 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	10	10	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	10	10	100%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	2	10	20%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>89%</b>

This SPEP report evaluates Individual Counseling, an intervention delivered at Dade Juvenile Residential Facility.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 25 total youth sampled, all 25 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 25 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 25 and 61 weeks of service, with an average of 31 weeks.

The program earned 2 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 25 total youth sampled, all 25 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 7 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 8 and 56 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.