
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: Thinking for a Change
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	1 # 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	_____ # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	4 # 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: 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. 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.

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): 9 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>	

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) review encompasses a review of twelve months of records. The program is currently utilizing the Thinking for a Change (T4C) 3.1 curriculum. All staff facilitating and providing on site internal fidelity monitoring were trained in the primary service. The staff included the director of case management and two case managers.

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 uses the curriculum Thinking for a Change (T4C) 3.1. The program utilized the highly detailed manual that provides lessons plans, facilitator notes, ideas to facilitate the curriculum, and long-term planning schedules. Groups were conducted as closed groups, meaning once a group commenced, no new youth can be added to the group.

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. The session lasted approximately 60 minutes and took place in a classroom of the on-site school. The facilitator provided the observer a copy of the lesson plan so the reviewer could follow along. The facilitator followed the script, but did occasionally add their own words to give meaning and context to the discussion. The facilitator seemed at ease in delivery of the primary service, and no behavioral issues occurred during the session.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 2 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>	

In reviewing documentation, and an informal interview with the director of case management, there was no facilitator turnover during the review period. In the event of a facilitator leaving the program, another facilitator trained in the primary service would assume facilitator duties. The program has several staff members trained to deliver the primary service. The program completed four cohorts during the reviewed time period.

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>	

A review of records provided by the program showed that internal fidelity monitoring was being completed in most cases. The first cohort had no internal fidelity monitoring. The second cohort had internal fidelity monitoring which took place once per month. The third cohort had fidelity monitoring take place three of the four months. The fourth cohort had internal fidelity monitoring take place two of four months. The internal fidelity monitoring sheets had several indicators that addressed the necessary skills in facilitating the group and a space was provided to discuss any corrective action plans that needed to be addressed.

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>	

A review of the internal fidelity monitoring revealed no corrective actions were noted. An informal interview with director of case management revealed the program has a policy for instituting corrective actions for facilitators who need to improve their skills.

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 employee evaluations documented their being facilitators of the group, 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 15 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: 0 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates a target of 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 13 youth in the sample, 8% (1 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	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	3 youth
High	=	9 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>13 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 69%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2		
High	=	9 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>13 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, 100% (13 of 13) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 69% (9 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	35	35	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	0	10	0%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	80	100	80%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking for a Change, 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, only 12 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 0 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 10 and 12 weeks of service, with an average of 11 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, 1 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 30 and 45 hours of service, with an average of 36 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.