
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Bartow Youth Academy
Truecore Behavioral Solutions, LLC
(Contract Provider)
2415 Bob Phillips Road
Bartow, Florida 33830

Primary Service: LifeSkills Training
SPEP Review Date(s): 11/06/18-11/08/18



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 11/09/18

Introduction

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) is a data-driven rating system for evaluating program effectiveness. The SPEP was developed by relying on hundreds of studies that have examined key characteristics of programs that demonstrated their ability to reduce recidivism. To determine a SPEP score, the program's services are compared to characteristics of effective programs in the research of a similar type.

The SPEP score is composed of four principle characteristics that have been shown to predict reductions in youth recidivism; service type, quality of service, dosage (amount of service), and youth level of risk.

- **Service Type:** service type points are awarded based on the group category that the service falls within
- **Quality of Service:** quality points are awarded by determining the extent to which the program is delivered in what research suggests is a high-quality manner
- **Amount of Service:** or "dosage" refers to the amount and duration of services that were received
- **Risk Level:** refers to the level of criminogenic risk for youth involved in the intervention.

The final output of the SPEP review is the Program Optimization Percentage (POP). This rate is derived from the Basic Score and Program Optimization Score. The POP rate is a percentage score that indicates how the service rates in effectiveness when compared to the potential effectiveness if optimized to match the most effective services in the research. This means the POP rate 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 based on the SPEP research.

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 LifeSkills Training. 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 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>	

There are five staff trained in the LifeSkills Training curriculum - one Transition Services Manager, one Case Manager, one Director of Case Management, one Clinical Director, and one Regional Clinical Coordinator. Two of the trained staff have facilitated this group during the review period.

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 manual provided to this reviewer was LifeSkills Training by Botvin. The manual contains a script for the facilitator for the groups. It provides lessons and includes implementation guidelines, identifies the order the lessons should be delivered in and includes detailed instructions for the delivery of each lesson.

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>	

The Lifeskills group was observed during the review. The facilitator provided a copy of the lesson plan for the observer from the program manual. The facilitator followed the manual, did not read the lesson verbatim, used her own words to convey the meaning of the discussed topic and did so in an easy to follow manner. The facilitator adhered to the lesson plan in every aspect.

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>	

There has been no recent facilitator turnover that adversely affected the delivery of the LifeSkills Training curriculum to the youth during the review period. However, there was a gap in service from 12/25/17 to 02/06/18. An informal discussion with program administration indicated this was not due to staff turnover, but rather due to the facility not having enough new youth to start a new group. A new Lifeskills group was started on 02/07/18.

A review of the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) revealed an average daily population of 24 youth, with numerous new admissions during the time preceeding the gap in service.

The program can earn 2 points if there are no unnecessary gaps in service.

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

e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring	Basic Score: 2 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>	

Fidelity monitoring was conducted each month for each facilitator while the group was running.

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 documentation provided verified the program has a process for corrective action based on the fidelity monitoring and monitoring checklists specific to the LifeSkills Training curriculum. A review of that documentation and an interview with the Regional Clinical Coordinator revealed there was no corrective action noted nor taken.

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 performance evaluation of the two trained facilitators who conducted group during the review period found entries on their evaluations of the staff's performance in the delivery of the LifeSkills Training curriculum. These included comments on any strengths or weaknesses of which the facilitator should be aware.

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 39 youth in the sample, 18% (7 of 39) 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 15 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 39 youth in the sample, 100% (39 of 39) 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	=	2 youth
Moderate-High	=	11 youth
High	=	26 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>39 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 67%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2		
High	=	26 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	39 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% (39 of 39) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 67% (27 of 39) 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	10	10	100%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	75	85	88%

This SPEP report evaluates LifeSkills Training, an intervention delivered at Bartow Youth Academy.

40 youth completed the program during the review period. Of those youth, 39 had not previously received this intervention in another setting.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The targeted number of weeks for this specific intervention is 15 weeks; the targeted number of hours for this specific intervention is 15 hours. After additional review and discussion with the Peabody Research Institute at Vanderbilt University, the Department determined it was within SPEP standards to deviate from the standard dosage targets for Group 3 services (16 weeks; 24 hours).

The program earned 2 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 39 total youth sampled, all 39 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 8 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 8 and 16 weeks of service, with an average of 11 weeks.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 39 total youth sampled, all 39 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 39 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 15 and 25 hours of service, with an average of 20 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 prior to the youths' admission.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Bartow Youth Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring there are no unnecessary gaps in service.

Bartow 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.