
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Dade Juvenile Residential Facility
TrueCore Behavioral Solutions, LLC

(Contract Provider)
18500 SW 424th Street
Homestead, Florida 33034

Primary Service: Impact of Crime
SPEP Review Date(s): February 26-March 1, 2019



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): March 4, 2019

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 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 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): 10 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 SPEP review encompasses twelve (12) months of SPEP records. According to training records maintained in the department's learning management system (SkillPro), all facilitators, and all staff providing internal fidelity monitoring were trained in the primary service. Those employees were the director of case management and three 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 utilizes the commercially produced 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. Homework materials are also utilized in the student manual to re-enforce learned concepts. Impact of Crime is a closed group meaning once a group commences, new youth cannot be added to the group.

Impact of Crime is based on the belief that crime is more than just a legal definition, but rather crime affects the victim, the offender, their families, and the community. The harm caused brings with it the moral responsibility to all involved. The focus of Impact of Crime is to help offenders understand the harm they have created, and then assisting them in taking personal accountability for their actions. Together, the victim, offender, and the community arrive at a viable solution to the repair the harm caused and the offender. Once the harm is repaired, the offender subsequently reintegrates back into the community. 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 annual review, the Technical Assistance Specialist observed the primary service. The group was held in a classroom within the educational building. The group consisted of five youth and was facilitated by a case manager. The facilitator provided a copy of the lesson plan so the observer could follow along. The facilitator followed along with the outline of the lesson. It was the second lesson, as the cohort had just begun two days earlier. The facilitator read the script, but also would put the information in their own words to help facilitate group discussion, answer questions and reinforce key concepts.

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>	

A review of documentation, and an informal interview with the Director of Case Management, confirmed there was no facilitator turnover or gaps in services during the review period. In the event of a facilitator leaving the program, another facilitator trained in the primary service would assume facilitator duties.

According to written documentation provided by the program, three cohorts of the primary service were conducted. The first cohort started May 2, 2018 and completed August 24, 2018. A second cohort ran September 5, 2018 and was completed January 11, 2019. The third cohort ran September 5, 2018 and completed December 19, 2018.

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>	

According to documentation provided by the program, monthly internal fidelity was completed by the Director of Case Management. The director is trained in the service and has experience in delivery of the primary service.

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 twelve months of fidelity monitoring documentation, no need for corrective actions were documented. An informal interview with the Director of Case Management revealed that if a need for corrective action was discovered, the program has a policy in place to improve the facilitator's skills. The facilitator and director would develop a plan to improve the quality of

service delivery. Additional follow up internal fidelity monitorings would then take place to ensure improvement took place.

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 employees either delivering or providing internal fidelity monitoring of the primary service were reviewed. The evaluations rated facilitator's skill in the service delivery. The facilitators evaluations also detail which primary service they were facilitating.

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 33 youth in the sample, 15% (5 of 33) 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 33 youth in the sample, 88% (29 of 33) 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	=	10 youth
High	=	22 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>33 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	=	22 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	33 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% (33 of 33) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 67% (22 of 33) 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.

40 youth completed the program during the review period.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 33 total youth sampled, only 28 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 5 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 3 and 19 weeks of service, with an average of 13 weeks.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 33 total youth sampled, all 33 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 29 received at least the

recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 13 and 32 hours of service, with an average of 25 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):

Impact of Crime is an intervention suitable for all youth. The Department recommends providing this service to every youth in the program.

Dade Juvenile Residential Facility can maintain their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by continuing the processes 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.