

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

**Dade Juvenile Residential Facility**  
***TrueCore Behavioral Solutions, LLC***

(Contract Provider)  
18500 SW 424 Street  
Florida City, Florida 33034-7100

***Primary Service: Thinking for a Change***  
***SPEP Review Date(s): February 26-March 1, 2019***



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s):*

## 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: 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 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): 8 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>	

According to documentation provided by the program, all staff facilitating the primary service, or performing internal fidelity, were trained by a qualified trainer. The director of case management, and two case managers are trained in the service.

<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 Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) review encompasses twelve months of records. A review of documents revealed the program utilizes the evidence-based curriculum Thinking for a Change (T4C) 3.1. The program utilizes a highly detailed, commercially produced manual that provides lessons plans, youth worksheets, homework assignments, 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.

T4C utilizes a problem-solving program with both cognitive restructuring, and social skills interventions bringing the identification of thinking, beliefs, attitudes and values to behavior. Effort is focused on helping youth become aware of their thoughts, feelings and beliefs in particular circumstances.

<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>	

This curriculum was not able to be observed; therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable. The program was not conducting a cohort of the primary service.

<b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 Point(s)</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
<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>	

According to documentation provided by the program, no facilitator turnover occurred which had adversely affected service delivery. If a facilitator leaves the program during a cohort, it is the practice that another trained facilitator will immediately replace the facilitator without a break in service.

During the last twelve months, one cohort of the primary service was completed. The cohort started May 2, 2018 and concluded August 8, 2018. There was a gap in service February-April, and August-February, 2018.

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.

<b>e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s)</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
<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, internal fidelity monitoring took place during each month the cohort was active. The internal monitoring was completed by the director of case management, who is trained in the primary service.

<b>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 Point</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
<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>	

According to the documentation provided by the program, there was no need for corrective actions. The program has a policy in place for facilitators who are found to be in need of corrective actions based on the outcomes of monthly fidelity monitoring.

<b>g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 Point</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
<i>Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.</i>	

A review of annual performance evaluations for the staff providing the primary service revealed the evaluations documented the staff as facilitators of the primary service. Additionally, the evaluations specified which service the employee was facilitating, and their 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 10 youth in the sample, 10% (1 of 10) 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 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 10 youth in the sample, 20% (2 of 10) 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	=	5 youth
High	=	5 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>10 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 50%  
 High Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2		
High	=	5 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	10 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% (10 of 10) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 50% (5 of 10) 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	2	10	20%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	82	100	82%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking for a Change, 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 10 total youth sampled, all 10 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 1 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 8 and 17 weeks of service, with an average of 13 weeks.

The program earned 2 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 10 total youth sampled, all 10 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth, 2 received at least the

recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 23 and 48 hours of service, with an average of 38 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):

Dade Juvenile Residential Facility can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring there are no unnecessary gaps in service.

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.