
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Bartow Youth Academy
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
2415 Bob Phillips Road
Bartow, Florida 33830

Primary Service: Skillstreaming the Adolescent
SPEP Review Date(s): September 29th - October 2nd, 2015



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 4/12/2016

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: **Bartow Youth Academy**
Provider Name: **G4S Youth Services, LLC**
Location: **Polk** County / Circuit: **10**
Review Date(s): **September 29 - October 2, 2015**

QI Program Code: **1268**
Contract Number: **R2118**
Number of Beds: **28**
Lead Reviewer Code: **132**

Persons Interviewed

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | <u>2</u> # Program Supervisors |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor | <u>1</u> # Case Managers | <u>5</u> # Youth |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee | <u>3</u> # Clinical Staff | <u>5</u> # Other (listed by title): Direct |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee | <u>1</u> # Healthcare Staff | Care Staff |

Documents Reviewed

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks | <u>12</u> # Personnel Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | <u>12</u> # Training Records/CORE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts | <u>3</u> # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization | <u>5</u> # Youth Records (Open) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook | _____ # Other: _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports | <u>5</u> # Health Records | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Scope of Services | <u>8</u> # 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: 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 Skillstreaming the Adolescent. 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 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 program had eight facilitators deliver the Skillstreaming curriculum during the annual compliance review period, of which two are clinical directors. A review of the Department's Learning Management System, SkillPro, and staff training files confirms each received the required training from a qualified trainer.

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 facilitators use the Skillstreaming Training manual and Student guides. The manual contains the order of the lessons to be delivered, lessons plans for each session, and implementation guides.

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 facilitator provided the lesson for Skill 27 – Standing Up for Your Rights. The facilitator followed the lesson plan, as described in the facilitator guide.

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| d. Facilitator Turnover | Basic Score: 1 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points |
|--------------------------------|---|

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

Four of the trained facilitators of this curriculum left the program during the annual compliance review period. There were no breaks in service delivery or gaps in service, as another trained facilitator was able to take over the group in each case.

The program can earn 2 points if they minimize staff turnover.

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> | |

The program uses a checklist to monitor the fidelity of this primary service, Skillstreaming the Adolescent. There was documentation of monthly fidelity monitoring for the facilitators of the service, which were completed by two clinical directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| 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> | |

The program has a process for corrective action, if indicated by fidelity monitoring. The process involves progressive disciplinary action, if required. A review of fidelity monitoring documentation indicated corrective action was not required.

| | |
|---|---|
| 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> | |

Facilitator skill delivery was addressed in the performance evaluation of one of the facilitators. The remaining facilitators of the primary service were not due for an annual evaluation until October 2015.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Research indicates the target duration of 16 weeks for this type of service. Of the 14 youth in the sample, 100% (14 of 14) 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: 4 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 40%

Research indicates a target of 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 14 youth in the sample, 50% (7 of 14) 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: 20 Points
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 79%

Moderate to High Score: 7 Points
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 58%

| Table 1 | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Moderate | = | 1 youth |
| Moderate-High | = | 5 youth |
| High | = | 5 youth |
| <u>Total Youth in Sample</u> | = | <u>14 youth</u> |

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 36%

High Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

| Table 2 | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------|
| High | = | 5 youth |
| Total Youth in Sample | = | 14 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, 79% (11 of 14) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 7 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 36% (5 of 14) 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 | 10 | 10 | 100% |
| Amount of Service: Contact Hours | 4 | 10 | 40% |
| Risk Level of Youth Served | 20 | 25 | 80% |
| Totals | 74 | 85 | 87% |

This SPEP report evaluates Skillstreaming the Adolescent, an intervention delivered at Bartow Youth Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing staff turnover.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 14 total youth sampled, all youth reached at least 16 weeks of service. Youth received an average of 24 weeks of service.

The program earned 4 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 14 total youth sampled, 7 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 17 and 38 hours of service, with an average of 24 hours.

The program was awarded 20 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 minimizing staff turnover.

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.