
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

**Broward Girls Academy
Youth Services International, Inc.**

(Contract Provider)
8301 South Palm Drive
Pembroke Pines, Florida 33025

Primary Service: Aggression Replacement Training (ART)

SPEP Review Date(s): October 6-9, 2015



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 3/21/2016

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: **Broward Girls Academy**
Provider Name: **Youth Services International, Inc.**
Location: **Broward** County / Circuit: **17**
Review Date(s): **October 6-9, 2015**

QI Program Code: **1175**
Contract Number: **R2074**
Number of Beds: **30**
Lead Reviewer Code: **139**

Persons Interviewed

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director | <input type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | _____ # Program Supervisors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor | 2 # Case Managers | _____ # Youth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee | 3 # 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks | _____ # Personnel Records |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | _____ # Training Records/CORE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts | _____ # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations | <input 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 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 Aggression Replacement Training (ART). 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): 8 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 six staff trained in Aggression Replacement Training (ART) working in the program during the annual compliance review. Each of the facilitators providing ART completed formal training in the primary service and received certificates from an ART master trainer-consultant. The clinical director originally completed ART training in November 2012. Three of five staff were trained in ART in 2014, and two staff were trained in 2015. Three staff members are no longer employed by the program.

| | |
|---|---|
| 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 Aggression Replacement Training (ART) facilitator's manual, which details how ART groups are delivered to youth. The manual provides an overview of the curriculum, including number of sessions, outlines, and preparations needed for groups.

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

A session of ART was observed during the annual compliance review, which was a lesson in moral reasoning. A copy of the lesson was provided to the annual compliance review team member prior to the group session. The facilitator adhered to the manual throughout the delivery of the session. The facilitator did not read the script verbatim during the activity, rather utilized her

own words to convey the meaning of the topic under discussion. Youth participated actively in the discussion while adhering to the group rules of taking turns and not interrupting.

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

Six staff and interns were trained in the primary service ART; however, only four of those staff were still employed with the program during the annual compliance review period. The four clinical staff delivering the primary service ART during the review period included the clinical director who conducted fidelity monitoring. The facilitator of the primary service changed during service provision; however, the service continued uninterrupted. The ART group sessions were facilitated by different facilitators on multiple occasions based on the facilitator schedules, rather than the same facilitator for all lessons each group.

The program can earn 2 points if facilitator turnover does not impact groups.

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

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

Reviewed documentation validated staff members who performed fidelity monitoring were trained by a qualified trainer. The director of clinical services is trained in the primary service Aggression Replacement Training (ART) and conducts internal fidelity monitoring at the program by sitting in on each facilitator's group for the entire group session. The program provided documentation of fidelity monitoring specific to the primary service, ART, for previously completed groups. Fidelity monitoring for previous groups was conducted on a monthly basis; however, fidelity monitoring did not take place in May for two staff, each of whom facilitated ART groups. On the fidelity adherence checklist, there is a section for the facilitator's self-evaluation and ideas for improvement and a listing of whether corrective action is needed. These signed documents were maintained in an ART binder along with the ART sign-in sheets.

The program can earn 2 points if fidelity monitoring is completed every month for every 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> | |

The program has a process to provide corrective action based on fidelity monitoring. Reviewed monthly fidelity adherence checklists included one instance documenting the need for corrective action to ensure each of the three components of ART were conducted once per week and for each sign-in sheet to clearly identify the topic covered during that session. Corrective action was applied and demonstrated, based on the documented findings in the fidelity monitoring report. Reviewed attendance sheets indicated the printed session times were corrected to reflect a one hour session.

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

There is evidence of biannual and annual performance evaluations of therapists including assessment of the therapist proficiency in delivering the primary service Aggression Replacement Training (ART). The performance evaluations were completed for two facilitators, by the director of clinical services, who is trained in the primary service but does not facilitate groups. One ART facilitator's annual performance evaluations was not available because the staff member is no longer employed with the program.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

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

Research indicates the target duration of 10 weeks for this type of service. Of the 6 youth in the sample, 100% (6 of 6) 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 30 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 6 youth in the sample, 100% (6 of 6) 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 | = | 0 youth |
| High | = | 4 youth |
| <u>Total Youth in Sample</u> | = | <u>6 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 | = | 4 youth |
| Total Youth in Sample | = | 6 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% (6 of 6) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 67% (4 of 6) 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 | 10 | 10 | 100% |
| Amount of Service: Contact Hours | 10 | 10 | 100% |
| Risk Level of Youth Served | 25 | 25 | 100% |
| Totals | 100 | 100 | 100% |

This SPEP report evaluates Aggression Replacement Training, an intervention delivered at Broward Girls Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 6 total youth sampled, all received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 10 and 14 weeks of service, with an average of 11.5 weeks. The targeted number of weeks for this specific intervention is 10 weeks. In previous SPEP review years, ART was held to the same standard as other Group 5 Services (15 weeks); however, according to Dr. Lipsey's SPEP research, ART meets criteria for an exception to the standard SPEP 15-week dosage target. Youth are considered to have met the target if they achieve 80% of the dosage specified in the ART manual.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 6 total youth sampled, all received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 26 and 45 hours of service, with an average of 34.6 hours. The targeted number of hours for this type of intervention is 30 hours. In previous SPEP review years, ART was held to the same standard as other Group 5 Services (45 hours); however, according to Dr. Lipsey's SPEP research, ART meets criteria for an exception to the standard SPEP 45-hour dosage target. Youth are considered to have met the target if they achieve 80% of the dosage specified in the ART manual.

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):

Broward Girls Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by minimizing facilitator turnover and ensuring fidelity monitoring is completed every month for every facilitator.