
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: Impact of Crime (IOC): Addressing the Harm to Victims
and the Community***

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: **104**

Persons Interviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director	<input type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff	_____ # Program Supervisors
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor	2 # Case Managers	_____ # Youth
<input type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee	_____ # 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 type="checkbox"/> Logbooks	_____ # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	_____ # Training Records/CORE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts	_____ # Youth Records (Closed)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization	_____ # Youth Records (Open)
<input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports	<input checked="" 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: 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 (IOC): Addressing the Harm to Victims and the Community. 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: 10 Points POS: 20 Points POP: 50%
<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): 5 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>	

Reviewed documentation reflected the program's four direct care staff member and the director of clinical services have each received formal training from a qualified trainer to become a group facilitator in the primary service Impact of Crime (IOC). The five staff have facilitated group sessions since the last annual compliance review. Two of the five staff members were trained in 2013 and three staff members were trained in 2014.

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 provides the Department's Impact of Crime (IOC) 2.0 curriculum, which is a practice with demonstrated effectiveness, to all applicable youth admitted to the program. The facilitators use the IOC manual to conduct each group. The manual contains the order of the lessons to be delivered, lesson plans for each session, and delivery guidelines for the facilitator. Each group session has an outline, a guided group discussion activity, worksheets, and a conclusion/wrap-up discussion about the material covered.

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>	

Observations and interviews with the facilitator during the annual compliance review supported the primary service Impact of Crime (IOC) was delivered utilizing the Department's IOC curriculum. A copy of the lesson was provided to the annual compliance review team member

prior to the group session. Observations during the session found the facilitator adhered to the lesson plan and the facilitator did not read the script verbatim during the activity, rather utilized their own words to convey the meaning of the topic under discussion.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 0 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>	

Reviewed documentation and an interview with the director of clinical services found there have been gaps in service delivery and turnover of facilitators related to IOC. The program facilitated one cycle of Impact of Crime during the time frame of October 2014 through December 2014; however, all objectives were not completed or covered during this timeframe. The director of clinical services indicated the facilitator left the agency during the IOC cycle. The next cycle of IOC began on May 22, 2015, and was continuing during the annual compliance review. Documentation indicated this group also experienced facilitator turnover.

The program can earn 2 points if there is no gap in service delivery and no turnover of facilitator/therapist.

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 and the corporate clinical director is trained in the primary service Impact of Crime (IOC) and conducts internal fidelity monitoring at the program by sitting in on each facilitator's group for the entire group session. Documentation indicated the program did not conduct fidelity checks on a monthly basis. There was no documentation of fidelity checks being conducted for May, June, July, August, and September 2015. One fidelity check was completed for the current cycle in October 2015. The program utilizes an IOC-specific fidelity adherence checklist. On the checklist, there is a corrective action follow-up component, which incorporated any applicable recommendations identified during fidelity monitoring. These signed documents are maintained in an IOC binder along with the IOC sign-in sheets.

The program can earn 2 points if fidelity monitoring is completed every month for each 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: 0 Point Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
--	---

The program has a process by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the delinquency intervention/therapeutic service.

When fidelity monitoring was done there were consistent critiques and recommendations, when applicable, where the fidelity monitor provided constructive feedback to the facilitator. The facilitator's signature on the fidelity monitoring checklist acknowledged the constructive feedback. There is no documentation of any deficiencies being corrected.

g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention

Basic Score: 0 Point
Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point

Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.

A review of the one current facilitator's annual performance evaluation found the staff's performance in delivering the primary service Impact of Crime (IOC) was not evaluated. The four remaining IOC facilitator's annual performance evaluations were not available because the staff members were no longer employed with the company.

The program can earn 1 point if each facilitator's performance evaluation includes an assessment of the facilitators' proficiency in delivering the Primary Service.

At the time of the review, the program did not meet criteria to earn a score of 1.

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 4 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 4) 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: 0 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates a target of 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 4 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 4) 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	=	2 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>4 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	=	2 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	4 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% (4 of 4) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 50% (2 of 4) 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	10	20	50%
Amount of Service: Duration	0	10	0%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	55	85	65%

This SPEP report evaluates Impact of Crime, an intervention delivered at Broward Girls Academy.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing turnover, completing fidelity monitoring monthly, and including an assessment of skill in delivering IOC in each facilitator's performance evaluation.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 4 total youth sampled, only 3 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 0 received at least the recommended weeks of service. All youth completed 9 weeks of service.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 4 total youth sampled, 0 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 3 and 15 hours of service, with an average of 11 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):

Broward Girls Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by working to minimize turnover and completing monthly fidelity monitoring.

Broward Girls 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.