

---

# 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: VOICES***  
*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	<b>2</b> # Case Managers	_____ # Youth
<input type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee	<b>3</b> # 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: 30 Points  
POS: 30 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 VOICES. The program was awarded 25 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 4 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Group Counseling. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it focuses on psychological or interpersonal problems or issues faced by an individual and involves a group of youths interacting with each other.

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.*

<b>2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score</b>	<b>Basic Score: 10 Points</b> <b>POS: 20 Points</b> <b>POP: 50%</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): 7 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>	

The program formally trained five therapists in the VOICES curriculum. Three of the therapists were trained on March 12, 2014, one was trained on March 23, 2015, and the last was trained on September 7, 2015. Six bachelor's-level student interns were also trained in VOICES. Training was completed by the director of clinical services for the program who is a certified VOICES trainer. All staff facilitating VOICES groups during the annual compliance review period maintained current certification, however two of the trained therapists are no longer employed at the program.

<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 program provides the primary service by utilizing the facilitator guide, VOICES - A Program of Self Discovery and Empowerment for Girls by Stephanie S. Covington with Kate Calhoun and Kay Young. The facilitator's guide is detailed to the extent it explains the format for delivering each session. Each session is written similar to a lesson plan and provides the structure and content for each topic and activity. There are multiple activities within each session.

<b>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 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>	

A group session was able to be observed. The review team member was provided with a copy of the lesson plan prior to the start of the VOICES group and received copies of the sign-in sheets

and fidelity adherence checklist forms. The observed session included a check-in at the beginning of the session, a teaching component, interactive discussion, and experiential role-play exercises, as well as closure questions. Observations included the youth celebrating each other's strengths and providing supportive statements to each other. Youth were very interactive both in the presentation and discussion.

<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>	

The facilitator of the primary service changed during service provision, but the service continued uninterrupted. One of the trained clinical staff separated from the program during the summer of 2015 and multiple trained staff facilitated each group over the course of sessions dependent upon schedules; however, there were no gaps in service during the specified review period. Each group enrolled in VOICES experienced some change of facilitators during the annual compliance review period.

The program can earn 2 points if there is no turnover impacting group sessions.

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: 1 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>	

The director of clinical services provides fidelity monitoring for the primary service and observes group as a component of fidelity monitoring; however, fidelity monitoring did not take place at least once per month per facilitator for each staff delivering group in the months of May, July, August, and September. Internal fidelity monitoring reports are specific to the primary service. The program utilizes a VOICES-specific fidelity adherence checklist. Completed internal fidelity monitoring reports consistently included checklists and supervision notes specific to the primary service.

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.

<b>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 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>	

The program has a process to provide corrective action based on fidelity monitoring. The program utilizes a VOICES-specific fidelity adherence checklist, including a section to notate corrective

action follow-up. Reviewed monthly fidelity reports included one documented instance with a need for corrective action to ensure each VOICES group was conducted for a minimum of sixty minutes rather than fifty minutes. The documented facilitator's signature on the fidelity monitoring checklist acknowledged the constructive feedback. The program has a practice in place to monitor this corrective action during the following fidelity monitoring sessions; however, the program's fidelity adherence checklist did not reflect whether the corrective action was applied and demonstrated. Reviewed documentation of attendance sheets reflected a correction of the attendance sheets to one-hour session lengths.

The program can earn 1 point if any corrective action needed is applied, demonstrated, and documented.

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

<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>	

There is evidence of biannual and annual performance evaluations of therapists including an assessment of the therapist's proficiency in delivering the primary service VOICES. Two of the five VOICES facilitator's annual performance evaluations were not available because the staff members were no longer employed.

### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 0 Points

Program Optimization Score: 10 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates the target duration of 24 weeks for this type of service. Of the 3 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 3) 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 40 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 3 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 3) 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	=	1 youth
High	=	2 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>3 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	=	2 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	3 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% (3 of 3) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 67% (2 of 3) 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	30	30	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	65	95	68%

This SPEP report evaluates VOICES, an intervention delivered at Broward Girls Academy.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing turnover and enhancing fidelity monitoring practices.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 3 total youth sampled, only 2 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 0 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed 18 weeks of service.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 3 total youth sampled, 0 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 25 and 27.5 hours of service, with an average of 26 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 better planning for facilitator turnover, ensuring fidelity monitoring is completed every month for each facilitator, and following through with corrective actions.

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.