
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Challenge Youth Academy
Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc.

(Contract Provider)
201 Culbreath Road
Brooksville, Florida 34602

Primary Service: Seven Challenges
SPEP Review Date(s): March 22-25, 2016



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 3/24/2017

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: Challenge Youth Academy
Provider Name: Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc.
Location: Hernando County / Circuit: 5
Review Date(s): March 22-25, 2016

MQI Program Code: 76
Contract Number: 10208
Number of Beds: 60
Lead Reviewer Code: 9

Persons Interviewed

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

Documents Reviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks	<u>5</u> # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	<u>5</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 type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization	_____ # Youth Records (Open)
<input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook	_____ # Other: _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports	_____ # Health Records	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Scope of Services	<u>7</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: 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 Seven Challenges. 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.

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>	

At the time of the annual compliance review site visit, two staff were identified as responsible for the delivery of the primary service, Seven Challenges. A review of their training files found one staff had been trained as a trainer of the Seven Challenges curriculum. The other staff was trained to deliver the primary service, Seven Challenges as well. The training was delivered by 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 program continues to use the Seven Challenges curriculum, which was written by Dr. Robert Schwebel. The program also continues to use the facilitator and student guides. Students participate in interactive journaling, which focuses on their specific “challenges”. The manual is detailed to the extent that it explains how each specific session is delivered and there is a script or outline for each session. Groups are conducted seven days per week..

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 delivery of the primary service, Seven Challenges, was observed during the annual compliance review. The facilitator was the trainer of the Seven Challenges curriculum. An informal interview was conducted with the facilitator. One youth had written a journal entry on his relapse prevention plan. The facilitator and group participants were going to discuss the relapse

prevention plan and how it related to the different Seven Challenges. All youth had a student guide, which they referenced during the group. The facilitator and group participants identified the challenges and related it to the implementation of the relapse prevention plan. The facilitator adhered to the manual.

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>	

Four facilitators delivered the primary service of Seven Challenges during the past year. One facilitator had delivered the primary service continuously during this timeframe. One facilitator left the employment of the program in July 2015. The designated mental health clinician authority (DMHCA), a trained facilitator, facilitated the group for two weeks. A new facilitator has facilitated the Seven Challenges groups since the end of July, the beginning of August 2015. There was no break in the delivery of service for Seven Challenges.

The program can earn 2 points by minimizing facilitator 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: 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>	

The program continues to have a policy for conducting fidelity monitoring of the primary service, Seven Challenges. It is to be conducted on a quarterly basis. Fidelity monitoring was documented during the past year. Two facilitators were responsible for the delivery of the Seven Challenges curriculum. One facilitator had documentation of four fidelity monitoring observations. The other facilitator had documentation of six fidelity monitoring observations during the past year. The former facilitator had documentation of three fidelity monitoring observations, before leaving the employment of the program in July 2015. Fidelity monitoring reports are specific about what has occurred during the group. Fidelity monitoring was conducted by trained facilitators.

The program can earn 2 points by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators.

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 fidelity monitoring observation forms did not indicate that any corrective action was required of the facilitators.

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>	

One facilitator received an annual performance evaluation, which addressed the delivery of the primary service, Seven Challenges. The facilitator received a good rating for facilitating Seven Challenges groups. The other facilitator is on probation and will receive a performance evaluation in July 2016.

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 39 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 39) 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 39 youth in the sample, 5% (2 of 39) 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: 95%

Moderate to High Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Score: 12 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	6 youth
Moderate-High	=	14 youth
High	=	17 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>39 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 44%

High Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2		
High	=	17 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	39 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, 95% (37 of 39) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 44% (17 of 39) 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	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	0	10	0%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	75	95	79%

This SPEP report evaluates Seven Challenges, an intervention delivered at Challenge Youth Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing facilitator turnover and by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 39 total youth sampled, none included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module of JJIS. Without end dates, it is impossible to calculate a duration score.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 39 total youth sampled, only 19 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth with dosage, only 2 received at least 40 hours of service.

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):

Challenge Youth Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by minimizing facilitator turnover and by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators.

Challenge 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.