
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
9502 East Columbus Drive
Tampa, Florida 33619

Primary Service: Thinking For A Change
SPEP Review Date(s): January 12-15, 2016



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 4/4/2017

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: Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Hillsborough County / Circuit: 13
Review Date(s): January 12-15, 2016

MQI Program Code: 1061
Contract Number: R2087
Number of Beds: 50
Lead Reviewer Code: 135

Persons Interviewed

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | 3 # Program Supervisors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor | 2 # Case Managers | 7 # Youth |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee | 2 # Clinical Staff | _____ # Other (listed by title): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee | 2 # Healthcare Staff | |

Documents Reviewed

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks | 7 # Personnel Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | 7 # Training Records/CORE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts | _____ # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization | _____ # Youth Records (Open) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook | _____ # Other: _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports | 7 # Health Records | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Scope of Services | 7 # 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 Thinking For A Change. 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): 10 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 has a licensed mental health counselor (LMHC) who has received the required training to serve as a juvenile sex offender therapist and is on site forty hours a week. The program also has four staff members, all have been trained in the Thinking For A Change curriculum. All five training files contained documentation of certification in the Thinking For A Change curriculum. Two of the five staff members have facilitated group sessions since the last annual compliance review. The remaining three conduct fidelity monitoring.

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>	

Facilitators receive formal training for Thinking For A Change (T4C) prior to facilitating the groups. Thinking For A Change training is provided Thinking For A Change training includes an overview of the curriculum, a breakdown of the sessions, overview of how to prepare for groups, overview of how to conduct the groups, information on preparing for the next group, service delivery protocol, and fidelity monitoring. The formal T4C manual is detailed and contains all sections of the curriculum.

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 program-developed Thinking For A Change (T4C) manual contains lessons and handouts for each Phase of treatment. The manuals are detailed and guide the therapist and youth through the curriculum. Two sessions of Thinking For A Change groups were observed. The quality improvement review team observed a session of T4C during the review.

The facilitator was prepared for the lesson and came to group with all necessary items. A sign in sheet was present and the facilitators were aware of what youth should be in the group. The group began with introductions, a review of the last session, and an introduction to today's topic. Youth appeared comfortable with the process and shared openly. Youth were respectful and cooperative. The group facilitator was respectful of the youth and guided them through the group lesson. All areas of the lesson were covered and adequate examples were used to assist the youth in learning new skills. Groups were run based on the curriculum.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 2 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>	

There have been no gaps in service delivery and no turnover of facilitators since the last annual compliance review. Facility has additional facilitators who are trained to facilitate delinquency intervention groups as back-ups. Additional staff will be trained on an as needed basis in the event staff turnover occurs.

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 has conducted monthly fidelity checks for this primary service by trained facilitators. In an event there is an issue identified during the primary service which is detrimental to the youth's safety and/or treatment, the matter will be taken up directly with the program's Human Resource Manager and be addressed in accordance with the employee handbook. The program has utilized seven facilitators to facilitate groups during the review period. A trained facilitator conducted each fidelity check. Training was verified for each facilitator. Group fidelity checks were reviewed and verified during the site monitoring.

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>	

A review of the programs fidelity monitoring documentation date range January 2015-January 2016 no evidence of a need for corrective action during the SPEP review cycle. Reviewed documentation and signatures of both the facilitator and the observer confirmed the facilitators received feedback and recommendations from the person conducting the fidelity check.

g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention

**Basic Score: 1 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 performance evaluations of all facilitators of the primary services included evaluation of skill in delivering the primary service. Each of the reviewed documentation included specific feedback regarding their delivery of the specific interventions being delivered.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 2 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 20%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 21 youth in the sample, 24% (5 of 21) 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 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 21 youth in the sample, 10% (2 of 21) 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: 8 Points
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 32%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 71%
Moderate to High Score: 5 Points
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 42%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	4 youth
Moderate-High	=	7 youth
High	=	4 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>21 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 19%
 High Score: 3 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 23%

Table 2	
High	= 4 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 21 youth</u>

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, 71% (15 of 21) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 5 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 19% (4 of 21) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 3 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	2	10	20%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	8	25	32%
Totals	65	100	65%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking For A Change (T4C), an intervention delivered at Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 2 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 21 total youth sampled, 5 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 9 and 28 weeks of service, with an average of 14 weeks.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 21 total youth sampled, 2 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 29 and 42 hours of service, with an average of 32 hours. This calculation included those youth who participated in both Thinking For a Change and Thinking For a Change Aftercare sessions.

The program was awarded 8 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. Based on the risk level of the youth placed at the program (32% Program Optimization Percentage), the Department should work to ensure a larger proportion of higher risk youth are recommended. As the program serves youth with a history of sexual behavior problems, this includes a multitier strategy of working with stakeholders to achieve that practice, as well as ensuring appropriate treatment services are available in the community to reduce the reliance on residential commitment for lower risk youth presenting with sexually-related offenses.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility 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.