

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

## **Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center/Cypress Creek Treatment Center**

***G4S Youth Services, LLC***

(Contract Provider)

2855 Woodland Ridge Drive

Lecanto, Florida 34461

***Primary Service: Living in Balance***

*SPEP Review Date(s): September 29<sup>th</sup> - October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2015*



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 4/12/2016*

## 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: Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center/Cypress Creek Treatment Center

Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC

Location: Citrus County / Circuit: 5

Review Date(s): September 29<sup>th</sup> - October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2015

QI Program Code: 1055

Contract Number: R2078

Number of Beds: 96

Lead Reviewer Code: 9

### Persons Interviewed

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | _____ # Program Supervisors            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor                  | _____ # 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                          | <b>8</b> # Personnel Records      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules      | <b>8</b> # Training Records/CORE  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts | <b>5</b> # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization  | _____ # Youth Records (Open)      |
| <input checked="" 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    | <b>9</b> # 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 Living in Balance. 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): 6 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 conducted training on facilitating the primary service, Living in Balance. One trained facilitator trained two new staff in February 2015. Three other new staff were trained by the same facilitator in July 2015. The trainer was trained as the trainer of the Living in Balance curriculum in May 2014.

<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 utilizes the Living in Balance manual. The manual is detailed and includes a facilitator’s guide, twelve core sessions, role-play exercises, and handouts.

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

This curriculum was not able to be observed during the review week; therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable.

<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 facilitators of the primary service, Living in Balance changed during the service provision to groups of youth, but the service continued uninterrupted. There were no gaps in service.

The program can earn 2 points if they minimize staff turnover.

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>	

Fidelity monitoring was conducted on the delivery of the primary service, Living in Balance. It was done on a monthly basis from April 2015 through September 2015 using a checklist.

<b>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 1 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 continues to have a process for identifying deficiencies with the delivery of Living in Balance. A review of fidelity monitoring checklists found facilitators adhered to the written protocol. No corrective action was needed.

<b>g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 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>	

The annual performance evaluations were reviewed for three facilitators. The performance evaluations included an evaluation of the facilitators' delivery of the primary service, Living in Balance. The probationary evaluations were reviewed for five facilitators. The probationary evaluations did not have an evaluation of the facilitators' delivery of the primary service, Living in Balance.

The program can earn 1 point if all employee evaluations include an assessment of the facilitators' delivery of Living in Balance.

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: 8 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates the target duration of 24 weeks for this type of service. Of the 29 youth in the sample, 97% (28 of 29) 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: 4 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 40%

Research indicates a target of 40 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 29 youth in the sample, 59% (17 of 29) 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: 20 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 72%  
Moderate to High Score: 7 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 58%

Moderate	=	2 youth
Moderate-High	=	8 youth
High	=	11 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>29 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 38%  
 High Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 11 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 29 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, 72% (21 of 29) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 7 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 38% (11 of 29) 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	8	10	80%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	4	10	40%
Risk Level of Youth Served	20	25	80%
Totals	<u>72</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>76%</u>

This SPEP report evaluates Living in Balance, an intervention delivered at Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center/Cypress Creek Treatment Center.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing staff turnover, ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is done at least monthly, and by ensuring that all employee evaluations include an assessment of the facilitators' delivery of Living in Balance. The program scored 7 points in this category - only one point away from a rating of High Quality. It's possible that if the review team had been able to observe a session of LIB during the evaluation, the program might have been able to earn a High Quality rating.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 29 total youth sampled, 28 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, all 28 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 26 and 58 weeks of service, with an average of 43 weeks.



The program earned 4 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 29 total youth sampled, 17 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 33 and 77 hours of service, with an average of 48 hours.

The program was awarded 20 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):

Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center/Cypress Creek Treatment Center can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by minimizing staff turnover, ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is done at least monthly, and by ensuring that all employee evaluations include an assessment of the facilitators' delivery of Living in Balance.

Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center/Cypress Creek Treatment Center can optimize their SPEP Amount of Service score by ensuring that youth receive the full targeted dosage of service.