

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

**DOVE Academy**  
***Twin Oaks Juvenile Development, Inc.***  
(Contract Provider)  
5270Ezell Road  
Graceville, Florida 32440

***Primary Service: Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT)***  
*SPEP Review Date(s): January 19-22, 2016*



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 3/22/2017*

## 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: DOVE Academy  
Provider Name: Twin Oaks Juvenile Development, Inc.  
Location: Jackson County County / Circuit: 14  
Review Date(s): January 19-22, 2016

MQI Program Code: 1102  
Contract Number: R2113  
Number of Beds: 24  
Lead Reviewer Code: 145

### Persons Interviewed

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director  | <input type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | <u>1</u> # Program Supervisors         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor                  | <u>1</u> # Case Managers                       | _____ # Youth                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee              | <u>3</u> # 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              | <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>8</u> # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization | <u>3</u> # Youth Records (Open)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook        | _____ # Other: _____              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports              | _____ # Health Records                                    |                                   |
| <input checked="" 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: 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 Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT). The program was awarded 15 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.*

<b>2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score</b>	<b>Basic Score: 20 Points POS: 20 Points POP: 100%</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): 9 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) 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 has four facilitators for the MRT curriculum. All three have received formal training in the intervention.

<b>b. Treatment Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
<i>There is a specific written manual/protocol detailing delivery of the Primary Service.</i>	

The facilitators utilize the brand-name manual entitled, How to Escape Your Prison. The curriculum is purchased from Correctional Counseling, Inc. Youth receive a student workbook, and the facilitator utilizes a workbook along with the facilitator’s handbook. The handbook gives specific guidelines for youth completing each step. The handbook also gives tips to facilitators on successful management of the group.

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

The intervention/group was observed. The group was conducted according the program schedule. The facilitator provided the reviewer with a copy of the lesson to follow. The session topic discussed was entitled Exploring Anger. The facilitator followed the written manual. Youth were actively engaged with the lesson, and eager to share and present information pertaining to the lesson.

<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 program experienced a turnover of one staff during the year. The program's clinical director facilitated the group until a new therapist was hired and received training. The clinical director has also previously received training in the intervention. There has been no gap in service delivery for more than two weeks due to facility turnover.

The program can earn 2 points by minimizing turnover that impacts a group cohort.

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: 2 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 clinical director is responsible for conducting monthly fidelity monitoring. The program utilizes a fidelity monitoring tool. Documentation indicated that fidelity monitoring had been completed each month since July 2015. Prior to July, fidelity monitoring was being conducted quarterly.

<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>	

A review of program policy, and interview with the Designated Mental Health Authority (DMHA) revealed a process for the DMHA to develop corrective action based on the fidelity monitoring observations. The fidelity monitoring tool contains an area to identify whether any corrective action is necessary based on the review. At the time of the annual compliance review, there was no documentation of the need of a corrective action.

<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>	

A review of the facilitator's annual performance evaluation found an entry for evaluation of staff's performance in delivering the MRT intervention/service.

### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 6 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 60%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 9 youth in the sample, 89% (8 of 9) 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: 8 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates a target of 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 9 youth in the sample, 67% (6 of 9) 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: 23 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 92%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 89%  
Moderate to High Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 83%

Moderate	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	3 youth
High	=	4 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>9 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	= 4 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 9 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, 89% (8 of 9) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 44% (4 of 9) 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	35	35	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	8	10	80%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	6	10	60%
Risk Level of Youth Served	23	25	92%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92%</b>

This SPEP report evaluates Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT), an intervention delivered at DOVE Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by minimizing turnover that impacts a group cohort.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 9 total youth sampled, 8 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 14 and 49 weeks of service, with an average of 29 weeks.

The program earned 6 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 9 total youth sampled, 6 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 44 and 102 hours of service, with an average of 57 hours.



The program was awarded 23 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):**

DOVE Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by minimizing turnover that impacts a group cohort.

DOVE 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.