

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

**Okaloosa Youth Development Center**  
***Gulf Coast Youth Services***  
(Contract Provider)  
4449 Straightline Road  
Crestview, Florida 32539

***Primary Service: Impact of Crime***  
*SPEP Review Date(s): January 5-8, 2016*



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 3/27/2017*

## 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: Okaloosa Youth Development Center  
Provider Name: Gulf Coast Youth Services  
Location: Okaloosa County / Circuit: 1  
Review Date(s): January 5-8, 2016

QI Program Code: 1165  
Contract Number: R2079  
Number of Beds: 25  
Lead Reviewer Code: 127

**Persons Interviewed**

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | <u>1</u> # Program Supervisors            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor       | <u>5</u> # Case Managers                                  | <u>3</u> # Youth                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee   | <u>2</u> # Clinical Staff                                 | <u>5</u> # Other (listed by title): _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee | <u>3</u> # Healthcare Staff                               |   |

**Documents Reviewed**

- |   |   |                                   |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <input 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        | <u>5</u> # Youth Records (Open)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook    | _____ # Other: _____              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports              | <u>5</u> # Health Records                             |                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract Scope of Services               | <u>5</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: 20 Points  
POS: 20 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 Impact of Crime. The program was awarded 15 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 3 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Social Skills Training. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it focuses on developing social skills required for an individual to interact in a positive way with others.

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 POS: 20 Points 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) 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>	

Interview with the treatment coordinator revealed one staff member is trained on Impact of Crime for each side of the program.

<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 program uses the Impact of Crime (IOC) curriculum. The manual consists of worksheets and detailed lesson plans. Each group session has an introduction, guided group discussion activity, worksheets, and a conclusion/wrap-up.

<b>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: N/A 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 group was not observed during the review. This indicator rates as not applicable.

<b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s) 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>	

A review of documents and interview with the treatment coordinator revealed there has not been any gaps in service delivery or facilitator turnover.

The Impact of Crime groups are ongoing and there is no indication of a break in service delivery since the last review.

<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>	

An interview with the treatment coordinator indicated the intervention groups were observed for fidelity monitoring each month. A review of the fidelity monitoring documents found the treatment coordinator conducts the fidelity monitoring sessions. The treatment coordinator is a licensed Clinical Social Worker and has received the required training to conduct fidelity monitoring of the facilitators. There was documentation the designated mental health clinician authority (DMHCA) had completed the train-the-trainer training.

Because fidelity monitoring did not identify a critical issue, 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>	

Interviews with the designated mental health clinician authority (DMHCA) and the treatment coordinator, along with a review of documentation, indicated there has not been an incident requiring corrective action identified based upon the fidelity monitoring. Unfortunately, none of the fidelity monitoring sessions addressed the issue of the group being run as open group instead of a closed group.

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

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>	

A review of the annual performance evaluations for the facilitators personal indicated the results of facilitator's performance on presenting the curriculum as prescribed was included in the evaluation.



### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 0 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates the target duration of 16 weeks for this type of service. Of the 0 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 0) 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 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 0 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 0) 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: 0 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 0%

Moderate to High Score: 0 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Moderate	=	0 youth
Moderate-High	=	0 youth
High	=	0 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>0 youth</u>



Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 0%  
 High Score: 0 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Table 2	
High	= 0 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 0 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, 0% (0 of 0) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 0 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 0% (0 of 0) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 0 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	20	20	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	0	25	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>35%</b>

This SPEP report evaluates Impact of Crime, an intervention delivered at Okaloosa Youth Development Center.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by ensuring IOC is run as a closed group, as designed.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration and Amount of Service: Contact Hours. There was no data entered into the Juvenile Justice Information system (JJIS) Evidence-Based Services (EBS) module for any youths. With no JJIS data to review, the SPEP score was reduced. The program must enter dosage data into JJIS in order to receive any score in this area.

The program was awarded 0 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):**

Okaloosa Youth Development Center can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by running IOC according to the curriculum design.

Okaloosa Youth Development Center 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.