
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Okaloosa Youth Academy
Gulf Coast Youth Services, Inc.
(Contract Provider)
4445 Straightline Road
Crestview, Florida 32536

Primary Service: ARISE
SPEP Review Date(s): July 14-17, 2015



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 11/4/2015

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 Academy
Provider Name: Gulf Coast Youth Services
Location: Okaloosa County / Circuit: 1
Review Date(s): July 14-17, 2015

QI Program Code: 1160
Contract Number: R2073
Number of Beds: 60
Lead Reviewer Code: 128

Persons Interviewed

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | <u>2</u> # Program Supervisors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor | <u>3</u> # Case Managers | <u>7</u> # Youth |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee | <u>4</u> # Clinical Staff | _____ # Other (listed by title): _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee | <u>2</u> # 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>3</u> # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations | <input type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization | <u>7</u> # Youth Records (Open) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook | _____ # Other: _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports | <u>7</u> # 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 ARISE. 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): 9 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>	

A review of staff training records revealed the staff member facilitating the group had the required training. The staff member was trained to be an ARISE facilitator by a qualified trainer.

b. Treatment Manual/Protocol	Basic Score: 1 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points
<i>There is a specific written manual/protocol detailing delivery of the Primary Service.</i>	

The program uses the ARISE instructor manual from the publisher. The manual provides stories, interviews, discussion questions, and posters, but is not detailed to the extent that it explains how each specific session is delivered.

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>	

A group session was observed. The facilitator followed the outline of the ARISE instructor manual to deliver the services to the youth. The youth were observed working on a worksheet from 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 has been no facilitator turnover within the past 12 months. There have been no gaps in service according to the provided documentation.

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 an internal monitoring process for fidelity. The Licensed Mental Health Counselor/ Clinical Supervisor observes groups monthly. The clinical coordinator offers assistance as needed and guidance when necessary.

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 program has a process in place should corrective action be required. There was no documentation to support corrective action was needed.

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>	

The facilitator received an annual evaluation in which she was specifically evaluated on the groups she facilitated with no issues noted in her performance of group facilitation.

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 36 youth in the sample, 5% (2 of 36) 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 40 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 36 youth in the sample, 83% (30 of 36) 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: 97%
Moderate to High Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Moderate	=	8 youth
Moderate-High	=	14 youth
High	=	13 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>36 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 36%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 13 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 36 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, 97% (35 of 36) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 36% (13 of 36) 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	8	10	80%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	83	95	87%

This SPEP report evaluates ARISE, an intervention delivered at Okaloosa Youth Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 36 total youth sampled, only 3 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those 3 youth with correct dosage, 2 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 19 and 32 weeks of service, with an average of 26 weeks.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 36 total youth sampled, only 34 included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 30 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 10 and 52 hours of service, with an average of 49 hours.

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):

Okaloosa Youth Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring the manual used is detailed and specifies the frequency and duration of the service, a general outline or lesson plan that applies to each topic delivered and the order in which the topics are to be delivered.

Okaloosa 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.