
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
7200 Highway 441 North
Okeechobee, Florida 34972

Primary Service: *Skillstreaming the Adolescent*
Review Date(s): *February 23-26, 2016*



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 3/29/2017

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: Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Okeechobee County / Circuit: 19
Review Date(s): February 23-26, 2016

QI Program Code: 1325
Contract Number: 10188
Number of Beds: 30
Lead Reviewer Code: 125

Persons Interviewed

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

Documents Reviewed

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logbooks | _____ # Personnel Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | 8 # 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 | 6 # 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: 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 Skillstreaming the Adolescent. 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.

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 revealed the program had four staff members who have each received formal training from a qualified trainer to become a group facilitator in the primary service Skillstreaming the Adolescent.

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>	

The facilitators utilized the Skillstreaming the Adolescent curriculum. The curriculum contains a general outline, an order of the lessons to be delivered, lesson plans for each session, and implementation guidelines to follow. The facilitator guide does have lesson plans with instructions for conducting each group.

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>	

Observations and interviews with the facilitator during the review supported the primary service Skillstreaming the Adolescent was delivered utilizing the curriculum. A copy of the lesson was provided to the review team member during the group session. The facilitator adhered to the manual throughout the delivery of the session being observed, and used his/her own words to convey the meaning of the topic under discussion. Youth participated in the discussion while adhering to the group rules and not interrupting the session.

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>	

Reviewed documentation and discussion with the director of treatment services confirmed there have been no gaps in service delivery and no turnover of facilitators for this primary service.

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>	

Fidelity monitoring was conducted by a trained staff member each month for each facilitator and the fidelity checklist was specific to the intervention.

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 corrective action process for this primary service. Reviewed documentation found fidelity monitoring was conducted monthly by trained staff. There were consistent critiques and recommendations, if applicable, where the fidelity monitor provided constructive feedback to the facilitator. The facilitator's signature on the fidelity monitoring checklist document acknowledged the constructive feedback and improvements were addressed the next month.

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>	

For those staff who conduct primary service groups, specific comments are included in their annual performance evaluation with specific comments addressing their skill in conducting the primary service groups and their adherence to the curriculum. Two facilitators were acknowledged on their annual performance evaluation in delivering the primary service Skillstreaming. The other two facilitators were not eligible for the evaluation at the time of the review.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

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

Research indicates the target duration of 16 weeks for this type of service. Of the 24 youth in the sample, 88% (21 of 24) 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 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 24 youth in the sample, 54% (13 of 24) 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: 88%
Moderate to High Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 83%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	3 youth
Moderate-High	=	7 youth
High	=	11 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>24 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 46%
 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>= 24 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, 88% (21 of 24) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 46% (11 of 24) 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	20	20	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	8	10	80%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	4	10	40%
Risk Level of Youth Served	23	25	92%
Totals	<u>75</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>88%</u>

This SPEP report evaluates Skillstreaming the Adolescent, an intervention delivered at Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 24 total youth sampled, 21 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 7 and 41 weeks of service, with an average of 24 weeks.

The program earned 4 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 24 total youth sampled, 13 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 16 and 37 hours of service, with an average of 24 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):

Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House can maintain their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring fidelity monitoring continues and any corrective actions are applied and demonstrated.

Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House 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.