Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

**Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center
(Sex Offense-Specific Services)**

G4S Youth Services, LLC
**(Contract Provider)
5050 North East 168th Street
Okeechobee, Florida 34974**

Primary Service: Thinking For A Change (T4C)
SPEP Review Date(s): March 8-11, 2016

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 4/17/2017

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 Juvenile Offender Correctional Center MQI Program Code: 1047
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC   Contract Number: R2075
Location: Okeechobee County / Circuit: 19   Number of Beds: 96
Review Date(s): March 8-11,2016   Lead Reviewer Code: 123

Persons Interviewed

☒ Program Director   ☒ Corporate QI/QA staff   **2** # Program Supervisors
☒ DJJ Monitor   **3** # Case Managers   **28** # Youth
☐ DHA or designee   **1** # Clinical Staff   **24** # Other (listed by title): **YCW**
☒ DMHCA or designee   **1** # Healthcare Staff

Documents Reviewed

☒ Written Protocol/Manual   ☒ Logbooks   **19** # Personnel Records
☒ Fidelity Monitoring Documents   ☒ Program Schedules   **24** # Training Records/CORE
☒ Internal Corrective Action Reports ☒ Supplemental Contracts   **7** # Youth Records (Closed)
☒ Staff Evaluations   ☒ Table of Organization   **14** # Youth Records (Open)
☐ Accreditation Reports   ☒ Youth Handbook   _____ # Other: **Group sign-in**
☐ Contract Monitoring Reports   **14** # Health Records   **sheets and fidelity reports**
☒ Contract Scope of Services   **14** # 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 Thinking For A Change (T4C). The program was awarded 30 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.

2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score	Basic Score: 20 Points POS: 20 Points POP: 100%
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.*	

Sum of all Indicator Scores (a – g below): 8 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
All facilitator(s) of the Primary Service must have received formal training specific to the intervention or model/protocol.	

The program's documentation reflects the program has a training protocol in which four staff members received formal training from a qualified trainer to become group facilitators in T4C. Within the last twelve months, four staff facilitated groups with one staff filling in as needed.

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

The program has a manual for delivery of services and provided a copy to the reviewer for reference while observing the group. The program currently uses Thinking for a Change (T4C) 3.1. The curriculum provides a script and instructions for twenty – five lessons. The curriculum includes implementation guidelines, the order in which the lessons should be delivered and detailed instructions for delivery of each lesson.

c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol	Basic Score: N/A Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
Upon observation of the Primary Service by the Quality Improvement reviewer, the facilitator of that service adhered to the written protocol/manual.	

This curriculum was not able to be observed, therefore, this section of the SPEP report rates as non-applicable.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points

> *Measures the extent to which facilitators of the specific intervention/service have changed as well as gaps in service of that Primary Service.*

The reviewed documentation and interview with the Program Compliance Manager confirms one of the four trained facilitators resigned from employment with the program, but there were no gaps in service delivery. The program's policy regarding turnover is to have enough staff trained, so a facilitator can step in and run group as the need occurs.

e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring	Basic Score: 1 Point(s)
	Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points
The program has a process to monitor the delivery of the intervention to examine how closely actual implementation matches the model protocol.	

Twelve months of internal fidelity monitoring reports were reviewed. The program has a process for conducting internal fidelity monitoring for the T4C curriculum. The staff members performing fidelity monitoring have been trained by a qualified trainer. Fidelity monitoring has occurred at least twice in the last twelve months for most of the facilitators, but not on a monthly basis. One facilitator was monitored once within the twelve month interval.

The program can earn 2 points by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators.

At the time of the review, the program did not meet criteria to earn a score of 2.

f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring	Basic Score: 1 Point
	Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
The program has a process by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the delinquency intervention/therapeutic service.	

The reviewed internal fidelity monitoring checklist includes a section for feedback and recommendations for facilitator improvement. Each completed checklist included feedback regarding the facilitator's delivery of the primary service, but did not require any corrective actions.

g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention	Basic Score: 1 Point
	Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.	

A review of the four designated facilitators for Thinking for a Change (T4C), ninety-day performance evaluations, and the annual performance evaluations found evidence of the facilitators' being rated on the proficiency in delivering the primary service, T4C.

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 3 youth in the sample, 67% (2 of 3) 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 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 3 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 3) 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: 12 Points
Program Optimization Score: 25 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 48%

Percentage of Youth with Moderate, Moderate-High, and High-Risk Levels to Reoffend: 33%
 Moderate to High Score: 2 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 17%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	0 youth
Moderate-High	=	0 youth
High	=	1 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	3 youth

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 33%
    High Score: 10 Points
    Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
    Program Optimization Percentage: 77%

Table 2		
High	=	1 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	**3** youth

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, 33% (1 of 3) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 2 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 33% (1 of 3) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 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	6	10	60%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	12	25	48%
Totals	73	100	**73**%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking For A Change (T4C), an intervention delivered at Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center (Sexual Offense-Specific Services).

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators.

The program earned 6 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 3 total youth sampled, two of the three received at least the recommended weeks of service. The youth completed 17 weeks of service.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 3 total youth sampled, none received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed 5 or 31 hours of service.

The program was awarded 12 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. Based on the risk level of the youth placed at the program (48% Program Optimization Percentage), the Department should work to ensure a larger proportion of higher risk youth are recommended. As the program serves youth with a history of sexual behavior problems, this includes a multitier strategy of working with stakeholders to achieve that practice, as well as ensuring appropriate treatment services are available in the community to reduce the reliance on residential commitment for lower risk youth presenting with sexually-related offenses.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center (Sexual Offense-Specific Services) can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for all facilitators.

Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center (Sexual Offense-Specific Services) 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.