
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Orlando Intensive Youth Academy
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
3150 39th Street
Orlando, Florida 32839

Primary Service: Thinking for a Change
SPEP Review Date(s): May 31- June 3, 2016



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 5/3/2017

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: Orlando Intensive Youth Academy
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Orange County / Circuit: 9
Review Date(s): May 31- June 3, 2016

QI Program Code: 1166
Contract Number: 10145
Number of Beds: 16
Lead Reviewer Code: 97

Persons Interviewed

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

Documents Reviewed

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual | <input type="checkbox"/> Logbooks | _____ # Personnel Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | _____ # Training Records/CORE |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts | _____ # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations | <input type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization | _____ # Youth Records (Open) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook | _____ # Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports | _____ # Health Records | |
| <input 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 Thinking for a Change. 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%
<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>	

The program's documentation showed the program adheres to a formal training protocol offered through a DJJ-approved qualified trainer. The training takes place over a four-day period requiring 32 hours of skilled instruction. The program has seven facilitators trained to conduct this intervention (three serving in the position of Case Manager, two Transition Services, one Administrative Assistant, and one Director of Case Management). During the review period six staff have actively facilitated this intervention.

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>	

Each facilitator is provided with a physical copy of the Thinking for a Change manual during the four-day training. There are no individual workbooks for the youth, the manual includes reproducible handouts and worksheets for the majority of the 25 lessons. The detailed manual is divided into three sections of concentration: Cognitive Self-Change, Social Skills, and Problem Solving. The T4C manual is specific to delivery, script, and outline.

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 session of Thinking for a Change was observed during the review. The lesson title was Stop and Think. The facilitators provided a copy of lesson from the manual for the observer to follow

along. The facilitators followed the lesson according to the manual. The use of visual aids and youth role plays was also used according to 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>	

The reviewed documents and interview with the Director of Case Management supported that the program has not had any facilitator turnover in the past twelve months. In the event of turnover, the program has several trained facilitators that are prepared to rotate into position until other staff are trained to replace the missing facilitators. During this review period, there are no issues with gaps in 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>	

Twelve months of documentation of internal fidelity monitoring reports were reviewed. The program’s internal fidelity process for this curriculum is completed monthly by the Director of Case Management. A total of six different facilitators conducted this group and received fidelity monitoring over the last twelve months.

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>	

An interview with the Director of Case Management verified that the program has a process for corrective action in place as needed to support the fidelity monitoring process. After reviewing the documentation for the twelve-month review period, there were no issues requiring corrective action.

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 review of annual performance evaluations for the, verified that all staff members are evaluated specifically on T4C and are meeting the proficiency standard for facilitating this primary service.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 4 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 40%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 6 youth in the sample, 50% (3 of 6) 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 6 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 6) 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: 100%
Moderate to High Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Moderate	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	0 youth
High	=	5 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>6 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 83%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 5 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 6 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, 100% (6 of 6) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 83% (5 of 6) 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	4	10	40%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	84	100	84%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking for a Change, an intervention delivered at Orlando Intensive Youth Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 4 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 6 total youth sampled, 3 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 12 and 21 weeks of service, with an average of 17 weeks.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 6 total youth sampled, none received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 25 and 41 hours of service, with an average of 33 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):

Orlando Intensive Youth Academy can maintain their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by continuing the same practices in place at the time of this review.

Orlando Intensive 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.