
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility
Youth Services International, Inc.

(Contract Provider)
9680 Process Drive
West Palm Beach, Florida 33411

Primary Service:
Aggression Replacement Training (ART)

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



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 9/8/2015

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: Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility
Provider Name: Youth Services International, Inc.
Location: Palm Beach County County / Circuit: 15
Review Date(s): July 14-17, 2015

QI Program Code: 1097
Contract Number: R2112
Number of Beds: 118
Lead Reviewer Code: 104

Persons Interviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff	_____ # Program Supervisors
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor	_____ # Case Managers	_____ # Youth
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee	1 # Clinical Staff	_____ # Other (listed by title): _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DMHCA 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	_____ # Training Records/CORE
<input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts	_____ # Youth Records (Closed)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization	_____ # Youth Records (Open)
<input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation Reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook	_____ # Other: _____
<input checked="" 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: 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 Aggression Replacement Training (ART). 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): 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
<i>All facilitator(s) of the Primary Service must have received formal training specific to the intervention or model/protocol.</i>	

Reviewed documentation reflected the program has ten (10) staff members who have each received formal training from a qualified trainer to become a group facilitator in the primary service Aggression Replacement Training (ART). Four of the ten staff members have facilitated group sessions since the last annual compliance review. Each of the facilitators are a master's-level clinician/therapist, has and have been trained in the cognitive behavioral modality and have received training in the primary service ART through a master-trainer consultant contracted through NBG Consultants (Noel Gillard). One staff member was trained in December of 2014, another in March of 2015, and the remaining eight staff were trained in May of 2015. An interview with the clinical director validated each new facilitator must successfully conduct their first two cycles with a co-facilitator before they can facilitate a group on their own.

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 program utilizes the evidence-based curriculum Aggression Replacement Training (ART) for all applicable youth identified by a risk and needs assessment to be in need of the curriculum. Each ART facilitator is a master's-level clinician/therapist at the program who use a cognitive behavioral modality for each group session. The curriculum consists of three core components: skill-streaming, anger-control training, and moral reasoning. The curriculum contained the order of the lessons to be delivered, lesson plans for each session, delivery guidelines, and a script to follow. The facilitator guide has lesson plans with instructions for conducting each group session.

c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol	Basic Score: N/A 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>	

This curriculum was not able to be observed during the review week; therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable.

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 interviews with the clinical director and corporate clinical services director confirmed there has been no gap in service delivery and no turnover of facilitators since the time of the last SPEP review.

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>	

Reviewed documentation validated multiple program staff conducted fidelity monitoring each month for each facilitator of the primary service Aggression Replacement Training (ART). A review of ART fidelity checklists confirmed the program's practice. Staff whom are trained in the primary service ART conduct internal fidelity monitoring at the program by observing another facilitator's group for the entire group session at least once per month. Internal fidelity monitoring reports consistently include checklists and supervision notes specific to the primary service.

f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring	Basic Score: 0 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 clinical director found a process for qualified staff to develop a corrective action based on the fidelity monitoring observations, if applicable. 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. The program has a practice in place to monitor this corrective action during the following fidelity monitoring session; however, the program's fidelity adherence checklist did not always reflect whether the corrective action was applied and demonstrated.

The program can earn 1 point if the adherence checklists clearly and consistently reflect information about the corrective action being applied and/or demonstrated.

At the time of the review, the program did not meet criteria to earn a score of 1.

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>	

A review of facilitator performance evaluations found an entry for evaluation of the staff's performance in delivering the primary service Aggression Replacement Training (ART). These included comments on any strengths or weaknesses in which the facilitator should be aware.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 6 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 60%

Research indicates the target duration of 10 weeks for this type of service. Of the 25 youth in the sample, 76% (19 of 25) 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: 6 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 60%

Research indicates a target of 30 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 25 youth in the sample, 76% (19 of 25) 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: 92%
Moderate to High Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 83%

Moderate	=	0 youth
Moderate-High	=	6 youth
High	=	17 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>25 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 68%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 17 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 25 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, 92% (23 of 25) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 10 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 68% (17 of 25) 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	6	10	60%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	6	10	60%
Risk Level of Youth Served	23	25	92%
Totals	90	100	90%

This SPEP report evaluates Aggression Replacement Training (ART), an intervention delivered at Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be further optimized by ensuring adherence checklists clearly and consistently reflect information about the corrective action being applied and/or demonstrated when applicable. (see section 2f above).

The program earned 6 points for Amount of Service: Duration. The targeted number of weeks for this specific intervention is 10 weeks. In previous SPEP review years, ART was held to the same standard as other Group 5 Services (15 weeks); however, according to Dr. Lipsey's SPEP research, ART meets criteria for an exception to the standard SPEP 15-week dosage target. Youth are considered to have met the target if they achieve 80% of the dosage specified in the ART manual. Of the 25 total youth sampled, only 19 had dosage recorded in EBS. Of 19 youth

with dosage, all 19 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth received between 9 and 16 weeks of service, with an average of 12 weeks.

The program earned 6 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. The targeted number of hours for this type of intervention is 30 hours. In previous SPEP review years, ART was held to the same standard as other Group 5 Services (45 hours); however, according to Dr. Lipsey's SPEP research, ART meets criteria for an exception to the standard SPEP 45-hour dosage target. Youth are considered to have met the target if they achieve 80% of the dosage specified in the ART manual. Of the 25 total youth sampled, only 19 had dosage recorded in EBS. Of 19 youth with dosage, all 19 received at least the recommended hours of service. All youth received between 30 and 44 hours of service, with an average of 33 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 Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility. The program itself has no control over youths' C-PACT risk level because the scored assessment was administered prior to the youths' admission to Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility. Out of 25 sampled youth, 23 of 25 scored Moderate, Moderate-High, or High on the C-PACT assessment. 17 of 25 scored High risk.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring fidelity adherence checklists clearly and consistently reflect information about the corrective action applied, if applicable.