
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Palmetto Youth Academy
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
14494 Harlee Rd.
Palmetto, Florida 34221

Primary Service: Thinking For A Change
SPEP Review Date(s): March 22-25, 2016



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 5/4/2017

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: Palmetto Youth Academy
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Manatee County / Circuit: 12
Review Date(s): March 22-25, 2016

MQI Program Code: 1139
Contract Number: 10144
Number of Beds: 48
Lead Reviewer Code: 140

Persons Interviewed

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | <u>3</u> # Program Supervisors |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor | <u>2</u> # Case Managers | <u>7</u> # Youth |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee | <u>2</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>9</u> # Personnel Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | <u>9</u> # Training Records/CORE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts | <u>5</u> # Youth Records (Closed) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations | <input checked="" 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: 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): 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>	

The program has four facilitators trained in the Thinking for a Change (T4C) curriculum. One of the four facilitators conducted groups during the last twelve-month period. A review of the facilitators training files contained documentation each facilitator was trained in the T4C curriculum. A qualified trainer trained all facilitators in the primary service.

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 is utilizing the Thinking for a Change (T4C) curriculum from the National Institute of Corrections Thinking for a Change Manual Version 3.1. All youth admitted to the program who are identified by the risk and needs assessment as in need of T4C are enrolled in the next available group. A review of the manual indicated it was very detailed and explains how each specific session is to be delivered and there is an outline for each 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>	

The review team could not observe the primary service during the annual compliance review due to time constraints. The primary service was being held every Monday and Wednesday at 4:00 p.m. The program did provide the reviewer with a copy of the lesson plan from the programs manual, prior to the facilitator teaching the class.

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 documentation confirmed there was no turnover and the same facilitator conducted all groups over the reviewed twelve-month period. There was a gap of approximately five months between the February 2015 class and the June 2015 class, due to the program waiting for new youth to enter the facility and be ready to start a new closed group.

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 Director of Case Management and Transition Service Manager were the only two staff members who performed fidelity monitoring for the Thinking for a Change curriculum. Both the fidelity monitors have been certified to teach the primary service. The program provided twelve-months of internal fidelity monitoring reports to confirm they have been in compliance with performing fidelity monitoring. The program utilizes fidelity adherence checklist to document fidelity monitoring. The program had fidelity adherence checklists for each month the primary service was taught by the one facilitator.

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 by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the primary service. The program utilizes internal fidelity monitoring corrective action checklists to specify if a facilitator is in need of corrective action or improvement. A review of the completed checklists for the last twelve months indicated there was no corrective action or improvement needed for the facilitator who conducted all T4C groups.

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 performance evaluation was completed on the one facilitator who delivered Thinking for a Change (T4C) interventions over the last year. The evaluation contained an entry for the evaluation of the facilitators' abilities and skills to deliver the primary service.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 1 youth in the sample, 100% (1 of 1) 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 1 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 1) 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%

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

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

Table 2	
High	= 1 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 1 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% (1 of 1) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 100% (1 of 1) 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	10	10	100%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	0	10	0%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	90	100	90%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking For A Change, an intervention delivered at Palmetto Youth Academy.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Duration. The one youth sampled completed 15 weeks of service.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. The one youth sampled completed 25 hours of service.

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):

Palmetto 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.