

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

**Pompano Youth Treatment Center**  
***Youth Services International, Inc.***  
(Contract Provider)  
3090 North Powerline Road  
Pompano Beach, Florida 33069

***Primary Service: Living in Balance***  
*SPEP Review Date(s): October 20-23, 2015*



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 8/6/2016*

## 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: Pompano Youth Treatment Center  
Provider Name: Youth Services International, Inc.  
Location: Broward County / Circuit: 17  
Review Date(s): October 20-24, 2015

QI Program Code: 1290  
Contract Number: 10112  
Number of Beds: 24  
Lead Reviewer Code: 142

### 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 type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee              | <b>2</b> # 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          | <b>3</b> # Personnel Records     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | <b>3</b> # 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 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: 30 Points  
POS: 30 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 Living in Balance. The program was awarded 25 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 4 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Group Counseling. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it focuses on psychological or interpersonal problems or issues faced by an individual and involves a group of youths interacting with each other.

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.*

<b>2. Overall Quality of Service Delivery Score</b>	<b>Basic Score: 10 Points</b> <b>POS: 20 Points</b> <b>POP: 50%</b>
<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): 5 Points

Overall Quality of Service Delivery Level:

- Low (Raw Score = 5)
- Medium (Raw Score = 10)
- High (Raw Score = 20 Points)

<b>a. Facilitator Training</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 Point(s)</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
<i>All facilitator(s) of the Primary Service must have received formal training specific to the intervention or model/protocol.</i>	

The Living in Balance (LIB) curriculum requires a two-day training from a qualified trainer to become a group facilitator LIB. The two clinical directors did not have evidence to show they received formal training from a certified trainer in Living in Balance. These same staff provide a two-hour training to their staff on delivering LIB.

Reviewed documentation reflected the program had eight staff members who have facilitated group sessions since the last annual compliance review. Each of the facilitators are a master’s-level clinician/therapist. Each received training from the clinical director. In addition to the eight facilitators, the master’s-level recreational therapist facilitated a few sessions; however, there is no documentation reflecting he received any training.

Only two trained staff members remain working at the facility. One of the staff members was trained in September of 2015 and there was no evidence of training for the other, who is the clinical director.

The program can earn 1 point if each facilitator completed formal training in the primary service with a qualified trainer.

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

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

The program utilizes the evidence-based curriculum of Living in Balance (LIB) for each youth. There are twelve core client worksheet sets, representing twelve core client sessions. Also, there are twenty-one supplemental client worksheet sets. The manual outlines the flow of each session.

<b>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: N/A Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
<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 annual compliance review week, therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable.

<b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
<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 confirmed there was a gap in service delivery during April 2015 through May of 2015.

Since the beginning of the primary service, five staff resigned and were replaced by three other staff. Reviewed documentation confirmed at least eight clinical staff have facilitated LIB since the last annual compliance review. There did not appear to be any plan in place to address changes in facilitators to minimize impact on the youth.

The program can earn 2 points if there are no gaps in service or changes in facilitator impacting a group cycle.

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

Note: There was an admission freeze in April 2015.

<b>e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points</b>
<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 the clinical director conducted fidelity monitoring each month for each facilitator of the primary service Living in Balance (LIB). A review of the LIB fidelity checklists confirmed the program's practice. The clinical director is currently conducting internal fidelity monitoring at the program by sitting in on the different facilitators' groups 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.

<b>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 Point Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------

*The program has a process by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the delinquency intervention/therapeutic service.*

An interview with the clinical director found a process for qualified staff to develop a corrective action based on the fidelity monitoring observations. Reviewed documentation found fidelity monitoring was conducted monthly by the clinical director. There were consistent critiques and recommendations, when applicable, where the fidelity monitor provided constructive feedback to the facilitator. The facilitator's signature on the fidelity monitoring checklist document acknowledged constructive feedback. 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 reflect whether corrective action was applied and demonstrated.

The program can earn 1 point if needed corrective action is applied and 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**

*Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.*

A review of facilitator annual performance evaluations found an entry for evaluation of the staff's performance in delivering the primary service Living in Balance. These included comments on any strengths or weaknesses.

### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

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

Research indicates the target duration of 24 weeks for this type of service. Of the 22 youth in the sample, 55% (12 of 22) 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: 8 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates a target of 40 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 22 youth in the sample, 95% (21 of 22) 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: 95%  
Moderate to High Score: 12 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Moderate	=	5 youth
Moderate-High	=	7 youth
High	=	9 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>22 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 41%  
 High Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 9 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 22 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, 95% (21 of 22) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 41% (9 of 22) 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	30	30	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	10	20	50%
Amount of Service: Duration	4	10	40%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	8	10	80%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	<u>77</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>81%</u>

This SPEP report evaluates Living in Balance, an intervention delivered at Pompano Youth Treatment Center.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by ensuring all facilitators are trained by a qualified trainer, turnover is not impacting group cycles, and corrective actions needed are applied and demonstrated.

The program earned 4 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 22 total youth sampled, only 17 included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 12 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 7 and 60 weeks of service, with an average of 34 weeks.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 22 total youth sampled, 21 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 44 and 84 hours of service, with an average of 55 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):**

Pompano Youth Treatment Center can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring all facilitators are trained by a qualified trainer, turnover and gaps in service are minimized, and corrective actions are addressed.

Pompano Youth Treatment Center 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.