
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
9502 East Columbus Drive
Tampa, Florida 33619

Primary Service: Thinking for a Change (T4C)
SPEP Review Date(s): December 13-16, 2016



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 6/15/2017

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: Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Hillsborough County / Circuit: 13
Review Date(s): December 13-16, 2016

QI Program Code: 1061
Contract Number: R2087
Number of Beds: 50
Lead Reviewer Code: 135

Persons Interviewed

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff	<u>3</u> # Program Supervisors
<input 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>5</u> # Personnel Records
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules	<u>5</u> # Training Records/CORE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal Corrective Action Reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Contracts	<u>3</u> # Youth Records (Closed)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Evaluations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Table of Organization	<u>5</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 (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%
<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 reflected that the program has a training protocol and three staff members received formal training from a qualified trainer to become group facilitators in the Thinking for a Change (T4C) curriculum. An interview with the Clinical Director confirmed that, per their policy, each new facilitator must successfully conduct two cycles with a co-facilitator before they can facilitate a group session 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 has a manual for the delivery of services and provided a copy to the team for reference during the review. The program uses the Thinking for a Change manual by NIC, Version 3.1. The curriculum provides a script and instructions for twenty-five lessons. The curriculum also includes: implementation guidelines, the order the lessons should be delivered, and detailed instructions for the delivery of each lesson. This is considered a closed group, meaning once the group begins, no new youth can be added to the group. The program conducts one T4C cycle at a time. New admissions are placed on a waiting list and will be enrolled in the next class. Group sessions take place on Tuesdays and Thursdays, each one an hour in length and range from one to ten youth at a time per group. Youth are chosen based on their needs as assessed by the RPACT and Youth Needs Assessment Summary.

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>	

This reviewer observed a session of T4C during the review on 12/13/16. The facilitator provided a copy of the lesson plan for the observer from the program manual. The facilitator followed the lesson according to the manual. He did not read the lesson verbatim and used his own words to convey the meaning of the discussed topic, and did so in a very easy to follow manner. The facilitator adhered to the lesson plan in every aspect.

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 and interview with the Regional Program Manager confirmed that there has been no turnover adversely affecting youth during the past twelve months. Turnover occurred in between group cycles. The program addresses turnover by ensuring any potentially affected groups are covered by other G4S staff who are formally trained so that there are no 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>	

The program has an internal process to conduct internal fidelity monitoring specific to T4C. Their process is for the Clinical Director to perform all fidelity monitoring. The Clinical Director is also formally trained in T4C. All facilitators received monthly internal fidelity monitoring during the past twelve months for this intervention.

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 acknowledged 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. There has been no corrective action needed or implemented for any of the facilitators.

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 all facilitators' performance evaluations was completed. The evaluations all contained an entry for the facilitator's abilities to demonstrate an appropriate level of skill when delivering the primary service Thinking for a Change.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 8 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 80%

Research indicates the target duration of 15 weeks for this type of service. Of the 29 youth in the sample, 93% (27 of 29) 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 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 29 youth in the sample, 93% (27 of 29) 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: 76%

Moderate to High Score: 7 Points
Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 58%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	8 youth
Moderate-High	=	7 youth
High	=	7 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>29 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 24%

High Score: 5 Points

Program Optimization Score: 13 Points

Program Optimization Percentage: 38%

Table 2		
High	=	7 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	29 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, 76% (22 of 29) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 7 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 24% (7 of 29) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 5 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	8	10	80%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	8	10	80%
Risk Level of Youth Served	12	25	48%
Totals	83	100	83%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking for a Change (T4C), an intervention delivered at Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 29 total youth sampled, 27 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 13 and 27 weeks of service, with an average of 19 weeks. This measure included both T4C and T4C Aftercare sessions.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 29 total youth sampled, 27 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 29 and 61 hours of service, with an average of 46 hours. This measure included both T4C and T4C Aftercare sessions.

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 (60% 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):

Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility can maintain their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by continuing the processes in place at the time of this review.

Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility 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.