

---

# Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

---

**Miami Youth Academy**  
***G4S Youth Services, LLC***  
(Contract Provider)  
10855 SW 84th Street  
Miami, Florida 33173

***Primary Service: Impact of Crime***  
***SPEP Review Date(s): August 16-19, 2016***



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Report Date(s): 5/30/2017*

## 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: Miami Youth Academy  
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC  
Location: Miami-Dade County / Circuit: 11  
Review Date(s): August 16-19, 2016

MQI Program Code: 1289  
Contract Number: 10000  
Number of Beds: 24  
Lead Reviewer Code: 149

**Persons Interviewed**

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Director  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corporate QI/QA staff | <b>3</b> # Program Supervisors                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DJJ Monitor                  | <b>2</b> # Case Managers                                  | <b>10</b> # Youth                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DHA or designee              | <b>3</b> # Clinical Staff                                 | <b>8</b> # Other (listed by title): <u>Youth</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DMHCA or designee | _____ # Healthcare Staff                                  | <b>Care Specialist</b>                           |

**Documents Reviewed**

- |  |   |                                  |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual            | <input type="checkbox"/> Logbooks                     | <b>8</b> # Personnel Records     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | <b>8</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: 20 Points  
POS: 20 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 Impact of Crime. The program was awarded 15 points because the Primary Service is identified as a Group 3 Service. The specific Sub-Component Service Type identified is Social Skills Training. The Primary Service was identified as this type of service as it focuses on developing social skills required for an individual to interact in a positive way with others.

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): 6 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: 1 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 program's documentation reflected the program had a training protocol and four staff members received formal training from a qualified trainer to become a group facilitator in Impact of Crime (IOC). The clinical director was trained in December, 2015 and two youth specialists were also trained in December, 2015. A youth specialist was trained August, 2014. Two staff members have facilitated groups during the last twelve months.

<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 has a manual for the delivery of services and provided a copy for the annual compliance review team to reference during the review. The program currently uses the Impact of Crime (IOC) curriculum. The curriculum provides a script and instructions for seven chapters with twenty-four lessons. The curriculum also includes implementation guidelines, identifies the order how each chapter and lessons within should be delivered, and includes detailed instructions for the delivery of each lesson.

<b>c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol</b>	<b>Basic Score: N/A Point(s)</b> <b>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; therefore, this indicator rates as non-applicable.

<b>d. Facilitator Turnover</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s)</b>
--------------------------------	--------------------------------

	<b>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>	

The reviewed documentation and interviews with the clinical director and corporate clinical services director confirmed there has been no turnover adversely affecting the youth during the past twelve months. The program’s policy and procedures regarding turnover is the anticipated turnover is addressed by ensuring any potentially affected groups are co-facilitated at the outset.

<b>e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 2 Point(s)</b> <b>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>	

The team reviewed twelve months of internal fidelity monitoring reports. The program had an internal process to conduct internal fidelity monitoring specific to the Impact of Crime (IOC); their process was the clinical director and case manager director performed all IOC fidelity monitoring. The clinical director and case manager director were also trained in IOC. One staff member received internal fidelity monitoring during the months September through December, 2015. Another staff received fidelity monitoring from January through July, 2016. Fidelity monitoring was conducted during all other applicable months for each facilitator of the primary service.

<b>f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 Point</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
<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 corporate clinical services director verified the program has a process for corrective actions based on fidelity monitoring conducted. The program uses internal fidelity monitoring/corrective action checklists specific to Impact of Crime (IOC). Each fidelity monitoring checklist includes a section for feedback and recommendations for facilitator improvement. Each completed checklist included feedback the facilitator did not require any corrective action, or included recommendations for future improvement. The reviewed month’s checklist did not include comments indicating the previous months’ recommendations were applied and demonstrated. The fidelity monitoring checklist from September 24, 2015, did not match the lesson listed on the sign-in sheet for September 24, 2015. Although the sign-in sheets reflect a staff member was regularly facilitating IOC groups on Tuesdays and Thursdays, the case manager director mentions this staff member was asked at the last minute to facilitate group and he “accepted the challenge.” During the November, 2015 review, the case manager director recommended for facilitator to review group norms, expectations, and consequences. He also explained on his report the group needed “structure”; these recommendations were not addressed during the December 2015 review. However, what was addressed during the following review is the facilitator failed to review group norms again, which was a recommendation from the previous report. Recommendations from fidelity monitoring review performed on March, 2016, were not confirmed as having been applied and demonstrated by facilitator.

The program can earn 1 point by ensuring that any needed corrective action is implemented and reflected in subsequent internal fidelity monitoring reports.

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

<b>g. Evaluation of Facilitator Skill Delivering the Intervention</b>	<b>Basic Score: 0 Point</b> <b>Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point</b>
<i>Performance evaluations of the facilitators of the specific intervention/service include evaluation of skill in delivering the intervention/service.</i>	

A review of four facilitator's performance evaluations found no entry for evaluation of the staff's performance in delivering IOC. These did not include comments on any strengths or weaknesses of which the facilitator should be aware.

The program can earn 1 point if performance evaluations specifically identify the facilitators' proficiency in delivering IOC.

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

### 3. Amount of Service - Duration

Basic Score: 0 Points  
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points  
Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Research indicates the target duration of 16 weeks for this type of service. Of the 13 youth in the sample, 0% (0 of 13) 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 24 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 13 youth in the sample, 92% (12 of 13) 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	=	4 youth
High	=	8 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>13 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 92%  
 High Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points  
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 8 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 13 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% (13 of 13) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 92% (8 of 13) 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	20	20	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	10	20	50%
Amount of Service: Duration	0	10	0%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	8	10	80%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>74%</b>

This SPEP report evaluates Impact of Crime, an intervention delivered at Miami Youth Academy.

The program scored Medium for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by ensuring that identified corrective action is remedied and documented in internal fidelity monitoring reports, and that facilitators' performance evaluations include an assessment of their performance in the delivery of IOC.

The program earned 0 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 13 total youth sampled, none received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 11 and 12 weeks of service.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 13 total youth sampled, 12 received at least the recommended hours of service. All but one youth completed 24 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):**

Miami Youth Academy can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring that identified corrective action is remedied and documented in internal fidelity monitoring reports, and that facilitators' performance evaluations include an assessment of their performance in the delivery of IOC.

Miami 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.