Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House

G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
7200 Highway 441 North]
Okeechobee, Florida 34972

Primary Service: Thinking For A Change (T4C)
SPEP Review Date(s): January 24-27, 2017

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 6/12/2017

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: Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Okeechobee County / Circuit: 19
Review Date(s): January 24-27, 2017

MQI Program Code: 1159
Contract Number: 10188
Number of Beds: 30
Lead Reviewer Code: 125

Persons Interviewed

- ☒ Program Director
- ☐ DJJ Monitor
- ☐ DHA or designee
- ☐ DMHCA or designee

- ☐ Corporate QI/QA staff
- **1** # Case Managers
- **1** # Clinical Staff
- _____ # Healthcare Staff

- _____ # Program Supervisors
- _____ # Youth
- _____ # Other (listed by title): _____

Documents Reviewed

- ☒ Written Protocol/Manual
- ☒ Fidelity Monitoring Documents
- ☐ Internal Corrective Action Reports
- ☒ Staff Evaluations
- ☐ Accreditation Reports
- ☐ Contract Monitoring Reports
- ☒ Contract Scope of Services

- ☐ Logbooks
- ☒ Program Schedules
- ☐ Supplemental Contracts
- ☐ Table of Organization
- ☐ Youth Handbook
- _____ # Health Records
- _____ # MH/SA Records

- _____ # Personnel Records
- **4** # Training Records/CORE
- _____ # Youth Records (Closed)
- _____ # Youth Records (Open)
- _____ # Other: _____

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%
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.*	

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
All facilitator(s) of the Primary Service must have received formal training specific to the intervention or model/protocol.	

Reviewed documentation revealed the program had four staff members who have each received formal training from a qualified trainer to become a group facilitator in the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C) during the first cycle. Two of the four facilitators were no longer employed with the program during the second cycle of T4C. Only one of the two remaining trained staff members, is now running T4C groups one to two times a week.

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

The program currently uses the curriculum of Thinking for a Change (T4C) 3.1 for all youth admitted to the program. Youth are chosen for participation in the T4C group based on their maturity level and level of motivation to change. Facilitators will determine which youth would best benefit from the curriculum. The curriculum provides a script and instructions for twenty-five lessons. The curriculum also includes implementation guidelines, identifies the order the lessons are to be delivered, and detailed instructions for each lesson.

c. Observed Adherence to the Manual/Protocol	Basic Score: 1 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
Upon observation of the Primary Service by the Quality Improvement reviewer, the facilitator of that service adhered to the written protocol/manual.	

Observations and interviews with the facilitator during the annual compliance review supported the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C) was delivered utilizing the T4C 3.1 curriculum.

A copy of the lesson twenty-two was provided to the annual compliance review team member prior to the group session. The facilitator read the script verbatim during each activity and adhered to the manual throughout the delivery of the session being observed. The facilitator did not complete the lesson by the end of the session. Youth participated in the discussion while adhering to the group rules of taking turns, role-plays, and provided feedback.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 2 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points
Measures the extent to which facilitators of the specific intervention/service have changed as well as gaps in service of that Primary Service.	

Reviewed documentation and an interview with the regional clinical director confirmed there have been no gaps in service delivery and no turnover of facilitators since the primary service Thinking for a Change (T4C) began in January 22, 2016. In the event of facilitator turnover, the co-facilitator will assume the role of the facilitator for the group.

e. Internal Fidelity Monitoring	Basic Score: 1 Point(s) Maximum Possible Score: 2 Points
The program has a process to monitor the delivery of the intervention to examine how closely actual implementation matches the model protocol.	

Reviewed documentation revealed staff members who performed fidelity monitoring were trained by a qualified trainer to teach the primary service. Fidelity monitoring was conducted for the first completed cycle of Thinking for a Change (T4C) during the time frame of January 22, 2016 through May 18, 2016. However, the staff member did not receive internal fidelity monitoring in the month of April, 2016. Fidelity monitoring for the second cycle of T4C was conducted during the annual compliance review for the months of October, November, and December 2016. Internal fidelity checklists are utilized to capture specifics of the primary service. On the checklist, there is a corrective action follow-up component which incorporated any applicable recommendations identified during fidelity monitoring. These documents were maintained in a Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) binder along with the T4C sign-in sheets.

The program can earn 2 points by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for each facilitator.

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

f. Corrective Action based on Fidelity Monitoring	Basic Score: 1 Point Maximum Possible Score: 1 Point
The program has a process by which corrective action is applied and demonstrated based on the fidelity monitoring of the delinquency intervention/therapeutic service.	

Reviewed documentation verified the program has a process for the application of corrective actions based on the results of the fidelity monitoring conducted. The program has not had any applicable issues requiring corrective actions. The completed fidelity monitoring forms recorded

the observer's feedback and recommendations, and ideas for improvement in the delivery of the primary service Thinking for a Chance (T4C).

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 one facilitator and a fidelity monitoring staff performance evaluation documents found the two case managers who delivered and observed groups were evaluated on the primary service. The regional compliance manager who conducted fidelity monitoring received an annual evaluation; however, the evaluation did not address internal fidelity for 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 7 youth in the sample, 100% (7 of 7) 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: 10 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Research indicates a target of 45 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 7 youth in the sample, 100% (7 of 7) 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: 100%
    Moderate to High Score: 12 Points
    Program Optimization Score: 12 Points
    Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 1		
Moderate	=	1 youth
Moderate-High	=	5 youth
High	=	1 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	7 youth

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 14%
    High Score: 0 Points
    Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
    Program Optimization Percentage: 0%

Table 2		
High	=	1 youth
Total Youth in Sample	=	**7** 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, 100% (7 of 7) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 14% (1 of 7) youth scored High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 0 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	10	10	100%
Risk Level of Youth Served	12	25	48%
Totals	87	100	**87**%

This SPEP report evaluates Thinking For A Change (T4C), an intervention delivered at Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for each facilitator.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 7 total youth sampled, all received at least the recommended weeks of service. All youth completed approximately 17 weeks of service.

The program earned 10 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 7 total youth sampled, all received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 50 and 51 hours of service.

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.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Okeechobee Intensive Halfway House can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score by ensuring that internal fidelity monitoring is conducted at least monthly for each facilitator.