
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol [SPEP] Report

Polk Halfway House
G4S Youth Services, LLC
(Contract Provider)
2145 Bob Phillips Road
Bartow, Florida 33830

Primary Service: Young Men's Work
SPEP Review Date(s): February 28 - March 3, 2017



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Report Date(s): 6/13/2017

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: Polk Halfway House
Provider Name: G4S Youth Services, LLC
Location: Polk County / Circuit: 10
Review Date(s): February 28 - March 3, 2017

MQI Program Code: 1049
Contract Number: R2095
Number of Beds: 24
Lead Reviewer Code: 152

Persons Interviewed

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

Documents Reviewed

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Written Protocol/Manual | <input type="checkbox"/> Logbooks | 5 # Personnel Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fidelity Monitoring Documents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Schedules | 5 # Training Records/CORE |
| <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Youth Handbook | _____ # Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract Monitoring Reports | _____ # Health Records | |
| <input 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 Young Men's Work. 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.

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): 8 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: 0 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 a protocol for primary service facilitator training, which states the youth care worker or therapist, who are facilitators of the primary service, will have conducted a formalized training from a qualified trainer. Upon review of the primary service, the cohorts were delivered by five facilitators during the SPEP review period. Three of the facilitators are program therapist, one of whom is no longer employed with the program. The additional facilitators are the program’s Regional Clinical Director and the provider’s Chief Clinical Officer. For this primary service, three of the five facilitators completed the minimum required training, Young Men’s Work Facilitator Training, prior to conducting the primary service; dates of training are September 27, 2013, July 24, 2015, and February 4, 2016, as documented in the Department’s Learning Management System (CORE and SkillPro). The Regional Clinical Director facilitated the primary service, YMW, during the SPEP review period and there is no supporting documentation of her YMW training. The Chief Clinical Officer facilitated one YMW session on December 29, 2016; however, there is no supporting documentation of YMW training for this facilitator. The program staff stated both the Regional Clinical Director and Chief Clinical Officer are the trainer for this primary service and conduct the train the trainer for YMW.

The program can earn 1 point if all facilitators are trained to deliver the intervention.

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

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 utilizes the brand-name facilitator manual for YMW, Young Men’s Work: Stopping Violence and Building Community and the Young Men’s Work: Teen Handbook. The program utilized the brand-name facilitator manual for every group session, which were reviewed during

the SPEP review period. The manual is divided into two parts. Part one of the facilitator manual concentrates on the roots of violence and on how to curb violent behavior through allies and other support systems. Part two focuses on self-empowerment and community connection. The manual includes an agenda, a description of each exercise, further suggestions for facilitators, and a guide to the use of the exercise. The Teen Handbook is meant to supplement the curriculum.

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>	

During the SPEP review period, the primary service, Young Men’s Work (YMW), was observed by Monitoring and Quality Improvement (MQI) staff. The facilitator provided the MQI staff, observing the session, with a copy of the lesson being delivered. The facilitator reviewed session # 5 and lesson # 8 with the youth during the observed session. The youth were engaged and all youth participated during the lesson. The facilitator adhered to the manual for both session # 5 and lesson #8 and utilized the white board as an aide when conducting the lesson.

d. Facilitator Turnover	Basic Score: 1 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 program has a protocol for facilitator turnover, which states in the event of facilitator turnover, the co-facilitator will assume the role of the facilitator for the group. The protocol further states, if a co-facilitator is not present, a new qualified facilitator for the primary service will take over conducting the service. A review of the sign-in sheets, during the SPEP review period, documented there was facilitator turnover for the primary service Young Men’s Work. The primary service continued weekly with no gap in service, despite the turnover. The group was facilitated by five facilitators from February 25, 2016 – February 23, 2017. The facilitator, who conducted the group on December 29, 2016, had not facilitated any additional groups during the SPEP review period. There is no documentation this facilitator was able to establish a rapport with the youth of this cohort.

The program can earn 2 points by minimizing facilitator turnover.

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

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 a protocol for fidelity monitoring which, in part, states designated staff are responsible for conducting fidelity monitoring of each facilitator of a primary service on a monthly basis. The protocol further states, the staff conducting the monitoring has received formal training

by a qualified trainer in the primary service. The fidelity monitor is required, per their protocol, to verify the facilitator adheres to the session plan, group size, population, frequency, needed materials, duration and interventions. During the 12 month SPEP review period, the three fidelity monitors, all program therapist, completed the required, Young Men’s Work Facilitator Training on September 27 2013, July 24, 2015, and February 4, 2016, as documented in the Department’s Learning Management System (CORE and SkillPro). During the 12 month SPEP review period, Fidelity Checklists were provided, documenting fidelity monitoring was completed monthly for the 12 month SPEP review period. The fidelity monitoring’s were conducted on February 18, 2016, March 10, 2016, April 28, 2016, May 12, 2016, June 9, 2016, July 21, 2016, August 18, 2016, September 1, 2016, October 6, 2016, November 10, 2016, December 1, 2016, January 19, 2017, and January 26, 2017. The Fidelity Checklist noted all required documentation per the program protocol.

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 protocol for corrective action planning which states in part, based on the results of the monthly fidelity monitoring correction action may be needed. The protocol further states the first stage of addressing areas identified as needing improvement through fidelity monitoring is providing coaching and supervision to the facilitator on that issue by a qualified facilitator in the primary service. The protocol continues, by stating if during additional fidelity monitoring the previously identified area addressed continues to be an issue, the next step is to completing a written warning and placing facilitator on a Performance Improvement Plan. During the SPEP review period there were no corrective action plans and no identified issues on the fidelity monitoring plans.

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>	

The program has a protocol on Annual Evaluation of Service Delivery which states, an annual evaluation of performance will be conducted on all facilitators of each primary service. During the performance evaluation, feedback from the fidelity monitoring tools and an assessment of the facilitator’s skill delivering the primary service, is utilized. A review of three of the five facilitator’s evaluations documented they were conducted during the SPEP review period and included the evaluation of the primary service skills for Young Men’s Work. The facilitator who left employment, left during the month of December 2016; therefore, this facilitator’s evaluation was not completed during the SPEP review period. A review of the Chief Clinical Officer’s evaluation documented it was completed on January 7, 2016, which was prior to the SPEP review period.

3. Amount of Service - Duration

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

Research indicates the target duration of 24 weeks for this type of service. Of the 10 youth in the sample, 90% (9 of 10) 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: 4 Points
Program Optimization Score: 10 Points
Program Optimization Percentage: 40%

Research indicates a target of 40 contact hours for this type of service. Of the 10 youth in the sample, 40% (4 of 10) 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	=	0 youth
Moderate-High	=	3 youth
High	=	7 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	=	<u>10 youth</u>

Percentage of Youth with High-Risk Level to Reoffend: 70%
 High Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Score: 13 Points
 Program Optimization Percentage: 100%

Table 2	
High	= 7 youth
<u>Total Youth in Sample</u>	<u>= 10 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% (10 of 10) youth scored Moderate to High-Risk to reoffend, for a score of 12 points.

Of the SPEP sample, 70% (7 of 10) 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	25	25	100%
Quality of Service Delivery	20	20	100%
Amount of Service: Duration	8	10	80%
Amount of Service: Contact Hours	4	10	40%
Risk Level of Youth Served	25	25	100%
Totals	<u>87</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>92%</u>

This SPEP report evaluates Young Men's Work, an intervention delivered at Polk Halfway House.

The program scored High for Quality of Service Delivery. This score can be optimized if all facilitators are trained to deliver the intervention, and if facilitator turnover is minimized.

The program earned 8 points for Amount of Service: Duration. Of the 10 total youth sampled, all included dosage with end dates in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 9 received at least the recommended weeks of service. Youth in the sample completed between 16 and 36 weeks of service, with an average of 31 weeks.

The program earned 4 points for Amount of Service: Contact Hours. Of the 10 total youth sampled, all included dosage in the EBS Module. Of those youth with correct dosage, 4 received at least the recommended hours of service. Youth in the sample completed between 18 and 40 hours of service, with an average of 36 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):

Polk Halfway House can optimize their SPEP Quality of Service Delivery score if all facilitators are trained to deliver the intervention, and if facilitator turnover is minimized.

Polk Halfway House 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.