

	<p><b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH &amp; HUMAN SERVICES</b>  <b>DELINQUENCY AND COURT SERVICES DIVISION</b></p> <h1>Milwaukee County</h1> <p>Héctor Colón • Director                  B. Thomas Wanta • Administrator</p>
---	---

**Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative (JJRRI)  
 Provider Feedback Report/ SPEP Review and Recommendations**

<b>Program/ Organization:</b>	<b>Example</b>
<b>Program Location:</b>	<b>Example</b>
<b>Specific Service:</b>	<b>Example: Mental Health Individual Counseling</b>
<b>Corresponding Service Category:</b>	<b>Example: Individual Counseling</b>
<b>Time Frame Studied:</b>	<b>Example: July 2012 - December 2013</b>
<b>Juveniles represented in the Cohort:</b>	<b>Example: N/A</b>
<b>Criteria Met:</b> ( $\geq 10$ youth and $\geq 80\%$ with Risk Score data)	<b>No*</b> (See Disclaimer)
<b>SPEP Score:</b>	<b>Example: 00</b>
<b>Report Author:</b>	<b>De Shell Parker, DCSD Administrative Coordinator</b>

<b>Provider Feedback Report Components</b>	
Introduction *Disclaimer	
Program Description	
SPEP Components	
	Service Type
	Quality of Service
	Duration of Service
	Contact Hours of Service
	Risk Level of Youth Served
Summary	
Program Strengths	
Program Improvement Capacity	
Conclusion	

### **Introduction**

The Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative (JJRRI) was launched by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in collaboration with the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University and the Peabody Research Institute at Vanderbilt University. This initiative aims to help juvenile justice jurisdictions achieve the high level of accountability that is necessary to operate in an evidence-based and cost effective manner while building on the jurisdiction's current service delivery model.

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) is a tool derived from meta-analytic research and is designed to compare existing juvenile justice intervention programs to the characteristics of the most effective programs found in the research. This scoring system, comprised of the components listed below, allows service providers, as well as county juvenile probation departments to identify areas in which improvements can be made to their existing programs that expect to increase effectiveness for reducing the recidivism of the juvenile offenders treated. In order to utilize the SPEP tool and receive SPEP scores, a service must have served at least 10 juveniles during the selected timeframe and at least 80% of the juveniles must have risk score data from a validated risk assessment tool. Risk scores are assigned based on the Youth Assessment Screening Instrument (YASI) conducted by our Human Service Workers (HSW) at the time of intake. Although we greatly value your partnership in this process and hope to provide valid SPEP scores once all data required for SPEP scoring are available, we were unable to score this service due to lack of risk scores and specific service date information.

### **\*Disclaimer**

This is a general feedback report informed with evidence-based research about reducing recidivism for juveniles involved in the juvenile justice system. This service provided by this program did not have adequate data to populate the SPEP tool developed as a component of the JJRRI. Adequate refers to the criteria specified above, in that there must be at least 10 juveniles in the cohort group during the specified time frame. Of those 10 juveniles receiving the service, at least 80% must have a risk score or a YASI completed by the HSW prior to that service starting with that juvenile. Lastly, we have to have accurate data that reflects each time the youth received the service, how much they received and the specific start and end dates for that service.

Given the inability to meet these thresholds, general feedback is being provided based on 1) the information gathered from the program providers regarding the programs' delivery of this specific service in addition to 2) guidance based on the research derived from the JJRRI regarding this particular service. There were not enough youth in the cohort that met these criteria in order to be included in the formalized scoring of this service.

### **Program Description**

*Example Provider's* mission, vision, tagline (if applicable).

*Example Provider* → Insert ALL Elements of the Program Profile (i.e. Org Name, Prgm Name, list services rendered)

*Example Provider's* → Referral Source(s) are/is...

*Example Provider's* → intake process entails...

Source: This data was provided by \_\_\_\_\_

**Service Type**

This section provides specific information on the service classification as it has been identified by the SPEP process. SPEP classifies services into 5 groups, where the assignment of a service into group #1 through #5 is based on the evidence of the greatest effects on recidivism for that specific service. This section identifies the specific service being rendered and matches that service to the SPEP group classification. Scores in this component can range from 5 to 35.

The \_\_\_\_\_ service that is rendered by \_\_\_\_\_ is identified as a Group \_\_\_\_ Service: \_\_\_\_\_ and receives \_\_ points based on the SPEP. \_\_ *supplemental points can be given if behavioral contracting/management is a built-in component of the service; (Optional) however this does not apply at this time to this service as it was not illustrated as a built-in component of the service.*

**Quality of Service Delivery**

The quality component of the SPEP is rated on a high to low scale in each of the following areas: written protocol, staff training, staff supervision, and response to drift. The ratings in each of these areas are combined to yield an overall quality score that ranges from 5 (low rating in each area) to 20 (high rating in each area) points. \_\_\_\_\_ received a total score of \_\_\_\_\_, based on implementation of the items identified below:

**Written Protocol** (up to 5 total points can be awarded)

- \_\_\_\_ Written manual/protocol of administrative practices that foster engagement (customer service protocol) 1pt
- \_\_\_\_ Written manual/protocol of how the service is to be delivered in addition to any protocols established by the Purchaser (clinical/service implementation protocol) 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Manuals/protocol is broken out by lesson/session by stage of involvement (start to finish) 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Written intake process that involves matching individual needs with the type and intensity of services to be provided 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Documentation that manual/protocol is reviewed and updated at specific intervals (year, semi-annually, etc.) 1 pt

**Staff Training** (up to 6 total points can be awarded)

- \_\_\_\_ Minimum education, experience, and/or certification is required and documented for service delivery staff 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Agency's education, experience, and/or certification requirements exceed those established by Purchaser 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Continued trainings or recertification for service delivery staff is formally tracked and documented 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Documentation that all staff has been oriented to protocol and reviewed policies and procedures 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Agency offers tuition reimbursement 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Agency offers in-service trainings at least annually 1 pt

**Staff Supervision** (up to 4 total points can be awarded)

- \_\_\_\_ Supervisors have face-to-face contact with all service delivery staff at identified intervals to review adherence to protocols and quality of service delivery (document findings) 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Supervision is individualized to service provider based on needs for supervision 1pt
- \_\_\_\_ Performance Evaluations are completed on all service delivery staff on a yearly basis 1pt
- \_\_\_\_ Performance Evaluations are, in part, based on adherence to protocol and by assessing the service that is being delivered as designed 1 pt

**Response to Drift** (up to 5 total points can be awarded)

- \_\_\_\_ Agency has a complaint/grievance process that clients know about and can access 1 pt
- \_\_\_\_ Agency conducts internal audits/peer reviews at identified intervals to address adherence to protocols and quality of service delivery 1 pt

Agency has specific outcome measures regarding service effectiveness, which are quantifiable and continually measured by the agency 1 pt  
 Agency has a client/family satisfaction process 1 pt  
 Annual turnover for service delivery staff is less than the median turnover rate for that service or less than 15% (total number of separations in previous 12 months divided by total number of providers budgeted/on average) 1 Pt.

### **Duration of Service**

For the purposes of SPEP, the duration of service refers to the amount of time between the first day that the primary service was provided to the youth and the last day that this same service was provided to the youth - not to include any administrative intake and/or termination dates, but actual service provision dates.

Information regarding the target duration and contact hours as identified by the SPEP process will be provided for every service that meets SPEP criteria, despite whether the service was able to be adequately scored or not.

Source: This data was provided by \_\_\_\_\_

### **Contact Hours**

For the purposes of SPEP, the contact hours refers to the total number of contact hours each youth has with the primary service - not to include any administrative processes that do not directly involve the youth.

Information regarding the target duration and contact hours as identified by the SPEP process will be provided for every service that meets SPEP criteria, despite whether the service was able to be adequately scored or not.

Source: This data was provided by \_\_\_\_\_

### **Risk Level of Youth**

The meta-analysis research on delinquency intervention programs has shown that there are larger positive effects on recidivism with higher risk youth than with their lower risk counterparts. For this reason, the risk score is included in the SPEP process with emphasis on the moderate and high risk youth in order to illustrate the most positive effects.

The risk level score is compiled by calculating the total % of juveniles with moderate to high risk scores (greater than low) to recidivate within the sample, and also the total % of juveniles with a high risk score (greater than moderate) to recidivate within the sample. The risk scores are based on the results of the YASI completed by the HSW. Scores on this component range from 0 to 25 with higher scores denoting that a greater percentage of the cohort has risk scores above low.

Source: This data was provided by \_\_\_\_\_

### **Summary**

At the present time we are unable to provide actual SPEP scores for this service due to lack of sufficient data, i.e. not having enough available risk scores for the youth represented in the cohort. However, we greatly value your partnership in this endeavor and hope to be able to provide scores for this service in the future.

It is essential to reiterate that the purpose of this report and process is not punitive in nature, but seen as an opportunity to improve programming offered to our at-risk youth involved the juvenile justice system as well as an opportunity to better align our youth with appropriate services according to research-based evidence that suggests the highest impact in reducing recidivism in youth.

Program improvement capacity is the results of the SPEP and information collection process that focuses on program development. It is the expectation of Milwaukee County Delinquency and Court Services Division that your organization will review and consider the changes identified in this report. Failure to do so will not result in a loss of contract; however standards identified in this process will be implemented in future contract requirements.

### **Program Strengths**

There are several areas where the *Example Program* excels and scored very well...

### **Program Improvement Capacity**

From a diagnostic and program improvement perspective, a SPEP score rating allows for the identification of aspects of a service that make the greatest impact on effectiveness as well as assessment and guidance on improving those aspects where the particular service may fall short.

Based on the SPEP and information collection process, the program could improve its capacity for recidivism reduction through programmatic changes in the following areas:

- 1) Including behavioral contracting/management as a built-in component of the therapy service,
- 2) Implementing any of the items from the quality of service component not currently in place,
- 3) Change format/design of programming to meet target dosages for the specified service for every youth,
- 4) Consider the level of programming your agency specializes in and your desired target risk population.

### **Action Plan**

An action plan template is available via DCSD. To address the capacity for program improvement, action plans are due to DCSD via email no later than 4 weeks from the date of the site visit and/or the date of this feedback report, which is \_\_\_\_\_.

### **Contact Person**

Please contact De Shell Parker (DCSD Administrative Coordinator/ JJRI Coordinator) at 414.257.5751 to further discuss scoring and for answers to any questions you may have with regard to the data required for future SPEP scoring. Email is also an option for contact: [DeShell.Parker@milwaukeecountywi.gov](mailto:DeShell.Parker@milwaukeecountywi.gov)