

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™):

Service Score Results: Baseline

Name of Program and Service: Big Brothers Big Sisters of Bucks County, OPTIONS-Mentoring Service
Cohort Total: 12 SPEP ID: 38
Selected Timeframe: 3/1/2012 – 4/30/2014
Date(s) of Interview(s): May 12, 2014
Lead County & SPEP Team Representatives: Bucks County, William Batty, Heather Perry & Maureen Raquet
Person Preparing Report: William Batty & Heather Perry

Description of Service: *This should include a **brief** overview of the service within the context of the program, the location and if community based or residential. Indicate the type of youth referred, how the service is delivered, the purpose of service and any other **relevant** information to help the reader understand the SPEP service type classification. (350 character limit)*

A chapter of Big Brothers Big Sisters has operated in Bucks County for 50 plus years. It was reported that it is “a local nonprofit chapter which offers mentoring relationships for all children who need and want them, and a one-to-one relationship built on trust and friendship that can blossom into a future of unlimited potential.” Big Brothers Big Sisters of Bucks County (BBBSBC) offers different types of programming and they are identified as “core programming” and “site-based programming.” The Options Program, a collaborative effort between the Bucks County Juvenile Probation Department and BBBSBC since prior to 1984, is the focus of this report. It was reported that the Options Program is unique to the BBBSBC Chapter as it is believed that it does not exist within other BBBS Chapters. It is unique because the traditional mission of BBBS involves a one on one match between an adult volunteer and a juvenile where the Options Program involves a match between a professional and multiple juveniles. The Options Program operates throughout Bucks County from as far north as Quakertown to as far south as Bristol. It was reported that the service was similar throughout the County. “Options Program is a direct service, Case Management/Mentoring program that provides youth between 7 and 17 years of age with a range of professional services including individual and family counseling, case management services, youth advocacy, coordination of services, community service, job coaching, community outreach and mentoring activities. This unique program emphasizes professional, one on one contact with youth involved, or at risk of involvement with the juvenile court system and who are in need of increased levels of support and guidance.” Those delivering the service were identified as case managers. Options had 1 full time case manager and 4 part time case managers. The number of contacts with juveniles/month was based on the referral source. Case managers were required to meet with a juvenile weekly, or at a minimum of 4 hours/month. The goal was identified as recidivism reduction and the tasks performed at the onsite visit/meeting are as follows: 1. “Targeting” a one on one relationship with the assigned juvenile, 2. Building trust with the assigned juvenile through the frequency of contacts and the setting where contacts occur, 3. Meeting with and acting as a role model with the assigned juvenile, 4. Participating in activities such as fishing, basketball, tutoring, etc. with the assigned juvenile, 5. Counseling in informal settings with the assigned juvenile, 6. Developing a case plan with the assigned juvenile, 7. Referring youth to other therapeutic services through the Therapeutic Services Coordinator, 8. Connecting youth with other community resources and, 9. Monitoring probation conditions (CSW, LOA, etc.) and assisting in their completion.

The four characteristics of a service found to be the most strongly related to reducing recidivism:

1. **SPEP™ Service Type:** Mentoring

Based on the meta-analysis, is there a qualifying supplemental service? Yes

If so, what is the Service type? Behavioral Contracting/Management

Was the supplemental service provided? No Total Points Possible for this Service Type: 30

Total Points Earned: 25 Total Points Possible: 35

2. **Quality of Service:** Research has shown that programs that deliver service with high quality are more likely to have a positive impact on recidivism reduction. Monitoring of quality is defined by existence of written protocol, staff training and supervision, and how drift from service delivery is addressed.

Total Points Earned: 10 Total Points Possible: 20

3. **Amount of Service:** Score was derived from examination of weeks and hours each youth in the cohort received the service. The amount of service is measured by the target amounts of service for the SPEP service categorization. Each SPEP service type has varying amounts of duration and dosage. Youth should receive the targeted amounts to have the greatest impact on recidivism reduction.

Points received for Duration or Number of Weeks: 6

Points received for Dosage or Number of Hours: 0

Total Points Earned: 6 Total Points Possible: 20

4. **Youth Risk Level:** The risk level score is compiled by calculating the total % of youth that score above low risk, and the total % of youth who score above moderate risk to reoffend based on the results of the YLS.

9 youth in the cohort are Moderate, High or Very High YLS Risk Level for a total of 7 points

1 youth in the cohort are High or Very High YLS Risk Level for a total of 0 points

Total Points Earned: 7 Total Points Possible: 25

Basic SPEP™ Score: 48 total points awarded out of 100 points. Compares service to any other type of SPEP therapeutic service. (eg: individual counseling compared to cognitive behavioral therapy, social skills training, mentoring, etc.)

Note: Services with scores greater than or equal to 50 show the service is having a positive impact on recidivism reduction.

Program Optimization Percentage: 51% This percentage compares the service to the same service types found in the research. (eg: individual counseling compared to all other individual counseling services included in the research)

The SPEP and Performance Improvement

The intended use of the SPEP is to optimize the effectiveness of reducing recidivism among juvenile offenders. Recommendations for performance improvement are included in the service feedback report, and these recommendations are the focus of the performance improvement plan, a shared responsibility of the service provider and the local juvenile court. The recommendations for this service included in the feedback report are:

1. Improving manual/written protocols
 - Include a description of the mentoring service type and how mentoring is to be delivered
 - Document that the manual/protocols are being utilized or referenced during service delivery
 - Review/update manual/protocols regularly and document review/update
 - Utilize the YLS to identify a target population best suited for service type and identify target population in manual/protocols and collaborate with probation department to train staff in YLS
2. Utilizing behavioral contracting/management as a supplemental service to mentoring
3. Improving upon the existing staff training
 - Increase and document service type specific (Mentoring) and service type specific delivery training for case managers
4. Improving upon the existing staff supervision
 - Provide written feedback to those delivering the service about their delivery beyond a yearly written performance
5. Improving response to drift
 - Responses to drift should be more specific for service type and delivery
6. Improving targeted dosage and risk level served
 - Collaborate with the probation department to meet targeted duration and contact hour requirements for mentoring service type and increase referrals of moderate/high risk juvenile and decrease low risk referrals
7. Consulting with developer of MAYSI as it relates to its uses- thomas.grisso@umassmed.edu