The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™):

**Service Score Results:** Baseline

**Name of Program and Service:** North Central Secure Treatment Unit (NCSTU)-Forward Thinking

Cohort Total: 13  
SPEP ID: 120-T01


Date(s) of Interview(s): Dec. 7, 2016

Lead County & SPEP Team Representatives: Tracie Davies, Lehigh Co. JPO & Heather Perry, EPISCenter

Person Preparing Report: Tracie Davies & 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)

NCSTU Male Program provides secure treatment programming for adjudicated delinquent males age 13–20. Located in Montour County, the Male Program offers a wide range of services designed to meet the diverse needs of its residents including specific programming for substance abuse, criminal behavior issues, programming for residents having lower cognitive functioning, and treatment for issues related to chronic delinquent behavior and mental health disorders. All treatment services and aftercare planning incorporates a BARJ perspective. The focus of this report is Forward Thinking, which is an interactive journaling series designed by the Change Companies and is offered to youth in the Rise General Secure Unit. Interactive journaling is included in SAMSHA’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP). The residential program utilizes a Cognitive Behavioral Therapy approach that uses strategies to assist youth in the Juvenile Justice System in making positive changes to their thoughts, feelings and behaviors. Forward Thinking is a 9 workbook series that covers the criminogenic needs identified through the residents’ YLS. The interactive journaling offers a simple but dynamic delivery system for the treatment team of this residential program, including the residents of this treatment program. Residents will complete 2 of the workbooks on an individual basis and 2 of the workbooks during two weekly group sessions each 45 minutes in length. The workbook “Substance Using Behaviors” is completed if a resident scores Moderate/High on their Juvenile Automated Substance Abuse Evaluation (JASAE) and the workbook “Re-entry Planning” is completed with the Transition Service Coordinator. The service is delivered by Youth Development Counselors (YDC). Youth Development Aides (YDA) assist with the facilitation of group work and homework assignments. Pre and post tests are administered. The journals are interactive and residents are given their own individual workbook to write in. Individual counselors re-enforce what is learned during the group sessions. Residents will work during their duration in this residential treatment program to understand their core issues and their areas of need, then designing a course of action to address their core issues that have been self-identified as well as identified in their YLS. Residents will work on exploring risks, needs and skill deficits, as well as strengths, resources and solutions to problem behaviors. In the course of gathering immediate and relevant information related to problem areas, residents can map out where they have been and where they wish to go. The interactive journals are designed to help participants identify patterns in their feelings, thoughts, and behaviors through a cognitive based approach. The common theme of each journal is to encourage participants to take ownership of their choices as well as impress upon them that positive, lasting life changes are possible.

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

1. **SPEP™ Service Type:** Cognitive-behavior Therapy

   Based on the meta-analysis, is there a qualifying supplemental service? No

   If so, what is the Service type? There is no qualifying supplemental service

   Was the supplemental service provided? n/a  
   Total Points Possible for this Service Type: 35

   Total Points Earned: 35  
   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: 20  
   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 SREP service categorization. Each SREP 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**: 8
**Points received for Dosage or Number of Hours**: 4

Total Points Earned: 12 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth in the cohort are Moderate, High or Very High YLS Risk Level for a total of</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>youth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points Earned: 25 Total Points Possible: 25

**Basic SREP™ Score**: 92 total points awarded out of 100 points. Compares service to any other type of SREP therapeutic service. *(e.g: 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**: 92% This percentage compares the service to the same service types found in the research. *(e.g: individual counseling compared to all other individual counseling services included in the research)*

---

**The SREP and Performance Improvement**

The intended use of the SREP 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:

The Forward Thinking Program at North Central Secure Treatment Unit scored a 92 for the Basic Score and a 92% Program Optimization Percentage. It is classified as a Cognitive-behavioral Therapy service type. The quality of the service was delivered at a high level, the amount of service provided to the residents fell slightly short of meeting the recommended targets of duration and dosage for this service type. The program could improve its capacity for recidivism reduction through:

1. **Enhance On-going Staff Supervision**:
   a. Continue to specify curriculum(s) staff are trained to deliver in performance evaluations and address their performance in relation to that curriculum.

2. **Enhance Organizational Response to Drift**:
   a. Document procedures that specifically address steps to be taken should a YDC and/or YDA fail to provide instruction as it is intended to be delivered, and ensure that these procedures are systematically applied.
   b. Enhance data collection to include outcome data and/or peer reviews.
   c. Investigate ways to improve the effectiveness of the service.

3. **Amount of Service**: Investigate ways to increase the number of weeks of service and contact hours to reach the recommended 15 weeks and 45 hours.
The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEPTM):

Service Score Results: Reassessment 1

Agency Name: North Central Secure Treatment Unit (NCSTU)

Program Name: Male General Secure- Rise Unit

Service Name: Forward Thinking

Cohort Total: 31

Timeframe of Selected Cohort: January 1, 2018 - December 31, 2019

Referral County(s): Allegheny (4), Bucks (1), Dauphin (1), Erie (1), Lehigh (2), Montgomery (2), Philadelphia (18), Snyder (1) and York (1)

Date(s) of Interview(s): March 9, 2020, May 12, 2020 and September 9, 2020

Lead County: Lehigh

Probation Representative(s): Tracie Davies, Eva Frederick and Andrew Guise (York County)

EPIS Representative: Lisa Freese

Description of Service:

North Central Secure Treatment Unit (NCSTU) Male Program provides secure treatment programming for adjudicated delinquent males age 13–20. The focus of this report is Forward Thinking, which is an interactive journaling series designed by the Change Companies and is offered to youth in the Rise General Secure Unit. Interactive journaling is included in SAMSHA’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP). The residential program utilizes a Cognitive Behavioral Therapy approach that uses strategies to assist youth in the Juvenile Justice System in making positive changes to their thoughts, feelings and behaviors. Forward Thinking is a 9-workbook series that covers the criminogenic needs identified through the residents’ Youth Level of Service Inventory (YLS). The interactive journaling offers a simple but dynamic delivery system for the treatment team of this residential program, including the residents of this treatment program. Residents complete all 9 Forward Thinking Journals in a group setting. Those journals include: What Got Me Here, Individual Change Plan, Responsible Behavior, Family, Relationships and Communication, Handling Difficult Feelings, Victim Awareness, Family and Substance Abuse. Residents participate in two weekly group sessions each 45 minutes in length for the duration of their stay. The service is delivered by Youth Development Counselors (YDC). Youth Development Aides (YDA) assist with the facilitation of group work and homework assignments. Pre and post tests are administered. The journals are interactive and residents are given their own individual workbook to write in and homework assignments are given. Individual counselors re-enforce what is learned during the group sessions. Residents will work during their duration in this residential treatment program to understand core issues and areas of need, then designing a course of action to address these issues that have been self-identified as well as identified in the YLS. Residents will work on exploring risks, needs and skill deficits, as well as strengths, resources and solutions to problem behaviors. In the course of gathering immediate and relevant information related to problem areas, residents can map out where they have been and where they wish to go. The interactive journals are designed to help participants identify patterns in their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors through a cognitive based approach. The common theme of each journal is to encourage participants to take ownership of their choices as well as impress upon them that positive, lasting life changes are possible.

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

1. **SPEPTM Service Type:** Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

   Based on the meta-analysis, is there a qualifying supplemental service? **No**

   If so, what is the Service Type? There is no qualifying supplemental service

   Was the supplemental service provided? **N/A**  

   Total Points Possible for this Service Type: **35**

   Total Points Received: **35**  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, staff supervision, and how drift from service delivery is addressed.

   Total Points Received: **20**  Total Points Possible: **20**
3. **Amount of Service:** Score was derived by calculating the total number of weeks and hours received by each youth in the service. The amount of service is measured by the target amounts of service for the SPEPTM service categorization. Each SPEPTM service type has varying amounts of duration and contact hours. 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 Contact Hours or Number of Hours: | 4 |
| **Total Points Received:** | 10 | **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.

| 28 | youth in the cohort are Moderate, High, Very High YLS Risk Level for a total of | 10 | points |
| 12 | youth in the cohort are High or Very High YLS Risk Level for a total of | 13 | points |
| **Total Points Received:** | 23 | **Total Points Possible:** | 25 |

**Basic SPEPTM Score:** 88 total points received out of 100 points. Compares service to any other type of SPEPTM therapeutic service. *(e.g. 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:** 88% This percentage compares the service to the same service types found in the research. *(e.g. individual counseling compared to all other individual counseling services included in the research.)*

**The SPEPTM and Performance Improvement**

The intended use of the SPEPTM 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 juvenile probation department.

Forward Thinking received an 88 for the Basic Score and a 88% Program Optimization Percentage. These Basic Scores represent a decrease of 4 percentage point(s) from the initial SPEPTM Assessment. These POP Scores represent a decrease of 4 percentage point(s) from the initial SPEPTM Assessment. The service was classified as a Group 5 service; Cognitive-behavioral Therapy Service Type. There is no qualifying supplemental service found in the research. The Quality of Service Delivery was found to be at a High Level. For Amount of Service, 74% of the youth received the recommended targeted weeks of duration and 52% of the youth received the recommended targeted contact hours for this service type. The Risk Levels of Youth admitted to the service were: 10% low risk, 52% moderate risk, 35% high risk, and 3% very high risk. The service could improve its capacity for recidivism reduction by addressing the following recommendations:

1. **Regarding Quality of Service Delivery:**
   a. Organizational Response to Drift:
      i. Document procedures that specifically address steps to be taken should a YDC and/or YDA fail to provide instruction as it is intended.
      ii. Include specific language that addresses the progression of steps to be taken should drift occur.

2. **Regarding Amount of Service:**
   a. Continue to communicate to referral sources that youth in a cognitive behavioral therapy service should remain in that service for a minimum of 15 weeks.
   b. Consider ways to increase the dosage to 45 hours. This could potentially be achieved through additional time spent in individual counseling on Forward Thinking or time spent reviewing concepts during weekend hours.

3. **Regarding Risk Level of Youth Served:**
   a. Continue to communicate to referral sources that NCSTU targets moderate to very high risk youth.

**Copyright held by Mark W. Lipsey, Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University. Portions of this content in this fact sheet are adapted from the “Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP): A User’s Guide.” Mark W. Lipsey, Ph.D. and Gabrielle Lynn Chapman, Ph.D., Vanderbilt University, October 2014  Last Revised 3.26.2020**