SPEP Overview & Process

For North Carolina’s Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) Programs

Historical Context of North Carolina’s Juvenile Justice Evidence–Based Practices

- First State-wide community-based alternatives (CBA) ~ late 1970s
- First “wraparound” model in the US via Willie M. Program~ 1979 class action lawsuit
- 1998 NC Juvenile Justice Reform Act ~ Second state to mandate evidence-based services
Historical Context of North Carolina’s Juvenile Justice Evidence–Based Practices

- First state to fully adopt the OJJDP Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders
- First legislated statewide, county-level Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils (also first statewide use of a risk factor assessment beginning in the late 1990’s)
- Most effective statewide use of a juvenile offender risk and needs assessment instrument along with a disposition matrix to reduce confinement (Nov, 2001)

Historical Context of SPEP in NC

- 1998 NC Juvenile Justice Reform Act required a statewide evaluation of programs funded through the JCPC
- The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol ~SPEP~ was developed specifically for this purpose in NC. 2006
- First statewide Level II services based on SPEP primary service types (2010)
Meta-Analysis of a Comprehensive Collection of Existing Studies of Interventions for Juvenile Offenders

- 500+ experimental and quasi-experimental studies
- Juveniles aged 12-21 in programs aimed at reducing delinquency
- Focus on the programs’ effects on recidivism (reoffending)

Most (57%) JJ programs reduce recidivism: Outcomes of 556 studies (Dr. Mark Lipsey, 2002)

Here’s where we want to be!
The Prevailing Definition of EBP: A Certified “Model” Program

The P part: A ‘brand name’ program, e.g.,
- Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
- Multi-systemic Therapy (MST)
- Big Brothers/Big Sisters mentoring
- Aggression Replacement Training (ART)

The EB part: Credible research supporting that specific program certified by, e.g.,
- Blueprints for Violence Prevention
- OJJDP Model Programs Guide
- National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP)

An Alternative Perspective on the P in EBP: Generic Program “types”

- Interventions with research on effectiveness can be described by the types of programs they represent rather than their brand names, e.g.,
  - family therapy
  - mentoring
  - cognitive behavioral therapy
- These types include the brand name programs, but also many ‘home grown’ programs as well
- Viewed this way, there are many evidence-based program types familiar to practitioners
Program vs. Structure

- Program – active treatment ingredient
- Structure – context that fulfills other needs
  - Foster/shelter care, detention, structured day
  - Graduated sanctions
  - May have services delivered within the structure:
    - group home with group counseling

Identification of “Philosophies” toward Altering Juvenile Behavior

- Program Services Fall into 3 Broad Categories:
  - External Control Techniques
    - Behavioral change through instilling discipline, fear, or detection of bad behavior in the absence of treatment
  - Therapeutic Techniques
    - Behavioral change through improved skills, relationships, insight.
    - These are the only services for which SPEP ratings are completed.
  - Other: Services for which there is insufficient research to estimate the effects on recidivism
Program Types Sorted by General Approach: Average Recidivism Effect

- Discipline
- Deterrence
- Surveillance
- Restorative
- Skill building
- Counseling
- Multiple services

Further Sorting by Intervention Type within, e.g., Counseling Approaches

- Individual
- Mentoring
- Family
- Family crisis
- Group
- Peer
- Mixed
- Mixed w/referrals
Further Sorting by **Intervention Type** within, e.g., **Skill-building Approaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Type</th>
<th>% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-behavioral</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job related</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Recidivism effects from 29 studies of family therapy intervention/Where are the model programs?

Average recidivism reduction of 13%
As Noted, Type of Program Matters

- Programs using control approaches on average have small or even negative effects on recidivism
- Programs using therapeutic approaches on average have positive effects
- Within the therapeutic category, program types differ widely in their average effects with some notably more effective than others

Service Amount and Quality Matters

Effects on recidivism associated with:
- Duration of service
- Total hours of service
- Quality of implementation
  - Explicit treatment protocol
  - Personnel trained in that treatment
  - Monitoring of treatment delivery
  - Corrective action for drift in delivery
Risk Level Matters

- A validated risk assessment instrument/tool is used to provide juvenile risk level data on each juvenile receiving services.
- In NC, risk scores entered into NC ALLIES on each juvenile are either obtained from court services or taken from the risk assessment administered by the program.
- The risk assessment tool used by both Court Services and JCPC funded programs is the North Carolina’s Assessment of Juvenile Risk of Future Offending – a validated tool.

To have good effects, interventions should be implemented to match the most effective practice as found in the research.

- Program Type: “Therapeutic” with some types more effective than others.
- Quality of Service: Written Protocol, Monitoring and Staff Training.
- Amount of Service: Dose, including total number of contact hours.
- Risk: Higher risk = larger effects.
IDENTIFY / MATCH SERVICES

DATA (DEMOGRAPHIC, RISK, QUALITY, QUANTITY FOR EACH SERVICE)

SPEP is Data Driven

SPEP SCORING PROCESS

IDENTIFY SERVICES

MATCH AGAINST RESEARCH-BASED CATEGORIES

DATA (DEMOGRAPHIC, RISK, QUALITY, QUANTITY FOR EACH SERVICE)

EVALUATE/PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT

SPEP SCORING PROCESS

Provider's Total SPEP Score 100
An Illustration: Incremental Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expected Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine Probation (P)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + Minimal Program</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + Best Intervention Type (B)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + B + Good Implementation (I)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + B + I + Over 6 Months' Duration</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stronger Services = Better Outcomes
TRAINING OBJECTIVES

- Historical context of NC’s EBPs
- Defining EBP and the Meta Analysis
- Program Characteristics that Impact Recidivism
- Review of the Tool
- SPEP Scoring Process