## Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice Practitioner's Logic Model for the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)

Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice Practitioner's Logic Model for the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)					
Inputs	Activities	Targets	Outputs	Short-term Outcomes	Mid-term Outcomes
<ul> <li>State level leadership activities (policy making, sustainability planning, rollout oversight)</li> <li>Technical assistance, support, consultation</li> <li>Probation selection of SPEP lead</li> <li>Probation develops Continuum of Services</li> <li>Stakeholder training on implementation of SPEP (County, JPO, provider, EPISCenter JJSIS)</li> <li>County stakeholders education on SPEP process (Key Leader Orientation &amp; Kickoff meetings)</li> <li>Webinars on SPEP process</li> <li>SPEP presentations at conferences and other venues</li> <li>Juvenile Probation Coordination of services to ensure Partnership between Probation &amp; Provider</li> <li>Learning Community development and education</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Preparation/Scheduling of Visits &amp; Meetings: <ul> <li>Preparation for SPEP (Pre-SPEP calls, visits, checklist)</li> <li>Preliminary discussion of data collection of dosage, duration, and risk</li> </ul> </li> <li>Service Classification: <ul> <li>Interview(s) to determine what services provider offers and if they are eligible to go through SPEP process</li> <li>Probation and provider collaborate on which services will be assessed; discussion facilitated by EPISCenter JJSIS</li> </ul> </li> <li>Quality Measures Interview: <ul> <li>Interview to assess quality of service delivery to youth</li> </ul> </li> <li>Measuring Service Amount and Risk Level: <ul> <li>Identification of timeframe for cohort selection determined collaboratively by probation and provider; discussion facilitated by EPISCenter JJSIS</li> </ul> </li> <li>Assess number of hours and weeks youth spend receiving service and compare against expected amount shown effective by research</li> <li>Calculate the level of risk for youth in each service</li> </ul> <li>Development of SPEP Information: <ul> <li>Compilation and review of Program Profile</li> <li>Discussion &amp; agreement on SPEP score elements</li> <li>Generate SPEP score where applicable</li> <li>Generate Feedback, Advisory or Provisional Report</li> <li>Fidelity of SPEP process</li> </ul> </li>	<ul> <li>Improving/ refining/ enhancing of service categories</li> <li>Quality-how well the specific service is implemented (written protocol, training of delivery staff, monitoring of quality of service delivery and procedures for responding to departures from protocol)</li> <li>Amount of service-duration (weeks) and dosage (hours)</li> <li>Focus on services that serve moderate and high risk youth based on YLS</li> <li>Partnership development- between the provider and the juvenile probation department/courts</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Provider &amp; probation meet to discuss SPEP findings for the feedback report findings</li> <li>Provider &amp; probation develop performance improvement plan that has been vetted by local probation dept. &amp; provider</li> <li>Provider &amp; probation implements performance improvement plan</li> <li>Re-assessment (subsequent SPEP)</li> <li>Updated service matrix</li> <li>Updated program profile</li> <li>Reduction of recidivis</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Probation/ provider awareness of services matching to research</li> <li>Increased understanding of the importance of quality of service delivery, duration, dosage and YLS</li> <li>Increase in provider understanding of YLS results and requesting them when missing</li> <li>Better communication and education across internal stakeholders</li> <li>Refine data collection</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Probation identifies services in place as well as additional services needed within the community</li> <li>Probation refers youth to the best matched program through YLS results and increased understanding of program and the services within it (SPEP re-assessment)</li> <li>New/improved/refined services identified and put into place (based on SPEP research)</li> <li>Increased buy-in of SPEP among juvenile courts and juvenile justice practitioners</li> <li>Integration of SPEP related policies and procedures into provider agencies and probation departments (dedicated personnel, job descriptions, program descriptions, and contract negotiations)</li> <li>Utilization of data collected</li> <li>Appropriate service referral results in improved efficiency of juvenile court involvement</li> <li>Building capacity for SPEP through ongoing training of new SPEPr's</li> <li>Increased validation of locally developed programs/services across the state</li> <li>Larger proportion of youth receive the SPEP recommended amounts of hours and weeks in each service (SPEP re-assessment)</li> <li>Providers improve quality and when appropriate add supplemental services (SPEP re-assessment)</li> <li>Probation and provider focus on continuous quality improvement (excellence versus compliance)</li> <li>Improved probation/provider relationship and communication (probation/provider partnership)</li> </ul>
	Quality Assurance/Inter-rater reliability				Length of stays align more closely with SPEP     Guidelines
Portions of the content in this resource are adapted from the "Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP): A Users Guide." Mark W. Lipsey, Ph.D. and Gabrielle Lynn Chapman, Ph.D., and the Bennett Pierce Lynn Chapman, P					

Vanderbilt University, May 2013. The EPISCenter represents a collaborative partnership between the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD), and the Bennett Pierce Prevention Research Center, College of Health and Human Development, Penn State University. The EPISCenter is funded by PCCD and the PA Department of Human Services. This resource was developed by the EPISCenter through PCCD grant VP-ST-24368.