

Department of Juvenile Justice's Program Accountability Measures: **The 2002 PAM Report** A Two-Year Analysis

December 2001



A Research Report Submitted to the:
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Jeb Bush, Governor
W.G. "Bill" Bankhead, Secretary

Presented by:
The Justice Research Center
443 East College Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32301

2002
Program Accountability Measures Report:
A Two-Year Analysis

December 2001

A Research Report Submitted to the



Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Jeb Bush, Governor

W.G. "Bill" Bankhead, Secretary

DJJ Management Report Number 02-01
Electronic copies of this document are available on the Web at

<http://www.djj.state.fl.us/RnD>

Produced by

Justice Research Center, Inc.
443 East College Avenue
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
850-521-9900

Kristin Winokur, Ph.D.
Julia Blankenship, MSW
Elizabeth Cass, Ph.D.
Gregory Hand
Amie Schuck

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Data and Methodology	2
Data Sources.....	2
Calculating the PAM Score.....	2
Program Effectiveness Measure	2
Program Cost Measure.....	4
The PAM Score: Combining Cost and Effectiveness Measures	4
Limitations.....	4
Findings	5
Program Effectiveness Categories	5
Cost Categories.....	5
PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level	6
PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level and Effectiveness Categories	12
PAM Scores by Cost Categories.....	19
Appendix 1	29
Definitions of Terms	29
Appendix 2	31
Programs Risk Factors by Restrictiveness Levels	31
Appendix 3	37
Calculating the Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score	37
Acknowledgements	38

Introduction

This is the sixth annual report ranking commitment programs based on client outcomes and program costs as mandated by Florida Statute §985.404. The Program Accountability Measure (PAM) has been under development since the 1980's to compare the cost and effectiveness of programs that provide care, custody, and treatment for youth committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). The methodology employed in the PAM has been recognized by the National Center for Juvenile Justice as a best practice in the use of juvenile justice data. This year, the Justice Research Center (JRC), Inc., was contracted by the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice to produce the PAM Report. Building on the strong methodological foundation in place, the Justice Research Center, in collaboration with the DJJ Bureau of Data and Research, employed Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM). HLM improves upon last year's methodology by providing more accurate figures predicting recidivism at the program level, controlling for the characteristics of the youth in each program.

The intent of this report is to evaluate the effectiveness of the range of programs to which youth can be committed. Committing a youth who is adjudicated delinquent to a residential program is one of the choices available to the juvenile court under Section 985.231 Florida Statutes. The court designates a restrictiveness level to which the youth will be committed based on the nature of the offense, security concerns, and treatment issues. Subsection 985.03 (46) Florida Statutes, defines restrictiveness level as "...the level of custody provided by programs that service the custody and care needs of committed children." The levels include, in ascending order of restrictiveness: Minimum-Risk Non-Residential Programs, Low-Risk Residential Programs, Moderate-Risk Residential Programs, High-Risk Residential Programs, and Maximum-Risk Residential Programs. Since the time the youth in this study were released, Minimum Risk programs have been reclassified as Probation and Community Corrections programs.

The desired outcome of juvenile justice commitment programs is to reduce the likelihood of future offending and to accomplish this in a cost-effective manner. However, by legislative and program design, commitment programs serve youth with widely varying risk factors. These factors affect the likelihood of recidivism by these youth. A simple comparison of recidivism rates does not take these effects into account. In fact, such a method would unfairly penalize programs that serve the most challenging youth. Outcome measures must take into consideration the risk factors that influence the likelihood of re-offending for the youth committed to each program.

Rather than simply compare differences in recidivism rates between programs, the PAM model takes into account the probability of recidivism for youth assigned to each program. In so doing, it is possible to calculate how well a program is *expected* to do based on the program youths' risk of re-offending (expected success), and to compare this to how well the program youths actually performed (observed success). This ensures that programs serving more difficult youth are not held to inequitable standards due to the higher risk of re-offending of the youth they serve, and provides a realistic measure of program effectiveness for those programs serving less challenging youth.

A PAM score is calculated for each program to provide a program rank based on its effectiveness and cost relative to other commitment programs. The PAM score is derived from a formula based on: (1) effectiveness as measured by reduced re-offending, and (2) cost per youth who completed the program.

The current report presents results for programs that released at least 15 youth during the two-year period between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 2000. Presenting results for programs that released a minimum of 15 youth ensures that the behavior of one or two youth does not unduly affect results.

The 2002 Program Accountability Measures Report: A Two-Year Report is available on the Department of Juvenile Justice website at <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/RnD/>

Data and Methodology

Data Sources

Data were compiled from the Department of Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Florida Criminal Information Center (FCIC), and the Florida Department of Corrections (DC). The JJIS system was used to identify a total of 17,762 youth who were released to the community, post-commitment probation, or a conditional release program during the two-year period between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 2000. Demographic data for these youth, as well as their offense histories, were obtained from JJIS. Youth who subsequently re-offended were identified through both juvenile offense records in JJIS and, for those who reached 18 years of age during the follow-up period or had a case handled in adult court, through adult records in FCIC and DC. Recidivism is defined here as *a subsequent juvenile adjudication, adjudication withheld or adult conviction for an offense that occurred within one year of a youth's release to the community or a conditional release program*. A success rate was calculated for each program based on the number of youth who did not recidivate.

Program results are presented for the 186 programs that released at least 15 youth during the two-year period. Programs that closed during 1998-1999 are not included. Programs that released youth as late as December 1999 were included for historical purposes even though they may have closed after that time. For a complete listing of closed commitment programs please see The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Quality Assurance 2000 Annual Report (February 2001) <http://www.djj.state.fl.us/qa/annualreport.html> and the 2001 Quality Assurance Report to be released in February 2002.

Calculating the PAM Score

Program Effectiveness Measure

Program effectiveness is defined as the difference between a program's predicted success and their actual success. To determine predicted success, data are used to calculate an expected success rate for each program. The computation of the rate is based on the risk factors of the cohort of youth, plus or minus a margin of error (i.e., the 99% confidence interval). A 99% confidence interval is defined as the range of values that, 99 times out of 100, can be expected to contain the number being estimated (expected success). This interval, referred to here as the *expected success range*, is then compared to how well the program actually performed, or the *observed success rate*. The size of a confidence interval is related to the number of youth released by a program. Smaller programs have larger confidence intervals and larger programs have smaller intervals. The difference between a program's expected success range and its actual success rate provides a measure of the crime reduction effect the program achieved.

In prior research conducted by DJJ,¹ logistic regression analysis was used to determine whether various risk factors available in the JJIS data were associated with recidivism. The following four factors were identified as statistically significant predictors of re-offending for commitment youth in Florida:

Risk Factors Identified by the Predictive Model
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age at release from program • Age at first offense • Number of prior adjudications • Gender

The same analysis performed on the 17,762 youth in this year's study revealed that these four factors continue to be the strongest predictors of re-offending available in the data. This year gender was the most powerful single predictor of the likelihood that a youth will re-offend. Males were much more likely than the females to receive a subsequent adjudication, adjudication withheld or adult conviction following program release. Age at first offense and age at release from the program were also related to re-offending. Younger offenders were more likely to re-offend than older youth when controlling for gender and prior adjudications. Offense history was also a strong predictor of re-offending behavior. The more prior adjudications a youth had, the more likely he/she was to re-offend after release.

Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) was used to calculate the probability of success (no subsequent adjudications or convictions) for the 186 programs that released 15 or more youth in FY 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

Continuing the approach taken last year, the confidence interval for expected success (expected success range) was used to answer the following question: "How large a difference between the expected rate and actual success rate is necessary to be 99 percent confident that the difference is not due to random error?"

The expected success range allows a comparison between expected and observed success taking into account an estimate of random error in the measure of expected success. It allows 99 percent confidence that any differences between the actual and observed success rate and the upper or lower limit of the confidence interval for expected success are not due to chance and would not be observed if youth with the same values for the risk factors were randomly selected from the population of youth. Subtracting a program's observed success rate from the upper or lower limits of the confidence interval for expected success allows an assessment of the effect of each program in reducing re-offending. Given that programs vary in the number of youth released, the corresponding confidence intervals will likewise vary in range.

For definitions of all terms used in the analyses, please see Appendix 1. In addition, for a breakdown of programs by the four risk factors of the youth served, see Appendix 2.

¹ 2001 Program Accountability Measures Report: A Two-Year Analysis. Bureau of Data and Research. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. Management Report Number 2001-4 (March 2001).

Program Cost Measure

Program cost per completion is calculated by dividing total DJJ expenditures for each program by the number of youth completing the program during the two-year period. These figures are limited to DJJ expenditures and do not include other sources of funding, either governmental or private. Total expenditures equal each program's combined costs for fiscal years 1998-99 and 1999-00. In calculating the PAM score, each program's cost per completion is compared to the average cost per completion of \$23,555.

The PAM Score: Combining Cost and Effectiveness Measures

As in previous reports, the program accountability score combines the cost and effectiveness measures, as defined above, standardized across all DJJ commitment programs. The PAM score is the sum of the program effectiveness measure weighted by a factor of two-thirds and the program cost measure weighted by a factor of one-third.² This year's scores range from a maximum of 100 to a minimum score of 24. For more information on PAM calculations including a step-by-step computation of the PAM score, please refer to Appendix 3.

Limitations

The expected success measure developed in this study explains only a portion of the variation in recidivism among programs. The remainder of the difference between observed success and expected success is due to program effects and to the effects of unmeasured factors. In the future, data on additional risk factors will be available in JJIS and will be examined to determine whether they further improve the predictive accuracy of the model. History of abuse, mental health problems, and substance abuse are among the factors identified in the research literature as predictive of recidivism. Provided that additional risk factors significantly improve the predictive accuracy of the model, the DJJ programs that specifically target these populations are the most likely to be impacted by the inclusion of these variables.

Expected success measures are designed to assist in evaluating program outcomes and not for predicting outcomes for individuals, as they explain only a portion of the variation in recidivism rates among individuals. They are not intended for individual prediction, and are not valid for that purpose.

² This methodology was developed by DJJ and the Juvenile Justice Advisory Board in consultation with the Legislature, the Governor's Office, OPPAGA, the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, contracted providers and other juvenile justice stakeholders.

Findings

The Program Accountability Measures Score derived for each of the 186 programs are presented here in three ways:

- 1) By restrictiveness level in descending order of PAM score;
- 2) By restrictiveness level in descending order of program effectiveness; and,
- 3) By program effectiveness categories in ascending order of cost (with separate tables for non-residential and residential programs).

Program Effectiveness Categories

Programs are divided into one of five categories based on the standardized difference between their expected success range and their observed success rates as follows:

- **Highly Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are greater than the upper limit of the expected success range by more than one standard deviation. Eight percent (n=15) of the programs fall in to this category.
- **Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that exceed the upper limit of the expected success range by up to one standard deviation. Eight percent (n=14) of the programs fall in to this category.
- **Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having actual observed success rates that are within the expected success range. Sixty percent (n=113) of the programs fall in to this category.
- **Below Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are up to one standard deviation below the lower limit of the expected success range. Seventeen percent (n=32) of the programs fall in to this category.
- **Least Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are more than one standard deviation below the lower limit of the expected success range. Seven percent (n=12) of the programs fall in to this category.

Cost Categories

Three cost categories were computed to compare programs in terms of their cost per successful completion. Each program's cost per completion is compared to the average cost per completion of \$23,555. Programs are divided into one of the following cost per completion categories.

- **Low Cost Programs:** One-third (n=62) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these commitment programs is less than \$15,690.
- **Moderate Cost Programs:** One-third (n=62) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these commitment programs is between \$15,690 and \$26,999.

- High Cost Programs: One-third (n=62) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per successful completion for these commitment program is \$27,000 or greater.

PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level

Tables 1 through 5 provide a summary of the PAM scores for 186 programs within each of the five restrictiveness levels. PAM scores are presented in descending order within restrictiveness level, along with the percent difference (i.e., percent above or below expected success range) and program cost per completion.

Table 1. Minimum-Risk Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference ¹	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
South West Florida Marine Institute	23	9%	\$10,465	100
Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	30	7%	\$16,701	96
Gulf Coast Marine Institute South	16	6%	\$10,049	94
Jacksonville Youth Center Sex Offender	22	12%	\$56,146	93
Lakeland Marine Institute	32	5%	\$3,870	92
Atlantic Coast Marine Institute	31	5%	\$6,396	91
Tampa Marine Institute	23	4%	\$13,218	86
Sutton Place of Nassau SIG	31	3%	\$9,484	84
Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	51	3%	\$12,505	83
Palm Beach Marine Institute	68	1%	\$8,083	77
DATA Day Treatment	37	1%	\$18,067	75
The Bridge Special Intensive Group	254	0%	\$2,946	75
Clay Behavioral Health SIG	44	0%	\$3,409	75
Ft. Pierce SIG C19	70	0%	\$5,143	74
New Port Richey Marine Institute	20	0%	\$5,152	74
ICCS - Bay Area Youth Services	216	0%	\$6,816	74
Escambia Bay Marine Institute	63	0%	\$8,584	73
Dade North Marine Institute	61	0%	\$8,712	73
Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	20	0%	\$9,939	73
Dade South Marine Institute	66	0%	\$10,147	73
Jacksonville West Marine Institute	93	0%	\$10,255	73
Orlando West Marine Institute	70	0%	\$11,042	73
Gainesville Marine Institute	34	0%	\$11,742	73
Jacksonville East Marine Institute	74	0%	\$12,453	73
Gulf Coast Marine Institute	26	0%	\$12,648	73
Oaks Day Treatment	103	0%	\$12,757	72
Panama City Marine Institute	30	0%	\$13,829	72
Pinellas Marine Institute	26	0%	\$15,018	72
Magellan Case Management SIG	101	0%	\$15,462	72
Friends of Children, Youth And Families Intensive Day Treatment	39	0%	\$16,846	71
JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	93	0%	\$17,803	71
Eckerd Leadership Program	55	0%	\$18,219	71
Visions	18	1%	\$36,472	70
Tallahassee Marine Institute	19	0%	\$22,351	70
Silver River Marine Institute	96	-1%	\$6,847	70
Charter Springs Intensive Work Program SIG	36	0%	\$26,041	69
Emerald Coast Marine Institute	15	-2%	\$10,549	66

¹ Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 2. Low-Risk Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference ¹	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female	21	9%	\$15,976	100
Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	35	9%	\$21,558	100
STEP (North and South)	250	0%	\$4,553	74
Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	266	0%	\$4,904	74
Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	219	0%	\$6,478	74
Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	125	0%	\$8,339	74
Lakeview Girls Center-Female	34	0%	\$15,473	72
New Beginnings-Female	48	0%	\$15,498	72
CATS Group Treatment Home-Female	44	0%	\$16,905	71
Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female	68	0%	\$17,397	71
Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	141	0%	\$17,491	71
Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	134	0%	\$18,268	71
Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home	74	-1%	\$5,919	71
Manatee Wilderness Camp	171	-1%	\$9,127	70
Myakka Short-Term Offender Program	146	-1%	\$9,275	70
Sankofa Group Treatment Home	32	0%	\$29,086	69
South Broward Group Treatment Home	21	0%	\$30,851	68
Palm Beach Group Treatment Home	22	0%	\$33,531	67
Dade Group Treatment Home	20	-1%	\$20,746	67
Brevard Group Treatment Home	63	-3%	\$18,750	61
Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #1	33	-5%	\$16,591	54
Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #2	16	-15%	\$19,076	40

¹ Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 3. Moderate-Risk Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference ¹	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Cove Halfway House(JSP)-Female	19	8%	\$15,849	100
Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	43	7%	\$40,291	90
Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	24	7%	\$40,375	90
YMCA Character Halfway House-Female	49	3%	\$17,878	82
Polk Boot Camp-Female	55	2%	\$27,000	76
Alachua Halfway House-Female	63	2%	\$29,835	75
Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	130	0%	\$10,090	73
Pines Halfway House-Female	84	0%	\$10,473	73
Withlacoochee Short-Term Offender Program	122	0%	\$10,984	73
Okeechobee Redirection Camp	200	0%	\$11,328	73
Dade Intensive Control	88	0%	\$11,459	73
Seminole Work and Learn Center	91	0%	\$11,968	73
Jefferson Halfway House	92	0%	\$12,497	73
Orange Halfway House Female	78	1%	\$27,944	72
Orange Boot Camp	73	0%	\$13,084	72
Space Coast Marine Institute	117	0%	\$14,038	72
Duval Halfway House	120	0%	\$14,042	72
Collier Drill Academy	111	0%	\$14,797	72
Pahokee Youth Development Center	736	0%	\$15,098	72
Gate Halfway House	61	0%	\$15,662	72
Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	182	0%	\$15,694	72
Taylor Halfway House	88	0%	\$15,850	72
Youth Development Academy	112	0%	\$16,033	72
ATC Dual Diagnosis	175	0%	\$16,043	72
Polk Halfway House	93	0%	\$16,179	72
Nassau Halfway House	91	0%	\$16,207	72
ARC Halfway House	178	0%	\$16,719	72
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center MR-Female	59	0%	\$16,731	72
Leaf Halfway House-Female	89	0%	\$17,540	71
Miami Halfway House	92	0%	\$17,600	71
West Florida Wilderness Institute	92	0%	\$17,661	71
Palm Beach Work Release	77	0%	\$17,915	71
Grove Unique Youth Services Dual Diagnosis	66	0%	\$18,250	71
Duval START Center	105	0%	\$18,505	71
Pompano Learning Academy	127	0%	\$19,414	71
Leon Drill Academy	178	0%	\$19,957	71
Kingsley Center-Female	80	0%	\$20,435	71
Orange County Correctional Program	98	0%	\$20,475	71
Crossroads Wilderness	95	0%	\$20,677	71
Martin Boot Camp	68	1%	\$36,636	70
Youth Environmental Services	85	0%	\$21,894	70
Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female	74	0%	\$24,743	70
Bridges Academy-Female	72	0%	\$25,411	69

Table 3, Continued. Moderate-Risk Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name	N	Percent Difference ¹	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
ICARE-Bay Point Schools	256	0%	\$26,196	69
Kelly Hall Halfway House	59	0%	\$28,306	69
Choices Halfway House-Female	53	0%	\$26,714	69
Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	67	0%	\$26,850	69
Polk Boot Camp-Male	153	0%	\$28,545	69
Volusia Halfway House	119	-1%	\$13,035	69
Pensacola Boys Base	116	-1%	\$13,320	69
Leslie Peters Halfway House	135	-1%	\$13,371	69
Impact Halfway House	114	-1%	\$12,007	69
MATS Halfway House	86	0%	\$31,831	68
Cannon Point Youth Academy	56	0%	\$32,119	68
Hastings Youth Academy	104	0%	\$32,142	68
Falkenberg Academy	105	0%	\$32,714	68
Okaloosa Youth Academy	116	0%	\$30,778	68
Britt Halfway House	91	-1%	\$15,526	68
Hendry Halfway House	115	-1%	\$15,615	68
San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	87	-1%	\$16,260	68
Price Halfway House	103	-1%	\$17,006	68
Manatee Boot Camp	80	-1%	\$17,068	68
Pinellas Boot Camp	88	0%	\$34,578	67
Wilson Academy-Female	34	0%	\$36,537	67
Escambia River Outward Bound	112	-1%	\$20,707	67
Marion Youth Development Center-Moderate Risk	52	-1%	\$22,500	67
Terrace Halfway House	78	-2%	\$11,183	66
Panther Success Center Halfway House	107	-2%	\$12,280	66
Hurricane Conservation Corp	79	0%	\$42,434	65
Gulf Coast Youth Academy	52	0%	\$43,275	65
Avon Park Youth Academy	223	0%	\$44,396	65
CSC Halfway House	92	-2%	\$14,266	65
Mandala ATC Halfway House-Mental Health	68	-2%	\$17,713	64
Peace River Outward Bound	98	-2%	\$19,554	64
Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program	31	0%	\$52,675	63
Bay Boot Camp	73	-2%	\$21,723	63
Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	-2%	\$24,382	63
Robert E. Lee, Jr. Hall Halfway House	79	-3%	\$10,936	62
Forestry Youth Academy	50	0%	\$58,400	61
Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	30	0%	\$60,288	61
Camp E-Kel-Etu-Mental Health	50	-2%	\$42,007	58
Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	46	-2%	\$42,207	58
Merit START	64	-4%	\$16,794	58
Madison Halfway House	85	-5%	\$13,526	55
Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	24	-5%	\$35,882	49
Palm Beach Halfway House	59	-6%	\$33,101	47

¹ Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 4. High-Risk Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name ¹	N	Percent Difference ²	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Manatee Adolescent Treatment Sex Offender	47	9%	\$64,572	91
Vernon Place-Female	72	4%	\$41,236	80
Florida Environmental Institute	39	3%	\$39,899	76
Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	47	3%	\$44,169	75
Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	17	0%	\$15,554	72
Palm Beach Youth Center	28	2%	\$52,216	70
Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	78	0%	\$21,338	70
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-HR Female	153	0%	\$23,750	70
Marion Youth Development Center-High Risk	177	0%	\$25,055	70
Glen Mills School	136	0%	\$27,592	69
ARC Intensive Halfway House	42	0%	\$28,070	69
Elaine Gordon Treatment Center Sex Offender	27	4%	\$144,432	68
Okeechobee JOCC Sex Offender	38	3%	\$74,251	68
Kingsley Center-Female	103	0%	\$30,063	68
Polk Youth Development Center	556	0%	\$32,464	68
Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	0%	\$32,487	68
Everglades Youth Development Center(YSI)	155	0%	\$34,015	67
Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	0%	\$34,565	67
Greenville Hills Academy	65	-1%	\$21,338	67
Hillsborough Alternative Residential Program (HARP)	22	0%	\$39,225	66
CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	0%	\$39,316	66
Broward Intensive Halfway House	69	0%	\$40,070	66
Manatee Youth Academy	65	-1%	\$26,311	66
Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	75	0%	\$43,938	65
Hastings Youth Academy-High Risk	46	-1%	\$30,774	65
Eckerd Intensive Halfway House	64	-1%	\$32,640	64
CSC Intensive Halfway House	74	-2%	\$18,728	64
ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	37	0%	\$51,297	63
NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	41	0%	\$55,689	62
Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	63	-2%	\$33,024	61
Eckerd Youth Development Center	231	0%	\$70,493	59
Dozier Training School for Boys	239	0%	\$77,819	57
PATH Intensive Halfway House	20	-4%	\$24,843	56
Jackson County JOCC	101	0%	\$83,750	55
Charter Pasco Treatment Center-Female	31	0%	\$94,181	54
NAFI Intensive Halfway House	42	-6%	\$25,351	49
Hillsborough Serious Habitual Offender Program	29	-5%	\$57,093	44
Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	23	-15%	\$87,283	24

¹ JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

² Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 5. Maximum-Risk Programs Ranked by PAM Score

Program Name ¹	N	Percent Difference ²	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Cypress Creek JOCC	83	0%	\$81,684	56
Omega JOCC	35	0%	\$130,924	54
Okeechobee JOCC	59	0%	\$105,580	54

¹ JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

² Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level and Effectiveness Categories

Tables 6 through 10 present the programs classified under the five effectiveness categories by program restrictiveness levels. For each program, the tables provide the observed success rate, expected success range, percent above or below expected success, two-year program expenditures, program cost per completion, and PAM score for each program. This allows for a comparison of program success rates within program restrictiveness levels. Some restrictiveness levels had no programs within given effectiveness categories.

Table 6. Minimum-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Jacksonville Youth Center Sex Offender	22	91%	72% - 79%	12%	\$1,235,219	\$56,146	93
South West Florida Marine Institute	23	87%	70% - 78%	9%	\$240,690	\$10,465	100
Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	30	83%	71% - 77%	7%	\$501,015	\$16,701	96
Gulf Coast Marine Institute South	16	81%	64% - 75%	6%	\$160,789	\$10,049	94
Lakeland Marine Institute	32	81%	70% - 76%	5%	\$123,853	\$3,870	92
Atlantic Coast Marine Institute	31	81%	70% - 76%	5%	\$198,269	\$6,396	91
Tampa Marine Institute	23	78%	66% - 74%	4%	\$304,007	\$13,218	86
Effective Programs							
Sutton Place of Nassau SIG	31	77%	68% - 74%	3%	\$294,000	\$9,484	84
Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	51	78%	72% - 75%	3%	\$637,763	\$12,505	83
Palm Beach Marine Institute	68	72%	68% - 72%	1%	\$549,627	\$8,083	77
DATA Day Treatment	37	73%	67% - 72%	1%	\$668,471	\$18,067	75
Visions	18	72%	61% - 71%	1%	\$656,500	\$36,472	70
Average Programs							
The Bridge Special Intensive Group	254	75%	75% - 75%	0%	\$748,345	\$2,946	75
Clay Behavioral Health SIG	44	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$149,976	\$3,409	75
Ft. Pierce SIG C19	70	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$360,022	\$5,143	74
New Port Richey Marine Institute	20	70%	61% - 70%	0%	\$103,049	\$5,152	74
ICCS - Bay Area Youth Services	216	66%	66% - 68%	0%	\$1,472,280	\$6,816	74
Escambia Bay Marine Institute	63	57%	57% - 60%	0%	\$540,786	\$8,584	73
Dade North Marine Institute	61	59%	58% - 62%	0%	\$531,452	\$8,712	73
Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	20	55%	54% - 63%	0%	\$198,784	\$9,939	73
Dade South Marine Institute	66	68%	65% - 69%	0%	\$669,700	\$10,147	73
Jacksonville West Marine Institute	93	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$953,719	\$10,255	73
Orlando West Marine Institute	70	60%	59% - 62%	0%	\$772,938	\$11,042	73
Gainesville Marine Institute	34	59%	57% - 63%	0%	\$399,219	\$11,742	73
Jacksonville East Marine Institute	74	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$921,554	\$12,453	73
Gulf Coast Marine Institute	26	69%	62% - 70%	0%	\$328,844	\$12,648	73
Oaks Day Treatment	103	55%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,314,000	\$12,757	72
Panama City Marine Institute	30	70%	63% - 70%	0%	\$414,873	\$13,829	72
Pinellas Marine Institute	26	65%	60% - 68%	0%	\$390,464	\$15,018	72
Magellan Case Management SIG	101	71%	69% - 72%	0%	\$1,561,689	\$15,462	72
Friends of Children, Youth And Families Intensive Day Treatment	39	62%	59% - 65%	0%	\$657,000	\$16,846	71
JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	93	60%	60% - 62%	0%	\$1,655,640	\$17,803	71
Eckerd Leadership Program	55	71%	67% - 71%	0%	\$1,002,029	\$18,219	71
Tallahassee Marine Institute	19	53%	52% - 63%	0%	\$424,673	\$22,351	70
Charter Springs Intensive Work Program SIG	36	67%	62% - 68%	0%	\$937,464	\$26,041	69
Below Average Programs							
Silver River Marine Institute	96	52%	53% - 55%	-1%	\$657,297	\$6,847	70
Emerald Coast Marine Institute	15	47%	49% - 62%	-2%	\$158,235	\$10,549	66

¹Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

²Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 7. Low-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female	21	86%	69% - 77%	9%	\$335,492	\$15,976	100
Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	35	89%	75% - 80%	9%	\$754,545	\$21,558	100
Average Programs							
STEP (North and South)	250	60%	61% - 62%	0%	\$1,138,152	\$4,553	74
Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	266	52%	53% - 54%	0%	\$1,304,549	\$4,904	74
Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	219	61%	61% - 62%	0%	\$1,418,578	\$6,478	74
Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	125	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$1,042,350	\$8,339	74
Lakeview Girls Center-Female	34	59%	57% - 63%	0%	\$526,080	\$15,473	72
New Beginnings-Female	48	58%	57% - 62%	0%	\$743,899	\$15,498	72
CATS Group Treatment Home-Female	44	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$743,798	\$16,905	71
Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female	68	66%	64% - 67%	0%	\$1,183,000	\$17,397	71
Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	141	61%	61% - 63%	0%	\$2,466,174	\$17,491	71
Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	134	54%	54% - 56%	0%	\$2,447,850	\$18,268	71
Sankofa Group Treatment Home	32	63%	59% - 66%	0%	\$930,750	\$29,086	69
South Broward Group Treatment Home	21	62%	57% - 66%	0%	\$647,867	\$30,851	68
Palm Beach Group Treatment Home	22	68%	60% - 69%	0%	\$737,677	\$33,531	67
Below Average Programs							
Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home	74	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$438,000	\$5,919	71
Manatee Wilderness Camp	171	48%	49% - 50%	-1%	\$1,560,742	\$9,127	70
Myakka Short-Term Offender Program	146	45%	46% - 47%	-1%	\$1,354,203	\$9,275	70
Dade Group Treatment Home	20	50%	51% - 61%	-1%	\$414,918	\$20,746	67
Least Effective Programs							
Brevard Group Treatment Home	63	43%	46% - 49%	-3%	\$1,181,231	\$18,750	61
Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #1	33	39%	45% - 51%	-5%	\$547,500	\$16,591	54
Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #2	16	25%	40% - 52%	-15%	\$305,220	\$19,076	40

¹Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

²Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 8. Moderate-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Cove Halfway House(JSP)-Female	19	84%	67% - 76%	8%	\$301,125	\$15,849	100
Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	43	86%	75% - 79%	7%	\$1,732,500	\$40,291	90
Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	24	83%	69% - 76%	7%	\$968,991	\$40,375	90
Effective Programs							
YMCA Character Halfway House-Female	49	78%	71% - 75%	3%	\$876,000	\$17,878	82
Polk Boot Camp-Female	55	75%	69% - 73%	2%	\$1,484,991	\$27,000	76
Alachua Halfway House-Female	63	76%	71% - 74%	2%	\$1,879,625	\$29,835	75
Orange Halfway House Female	78	73%	70% - 72%	1%	\$2,179,669	\$27,944	72
Martin Boot Camp	68	75%	70% - 74%	1%	\$2,491,248	\$36,636	70
Average Programs							
Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	130	61%	60% - 62%	0%	\$1,311,750	\$10,090	73
Pines Halfway House-Female	84	61%	60% - 63%	0%	\$879,750	\$10,473	73
Withlacoochee Short-Term Offender Program	122	60%	59% - 61%	0%	\$1,340,065	\$10,984	73
Okeechobee Redirection Camp	200	60%	60% - 61%	0%	\$2,265,556	\$11,328	73
Dade Intensive Control	88	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$1,008,398	\$11,459	73
Seminole Work and Learn Center	91	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$1,089,120	\$11,968	73
Jefferson Halfway House	92	57%	56% - 59%	0%	\$1,149,750	\$12,497	73
Orange Boot Camp	73	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$955,125	\$13,084	72
Space Coast Marine Institute	117	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$1,642,500	\$14,038	72
Duval Halfway House	120	63%	62% - 64%	0%	\$1,685,000	\$14,042	72
Collier Drill Academy	111	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$1,642,500	\$14,797	72
Pahokee Youth Development Center	736	44%	44% - 44%	0%	\$11,247,855	\$15,098	72
Gate Halfway House	61	57%	57% - 61%	0%	\$955,386	\$15,662	72
Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	182	54%	55% - 56%	0%	\$2,856,273	\$15,694	72
Taylor Halfway House	88	56%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,394,806	\$15,850	72
Youth Development Academy	112	56%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,795,684	\$16,033	72
ATC Dual Diagnosis	175	58%	58% - 59%	0%	\$2,807,475	\$16,043	72
Polk Halfway House	93	60%	60% - 62%	0%	\$1,504,674	\$16,179	72
Nassau Halfway House	91	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$1,474,811	\$16,207	72
ARC Halfway House	178	59%	59% - 60%	0%	\$2,976,000	\$16,719	72
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center MR-Female	59	64%	62% - 66%	0%	\$1,003,855	\$16,731	72
Leaf Halfway House-Female	89	66%	64% - 67%	0%	\$1,561,032	\$17,540	71
Miami Halfway House	92	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$1,619,240	\$17,600	71
West Florida Wilderness Institute	92	62%	61% - 64%	0%	\$1,642,500	\$17,661	71
Palm Beach Work Release	77	58%	58% - 61%	0%	\$1,379,457	\$17,915	71
Grove Unique Youth Services Dual Diagnosis	66	59%	58% - 62%	0%	\$1,204,500	\$18,250	71
Duval START Center	105	60%	59% - 62%	0%	\$1,943,009	\$18,505	71
Pompano Learning Academy	127	53%	53% - 55%	0%	\$2,465,639	\$19,414	71
Leon Drill Academy	178	52%	53% - 54%	0%	\$3,871,575	\$19,957	71
Kingsley Center-Female	80	66%	64% - 67%	0%	\$1,634,824	\$20,435	71
Orange County Correctional Program	98	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$2,006,557	\$20,475	71
Crossroads Wilderness	95	55%	55% - 57%	0%	\$1,964,284	\$20,677	71

Table 8, Continued. Moderate-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Average Programs Continued							
Youth Environmental Services	85	60%	59% - 62%	0%	\$1,860,985	\$21,894	70
Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female	74	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$1,830,994	\$24,743	70
Bridges Academy-Female	72	63%	61% - 64%	0%	\$1,829,621	\$25,411	69
ICARE-Bay Point Schools	256	62%	62% - 63%	0%	\$6,732,350	\$26,196	69
Choices Halfway House-Female	53	60%	59% - 63%	0%	\$1,415,850	\$26,714	69
Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	67	70%	67% - 70%	0%	\$1,798,950	\$26,850	69
Kelly Hall Halfway House	59	68%	64% - 68%	0%	\$1,670,049	\$28,306	69
Polk Boot Camp-Male	153	61%	61% - 62%	0%	\$4,453,047	\$28,545	69
Okaloosa Youth Academy	116	59%	58% - 60%	0%	\$3,570,301	\$30,778	68
MATS Halfway House	86	57%	57% - 60%	0%	\$2,737,500	\$31,831	68
Cannon Point Youth Academy	56	54%	54% - 58%	0%	\$1,798,678	\$32,119	68
Hastings Youth Academy	104	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$3,342,816	\$32,142	68
Falkenberg Academy	105	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$3,729,347	\$32,714	68
Pinellas Boot Camp	88	58%	57% - 60%	0%	\$3,284,898	\$34,578	67
Wilson Academy-Female	34	68%	62% - 68%	0%	\$1,242,252	\$36,537	67
Hurricane Conservation Corp	79	59%	59% - 62%	0%	\$3,352,303	\$42,434	65
Gulf Coast Youth Academy	52	54%	54% - 58%	0%	\$2,250,280	\$43,275	65
Avon Park Youth Academy	223	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$9,944,686	\$44,396	65
Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program	31	68%	62% - 68%	0%	\$1,632,937	\$52,675	63
Forestry Youth Academy	50	66%	63% - 67%	0%	\$2,920,000	\$58,400	61
Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	30	57%	55% - 62%	0%	\$1,808,630	\$60,288	61
Below Average Programs							
Impact Halfway House	114	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$1,368,750	\$12,007	69
Volusia Halfway House	119	44%	45% - 47%	-1%	\$1,551,143	\$13,035	69
Pensacola Boys Base	116	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$1,545,065	\$13,320	69
Leslie Peters Halfway House	135	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$1,805,147	\$13,371	69
Britt Halfway House	91	52%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,412,845	\$15,526	68
Hendry Halfway House	115	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$1,795,684	\$15,615	68
San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	87	49%	50% - 53%	-1%	\$1,414,580	\$16,260	68
Price Halfway House	103	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$1,751,668	\$17,006	68
Manatee Boot Camp	80	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,587,300	\$17,068	68
Escambia River Outward Bound	112	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$2,319,156	\$20,707	67
Marion Youth Development Center-Moderate Risk	52	52%	53% - 57%	-1%	\$1,170,000	\$22,500	67
Terrace Halfway House	78	42%	45% - 48%	-2%	\$872,250	\$11,183	66
Panther Success Center Halfway House	107	39%	42% - 44%	-2%	\$1,314,000	\$12,280	66
CSC Halfway House	92	42%	44% - 47%	-2%	\$1,312,433	\$14,266	65
Mandala ATC Halfway House-Mental Health	68	47%	49% - 52%	-2%	\$1,204,500	\$17,713	64
Peace River Outward Bound	98	44%	46% - 48%	-2%	\$1,916,250	\$19,554	64
Bay Boot Camp	73	44%	46% - 49%	-2%	\$1,672,685	\$21,723	63
Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	47%	49% - 53%	-2%	\$1,414,144	\$24,382	63
Camp E-Kel-Etu-Mental Health	50	48%	50% - 54%	-2%	\$2,100,352	\$42,007	58
Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	46	48%	50% - 55%	-2%	\$1,941,515	\$42,207	58

Table 8, Continued. Moderate-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Least Effective Programs							
Robert E. Lee, Jr. Hall Halfway House	79	42%	44% - 47%	-3%	\$863,925	\$10,936	62
Merit START	64	38%	41% - 45%	-4%	\$1,074,810	\$16,794	58
Madison Halfway House	85	31%	35% - 38%	-5%	\$1,149,750	\$13,526	55
Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	24	42%	47% - 55%	-5%	\$861,166	\$35,882	49
Palm Beach Halfway House	59	31%	37% - 40%	-6%	\$1,952,982	\$33,101	47

¹Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

²Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 9. High-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name ¹	N	Observed Success Rate ²	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ³	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Highly Effective Programs							
Manatee Adolescent Treatment Sex Offender	47	91%	79% - 83%	9%	\$3,034,874	\$64,572	91
Vernon Place-Female	72	83%	77% - 79%	4%	\$2,968,976	\$41,236	80
Elaine Gordon Treatment Center Sex Offender	27	78%	67% - 74%	4%	\$3,899,674	\$144,432	68
Effective Programs							
Florida Environmental Institute	39	77%	69% - 74%	3%	\$1,556,078	\$39,899	76
Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	47	79%	71% - 75%	3%	\$2,075,940	\$44,169	75
Palm Beach Youth Center	28	75%	66% - 73%	2%	\$1,462,056	\$52,216	70
Okeechobee JOCC Sex Offender	38	76%	69% - 74%	3%	\$2,821,540	\$74,251	68
Average Programs							
Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	17	71%	60% - 71%	0%	\$264,415	\$15,554	72
Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	78	55%	55% - 58%	0%	\$1,664,400	\$21,338	70
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-HR Female	153	71%	69% - 71%	0%	\$3,681,225	\$23,750	70
Marion Youth Development Center-High Risk	177	51%	52% - 53%	0%	\$4,434,659	\$25,055	70
Glen Mills School	136	72%	70% - 72%	0%	\$3,752,527	\$27,592	69
ARC Intensive Halfway House	42	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$1,178,950	\$28,070	69
Kingsley Center-Female	103	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$3,096,465	\$30,063	68
Polk Youth Development Center	556	56%	57% - 57%	0%	\$18,147,193	\$32,464	68
Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	60%	58% - 64%	0%	\$1,396,929	\$32,487	68
Everglades Youth Development Center(YSI)	155	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$5,272,347	\$34,015	67
Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	57%	56% - 60%	0%	\$2,004,745	\$34,565	67
Hillsborough Alternative Residential Program (HARP)	22	64%	58% - 67%	0%	\$862,950	\$39,225	66
CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$2,398,254	\$39,316	66
Broward Intensive Halfway House	69	62%	61% - 64%	0%	\$2,764,806	\$40,070	66
Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	75	57%	57% - 60%	0%	\$3,295,336	\$43,938	65
ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	37	59%	58% - 63%	0%	\$1,898,000	\$51,297	63
NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	41	59%	57% - 62%	0%	\$2,338,950	\$55,689	62
Eckerd Youth Development Center	231	59%	59% - 60%	0%	\$16,283,903	\$70,493	59
Dozier Training School for Boys	239	62%	62% - 63%	0%	\$18,832,270	\$77,819	57
Jackson County JOCC	101	55%	56% - 58%	0%	\$8,458,775	\$83,750	55
Charter Pasco Treatment Center-Female	31	68%	62% - 69%	0%	\$2,919,620	\$94,181	54
Below Average Programs							
Greenville Hills Academy	65	52%	53% - 56%	-1%	\$1,387,000	\$21,338	67
Manatee Youth Academy	65	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,762,829	\$26,311	66
Hastings Youth Academy-High Risk	46	52%	53% - 58%	-1%	\$1,415,615	\$30,774	65
Eckerd Intensive Halfway House	64	50%	51% - 55%	-1%	\$2,088,931	\$32,640	64
CSC Intensive Halfway House	74	43%	46% - 49%	-2%	\$1,385,896	\$18,728	64
Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	63	44%	47% - 51%	-2%	\$2,080,500	\$33,024	61

Table 9, Continued. High-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name ¹	N	Observed Success Rate ²	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ³	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Least Effective Programs							
PATH Intensive Halfway House	20	45%	49% - 58%	-4%	\$496,850	\$24,843	56
Hillsborough Serious Habitual Offender Program	29	41%	46% - 54%	-5%	\$1,655,700	\$57,093	44
NAFI Intensive Halfway House	42	36%	42% - 47%	-6%	\$1,064,758	\$25,351	49
Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	23	22%	37% - 45%	-15%	\$2,007,500	\$87,283	24

¹JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

²Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

³Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 10. Maximum-Risk Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

Program Name ¹	N	Observed Success Rate ²	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ³	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Average Programs							
Omega JOCC	35	66%	61% - 67%	0%	\$4,713,249	\$130,924	54
Cypress Creek JOCC	83	67%	65% - 68%	0%	\$6,779,751	\$81,684	56
Okeechobee JOCC	59	69%	66% - 70%	0%	\$6,229,191	\$105,580	54

¹JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

²Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

³Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

PAM Scores by Cost Categories

Tables 11 through 16, compare program PAM scores and effectiveness groupings in relation to the three cost categories. This allows for a comparison of program success rates to the cost effectiveness of programs. Programs are presented in separate tables for non-residential and residential commitment programs.

Table 11. Minimum Risk Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
Min	Lakeland Marine Institute	32	81%	70% - 76%	5%	\$123,853	\$3,870	92
Min	Atlantic Coast Marine Institute	31	81%	70% - 76%	5%	\$198,269	\$6,396	91
Min	Gulf Coast Marine Institute South	16	81%	64% - 75%	6%	\$160,789	\$10,049	94
Min	South West Florida Marine Institute	23	87%	70% - 78%	9%	\$240,690	\$10,465	100
Min	Tampa Marine Institute	23	78%	66% - 74%	4%	\$304,007	\$13,218	86
Moderate Cost								
Min	Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	30	83%	71% - 77%	7%	\$501,015	\$16,701	96
High Cost								
Min	Jacksonville Youth Center Sex Offender	22	91%	72% - 79%	12%	\$1,235,219	\$56,146	93
EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
Min	Palm Beach Marine Institute	68	72%	68% - 72%	1%	\$549,627	\$8,083	77
Min	Sutton Place of Nassau SIG	31	77%	68% - 74%	3%	\$294,000	\$9,484	84
Min	Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	51	78%	72% - 75%	3%	\$637,763	\$12,505	83
Moderate Cost								
Min	DATA Day Treatment	37	73%	67% - 72%	1%	\$668,471	\$18,067	75
High Cost								
Min	Visions	18	72%	61% - 71%	1%	\$656,500	\$36,472	70
AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
Min	The Bridge Special Intensive Group	254	75%	75% - 75%	0%	\$748,345	\$2,946	75
Min	Clay Behavioral Health SIG	44	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$149,976	\$3,409	75
Min	Ft. Pierce SIG C19	70	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$360,022	\$5,143	74
Min	New Port Richey Marine Institute	20	70%	61% - 70%	0%	\$103,049	\$5,152	74
Min	ICCS - Bay Area Youth Services	216	66%	66% - 68%	0%	\$1,472,280	\$6,816	74
Min	Escambia Bay Marine Institute	63	57%	57% - 60%	0%	\$540,786	\$8,584	73
Min	Dade North Marine Institute	61	59%	58% - 62%	0%	\$531,452	\$8,712	73
Min	Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	20	55%	54% - 63%	0%	\$198,784	\$9,939	73
Min	Dade South Marine Institute	66	68%	65% - 69%	0%	\$669,700	\$10,147	73
Min	Jacksonville West Marine Institute	93	71%	68% - 71%	0%	\$953,719	\$10,255	73
Min	Orlando West Marine Institute	70	60%	59% - 62%	0%	\$772,938	\$11,042	73
Min	Gainesville Marine Institute	34	59%	57% - 63%	0%	\$399,219	\$11,742	73
Min	Jacksonville East Marine Institute	74	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$921,554	\$12,453	73
Min	Gulf Coast Marine Institute	26	69%	62% - 70%	0%	\$328,844	\$12,648	73
Min	Oaks Day Treatment	103	55%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,314,000	\$12,757	72
Min	Panama City Marine Institute	30	70%	63% - 70%	0%	\$414,873	\$13,829	72
Min	Pinellas Marine Institute	26	65%	60% - 68%	0%	\$390,464	\$15,018	72
Min	Magellan Case Management SIG	101	71%	69% - 72%	0%	\$1,561,689	\$15,462	72

Table 11, Continued. Minimum Risk Non-Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Moderate Cost								
Min	Friends of Children, Youth And Families Intensive Day	39	62%	59% - 65%	0%	\$657,000	\$16,846	71
Min	JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	93	60%	60% - 62%	0%	\$1,655,640	\$17,803	71
Min	Eckerd Leadership Program	55	71%	67% - 71%	0%	\$1,002,029	\$18,219	71
Min	Tallahassee Marine Institute	19	53%	52% - 63%	0%	\$424,673	\$22,351	70
Min	Charter Springs Intensive Work Program SIG	36	67%	62% - 68%	0%	\$937,464	\$26,041	69
BELOW AVERAGE PROGRAMS								
Low Cost								
Min	Silver River Marine Institute	96	52%	53% - 55%	-1%	\$657,297	\$6,847	70
Min	Emerald Coast Marine Institute	15	47%	49% - 62%	-2%	\$158,235	\$10,549	66

¹Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

²Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 12. Highly Effective Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Moderate Cost								
Mod	Cove Halfway House(JSP)-Female	19	84%	67% - 76%	8%	\$301,125	\$15,849	100
Low	Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female	21	86%	69% - 77%	9%	\$335,492	\$15,976	100
Low	Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	35	89%	75% - 80%	9%	\$754,545	\$21,558	100
High Cost								
Mod	Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	43	86%	75% - 79%	7%	\$1,732,500	\$40,291	90
Mod	Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	24	83%	69% - 76%	7%	\$968,991	\$40,375	90
High	Vernon Place-Female	72	83%	77% - 79%	4%	\$2,968,976	\$41,236	80
High	Manatee Adolescent Treatment Sex Offender	47	91%	79% - 83%	9%	\$3,034,874	\$64,572	91
High	Elaine Gordon Treatment Center Sex Offender	27	78%	67% - 74%	4%	\$3,899,674	\$144,432	68

¹Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

²Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 13. Effective Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name ¹	N	Observed Success Rate ²	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ³	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Moderate Cost								
Mod	YMCA Character Halfway House-Female	49	78%	71% - 75%	3%	\$876,000	\$17,878	82
High Cost								
Mod	Polk Boot Camp-Female	55	75%	69% - 73%	2%	\$1,484,991	\$27,000	76
Mod	Orange Halfway House Female	78	73%	70% - 72%	1%	\$2,179,669	\$27,944	72
Mod	Alachua Halfway House-Female	63	76%	71% - 74%	2%	\$1,879,625	\$29,835	75
Mod	Martin Boot Camp	68	75%	70% - 74%	1%	\$2,491,248	\$36,636	70
High	Florida Environmental Institute	39	77%	69% - 74%	3%	\$1,556,078	\$39,899	76
High	Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	47	79%	71% - 75%	3%	\$2,075,940	\$44,169	75
High	Palm Beach Youth Center	28	75%	66% - 73%	2%	\$1,462,056	\$52,216	70
High	Okeechobee JOCC Sex Offender	38	76%	69% - 74%	3%	\$2,821,540	\$74,251	68

¹JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

²Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

³Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

**Table 14. Average Residential Programs Ranked by
Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories**

Level	Program Name ¹	N	Observed Success Rate ²	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ³	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Low Cost								
Low	STEP (North and South)	250	60%	61% - 62%	0%	\$1,138,152	\$4,553	74
Low	Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	266	52%	53% - 54%	0%	\$1,304,549	\$4,904	74
Low	Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	219	61%	61% - 62%	0%	\$1,418,578	\$6,478	74
Low	Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	125	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$1,042,350	\$8,339	74
Mod	Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	130	61%	60% - 62%	0%	\$1,311,750	\$10,090	73
Mod	Pines Halfway House-Female	84	61%	60% - 63%	0%	\$879,750	\$10,473	73
Mod	Withlacochee Short-Term Offender Program	122	60%	59% - 61%	0%	\$1,340,065	\$10,984	73
Mod	Okeechobee Redirection Camp	200	60%	60% - 61%	0%	\$2,265,556	\$11,328	73
Mod	Dade Intensive Control	88	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$1,008,398	\$11,459	73
Mod	Seminole Work and Learn Center	91	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$1,089,120	\$11,968	73
Mod	Jefferson Halfway House	92	57%	56% - 59%	0%	\$1,149,750	\$12,497	73
Mod	Orange Boot Camp	73	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$955,125	\$13,084	72
Mod	Space Coast Marine Institute	117	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$1,642,500	\$14,038	72
Mod	Duval Halfway House	120	63%	62% - 64%	0%	\$1,685,000	\$14,042	72
Mod	Collier Drill Academy	111	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$1,642,500	\$14,797	72
Mod	Pahokee Youth Development Center	736	44%	44% - 44%	0%	\$11,247,855	\$15,098	72
Low	Lakeview Girls Center-Female	34	59%	57% - 63%	0%	\$526,080	\$15,473	72
Low	New Beginnings-Female	48	58%	57% - 62%	0%	\$743,899	\$15,498	72
High	Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	17	71%	60% - 71%	0%	\$264,415	\$15,554	72
Mod	Gate Halfway House	61	57%	57% - 61%	0%	\$955,386	\$15,662	72
Moderate Cost								
Mod	Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	182	54%	55% - 56%	0%	\$2,856,273	\$15,694	72
Mod	Taylor Halfway House	88	56%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,394,806	\$15,850	72
Mod	Youth Development Academy	112	56%	56% - 58%	0%	\$1,795,684	\$16,033	72
Mod	ATC Dual Diagnosis	175	58%	58% - 59%	0%	\$2,807,475	\$16,043	72
Mod	Polk Halfway House	93	60%	60% - 62%	0%	\$1,504,674	\$16,179	72
Mod	Nassau Halfway House	91	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$1,474,811	\$16,207	72
Mod	ARC Halfway House	178	59%	59% - 60%	0%	\$2,976,000	\$16,719	72
Mod	Charter Pinellas Treatment Center MR-Female	59	64%	62% - 66%	0%	\$1,003,855	\$16,731	72
Low	CATS Group Treatment Home-Female	44	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$743,798	\$16,905	71
Low	Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female	68	66%	64% - 67%	0%	\$1,183,000	\$17,397	71
Low	Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	141	61%	61% - 63%	0%	\$2,466,174	\$17,491	71
Mod	Leaf Halfway House-Female	89	66%	64% - 67%	0%	\$1,561,032	\$17,540	71
Mod	Miami Halfway House	92	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$1,619,240	\$17,600	71
Mod	West Florida Wilderness Institute	92	62%	61% - 64%	0%	\$1,642,500	\$17,661	71
Mod	Palm Beach Work Release	77	58%	58% - 61%	0%	\$1,379,457	\$17,915	71
Mod	Grove Unique Youth Services Dual Diagnosis	66	59%	58% - 62%	0%	\$1,204,500	\$18,250	71
Low	Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	134	54%	54% - 56%	0%	\$2,447,850	\$18,268	71
Mod	Duval START Center	105	60%	59% - 62%	0%	\$1,943,009	\$18,505	71

Table 14, Continued. Average Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name ¹	N	Observed Success Rate ²	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ³	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Moderate Cost Continued								
Mod	Pompano Learning Academy	127	53%	53% - 55%	0%	\$2,465,639	\$19,414	71
Mod	Leon Drill Academy	178	52%	53% - 54%	0%	\$3,871,575	\$19,957	71
Mod	Kingsley Center-Female	80	66%	64% - 67%	0%	\$1,634,824	\$20,435	71
Mod	Orange County Correctional Program	98	59%	59% - 61%	0%	\$2,006,557	\$20,475	71
Mod	Crossroads Wilderness	95	55%	55% - 57%	0%	\$1,964,284	\$20,677	71
High	Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	78	55%	55% - 58%	0%	\$1,664,400	\$21,338	70
Mod	Youth Environmental Services	85	60%	59% - 62%	0%	\$1,860,985	\$21,894	70
High	Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-HR Female	153	71%	69% - 71%	0%	\$3,681,225	\$23,750	70
Mod	Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female	74	69%	66% - 69%	0%	\$1,830,994	\$24,743	70
High	Marion Youth Development Center-High Risk	177	51%	52% - 53%	0%	\$4,434,659	\$25,055	70
Mod	Bridges Academy-Female	72	63%	61% - 64%	0%	\$1,829,621	\$25,411	69
Mod	ICARE-Bay Point Schools	256	62%	62% - 63%	0%	\$6,732,350	\$26,196	69
Mod	Choices Halfway House-Female	53	60%	59% - 63%	0%	\$1,415,850	\$26,714	69
Mod	Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	67	70%	67% - 70%	0%	\$1,798,950	\$26,850	69
High Cost								
High	Glen Mills School	136	72%	70% - 72%	0%	\$3,752,527	\$27,592	69
High	ARC Intensive Halfway House	42	64%	61% - 66%	0%	\$1,178,950	\$28,070	69
Mod	Kelly Hall Halfway House	59	68%	64% - 68%	0%	\$1,670,049	\$28,306	69
Mod	Polk Boot Camp-Male	153	61%	61% - 62%	0%	\$4,453,047	\$28,545	69
Low	Sankofa Group Treatment Home	32	63%	59% - 66%	0%	\$930,750	\$29,086	69
High	Kingsley Center-Female	103	64%	63% - 65%	0%	\$3,096,465	\$30,063	68
Mod	Okaloosa Youth Academy	116	59%	58% - 60%	0%	\$3,570,301	\$30,778	68
Low	UMOJA Group Treatment Home	21	62%	57% - 66%	0%	\$647,867	\$30,851	68
Mod	MATS Halfway House	86	57%	57% - 60%	0%	\$2,737,500	\$31,831	68
Mod	Cannon Point Youth Academy	56	54%	54% - 58%	0%	\$1,798,678	\$32,119	68
Mod	Hastings Youth Academy	104	59%	58% - 61%	0%	\$3,342,816	\$32,142	68
High	Polk Youth Development Center	556	56%	57% - 57%	0%	\$18,147,193	\$32,464	68
High	Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	60%	58% - 64%	0%	\$1,396,929	\$32,487	68
Mod	Falkenberg Academy	105	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$3,729,347	\$32,714	68
Low	Palm Beach Group Treatment Home	22	68%	60% - 69%	0%	\$737,677	\$33,531	67
High	Everglades Youth Development Center(YSI)	155	58%	58% - 60%	0%	\$5,272,347	\$34,015	67
High	Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	57%	56% - 60%	0%	\$2,004,745	\$34,565	67
Mod	Pinellas Boot Camp	88	58%	57% - 60%	0%	\$3,284,898	\$34,578	67
Mod	Wilson Academy-Female	34	68%	62% - 68%	0%	\$1,242,252	\$36,537	67
High	Hillsborough Alternative Residential Program (HARP)	22	64%	58% - 67%	0%	\$862,950	\$39,225	66
High	CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	56%	56% - 59%	0%	\$2,398,254	\$39,316	66
High	Broward Intensive Halfway House	69	62%	61% - 64%	0%	\$2,764,806	\$40,070	66

Table 14, Continued. Average Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name ¹	N	Observed Success Rate ²	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ³	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
High Cost Continued								
Mod	Hurricane Conservation Corp	79	59%	59% - 62%	0%	\$3,352,303	\$42,434	65
Mod	Gulf Coast Youth Academy	52	54%	54% - 58%	0%	\$2,250,280	\$43,275	65
High	Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	75	57%	57% - 60%	0%	\$3,295,336	\$43,938	65
Mod	Avon Park Youth Academy	223	65%	64% - 66%	0%	\$9,944,686	\$44,396	65
High	ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	37	59%	58% - 63%	0%	\$1,898,000	\$51,297	63
Mod	Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program	31	68%	62% - 68%	0%	\$1,632,937	\$52,675	63
High	NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	41	59%	57% - 62%	0%	\$2,338,950	\$55,689	62
Mod	Forestry Youth Academy	50	66%	63% - 67%	0%	\$2,920,000	\$58,400	61
Mod	Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	30	57%	55% - 62%	0%	\$1,808,630	\$60,288	61
High	Eckerd Youth Development Center	231	59%	59% - 60%	0%	\$16,283,903	\$70,493	59
High	Dozier Training School for Boys	239	62%	62% - 63%	0%	\$18,832,270	\$77,819	57
Max	Cypress Creek JOCC	83	67%	65% - 68%	0%	\$6,779,751	\$81,684	56
High	Jackson County JOCC	101	55%	56% - 58%	0%	\$8,458,775	\$83,750	55
High	Charter Pasco Treatment Center-Female	31	68%	62% - 69%	0%	\$2,919,620	\$94,181	54
Max	Okeechobee JOCC	59	69%	66% - 70%	0%	\$6,229,191	\$105,580	54
Max	Omega JOCC	35	66%	61% - 67%	0%	\$4,713,249	\$130,924	54

¹JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

²Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

³Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 15. Below Average Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Low Cost								
Low	Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home	74	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$438,000	\$5,919	71
Low	Manatee Wilderness Camp	171	48%	49% - 50%	-1%	\$1,560,742	\$9,127	70
Low	Myakka Short-Term Offender Program	146	45%	46% - 47%	-1%	\$1,354,203	\$9,275	70
Mod	Terrace Halfway House	78	42%	45% - 48%	-2%	\$872,250	\$11,183	66
Mod	Impact Halfway House	114	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$1,368,750	\$12,007	69
Mod	Panther Success Center Halfway House	107	39%	42% - 44%	-2%	\$1,314,000	\$12,280	66
Mod	Volusia Halfway House	119	44%	45% - 47%	-1%	\$1,551,143	\$13,035	69
Mod	Pensacola Boys Base	116	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$1,545,065	\$13,320	69
Mod	Leslie Peters Halfway House	135	51%	52% - 54%	-1%	\$1,805,147	\$13,371	69
Mod	CSC Halfway House	92	42%	44% - 47%	-2%	\$1,312,433	\$14,266	65
Mod	Britt Halfway House	91	52%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,412,845	\$15,526	68
Mod	Hendry Halfway House	115	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$1,795,684	\$15,615	68
Moderate Cost								
Mod	San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	87	49%	50% - 53%	-1%	\$1,414,580	\$16,260	68
Mod	Price Halfway House	103	50%	51% - 54%	-1%	\$1,751,668	\$17,006	68
Mod	Manatee Boot Camp	80	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,587,300	\$17,068	68
Mod	Mandala ATC Halfway House-Mental Health	68	47%	49% - 52%	-2%	\$1,204,500	\$17,713	64
High	CSC Intensive Halfway House	74	43%	46% - 49%	-2%	\$1,385,896	\$18,728	64
Mod	Peace River Outward Bound	98	44%	46% - 48%	-2%	\$1,916,250	\$19,554	64
Mod	Escambia River Outward Bound	112	50%	51% - 53%	-1%	\$2,319,156	\$20,707	67
Low	Dade Group Treatment Home	20	50%	51% - 61%	-1%	\$414,918	\$20,746	67
High	Greenville Hills Academy	65	52%	53% - 56%	-1%	\$1,387,000	\$21,338	67
Mod	Bay Boot Camp	73	44%	46% - 49%	-2%	\$1,672,685	\$21,723	63
Mod	Marion Youth Development Center-Moderate Risk	52	52%	53% - 57%	-1%	\$1,170,000	\$22,500	67
Mod	Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	47%	49% - 53%	-2%	\$1,414,144	\$24,382	63
High	Manatee Youth Academy	65	51%	52% - 55%	-1%	\$1,762,829	\$26,311	66
High Cost								
High	Hastings Youth Academy-High Risk	46	52%	53% - 58%	-1%	\$1,415,615	\$30,774	65
High	Eckerd Intensive Halfway House	64	50%	51% - 55%	-1%	\$2,088,931	\$32,640	64
High	Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	63	44%	47% - 51%	-2%	\$2,080,500	\$33,024	61
Mod	Camp E-Kei-Etu-Mental Health	50	48%	50% - 54%	-2%	\$2,100,352	\$42,007	58
Mod	Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	46	48%	50% - 55%	-2%	\$1,941,515	\$42,207	58

¹Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

²Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Table 16. Least Effective Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness and Cost Categories

Level	Program Name	N	Observed Success Rate ¹	Expected Success Range	Percent Difference ²	Two-Year Expenditures	Cost per Completion	PAM Score
Low Cost								
Mod	Robert E. Lee, Jr. Hall Halfway House	79	42%	44% - 47%	-3%	\$863,925	\$10,936	62
Mod	Madison Halfway House	85	31%	35% - 38%	-5%	\$1,149,750	\$13,526	55
Moderate Cost								
Low	Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #1	33	39%	45% - 51%	-5%	\$547,500	\$16,591	54
Mod	Merit START	64	38%	41% - 45%	-4%	\$1,074,810	\$16,794	58
Low	Brevard Group Treatment Home	63	43%	46% - 49%	-3%	\$1,181,231	\$18,750	61
Low	Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #2	16	25%	40% - 52%	-15%	\$305,220	\$19,076	40
High	PATH Intensive Halfway House	20	45%	49% - 58%	-4%	\$496,850	\$24,843	56
High	NAFI Intensive Halfway House	42	36%	42% - 47%	-6%	\$1,064,758	\$25,351	49
High Cost								
Mod	Palm Beach Halfway House	59	31%	37% - 40%	-6%	\$1,952,982	\$33,101	47
Mod	Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	24	42%	47% - 55%	-5%	\$861,166	\$35,882	49
High	Hillsborough Serious Habitual Offender Program	29	41%	46% - 54%	-5%	\$1,655,700	\$57,093	44
High	Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	23	22%	37% - 45%	-15%	\$2,007,500	\$87,283	24

¹Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent

²Percent difference: The difference between the observed rate and the upper or lower limit of the expected success range.

Appendix 1

Definitions of Terms

Cost minimization index: the negative of the standardized measure for cost per completion, inverted to allow lower costs to contribute positively in the PAM score. Cost is standardized by dividing the program cost per completion by the standard deviation of program cost per completion among all programs included in the report.

Expected success range: the expected success rate plus or minus the margin of error, or the 99% confidence interval for the measure of expected success. If the observed success rate falls below the lower limit or exceeds the upper limit of the expected success range, the probability that the difference is due to random error is less than 1%.

Expected success rate: the average probability of success for youth released from a program, based on the risk factors for recidivism. The risk factors identified in available data as significant predictors of recidivism include the number of prior adjudications, age at first offense, age at release, and gender.

Included programs: residential and non-residential programs, excluding conditional release programs, with at least 15 youth released between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 2000. Programs closed during 1998-99 are not included.

Percentage above expected: the difference between the observed success rate of youth released and the upper limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percentage below expected: the difference between the observed success rate of youth released and the lower limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percent difference: the percent above or below the expected success range.

Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score: The PAM score is calculated by adding together the program cost measure, weighted as one third, and the program effectiveness measure, weighted as two-thirds. The combined measure is then standardized and transformed into a PAM score similar to a grade, with a maximum this year of 100, an average of 70, and a minimum of 24.

Program completions: youth in the recidivism pool. Youth who leave without completing a program, including those who are laterally transferred to other programs that are not transitional or conditional release programs, are not counted as program completions. The only exception to this is the few youth who agree to attend the Forestry Youth Academy after program release.

Program cost per completion: Total DJJ expenditures for each program divided by the number of youth completing the program during the two-year period between FY 1998-1999 and FY 1999-2000. (see definition of program completions above).

Recidivism: a subsequent juvenile adjudication, adjudication withheld or adult conviction for an offense that occurred within one year of a youth's release from a Department of Juvenile Justice commitment program to the community or a conditional release program.

Recidivism pool: a pool of 17,762 youth released from residential or non-residential programs to the community or a conditional release program between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 2000. Recidivism is tracked for one year after each youth's release. Therefore, a youth released on June 28, 1999 is tracked till June 27, 2000.

Recidivism reduction effect, or program effectiveness index: the difference between the observed success rate and the upper limit (for positive differences) or lower limit (for negative differences) of the expected success range. The difference is standardized by dividing it by the standard deviation of those differences among all programs in the report.

Standardization: conversion of the separate accountability measures to a uniform scale so they can be combined into a single measure; a process similar to converting all grades to a scale of 100. Cost and effectiveness measures are standardized by dividing each program's value on the measure by the standard deviation for the distribution of values for all included programs.

Success rate: the percentage of youth released from a program who do not recidivate (as defined above) within one year after release.

Appendix 2

Programs Risk Factors by Restrictiveness Levels

Table A1. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Minimum-Risk Programs

Minimum Risk Programs	Successful Releases	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	Average Age at 1st Offense	Average Age at Release	% Male	Expected Success Range	Success Rate
Atlantic Coast Marine Institute	31	2.8	13.5	17.6	77%	70% - 76%	81%
Charter Springs Intensive Work Program SIG	36	4.2	13.3	16.8	83%	62% - 68%	67%
Clay Behavioral Health SIG	44	2.4	13.9	16.8	80%	61% - 66%	64%
Crossroads Rainwater Center Day Treatment-Female	30	3.6	13.8	16.5	0%	71% - 77%	83%
Dade North Marine Institute	61	3.0	13.5	16.6	98%	58% - 62%	59%
Dade South Marine Institute	66	2.5	13.6	16.6	92%	65% - 69%	68%
DATA Day Treatment	37	3.4	13.1	16.3	62%	67% - 72%	73%
Eckerd Leadership Program	55	2.7	13.8	16.2	55%	67% - 71%	71%
Emerald Coast Marine Institute	15	3.2	13.7	16.3	73%	49% - 62%	47%
Escambia Bay Marine Institute	63	3.3	13.7	17.0	83%	57% - 60%	57%
Evaluation & Treatment Services (St. Johns)	20	3.6	13.6	16.9	75%	54% - 63%	55%
Florida Ocean Sciences Marine Institute	51	3.4	13.5	16.7	86%	72% - 75%	78%
Friends of Children, Youth And Families Intensive Day Treatment	39	4.5	12.6	16.3	100%	59% - 65%	62%
Ft. Pierce SIG C19	70	2.9	13.9	16.8	60%	68% - 71%	71%
Gainesville Marine Institute	34	3.8	13.4	16.4	79%	57% - 63%	59%
Gulf Coast Marine Institute	26	3.0	13.7	16.7	77%	62% - 70%	69%
Gulf Coast Marine Institute South	16	2.9	13.6	16.5	69%	64% - 75%	81%
ICCS - Bay Area Youth Services	216	4.1	13.3	16.6	72%	66% - 68%	66%
Jacksonville East Marine Institute	74	2.1	13.7	16.6	81%	66% - 69%	69%
Jacksonville West Marine Institute	93	2.2	13.8	16.7	89%	68% - 71%	71%
Jacksonville Youth Center Sex Offender	22	1.3	13.5	15.9	100%	72% - 79%	91%
JESCA Floyd Day Treatment	93	3.0	13.4	16.7	87%	60% - 62%	60%
Lakeland Marine Institute	32	3.9	13.8	17.0	78%	70% - 76%	81%
Magellan Case Management SIG	101	3.4	13.4	16.8	76%	69% - 72%	71%
New Port Richey Marine Institute	20	4.4	13.1	16.1	80%	61% - 70%	70%
Oaks Day Treatment	103	2.8	13.5	16.2	72%	56% - 58%	55%
Orlando West Marine Institute	70	2.9	13.9	16.9	83%	59% - 62%	60%
Palm Beach Marine Institute	68	3.0	13.8	17.2	88%	68% - 72%	72%
Panama City Marine Institute	30	2.1	13.9	16.3	53%	63% - 70%	70%
Pinellas Marine Institute	26	5.5	13.3	16.6	69%	60% - 68%	65%
Silver River Marine Institute	96	3.6	13.5	16.4	86%	53% - 55%	52%
South West Florida Marine Institute	23	3.8	13.9	17.0	87%	70% - 78%	87%
Sutton Place of Nassau SIG	31	3.3	13.3	16.3	81%	68% - 74%	77%
Tallahassee Marine Institute	19	3.9	13.1	16.5	89%	52% - 63%	53%
Tampa Marine Institute	23	3.8	13.4	17.5	83%	66% - 74%	78%
The Bridge Special Intensive Group	254	2.5	13.6	16.5	72%	75% - 75%	75%
Visions	18	4.4	13.7	16.5	72%	61% - 71%	72%

**Table A2. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures
for Low-Risk Programs**

Low Risk Programs	Successful Releases	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	Average Age at 1st Offense	Average Age at Release	% Male	Expected Success Range	Success Rate
Akanke Group Treatment Home-Female	21	3.7	13.3	15.7	0%	69% - 77%	86%
Alligator Short-Term Offender Program	219	3.4	13.6	16.5	100%	61% - 62%	61%
Blackwater Short-Term Offender Program Camp	266	3.6	13.7	16.4	100%	53% - 54%	52%
Brevard Group Treatment Home	63	4.2	11.1	13.4	100%	46% - 49%	43%
CATS Group Treatment Home-Female	44	4.2	13.3	15.7	0%	61% - 66%	64%
Dade Group Treatment Home	20	3.5	11.5	13.9	100%	51% - 61%	50%
Eckerd Youth Conservation Academy	134	4.4	13.1	16.2	100%	54% - 56%	54%
Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #1	33	5.4	10.5	13.0	100%	45% - 51%	39%
Hillsborough Group Treatment Home #2	16	6.6	10.1	14.0	100%	40% - 52%	25%
Jonathan Dickinson Short-Term Offender Program Camp	125	3.3	14.1	16.7	100%	63% - 65%	64%
Lakeview Girls Center-Female	34	3.6	13.8	16.1	0%	57% - 63%	59%
Leaf Group Treatment Home-Female	35	3.6	13.7	16.6	0%	75% - 80%	89%
Manatee Wilderness Camp	171	4.9	13.3	16.3	100%	49% - 50%	48%
Myakka Short-Term Offender Program	146	4.5	13.4	16.0	100%	46% - 47%	45%
New Beginnings-Female	48	4.0	13.1	15.5	0%	57% - 62%	58%
Palm Beach Group Treatment Home	22	4.6	10.6	13.6	100%	60% - 69%	68%
Panama Key Island Group Treatment Home	74	5.9	13.1	16.3	100%	51% - 54%	50%
Project Star Group Treatment Home-Female	68	3.5	13.4	15.5	0%	64% - 67%	66%
Rilla White Foundation Family Homes	141	3.2	13.1	15.7	55%	61% - 63%	61%
Sankofa Group Treatment Home	32	5.3	12.5	16.0	100%	59% - 66%	62%
STEP (North and South)	250	3.2	13.6	16.4	78%	61% - 62%	60%
UMOJA Group Treatment Home	21	5.2	11.7	15.6	100%	57% - 66%	62%

Table A3. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Moderate-Risk Programs

Moderate Risk Programs	Successful Releases	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	Average Age at 1st Offense	Average Age at Release	% Male	Expected Success Range	Success Rate
Alachua Halfway House-Female	63	4.1	13.6	16.8	0%	71% - 74%	76%
ARC Halfway House	178	5.5	13.3	17.1	100%	59% - 60%	59%
ATC Dual Diagnosis	175	5.1	13.6	16.9	100%	58% - 59%	58%
Avon Park Youth Academy	224	5.8	13.7	17.9	100%	64% - 66%	65%
Bay Boot Camp	77	4.1	13.4	16.8	100%	46% - 49%	44%
Francis Walker Halfway House-Female	67	4.2	13.7	16.6	0%	67% - 70%	70%
Bridges Academy-Female	72	4.1	13.8	16.3	0%	61% - 64%	62%
Britt Halfway House	91	6.9	12.9	16.9	100%	52% - 55%	52%
Camp E-How-Kee-Mental Health	24	5.3	12.9	15.6	100%	47% - 55%	42%
Camp E-Kel-Etu-Mental Health	50	4.5	12.6	15.8	100%	50% - 54%	48%
Camp E-Ma-Chamee-Mental Health	46	3.6	12.5	15.2	100%	50% - 55%	48%
Camp E-Nini-Hassee-Female-Mental Health	24	5.2	13.3	16.5	0%	69% - 76%	83%
Camp E-Tu-Makee-Mental Health	30	4.3	12.4	15.7	100%	55% - 62%	57%
Cannon Point Youth Academy	56	5.9	12.9	16.9	100%	54% - 58%	54%
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center MR-Female	60	5.1	13.1	16.7	0%	62% - 66%	64%
Choices Halfway House-Female	53	5.0	13.2	16.5	0%	59% - 63%	60%
Collier Drill Academy	111	3.3	13.7	16.4	100%	63% - 65%	64%
Cove Halfway House(JSP)-Female	19	4.1	13.6	16.1	0%	67% - 76%	84%
Crossroads Wilderness	95	5.0	13.3	16.9	100%	55% - 57%	55%
CSC Halfway House	92	6.6	12.1	16.1	100%	44% - 47%	42%
Dade Intensive Control	88	4.2	12.8	15.8	100%	59% - 61%	59%
Duval Halfway House	120	3.1	13.5	16.7	100%	62% - 64%	62%
Duval START Center	105	3.6	11.8	14.4	100%	59% - 62%	60%
Eckerd Comprehensive Treatment Program	31	3.5	12.6	16.4	100%	62% - 68%	68%
Eckerd Youth Challenge Program	182	4.8	13.3	16.7	100%	55% - 56%	54%
Escambia River Outward Bound	112	4.3	13.2	15.9	100%	51% - 53%	50%
Falkenberg Academy	114	6.6	12.6	16.6	100%	56% - 59%	56%
Forestry Youth Academy	50	5.8	13.7	17.5	100%	63% - 67%	66%
Gate Halfway House	61	4.3	12.5	15.1	100%	57% - 61%	57%
Girls Intensive Residential Learning Services-Female	74	5.2	12.9	16.1	0%	66% - 69%	69%
Grove Unique Youth Services Dual Diagnosis	66	4.7	13.7	17.0	100%	58% - 62%	59%
Gulf Coast Youth Academy	52	5.3	13.5	17.1	100%	54% - 58%	54%
Hastings Youth Academy	104	5.1	13.2	16.9	100%	58% - 61%	59%
Hendry Halfway House	115	5.0	13.2	16.2	100%	51% - 53%	50%
Hurricane Conservation Corp	79	3.9	13.3	16.7	100%	59% - 62%	59%
ICARE-Bay Point Schools	257	4.3	13.4	17.4	100%	62% - 63%	62%
Impact Halfway House	114	3.6	13.6	16.6	100%	51% - 53%	50%
Jefferson Halfway House	92	5.1	12.8	16.6	100%	56% - 59%	57%
Kelly Hall Halfway House	59	4.7	13.8	17.5	100%	64% - 68%	68%
Kingsley Center-Female	80	4.1	13.2	16.5	0%	64% - 67%	66%
Leaf Halfway House-Female	89	4.8	13.4	16.3	0%	64% - 67%	66%
Leon Drill Academy	194	4.9	13.2	16.7	100%	53% - 54%	52%
Leslie Peters Halfway House	135	5.2	12.9	16.8	100%	52% - 54%	51%
Liberty Crossroads Wilderness Program	43	4.4	13.8	17.2	100%	75% - 79%	86%

**Table A3, Continued. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures
for Moderate-Risk Programs**

Moderate Risk Programs	Average # of Successful Releases	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	Average Age at 1st Offense	Average Age at Release	% Male	Expected Success Range	Success Rate
Madison Halfway House	85	4.9	11.0	13.7	100%	35% - 38%	31%
Manatee Boot Camp	93	4.3	13.2	17.1	100%	52% - 55%	51%
Mandala ATC Halfway House-Mental Health	68	7.2	12.1	15.8	100%	49% - 52%	47%
Marion Youth Development Center-Moderate Risk	52	6.4	12.8	16.8	100%	53% - 57%	52%
Martin Boot Camp	68	4.4	13.4	17.4	100%	70% - 74%	75%
MATS Halfway House	86	5.0	12.7	16.6	100%	57% - 60%	57%
Merit START	64	4.1	11.1	13.5	100%	41% - 45%	37%
Miami Halfway House	92	3.8	13.5	16.7	100%	63% - 65%	64%
Nassau Halfway House	91	3.4	13.5	16.7	100%	58% - 60%	58%
Okaloosa Youth Academy	116	5.0	13.5	16.8	100%	58% - 60%	59%
Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	4.9	13.7	16.7	100%	49% - 53%	47%
Okeechobee Redirection Camp	200	4.5	13.6	16.9	100%	60% - 61%	60%
Orange Boot Camp	73	5.0	13.8	16.9	100%	58% - 61%	59%
Orange County Correctional Program	98	5.1	13.7	17.1	100%	59% - 61%	59%
Orange Halfway House Female	78	5.2	13.5	16.4	0%	70% - 72%	73%
Pahokee Youth Development Center	745	6.2	12.8	16.6	100%	44% - 44%	44%
Palm Beach Halfway House	59	5.4	12.2	15.4	100%	37% - 40%	31%
Palm Beach Work Release	77	4.7	13.9	17.6	100%	58% - 61%	58%
Panther Success Center Halfway House	107	5.0	12.9	16.2	100%	42% - 44%	39%
Peace River Outward Bound	98	4.7	11.8	14.8	100%	46% - 48%	44%
Pensacola Boys Base	116	4.0	14.2	16.9	100%	52% - 54%	51%
Pinellas Boot Camp	95	7.5	13.3	16.9	100%	57% - 60%	58%
Pines Halfway House-Female	84	4.3	13.7	16.4	0%	60% - 63%	61%
Polk Boot Camp-Female	55	4.5	13.6	16.9	0%	69% - 73%	75%
Polk Boot Camp-Male	156	5.3	13.2	16.9	100%	61% - 62%	61%
Polk Halfway House	93	5.8	12.6	16.5	100%	60% - 62%	60%
Pompano Learning Academy	127	7.0	12.7	16.8	100%	53% - 55%	53%
Price Halfway House	103	5.1	13.7	17.5	100%	51% - 54%	50%
Robert E. Lee, Jr. Hall Halfway House	79	6.1	13.3	16.7	100%	44% - 47%	42%
San Antonio Boys Village Halfway House	87	6.8	12.4	16.1	100%	50% - 53%	49%
Seminole Work and Learn Center	91	4.7	13.7	17.0	100%	56% - 59%	56%
Space Coast Marine Institute	117	5.0	13.5	16.9	100%	64% - 66%	65%
Taylor Halfway House	88	5.2	12.5	15.9	100%	56% - 58%	56%
Terrace Halfway House	78	5.1	13.2	16.6	100%	45% - 48%	42%
Timberline Academy-(Stewart Marchman)-Female	130	4.9	13.7	16.4	0%	60% - 62%	61%
Volusia Halfway House	119	6.0	13.2	16.8	100%	45% - 47%	44%
West Florida Wilderness Institute	93	3.8	13.8	16.8	100%	61% - 64%	62%
Wilson Academy-Female	34	5.2	13.9	16.8	0%	62% - 68%	68%
Withlacoochee Short-Term Offender Program	122	4.3	13.3	16.6	100%	59% - 61%	60%
YMCA Character Halfway House-Female	49	4.7	13.6	17.1	0%	71% - 75%	78%
Youth Development Academy	112	4.4	13.6	16.6	100%	56% - 58%	56%
Youth Environmental Services	85	5.7	12.6	17.1	100%	59% - 62%	60%

**Table A4. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures
for High-Risk Programs**

High Risk Programs	Successful Releases	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	Average Age at 1st Offense	Average Age at Release	% Male	Expected Success Range	Success Rate
Adolescent Therapeutic Center-Female	47	5.6	13.7	16.9	0%	71% - 75%	79%
ARC Intensive Halfway House	42	7.0	12.9	17.6	100%	61% - 66%	64%
ARC Serious Habitual Offender Program	37	7.1	12.7	17.4	100%	58% - 63%	59%
Big Cypress Wilderness Institute	63	6.4	12.9	17.0	100%	47% - 51%	44%
Broward Intensive Halfway House	69	7.9	12.4	17.1	100%	61% - 64%	62%
Charter Pasco Treatment Center-Female	31	6.8	13.4	16.5	0%	62% - 69%	68%
Charter Pinellas Treatment Center-HR Female	155	6.4	13.0	16.7	0%	69% - 71%	71%
CSC Intensive Halfway House	74	7.6	12.4	17.0	100%	46% - 49%	43%
CSC Serious Habitual Offender Program	61	7.9	12.4	17.6	100%	56% - 59%	56%
Dozier Training School for Boys	242	5.7	13.0	17.4	100%	62% - 63%	62%
Eckerd Intensive Halfway House	64	6.0	12.6	16.7	100%	51% - 55%	50%
Eckerd Youth Development Center	231	5.8	12.6	17.4	100%	59% - 60%	59%
Elaine Gordon Treatment Center Sex Offender	27	2.3	13.7	17.4	100%	67% - 74%	78%
Everglades Youth Development Center (Ramsey)	17	7.5	12.3	17.8	100%	60% - 71%	71%
Everglades Youth Development Center(YSI)	155	6.6	12.8	17.5	100%	58% - 60%	58%
Florida Environmental Institute	39	4.9	12.9	17.9	100%	69% - 74%	77%
Glen Mills School	136	5.5	13.4	17.9	100%	70% - 72%	72%
Greenville Hills Academy	65	5.9	13.0	17.2	100%	53% - 56%	52%
Hastings Youth Academy-High Risk	46	6.7	12.6	17.4	100%	53% - 58%	52%
Hillsborough Alternative Residential Program (HARP)	22	6.6	12.2	16.8	100%	58% - 67%	64%
Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT)	23	7.5	9.6	13.6	100%	37% - 45%	22%
Hillsborough Serious Habitual Offender Program	29	6.8	12.8	17.1	100%	46% - 54%	41%
Jackson County JOCC	101	6.8	12.9	17.4	100%	56% - 58%	55%
Kingsley Center-Female	103	5.5	13.0	16.8	0%	63% - 65%	64%
Manatee Adolescent Treatment Sex Offender	47	2.0	13.7	17.2	100%	79% - 83%	91%
Manatee Youth Academy	67	6.4	12.6	16.9	100%	52% - 55%	51%
Marion Intensive Treatment Facility	75	7.3	12.7	17.2	100%	57% - 60%	57%
Marion Youth Development Center-High Risk	177	6.7	12.8	17.2	100%	52% - 53%	51%
NAFI Intensive Halfway House	42	5.7	13.0	16.9	100%	42% - 47%	36%
NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program	42	5.0	13.3	17.4	100%	57% - 62%	59%
Okaloosa Youth Development Center	58	6.2	13.0	17.3	100%	56% - 60%	57%
Okeechobee JOCC Sex Offender	38	3.1	13.5	16.8	100%	69% - 74%	76%
Palm Beach Youth Center	28	6.1	12.7	17.4	100%	66% - 73%	75%
Panther Success Center Intensive Halfway House	78	4.8	12.8	16.5	100%	55% - 58%	55%
PATH Intensive Halfway House	20	6.4	12.8	17.2	100%	49% - 58%	45%
Polk Youth Development Center	559	7.3	12.6	17.6	100%	57% - 57%	56%
Tiger Success Serious Habitual Offender Program	43	5.5	12.5	17.0	100%	58% - 64%	60%
Vernon Place-Female	72	5.9	13.4	17.3	0%	77% - 79%	83%

Table A5. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Maximum-Risk Programs

Maximum Risk Programs ¹	Successful Releases	Average # of Adjudicated Referrals	Average Age at 1st Offense	Average Age at Release	% Male	Expected Success Range	Success Rate
Cypress Creek JOCC	83	6.4	12.7	18.3	100%	65% - 68%	67%
Okeechobee JOCC	59	7.6	12.5	18.2	100%	66% - 70%	69%
Omega JOCC	36	7.6	13.0	18.8	100%	61% - 67%	66%

¹JOCC=Juvenile Offender Correctional Center

Appendix 3

Calculating the Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score

1. **Calculate the program effect on recidivism.** For each program, calculate the difference between the program's success rate and the upper limit of its expected success range (if observed success is higher than expected) or the lower limit of its expected success range (if observed success is lower than expected). If the observed success rate is within the confidence interval, the difference is not statistically significant and is counted as 0. This value is referred to as the percent difference.

Program: Alachua Halfway House
 Success Rate: 76%
 Expected success range: 71%-74%
 Percent Difference: 76%-74% = 2%

2. **Calculate the program cost per successful completion** by dividing total DJJ expenditures by the total number of successful completions during the period being tracked.
 Cost Per Successful Completion: $\$1,879,625 / 63 = \$29,835$
3. **Standardize.** To standardize the program percent differences, calculate the average percent difference for all the programs. Then, for each program, subtract this average percent difference from the program's percent difference, and divide by the standard deviation of the percent difference.

$$Z_{\text{success}} = (2\% - 0.075\%) / 2.96 = 0.65$$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Mean: } 0.075\% \\ \text{Standard deviation: } 2.96 \end{array} \right.$

Note: The top-scoring program had a program effect that was more than three standard deviations above the mean and was given a maximum z-score of 3.

To calculate the cost difference for each program, subtract the program's cost per successful completion (in this example, \$29,835) from the mean program cost per successful completion (in this example, \$23,555).

$$\text{Cost Difference} = \$23,555 - \$29,835 = -\$6,280$$

Standardize this difference by subtracting the mean cost difference for all programs from the program's cost difference, and divide by the standard deviation.

$$Z_{\text{cost}} = (-\$6,280 - (-\$2,580)) / \$21,369 = -0.17$$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Mean: } -\$2,580 \\ \text{Standard deviation: } \$21,369 \end{array} \right.$

Note: Any program having a cost per successful completion that was 3 standard deviations or more above/below the mean cost per youth was given a standardized cost score of +/-3.

4. **Add the z-scores together** with a factor of 2/3 for the recidivism component and 1/3 for the cost.

$$\text{PAM Index} = 2/3 \times Z_{\text{success}} + 1/3 \times (Z_{\text{cost}}) = .43 + (-0.06) = 0.38$$

5. **Standardize sum of component z-scores.** For standardization, subtract the mean PAM Index value from the program PAM Index value, and divide by the standard deviation.

$$Z = (0.38 - 0.03) / 0.65 = 0.54$$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{PAM Index average: } 0.03 \\ \text{PAM Index standard deviation: } 0.65 \end{array} \right.$

6. **Translate** into a distribution with an average of 70 and a standard deviation of 10, modeled after A-F report card grades.

$$\text{PAM Score} = (0.54 \times 10) + 70 = 75$$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{PAM Score average: } 75 \\ \text{PAM Score standard deviation: } 10 \end{array} \right.$

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the consultation and assistance of the DJJ Bureau of Data and Research. In particular, we would like to thank Ted Tollett, Dr. Steven Chapman, and Sherry Jackson. We would also like to extend our appreciation to Amie Schuck, Assistant Professor of Criminology at the University of South Florida, for assistance with statistical analyses. Our thanks go to the DJJ bureaus of Quality Assurance, Budget, Finance and Accounting and Contracts specifically John Criswell, Eleese Davis, Makisha Davis, Mike Mauterer, Jeff Jefferson, Brenda Dwyer and Frances Kimber for their assistance with obtaining the program expenditures used in the PAM analyses. Our thanks also go to the Division of residential commitment specifically Richard Kline, Dave Douglass and Gene McMahon. Finally and most importantly, we would like to thank Secretary Bankhead and Deputy Secretary Alarcon for their continued support and commitment to effective performance measurement and cost accountability.