



FL Department of Juvenile Justice

2008 Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Report



The Justice Research Center
2898 Mahan Drive, Suite 4
Tallahassee, FL 32308

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

2008 Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Report

December 2008

A Research Report Prepared for the:



**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Frank Peterman, Jr., Secretary**

Produced by:

The Justice Research Center

Electronic copies of this document are available on the Web at:
<http://www.djj.state.fl.us/Research/index.html>

Produced by

**The Justice Research Center, Inc.
2898 Mahan Drive, Suite 4
Tallahassee, Florida 32308
850-521-9900**

**Kristin Parsons Winokur, Ph.D.
Julia L. Blankenship, MSW
Gregory A. Hand, B.S.**

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Table of Contents..... | 1 |
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Data and Methodology | 4 |
| Data Sources | 4 |
| Methodology..... | 5 |
| Calculating the PAM Score | 5 |
| Program Success Effectiveness Measure..... | 6 |
| Program Cost Effectiveness Measure | 8 |
| The PAM Score: Combining Program Success and Cost Effectiveness Measures | 9 |
| Findings | 9 |
| Program Success Effectiveness Categories | 10 |
| Program Cost Effectiveness Categories..... | 10 |
| PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level..... | 12 |
| PAM Scores by Program and Gender..... | 18 |
| PAM Scores by Gender, Restrictiveness Level and Effectiveness Categories..... | 22 |
| PAM Scores by Gender and Program Type..... | 31 |
| PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider..... | 37 |
| Appendix 1 Definitions of Terms | 44 |
| Appendix 2 Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations..... | 46 |
| Appendix 3 Variables Examined at Bivariate and Multivariate Level | 47 |
| Appendix 4 Program Risk Factors by Gender and Restrictiveness Levels..... | 50 |
| Appendix 5 Acronym Descriptions | 60 |
| Acknowledgements..... | 61 |

Executive Summary

The Florida Legislature has mandated in statute that the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) evaluate the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs that provide care, custody and treatment for committed youth (see inset). To meet this requirement, the annual Program Accountability Measures (PAM) model was developed. This evaluation report is critical given that DJJ processes approximately 145,000 intake referrals annually, with approximately 7,116 youth released from one of the more than 135 residential programs. By implementing an evaluation tool that assesses the effectiveness of programs in reducing recidivism while including a cost effectiveness measure, the DJJ *PAM Report* promotes accountability in the delivery of juvenile residential services.

Basic comparisons of program success rates are often used to assess effectiveness. However, beginning in 1996, DJJ sought a more equitable, objective means of evaluating programs that would address differences in program costs as well as account for the fact that facilities serve youth whose risk for re-offending varies widely.¹ The PAM model does this through two core measures: 1) success effectiveness, which is measured as the difference between how well a program is expected to do given the risk for re-offending attributed to each youth completing the program (expected success rate, inverse of recidivism rate), and how well the program youth actually performed (observed success rate); and 2) cost effectiveness, which is measured as the program's average cost per youth completing the program compared to the statewide program average cost per completion. Success effectiveness is further broken down into five categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Average, Below Average, and Least Effective. Cost effectiveness is categorized into: Low, Medium and High costs. The two measures are combined into a PAM score for each residential facility that can range from 1 to 100. The most recent year of release data are used in the annual PAM report and success rates (subsequent non-adjudication/non-conviction) are tracked for one year following program completion. The *2008 PAM Report* presents results for the 128 programs that released at least 15 youth during the period between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007, tracking success through June 30, 2008.

Florida Statute 985.632 (2008) – Quality Assurance and Cost-Effectiveness:

(4)(a) The Department of Juvenile Justice, in consultation with the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, and contract service providers, shall develop a cost-effectiveness model and apply the model to each commitment program. Program recidivism rates shall be a component of the model. The cost-effectiveness model shall compare program costs to client outcomes and program outputs. It is the intent of the Legislature that continual development efforts take place to improve the validity and reliability of the cost-effectiveness model and to integrate the standard methodology developed under 1s. 985.401(4) for interpreting program outcome evaluations.

(b) The department shall rank commitment programs based on the cost-effectiveness model and shall submit a report to the appropriate substantive and fiscal committees of each house of the Legislature by December 31 of each year.

¹ Initial versions of program accountability measures were presented in the late 1980s and further refined into the 1990s when the PAM model, in its current form, was developed.

Highlights from this year's report include:

- **Results of this year’s PAM analyses illustrate that PAM scores, comparing expected success rates to actual program performance, improved between 2007 and 2008.**
- Twenty residential commitment programs (16%), achieved PAM scores of 80 or higher, representing a 25% increase over the number of programs scoring at this level last year.
- More than one-third of all residential programs in the state were rated as Effective or Highly Effective (n=52, 41%), potentially reflecting strong performance outcomes resulting from the DJJ What Works Initiative Residential Pilot Project designed to implement evidence-based practices in commitment programming.
- 17 programs were categorized as Highly Effective. Three of these residential facilities were Low Cost programs, while two were Moderate Cost and the remaining 12 were High Cost facilities.
- 16 programs were categorized as Least Effective. Of these residential facilities, six were Low Cost programs, which means their low scores were primarily due to their higher than expected recidivism rates. Five of the Least Effective programs were Moderate Cost and five were High Cost facilities.

The table below lists the highest and lowest PAM scores for the male and female programs.

**PAM Outcomes (FY 2006-07):
Highest and Lowest PAM Scores by Gender**

| Program Name | PAM Score | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference from Expected Range* | Cost Per Completion | Number of Releases |
|---|-----------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Highest PAM Scores - Female</i> | | | | | |
| YMCA Character Halfway House | 93 | 89% | 12% | \$48,166 | 28 |
| Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility | 88 | 82% | 6% | \$10,313 | 22 |
| Dove Academy | 85 | 93% | 16% | \$162,145 | 15 |
| Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 84 | 89% | 11% | \$85,801 | 35 |
| First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** | 80 | 79% | 4% | \$30,501 | 29 |
| Umatilla Girls Academy** | 80 | 81% | 5% | \$39,258 | 26 |
| <i>Highest PAM Scores - Male</i> | | | | | |
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 93 | 83% | 23% | \$93,083 | 18 |
| Florida Environmental Institute | 91 | 69% | 11% | \$41,732 | 29 |
| Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 90 | 67% | 9% | \$27,949 | 43 |
| Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | 87 | 63% | 5% | \$12,039 | 57 |
| Impact Halfway House | 87 | 65% | 7% | \$28,839 | 40 |
| Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 87 | 67% | 8% | \$35,448 | 48 |
| <i>Lowest PAM Scores - Female</i> | | | | | |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 57 | 67% | -3% | \$75,702 | 33 |
| Vernon Place-Female** | 57 | 60% | -9% | \$18,218 | 20 |
| Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 54 | 62% | -7% | \$58,113 | 60 |
| Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** | 53 | 58% | -10% | \$26,635 | 24 |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 42 | 61% | -8% | \$109,574 | 23 |
| <i>Lowest PAM Scores - Male</i> | | | | | |
| Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** | 53 | 38% | -10% | \$26,850 | 32 |
| Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** | 51 | 35% | -12% | \$23,581 | 43 |
| Blackwater Short Term Offender** | 49 | 33% | -14% | \$5,437 | 18 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 49 | 42% | -7% | \$84,582 | 36 |
| Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - SOP** | 45 | 65% | -11% | \$64,633 | 23 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Introduction

The Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Report presents the annual assessment and ranking of Florida's residential juvenile justice programs based on success and cost effectiveness. Mandated by Florida Statute 985.632(4)(a)(b), the *PAM Report* is designed to

The PAM Report was named a semifinalist (top five percent in the nation) in the 2005 Harvard University Innovations in American Government Awards Program.

evaluate the performance of juvenile justice programs that provide care, custody and treatment for youth committed to the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). The methodology employed in the PAM has been recognized by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) as a best practice in the use of juvenile justice data. In addition, the Florida PAM model was selected as semifinalist in the prestigious *Innovations in American*

Government Awards, sponsored by the Harvard University, Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation. The report is produced by the Justice Research Center (JRC), Inc., under contract with the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.

The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice has established itself as a national leader in juvenile justice program evaluation and accountability. This accomplishment derives from its use of the PAM Report in conjunction with the Department's commitment to implementing evidence-based practices throughout the juvenile justice continuum. In 2004, DJJ officially commenced its statewide *What Works* Initiative designed to reduce recidivism by moving all programs towards operating in accordance with the principals of effective evidence-based interventions. The PAM Report is an important component in this process and the initial step in identifying the relative effectiveness of programs in reducing youths' return to the system. The purpose of the report is to assess residential commitment programs serving youth in Florida in terms of both success outcomes and cost effectiveness.

The juvenile court has the discretion to commit a youth who is adjudicated delinquent to the Department under Florida Statutes, Section 985.441 (2008). The court designates a restrictiveness level (see inset) to which the youth will be committed based on the nature of the offense, security concerns, and treatment issues. Residential restrictiveness levels include, in ascending order of restrictiveness: low-risk, moderate-risk, high-risk and maximum-risk residential programs.²

Florida Statute 985.03(44):

"Restrictiveness level" means the level of programming and security provided by programs that service the supervision, custody, care, and treatment needs of committed children. Sections 985.601(10) and 985.721 apply to children placed in programs at any residential commitment level.

The desired outcome of juvenile justice programs is to reduce future offending in a cost-effective manner. However, by legislative and program design, programs serve youth whose risk to re-offend varies widely. These factors

² These restrictiveness levels should not be confused with risk to re-offend, which is also often described in terms of low, moderate, and high levels.

affect the likelihood that youth will recidivate. A simple comparison of program success rates does not take these factors into account. In fact, such a method would unfairly penalize programs that serve the most challenging youth. It is therefore important that outcome measurement take into consideration the risk factors that influence the likelihood of re-offending for the youth released from each program.

The PAM model takes into account the risk factors of the youth completing each program and estimates the probability of those youth recidivating. In so doing, it is possible to calculate how well a program is *expected* to perform based on the risk of re-offending of the youth completing the program, and to compare this to how well those youth actually performed after release. 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. For definitions of terms used in the report, see Appendix 1.

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 completing the program.

The current report presents results for programs that released at least 15 youth during the period between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007. Excluding programs that released fewer than 15 youth ensures that small sample sizes do not impact the reliability of results. For a listing of programs that released less than 15 youth during this period, see Appendix 2, Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations.

Data and Methodology

Data Sources

Data for this report were compiled from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS), the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Florida Criminal Information Center (FCIC), the Florida Department of Corrections (DC), the DJJ Office of Management and Budget, and the DJJ Bureau of Quality Assurance. The JJIS system was used to identify the 7,116 youth who completed services at 128 residential programs during the period from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007. 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.

The year's PAM analysis evaluates success rates and cost effectiveness for the 128 programs that released more than 15 youth in Florida during fiscal year 2006-07.

For a number of years, many stakeholders have noted the need to incorporate additional risk factors in controlling for program differences in the relative risk of offenders served. To that end, the Department and JRC have been committed to incorporating

other variables and determined that such data could be gleaned from JJIS risk assessment instruments. Until recently however, these data were not available in JJIS. Risk assessment data are now included in the PAM calculations. JJIS was used to extract individual youth risk factor data from the Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT), Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (DRAI) and Supervision Risk Classification Instrument (SRCI) administrations. Only data from risk assessment administrations completed *prior* to program admission were examined in these analyses.

Methodology

Each year, the Department hosts a Common Definitions meeting to outline the methodology for calculating outcome measures for departmental reporting. This methodology is carefully considered and developed by key juvenile justice policymakers and providers including DJJ, the Justice Research Center, the Legislature, the Governor's Office, the Office of Program Planning and Government Accountability (OPPAGA), the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, contracted providers and other juvenile justice stakeholders. In a continual effort to improve measurement and program review, participants at the Common Definition meetings discuss potential additions to analyses and reporting. Under agreement with these major stakeholders, the official measure of recidivism has been defined as a subsequent adjudication or conviction within one year of program completion (see inset). For the most recent Department

of Juvenile Justice Common Definitions Report go to: http://www.djj.state.fl.us/Research/Common_Definitions/Common_Def_FY0708_Final.pdf.

Recidivism is defined as:

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

While consistency in measurement over time is a primary objective, there are times when changes are introduced in a given year's PAM report (e.g., availability of data on additional risk factors; reporting changes stemming from the re-classification of non-residential programs as probation facilities). Such changes and improvements to methodology are reported below when applicable.

Program results are presented for the 128 residential programs that released at least 15 youth during fiscal year 2006-07. Scores are reported for some programs that have closed for use in evaluating past performance for future contracting. Programs that did not release any youth in FY 2006-07 are not included. For a listing of closed programs not included 2008 PAM analyses see Appendix 2.

Calculating the PAM Score

The PAM Score is comprised of a program success effectiveness measure and a cost effectiveness measure. Program success effectiveness is the standardized difference between the programs' expected success rate and observed success rate. Cost effectiveness is measured as the standardized difference between each program's average cost per youth completing the program and the statewide average cost per completion.

Program Success Effectiveness Measure

As noted above, program effectiveness examines the difference between the program’s expected success range (based on the characteristics of the youth in the program) and observed success rate. The difference between a program’s expected success range and its observed success rate provides a measure of the impact the program had on reducing recidivism.

Determining significant predictors of subsequent offending and calculating program expected success is a multi-stage process. Initially, risk factors are correlated at the bivariate level. All available legal, socio-demographic, and risk variables in the JJIS data are included at this stage. A comprehensive listing of all variables examined in this year's analyses is presented in Appendix 3. Those factors significantly related to re-offending at the bivariate level are then entered into multivariate logistic regression analyses. Logistic regression is the proper statistical technique to use when the outcome variable, in this instance whether youth recidivated (yes/no), is a dichotomous or binary measure. The multivariate analyses revealed the following factors as statistically significant predictors of re-offending for the 7,116 youth released from residential programs in Florida during fiscal year 2006-07:

| Risk Factors Identified in the Logistic Regression Analyses |
|--|
| 1. Age at first offense |
| 2. Chronic drug use |
| 3. Gender |
| 4. Number of prior juvenile referrals |
| 5. Prior property adjudication |
| 6. Parental supervision |
| 7. Race |
| 8. Youth assessed risk level |
| 9. School attendance |
| 10. Sex offender referral |

Three demographic variables were significantly related to the likelihood that a youth would recidivate: age at first offense, gender, and race. Consistent with the research literature, younger offenders were more likely to recidivate than older youth, when controlling for the other variables in the model. Males and non-white youths were more likely than females and white youth to recidivate.

Measures of the extent and seriousness of prior offending were strong predictors of success. The more delinquency referrals a youth had in the past, the more likely he or she was to recidivate within one year of release. Youth with a history of property offending were more likely to be recidivists than those involved with other crimes (e.g., person offenses, drug offenses). While few juveniles had a history of sex offending, those who did were significantly *less* likely than those without such histories to re-offend within one year of program completion.

Four factors derived from risk assessment data in JJIS were statistically significant predictors of subsequent offending following program release: parental supervision, youth assessed risk level, school attendance, and drug use. Youth who had dropped out of school or been expelled or suspended, were significantly more like to re-offend than those attending school. Additionally, those youth whose parents/caregivers had limited or no supervision over them had greater odds of re-adjudication/re-conviction within one year of release, as compared to those whose parent/caregivers were rated by juvenile probation officers as maintaining control and supervision over their child. Drug use also proved a significant predictor of success, as the odds of being subsequently adjudicated or convicted within one year of program release were significantly increased when a youth chronically used drugs. Finally, the odds of success were significantly reduced if a youth was assessed as very high risk, versus low, moderate or high risk.

In addition to the predictors identified in this year's model, other factors (including whether a youth was transferred into or out of a program, as requested by DJJ providers) were examined, but failed to remain statistically significant in the final model. The aggregated program mean values for the ten identified significant risk factors are presented for each program in Appendix 4. These data allow for an assessment of the impact of each risk factor on the calculation of each program's expected success rate.

Following the determination of significant success predictors, Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) was used to calculate the probability of success (no subsequent adjudications or convictions) for the 128 residential programs that released 15 or more youth during fiscal year 2006-07. HLM is the appropriate statistical technique for effectively predicting success at the program level while controlling for the individual characteristics of the youth in each program. Two of the identified predictors were entered as program (Level 2) indicators in the HLM analyses: whether the program serves males or females, and whether the program serves sex offenders. These were deemed program attributes, as each program evaluated serves either an all-female or all-male juvenile population, and a number of facilities around the state are designed specifically to serve sex offenders.

An estimated success range is calculated for each program based on the significant risk factors identified, plus or minus a margin of error (99% confidence interval). The confidence interval for expected success was used to answer the following question: How large a difference between the expected success rate and the observed rate is necessary to be 99% confident that the difference is not due to random error? 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. This interval, referred to here as the *expected success range*, is 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 completing a program. Programs with fewer completions have wider confidence intervals than programs with a larger number of completions.

The expected success range allows for a comparison between expected and observed success taking into account an estimate of random error in the measure of expected success. 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. For definitions of terms used in the analyses, see Appendix 1.

Program Cost Effectiveness Measure

Program cost per completion is calculated by dividing total expenditures for each program by the number of youth completing the program during FY 2006-07. Program total costs are defined as all DJJ expenditures allocated to the program over the study period, plus all other sources of government funding including all state and federal monies, and excluding school board funding.³ Program cost per completion is impacted by the proportion of youth who complete a program as compared to all youth who enter a program. As the number of youth completing a program increases, the program cost per completion correspondingly decreases. Program length of stay may also indirectly affect cost per completion calculations. By design, length of stay increases as the restrictiveness level increases. Admission rates being equivalent, a low-risk restrictiveness program, for example, could serve more youth within a shorter period of time than a high-risk restrictiveness program, thus impacting the rate of completions as well as the overall program cost per completion during the PAM analysis period. Restrictiveness levels were controlled for in the multivariate analyses.

The statewide average cost per program completion for fiscal year 2006-07 was \$40,697.

Overall, the statewide average cost per completion for fiscal year 2006-07 was \$40,697. Program costs per completion varied by restrictiveness level as follows:

- Low-risk restrictiveness programs: \$22,894
- Moderate-risk restrictiveness programs: \$41,948
- High-risk restrictiveness programs: \$61,669
- Maximum-risk restrictiveness programs: \$77,667

In calculating PAM scores, each program's average cost per youth completing the program is compared to the statewide average cost per completion of \$40,697. Variations in program costs are partially attributable to federal funding which includes monies for Behavioral Health or Mental Health Overlay Services, and the national school lunch program. These amounts can be considerable. Total program expenditures incorporate such funding and should be considered in comparing average costs.

³ In years past at annual Common Definitions meetings, there has been deliberation over whether programs' total expenditures should include school board funding. A number of participants maintained that program costs should not include school funding. It was argued that school monies would be uniformly allocated to youth regardless of their incarceration in a juvenile justice facility and, therefore, should not be included as an element of the costs incurred to serve these youth. Given these arguments, school board funding is not included in total overall program expenditure calculations.

The PAM Score: Combining Program Success and Cost Effectiveness Measures

The PAM score combines the cost and effectiveness measures, as defined above. The PAM score is the sum of the program effectiveness measure weighted by a factor of two-thirds and the

2008 PAM scores for the 128 residential programs ranged from a high of 93 to a low of 42.

program cost measure weighted by a factor of one-third.⁴ This year's scores ranged from 42 to 93. By standardizing the scores on a scale from 1 to 100, the PAM scores are comparable to academic grades. A score between 90 and 100, for example, could be considered an "A," below 60, an "F" and so forth.

Findings

Results of the PAM analyses are presented in the tables that follow. The initial table summarizes the overall findings by grouping all 128 programs within their resulting program and costs effectiveness categories (see below for category descriptions). In general, scores are presented in three ways:

- 1) By restrictiveness level (low, moderate, high, and maximum) in descending order of program effectiveness (Tables 1-4);
- 2) By gender of youth served in descending order of PAM score (Tables 5-6);
- 3) By gender, program restrictiveness and effectiveness categories in ascending order of cost (Tables 7-14).

PAM results are also presented by gender and program type (Tables 15-16), as well as by program provider (Table 17).

⁴ These weights were approved during the Common Definitions meetings after consultation with members of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Board, the Legislature, the Governor's Office, OPPAGA, the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, contracted providers and other juvenile justice stakeholders.

Program Success 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:

More than one-third (41%) of the programs in the 2008 PAM Report fell within the effective or highly effective categories.

- **Highly Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are more than one standard deviation above the upper limit of the expected success range. Thirteen percent (n=17) of the programs fell into this category.
- **Effective Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are up to one standard deviation above the upper limit of the expected success range. Twenty-seven percent (n=35) of the programs fell into this category.
- **Average Programs:** These programs are defined as having observed success rates that are within the expected success range. Eighteen percent (n=23) of the programs fell into 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. Twenty-nine percent (n=37) of the programs fell into 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. Twelve percent (n=16) of the programs fell into this category.

Program Cost Effectiveness Categories

Each program's average cost per completion is compared to the statewide average cost per completion of \$40,697. Programs are divided into one of the following cost per completion categories:

Average costs per completion among the 128 programs for fiscal year 2006-07 ranged from a low of \$5,437 to a high of \$45,785.

- **Low Cost Programs:** One-third (n=42) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per completion for these residential programs is less than \$29,768.
- **Moderate Cost Programs:** One-third (n=43) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per completion for these residential programs is between \$29,769 and \$47,933.
- **High Cost Programs:** One-third (n=43) of programs are grouped into this category. The cost per completion for these residential programs is \$47,934 or greater.

The table that follows on the next page presents all 158 programs relative to the program success and cost effectiveness categories into which they fell.

Summary of PAM Program Success and Cost Effectiveness

| Cost Effectiveness Categories | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Low Cost | Moderate Cost | High Cost | |
| Success Effectiveness Categories | Highly Effective Programs | Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility Crossroads Wilderness Institute Impact Halfway House | Florida Environmental Institute Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | Camp E-Kel-Etu Camp E-Nini-Hassee DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male Dove Academy Eckerd Intensive Halfway House Forestry Youth Academy** HOPE Jackson JOCC Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP Orange Intensive Halfway House** YMCA Character Halfway House |
| | Effective Programs | Avon Park Youth Academy Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy Greenville Hills - Bassin House** Greenville Hills - Jefferson Halfway House** Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility** Miami Halfway House Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility Pensacola Boys Base San Antonio Boys Village Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility South Pines - Low** Space Coast Marine Institute STEP I - Male Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** Francis Walker Halfway House Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility Riverside Academy Sago Palm - Pathfinders** South Pines - Moderate** Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program Umatilla Girls Academy** Wilson Youth Academy | Broward Intensive Halfway House Camp E-Tu-Makee** Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility Cypress Creek JOCC - Maximum GOALS** Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center** Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility Polk STAR** St Johns Correctional Facility Union Juvenile Residential Facility |
| | Average Programs | Duval Juvenile Residential Facility Greenville Hills - MERIT** Red Road Academy STEP II - Female** West Florida Wilderness Institute White Foundation Family Homes - Male** Youth Environmental Services | ARC Halfway House Big Cypress Wilderness Institute Eckerd Academy Eckerd Youth Challenge Program Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate MATS - Halfway House Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged Sago Palm - Trailblazers** Thompson Academy Choices | Camp E-Ma-Chamee DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male Dozier Sex Offender Program** Eckerd Youth Development Center Gulf Academy - Mental Health Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility Manatee Youth Academy** |
| | Below Average Programs | Escambia River Outward Bound** Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy** Les Peters Halfway House Marion Youth Development Center** Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility Panther Success Center - White Foundation Peace River Outward Bound** Pines Juvenile Residential Facility Price Halfway House Seminole Work and Learn Center Vision Quest - Low | Bay Point Schools-North Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF Bristol Youth Academy Britt Halfway House Falkenberg Academy Gulf Coast Youth Academy Hastings Youth Academy - High** Joann Bridges Academy Lake Academy Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility Monticello New Life NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program Okaloosa Halfway House** Okaloosa Youth Academy Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services** Sago Palm - Youth Development Center** Thompson Academy Vision Quest - Moderate | DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female Dozier Training School** Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)** MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility** Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program** Three Springs Sex Offender Program |
| | Least Effective Programs | Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** Blackwater Short Term Offender** Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** Vernon Place-Female** White Foundation Family Homes - Female** | Blackwater Stop** Brevard Group Treatment Home Cypress Creek JOCC - High NAFI Intensive Halfway House Polk Halfway House | DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health Jackson JOCC - SOP** Milton Juvenile Residential Facility Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House** |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

PAM Scores by Restrictiveness Level

Tables 1 through 4 provide a summary of the PAM scores for the 128 residential programs within each of the four restrictiveness levels. PAM scores are presented in descending order, along with the percent difference (i.e., percent above or below the expected success range) and program cost per completion.

Table 1. Low Risk Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Low Risk Programs | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|---|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | 57 | 5.5% | \$12,039 | 87 |
| Forestry Youth Academy** | 31 | 9.6% | \$64,472 | 85 |
| STEP I - Male | 113 | 3.7% | \$8,828 | 84 |
| STEP II - Female** | 50 | 0.0% | \$6,578 | 77 |
| South Pines - Low** | 86 | 1.2% | \$22,626 | 76 |
| White Foundation Family Homes - Male** | 51 | 0.0% | \$27,327 | 73 |
| Escambia River Outward Bound** | 65 | -1.2% | \$17,739 | 72 |
| Peace River Outward Bound** | 89 | -2.3% | \$13,134 | 71 |
| Eckerd Academy | 61 | 0.0% | \$41,188 | 70 |
| Seminole Work and Learn Center | 36 | -2.5% | \$18,980 | 70 |
| Vision Quest - Low | 112 | -2.3% | \$23,557 | 69 |
| White Foundation Family Homes - Female** | 19 | -6.2% | \$26,343 | 61 |
| Brevard Group Treatment Home | 43 | -6.5% | \$32,261 | 59 |
| Blackwater Short Term Offender** | 18 | -14.1% | \$5,437 | 49 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 2. Moderate Risk Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Moderate Risk Programs | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|--|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| YMCA Character Halfway House | 28 | 12.2% | \$48,166 | 93 |
| Florida Environmental Institute | 29 | 10.7% | \$41,732 | 91 |
| Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 43 | 8.9% | \$27,949 | 90 |
| Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility | 22 | 5.8% | \$10,313 | 88 |
| Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 48 | 8.1% | \$35,448 | 87 |
| Impact Halfway House | 40 | 7.2% | \$28,839 | 87 |
| Dove Academy | 15 | 16.1% | \$162,145 | 85 |
| Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 35 | 11.3% | \$85,801 | 84 |
| Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 4.9% | \$18,999 | 84 |
| Miami Halfway House | 34 | 4.9% | \$25,458 | 83 |
| Space Coast Marine Institute | 44 | 4.4% | \$28,298 | 82 |
| Pensacola Boys Base | 46 | 4.1% | \$22,216 | 82 |
| Greenville Hills - Jefferson Halfway House** | 38 | 3.9% | \$22,659 | 81 |
| San Antonio Boys Village | 39 | 2.7% | \$12,452 | 81 |
| First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** | 29 | 3.7% | \$30,501 | 80 |
| Eckerd Intensive Halfway House | 30 | 6.1% | \$59,871 | 79 |
| Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment | 21 | 4.9% | \$48,140 | 79 |
| Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy | 182 | 3.3% | \$29,525 | 79 |
| Camp E-Kel-Etu | 45 | 6.7% | \$69,720 | 78 |
| South Pines - Moderate** | 66 | 2.6% | \$30,397 | 78 |
| Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility** | 60 | 2.2% | \$23,146 | 78 |
| Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 3.0% | \$36,827 | 77 |
| Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility | 43 | 2.1% | \$25,562 | 77 |
| Avon Park Youth Academy | 223 | 1.4% | \$29,088 | 75 |
| HOPE | 18 | 7.1% | \$97,342 | 74 |
| GOALS** | 36 | 4.3% | \$67,306 | 74 |
| Greenville Hills - Bassin House** | 23 | 1.0% | \$29,767 | 74 |
| Duval Juvenile Residential Facility | 46 | 0.0% | \$22,341 | 74 |
| West Florida Wilderness Institute | 58 | 0.0% | \$23,474 | 74 |
| Greenville Hills - MERIT** | 33 | 0.0% | \$24,127 | 74 |
| Camp E-Tu-Makee** | 40 | 3.5% | \$67,119 | 73 |
| Wilson Youth Academy | 46 | 1.1% | \$37,704 | 73 |
| Francis Walker Halfway House | 44 | 1.0% | \$30,139 | 73 |
| Riverside Academy | 239 | 1.0% | \$31,087 | 73 |
| Youth Environmental Services | 47 | 0.0% | \$27,138 | 73 |
| Red Road Academy | 74 | 0.0% | \$28,566 | 73 |
| Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility | 39 | 3.2% | \$65,403 | 72 |
| Big Cypress Wilderness Institute | 42 | 0.0% | \$32,655 | 72 |
| ARC Halfway House | 150 | 0.0% | \$33,160 | 71 |
| Eckerd Youth Challenge Program | 80 | 0.0% | \$39,591 | 71 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 2, (Continued). Moderate Risk Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Moderate Risk Programs | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|--|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate | 139 | 0.0% | \$39,030 | 71 |
| Thompson Academy Choices | 28 | 0.0% | \$33,692 | 71 |
| Thompson Academy | 136 | -0.7% | \$32,803 | 71 |
| MATS - Halfway House | 53 | 0.0% | \$42,613 | 70 |
| Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged | 38 | 0.0% | \$44,439 | 70 |
| Vision Quest - Moderate | 119 | -1.3% | \$32,186 | 70 |
| Joann Bridges Academy | 46 | -1.3% | \$31,985 | 70 |
| Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility | 70 | -1.6% | \$26,372 | 70 |
| Bristol Youth Academy | 70 | -0.7% | \$40,855 | 69 |
| Price Halfway House | 42 | -2.3% | \$27,141 | 69 |
| Marion Youth Development Center** | 66 | -2.6% | \$20,782 | 69 |
| Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program | 66 | -3.6% | \$10,861 | 69 |
| Okaloosa Halfway House** | 31 | -1.6% | \$36,993 | 68 |
| Okaloosa Youth Academy | 130 | -1.8% | \$33,295 | 68 |
| Falkenberg Academy | 139 | -2.1% | \$30,522 | 68 |
| Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy** | 55 | -2.5% | \$28,720 | 68 |
| Panther Success Center - White Foundation | 88 | -3.3% | \$20,548 | 68 |
| Union Juvenile Residential Facility | 17 | 1.0% | \$68,217 | 67 |
| Gulf Academy - Mental Health | 44 | 0.0% | \$58,202 | 67 |
| Camp E-Ma-Chamee | 36 | 0.0% | \$73,406 | 65 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male | 112 | 0.0% | \$69,849 | 65 |
| Lake Academy | 66 | -2.3% | \$47,933 | 65 |
| Gulf Coast Youth Academy | 140 | -3.5% | \$32,406 | 65 |
| Les Peters Halfway House | 49 | -4.2% | \$28,147 | 65 |
| Pines Juvenile Residential Facility | 91 | -4.2% | \$25,869 | 65 |
| Polk STAR** | 24 | 5.5% | \$159,506 | 64 |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF | 21 | -3.3% | \$38,951 | 64 |
| Britt Halfway House | 45 | -4.5% | \$31,410 | 63 |
| Bay Point Schools-North | 27 | -4.7% | \$39,957 | 61 |
| Blackwater Stop** | 21 | -5.9% | \$33,139 | 60 |
| Polk Halfway House | 31 | -6.7% | \$36,070 | 58 |
| MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility | 21 | -0.9% | \$106,254 | 57 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 33 | -3.5% | \$75,702 | 57 |
| Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)** | 36 | -4.6% | \$68,722 | 56 |
| Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 60 | -6.9% | \$58,113 | 54 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 2, (Continued). Moderate Risk Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Moderate Risk Programs | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|--|----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** | 32 | -10.1% | \$26,850 | 53 |
| Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** | 24 | -10.4% | \$26,635 | 53 |
| Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** | 43 | -11.5% | \$23,581 | 51 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 3. High Risk Residential Programs by PAM Score

| High Risk Programs | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|--|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Umatilla Girls Academy** | 26 | 4.9% | \$39,258 | 80 |
| Orange Intensive Halfway House** | 17 | 6.2% | \$72,256 | 77 |
| Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center** | 41 | 4.2% | \$48,526 | 77 |
| Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment | 21 | 4.9% | \$65,577 | 76 |
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP | 35 | 6.5% | \$103,228 | 72 |
| Broward Intensive Halfway House | 27 | 2.9% | \$60,927 | 72 |
| Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program | 30 | 1.0% | \$39,054 | 72 |
| Sago Palm - Trailblazers** | 51 | 0.0% | \$31,215 | 72 |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male | 70 | 6.7% | \$110,713 | 71 |
| Sago Palm - Pathfinders** | 60 | 1.0% | \$41,268 | 70 |
| Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility | 47 | -1.4% | \$37,329 | 69 |
| Manatee Youth Academy** | 18 | 0.0% | \$54,004 | 68 |
| Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services** | 51 | -2.7% | \$44,447 | 65 |
| NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program | 32 | -2.8% | \$38,702 | 65 |
| Hastings Youth Academy - High** | 63 | -3.3% | \$37,470 | 65 |
| Eckerd Youth Development Center | 123 | 0.0% | \$72,515 | 64 |
| Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility | 37 | 0.0% | \$78,622 | 64 |
| Sago Palm - Youth Development Center** | 48 | -3.6% | \$38,383 | 64 |
| Dozier Training School** | 93 | -1.0% | \$72,716 | 63 |
| Monticello New Life | 39 | -3.4% | \$45,672 | 63 |
| St Johns Correctional Facility | 28 | 1.1% | \$97,949 | 62 |
| Dozier Sex Offender Program** | 50 | 0.0% | \$93,887 | 61 |
| Three Springs Sex Offender Program | 34 | -3.5% | \$57,844 | 61 |
| Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility** | 220 | -4.8% | \$49,082 | 60 |
| Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program** | 54 | -4.5% | \$62,939 | 58 |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - High | 52 | -7.2% | \$33,935 | 58 |
| Vernon Place-Female** | 20 | -9.0% | \$18,218 | 57 |
| Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility | 28 | 1.1% | \$137,597 | 56 |
| Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House** | 36 | -6.8% | \$49,852 | 56 |
| NAFI Intensive Halfway House | 24 | -7.0% | \$43,093 | 56 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 36 | -6.8% | \$84,582 | 49 |
| Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - SOP** | 23 | -10.6% | \$64,633 | 45 |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 23 | -8.3% | \$109,574 | 42 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 4. Maximum Risk Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Maximum Risk Programs | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|---|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 18 | 23.4% | \$93,083 | 93 |
| Jackson JOCC | 25 | 6.7% | \$48,729 | 82 |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - Maximum | 33 | 4.0% | \$91,190 | 69 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

PAM Scores by Program and Gender

Tables 5 and 6 provide a summary of the PAM scores for the 128 residential programs grouped by gender. PAM scores are presented in descending order, along with the percent difference (i.e., percent above or below the expected success range) and program cost per completion.

Table 5. Female Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Name | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|-----------------------|--|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Moderate | YMCA Character Halfway House | 28 | 12% | \$48,166 | 93 |
| Moderate | Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility | 22 | 6% | \$10,313 | 88 |
| Moderate | Dove Academy | 15 | 16% | \$162,145 | 85 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 35 | 11% | \$85,801 | 84 |
| High | Umatilla Girls Academy** | 26 | 5% | \$39,258 | 80 |
| Moderate | First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** | 29 | 4% | \$30,501 | 80 |
| High | Orange Intensive Halfway House** | 17 | 6% | \$72,256 | 77 |
| Moderate | Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 3% | \$36,827 | 77 |
| Low | STEP II - Female** | 50 | 0% | \$6,578 | 77 |
| Moderate | HOPE | 18 | 7% | \$97,342 | 74 |
| Moderate | Wilson Youth Academy | 46 | 1% | \$37,704 | 73 |
| Moderate | Francis Walker Halfway House | 44 | 1% | \$30,139 | 73 |
| Moderate | Vision Quest - Moderate | 119 | -1% | \$32,186 | 70 |
| Moderate | Joann Bridges Academy | 46 | -1% | \$31,985 | 70 |
| Low | Vision Quest - Low | 112 | -2% | \$23,557 | 69 |
| Moderate | Lake Academy | 66 | -2% | \$47,933 | 65 |
| Moderate | Pines Juvenile Residential Facility | 91 | -4% | \$25,869 | 65 |
| Moderate | Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF | 21 | -3% | \$38,951 | 64 |
| High | Monticello New Life | 39 | -3% | \$45,672 | 63 |
| Low | White Foundation Family Homes - Female** | 19 | -6% | \$26,343 | 61 |
| Moderate | DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 33 | -3% | \$75,702 | 57 |
| High | Vernon Place-Female** | 20 | -9% | \$18,218 | 57 |
| Moderate | Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 60 | -7% | \$58,113 | 54 |
| Moderate | Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** | 24 | -10% | \$26,635 | 53 |
| High | DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 23 | -8% | \$109,574 | 42 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 6. Male Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Name | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|-----------------------|--|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Maximum | Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 18 | 23% | \$93,083 | 93 |
| Moderate | Florida Environmental Institute | 29 | 11% | \$41,732 | 91 |
| Moderate | Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 43 | 9% | \$27,949 | 90 |
| Moderate | Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 48 | 8% | \$35,448 | 87 |
| Moderate | Impact Halfway House | 40 | 7% | \$28,839 | 87 |
| Low | Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | 57 | 5% | \$12,039 | 87 |
| Low | Forestry Youth Academy** | 31 | 10% | \$64,472 | 85 |
| Moderate | Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 5% | \$18,999 | 84 |
| Low | STEP I - Male | 113 | 4% | \$8,828 | 84 |
| Moderate | Miami Halfway House | 34 | 5% | \$25,458 | 83 |
| Maximum | Jackson JOCC | 25 | 7% | \$48,729 | 82 |
| Moderate | Space Coast Marine Institute | 44 | 4% | \$28,298 | 82 |
| Moderate | Pensacola Boys Base | 46 | 4% | \$22,216 | 82 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Jefferson Halfway House** | 38 | 4% | \$22,659 | 81 |
| Moderate | San Antonio Boys Village | 39 | 3% | \$12,452 | 81 |
| Moderate | Eckerd Intensive Halfway House | 30 | 6% | \$59,871 | 79 |
| Moderate | Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment | 21 | 5% | \$48,140 | 79 |
| Moderate | Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy | 182 | 3% | \$29,525 | 79 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Kel-Etu | 45 | 7% | \$69,720 | 78 |
| Moderate | South Pines - Moderate** | 66 | 3% | \$30,397 | 78 |
| Moderate | Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility** | 60 | 2% | \$23,146 | 78 |
| High | Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center** | 41 | 4% | \$48,526 | 77 |
| Moderate | Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility | 43 | 2% | \$25,562 | 77 |
| High | Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment | 21 | 5% | \$65,577 | 76 |
| Low | South Pines - Low** | 86 | 1% | \$22,626 | 76 |
| Moderate | Avon Park Youth Academy | 223 | 1% | \$29,088 | 75 |
| Moderate | GOALS** | 36 | 4% | \$67,306 | 74 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Bassin House** | 23 | 1% | \$29,767 | 74 |
| Moderate | Duval Juvenile Residential Facility | 46 | 0% | \$22,341 | 74 |
| Moderate | West Florida Wilderness Institute | 58 | 0% | \$23,474 | 74 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - MERIT** | 33 | 0% | \$24,127 | 74 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Tu-Makee** | 40 | 4% | \$67,119 | 73 |
| Moderate | Riverside Academy | 239 | 1% | \$31,087 | 73 |
| Low | White Foundation Family Homes - Male** | 51 | 0% | \$27,327 | 73 |
| Moderate | Youth Environmental Services | 47 | 0% | \$27,138 | 73 |
| Moderate | Red Road Academy | 74 | 0% | \$28,566 | 73 |
| High | Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP | 35 | 7% | \$103,228 | 72 |
| Moderate | Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility | 39 | 3% | \$65,403 | 72 |
| High | Broward Intensive Halfway House | 27 | 3% | \$60,927 | 72 |
| High | Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program | 30 | 1% | \$39,054 | 72 |
| High | Sago Palm - Trailblazers** | 51 | 0% | \$31,215 | 72 |
| Moderate | Big Cypress Wilderness Institute | 42 | 0% | \$32,655 | 72 |
| Low | Escambia River Outward Bound** | 65 | -1% | \$17,739 | 72 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 6, (Continued). Male Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Name | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|-----------------------|---|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| High | DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male | 70 | 7% | \$110,713 | 71 |
| Moderate | ARC Halfway House | 150 | 0% | \$33,160 | 71 |
| Moderate | Eckerd Youth Challenge Program | 80 | 0% | \$39,591 | 71 |
| Moderate | Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate | 139 | 0% | \$39,030 | 71 |
| Moderate | Thompson Academy Choices | 28 | 0% | \$33,692 | 71 |
| Moderate | Thompson Academy | 136 | -1% | \$32,803 | 71 |
| Low | Peace River Outward Bound** | 89 | -2% | \$13,134 | 71 |
| High | Sago Palm - Pathfinders** | 60 | 1% | \$41,268 | 70 |
| Low | Eckerd Academy | 61 | 0% | \$41,188 | 70 |
| Moderate | MATS - Halfway House | 53 | 0% | \$42,613 | 70 |
| Moderate | Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged | 38 | 0% | \$44,439 | 70 |
| Moderate | Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility | 70 | -2% | \$26,372 | 70 |
| Low | Seminole Work and Learn Center | 36 | -3% | \$18,980 | 70 |
| Maximum | Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - Maximum | 33 | 4% | \$91,190 | 69 |
| Moderate | Bristol Youth Academy | 70 | -1% | \$40,855 | 69 |
| High | Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility | 47 | -1% | \$37,329 | 69 |
| Moderate | Price Halfway House | 42 | -2% | \$27,141 | 69 |
| Moderate | Marion Youth Development Center** | 66 | -3% | \$20,782 | 69 |
| Moderate | Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program | 66 | -4% | \$10,861 | 69 |
| High | Manatee Youth Academy** | 18 | 0% | \$54,004 | 68 |
| Moderate | Okaloosa Halfway House** | 31 | -2% | \$36,993 | 68 |
| Moderate | Okaloosa Youth Academy | 130 | -2% | \$33,295 | 68 |
| Moderate | Falkenberg Academy | 139 | -2% | \$30,522 | 68 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy** | 55 | -2% | \$28,720 | 68 |
| Moderate | Panther Success Center - White Foundation | 88 | -3% | \$20,548 | 68 |
| Moderate | Union Juvenile Residential Facility | 17 | 1% | \$68,217 | 67 |
| Moderate | Gulf Academy - Mental Health | 44 | 0% | \$58,202 | 67 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Ma-Chamee | 36 | 0% | \$73,406 | 65 |
| Moderate | DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male | 112 | 0% | \$69,849 | 65 |
| High | Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services** | 51 | -3% | \$44,447 | 65 |
| High | NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program | 32 | -3% | \$38,702 | 65 |
| High | Hastings Youth Academy - High** | 63 | -3% | \$37,470 | 65 |
| Moderate | Gulf Coast Youth Academy | 140 | -4% | \$32,406 | 65 |
| Moderate | Les Peters Halfway House | 49 | -4% | \$28,147 | 65 |
| Moderate | Polk STAR** | 24 | 5% | \$159,506 | 64 |
| High | Eckerd Youth Development Center | 123 | 0% | \$72,515 | 64 |
| High | Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility | 37 | 0% | \$78,622 | 64 |
| High | Sago Palm - Youth Development Center** | 48 | -4% | \$38,383 | 64 |
| High | Dozier Training School** | 93 | -1% | \$72,716 | 63 |
| Moderate | Britt Halfway House | 45 | -5% | \$31,410 | 63 |
| High | St Johns Correctional Facility | 28 | 1% | \$97,949 | 62 |
| High | Dozier Sex Offender Program** | 50 | 0% | \$93,887 | 61 |
| High | Three Springs Sex Offender Program | 34 | -4% | \$57,844 | 61 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 6, (Continued). Male Residential Programs by PAM Score

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Name | N | Percent Difference* | Cost Per Completion | PAM Score |
|-----------------------|--|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Moderate | Bay Point Schools-North | 27 | -5% | \$39,957 | 61 |
| High | Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility** | 220 | -5% | \$49,082 | 60 |
| Moderate | Blackwater Stop** | 21 | -6% | \$33,139 | 60 |
| Low | Brevard Group Treatment Home | 43 | -6% | \$32,261 | 59 |
| High | Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program** | 54 | -4% | \$62,939 | 58 |
| Moderate | Polk Halfway House | 31 | -7% | \$36,070 | 58 |
| High | Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - High | 52 | -7% | \$33,935 | 58 |
| Moderate | MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility | 21 | -1% | \$106,254 | 57 |
| High | Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility | 28 | 1% | \$137,597 | 56 |
| Moderate | Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)** | 36 | -5% | \$68,722 | 56 |
| High | Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House** | 36 | -7% | \$49,852 | 56 |
| High | NAFI Intensive Halfway House | 24 | -7% | \$43,093 | 56 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** | 32 | -10% | \$26,850 | 53 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** | 43 | -12% | \$23,581 | 51 |
| High | DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 36 | -7% | \$84,582 | 49 |
| Low | Blackwater Short Term Offender** | 18 | -14% | \$5,437 | 49 |
| High | Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - SOP** | 23 | -11% | \$64,633 | 45 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

PAM Scores by Gender, Restrictiveness Level and Effectiveness Categories

Tables 7 through 13 present programs classified by gender and the five program success effectiveness categories within each restrictiveness level. This allows for a comparison of success outcomes by low-, moderate-, high-, and maximum-risk restrictiveness levels for facilities serving females and those serving males. In tables 7 through 13, the following variables are provided for each program:

- Number of youth completing program during fiscal year 2006-07 (N)
- Observed success rate
- Expected success range
- Percent above or below the expected success range
- Two-year program expenditures
- Program cost per completion
- PAM score
- Success effectiveness category within which each program falls
- Cost effectiveness category within which each program falls

Table 7. Female Low-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| Low Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| STEP II - Female** | 50 | 74.0% | 72.0% - 74.5% | 0.0% | \$328,920 | \$6,578 | 77 | Average | Low |
| Vision Quest - Low | 112 | 67.9% | 70.2% - 71.6% | -2.3% | \$2,638,347 | \$23,557 | 69 | Below Average | Low |
| White Foundation Family Homes - Female** | 19 | 63.2% | 69.4% - 74.0% | -6.2% | \$500,524 | \$26,343 | 61 | Least Effective | Low |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 8. Male Low-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| Low Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|---|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| Forestry Youth Academy** | 31 | 67.7% | 54.1% - 58.1% | 9.6% | \$1,998,645 | \$64,472 | 85 | Highly Effective | High |
| Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | 57 | 63.2% | 55.0% - 57.7% | 5.5% | \$686,240 | \$12,039 | 87 | Effective | Low |
| STEP I - Male | 113 | 62.0% | 56.7% - 58.3% | 3.7% | \$997,608 | \$8,828 | 84 | Effective | Low |
| South Pines - Low** | 86 | 57.0% | 53.7% - 55.8% | 1.2% | \$1,945,835 | \$22,626 | 76 | Effective | Low |
| White Foundation Family Homes - Male** | 51 | 54.9% | 52.1% - 55.1% | 0.0% | \$1,393,682 | \$27,327 | 73 | Average | Low |
| Eckerd Academy | 61 | 51.0% | 51.0% - 53.5% | 0.0% | \$2,512,491 | \$41,188 | 70 | Average | Moderate |
| Escambia River Outward Bound** | 65 | 49.2% | 50.4% - 52.9% | -1.2% | \$1,153,037 | \$17,739 | 72 | Below Average | Low |
| Peace River Outward Bound** | 89 | 47.2% | 49.5% - 51.5% | -2.3% | \$1,168,917 | \$13,134 | 71 | Below Average | Low |
| Seminole Work and Learn Center | 36 | 47.2% | 49.7% - 53.5% | -2.5% | \$683,291 | \$18,980 | 70 | Below Average | Low |
| Brevard Group Treatment Home | 43 | 41.9% | 48.3% - 51.6% | -6.5% | \$1,387,215 | \$32,261 | 59 | Least Effective | Moderate |
| Blackwater Short Term Offender** | 18 | 33.3% | 47.4% - 53.3% | -14.1% | \$97,863 | \$5,437 | 49 | Least Effective | Low |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 9. Female Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| Moderate Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| YMCA Character Halfway House | 28 | 89.3% | 73.8% - 77.1% | 12.2% | \$1,348,659 | \$48,166 | 93 | Highly Effective | High |
| Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility | 22 | 81.8% | 72.0% - 76.0% | 5.8% | \$226,886 | \$10,313 | 88 | Highly Effective | Low |
| Dove Academy | 15 | 93.3% | 72.1% - 77.2% | 16.1% | \$2,432,170 | \$162,145 | 85 | Highly Effective | High |
| Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 35 | 88.6% | 74.4% - 77.3% | 11.3% | \$3,003,039 | \$85,801 | 84 | Highly Effective | High |
| HOPE | 18 | 83.3% | 71.7% - 76.3% | 7.1% | \$1,752,160 | \$97,342 | 74 | Highly Effective | High |
| First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** | 29 | 79.3% | 72.3% - 75.6% | 3.7% | \$884,543 | \$30,501 | 80 | Effective | Moderate |
| Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 78.6% | 72.9% - 75.6% | 3.0% | \$1,546,733 | \$36,827 | 77 | Effective | Moderate |
| Francis Walker Halfway House | 44 | 75.0% | 72.1% - 73.7% | 1.0% | \$1,326,122 | \$30,139 | 73 | Effective | Moderate |
| Wilson Youth Academy | 46 | 76.1% | 72.4% - 74.9% | 1.1% | \$1,734,375 | \$37,704 | 73 | Effective | Moderate |
| Joann Bridges Academy | 46 | 69.6% | 70.8% - 73.4% | -1.3% | \$1,471,298 | \$31,985 | 70 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Vision Quest - Moderate | 119 | 69.8% | 71.0% - 72.4% | -1.3% | \$3,830,193 | \$32,186 | 70 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Lake Academy | 66 | 68.2% | 70.5% - 72.6% | -2.3% | \$3,163,568 | \$47,933 | 65 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Pines Juvenile Residential Facility | 91 | 64.8% | 69.1% - 70.8% | -4.2% | \$2,354,055 | \$25,869 | 65 | Below Average | Low |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF | 21 | 66.7% | 69.9% - 74.3% | -3.3% | \$817,971 | \$38,951 | 64 | Below Average | Moderate |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 33 | 66.7% | 70.1% - 73.4% | -3.5% | \$2,498,163 | \$75,702 | 57 | Below Average | High |
| Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 60 | 61.7% | 68.5% - 70.8% | -6.9% | \$3,486,804 | \$58,113 | 54 | Least Effective | High |
| Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** | 24 | 58.3% | 68.7% - 72.8% | -10.4% | \$639,244 | \$26,635 | 53 | Least Effective | Low |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 10. Male Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| Moderate Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| Florida Environmental Institute | 29 | 69.0% | 54.1% - 58.3% | 10.7% | \$1,210,228 | \$41,732 | 91 | Highly Effective | Moderate |
| Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 43 | 67.4% | 55.3% - 58.5% | 8.9% | \$1,201,793 | \$27,949 | 90 | Highly Effective | Low |
| Impact Halfway House | 40 | 65.0% | 54.4% - 57.8% | 7.2% | \$1,153,557 | \$28,839 | 87 | Highly Effective | Low |
| Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 48 | 66.7% | 55.5% - 58.5% | 8.1% | \$1,701,484 | \$35,448 | 87 | Highly Effective | Moderate |
| Eckerd Intensive Halfway House | 30 | 63.3% | 53.1% - 57.2% | 6.1% | \$1,796,137 | \$59,871 | 79 | Highly Effective | High |
| Camp E-Kel-Etu | 45 | 64.4% | 54.7% - 57.8% | 6.7% | \$3,137,404 | \$69,720 | 78 | Highly Effective | High |
| Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 61.9% | 53.7% - 57.0% | 4.9% | \$797,972 | \$18,999 | 84 | Effective | Low |
| Miami Halfway House | 34 | 61.8% | 53.1% - 56.9% | 4.9% | \$865,562 | \$25,458 | 83 | Effective | Low |
| Pensacola Boys Base | 46 | 60.9% | 53.7% - 56.8% | 4.1% | \$1,021,928 | \$22,216 | 82 | Effective | Low |
| Space Coast Marine Institute | 44 | 61.4% | 53.7% - 56.9% | 4.4% | \$1,245,094 | \$28,298 | 82 | Effective | Low |
| San Antonio Boys Village | 39 | 59.0% | 52.7% - 56.3% | 2.7% | \$485,637 | \$12,452 | 81 | Effective | Low |
| Greenville Hills - Jefferson Halfway House** | 38 | 60.5% | 53.1% - 56.7% | 3.9% | \$861,045 | \$22,659 | 81 | Effective | Low |
| Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy | 182 | 63.2% | 58.8% - 59.9% | 3.3% | \$5,373,559 | \$29,525 | 79 | Effective | Low |
| Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment | 21 | 61.9% | 51.7% - 57.0% | 4.9% | \$1,010,946 | \$48,140 | 79 | Effective | High |
| Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility** | 60 | 58.3% | 53.5% - 56.1% | 2.2% | \$1,388,760 | \$23,146 | 78 | Effective | Low |
| South Pines - Moderate** | 66 | 59.1% | 54.0% - 56.5% | 2.6% | \$2,006,199 | \$30,397 | 78 | Effective | Moderate |
| Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility | 43 | 58.1% | 52.8% - 56.0% | 2.1% | \$1,099,145 | \$25,562 | 77 | Effective | Low |
| Avon Park Youth Academy | 223 | 58.7% | 56.4% - 57.4% | 1.4% | \$6,486,731 | \$29,088 | 75 | Effective | Low |
| GOALS** | 36 | 61.1% | 53.1% - 56.8% | 4.3% | \$2,423,023 | \$67,306 | 74 | Effective | High |
| Greenville Hills - Bassin House** | 23 | 56.5% | 51.1% - 55.5% | 1.0% | \$684,647 | \$29,767 | 74 | Effective | Low |
| Camp E-Tu-Makee** | 40 | 60.0% | 53.1% - 56.5% | 3.5% | \$2,684,748 | \$67,119 | 73 | Effective | High |
| Riverside Academy | 239 | 56.5% | 55.0% - 55.5% | 1.0% | \$7,460,987 | \$31,087 | 73 | Effective | Moderate |
| Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility | 39 | 84.6% | 79.1% - 81.4% | 3.2% | \$2,550,728 | \$65,403 | 72 | Effective | High |
| Union Juvenile Residential Facility | 17 | 82.4% | 77.5% - 81.4% | 1.0% | \$1,159,684 | \$68,217 | 67 | Effective | High |
| Polk STAR** | 24 | 62.5% | 52.2% - 57.0% | 5.5% | \$3,828,154 | \$159,506 | 64 | Effective | High |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 10, (Continued). Male Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| Moderate Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| Duval Juvenile Residential Facility | 46 | 52.2% | 51.2% - 54.3% | 0.0% | \$1,027,706 | \$22,341 | 74 | Average | Low |
| West Florida Wilderness Institute | 58 | 51.7% | 51.2% - 53.9% | 0.0% | \$1,361,503 | \$23,474 | 74 | Average | Low |
| Greenville Hills - MERIT** | 33 | 51.5% | 50.7% - 54.6% | 0.0% | \$796,188 | \$24,127 | 74 | Average | Low |
| Youth Environmental Services | 47 | 51.1% | 50.9% - 54.0% | 0.0% | \$1,275,506 | \$27,138 | 73 | Average | Low |
| Red Road Academy | 74 | 52.7% | 51.8% - 54.0% | 0.0% | \$2,113,908 | \$28,566 | 73 | Average | Low |
| Big Cypress Wilderness Institute | 42 | 54.8% | 51.8% - 55.1% | 0.0% | \$1,371,505 | \$32,655 | 72 | Average | Moderate |
| ARC Halfway House | 150 | 51.1% | 51.1% - 52.4% | 0.0% | \$4,974,060 | \$33,160 | 71 | Average | Moderate |
| Eckerd Youth Challenge Program | 80 | 51.3% | 51.2% - 53.3% | 0.0% | \$3,167,240 | \$39,591 | 71 | Average | Moderate |
| Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate | 139 | 51.8% | 51.7% - 53.1% | 0.0% | \$5,425,204 | \$39,030 | 71 | Average | Moderate |
| Thompson Academy Choices | 28 | 50.2% | 50.2% - 54.6% | 0.0% | \$943,364 | \$33,692 | 71 | Average | Moderate |
| MATS - Halfway House | 53 | 52.8% | 51.5% - 54.4% | 0.0% | \$2,258,476 | \$42,613 | 70 | Average | Moderate |
| Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged | 38 | 52.6% | 51.1% - 54.8% | 0.0% | \$1,688,697 | \$44,439 | 70 | Average | Moderate |
| Gulf Academy - Mental Health | 44 | 54.6% | 51.8% - 55.1% | 0.0% | \$2,560,878 | \$58,202 | 67 | Average | High |
| Camp E-Ma-Chamee | 36 | 52.8% | 51.1% - 54.8% | 0.0% | \$2,642,623 | \$73,406 | 65 | Average | High |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male | 112 | 51.2% | 51.2% - 52.8% | 0.0% | \$7,823,077 | \$69,849 | 65 | Average | High |
| Thompson Academy | 136 | 50.0% | 50.7% - 52.1% | -0.7% | \$4,461,218 | \$32,803 | 71 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility | 70 | 48.6% | 50.2% - 52.5% | -1.6% | \$1,846,018 | \$26,372 | 70 | Below Average | Low |
| Price Halfway House | 42 | 47.6% | 49.9% - 53.2% | -2.3% | \$1,139,913 | \$27,141 | 69 | Below Average | Low |
| Bristol Youth Academy | 70 | 50.0% | 50.7% - 53.0% | -0.7% | \$2,859,863 | \$40,855 | 69 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program | 66 | 45.5% | 49.0% - 51.5% | -3.6% | \$716,800 | \$10,861 | 69 | Below Average | Low |
| Marion Youth Development Center** | 66 | 47.0% | 49.6% - 52.0% | -2.6% | \$1,371,594 | \$20,782 | 69 | Below Average | Low |
| Okaloosa Halfway House** | 31 | 48.4% | 50.0% - 54.1% | -1.6% | \$1,146,794 | \$36,993 | 68 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Okaloosa Youth Academy | 130 | 47.7% | 49.5% - 50.9% | -1.8% | \$4,328,314 | \$33,295 | 68 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Falkenberg Academy | 139 | 46.8% | 48.9% - 50.3% | -2.1% | \$4,242,523 | \$30,522 | 68 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy** | 55 | 47.3% | 49.7% - 52.5% | -2.5% | \$1,579,611 | \$28,720 | 68 | Below Average | Low |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 10, (Continued). Male Moderate-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| Moderate Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| Panther Success Center - White Foundation | 88 | 45.5% | 48.7% - 50.7% | -3.3% | \$1,808,248 | \$20,548 | 68 | Below Average | Low |
| Les Peters Halfway House | 49 | 44.9% | 49.1% - 52.1% | -4.2% | \$1,379,203 | \$28,147 | 65 | Below Average | Low |
| Gulf Coast Youth Academy | 140 | 43.6% | 47.1% - 48.5% | -3.5% | \$4,536,884 | \$32,406 | 65 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Britt Halfway House | 45 | 44.4% | 49.0% - 52.2% | -4.5% | \$1,413,469 | \$31,410 | 63 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Bay Point Schools-North | 27 | 44.4% | 49.1% - 53.6% | -4.7% | \$1,078,834 | \$39,957 | 61 | Below Average | Moderate |
| MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility | 21 | 76.2% | 77.1% - 80.7% | -0.9% | \$2,231,340 | \$106,254 | 57 | Below Average | High |
| Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)** | 36 | 44.4% | 49.1% - 52.8% | -4.6% | \$2,473,999 | \$68,722 | 56 | Below Average | High |
| Blackwater Stop** | 21 | 42.9% | 48.8% - 54.1% | -5.9% | \$695,917 | \$33,139 | 60 | Least Effective | Moderate |
| Polk Halfway House | 31 | 41.9% | 48.6% - 52.7% | -6.7% | \$1,118,171 | \$36,070 | 58 | Least Effective | Moderate |
| Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** | 32 | 37.5% | 47.6% - 51.6% | -10.1% | \$859,191 | \$26,850 | 53 | Least Effective | Low |
| Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** | 43 | 34.9% | 46.4% - 49.7% | -11.5% | \$1,013,964 | \$23,581 | 51 | Least Effective | Low |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 11. Female High-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| High Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|--|----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| Orange Intensive Halfway House** | 17 | 82.4% | 71.4% - 76.2% | -3.3% | \$1,228,353 | \$72,256 | 77 | Highly Effective | High |
| Umatilla Girls Academy** | 26 | 80.8% | 72.3% - 75.9% | -3.6% | \$1,020,704 | \$39,258 | 80 | Effective | Moderate |
| Monticello New Life | 39 | 66.7% | 70.1% - 73.1% | -4.5% | \$1,781,208 | \$45,672 | 63 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Vernon Place-Female** | 20 | 60.0% | 69.0% - 73.5% | 0.0% | \$364,362 | \$18,218 | 57 | Least Effective | Low |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 23 | 60.9% | 69.1% - 73.3% | -10.6% | \$2,520,204 | \$109,574 | 42 | Least Effective | High |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 12. Male High-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| High Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP | 35 | 88.6% | 79.6% - 82.0% | 6.5% | \$3,612,973 | \$103,228 | 72 | Highly Effective | High |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male | 70 | 65.7% | 56.7% - 59.0% | -7.2% | \$7,749,921 | \$110,713 | 71 | Highly Effective | High |
| Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center** | 41 | 61.0% | 53.4% - 56.8% | 1.0% | \$1,989,572 | \$48,526 | 77 | Effective | High |
| Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment | 21 | 61.9% | 51.7% - 57.0% | -4.8% | \$1,377,124 | \$65,577 | 76 | Effective | High |
| Broward Intensive Halfway House | 27 | 59.3% | 52.0% - 56.4% | 0.0% | \$1,645,024 | \$60,927 | 72 | Effective | High |
| Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program | 30 | 56.7% | 51.7% - 55.7% | 4.9% | \$1,171,623 | \$39,054 | 72 | Effective | Moderate |
| Sago Palm - Pathfinders** | 60 | 55.0% | 52.4% - 54.0% | -1.4% | \$2,476,097 | \$41,268 | 70 | Effective | Moderate |
| St Johns Correctional Facility | 28 | 82.1% | 78.2% - 81.1% | -2.7% | \$2,742,562 | \$97,949 | 62 | Effective | High |
| Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility | 28 | 57.1% | 51.7% - 56.0% | 1.1% | \$3,852,728 | \$137,597 | 56 | Effective | High |
| Sago Palm - Trailblazers** | 51 | 54.9% | 52.1% - 55.1% | 23.4% | \$1,591,965 | \$31,215 | 72 | Average | Moderate |
| Manatee Youth Academy** | 18 | 55.6% | 50.4% - 56.3% | 4.0% | \$972,063 | \$54,004 | 68 | Average | High |
| Eckerd Youth Development Center | 123 | 51.4% | 51.4% - 52.9% | 6.7% | \$8,919,323 | \$72,515 | 64 | Average | High |
| Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility | 37 | 78.4% | 77.9% - 80.4% | 0.0% | \$2,908,998 | \$78,622 | 64 | Average | High |
| Dozier Sex Offender Program** | 50 | 80.0% | 78.5% - 80.5% | 0.0% | \$4,694,327 | \$93,887 | 61 | Average | High |
| Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility | 47 | 48.9% | 50.3% - 53.4% | 0.0% | \$1,754,485 | \$37,329 | 69 | Below Average | Moderate |
| NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program | 32 | 46.9% | 49.7% - 53.7% | 0.0% | \$1,238,475 | \$38,702 | 65 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Hastings Youth Academy - High** | 63 | 46.0% | 49.3% - 51.8% | 0.0% | \$2,360,619 | \$37,470 | 65 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services** | 51 | 47.1% | 49.7% - 52.7% | 0.0% | \$2,266,814 | \$44,447 | 65 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Sago Palm - Youth Development Center** | 48 | 45.8% | 49.4% - 52.5% | 0.0% | \$1,842,384 | \$38,383 | 64 | Below Average | Moderate |
| Dozier Training School** | 93 | 49.5% | 50.5% - 52.4% | 0.0% | \$6,762,544 | \$72,716 | 63 | Below Average | High |
| Three Springs Sex Offender Program | 34 | 73.5% | 77.0% - 79.7% | 0.0% | \$1,966,691 | \$57,844 | 61 | Below Average | High |
| Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility** | 220 | 37.3% | 42.1% - 43.0% | 0.0% | \$10,797,936 | \$49,082 | 60 | Below Average | High |
| Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program** | 54 | 72.2% | 76.7% - 78.8% | 0.0% | \$3,398,696 | \$62,939 | 58 | Below Average | High |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - High | 52 | 40.4% | 47.6% - 50.5% | 0.0% | \$1,764,601 | \$33,935 | 58 | Least Effective | Moderate |
| NAFI Intensive Halfway House | 24 | 41.7% | 48.6% - 53.5% | 0.0% | \$1,034,237 | \$43,093 | 56 | Least Effective | Moderate |
| Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House** | 36 | 41.7% | 48.4% - 52.2% | 0.0% | \$1,794,668 | \$49,852 | 56 | Least Effective | High |
| DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 36 | 41.7% | 48.4% - 52.2% | 0.0% | \$3,044,957 | \$84,582 | 49 | Least Effective | High |
| Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - SOP** | 23 | 65.2% | 75.8% - 79.3% | 0.0% | \$1,486,558 | \$64,633 | 45 | Least Effective | High |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table 13. Male Max-Risk Residential Programs Ranked by Program Effectiveness

| Maximum Risk Programs | N | Observed Success Rate | Expected Recidivism Range | Percent Difference* | Two-Year Expenditures | Cost per Completion | PAM Score | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category |
|---|----|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 18 | 83.3% | 54.2% - 59.9% | 23.4% | \$1,675,492 | \$93,083 | 93 | Highly Effective | High |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - Maximum | 33 | 60.6% | 52.7% - 56.7% | 4.0% | \$3,009,259 | \$91,190 | 69 | Effective | High |
| Jackson JOCC | 25 | 64.0% | 52.6% - 57.3% | 6.7% | \$1,218,227 | \$48,729 | 82 | Highly Effective | High |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

PAM Scores by Gender and Program Type

Tables 14 and 15 compare program PAM scores by gender and program type. Program types are derived from the DJJ Bed Management System and were available for use for the first time this year. These categories distinguish programs by restrictiveness level and by treatment specialty. There are a variety of specialty program types including: boot camps, mental health programs, substance abuse programs, and sex offender programs which each serve youth with specific treatment needs. These tables present the following variables for each of the residential programs serving males and females:

- Restrictiveness level (low, moderate, high, maximum)
- Number of youth completing program during the two-year period (N)
- Observed success rate
- Expected success range
- Percent above or below the expected success range
- Program expenditures
- Program cost per completion
- PAM score
- Success effectiveness category within which each program falls
- Cost effectiveness category within which each program falls

**Table 14. Female Residential Programs Listed by Program Type
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference* | Expected Success Range | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|--|-----|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Female Low Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | STEP II - Female** | 50 | 74.0% | 0.0 | 72.0% - 74.5% | \$328,920 | \$6,578 | Average | Low | 77 |
| Low | Vision Quest - Low | 112 | 67.9% | -2.3 | 70.2% - 71.6% | \$2,638,347 | \$23,557 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Low | White Foundation Family Homes - Female** | 19 | 63.2% | -6.2 | 69.4% - 74.0% | \$500,524 | \$26,343 | Least Effective | Low | 61 |
| Female Moderate Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | YMCA Character Halfway House | 28 | 89.3% | 12.2 | 73.8% - 77.1% | \$1,348,659 | \$48,166 | Highly Effective | High | 93 |
| Moderate | Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility | 22 | 81.8% | 5.8 | 72.0% - 76.0% | \$226,886 | \$10,313 | Highly Effective | Low | 88 |
| Moderate | Dove Academy | 15 | 93.3% | 16.1 | 72.1% - 77.2% | \$2,432,170 | \$162,145 | Highly Effective | High | 85 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 35 | 88.6% | 11.3 | 74.4% - 77.3% | \$3,003,039 | \$85,801 | Highly Effective | High | 84 |
| Moderate | First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** | 29 | 79.3% | 3.7 | 72.3% - 75.6% | \$884,543 | \$30,501 | Effective | Moderate | 80 |
| Moderate | Wilson Youth Academy | 46 | 76.1% | 1.1 | 72.4% - 74.9% | \$1,734,375 | \$37,704 | Effective | Moderate | 73 |
| Moderate | Joann Bridges Academy | 46 | 69.6% | -1.3 | 70.8% - 73.4% | \$1,471,298 | \$31,985 | Below Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Moderate | Vision Quest - Moderate | 119 | 69.8% | -1.3 | 71.0% - 72.4% | \$3,830,193 | \$32,186 | Below Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Moderate | Pines Juvenile Residential Facility | 91 | 64.8% | -4.2 | 69.1% - 70.8% | \$2,354,055 | \$25,869 | Below Average | Low | 65 |
| Moderate | Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF | 21 | 66.7% | -3.3 | 69.9% - 74.3% | \$817,971 | \$38,951 | Below Average | Moderate | 64 |
| Moderate | Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** | 24 | 58.3% | -10.4 | 68.7% - 72.8% | \$639,244 | \$26,635 | Least Effective | Low | 53 |
| Female Moderate Risk Substance Abuse Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Francis Walker Halfway House | 44 | 75.0% | 1.0 | 72.1% - 73.7% | \$1,326,122 | \$30,139 | Effective | Moderate | 73 |
| Female Moderate Risk Mental Health Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 78.6% | 3.0 | 72.9% - 75.6% | \$1,546,733 | \$36,827 | Effective | Moderate | 77 |
| Moderate | HOPE | 18 | 83.3% | 7.1 | 71.7% - 76.3% | \$1,752,160 | \$97,342 | Highly Effective | High | 74 |
| Moderate | Lake Academy | 66 | 68.2% | -2.3 | 70.5% - 72.6% | \$3,163,568 | \$47,933 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Moderate | DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 33 | 66.7% | -3.5 | 70.1% - 73.4% | \$2,498,163 | \$75,702 | Below Average | High | 57 |
| Moderate | Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 60 | 61.7% | -6.9 | 68.5% - 70.8% | \$3,486,804 | \$58,113 | Least Effective | High | 54 |
| Female High Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Orange Intensive Halfway House** | 17 | 82.4% | 6.2 | 71.4% - 76.2% | \$1,228,353 | \$72,256 | Highly Effective | High | 77 |
| High | Monticello New Life | 39 | 66.7% | -3.4 | 70.1% - 73.1% | \$1,781,208 | \$45,672 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| High | Vernon Place-Female** | 20 | 60.0% | -9.0 | 69.0% - 73.5% | \$364,362 | \$18,218 | Least Effective | Low | 57 |
| Female High Risk Mental Health Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Umatilla Girls Academy** | 26 | 80.8% | 4.9 | 72.3% - 75.9% | \$1,020,704 | \$39,258 | Effective | Moderate | 80 |
| High | DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 23 | 60.9% | -8.3 | 69.1% - 73.3% | \$2,520,204 | \$109,574 | Least Effective | High | 42 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 15. Male Residential Programs Listed by Program Type
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | Percent Difference* | Expected | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----|--------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | Success Rate | | Success Range | | | | | |
| Male Low Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | 57 | 63.2% | 5.5 | 55.0% - 57.7% | \$686,240 | \$12,039 | Effective | Low | 87 |
| Low | Forestry Youth Academy** | 31 | 67.7% | 9.6 | 54.1% - 58.1% | \$1,998,645 | \$64,472 | Highly Effective | High | 85 |
| Low | STEP I - Male | 113 | 62.0% | 3.7 | 56.7% - 58.3% | \$997,608 | \$8,828 | Effective | Low | 84 |
| Low | South Pines - Low** | 86 | 57.0% | 1.2 | 53.7% - 55.8% | \$1,945,835 | \$22,626 | Effective | Low | 76 |
| Low | White Foundation Family Homes - Male** | 51 | 54.9% | 0.0 | 52.1% - 55.1% | \$1,393,682 | \$27,327 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Low | Escambia River Outward Bound** | 65 | 49.2% | -1.2 | 50.4% - 52.9% | \$1,153,037 | \$17,739 | Below Average | Low | 72 |
| Low | Peace River Outward Bound** | 89 | 47.2% | -2.3 | 49.5% - 51.5% | \$1,168,917 | \$13,134 | Below Average | Low | 71 |
| Low | Eckerd Academy | 61 | 51.0% | 0.0 | 51.0% - 53.5% | \$2,512,491 | \$41,188 | Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Low | Seminole Work and Learn Center | 36 | 47.2% | -2.5 | 49.7% - 53.5% | \$683,291 | \$18,980 | Below Average | Low | 70 |
| Low | Brevard Group Treatment Home | 43 | 41.9% | -6.5 | 48.3% - 51.6% | \$1,387,215 | \$32,261 | Least Effective | Moderate | 59 |
| Low | Blackwater Short Term Offender** | 18 | 33.3% | -14.1 | 47.4% - 53.3% | \$97,863 | \$5,437 | Least Effective | Low | 49 |
| Male Moderate Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Florida Environmental Institute | 29 | 69.0% | 10.7 | 54.1% - 58.3% | \$1,210,228 | \$41,732 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 91 |
| Moderate | Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 43 | 67.4% | 8.9 | 55.3% - 58.5% | \$1,201,793 | \$27,949 | Highly Effective | Low | 90 |
| Moderate | Impact Halfway House | 40 | 65.0% | 7.2 | 54.4% - 57.8% | \$1,153,557 | \$28,839 | Highly Effective | Low | 87 |
| Moderate | Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 48 | 66.7% | 8.1 | 55.5% - 58.5% | \$1,701,484 | \$35,448 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 87 |
| Moderate | Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 61.9% | 4.9 | 53.7% - 57.0% | \$797,972 | \$18,999 | Effective | Low | 84 |
| Moderate | Pensacola Boys Base | 46 | 60.9% | 4.1 | 53.7% - 56.8% | \$1,021,928 | \$22,216 | Effective | Low | 82 |
| Moderate | Space Coast Marine Institute | 44 | 61.4% | 4.4 | 53.7% - 56.9% | \$1,245,094 | \$28,298 | Effective | Low | 82 |
| Moderate | San Antonio Boys Village | 39 | 59.0% | 2.7 | 52.7% - 56.3% | \$485,637 | \$12,452 | Effective | Low | 81 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Jefferson Halfway House** | 38 | 60.5% | 3.9 | 53.1% - 56.7% | \$861,045 | \$22,659 | Effective | Low | 81 |
| Moderate | Eckerd Intensive Halfway House | 30 | 63.3% | 6.1 | 53.1% - 57.2% | \$1,796,137 | \$59,871 | Highly Effective | High | 79 |
| Moderate | Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy | 182 | 63.2% | 3.3 | 58.8% - 59.9% | \$5,373,559 | \$29,525 | Effective | Low | 79 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Kel-Etu | 45 | 64.4% | 6.7 | 54.7% - 57.8% | \$3,137,404 | \$69,720 | Highly Effective | High | 78 |
| Moderate | Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility** | 60 | 58.3% | 2.2 | 53.5% - 56.1% | \$1,388,760 | \$23,146 | Effective | Low | 78 |
| Moderate | South Pines - Moderate** | 66 | 59.1% | 2.6 | 54.0% - 56.5% | \$2,006,199 | \$30,397 | Effective | Moderate | 78 |
| Moderate | Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility | 43 | 58.1% | 2.1 | 52.8% - 56.0% | \$1,099,145 | \$25,562 | Effective | Low | 77 |
| Moderate | Avon Park Youth Academy | 223 | 58.7% | 1.4 | 56.4% - 57.4% | \$6,486,731 | \$29,088 | Effective | Low | 75 |
| Moderate | GOALS** | 36 | 61.1% | 4.3 | 53.1% - 56.8% | \$2,423,023 | \$67,306 | Effective | High | 74 |
| Moderate | Duval Juvenile Residential Facility | 46 | 52.2% | 0.0 | 51.2% - 54.3% | \$1,027,706 | \$22,341 | Average | Low | 74 |
| Moderate | West Florida Wilderness Institute | 58 | 51.7% | 0.0 | 51.2% - 53.9% | \$1,361,503 | \$23,474 | Average | Low | 74 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 15, (Continued). Male Residential Programs Listed by Program Type
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | | Expected Success Range | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----|--------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | Success Rate | Percent Difference* | | | | | | |
| Male Moderate Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - MERIT** | 33 | 51.5% | 0.0 | 50.7% - 54.6% | \$796,188 | \$24,127 | Average | Low | 74 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Tu-Makee** | 40 | 60.0% | 3.5 | 53.1% - 56.5% | \$2,684,748 | \$67,119 | Effective | High | 73 |
| Moderate | Youth Environmental Services | 47 | 51.1% | 0.0 | 50.9% - 54.0% | \$1,275,506 | \$27,138 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Moderate | Red Road Academy | 74 | 52.7% | 0.0 | 51.8% - 54.0% | \$2,113,908 | \$28,566 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Moderate | Big Cypress Wilderness Institute | 42 | 54.8% | 0.0 | 51.8% - 55.1% | \$1,371,505 | \$32,655 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Moderate | ARC Halfway House | 150 | 51.1% | 0.0 | 51.1% - 52.4% | \$4,974,060 | \$33,160 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Moderate | Eckerd Youth Challenge Program | 80 | 51.3% | 0.0 | 51.2% - 53.3% | \$3,167,240 | \$39,591 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Moderate | Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate | 139 | 51.8% | 0.0 | 51.7% - 53.1% | \$5,425,204 | \$39,030 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Moderate | Thompson Academy Choices | 28 | 50.2% | 0.0 | 50.2% - 54.6% | \$943,364 | \$33,692 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Moderate | Thompson Academy | 136 | 50.0% | -0.7 | 50.7% - 52.1% | \$4,461,218 | \$32,803 | Below Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Moderate | MATS - Halfway House | 53 | 52.8% | 0.0 | 51.5% - 54.4% | \$2,258,476 | \$42,613 | Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Moderate | Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility | 70 | 48.6% | -1.6 | 50.2% - 52.5% | \$1,846,018 | \$26,372 | Below Average | Low | 70 |
| Moderate | Price Halfway House | 42 | 47.6% | -2.3 | 49.9% - 53.2% | \$1,139,913 | \$27,141 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Moderate | Marion Youth Development Center** | 66 | 47.0% | -2.6 | 49.6% - 52.0% | \$1,371,594 | \$20,782 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Moderate | Bristol Youth Academy | 70 | 50.0% | -0.7 | 50.7% - 53.0% | \$2,859,863 | \$40,855 | Below Average | Moderate | 69 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy** | 55 | 47.3% | -2.5 | 49.7% - 52.5% | \$1,579,611 | \$28,720 | Below Average | Low | 68 |
| Moderate | Panther Success Center - White Foundation | 88 | 45.5% | -3.3 | 48.7% - 50.7% | \$1,808,248 | \$20,548 | Below Average | Low | 68 |
| Moderate | Okaloosa Halfway House** | 31 | 48.4% | -1.6 | 50.0% - 54.1% | \$1,146,794 | \$36,993 | Below Average | Moderate | 68 |
| Moderate | Okaloosa Youth Academy | 130 | 47.7% | -1.8 | 49.5% - 50.9% | \$4,328,314 | \$33,295 | Below Average | Moderate | 68 |
| Moderate | Falkenberg Academy | 139 | 46.8% | -2.1 | 48.9% - 50.3% | \$4,242,523 | \$30,522 | Below Average | Moderate | 68 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Ma-Chamee | 36 | 52.8% | 0.0 | 51.1% - 54.8% | \$2,642,623 | \$73,406 | Average | High | 65 |
| Moderate | Les Peters Halfway House | 49 | 44.9% | -4.2 | 49.1% - 52.1% | \$1,379,203 | \$28,147 | Below Average | Low | 65 |
| Moderate | Gulf Coast Youth Academy | 140 | 43.6% | -3.5 | 47.1% - 48.5% | \$4,536,884 | \$32,406 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Moderate | Polk STAR** | 24 | 62.5% | 5.5 | 52.2% - 57.0% | \$3,828,154 | \$159,506 | Effective | High | 64 |
| Moderate | Britt Halfway House | 45 | 44.4% | -4.5 | 49.0% - 52.2% | \$1,413,469 | \$31,410 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| Moderate | Bay Point Schools-North | 27 | 44.4% | -4.7 | 49.1% - 53.6% | \$1,078,834 | \$39,957 | Below Average | Moderate | 61 |
| Moderate | Blackwater Stop** | 21 | 42.9% | -5.9 | 48.8% - 54.1% | \$695,917 | \$33,139 | Least Effective | Moderate | 60 |
| Moderate | Polk Halfway House | 31 | 41.9% | -6.7 | 48.6% - 52.7% | \$1,118,171 | \$36,070 | Least Effective | Moderate | 58 |
| Moderate | Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)** | 36 | 44.4% | -4.6 | 49.1% - 52.8% | \$2,473,999 | \$68,722 | Below Average | High | 56 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** | 32 | 37.5% | -10.1 | 47.6% - 51.6% | \$859,191 | \$26,850 | Least Effective | Low | 53 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** | 43 | 34.9% | -11.5 | 46.4% - 49.7% | \$1,013,964 | \$23,581 | Least Effective | Low | 51 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 15, (Continued). Male Residential Programs Listed by Program Type
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | | Expected | | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|--|---|-----|--------------|---------------------|----------|---------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | Success Rate | Percent Difference* | Success | Range | | | | | |
| Male Moderate Risk Substance Abuse Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Miami Halfway House | 34 | 61.8% | 4.9 | 53.1% | - 56.9% | \$865,562 | \$25,458 | Effective | Low | 83 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Bassin House** | 23 | 56.5% | 1.0 | 51.1% | - 55.5% | \$684,647 | \$29,767 | Effective | Low | 74 |
| Moderate | Riverside Academy | 239 | 56.5% | 1.0 | 55.0% | - 55.5% | \$7,460,987 | \$31,087 | Effective | Moderate | 73 |
| Moderate | Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program | 66 | 45.5% | -3.6 | 49.0% | - 51.5% | \$716,800 | \$10,861 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Male Moderate Risk Sex Offender Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility | 39 | 84.6% | 3.2 | 79.1% | - 81.4% | \$2,550,728 | \$65,403 | Effective | High | 72 |
| Moderate | Union Juvenile Residential Facility | 17 | 82.4% | 1.0 | 77.5% | - 81.4% | \$1,159,684 | \$68,217 | Effective | High | 67 |
| Moderate | MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility | 21 | 76.2% | -0.9 | 77.1% | - 80.7% | \$2,231,340 | \$106,254 | Below Average | High | 57 |
| Male Moderate Risk Mental Health Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment | 21 | 61.9% | 4.9 | 51.7% | - 57.0% | \$1,010,946 | \$48,140 | Effective | High | 79 |
| Moderate | Gulf Academy - Mental Health | 44 | 54.6% | 0.0 | 51.8% | - 55.1% | \$2,560,878 | \$58,202 | Average | High | 67 |
| Moderate | DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male | 112 | 51.2% | 0.0 | 51.2% | - 52.8% | \$7,823,077 | \$69,849 | Average | High | 65 |
| Male Moderate Risk Developmentally Disabled Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged | 38 | 52.6% | 0.0 | 51.1% | - 54.8% | \$1,688,697 | \$44,439 | Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Male High Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program | 32 | 46.9% | -2.8 | 49.7% | - 53.7% | \$1,238,475 | \$38,702 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| High | NAFI Intensive Halfway House | 24 | 41.7% | -7.0 | 48.6% | - 53.5% | \$1,034,237 | \$43,093 | Least Effective | Moderate | 56 |
| High | Manatee Youth Academy** | 18 | 55.6% | 0.0 | 50.4% | - 56.3% | \$972,063 | \$54,004 | Average | High | 68 |
| High | Eckerd Youth Development Center | 123 | 51.4% | 0.0 | 51.4% | - 52.9% | \$8,919,323 | \$72,515 | Average | High | 64 |
| High | Broward Intensive Halfway House | 27 | 59.3% | 2.9 | 52.0% | - 56.4% | \$1,645,024 | \$60,927 | Effective | High | 72 |
| High | Dozier Training School** | 93 | 49.5% | -1.0 | 50.5% | - 52.4% | \$6,762,544 | \$72,716 | Below Average | High | 63 |
| High | Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center** | 41 | 61.0% | 4.2 | 53.4% | - 56.8% | \$1,989,572 | \$48,526 | Effective | High | 77 |
| High | Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House** | 36 | 41.7% | -6.8 | 48.4% | - 52.2% | \$1,794,668 | \$49,852 | Least Effective | High | 56 |
| High | Hastings Youth Academy - High** | 63 | 46.0% | -3.3 | 49.3% | - 51.8% | \$2,360,619 | \$37,470 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| High | Sago Palm - Youth Development Center** | 48 | 45.8% | -3.6 | 49.4% | - 52.5% | \$1,842,384 | \$38,383 | Below Average | Moderate | 64 |
| High | Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - | 52 | 40.4% | -7.2 | 47.6% | - 50.5% | \$1,764,601 | \$33,935 | Least Effective | Moderate | 58 |
| High | Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program | 30 | 56.7% | 1.0 | 51.7% | - 55.7% | \$1,171,623 | \$39,054 | Effective | Moderate | 72 |
| High | Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility** | 220 | 37.3% | -4.8 | 42.1% | - 43.0% | \$10,797,936 | \$49,082 | Below Average | High | 60 |
| High | Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment | 21 | 61.9% | 4.9 | 51.7% | - 57.0% | \$1,377,124 | \$65,577 | Effective | High | 76 |
| High | Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility | 47 | 48.9% | -1.4 | 50.3% | - 53.4% | \$1,754,485 | \$37,329 | Below Average | Moderate | 69 |
| High | Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility | 28 | 57.1% | 1.1 | 51.7% | - 56.0% | \$3,852,728 | \$137,597 | Effective | High | 56 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 15, (Continued). Male Residential Programs Listed by Program Type
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | | Expected Success Range | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|---|----|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| | | | Success Rate | Percent Difference* | | | | | | |
| Male High Risk Substance Abuse Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Sago Palm - Pathfinders** | 60 | 55.0% | 1.0 | 52.4% - 54.0% | \$2,476,097 | \$41,268 | Effective | Moderate | 70 |
| High | Sago Palm - Trailblazers** | 51 | 54.9% | 0.0 | 52.1% - 55.1% | \$1,591,965 | \$31,215 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Male High Risk Sex Offender Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Three Springs Sex Offender Program | 34 | 73.5% | -3.5 | 77.0% - 79.7% | \$1,966,691 | \$57,844 | Below Average | High | 61 |
| High | Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program** | 54 | 72.2% | -4.5 | 76.7% - 78.8% | \$3,398,696 | \$62,939 | Below Average | High | 58 |
| High | Dozier Sex Offender Program** | 50 | 80.0% | 0.0 | 78.5% - 80.5% | \$4,694,327 | \$93,887 | Average | High | 61 |
| High | Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - SOP** | 23 | 65.2% | -10.6 | 75.8% - 79.3% | \$1,486,558 | \$64,633 | Least Effective | High | 45 |
| High | Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility | 37 | 78.4% | 0.0 | 77.9% - 80.4% | \$2,908,998 | \$78,622 | Average | High | 64 |
| High | St Johns Correctional Facility | 28 | 82.1% | 1.1 | 78.2% - 81.1% | \$2,742,562 | \$97,949 | Effective | High | 62 |
| High | Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SO | 35 | 88.6% | 6.5 | 79.6% - 82.0% | \$3,612,973 | \$103,228 | Highly Effective | High | 72 |
| Male High Risk Mental Health Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 36 | 41.7% | -6.8 | 48.4% - 52.2% | \$3,044,957 | \$84,582 | Least Effective | High | 49 |
| High | DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male | 70 | 65.7% | 6.7 | 56.7% - 59.0% | \$7,749,921 | \$110,713 | Highly Effective | High | 71 |
| High | Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services** | 51 | 47.1% | -2.7 | 49.7% - 52.7% | \$2,266,814 | \$44,447 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Male Maximum Risk Residential | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum | Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 18 | 83.3% | 23.4 | 54.2% - 59.9% | \$1,675,492 | \$93,083 | Highly Effective | High | 93 |
| Maximum | Jackson JOCC | 25 | 64.0% | 6.7 | 52.6% - 57.3% | \$1,218,227 | \$48,729 | Highly Effective | High | 82 |
| Maximum | Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - | 33 | 60.6% | 4.0 | 52.7% - 56.7% | \$3,009,259 | \$91,190 | Effective | High | 69 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider

Table 16 presents PAM scores, effectiveness and cost categories by program provider. This allows for a comparison of program effectiveness relative to cost effectiveness by provider organizations.

These tables present the following variables for each of the provider organizations and the programs they operate:

- Restrictiveness level (low, moderate, high, maximum)
- Number of youth completing program during the two-year period (N)
- Observed success rate
- Expected success range
- Percent above or below the expected success range
- Program expenditures
- Program cost per completion
- PAM score
- Success effectiveness category within which each program falls
- Cost effectiveness category within which each program falls

**Table 16. PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed Success Rate | Percent Difference* | Expected Success Range | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|--|---|-----|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Associated Marine Institutes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Big Cypress Wilderness Institute | 42 | 54.8% | 0.0 | 51.8% - 55.1% | \$1,371,505 | \$32,655 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| Moderate | Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 43 | 67.4% | 8.9 | 55.3% - 58.5% | \$1,201,793 | \$27,949 | Highly Effective | Low | 90 |
| Moderate | Florida Environmental Institute | 29 | 69.0% | 10.7 | 54.1% - 58.3% | \$1,210,228 | \$41,732 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 91 |
| Moderate | Space Coast Marine Institute | 44 | 61.4% | 4.4 | 53.7% - 56.9% | \$1,245,094 | \$28,298 | Effective | Low | 82 |
| Moderate | West Florida Wilderness Institute | 58 | 51.7% | 0.0 | 51.2% - 53.9% | \$1,361,503 | \$23,474 | Average | Low | 74 |
| Moderate | Youth Environmental Services | 47 | 51.1% | 0.0 | 50.9% - 54.0% | \$1,275,506 | \$27,138 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Bay Point Schools, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Bay Point Schools-North | 27 | 44.4% | -4.7 | 49.1% - 53.6% | \$1,078,834 | \$39,957 | Below Average | Moderate | 61 |
| Moderate | Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy | 182 | 63.2% | 3.3 | 58.8% - 59.9% | \$5,373,559 | \$29,525 | Effective | Low | 79 |
| Moderate | Miami Halfway House | 34 | 61.8% | 4.9 | 53.1% - 56.9% | \$865,562 | \$25,458 | Effective | Low | 83 |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy, LLC | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF | 21 | 66.7% | -3.3 | 69.9% - 74.3% | \$817,971 | \$38,951 | Below Average | Moderate | 64 |
| Center for Drug Free Living, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | ARC Halfway House | 150 | 51.1% | 0.0 | 51.1% - 52.4% | \$4,974,060 | \$33,160 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Low | Brevard Group Treatment Home | 43 | 41.9% | -6.5 | 48.3% - 51.6% | \$1,387,215 | \$32,261 | Least Effective | Moderate | 59 |
| Moderate | Francis Walker Halfway House | 44 | 75.0% | 1.0 | 72.1% - 73.7% | \$1,326,122 | \$30,139 | Effective | Moderate | 73 |
| Correctional Services Corporation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | Blackwater Short Term Offender** | 18 | 33.3% | -14.1 | 47.4% - 53.3% | \$97,863 | \$5,437 | Least Effective | Low | 49 |
| Moderate | Marion Youth Development Center** | 66 | 47.0% | -2.6 | 49.6% - 52.0% | \$1,371,594 | \$20,782 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Correctional Services of Florida | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program | 30 | 56.7% | 1.0 | 51.7% - 55.7% | \$1,171,623 | \$39,054 | Effective | Moderate | 72 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 16, (Continued). PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | Percent Difference* | Expected | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|--|---|-----|--------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | Success Rate | | Success Range | | | | | |
| Department of Juvenile Justice | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Britt Halfway House | 45 | 44.4% | -4.5 | 49.0% - 52.2% | \$1,413,469 | \$31,410 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| High | Broward Intensive Halfway House | 27 | 59.3% | 2.9 | 52.0% - 56.4% | \$1,645,024 | \$60,927 | Effective | High | 72 |
| High | DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 23 | 60.9% | -8.3 | 69.1% - 73.3% | \$2,520,204 | \$109,574 | Least Effective | High | 42 |
| High | DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male | 70 | 65.7% | 6.7 | 56.7% - 59.0% | \$7,749,921 | \$110,713 | Highly Effective | High | 71 |
| High | DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 36 | 41.7% | -6.8 | 48.4% - 52.2% | \$3,044,957 | \$84,582 | Least Effective | High | 49 |
| Moderate | DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 33 | 66.7% | -3.5 | 70.1% - 73.4% | \$2,498,163 | \$75,702 | Below Average | High | 57 |
| Moderate | DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male | 112 | 51.2% | 0.0 | 51.2% - 52.8% | \$7,823,077 | \$69,849 | Average | High | 65 |
| High | Dozier Sex Offender Program** | 50 | 80.0% | 0.0 | 78.5% - 80.5% | \$4,694,327 | \$93,887 | Average | High | 61 |
| High | Dozier Training School** | 93 | 49.5% | -1.0 | 50.5% - 52.4% | \$6,762,544 | \$72,716 | Below Average | High | 63 |
| Moderate | Duval Juvenile Residential Facility | 46 | 52.2% | 0.0 | 51.2% - 54.3% | \$1,027,706 | \$22,341 | Average | Low | 74 |
| Moderate | Falkenberg Academy | 139 | 46.8% | -2.1 | 48.9% - 50.3% | \$4,242,523 | \$30,522 | Below Average | Moderate | 68 |
| Maximum | Jackson JOCC | 25 | 64.0% | 6.7 | 52.6% - 57.3% | \$1,218,227 | \$48,729 | Highly Effective | High | 82 |
| High | Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center** | 41 | 61.0% | 4.2 | 53.4% - 56.8% | \$1,989,572 | \$48,526 | Effective | High | 77 |
| High | Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - SOP** | 23 | 65.2% | -10.6 | 75.8% - 79.3% | \$1,486,558 | \$64,633 | Least Effective | High | 45 |
| Moderate | Les Peters Halfway House | 49 | 44.9% | -4.2 | 49.1% - 52.1% | \$1,379,203 | \$28,147 | Below Average | Low | 65 |
| High | Orange Intensive Halfway House** | 17 | 82.4% | 6.2 | 71.4% - 76.2% | \$1,228,353 | \$72,256 | Highly Effective | High | 77 |
| Moderate | Pensacola Boys Base | 46 | 60.9% | 4.1 | 53.7% - 56.8% | \$1,021,928 | \$22,216 | Effective | Low | 82 |
| Moderate | Price Halfway House | 42 | 47.6% | -2.3 | 49.9% - 53.2% | \$1,139,913 | \$27,141 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Diversified Behavioral Health Solutions, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility | 22 | 81.8% | 5.8 | 72.0% - 76.0% | \$226,886 | \$10,313 | Highly Effective | Low | 88 |
| High | Umatilla Girls Academy** | 26 | 80.8% | 4.9 | 72.3% - 75.9% | \$1,020,704 | \$39,258 | Effective | Moderate | 80 |
| Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Camp E-Kel-Etu | 45 | 64.4% | 6.7 | 54.7% - 57.8% | \$3,137,404 | \$69,720 | Highly Effective | High | 78 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Ma-Chamee | 36 | 52.8% | 0.0 | 51.1% - 54.8% | \$2,642,623 | \$73,406 | Average | High | 65 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 35 | 88.6% | 11.3 | 74.4% - 77.3% | \$3,003,039 | \$85,801 | Highly Effective | High | 84 |
| Moderate | Camp E-Tu-Makee** | 40 | 60.0% | 3.5 | 53.1% - 56.5% | \$2,684,748 | \$67,119 | Effective | High | 73 |
| Low | Eckerd Academy | 61 | 51.0% | 0.0 | 51.0% - 53.5% | \$2,512,491 | \$41,188 | Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Moderate | Eckerd Intensive Halfway House | 30 | 63.3% | 6.1 | 53.1% - 57.2% | \$1,796,137 | \$59,871 | Highly Effective | High | 79 |
| Moderate | Eckerd Youth Challenge Program | 80 | 51.3% | 0.0 | 51.2% - 53.3% | \$3,167,240 | \$39,591 | Average | Moderate | 71 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 16, (Continued). PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | Percent | Expected | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|---|---|-----|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | Success Rate | Difference* | Success Range | | | | | |
| Eckerd Youth Alternatives, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Eckerd Youth Development Center | 123 | 51.4% | 0.0 | 51.4% - 52.9% | \$8,919,323 | \$72,515 | Average | High | 64 |
| High | Vernon Place-Female** | 20 | 60.0% | -9.0 | 69.0% - 73.5% | \$364,362 | \$18,218 | Least Effective | Low | 57 |
| First Step Adolescent Services, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** | 24 | 58.3% | -10.4 | 68.7% - 72.8% | \$639,244 | \$26,635 | Least Effective | Low | 53 |
| Moderate | First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** | 29 | 79.3% | 3.7 | 72.3% - 75.6% | \$884,543 | \$30,501 | Effective | Moderate | 80 |
| Florida Department of Agriculture Division of Forestry | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | Forestry Youth Academy** | 31 | 67.7% | 9.6 | 54.1% - 58.1% | \$1,998,645 | \$64,472 | Highly Effective | High | 85 |
| G4S Youth Services | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Avon Park Youth Academy | 223 | 58.7% | 1.4 | 56.4% - 57.4% | \$6,486,731 | \$29,088 | Effective | Low | 75 |
| High | Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - High | 52 | 40.4% | -7.2 | 47.6% - 50.5% | \$1,764,601 | \$33,935 | Least Effective | Moderate | 58 |
| Maximum | Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - Maximum | 33 | 60.6% | 4.0 | 52.7% - 56.7% | \$3,009,259 | \$91,190 | Effective | High | 69 |
| High | Hastings Youth Academy - High** | 63 | 46.0% | -3.3 | 49.3% - 51.8% | \$2,360,619 | \$37,470 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Moderate | Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate | 139 | 51.8% | 0.0 | 51.7% - 53.1% | \$5,425,204 | \$39,030 | Average | Moderate | 71 |
| Maximum | Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 18 | 83.3% | 23.4 | 54.2% - 59.9% | \$1,675,492 | \$93,083 | Highly Effective | High | 93 |
| High | Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP | 35 | 88.6% | 6.5 | 79.6% - 82.0% | \$3,612,973 | \$103,228 | Highly Effective | High | 72 |
| High | Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility** | 220 | 37.3% | -4.8 | 42.1% - 43.0% | \$10,797,936 | \$49,082 | Below Average | High | 60 |
| High | Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services** | 51 | 47.1% | -2.7 | 49.7% - 52.7% | \$2,266,814 | \$44,447 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| High | Sago Palm - Pathfinders** | 60 | 55.0% | 1.0 | 52.4% - 54.0% | \$2,476,097 | \$41,268 | Effective | Moderate | 70 |
| High | Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program** | 54 | 72.2% | -4.5 | 76.7% - 78.8% | \$3,398,696 | \$62,939 | Below Average | High | 58 |
| High | Sago Palm - Trailblazers** | 51 | 54.9% | 0.0 | 52.1% - 55.1% | \$1,591,965 | \$31,215 | Average | Moderate | 72 |
| High | Sago Palm - Youth Development Center** | 48 | 45.8% | -3.6 | 49.4% - 52.5% | \$1,842,384 | \$38,383 | Below Average | Moderate | 64 |
| Gateway Community Services, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Impact Halfway House | 40 | 65.0% | 7.2 | 54.4% - 57.8% | \$1,153,557 | \$28,839 | Highly Effective | Low | 87 |
| Global Redirection Services | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Wilson Youth Academy | 46 | 76.1% | 1.1 | 72.4% - 74.9% | \$1,734,375 | \$37,704 | Effective | Moderate | 73 |
| Grove Counseling Center | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | GOALS** | 36 | 61.1% | 4.3 | 53.1% - 56.8% | \$2,423,023 | \$67,306 | Effective | High | 74 |
| Moderate | Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)** | 36 | 44.4% | -4.6 | 49.1% - 52.8% | \$2,473,999 | \$68,722 | Below Average | High | 56 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 16, (Continued). PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | Percent Difference* | Expected | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|--|---|-----|--------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | | | Success Rate | | Success Range | | | | | |
| Harbor Behavioral Health Care | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 48 | 66.7% | 8.1 | 55.5% - 58.5% | \$1,701,484 | \$35,448 | Highly Effective | Moderate | 87 |
| Henry and Rilla White, Foundation, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 61.9% | 4.9 | 53.7% - 57.0% | \$797,972 | \$18,999 | Effective | Low | 84 |
| Moderate | Panther Success Center - White Foundation | 88 | 45.5% | -3.3 | 48.7% - 50.7% | \$1,808,248 | \$20,548 | Below Average | Low | 68 |
| Low | White Foundation Family Homes - Female** | 19 | 63.2% | -6.2 | 69.4% - 74.0% | \$500,524 | \$26,343 | Least Effective | Low | 61 |
| Low | White Foundation Family Homes - Male** | 51 | 54.9% | 0.0 | 52.1% - 55.1% | \$1,393,682 | \$27,327 | Average | Low | 73 |
| Keystone Education and Youth Services | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Bristol Youth Academy | 70 | 50.0% | -0.7 | 50.7% - 53.0% | \$2,859,863 | \$40,855 | Below Average | Moderate | 69 |
| Moderate | HOPE | 18 | 83.3% | 7.1 | 71.7% - 76.3% | \$1,752,160 | \$97,342 | Highly Effective | High | 74 |
| Lighthouse Care Center | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 78.6% | 3.0 | 72.9% - 75.6% | \$1,546,733 | \$36,827 | Effective | Moderate | 77 |
| Manatee County Sheriff's Office | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Manatee Youth Academy** | 18 | 55.6% | 0.0 | 50.4% - 56.3% | \$972,063 | \$54,004 | Average | High | 68 |
| North American Family Institute | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Monticello New Life | 39 | 66.7% | -3.4 | 70.1% - 73.1% | \$1,781,208 | \$45,672 | Below Average | Moderate | 63 |
| High | NAFI Intensive Halfway House | 24 | 41.7% | -7.0 | 48.6% - 53.5% | \$1,034,237 | \$43,093 | Least Effective | Moderate | 56 |
| High | NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program | 32 | 46.9% | -2.8 | 49.7% - 53.7% | \$1,238,475 | \$38,702 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Outward Bound | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | Escambia River Outward Bound** | 65 | 49.2% | -1.2 | 50.4% - 52.9% | \$1,153,037 | \$17,739 | Below Average | Low | 72 |
| Low | Peace River Outward Bound** | 89 | 47.2% | -2.3 | 49.5% - 51.5% | \$1,168,917 | \$13,134 | Below Average | Low | 71 |
| Low | STEP I - Male | 113 | 62.0% | 3.7 | 56.7% - 58.3% | \$997,608 | \$8,828 | Effective | Low | 84 |
| Low | STEP II - Female** | 50 | 74.0% | 0.0 | 72.0% - 74.5% | \$328,920 | \$6,578 | Average | Low | 77 |
| Polk County Sheriffs Office | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Polk STAR** | 24 | 62.5% | 5.5 | 52.2% - 57.0% | \$3,828,154 | \$159,506 | Effective | High | 64 |
| Premier Behavioral Solutions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program | 66 | 45.5% | -3.6 | 49.0% - 51.5% | \$716,800 | \$10,861 | Below Average | Low | 69 |
| Moderate | Gulf Coast Youth Academy | 140 | 43.6% | -3.5 | 47.1% - 48.5% | \$4,536,884 | \$32,406 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Moderate | MATS - Halfway House | 53 | 52.8% | 0.0 | 51.5% - 54.4% | \$2,258,476 | \$42,613 | Average | Moderate | 70 |
| Moderate | MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility | 21 | 76.2% | -0.9 | 77.1% - 80.7% | \$2,231,340 | \$106,254 | Below Average | High | 57 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 16, (Continued). PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | Percent Difference* | Expected | | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score |
|--|---|-----|-----------------|------------------------|----------|---------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| | | | Success Rate | | Success | Range | | | | | |
| Premier Behavioral Solutions | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 60 | 61.7% | -6.9 | 68.5% | - 70.8% | \$3,486,804 | \$58,113 | Least Effective | High | 54 |
| Moderate | Okaloosa Youth Academy | 130 | 47.7% | -1.8 | 49.5% | - 50.9% | \$4,328,314 | \$33,295 | Below Average | Moderate | 68 |
| Psychotherapeutic Juvenile Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | South Pines - Low** | 86 | 57.0% | 1.2 | 53.7% | - 55.8% | \$1,945,835 | \$22,626 | Effective | Low | 76 |
| Moderate | South Pines - Moderate** | 66 | 59.1% | 2.6 | 54.0% | - 56.5% | \$2,006,199 | \$30,397 | Effective | Moderate | 78 |
| San Antonio Boys Village Inc | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | San Antonio Boys Village | 39 | 59.0% | 2.7 | 52.7% | - 56.3% | \$485,637 | \$12,452 | Effective | Low | 81 |
| Sarasota Family YMCA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | YMCA Character Halfway House | 28 | 89.3% | 12.2 | 73.8% | - 77.1% | \$1,348,659 | \$48,166 | Highly Effective | High | 93 |
| Stewart Marchman Center | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility | 70 | 48.6% | -1.6 | 50.2% | - 52.5% | \$1,846,018 | \$26,372 | Below Average | Low | 70 |
| Moderate | Pines Juvenile Residential Facility | 91 | 64.8% | -4.2 | 69.1% | - 70.8% | \$2,354,055 | \$25,869 | Below Average | Low | 65 |
| Sunshine Youth Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility | 39 | 84.6% | 3.2 | 79.1% | - 81.4% | \$2,550,728 | \$65,403 | Effective | High | 72 |
| Moderate | Gulf Academy - Mental Health | 44 | 54.6% | 0.0 | 51.8% | - 55.1% | \$2,560,878 | \$58,202 | Average | High | 67 |
| High | Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment | 21 | 61.9% | 4.9 | 51.7% | - 57.0% | \$1,377,124 | \$65,577 | Effective | High | 76 |
| Moderate | Lake Academy | 66 | 68.2% | -2.3 | 70.5% | - 72.6% | \$3,163,568 | \$47,933 | Below Average | Moderate | 65 |
| Moderate | Polk Halfway House | 31 | 41.9% | -6.7 | 48.6% | - 52.7% | \$1,118,171 | \$36,070 | Least Effective | Moderate | 58 |
| Moderate | Riverside Academy | 239 | 56.5% | 1.0 | 55.0% | - 55.5% | \$7,460,987 | \$31,087 | Effective | Moderate | 73 |
| Three Springs, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility | 37 | 78.4% | 0.0 | 77.9% | - 80.4% | \$2,908,998 | \$78,622 | Average | High | 64 |
| High | Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility | 47 | 48.9% | -1.4 | 50.3% | - 53.4% | \$1,754,485 | \$37,329 | Below Average | Moderate | 69 |
| High | St Johns Correctional Facility | 28 | 82.1% | 1.1 | 78.2% | - 81.1% | \$2,742,562 | \$97,949 | Effective | High | 62 |
| High | Three Springs Sex Offender Program | 34 | 73.5% | -3.5 | 77.0% | - 79.7% | \$1,966,691 | \$57,844 | Below Average | High | 61 |
| Moderate | Union Juvenile Residential Facility | 17 | 82.4% | 1.0 | 77.5% | - 81.4% | \$1,159,684 | \$68,217 | Effective | High | 67 |
| Low | Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | 57 | 63.2% | 5.5 | 55.0% | - 57.7% | \$686,240 | \$12,039 | Effective | Low | 87 |
| Twin Oaks Juvenile Development | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Dove Academy | 15 | 93.3% | 16.1 | 72.1% | - 77.2% | \$2,432,170 | \$162,145 | Highly Effective | High | 85 |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Bassin House** | 23 | 56.5% | 1.0 | 51.1% | - 55.5% | \$684,647 | \$29,767 | Effective | Low | 74 |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

**Table 16, (Continued). PAM Scores and Program Expenditures by Provider
Youth Completions FY 2006-07**

| Restrictiveness Level | Program Type/Program Name | N | Observed | Percent | Expected | One-Year Expenditures | Cost Per Completion | Effectiveness Category | Cost Category | PAM Score | |
|--|--|-----|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|--|
| | | | Success Rate | Difference* | Success Range | | | | | | |
| Twin Oaks Juvenile Development | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy** | 55 | 47.3% | -2.5 | 49.7% - 52.5% | \$1,579,611 | \$28,720 | Below Average | Low | 68 | |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Jefferson Halfway House** | 38 | 60.5% | 3.9 | 53.1% - 56.7% | \$861,045 | \$22,659 | Effective | Low | 81 | |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** | 32 | 37.5% | -10.1 | 47.6% - 51.6% | \$859,191 | \$26,850 | Least Effective | Low | 53 | |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - MERIT** | 33 | 51.5% | 0.0 | 50.7% - 54.6% | \$796,188 | \$24,127 | Average | Low | 74 | |
| Moderate | Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** | 43 | 34.9% | -11.5 | 46.4% - 49.7% | \$1,013,964 | \$23,581 | Least Effective | Low | 51 | |
| Moderate | Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment | 21 | 61.9% | 4.9 | 51.7% - 57.0% | \$1,010,946 | \$48,140 | Effective | High | 79 | |
| Moderate | Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility** | 60 | 58.3% | 2.2 | 53.5% - 56.1% | \$1,388,760 | \$23,146 | Effective | Low | 78 | |
| Moderate | Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged | 38 | 52.6% | 0.0 | 51.1% - 54.8% | \$1,688,697 | \$44,439 | Average | Moderate | 70 | |
| Vision Quest | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Red Road Academy | 74 | 52.7% | 0.0 | 51.8% - 54.0% | \$2,113,908 | \$28,566 | Average | Low | 73 | |
| Low | Vision Quest - Low | 112 | 67.9% | -2.3 | 70.2% - 71.6% | \$2,638,347 | \$23,557 | Below Average | Low | 69 | |
| Moderate | Vision Quest - Moderate | 119 | 69.8% | -1.3 | 71.0% - 72.4% | \$3,830,193 | \$32,186 | Below Average | Moderate | 70 | |
| Youth Services International of Florida, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moderate | Blackwater Stop** | 21 | 42.9% | -5.9 | 48.8% - 54.1% | \$695,917 | \$33,139 | Least Effective | Moderate | 60 | |
| Moderate | Joann Bridges Academy | 46 | 69.6% | -1.3 | 70.8% - 73.4% | \$1,471,298 | \$31,985 | Below Average | Moderate | 70 | |
| Moderate | Okaloosa Halfway House** | 31 | 48.4% | -1.6 | 50.0% - 54.1% | \$1,146,794 | \$36,993 | Below Average | Moderate | 68 | |
| High | Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House** | 36 | 41.7% | -6.8 | 48.4% - 52.2% | \$1,794,668 | \$49,852 | Least Effective | High | 56 | |
| High | Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility | 28 | 57.1% | 1.1 | 51.7% - 56.0% | \$3,852,728 | \$137,597 | Effective | High | 56 | |
| Moderate | Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility | 43 | 58.1% | 2.1 | 52.8% - 56.0% | \$1,099,145 | \$25,562 | Effective | Low | 77 | |
| Moderate | Thompson Academy | 136 | 50.0% | -0.7 | 50.7% - 52.1% | \$4,461,218 | \$32,803 | Below Average | Moderate | 71 | |
| Moderate | Thompson Academy Choices | 28 | 50.2% | 0.0 | 50.2% - 54.6% | \$943,364 | \$33,692 | Average | Moderate | 71 | |
| Youthtrack, Inc. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low | Seminole Work and Learn Center | 36 | 47.2% | -2.5 | 49.7% - 53.5% | \$683,291 | \$18,980 | Below Average | Low | 70 | |

*Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent.

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Appendix 1

Definitions of Terms

Expected success range: The expected success rate plus or minus the margin of error (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 success. The risk factors are listed in Appendix 3.

Included programs: Residential programs with at least 15 youth released between July 1, 2002 and June 30, 2004. Programs with no releases in FY 2003-04 are excluded from PAM calculations.

Percentage above expected success range: The difference between the observed success rate for a program and the upper limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percentage below expected success range: The difference between the observed success rate for a program and the lower limit of the confidence interval of the expected success rate.

Percent difference: The percent above or below the expected success range (see recidivism reduction effect).

Program Accountability Measures (PAM) Score: The PAM score is calculated by summing the program cost measure (weighted by a factor of one-third) and the program effectiveness measure (weighted by a factor of two-thirds). The combined measure is then standardized and transformed into a PAM score similar to the typical grading scale where 70 is considered average.

Program completions: Youth in the success pool plus the 1 youth who volunteered for the Forestry Youth Academy. While this youth is not included in the success pool, programs are given credit for these youth in the calculations of cost per completion.

Program cost per completion: Total expenditures for each program divided by the number of program completions for fiscal year 2006-07 (see definition of *program completions* above and *total expenditures* below).

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

Success pool: A pool of 7,116 youth completing a residential program and released from the program to the community or a conditional release program between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007. Success is tracked for one year after each youth's release. Therefore, a youth released on June 29, 2006 is tracked till June 28, 2007. Details of the selection of the success pool can be found in the *2008 Outcome Evaluation Report* available at: www.djj.state.fl.us.

Success rate: The percentage of youth completing a program who did not recidivate (as defined above) within one year after release.

Recidivism reduction effect, or program effectiveness index: The difference between the observed recidivism rate and the upper limit (for positive differences) or lower limit (for negative differences) of the expected recidivism 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 in order to combined them into a single measure; a process similar to converting academic grades to a scale of 100. Cost and effectiveness measures are standardized by dividing each program's value on each of the two measures by the standard deviation for the distribution of values for all included programs.

Total Expenditures: DJJ expenditures plus all other sources of government funding including all state and federal monies, excluding school funding, for FY 2006-07.

Appendix 2 Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations

Table A1. Programs Not Included in PAM Score Calculations

| Name of Program | 2006-07 Completions | 2006-07 Expenditures | Reason Dropped from Analysis |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Bartow Juvenile Correctional Facility (Closed) | 11 | \$549,045.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| Bartow Serious Habitual Offender Program (Closed) | 11 | \$469,570.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| Dade Group Treatment Home | 12 | \$307,507.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility-Dual Diagnosis-L8-Female | 10 | \$4,276,712.10 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| Eckerd "Intensive" Halfway House | 14 | \$1,446,316.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| First Step Adolescent Group Treatment Home-Female | 14 | \$527,461.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| Florida Institute for Girls (Lighthouse) (Closed) | 13 | \$572,364.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment (YSI) (Provider changed) | 14 | \$1,197,592.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| Palm Beach Juvenile Residential Facility-Female (Closed) | 8 | \$147,530.00 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |
| Polk Boot Camp-Female (Closed) | 3 | \$202,602.18 | Less than 15 completions in FY 2006-07 |

Appendix 3

Variables Examined at Bivariate and Multivariate Level

Demographic Variables

- REGION: Region of state where youth resides (northwest, northeast, east, west, south)
- LEVEL: Program restrictiveness level (low, moderate, high, maximum)
- TRANSFER : Whether youth was transferred into or out of another residential program
- DAYS SERVED: Youth's length of stay in the program (in days)
- AGE AT FIRST OFFENSE: Age at time of first offense
- AGE AT RELEASE: Age at time of release from PAM program
- SEX : Male, female
- RACE: Non-white, white

Extent of Prior Offending Variables

- TOTAL REFERRALS: Total number of prior referrals
- TOTAL ADJUDICATIONS: Total number of prior referrals adjudicated
- PRIOR REFERRALS (Categorized): Total prior referrals categorized into quartiles
- PRIOR ADJUDICATIONS (Categorized): Total prior referrals adjudicated, categorized into quartiles
- CHRONIC REFERRALS: Whether youth has five or more total prior referrals
- CHRONIC ADJUDICATIONS: Whether youth has five or more prior referral adjudications

Seriousness of Prior Offending Variables

- MOST SERIOUS PRIOR OFFENSE: Specific most serious prior offense (ordinal)
- WORST OFFENSE: Most serious prior offense categorized into: violent felony, felony property, felony other, misdemeanor, other delinquency, interstate compact
- REFERRAL INDEX: Average seriousness score of all prior referrals (1 to 8, with 8 highest)
- ADJUDICATION INDEX: Average seriousness score of all prior adjudications (1 to 8, with 8 highest)
- PERSON OFFENSE: Whether most serious prior referral was a person offense
- PROPERTY OFFENSE: Whether most serious prior referral was a property offense
- PUBLIC ORDER OFFENSE: Whether most serious prior referral was a public order offense
- DRUG OFFENSE: Whether most serious prior referral was a drug offense

Prior Felony and Misdemeanor Variables

- FELONY REFERRALS (Categorized): Total prior felony referrals categorized into quartiles
- FELONY ADJUDICATIONS (Categorized): Total prior felony referrals adjudicated categorized into quartiles
- NUMBER OF FELONY REFERRALS: Total number of prior felony referrals
- NUMBER OF FELONY ADJUDICATIONS: Total number of prior felony referrals adjudicated
- FELONY ONE: Whether youth had only one prior felony referral
- FELONY TWO-THREE: Whether youth had two or three prior felony referrals
- FELONY FOUR-SIX: Whether youth had four to six prior felony referrals
- FELONY SEVEN: Whether youth had seven or more prior felony referrals (the last four variables were used to examine curvilinear effects of prior felony referral variable)

- ANY FELONY REFERRAL: Whether youth had any prior felony referrals
- ANY FELONY ADJUDICATION: Whether youth had any prior felony adjudications
- NUMBER OF VIOLENT FELONY ADJUDICATIONS: Total number of prior violent felony adjudications
- VIOLENT FELONY ADJUDICATION: Whether youth had any prior violent felony referral adjudications
- VIOLENT FELONY REFERRAL: Whether youth had any prior violent felony referrals
- NUMBER OF FELONY PROPERTY ADJUDICATIONS: Total number of prior property felony adjudications
- FELONY PROPERTY ADJUDICATION: Whether youth had any prior felony property adjudications
- NUMBER OF PRIOR MISDEMEANOR REFERRALS ADJUDICATED: Total number of prior misdemeanor referrals adjudicated
- PRIOR MISDEMEANOR REFERRALS ADJUDICATED (Categorized): Prior misdemeanor adjudications categorized into quartiles
- MISDEMEANOR: Whether youth had more than one prior misdemeanor adjudication

Specific Offenses (Whether most serious prior referral was...)

- MURDER
- ROBBERY
- AGGRAVATED ASSAULT
- ASSAULT-BATTERY
- BURGLARY
- AUTO THEFT
- GRAND LARCENY
- VANDALISM
- DISORDERLY CONDUCT
- ESCAPE
- FELONY WEAPON OFFENSE
- FELONY DRUG OFFENSE
- MISDEMEANOR DRUG OFFENSE
- FELONY SEX OFFENSE
- MISDEMEANOR SEX OFFENSE
- SEX OFFENSE
- ANY SEX OFFENSE REFERRAL: Whether any prior referrals was for a sex offense

DRAI and SRCI Variables

- DETENTION PLACEMENT: Detention Risk Assessment Instrument placement decision prior to admission into PAM program (DRAI variable)
- CURRENT ABUSE: Whether youth was currently being abused (DRAI variable)
- HISTORY OF ABUSE: Whether youth had history of abuse (DRAI variable)
- PHYSICAL ABUSE: Whether youth was physically abused (DRAI variable)
- SEXUAL ABUSE: Whether youth was sexually abused (DRAI variable)
- NEGLECT: Whether youth was neglected (DRAI variable)
- EMOTIONAL ABUSE: Whether youth was emotionally abused (DRAI variable)
- ESCAPE: Whether youth escaped from a program (DRAI variable)

- DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENSE: Whether current offense involved domestic violence incident (DRAI variable)
- TOTAL SRCI SCORE: Maximum SRCI score received prior to youth's admission into the PAM residential program (SRCI variable)
- SRCI RISK LEVEL: Youth's classified risk level on SRCI (SRCI variable)
- HIGHEST PLACEMENT LEVEL: Highest level of prior sanction: none, probation, commitment (SRCI variable)
- DRUG USE: Whether youth uses drugs chronically, occasionally, or not at all (SRCI variable)
- SCHOOL ATTENDANCE: Whether youth was regularly attending school, chronically truant or tardy, or dropped out of school or was expelled/suspended (SRCI variable)
- NEGATIVE PEERS: Whether youth associated with primarily negative peers (SRCI variable)
- GANG-INVOLVED PEERS: Whether youth was in a gang or associated with gang members (SRCI variable)
- PARENTAL CONTROL: Whether parents supervised and controlled youth, had limited control and supervision over youth, or had no control or supervision over youth (SRCI variable)
- NEGLECT: Whether youth was neglected (SRCI variable)
- ABUSE: Whether youth was physically or sexually abused (SRCI variable)
- MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT NEEDED: Whether youth was deemed in need of mental health assessment (SRCI variable)
- MENTAL HEALTH DIAGNOSIS: Whether youth had been diagnosed with a mental health problem or DSM-4 diagnosis (SRCI variable)
- EMPLOYMENT: Whether youth was 16 or older, not employed and not pursuing education (SRCI variable)

Appendix 4

Program Risk Factors by Gender and Restrictiveness Levels

Tables A2 through A9 present the mean values for identified risk factors in the 2008 PAM analyses for each program by gender and restrictiveness level. Program averages on these risk factors provide an indication of the seriousness of youth served by the facility, which in turn contributes to the program's expected success range. Each table includes data on the following variables for each program:

- Success pool (total number of youth completing the program and released to the community or a conditional release program)
- Average age of youth at first offense
- Gender of youth (presented as percent male)
- Race of youth (presented as percent non-white)
- Average number of prior juvenile referrals
- Percent of youth with at least one prior property adjudication
- Percent of youth chronically using drugs (0=none/occasional drug use; 1=chronic drug use)
- Percent of youth not regularly attending school (1=suspended or expelled or dropped out; 0=regularly attending)
- Percent of youth whose parents have limited or no supervision (0=parental supervision; 1=limited or no supervision)
- Percent of youth rated as very high-risk youth risk level (very high-risk=1, low, moderate and high risk=0).

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

| Low Risk Programs | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| STEP II - Female** | 50 | 14.0 | 46% | 0% | 0 | 10.5 | 22% | 14% | 68% | 42% | 2% |
| Vision Quest - Low | 112 | 13.3 | 64% | 0% | 0 | 11.9 | 19% | 17% | 72% | 54% | 9% |
| White Foundation Family Homes - Female** | 19 | 12.9 | 79% | 0% | 0 | 12.2 | 16% | 11% | 74% | 42% | 16% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A3. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male Low-Risk Residential Programs

| Low Risk Programs | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Blackwater Short Term Offender** | 18 | 14.2 | 61% | 100% | 0 | 11.6 | 22% | 11% | 78% | 22% | 0% |
| Brevard Group Treatment Home | 43 | 11.2 | 63% | 100% | 0 | 18.7 | 63% | 7% | 74% | 47% | 16% |
| Eckerd Academy | 61 | 12.9 | 48% | 100% | 0 | 14.6 | 56% | 30% | 72% | 52% | 5% |
| Escambia River Outward Bound** | 65 | 12.9 | 72% | 100% | 0 | 10.6 | 38% | 18% | 62% | 34% | 2% |
| Forestry Youth Academy** | 31 | 13.9 | 35% | 100% | 0 | 15.9 | 68% | 19% | 84% | 55% | 3% |
| Peace River Outward Bound** | 89 | 13.2 | 38% | 100% | 0 | 16.2 | 52% | 20% | 74% | 51% | 10% |
| Seminole Work and Learn Center | 36 | 13.4 | 81% | 100% | 0 | 13.1 | 36% | 3% | 81% | 25% | 6% |
| South Pines - Low** | 86 | 13.0 | 76% | 100% | 0 | 15.5 | 51% | 22% | 84% | 59% | 8% |
| STEP I - Male | 113 | 13.6 | 63% | 100% | 0 | 13.3 | 38% | 19% | 69% | 31% | 4% |
| White Foundation Family Homes - Male** | 51 | 13.2 | 71% | 100% | 0 | 11.3 | 31% | 18% | 90% | 39% | 4% |
| Withlacoochee Juvenile Residential Facility** | 57 | 13.3 | 67% | 100% | 0 | 11.1 | 44% | 18% | 88% | 44% | 4% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A4. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Female Moderate-Risk Residential Programs

| | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Low Risk Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bowling Green Juvenile Residential Facility | 22 | 14.1 | 55% | 0% | 0 | 12.7 | 27% | 23% | 91% | 82% | 23% |
| Camp E-Nini-Hassee | 35 | 13.4 | 20% | 0% | 0 | 10.5 | 31% | 31% | 86% | 69% | 14% |
| First Step Girls Juvenile Residential Facility** | 29 | 13.6 | 48% | 0% | 0 | 15.3 | 24% | 31% | 83% | 69% | 21% |
| HOPE | 18 | 13.0 | 39% | 0% | 0 | 16.2 | 11% | 33% | 83% | 72% | 28% |
| Joann Bridges Academy | 46 | 13.3 | 59% | 0% | 0 | 13.9 | 37% | 22% | 83% | 72% | 22% |
| Lake Academy | 66 | 12.9 | 53% | 0% | 0 | 17.3 | 21% | 20% | 82% | 74% | 17% |
| Vision Quest - Moderate | 119 | 13.9 | 57% | 0% | 0 | 12.1 | 33% | 29% | 79% | 71% | 9% |
| YMCA Character Halfway House | 28 | 13.6 | 61% | 0% | 0 | 14.4 | 25% | 36% | 89% | 71% | 14% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A5. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male Moderate-Risk Residential Programs

| | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Moderate Risk Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alachua Juvenile Residential Facility** | 24 | 13.2 | 58% | 0% | 0 | 12.6 | 42% | 33% | 79% | 46% | 8% |
| ARC Halfway House | 150 | 13.3 | 53% | 100% | 0 | 21.6 | 52% | 42% | 87% | 62% | 16% |
| Avon Park Youth Academy | 223 | 13.9 | 48% | 100% | 0 | 18.5 | 61% | 45% | 88% | 65% | 11% |
| Bay Point Schools-North | 27 | 12.0 | 74% | 100% | 0 | 17.4 | 48% | 26% | 96% | 74% | 33% |
| Bay Point Schools-West-Kennedy | 182 | 13.8 | 66% | 100% | 0 | 15.0 | 57% | 25% | 84% | 59% | 5% |
| Big Cypress Wilderness Institute | 42 | 13.3 | 48% | 100% | 0 | 14.0 | 33% | 52% | 86% | 55% | 14% |
| Blackwater Stop** | 21 | 14.0 | 71% | 100% | 0 | 16.2 | 67% | 29% | 71% | 62% | 14% |
| Bowling Green Youth Academy - JRF | 21 | 13.1 | 67% | 0% | 0 | 17.2 | 24% | 38% | 90% | 76% | 24% |
| Bristol Youth Academy | 70 | 12.7 | 53% | 100% | 0 | 18.8 | 53% | 47% | 87% | 69% | 17% |
| Britt Halfway House | 45 | 13.3 | 56% | 100% | 0 | 19.1 | 60% | 56% | 84% | 64% | 11% |
| Camp E-Kel-Etu | 45 | 12.7 | 22% | 100% | 0 | 13.4 | 56% | 22% | 80% | 53% | 20% |
| Camp E-Ma-Chamee | 36 | 12.5 | 36% | 100% | 0 | 11.2 | 39% | 3% | 89% | 28% | 8% |
| Camp E-Tu-Makee** | 40 | 12.1 | 28% | 100% | 0 | 11.6 | 55% | 23% | 85% | 57% | 5% |
| Columbus Juvenile Residential Facility | 39 | 13.4 | 38% | 100% | 1 | 8.7 | 15% | 10% | 59% | 26% | 5% |
| Crossroads Wilderness Institute | 43 | 13.9 | 49% | 100% | 0 | 21.1 | 51% | 23% | 84% | 56% | 14% |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Female | 33 | 13.8 | 24% | 0% | 0 | 14.9 | 48% | 70% | 85% | 88% | 24% |
| DeSoto Juvenile Residential Facility - Male | 112 | 12.6 | 30% | 100% | 0 | 18.3 | 57% | 38% | 87% | 71% | 29% |
| Dove Academy | 15 | 14.3 | 27% | 0% | 0 | 16.7 | 47% | 53% | 73% | 67% | 20% |
| Duval Juvenile Residential Facility | 46 | 12.9 | 78% | 100% | 0 | 16.4 | 35% | 24% | 87% | 67% | 11% |
| Eckerd Intensive Halfway House | 30 | 12.7 | 60% | 100% | 0 | 19.1 | 57% | 30% | 83% | 70% | 30% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A5, (Continued). Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male Moderate-Risk Residential Programs

| | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Moderate Risk Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eckerd Youth Challenge Program | 80 | 12.8 | 43% | 100% | 0 | 13.1 | 59% | 16% | 88% | 54% | 11% |
| Falkenberg Academy | 139 | 13.3 | 47% | 100% | 0 | 19.9 | 60% | 53% | 85% | 72% | 17% |
| Florida Environmental Institute | 29 | 14.1 | 76% | 100% | 0 | 16.0 | 59% | 38% | 93% | 66% | 10% |
| Francis Walker Halfway House | 44 | 14.3 | 23% | 0% | 0 | 13.7 | 41% | 66% | 86% | 80% | 16% |
| Ft. Walton Adolescent Substance Abuse Program | 66 | 13.7 | 21% | 100% | 0 | 14.1 | 58% | 71% | 91% | 47% | 11% |
| GOALS** | 36 | 13.7 | 25% | 100% | 0 | 17.3 | 53% | 53% | 94% | 75% | 11% |
| Greenville Hills - Bassin House** | 23 | 14.4 | 26% | 100% | 0 | 10.3 | 22% | 61% | 83% | 48% | 4% |
| Greenville Hills - Greenville Academy** | 55 | 13.6 | 53% | 100% | 0 | 15.7 | 49% | 27% | 85% | 67% | 13% |
| Greenville Hills - Jefferson Halfway House** | 38 | 14.0 | 42% | 100% | 0 | 14.1 | 45% | 34% | 95% | 71% | 16% |
| Greenville Hills - Madison Halfway House** | 32 | 11.4 | 56% | 100% | 0 | 15.2 | 50% | 16% | 88% | 56% | 25% |
| Greenville Hills - MERIT** | 33 | 11.7 | 58% | 100% | 0 | 13.4 | 52% | 12% | 88% | 64% | 21% |
| Greenville Hills - Taylor Halfway House** | 43 | 13.3 | 70% | 100% | 0 | 14.3 | 63% | 33% | 79% | 60% | 14% |
| Grove Unique Youth Services (GUYS)** | 36 | 13.0 | 44% | 100% | 0 | 19.3 | 61% | 28% | 81% | 58% | 17% |
| Gulf Academy - Mental Health | 44 | 12.7 | 32% | 100% | 0 | 18.9 | 45% | 30% | 91% | 64% | 18% |
| Gulf Coast Youth Academy | 140 | 13.1 | 66% | 100% | 0 | 17.5 | 51% | 33% | 88% | 60% | 14% |
| Hastings Youth Academy - Moderate | 139 | 13.3 | 67% | 100% | 0 | 18.4 | 52% | 47% | 92% | 64% | 22% |
| Impact Halfway House | 40 | 13.6 | 75% | 100% | 0 | 11.7 | 43% | 23% | 73% | 38% | 8% |
| Juvenile Unit For Specialized Treatment | 21 | 12.3 | 10% | 100% | 0 | 12.3 | 43% | 24% | 90% | 43% | 19% |
| Les Peters Halfway House | 49 | 13.6 | 49% | 100% | 0 | 20.9 | 45% | 65% | 82% | 57% | 18% |
| Liberty Juvenile Residential Facility** | 60 | 13.8 | 53% | 100% | 0 | 18.7 | 60% | 23% | 92% | 57% | 8% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A5, (Continued). Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male Moderate-Risk Residential Programs

| | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Moderate Risk Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighthouse Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 14.0 | 36% | 0% | 0 | 16.6 | 24% | 38% | 83% | 76% | 19% |
| Mandala Adolescent Treatment Center | 48 | 12.6 | 23% | 100% | 0 | 19.0 | 58% | 54% | 85% | 69% | 27% |
| Marion Youth Development Center** | 66 | 13.4 | 53% | 100% | 0 | 18.1 | 52% | 52% | 91% | 70% | 23% |
| MATS - Halfway House | 53 | 12.5 | 36% | 100% | 0 | 21.3 | 51% | 47% | 83% | 66% | 28% |
| MATS - Manatee Juvenile Residential Facility | 21 | 13.9 | 62% | 100% | 1 | 9.0 | 19% | 10% | 57% | 38% | 10% |
| Miami Halfway House | 34 | 13.8 | 35% | 100% | 0 | 18.0 | 68% | 71% | 79% | 74% | 24% |
| Milton Juvenile Residential Facility | 60 | 13.5 | 40% | 0% | 0 | 13.3 | 35% | 35% | 92% | 68% | 23% |
| Nassau Juvenile Residential Facility | 42 | 14.0 | 55% | 100% | 0 | 9.9 | 57% | 33% | 67% | 33% | 5% |
| Oaks Juvenile Residential Facility | 70 | 12.9 | 51% | 100% | 0 | 14.8 | 41% | 17% | 76% | 49% | 9% |
| Okaloosa Halfway House** | 31 | 12.8 | 68% | 100% | 0 | 14.9 | 55% | 26% | 90% | 52% | 3% |
| Okaloosa Youth Academy | 130 | 13.4 | 65% | 100% | 0 | 16.2 | 47% | 32% | 91% | 63% | 11% |
| Panther Success Center - White Foundation | 88 | 13.5 | 65% | 100% | 0 | 13.6 | 56% | 24% | 88% | 49% | 13% |
| Pensacola Boys Base | 46 | 14.8 | 52% | 100% | 0 | 11.3 | 39% | 24% | 78% | 41% | 7% |
| Pines Juvenile Residential Facility | 91 | 13.8 | 49% | 0% | 0 | 14.0 | 31% | 16% | 85% | 65% | 10% |
| Polk Halfway House | 31 | 11.0 | 55% | 100% | 0 | 21.8 | 52% | 19% | 81% | 71% | 35% |
| Polk STAR** | 24 | 13.4 | 50% | 100% | 0 | 20.3 | 63% | 33% | 75% | 50% | 4% |
| Price Halfway House | 42 | 13.6 | 50% | 100% | 0 | 25.8 | 60% | 52% | 100% | 79% | 38% |
| Red Road Academy | 74 | 13.1 | 54% | 100% | 0 | 14.6 | 45% | 28% | 74% | 49% | 1% |
| Residential Alternatives for the Mentally Challenged | 38 | 12.2 | 79% | 100% | 0 | 23.3 | 39% | 26% | 100% | 71% | 29% |
| Riverside Academy | 239 | 13.8 | 37% | 100% | 0 | 18.1 | 49% | 67% | 88% | 68% | 17% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A5, (Continued). Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male Moderate-Risk Residential Programs

| | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Moderate Risk Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| San Antonio Boys Village | 39 | 13.4 | 26% | 100% | 0 | 15.9 | 69% | 51% | 82% | 56% | 15% |
| Santa Rosa Juvenile Residential Facility | 43 | 13.9 | 33% | 100% | 0 | 12.5 | 56% | 51% | 79% | 56% | 12% |
| South Pines - Moderate** | 66 | 13.1 | 58% | 100% | 0 | 17.1 | 56% | 35% | 83% | 61% | 14% |
| Space Coast Marine Institute | 44 | 13.8 | 55% | 100% | 0 | 19.1 | 57% | 34% | 82% | 50% | 5% |
| Thompson Academy | 136 | 13.1 | 61% | 100% | 0 | 18.0 | 62% | 33% | 89% | 72% | 20% |
| Thompson Academy Choices | 28 | 13.7 | 50% | 100% | 0 | 18.4 | 57% | 54% | 89% | 50% | 11% |
| Union Juvenile Residential Facility | 17 | 13.6 | 71% | 100% | 1 | 11.2 | 6% | 6% | 65% | 18% | 12% |
| West Florida Wilderness Institute | 58 | 13.8 | 67% | 100% | 0 | 12.9 | 50% | 22% | 81% | 33% | 3% |
| Wilson Youth Academy | 46 | 13.4 | 43% | 0% | 0 | 14.9 | 37% | 50% | 91% | 80% | 17% |
| Youth Environmental Services | 47 | 12.7 | 62% | 100% | 0 | 16.0 | 68% | 19% | 81% | 64% | 13% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A6. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Female High-Risk Residential Programs

| | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| High Risk Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Female | 23 | 13.4 | 26% | 0% | 0 | 21.2 | 43% | 70% | 96% | 70% | 52% |
| Monticello New Life | 39 | 13.2 | 38% | 0% | 0 | 17.8 | 46% | 44% | 95% | 82% | 38% |
| Orange Intensive Halfway House** | 17 | 13.5 | 59% | 0% | 0 | 18.8 | 71% | 29% | 94% | 94% | 29% |
| Umatilla Girls Academy** | 26 | 13.3 | 42% | 0% | 0 | 19.0 | 50% | 54% | 92% | 88% | 23% |
| Vernon Place-Female** | 20 | 12.4 | 40% | 0% | 0 | 18.8 | 60% | 55% | 90% | 85% | 45% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A7. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male High-Risk Residential Programs

| High Risk Programs | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Broward Intensive Halfway House | 27 | 12.7 | 78% | 100% | 0 | 20.1 | 85% | 22% | 93% | 81% | 15% |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - High | 52 | 13.0 | 52% | 100% | 0 | 26.4 | 73% | 58% | 90% | 83% | 29% |
| DeSoto Dual Diagnosis Correctional Facility - Male | 70 | 13.2 | 23% | 100% | 0 | 21.1 | 84% | 71% | 96% | 84% | 39% |
| DeSoto Juvenile Correctional Facility - Mental Health | 36 | 12.0 | 47% | 100% | 0 | 27.6 | 64% | 33% | 94% | 86% | 47% |
| Dozier Sex Offender Program** | 50 | 14.0 | 38% | 100% | 1 | 9.0 | 28% | 10% | 44% | 32% | 6% |
| Dozier Training School** | 93 | 12.7 | 65% | 100% | 0 | 26.6 | 70% | 53% | 92% | 76% | 29% |
| Eckerd Youth Development Center | 123 | 12.6 | 63% | 100% | 0 | 28.5 | 73% | 41% | 86% | 81% | 34% |
| Hastings Youth Academy - High** | 63 | 12.8 | 62% | 100% | 0 | 23.1 | 67% | 30% | 89% | 73% | 27% |
| Hillsborough Intensive Residential Treatment | 21 | 10.1 | 76% | 100% | 0 | 19.9 | 52% | 14% | 90% | 67% | 33% |
| Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center** | 41 | 13.5 | 54% | 100% | 0 | 19.2 | 61% | 39% | 90% | 71% | 27% |
| Jackson Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - SOP** | 23 | 14.3 | 52% | 100% | 1 | 9.1 | 9% | 0% | 70% | 13% | 0% |
| Kissimmee Juvenile Correctional Facility | 37 | 13.6 | 46% | 100% | 1 | 10.4 | 19% | 8% | 54% | 27% | 5% |
| Manatee Youth Academy** | 18 | 13.5 | 56% | 100% | 0 | 20.4 | 72% | 33% | 72% | 78% | 22% |
| Marion Juvenile Correctional Facility | 47 | 13.4 | 47% | 100% | 0 | 23.1 | 70% | 45% | 91% | 72% | 32% |
| NAFI Intensive Halfway House | 24 | 12.4 | 33% | 100% | 0 | 21.9 | 63% | 21% | 100% | 58% | 42% |
| NAFI Serious Habitual Offender Program | 32 | 12.9 | 41% | 100% | 0 | 27.1 | 81% | 44% | 84% | 81% | 31% |
| Okaloosa Intensive Halfway House** | 36 | 12.5 | 64% | 100% | 0 | 22.6 | 56% | 33% | 92% | 72% | 22% |
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center SOP | 35 | 13.3 | 26% | 100% | 1 | 9.8 | 14% | 17% | 71% | 31% | 6% |
| Palm Beach Juvenile Correctional Facility | 28 | 13.2 | 68% | 100% | 0 | 27.0 | 71% | 64% | 93% | 86% | 39% |
| Polk Juvenile Correctional Facility** | 220 | 12.5 | 74% | 100% | 0 | 27.2 | 70% | 38% | 95% | 84% | 30% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A7, (Continued). Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male High-Risk Residential Programs

| | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| High Risk Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sago Palm - Mental Health Overlay Services** | 51 | 12.4 | 65% | 100% | 0 | 23.0 | 69% | 55% | 94% | 76% | 39% |
| Sago Palm - Pathfinders** | 60 | 13.0 | 50% | 100% | 0 | 24.5 | 72% | 77% | 100% | 80% | 35% |
| Sago Palm - Sex Offender Program** | 54 | 13.8 | 44% | 100% | 1 | 9.6 | 26% | 15% | 61% | 31% | 6% |
| Sago Palm - Trailblazers** | 51 | 13.0 | 41% | 100% | 0 | 24.0 | 69% | 65% | 94% | 92% | 27% |
| Sago Palm - Youth Development Center** | 48 | 13.1 | 81% | 100% | 0 | 23.1 | 65% | 27% | 90% | 79% | 27% |
| St Johns Correctional Facility | 28 | 12.1 | 29% | 100% | 1 | 7.5 | 4% | 0% | 29% | 18% | 0% |
| Three Springs Sex Offender Program | 34 | 13.8 | 41% | 100% | 1 | 10.5 | 21% | 3% | 38% | 26% | 6% |
| Tiger Serious Habitual Offender Program | 30 | 12.7 | 80% | 100% | 0 | 17.2 | 47% | 43% | 83% | 70% | 47% |

**These programs have closed, changed providers, or had a structural programmatic change since the time period of the evaluation.

Table A8. Risk Factors Used to Calculate Effectiveness Measures for Male Maximum-Risk Residential Programs

| Maximum Risk Programs | Risk Factors | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | Recidivism Pool | Average Age at First Offense | Percent Non-White | Percent Male | Sex Offender Program (1=yes) | Average Prior Juvenile Rererrals | Percent of Youth with Prior Felony Property Adjudication | Percent Chronic Drug Users | Percent Dropped Out, Suspended or Expelled | Percent w/ Parents w/ Limited/No Supervision or Control | Percent Assessed as Very High Risk |
| Cypress Creek Juvenile Offender Correctional Center - Maximum | 33 | 12.8 | 55% | 100% | 0 | 25.6 | 73% | 42% | 91% | 70% | 42% |
| Jackson JOCC | 25 | 11.6 | 68% | 100% | 0 | 31.8 | 84% | 40% | 88% | 80% | 40% |
| Okeechobee Juvenile Offender Correctional Center | 18 | 12.8 | 78% | 100% | 0 | 21.4 | 56% | 50% | 78% | 72% | 39% |

Appendix 5

Acronym Descriptions

ARC: Adolescent Residential Campus
ATC: Adolescent Therapeutic Center
CCA: Corrections Corporation of America
CSC: Correctional Services Corporation
FIG: Florida Institute for Girls
GATE: Guided Adolescent Treatment Environment
GTH: Group Treatment Home
HWH: Halfway House
IHWH: Intensive Halfway House
IRT: Intensive Residential Treatment
JCF: Juvenile Correctional Facility
JOCC: Juvenile Offender Correctional Center
JRF: Juvenile Residential Facility
JUST: Juvenile Unit for Specialized Treatment
MATS: Mandala Adolescent Treatment Services
MERIT: Madison Early Residential Intervention and Treatment
MH: Mental Health
NAFI: North American Family Institute
RAMC: Residential Alternative for the Mentally Challenged
SA: Substance Abuse
SHOP: Serious Habitual Offender Program
SOP: Sex Offender Program
START: Short-Term Adolescent Rehabilitation and Treatment Center
STEP: Short Term Expedition Program
WINGS: Women in Need of Greater Strength
YDC: Youth Development Center
YMCA: Young Men's Christian Association
YSI: Youth Services International

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the consultation and assistance of the DJJ Office of Research and Planning. Our thanks also goes to the DJJ Bureaus of Quality Assurance, Budget, Finance and Accounting and Contracts, for their assistance in obtaining the program expenditure data used in the PAM analyses. We extend our gratitude to the DJJ Office of Juvenile Justice Residential Services. The contributions of those who annually participate in the Common Definitions Workgroup are also extremely appreciated, including staff from the Governor's Office, the Office of Program Planning and Government Accountability (OPPAGA), the Office of Economic and Demographic Research, the Florida Juvenile Justice Association, numerous contracted providers and other juvenile justice stakeholders. Finally and most importantly, we would like to thank Governor Crist and Secretary Peterman for their support and commitment to outcome evaluation, effective performance measurement and cost accountability.