



Special Provision 16.11
2005 Session of NC General Assembly
Alternative to Commitment Programs

May 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is required by Special Provision 16.11 of the 2005 North Carolina General Assembly regarding the implementation of Demonstration Projects to provide alternatives to juvenile commitment services through the Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils. This report focuses on the youth served in the Demonstration Projects in FY 2006-2007. The programs provided by the Demonstration Projects delivered services to youth in Level III disposition (commitment) and youth in Level II disposition (intermediate) who were at risk of a Level III disposition.

The Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Department) was directed by the 2004 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly to make \$500,000 available to Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils (JCPCs) to establish community programs for youth who otherwise would be placed in a youth development center. The 2005 General Assembly appropriated an additional \$250,000 to expand the Demonstration Projects and to build on this programmatic concept. In FY 2006-2007, the funding allocated by the General Assembly remained at \$750,000 for the Demonstration Projects. The Department was approved to carry-forward federal funds from the previous fiscal year identified from the Governor's Crime Commission in the amount of \$161,981. A total of \$911,981 was available to support the projects from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

The grant award process for FY 2006-2007 continued funding for established Demonstration Projects. Awards were made based on the previously funded projects' outcome data, the services provided to the population identified by this Special Provision, and the state and local support for these projects to continue. Eleven (11) projects were selected for continued funding. The selected projects submitted program agreements to contract with the Department and a county to provide the proposed intermediate and commitment services.

Statewide, the Demonstration Projects delivered somewhat similar intensive case management services that "wrapped services around" the juvenile and family. Typical services included family counseling, individual counseling, tutoring, mentoring, interpersonal skill building, behavior management and cognitive behavior training. Projects coordinated a 24 hour a day, 7 days per week adult supervision plan for each Level III youth. Program providers and court counselors supported and planned for youth as they integrated into the community. The programs also managed referrals to a variety of other community services including such education programs as structured day, after school programming and tutoring. On occasion, court counselors used electronic monitoring as a support for supervision of youth.

Demonstration Project programs served 106 youth during FY 2006-07. During that time period, new admissions totaled 68 and exits from the program totaled 64. Recidivism rates at six and twelve months after termination for youth served in the Demonstration Projects were low. A remarkable number of 55 (86%) youth had no complaints or warrants filed six months after exiting the project and 49 (77%) youth had no complaints or warrants filed twelve months after exiting the project. Of the 64 youth who exited the programs in FY 2006-2007, 43 completed the program meeting the goals of the program with a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals. Only 8 youth required placement in a Youth Development Center while 56 youth continued to live and/or be served in the community.

For FY 2006-2007 the average annual cost (based on actual expenditures) per youth in Demonstration Project programs was \$8,578 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$95,720.

The positive data indicate that the Demonstration Projects continued to be effective and cost-efficient programs that developed and delivered programming for committed youth at the local level while addressing unmet gaps in the continuum of services within the communities.

This report gives information about the funding process for the programs as well as the training and technical assistance provided to the Demonstration Projects by the Department. In response to the legislation, this report also provides a description of the programs, the number of youth served, their adjudication status at the time of service, services and treatments provided, the length of service, the total cost per youth, and the six (6) and twelve (12) month recidivism rates for the youth after the termination of program services.

Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Demonstration Projects

Project Background

The Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was directed by the 2004 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly to make \$500,000 available to Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils (JCPCs) to establish community programs for youth who otherwise would be placed in a youth development center. The 2005 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated \$250,000 to the Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to expand the demonstration projects. This legislation required that funded programs provide residential and/or community-based intensive services to juveniles who have been adjudicated delinquent and have been given a Level III or Level II disposition or juveniles who are re-entering the community after receiving commitment programming in a youth development center.

By statute, there are three disposition levels for adjudicated youth in North Carolina: Level I, Community Dispositions; Level II, Intermediate Dispositions; and Level III, Commitment. The intent of the 2004 legislation was that programs be established to serve youth who were at either a Level II or Level III disposition.

Funding Process

The 2004 session of the General Assembly directed the Department to develop a competitive process for grant selection. The process was to provide consideration of the history of commitments of a community, of services to youth in rural areas, of services being provided in all geographic areas of North Carolina and collaboration among counties with no project receiving more than \$100,000. Demonstration projects contracted with a county and the Department through JCPC program agreements that specified program objectives, services, activities and budgets.

In response to the legislation, the Department developed and executed a process to offer every county and Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) the opportunity to develop a JCPC Demonstration Project. Training, technical assistance, and oversight processes were developed for the selected projects. The Department also established protocols for monitoring project operations to insure that programs serve targeted youth and families and demonstrate desired outcomes.

The Department defines a program structure as a setting, context or framework within which a service is delivered. In reviewing grant applications, the following program structures were prioritized for funding consideration:

- Community Day Programs - A multi-component, community based, non-residential program structure that provides closely supervised intervention and prevention services;
- Structured Activities Programs - Programs that offer skill-building activities in a non-residential setting. Programs may offer these skills to juveniles and/or their parents for the purpose of enhancing their personal enrichment, skills or abilities in a particular area:
 - Mentoring
 - Parent/Family Skill Building

- Interpersonal Skill Building
- Experiential Skill Building
- Tutoring/Academic Enhancement
- Vocational Development
- Psycho-education/Supportive Counseling
- Restorative Programs - Programs that offer immediate and short-term involvement with juveniles to focus on negative and/or offending behaviors with the aim of resolution of the presenting problem and extinction of the behavior.
 - Mediation/Conflict Resolution
 - Restitution
 - Teen Court
- Clinical Treatment Programs - Programs that offer professional help to a juvenile and/or his or her family to solve problems through goal directed planning. It may include individual, group, family counseling or a combination. It may have a particular focus such as sex offender treatment or substance abuse treatment. Services may be community or home based.
 - Counseling
 - Home Based Family Counseling
 - Crisis Counseling
 - Substance Abuse Treatment
 - Sexual Offender Treatment
- Residential Treatment Programs - Residential: Programs that offer services in a residential setting.
 - Group Home Care
 - Temporary Shelter Care
 - Runaway Shelter Care
 - Specialized Foster Care
 - Temporary Foster Care

Based on the projects' outcome data from FY 2005-2006, services provided to the population identified and state and local support for these projects to continue, eleven (11) projects were selected for continued funding for the period beginning July 1, 2006 and ending June 30, 2007. The selected projects submitted program agreements to contract with the Department and a county to provide the proposed intermediate and commitment services.

The Department was approved to carry-forward federal funds from the previous fiscal year identified from the Governor's Crime Commission in the amount of \$161,981. A total of \$911,981 was available to support the projects from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 (See Table 1.)

Table 1

Grant Level Funding

| Area of the State | Host County (Sponsoring Agency) | 12 Month Funding July 2006-June 2007 | Counties Served |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| Eastern | WAYNE (Methodist Home for Children) | \$76,237 | Wayne, Lenoir and Greene |
| | DARE (Dare County Schools) | \$15,000 | Dare |
| | ONSLOW (Onslow County Youth Services) | \$86,828 | Onslow |
| Piedmont | DAVIDSON (Family Services of Davidson County Inc.) | \$87,250 | Davidson |
| | IREDELL (Exchange SCAN) | \$98,979 | Iredell, Alexander and Davie |
| | ROCKINGHAM (Rockingham County Youth Services.) | \$87,250 | Rockingham, Stokes, and Surry |
| Central | ALAMANCE (Alamance County Dispute Settlement and Youth Services) | \$87,250 | Alamance |
| | VANCE (Kerr-Tar Regional Council of Governments) | \$87,250 | Vance, Granville, Franklin, Warren, Person, and Caswell |
| | CUMBERLAND (Cumberland County CommuniCare, Inc.) | \$86,312 | Cumberland |
| Western | CALDWELL (Meridian Behavioral Health Services) | \$99,625 | Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Macon, Swain, Jackson, Haywood, Polk, Transylvania, Henderson, Buncombe, Madison, Yancey, McDowell, Rutherford, Mitchell, Avery, Watauga, Ashe, Alleghany, Wilkes, Yadkin, Caldwell, Burke, Catawba, Gaston, Cleveland, and Lincoln |
| | BURKE (Appalachian Family Innovations) | \$100,000 | Burke, Caldwell and Catawba |
| Totals | | \$911,981 | 51 Counties |

Training and Technical Support for Projects

Because serving Level III youth in a community setting is a relatively new concept in North Carolina, the Department provided considerable training and technical assistance for program providers and community stakeholders to insure that appropriate programs and safety mechanisms were in place in each program. Development of 24-hour plans for providing adult supervision for each youth is a requirement for Level III programming. The Department required monthly client progress reports from program providers. Juvenile Court Counselors, Area Administrators, and Department Clinical Services staff reviewed reports and provided written feedback.

Clinical Services staff and the Demonstration Project Director made site visits to all funded programs to provide on-going training and technical assistance. They also provided training to the Department's staff and community stakeholders.

Services and Treatments Provided

Through the development of program agreements, the service providers worked to match the services they provided to services that are identified through research to be characteristic of effective services. Statewide, the programs delivered somewhat similar intensive case management services that "wrapped services around" the youth and family. Typical services included family counseling, individual counseling, tutoring, mentoring, interpersonal skill building, behavior management and cognitive behavior training. Projects coordinated a 24 hour a day, 7 days per week adult supervision plan for each Level III youth. Program providers and court counselors supported and planned for youth as they integrated into the community. The programs also managed referrals to a variety of other community services including education programs such as structured day, after school programming and tutoring. On occasion, court counselors used electronic monitoring as a support for supervision of youth.

Table 2 describes the services and treatments provided by the demonstration projects in FY 2006-07. The host county, sponsoring agency, the counties receiving services and the number of youth who could be served at one time (capacity) are identified.

Table 2

Program Description

| Host County (Sponsoring Agency) | Counties Served | Services Provided <i>(includes 24/7 staff availability)</i> | Capacity |
|--|---|--|-----------------|
| ALAMANCE (Alamance County Dispute Settlement and Youth Services) | Alamance | Intensive wraparound services including individual and family counseling as well as mentoring and tutoring. | 6 |
| BURKE (Appalachian Family Innovations) | Burke, Caldwell and Catawba | Intensive wraparound in-home services for youths and families | 4 |
| CALDWELL (Meridian Behavioral Health Services) | Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Macon, Swain, Jackson, Haywood, Polk, Transylvania, Henderson, Buncombe, Madison, Yancey, McDowell, Rutherford, Mitchell, Avery, Watauga, Ashe, Alleghany, Wilkes, Yadkin, Caldwell, Burke, Catawba, Gaston, Cleveland, and Lincoln | Residential placements arranged with intensive wraparound services including drug and alcohol counseling, life skills classes and tutoring. | 6 |
| CUMBERLAND (Cumberland County CommuniCare, Inc.) | Cumberland | Intensive home-based services including individual and family counseling | 5 |
| DARE (Dare County Schools) | Dare | Substance abuse assessments, individual and group counseling, intensive home-based family counseling, substance abuse education and interpersonal skills development | 6 |
| DAVIDSON (Family Services of Davidson County Inc.) | Davidson | Intensive family wraparound services including family and individual counseling | 4 |
| IREDELL (Exchange SCAN) | Iredell, Alexander and Davie | Intensive wraparound services for youths, parenting classes, drug and alcohol counseling, life skills classes, tutoring | 4 |
| ONslow (Onslow County Youth Services) | Onslow | Intensive wraparound serviced including residential placement, alternative education activities, life skills groups, family counseling, mentoring and tutoring | 6 |
| ROCKINGHAM (Rockingham County Youth Services.) | Rockingham, Stokes, and Surry | Intensive home-based counseling and cognitive behavioral group counseling | 8 |
| VANCE (Kerr-Tar Regional Council of Governments) | Vance, Granville, Franklin, Warren, Person, and Caswell | Intensive wraparound services including home-based family therapy, individual therapy and parenting classes | 5 |
| WAYNE (Methodist Home for Children) | Wayne, Lenoir and Greene | Intensive home-based individual and family therapy | 3 |

Adjudication Status

On July 1, 2006 there were 38 youth receiving services in the projects. During FY 2006-2007, 68 youth were admitted. The projects served a total of 106 youth. Table 3 identifies the disposition level for all 106 youth served. Table 4 identifies the adjudication status at the time of admission of the 68 youth.

Table 3

Disposition Level of Youth Served

| Host County | Level II | | Level III | | Post-Release Supervision | | Total Youth Served |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | # | Percent | # | Percent | # | Percent | |
| Alamance | 6 | 60.0% | 3 | 30.0% | 1 | 10.0% | 10 |
| Burke | 4 | 66.7% | 2 | 33.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 |
| Caldwell | 8 | 40.0% | 9 | 45.0% | 3 | 15.0% | 20 |
| Cumberland | 10 | 83.3% | 2 | 16.7% | 0 | 0.0% | 12 |
| Dare | 6 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 |
| Davidson | 2 | 66.7% | 1 | 33.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 |
| Iredell | 4 | 57.1% | 3 | 42.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 |
| Onslow | 4 | 50.0% | 4 | 50.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 8 |
| Rockingham | 17 | 89.5% | 1 | 5.3% | 1 | 5.3% | 19 |
| Vance | 3 | 75.0% | 1 | 25.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 |
| Wayne | 1 | 9.1% | 3 | 27.3% | 7 | 63.6% | 11 |
| Total | 65 | 61.3% | 29 | 27.4% | 12 | 11.3% | 106 |

Table 4

Disposition Level of FY 2006-2007 Admissions

| Host County | Level II | | Level III | | Post-Release Supervision | | Admissions |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|------------|
| | # | Percent | # | Percent | # | Percent | |
| Alamance | 3 | 42.9% | 3 | 42.9% | 1 | 14.3% | 7 |
| Burke | 3 | 60.0% | 2 | 40.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 |
| Caldwell | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 83.3% | 1 | 16.7% | 6 |
| Cumberland | 7 | 87.5% | 1 | 12.5% | 0 | 0.0% | 8 |
| Dare | 3 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 |
| Davidson | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 |
| Iredell | 4 | 66.7% | 2 | 33.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 |
| Onslow | 4 | 57.1% | 3 | 42.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 |
| Rockingham | 11 | 84.6% | 1 | 7.7% | 1 | 7.7% | 13 |
| Vance | 2 | 66.7% | 1 | 33.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 |
| Wayne | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 33.3% | 6 | 66.7% | 9 |
| Total | 37 | 54.4% | 22 | 32.4% | 9 | 13.2% | 68 |

Program Data

The following tables provide detailed data of the 11 demonstration projects for FY 2006-07. These tables include the number of youth served, adjudication status at the time of service, average length of service, grant funding level, actual expenditure and total cost per youth. The projects are identified by the host county.

Program Cost

Table 5 identifies the grant funding level, total youth served and cost per youth for FY 2006-2007. The actual expenditures differ from the grant funding level for eight of the eleven programs. Four programs spent less than the grant funding level, and they returned unused funds to the Department. Another four programs spent more than the grant funding level. The sponsoring agency secured these additional funds from other funding sources.

Table 5

| Program Cost | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Host County | Grant Level | Actual Expenditure | Total Youth Served | DJJDP Cost per Youth | Total Cost per Youth |
| Alamance | \$87,250 | \$89,100 | 10 | \$8,725 | \$8,910 |
| Burke | \$100,000 | \$101,135 | 6 | \$16,667 | \$16,856 |
| Caldwell | \$99,625 | \$152,942 | 20 | \$4,981 | \$7,647 |
| Cumberland | \$86,312 | \$82,105 | 12 | \$6,842 | \$6,842 |
| Dare | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | 6 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 |
| Davidson | \$87,250 | \$92,341 | 3 | \$29,083 | \$30,780 |
| Iredell | \$98,979 | \$98,979 | 7 | \$14,140 | \$14,140 |
| Onslow | \$86,828 | \$58,380 | 8 | \$7,298 | \$7,298 |
| Rockingham | \$87,250 | \$80,208 | 19 | \$4,221 | \$4,221 |
| Vance | \$87,250 | \$62,887 | 4 | \$15,722 | \$15,722 |
| Wayne | \$76,237 | \$76,237 | 11 | \$6,931 | \$6,931 |
| | \$911,981 | \$909,314 | 106 | \$7,999 | \$8,578 |

Length of Service

Demonstration Projects continued to serve youth who were high risk and in need of intensive interventions for a considerable length of time. Youth were served by a program for an average length of stay ranging from 85 days to 354 days. The statewide average length of stay was 177 days.

Table 6

| Days in Program | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Host County | Average Length of Stay |
| Alamance | 166 |
| Burke | 104 |
| Caldwell | 234 |
| Cumberland | 220 |
| Dare | 354 |
| Davidson | 179 |
| Iredell | 119 |
| Onslow | 133 |
| Rockingham | 170 |
| Vance | 187 |
| Wayne | 85 |
| Average | 177 |

Exit from Program

Sixty-four youth exited the projects in FY 2006-2007. Forty-three youth completed their programming at a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals. Program completion was categorized as successful, satisfactory, unsuccessful or non-compliance (See definitions below.).

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Successful Completion | Indicates a high level of youth participation in program activities and achievement of behavior improvement goals. |
| Satisfactory Completion | Indicates an acceptable level of youth participation and behavior improvement even though the youth did not complete all program activities and did not meet all behavior goals. |
| Unsuccessful Completion | Failure to meet specific goals and requirement or make sufficient progress in the program. |
| Non-Compliance | Unexcused absences or refusing to participate in treatment activities. |

Table 7

Assessment at Exit

| Host County | Successful Completion | Satisfactory Completion | Unsuccessful Completion | Non-Compliance | Total |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Alamance | 2 | 2 | | 4 | 8 |
| Burke | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 |
| Caldwell | 14 | 2 | 1 | | 17 |
| Cumberland | 3 | | 2 | | 5 |
| Dare | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| Davidson | | 2 | | | 2 |
| Iredell | 1 | 2 | | | 3 |
| Onslow | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| Rockingham | 4 | 2 | 3 | | 9 |
| Vance | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Wayne | 1 | | 7 | | 8 |
| Total | 29 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 64 |

Recidivism

The 64 youth who exited the projects during FY 2006-2007 were tracked for recidivism in the juvenile and adult systems and illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8

Recidivism Data for Youth at 6 and 12 Months After Termination

| | 6 Month | Percent | 12 Month | Percent |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| Adult Warrants | 6 | 9.4 % | 7 | 10.9% |
| Juvenile Complaints | 3 | 4.7% | 8 | 12.5% |
| No Complaints or Warrants | 55 | 85.9% | 49 | 76.6% |
| Totals | 64 | | 64 | |

Data Sources: North Carolina On-line Information Network (NC-JOIN) and the Department of Correction (DOC) Offender Search

Summary and Conclusion

Demonstration Projects served high risk youth who were in need of intensive interventions to be successfully served in the community. Without the projects these youth may have been served in a more costly youth development center. Noteworthy outcomes of the projects are:

- At six and twelve months after exiting the Demonstration Projects, recidivism rates for youth served in the programs were low. Eighty-six percent (86%) had no complaints or warrants filed six months after exiting the project and seventy-seven percent (77%) had no complaints or warrants filed twelve months after exiting the project.
- Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the youth exiting the projects completed their programming at a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals.
- Of the youth exiting the Demonstration Projects, eighty-eight percent (88%) continued to live and be served in the community with only twelve percent (12%) requiring placement in a youth development center.
- The average annual cost per youth in the Demonstration Projects in FY 2006-2007 was \$8,578 while the average annual cost per youth during the same fiscal year in a youth development center was \$95,720.

The positive data indicate that the Demonstration Projects continue to be effective and cost-efficient programs that develop and deliver programming for committed youth at the local level while addressing unmet gaps in the continuum of services within communities.