



Roy Cooper, Governor

Todd Ishee, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety
Chairs, House Appropriations Committee on Justice and Public Safety
Chairs, Senate Appropriations Committee on Justice and Public Safety

FROM: Todd E. Ishee, Secretary 

RE: Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Program

DATE: July 17, 2024

Pursuant to G.S. 143B-1500(c), The Department of Adult Correction, Division of Community Supervision and Reentry, shall report by March 1 of each year to the Chairs of the Senate and House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety on the status of the programs funded through the Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Program.

MAILING ADDRESS:
5201 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-5201

OFFICE LOCATION:
214 W. Jones St
Raleigh, NC 27603



An Equal Opportunity Employer

FROM THE OFFICE OF:
Todd Ishee
Secretary
Telephone: 919-733-2126

<http://dac.nc.gov>

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF ADULT CORRECTION

Division of Rehabilitation and Reentry

STATUS OF THE TREATMENT FOR EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY SUPERVISION PROGRAM
G.S. 143B-1500(c)

July 17, 2024



Roy Cooper, Governor

Todd Ishee, Secretary

Introduction

The Justice Reinvestment Act of 2011 created the Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Program (TECSP). The program is designed to support the use of evidence-based practices to reduce recidivism and to promote coordination between state and community-based corrections programs. The target populations for these programs are high-risk, high-need offenders who are most likely to reoffend and face significant barriers or destabilizing factors that contribute to reoffending.

Considering the myriad of treatment, programming, and service needs offenders under community supervision demonstrate, the Department took a critical look at what was available to offenders and decided to refocus the purpose of TECSP funding. Historically, this funding has primarily provided substance abuse treatment. However, national research studies indicate that Cognitive Behavioral Intervention (CBI) programming also has a significant impact on recidivism. Therefore, as part of the recidivism reduction strategy, the Department has designated a large portion of the TECSP funding towards CBI.

With the advent of evidence-based practices in correctional interventions and the implementation of the risk/need assessment process, the Department now has empirical evidence demonstrating that the offenders who are more likely to reoffend have other programmatic and treatment needs in addition to substance abuse. Therefore, TECSP is a multi-pronged approach to programming, treatment, and reentry related services, and essentially represents an "umbrella" of funding. Under TECSP, the Department contracts with "eligible entities" directly through the competitive procurement process to provide community-based services to offenders on probation, parole, or post-release supervision. The different programs funded by TECSP are described below.

Recidivism Reduction Services (RRS)

Formerly called the Criminal Justice Partnership Program (CJPP) from 1994-2011 and then TECS from 2011-2015, the Recidivism Reduction Services is the single largest program funded under the TECSP umbrella and serves the largest number of offenders through services available in 100 counties during FY 22-23. The core services offered to offenders include cognitive behavioral intervention, booster sessions and a continuum of substance abuse services to include outpatient and aftercare/recovery management services. Support services such as education, employment, health/nutrition, education, and social support services based on the offender needs must also be addressed by vendors through community linkages and collaboration.

Transitional/Temporary Housing (TH)

Transitional and Temporary Housing (TH) is community-based housing provided to offenders who need a structured, positive, and safe environment for an interim period. The issue of homelessness among offenders supervised in the community has been a significant problem for supervising officers. By providing housing to these homeless offenders, it is the Department's intent to reduce recidivism and the rate of probation and post release supervision revocations. Vendors provide social support and program services in addition to housing.

Local Reentry Councils (LRC)

The Department continues to focus on providing reentry services to the growing numbers of individuals released from prison, post-release supervision and individuals with a criminal record as a barrier. Local Reentry Councils (LRC) represent an organized network consisting of a broad range of individuals and agencies from different disciplines and backgrounds having a role or significant interest in helping people successfully transition from correctional supervision (including prison, probation, parole and/or post-release supervision). The mission of the LRC is to coordinate resources in the community to efficiently provide and streamline resources for incarcerated and formally incarcerated individuals to reduce recidivism and promote public safety.

The following sections provide specific information about the status of each program funded under TECSP during FY 22-23.

(1) Recidivism Reduction Services (RRS)

a. Method by which offenders are referred to the program:

All referrals are generated through the automation process on the Offender Case Plan. Care managers from Treatment Accountability for Safer Communities (TASC) can also refer to RRS based on results of the TASC assessment.

b. Target population:

The eligible pool of offenders for RRS programming is the population of offenders in each county who have been assessed as Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 in terms of supervision level.

c. The number of services contracted for, and the amount of funding expended in each fiscal year:

FY 22-23 was the eighth year of the Recidivism Reduction Services (RRS) program where the contracts for services were performance-based. Vendor payments are directly related to offender engagement and outcomes. During FY 22-23, RRS expenditures were low due to several counties not receiving services. Several vendors opted not to renew their contract during the 1-year renewal option. The contract totals were based on a 5-year RFP contract. Vendors made tremendous progress during the seventh year of the RRS contracts by improving on data entries. Additionally, the performance-based contracts included an upfront payment during the first month of the fiscal year equaling 25% of the contract total (the amount a vendor could possibly earn providing services).

Total amount of contracts - \$21,410,046

Total expenditures - \$3,831,371

Note: The legislative language asks specifically about the total amount of contracts and total expenditures for the RRS program. Since these are performance-based contracts, the total amount of contracts is a derived figure based on the assumption that each vendor achieves all milestones with all offenders and is used by the Department for contractual purposes only. It is a separate and distinct figure that is derived for the purpose of creating a purchase order with each vendor. Therefore, it is not appropriate to compare this derived figure with the budget or the expenditures for this program.

d. The supervision type of the offenders served.

Table 1: Recidivism Reduction Services by Supervision Type (FY 22-23)

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	6,908
Post-Release	2,805
Parole	53
Total	9,766

e. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 2: Recidivism Reduction Services by Risk Level (FY 22-23)

Risk Level	Count
R1	2,897
R2	3,716
R3	2,358
R4	741
R5	52
Not Leveled	2
Total	9,766

f. The number of successful and unsuccessful core service exits with a breakdown of reasons for unsuccessful exits.

Table 3: Recidivism Reduction Services - Core Service Outcomes (FY 22-23)

	Completed ¹		Not Completed		Non-Compliance ²		Inappropriate Referral		Other ³		
Core Service	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total
ROP ⁴ Treatment	439	44%	27	3%	348	35%	62	6%	129	13%	1,005
ROP Aftercare	70	70%	1	1%	22	22%	0	0%	7	7%	100
IOP ⁵ Treatment	57	51%	3	3%	37	33%	6	5%	8	7%	111
IOP Aftercare	8	53%	4	27%	2	13%	0	0%	1	7%	15
CBI ⁶ Group Therapy	2,546	46%	174	3%	2,031	37%	113	2%	669	12%	5,533
CBI Booster Sessions	16	57%	1	4%	7	25%	0	2%	4	14%	28
Total	3,136	46%	210	3%	2,447	36%	181	3%	818	12%	6,794

¹ Completed means offenders satisfied all program requirements.

² Non-compliance includes both non-compliance with program requirements and conditions of supervision.

³ Other includes moved out of area, died, changed meeting times, moved to unsupervised probation, completed, or terminated a probation term.

⁴ ROP means Regular Outpatient

⁵ IOP means Intensive Outpatient

⁶ CBI means Cognitive Behavioral Intervention. Successful completion means offenders satisfied all program requirements, non-compliance includes both non-compliance with program requirements and conditions of supervision, other includes moved out of the area, died, changed meeting times, moved to unsupervised probation or the probation term was complete or terminated.

g. The demographics of the population served.

Table 4: Recidivism Reduction Services – Population Demographics (FY 22-23)

	White		Black		Other		Total	
Age Group	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Total	Percent
13-18	.	4	1	8	.	.	13	0%
19-21	18	76	19	266	1	39	419	4%
22-25	74	273	56	804	5	101	1,313	13%
26-30	179	489	59	977	15	94	1,813	19%
31-35	277	596	68	944	12	63	1,960	20%
36-40	235	572	50	561	10	51	1,479	15%
41-45	164	519	36	410	7	32	1,168	12%
46-50	108	266	23	257	8	16	678	7%
51-55	80	202	17	161	3	13	476	5%
56-60	27	106	10	122	.	4	269	3%
61-65	8	46	6	62	.	4	126	1%
66-70	2	9	.	30	.	3	44	0%
71+	.	2	.	5	.	1	8	0%
All	1,172	3,160	345	4,607	61	421	9,766	100%

h. The number and type of mandatory and optional services received by offenders in this program.

During the FY 22-23, 16,237 mandatory and optional services were rendered to RRS clients.

Table 5: Recidivism Reduction- Mandatory Service Outcomes (FY 22-23)

	Completed		Not Completed		Non- Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		
Mandatory Services	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total
Education	3,186	72%	755	17%	364	8%	18	-	89	2%	4,412
Employment Services	3,228	73%	757	17%	372	8%	14	-	78	2%	4,449
Health/Nutrition	3,052	71%	749	17%	389	9%	13	-	87	2%	4,290
Total	9,466	72%	2,261	17%	1,125	9%	45	-	254	2%	13,151

Note: Clients can receive multiple services.

Table 6: Recidivism Reduction - Optional Service Outcomes (FY 22-23)

	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		
Optional Services	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total
Child Care Services	93	84%	11	10%	6	5%	1	1%	0	0%	111
Family Counseling	798	59%	316	23%	204	15%	5	0%	33	2%	1,356
Parenting Classes	969	60%	384	24%	223	14%	4	0%	39	2%	1,619
Total	1,860	60%	711	23%	433	14%	10	0%	72	2%	3,086

Note: Clients can receive multiple services

i. Employment status at entry and exit for offenders served.

Table 7: Recidivism Reduction Services - Employment Status at Entry and Exit (FY 22-23)

	Employment Status at Exit			
Employment Status at Entry	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	Count
Employed	2,992	696	175	3,863
Unemployed	637	1,674	189	2,500
Unknown	44	89	3,270	3,403
Total	3,673	2,459	3,634	9,766

j. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination for offenders served.

Table 8: Recidivism Reduction Services - Supervision Outcomes (FY 22-23)

Supervision Outcomes	Count	Percent
Active	4,175	43%
Completed	2,215	23%
Terminated	1,837	18%
Revoked	1,037	11%
Moved to Unsupervised	326	3%
Other*	176	2%
Total	9,766	100%

*Other includes offenders that have died or failed to comply

(2) Transitional and Temporary Housing

a. The target population

Offenders (male and female) who are 18 years or older under community supervision who voluntarily agree to live in transitional housing due to being homeless or recently released from prison without a confined home plan, and do not have any family or community resources willing to provide suitable living arrangements. In FY 22-23, the Department had 182 transitional housing beds using nine vendors across the state. Additionally, there were 829 admissions (an individual staying at least one night). The average length of stay was 49 days. Offenders typically reside in housing for up to 90 days, but that period can be extended up to 120 days under unique circumstances. The average daily population was 137 individuals in transitional housing for FY 22-23.

b. The amount of funds contracted for and expended each fiscal year.

Based on risk/need assessment data, those offenders facing homelessness are more likely to become at risk for violation and revocation. Therefore, without a statewide network of housing options available to the offender population, the Department began to provide transitional housing in 2013 to address this need for structured, positive, and safe housing environments.

Total amount of contracts for non-sex offender housing- \$4,684,245

Total expenditures - \$2,303,025

c. The supervision type by offenders served.

Table 9: Transitional and Temporary Housing by Supervision Type (FY 22-23)

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	287
Post-Release	643
Parole	7
Post-Release/ Probation	1
Total	938

d. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 10: Transitional and Temporary Housing by Risk Level (FY 22-23)

Risk Level	Count
R1	401
R2	269
R3	181
R4	36
R5	2
Not Leveled	49
Total	938

e. The number of completions and non-completions for core services

Table 11: Transitional and Temporary Housing - Core Service Outcomes (FY 22-23)

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
CBI Group Therapy	7	64%	4	36%	11
Regular Outpatient Substance Treatment	34	41%	49	59%	83
CBI Booster Sessions	75	42%	102	58%	177
Total	116	43%	155	57%	271

Beginning in FY 22-23, transitional/temporary housing providers were not required to provide CBI group therapy and regular outpatient substance abuse treatment. Instead, housing providers were instructed to make referrals to existing contractual services offered under RRS contracts. However, some housing providers elected to continue these services at no additional cost.

f. The demographics of the offenders served.

Table 12: Transitional and Temporary Housing – Population Demographics (FY 22-23)

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
19-21	.	3	.	11	.	1	15	2%
22-25	4	19	3	44	.	4	74	8%
26-30	15	50	4	52	.	4	125	13%
31-35	15	76	7	67	.	13	178	19%
36-40	16	92	4	63	1	7	183	20%
41-45	15	63	.	37	2	6	123	13%
46-50	10	35	1	46	.	7	99	11%
51-55	3	27	2	28	1	2	63	7%
56-60	1	10	.	26	.	.	37	4%
61-65	2	13	.	12	.	1	28	3%
66-70	2	1	.	8	.	.	11	1%
70+	.	.	.	2	.	.	2	0%
All	83	389	21	396	4	45	938	100%

g. The employment status at entry and exit of offenders served.

Table 13: Transitional and Temporary Housing - Employment Status at Entry and Exit (FY 22-23)

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	Count
Employed	46	6	0	52
Unemployed	467	356	28	851
Unknown	2	4	29	35
Total	515	366	57	938

h. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination of offenders served.

Table 14: Transitional and Temporary Housing - Supervision Outcomes (FY 22-23)

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active	287	31%
Completed	374	39%
Revoked	158	17%
Terminated	90	10%
Moved to Unsupervised	10	1%
Other*	19	2%
Total	938	100%
<i>*Other includes offenders who died or failed to comply</i>		

(3) Local Reentry Councils (LRC)

a. The target population:

The primary target population for LRCs are offenders currently under community supervision (includes probation, post-release, and parole). In FY 22-23, LRCs across the state enrolled 2,575 clients and 1,721 clients were served in 19 counties which include Buncombe, Craven, Cumberland, Durham, Edgecombe, Forsyth, Guilford, Hoke, McDowell, Mecklenburg, Nash, New Hanover, Orange, Pamlico, Pitt, Roberson, Scotland, Wake and Wilson. Any justice-involved individual in these communities is eligible for reentry services through the LRC especially those recently released from local confinement or incarceration. Core services provided to include housing, employment, transportation childcare assistance, as well as referrals to substance abuse and mental health services.

The data shown in the following tables were collected by sites using LRC Case Management Tool for tracking reentry services provided and offender outcomes. The statistics reported below represent the available data entered in the tool and may result in missing data.

b. The amount of funds contracted for and expended each fiscal year.

Total amount of contracts - \$2,798,495

Total expenditures - \$ 1,154,904

*LRC contract terms may overlap fiscal years; however, in this report, the expenditures are presented for FY 22-23 only.

c. The supervision type for population served.

Table 15: Supervision Type (FY 22-23)

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	333
Post-Release	401
Parole	115
Dual Supervision	16
N/A	856
Total	1,721

d. The risk level of the population served.

Table 16: Risk Level (FY 22-23)

Risk Level*	Count
High	269
Medium	811
Low	641
Total	1,721

* Local Reentry Council staff use an instrument called the Proxy to identify risk and they may also obtain risk information from the state's risk assessment instrument from the supervising probation officer. This data was combined into categories of risk in the table.

e. The number of supportive services provided.

Table 17: Supportive Services Provided (FY 22-23)

Note: The numbers of reentry activities shown below include contacts with an individual participant.

Supportive Services	Count
Adult Education	27
Child Care	3
Community Involvement	7
Disabilities	7
Employment ¹	344
Family/Social Relations	20
Food	135
Health Care Coverage	31
Housing	332
Income ²	69
Legal	32
Life Skills	24
Mental Health	158
Mobility ³	227
Parenting Skills	16
Safety	5
Substance Abuse	61
Total⁴	1,498

¹ Employment activities include job search and job placement.

² Income activities refer to any additional income such as SSI, disability, etc.

³ Mobility activities include transportation.

⁴ Service total includes multiple contacts with individual participants.

f. The demographics of the population served.

Table 18: Age at Intake (FY 22-23)

Age Group	Total
Under 20	29
20-29	271
30-39	549
40-49	441
50+	422
Missing	9
Total	1,721

Table 19: Gender at Intake (FY 22-23)

Gender	Count
Male	1,357
Female	358
Transgender	6
Total	1,721

Table 20: Race/Ethnicity at Intake (FY 22-23)

Race/Ethnicity	Count
Black/African American	989
White/Caucasian	628
American Indian/Alaska Native	60
Other	40
Indian	0
Asian	0
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Island	2
Unknown	2
Total	1,721

Table 21: Marital Status at Intake (FY 22-23)

Marital Status	Count
Single/Separate	1,409
Divorced	160
Married	104
Widowed	29
Other	19
Total	1,721

Table 22: Ethnicity at Intake (FY 22-23)

Ethnicity	Count
Non-Hispanic /Latino	1,681
Hispanic	40
Total	1,721

g. Hourly Wages Received and Housing Status of population served.

Table 23: Hourly Wage (FY 22-23)

Hourly Wage	At Entry	Most Recently Recorded
Unemployed	1,424	431
Min. Wage+ - \$9.00	13	5
\$9.01 - \$10.00	47	45
\$10.01 +	237	337
Total	1,721	818

Table 24: Housing Status (FY 22-23)

Housing Status	At Entry	Most Recently Recorded
Own/Rent	457	326
Homeless	450	111
Other	375	174
Transitional	386	176
Emergency	53	6
Total	1,721	793

h. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination of population served.

Table 25: Most recent outcome status (FY 22-23)

Supervision Outcome	Total
Successfully Completed	664
Quit/Terminated	304
Non-Compliant	359
Moved Away	67
Re-arrest	77
Deceased	4
Transferred to Another LRC	7
Total	1,482

Summary

Across the state, 12,313 justice-involved individuals received services under the TECSP during FY 22-23. In some instances, offenders may have been enrolled in multiple programs during the reporting period.

FY 22-23 was the eighth full year of services under the RRS programming as a performance-based model. RRS providers continue to have a better understanding of the model and how to serve high-risk offenders. Providers have learned that creativity is necessary in motivating offenders to change behavior. Overall, RRS provides probation/parole officers with quality programs and services to which they can refer offenders under their supervision. Officers receive regular updates of offender progress and compliance. All RRS vendors conduct graduation or recognition ceremonies for those offenders who complete the programs. These ceremonies are supported by probation/parole officers, judicial officials, family, and friends, and make a significant impact on the lives of the offenders completing these programs.

Transitional housing for non-sex offenders continues to expand across the state. In FY 22-23, the number of transitional/temporary beds increased to 182 beds across the state of NC. Interest in providing transitional housing creates housing assistance opportunities to some of the most difficult offenders to place in permanent housing. The Department actively works on partnerships to provide more transitional housing assistance for sex offenders, as well as offenders with medical and/or mental health needs. Finding a solution will require stakeholders to commit to educate, communicate, and promote legislative public policy regarding these issues.

In FY 22-23, there were 17 LRCs covering 19 counties and numerous communities organizing in support of establishing a LRC council in the future. As the reentry conversation continues to grow, the Department will need to identify more sustainable funding mechanisms to scale up reentry programs and services across the state.

The Department continues to work with community partners to develop effective, evidence-based programming for recently released offenders and those on community supervision. The Department works to ensure that staff, vendors, service providers and volunteers understand the research on correctional interventions, as well as the importance of delivering quality programs in a consistent manner. The ongoing challenge will be to keep the high-risk offender engaged in services. Correctional research and practice dictate that justice-involved individuals must remain engaged for longer periods of time and receive the appropriate dosage of services for programs to be effective and have an impact on recidivism.