



North Carolina Department of Public Safety

Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

Roy Cooper, Governor
Erik A. Hooks, Secretary

Timothy Moose, Chief Deputy Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs of House Appropriations Committee on Justice and Public Safety
Chairs of Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Justice and Public Safety
Chairs of the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety

FROM: Erik A. Hooks, Secretary *EAH*
Timothy Moose, Chief Deputy Secretary *Timothy Moose*

RE: Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Report

DATE: March 1, 2020

Pursuant to G. S. 143b-1155(c), the Department of Public Safety, Community Corrections Section, 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. The report shall include the following information from each of the following components:

(1) *Recidivism Reduction Services:*

- a. The method by which offenders are referred to the program.
- b. The target population.
- c. The amount of services contracted for and the amount of funding expended in each fiscal year.
- d. The supervision type.
- e. The risk level of the offenders served.
- f. The number of successful and unsuccessful core service exits with a breakdown of reasons for unsuccessful exits.
- g. The demographics of the population served.
- h. The number and kind of mandatory and optional services received by offenders in this program.
- i. Employment status at entry and exit.
- j. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination.

(2) *Community Intervention Centers (CIC):*

- a. The target population.
- b. The amount of funds contracted for and expended each fiscal year.
- c. The supervision type.
- d. The risk level of the offenders served.
- e. The number of successful and unsuccessful core service exits with a breakdown of reasons for unsuccessful exits.
- f. The demographics of the population served.
- g. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination.

MAILING ADDRESS:
4201 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4201
www.ncdps.gov



An Equal Opportunity Employer

OFFICE LOCATION:
512 N. Salisbury Street
Raleigh, NC 27604
Telephone: (919) 825-2761



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

STATUS OF THE TREATMENT FOR EFFECTIVE
COMMUNITY SUPERVISION PROGRAM
G.S. 143B-1155(c)

March 1, 2020

Roy Cooper
Governor

Erik A. Hooks
Secretary

I. Introduction

The Justice Reinvestment Act was signed into law in June of 2011 (S.L. 2011-192). This body of legislation created the Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Program (TECSP) which is to be administered by the Community Corrections section of the Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice. 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 re-offend and also face significant barriers, or destabilizing factors that contribute to re-offending.

Considering the myriad of treatment, programming, and service needs that 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 through its various name changes 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 re-offend 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 18-19. 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.

Community Intervention Centers (CIC)

Community Intervention Centers (CIC) are designed as an intensive day program offering treatment, programming and services for 3-6 hours per day, five (5) days a week. The CIC program targets offenders under supervision who are in violation or at risk of revocation. The CIC provides cognitive behavioral intervention; substance abuse treatment, employment and educational services, and any other additional services which support evidence-based programming to avoid revocation and the possibility of incarceration.

This program is currently not offered.

Transitional/Temporary Housing (TH)

Transitional and Temporary Housing (TH) is community-based housing provided to offenders who are in need of 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 along with the transitional housing.

Local Reentry Councils (LRC)

Due to Justice Reinvestment, 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) is an organized network consisting of a broad range of individuals and agencies from different disciplines and backgrounds that have 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 Local Reentry Council is to coordinate resources in the community in a best effort to provide and streamline resources for incarcerated and formally incarcerated individuals and, as a result, reduce recidivism and promote public safety.

Intensive Outpatient Services (IOP)

Intensive substance abuse treatment services are an ASAM Level 2.1 non-residential treatment service that includes structured individual and group activities and services that are provided at an outpatient program designed to assist offenders to begin recovery and learn skills for recovery maintenance. The services are offered at least 3 hours a day, at least 3 events a week for 12 weeks. IOP structured programming includes individual and group counseling and support, cognitive behavioral programming, family counseling and support, drug testing coordinated with supervising Probation/Parole Officer and TASC Care Manager, relapse prevention strategies, lifeskills, crisis planning, disease and recovery management, and treatment support activities for those with physical disability, co-occurring mental illness, and developmental differences.

This program was not offered during FY 18-19 as a stand-alone service, but will be incorporated into the next round of Requests for Proposals for Recidivism Reduction Services in FY 19-20.

The following sections provide specific information about the status of each program funded under TECSP during FY 18-19:

(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. Offenders can also be recommended by TASC Care Managers as a result 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. On July 1, 2018, 77% of the population under community supervision were Level 1, Level 2, or Level 3 offenders (not including offenders unlevelled at the time). However, due to the availability of funding, the RRS program uses a 35% threshold for the target population, and thus the program targeted 26,308 offenders as the eligible pool of offenders for RRS.

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

FY 18-19 was the fourth 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. Vendors made tremendous progress during the third 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).

Expenditures for FY 18-19 increased by 12% compared to last fiscal year, due to the Vendors becoming more familiar and comfortable with the RRS performance-based contracting approach, as well as the department awarding contracts in all 100 counties of North Carolina. We are anticipating an increase in expenditures in FY19-20 because the Department is planning to increase the payout structure for core and wrap-around services, in addition to including the option for intensive outpatient substance abuse services.

Total amount of contracts: \$11,662,490.07

Total Expenditures:
\$5,980,640.58

***Note:** The legislative report 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 Purchasing 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:

Table 1: Recidivism Reduction Services Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 18-19.

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	8,649
Post-Release	3,096
Parole	59
Post Release Probation	0
Total	11,804

- e. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 2: Recidivism Reduction Services Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 18-19.

Risk Level	Count
R1	3,319
R2	4,314
R3	3,279
R4	827
R5	56
Not Leveled	9
Total	11,804

- 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 for Offenders Served FY 18-19.

	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		
Core Service	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total
ROP Treatment	728	37%	187	7%	759	38%	130	9%	187	9%	1,991
ROP Aftercare	223	61%	47	5%	57	16%	17	13%	18	5%	362
CBI Group Therapy	2,563	37%	728	5%	2,527	36%	311	10%	829	12%	6,958
CBI Booster Sessions	56	60%	13	4%	13	14%	4	14%	7	8%	93
Total	3,570	38%	975	5%	3,356	36%	462	10%	1,041	11%	9,404

**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 Demographics of Population Served FY 18-19.

	White		Black		Other		Total	
Age Group	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	3	26	7	83	2	9	130	1%
19-21	56	272	43	732	17	97	1,217	10%
22-25	130	472	99	1,242	16	147	2,106	18%
26-30	300	789	111	1,476	20	117	2,813	24%
31-35	264	644	92	800	13	54	1,867	16%
36-40	232	522	64	588	14	47	1,467	12%
41-45	151	342	48	365	10	21	937	8%
46-50	78	195	39	216	4	15	547	5%
51-55	43	117	24	160	1	11	356	3%
56-60	21	80	13	135	.	4	253	2%
61-65	6	24	1	45	1	1	78	1%
66-70	1	6	1	18	.	1	27	0%
71+	.	1	.	2	.	3	6	0%
All	1,285	3,490	542	5,862	98	527	11,804	100%

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

During FY 18-19: 13,850 services were rendered to RRS clients.

Table 5: Recidivism Reduction Mandatory Service Outcomes Population Served FY 18-19.

Mandatory Services	Count	Percent
Health/Nutrition	3,435	35%
Employment Services	3,240	33%
Education	3,098	32%
Total	9,773	

Table 6: Recidivism Reduction Optional Service Outcomes Population Served FY 18-19.

Optional Services	Count	Percent
Parenting Classes	1,901	47 %
Family Counseling	2,102	51 %
Child Care Services	74	2 %
Total	4,077	

***Note:** The mandatory and optional services are generally rendered as a one-time event, therefore the number of services rendered may be under-reported. Changes to the programs database during FY 18-19 did not allow for vendors to enter specific outcomes for services.*

i. **Employment Status at entry and exit:**

Table 7: Recidivism Reduction Employment Status at Entry & Exit Population Served FY 18-19.

Employment Status at Entry	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	Total
Employed	2,966	1,005	54	4,025
Unemployed	1,084	2,799	169	4,052
Unknown	38	157	3,532	3,727
Total	4,088	3,961	3,755	11,804

j. **Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination:**

Table 8: Recidivism Reduction Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 18-19.

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active	4,601	39%
Completed	2,377	20%
Revoked	1,991	17%
Terminated	2229	19%
Moved to Unsupervised	377	3%
Other	229	2%
Total	11,804	100%
<i>“Other” includes offender died and failed to comply</i>		

Community Intervention Centers (CIC)

The CIC contracts were initially awarded in 6 counties primarily in the urban communities where the number of offenders in violation and/or at risk for revocation is usually a greater percentage of the supervised population. However, the Vendors involved with CIC programming were also involved in RRS programming and the overlap was difficult to manage for both the Vendors and the supervising officers. Therefore, based on requests from Vendors and due to low numbers of referrals, the Department agreed to allow these contracts to expire during FY 15-16 and they were not renewed after August 2016. There were no operational programs during FY 18-19. New programming options are being considered.

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 18-19, the Department had 122 transitional housing beds using nine (9) vendors across the state. Additionally, there were 589 admissions (an individual staying at least one night) and most participants had a length of stay of about 75 days but are allowed up to 90 days. Under unique circumstances, individuals can be extended up to 120 days.

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 contract for non-sex offender housing:

\$ 2,377,053

Total Expenditures:

\$1,814,250

c. The supervision type:

Table 9: Transitional and Temporary Housing Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 18-19.

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	193
Parole	4
Post-Release	268
Total	465

d. The risk level of the offenders served:

Table 10: Transitional and Temporary Housing Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 18-19.

Risk Level	Count
R1	147
R2	145
R3	111
R4	17
R5	2
Not Leveled	43
Total	465

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

Table 11: Transitional and Temporary Housing Core Service Outcomes for Offenders Served FY 18-19.

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
CBI Group Therapy	48	25%	141	75%	189
Regular Outpatient Substance Treatment	25	47%	28	53%	53
CBI Booster Sessions	6	86%	1	14%	7
Total	79	32%	170	68%	249

***Note:** Starting in FY 17-18, transitional/temporary housing providers were not required to provide CBI group therapy and regular outpatient substance abuse treatment. Rather, 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 population served:

Table 12: Transitional and Temporary Housing Demographics of Population Served FY 18-19.

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	2	10	.	12	.	.	24	5%
19-21	2	5	.	17	.	2	26	6%
22-25	2	16	.	36	1	1	56	12%
26-30	6	33	5	44	1	3	92	20%
31-35	7	30	1	32	.	1	71	15%
36-40	11	31	.	18	.	.	60	13%
41-45	4	16	3	17	.	.	40	9%
46-50	1	10	3	21	.	2	37	8%
51-55	2	10	2	14	.	.	28	6%
56-60	1	6	.	8	.	.	15	3%
61-65	1	1	1	4	.	.	7	2%
66-70	.	3	.	4	.	.	7	2%
71+	.	1	.	1	.	.	2	0%
All	39	172	15	228	2	9	465	100%

g. The employment status at entry and exit:

Table 13: Transitional and Temporary Housing Employment Status at Entry and Exit Population Served FY 18-19.

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	
Employed	45	13	0	58
Unemployed	205	149	17	371
Unknown	1	2	33	36
Total	251	164	50	465

h. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination:

Table 14: Transitional and Temporary Housing Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 18-19.

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active	136	29%
Completed	152	32%
Revoked	117	25%
Terminated	45	10%
Moved to Unsupervised	7	2%
Other	8	2%
Total	465	100%
<i>Other includes offender died and failed to comply</i>		

Local Reentry Councils (LRC)

a. The target population:

The primary target population are incarcerated individuals, individuals currently under community supervision (including Probation, Post-Release, or Parole) and individuals that have a criminal background as a barrier. For the FY 18-19, there were 14 LRCs serving 19 counties and 3,204 individuals. These sites include: Buncombe, Mecklenburg, Pitt, Nash/Edgecombe/Wilson, Hoke/Scotland/Robeson, Craven/Pamlico, Cumberland, Durham, Orange, New Hanover, McDowell, Wake, Forsyth and Guilford. Any individual in the Reentry Council community who has been involved in the criminal justice system, currently under community supervision or released from federal prison, state prison, or county jail are eligible for reentry services through the Local Reentry Council. The core services include, but are not limited to housing, employment, transportation and childcare assistance, as well as referrals to substance abuse and mental health services.

The data shown in the following tables were manually collected by LRC staff. It should be noted that not all information for some participants was available for analysis. Future plans are to purchase a comprehensive case management system to ensure that participant information can be systematically collected and tracked.

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

Total Amount of contracts:

\$2,294,018.00

Total Expenditures:

\$1,932,401.31

c. The supervision type:

Table 15: Clients by Supervision Type during FY 18-19.

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	2,220
Post-Release	199
Parole	85
Dual Supervision	6
Missing Data	694
Total	3,204

d. The risk level of the offenders served:

Table 16: Risk Level of Offenders Served during FY 18-19.

Risk Level	Count
High	631
Medium	1,698
Low	875
Total	3,204

Note: 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. These data were combined into categories of risk as presented in the table.

e. The number of supportive services provided:

Table 17: Local Reentry Council Supportive Services Provided FY 18-19.

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

Supportive Services	Total
Transportation	3,144
*Employment	2,796
Clothing/Food/Hygiene	2,004
Housing	1,266
Life Skills	939
SA/MH Treatment	733
Vocational Training	400
Academic Education	361
**Documentation	275
Child Care	45
Mentorship	1,043
Total	13,006

* Employment activities include job search and job placement.

**Documentation activities include assisting participants with obtaining items, such as: a social security card, birth and marriage certificates, and state issued identification.

f. The demographics of the population served:

Table 18: Age at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 18-19.

Age Group	Total
16-20	4%
21-29	26%
30-39	31%
40-49	22%
50+	17%
Total	100%

Table 19: Gender at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 18-19.

Gender	Percent
Male	80%
Female	20%
Total	100%

Table 20: Race/Ethnicity at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 18-19.

Race/Ethnicity	Percent
Black	63%
White	26%
Hispanic	9%
Native American/Other	2%
Unknown	0%
Asian	0%
Total	100%

g. Hourly Wages Received:

Table 21: Hourly Wage of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils during FY 18-19.

Hourly Wages	Total
Min. Wage	55
Min. Wage - \$8.00	613
\$9.01 - \$10.00	466
\$10.00 +	630
Total	1,764

h. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination:

Table 22: Most Recent Outcome Status of Offenders Served Through CART during FY 18-19.

Supervision Outcome	Total	Percent
Active Supervision	577	18%
Completed	1,416	44%
*No Contact	858	27%
**Dropped Out	93	3%
Re-arrest	62	2%
Moved to Unsupervised	10	<1%
***Other	188	6%
Total	3,204	100%

* “No contact” indicates there was no response from participants after LRC staff attempted to contact several times.

** “Dropped out” indicates participant no longer wanted assistance.

*** “Other” includes participants who died, failed to comply, or moved away.

(2) INTENSIVE OUTPATIENT SERVICES

The Department did not have any contract(s) for this service during FY 18-19, but did incorporate this service under Recidivism Reduction Services (RRS) for the new contracts issued in August 2019.

II. Summary

Across the state, 15,473 justice involved individuals received services under the TECSP, and in some instances, offenders may have been enrolled in multiple programs during the reporting period.

FY 18-19 was the fourth full year of services under the RRS programming as a performance-based model. The RRS providers have a better understanding of the model and how to serve high risk offenders. The providers have learned that creativity is necessary in motivating offenders to change behavior. Overall, the RRS provides probation/parole officers with quality programs and services that offenders under their supervision can be referred to. Officers receive regular updates about offender progress and compliance. Lastly, 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 18-19, the number of transitional/temporary beds increased to 122 beds in 7 counties. The interest in providing transitional housing may create opportunities to provide housing assistance to some of the most difficult offenders to place in permanent housing. We are actively working on partnerships to provide 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 18-19, there were 14 LRCs serving 19 counties. However, there are numerous communities who are organizing in support of establishing a local reentry council in the future. As the reentry conversation continues to grow among the various segments of society, we will need to identify more sustainable funding mechanisms to scale up reentry and support across the state. There are currently 19 additional counties interested in becoming funded Local Reentry Councils.

The Department continues to work with community partners in developing effective, evidence-based programming for justice involve individuals during incarceration and on community supervision. We are working to ensure that NCDPS staff, vendors, service providers and volunteers not only understand the research on correctional interventions, but also understand the importance of delivering quality programs in a consistent manner. The on-going challenge will be to keep the high-risk offender engaged in services. Correctional research and practice dictates that for programs to be effective and have an impact on recidivism, justice involved individuals must remain engaged for a longer period of time and receive the appropriate services.