



North Carolina Department of Public Safety

Prevent. Protect. Prepare.

Pat McCrory, Governor

Frank L. Perry, Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs of House Appropriations Subcommittee on Justice and Public Safety
Chairs of Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety

FROM: Frank L. Perry, Secretary
W. David Guice, Commissioner

RE: Alternatives to Commitment Report

DATE: March 1, 2014

Pursuant to S.L. 2005-276, 16.11(c), *The Division of Juvenile Justice of the Department of Public Safety shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety no later than March 1, 2006, and annually thereafter, on the results of the alternatives to commitment demonstration programs funded by Section 16.7 of S.L. 2004-124. The 2007 report and all annual reports thereafter shall also include projects funded by Section 16.11 of S.L. 2005-276 for the 2005-2006 fiscal year. Specifically, the report shall provide a detailed description of each of the demonstration programs, including the numbers of juveniles served, their adjudication status at the time of service, the services/treatments provided, the length of service, the total cost per juvenile, and the six- and 12-month recidivism rates for the juveniles after the termination of program services. (1998-202, s. 1(b); 2000-137, s. 1(b); 2005-276, s. 16.11(c); 2011-145, s. 19.1(l), (x), (ggg).)*

MAILING ADDRESS:
4233 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4233

Telephone: (919) 733-4060
Fax: (919) 733-8002



An Equal Opportunity employer

OFFICE LOCATION:
430 N. Salisbury Street
Suite 2056
Raleigh, NC 27603-5926
www.ncdps.gov



**Alternatives to Commitment Programs
Annual Evaluation Report
March 2014**

Session Law 2004-124, Section 16.7

**Submitted by:
Department of Public Safety
Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice
Juvenile Community Programs Section**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is required by Session Law 2004-124, Section 16.7 to provide alternatives to juvenile commitment services through the Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils. This report focuses on the youth served in programs for FY 2012-2013 that 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. In FY 2012-2013, the General Assembly allocated \$750,000 for these services.

Statewide, the Alternatives to Commitment Programs delivered somewhat similar intensive case management services that “wrapped services around” the juvenile and family. Typical services included home-based family counseling, individual counseling, tutoring, 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.

Alternatives to Commitment Programs served 144 youth and exits from the programs totaled 105 during FY 2012-2013. Of the 105 youth who exited the programs in FY 2012-2013, 67 youth completed the program meeting the goals of the program with a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals.

For FY 2012-2013, the average annual cost (based on actual expenditures) per youth in Alternatives to Commitment Programs was \$5,025 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$138,872

This report is in response to the legislation and 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 youth after the termination of program services. In this report, data support the need for the continued development and delivery of Alternatives to Commitment Programs for committed youth at the local level to addresses unmet gaps in the continuum of services within the communities.

Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Alternatives to Commitment Programs

Project Background

Session Law 2004-124, Section 16.7 made available \$750,000 to establish community programs for youth who otherwise would be placed in a youth development center. 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. Data since the implementation of services since FY 2004-2005 confirm that intensive case management that provide wrap-around services to the juvenile and family continue to be effective and cost-efficient programs. Services provided in FY 2012-2013 as Alternatives to Commitment Programs continued to provide those services.

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.

Program Data

The following tables provide detailed data of the eight (8) Alternatives to Commitment Programs funded in FY 2012-2013. These tables include the number of youth served, adjudication status at the time of service, the services/treatments provided, average length of service, total cost per youth, status when exiting the program, living arrangements after exit, and the six and twelve month recidivism rates. The projects are identified by the host county.

Youth Served and Adjudication Status

In FY 2012-2013 projects served a total of 144 youth. Table 1 below identifies the number of youth served and their adjudication status.

Table 1: Youth Served and Adjudication Status

Host County	Level II	Level III	Post Release Supervision	Total Served
Alamance	45	0	2	47
Burke	5	0	4	9
Cumberland	12	0	2	14
Dare	17	0	0	17
Davidson	8	0	0	8
Onslow	16	0	0	16
Rockingham	24	0	0	24
Wayne	4	1	4	9
Total	131	1	12	144

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, behavioral management, and cognitive behavioral 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. On occasion, court counselors used electronic monitoring as a support for supervision of youth.

Table 2 describes the services and treatments provided by the Alternatives to Commitment Programs in FY 2012-2013. 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 Services and Treatments

Host County (Sponsoring Agency)	Counties Served	Services Provided (includes 24/7 staff availability)	Capacity
ALAMANCE (Alamance County Dispute Settlement and Youth Services)	Alamance	Program Type: Structured Day Intensive wraparound services including parenting classes and educational alternatives as well as tutoring for youth.	5
BURKE (Barium Springs for Children, Inc.)	Burke, Caldwell and Catawba	Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building Intensive wraparound in-home services including individual and family counseling. .	3
CUMBERLAND (Cumberland County CommuniCare, Inc.)	Cumberland	Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building Intensive home-based services including individual and family counseling, mentoring, and community service.	5
DARE (Dare County Schools)	Dare	Program Type: Counseling Substance abuse assessments, individual and group counseling, intensive home-based family counseling, substance abuse education, and interpersonal skills development.	10
DAVIDSON (Family Services of Davidson County, Inc.)	Davidson	Program Type: Counseling Intensive wraparound in-home services including family and individual counseling.	4
ONslow (Onslow County Youth Services)	Onslow and Sampson	Program Type: Structured Day Intensive wraparound services including alternative education activities, life skills groups, and family counseling.	9
ROCKINGHAM (Rockingham County Youth Services)	Rockingham, Stokes, and Surry	Program Type: Home-Based Family Counseling Intensive home-based counseling and cognitive behavioral group counseling.	10
WAYNE (Methodist Home for Children)	Wayne, Lenoir and Greene	Program Type: Home-Based Family Counseling Intensive wraparound home-based individual and family therapy.	3

Length of Service

Alternatives to Commitment Programs continued to serve youth who were high risk and in need of intensive interventions for a considerable length of time. Table 3 illustrates youth being served by a program for an average length of stay ranging from 73 days to 358 days. The statewide average length of stay was 143 days.

Table 3: Days in Program

Host County	Average Length of Stay
Alamance	73
Burke	101
Cumberland	172
Dare	358
Davidson	93
Onslow	208
Rockingham	152
Wayne	127
Average	143

Program Cost

As legislatively mandated, no one program received more than \$100,000. Table 4 illustrates the total youth served, actual program expenditures, and annual cost for FY 2012-2013 which averaged \$5,025 per youth. Two programs spent additional funds that were secured by the sponsoring agency from other funding sources.

Table 4: Program Cost

Host County (Program Type)	Total Youth Served	Actual Expenditure	Cost per Youth
Alamance (Structured Day)	47	\$99,492	2,117
Burke (Parent/Family Skill Building)	9	\$58,764	\$6,529
Cumberland (Parent/Family Skill Building)	14	\$93,508	\$6,679
Dare (Counseling)	17	\$89,751	\$5,279
Davidson (Counseling)	8	\$111,211	\$13,901
Onslow (Structured Day)	16	\$77,845	\$4,865
Rockingham (Home-Based Counseling)	24	\$99,224	\$4,134
Wayne (Home-Based Counseling)	9	\$93,868	\$10,429
Total	144	\$723,663	\$5,025

Exit from Program

Table 5 illustrates the 105 youth who exited the projects in FY 2012-2013. Sixty-three percent (63%) of 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.

Table 5: Status of Youth at Exit

Host County	Successful Completion	Satisfactory Completion	Unsuccessful Completion	Non-Compliance	Total
Alamance	16	8	13	1	38
Burke	3	0	3	3	9
Cumberland	6	2	6	3	17
Dare	2	6	2	2	12
Davidson	1	0	0	0	1
Onslow	9	2	0	0	11
Rockingham	6	1	3	0	10
Wayne	3	2	2	0	7
Totals	46	21	29	9	105

Table 6 illustrates the living arrangements for those 105 youth upon exit from the program which shows eighty-four percent (84%) of the youth were living in the community with their parent(s) or guardian; twelve percent (12%) were in a treatment facility while four percent (4%) were in a youth development center or detention.

Table 6: Youth Living Arrangement at Exit

Host County	At Home with Parent(s) or Guardian	Treatment Facility	YDC/Detention	Total
Alamance	38	0	1	39
Burke	6	0	0	6
Cumberland	13	1	0	14
Dare	8	1	1	10
Davidson	2	3	0	5
Onslow	5	6	0	11
Rockingham	10	2	1	13
Wayne	6	0	1	7
Totals	88	13	4	105

Recidivism

Table 7 below illustrates youth who exited the projects during FY 2012-2013 and incurred additional delinquent complaints with the juvenile justice system.

Table 7: Recidivism Measure 1

Recidivism Measure 1: Juveniles Receiving an Addition Juvenile Complaint Post-Discharge			
Post-Discharge Timeframe	0 to 6 Months	0 to 12 Months	0 to 24 Months
Distinct Juveniles who had at Least 6, 12 or 24 Months Post-Discharge to be Studied	176	130	36
Distinct Juveniles with Additional Delinquent Complaints	24	27	3
Percentage of Juveniles with Additional Delinquent Complaints	14%	21%	8%

Table 8 below shows the percentage of youth who recidivated by receiving a juvenile adjudication or adult conviction post-discharge from the programs.

Table 8: Recidivism Measure 2

Recidivism Measure 2: Youth Receiving a Juvenile Adjudication or Adult Conviction Post-Discharge			
Post-Discharge Timeframe	0 to 6 Months	0 to 12 Months	0 to 24 Months
Distinct Juveniles who had at Least 6, 12 or 24 Months Post-Discharge to be Studied	176	130	36
Distinct Juveniles with Delinquent Adjudications	18	23	3
Percentage of Juveniles with Delinquent Adjudications	10%	18%	8%
Distinct Juveniles with Adult Convictions	9	11	4
Percentage of Juveniles with Adult Convictions	5%	8%	11%
Distinct Juveniles with Adjudication(s) or Adult Conviction(s)	27	34	7
Juvenile Adjudications + Adult Convictions	15%	26%	19%

In comparison, according to the NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission's SPAC *Juvenile Recidivism Study: Sample FY 2008/09*, 40.1% of juveniles who were both adjudicated and disposed received an additional adjudication or conviction within 36 months. Although the time span for the SPAC's study was longer than the recidivism study conducted by the Department, the SPAC recidivism study shows that the average juvenile will recidivate within the first 12 months.

Summary and Conclusion

Alternatives to Commitment Programs served high-risk youth who were in need of intensive interventions to be successfully served in the community. Without the programs these youth may have been served in a more costly youth development center. Noteworthy outcomes of the programs are:

- Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the youth exiting the projects were in a non-secure living arrangement while only one percent (1%) of the youth exiting the projects were committed to a youth development center.
- Sixty-three percent (63%) of the youth exiting the projects completed their programming at a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals.
- Fifteen percent (15%) of the distinct juveniles who could be followed for a full 6 month post-discharge received a delinquent adjudication or an adult conviction while 26% received a delinquent adjudication or an adult conviction at 12 months post discharge. This data supports research that shows the average juvenile will recidivate within the first 12 months. At 24 months post discharge, 19% received a delinquent adjudication or an adult conviction.
- The average annual cost per youth in the Alternatives for Commitment Programs was \$5,360 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$138,872. The data indicate that Alternatives to Commitment Programs 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.