



North Carolina Department of Public Safety

Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

Roy Cooper, Governor
Eddie M. Buffaloe, Jr., Secretary

Timothy D. Moose, Chief Deputy Secretary

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Eddie M. Buffaloe, Jr., Secretary
Timothy Moose, Chief Deputy Secretary
Nicole Sullivan, Deputy Secretary for Analysis, Programming and Policy

RE: Report on Treatment for Effective Community Supervision

DATE: March 7, 2022

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.

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) 825-2719

- 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.
- (3) Transitional and Temporary Housing:
- 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. The employment status at entry and exit.
 - h. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination.
- (4) Local Reentry Councils (LRC):
- 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. The employment status at entry and exit including, wherever possible, the average wage received at entry and exit.
 - h. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination.
- (5) Intensive Outpatient Services. – If the Department enters into a contract for Intensive Outpatient Services, the Department of Public Safety shall report in the next fiscal year on this service including the following:
- 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.

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)

February 1, 2022



Roy Cooper, Governor

Eddie M. Buffaloe, Sr. Secretary

Introduction

The Justice Reinvestment Act of 2011 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 within the Department of Public Safety (Department). 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 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 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 20-21. 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 offer an intensive day program offering treatment, programming and services for three to six hours per day, five days a week. The 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 that 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 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 in order to reduce recidivism and promote public safety.

The following sections provide specific information about the status of each program funded under TECSP during FY 20-21.

(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. Using July 1, 2018 risk scores, 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 20-21 was the sixth 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 20-21 increased compared to the previous fiscal year due to an increased payout structure for core and wrap-around services, including the option for intensive outpatient substance abuse services in the last RRS contract.

Total amount of contracts - \$16,756,560

Total expenditures - \$6,402,923.22

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 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 20-21)

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	6,488
Post-Release	2,901
Parole	60
Total	9,449

e. The risk level of the offenders served

Table 2: Recidivism Reduction Services by Risk Level (FY 20-21)

Risk Level	Count
R1	2,994
R2	3,421
R3	2,385
R4	579
R5	50
Not Leveled	20
Total	9,449

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 20-21)

	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	349	42%	92	11%	276	33%	42	5%	79	9%	838
ROP Aftercare	173	71%	9	4%	40	16%	9	4%	12	5%	243
IOP ⁵ Treatment	58	40%	14	10%	45	31%	13	9%	14	10%	144
IOP Aftercare	3	75%	-	-	-	-	1	25%	-	-	4
CBI ⁶ Group Therapy	2,270	42%	524	10%	1,797	33%	163	3%	677	13%	5,431
CBI Booster Sessions	18	35%	19	37%	6	12%	5	10%	4	8%	52
Total	2,871	43%	658	10%	2,164	32%	233	3%	786	12%	6,712

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

g. The demographics of the population served

Table 4: Recidivism Reduction Services – Population Demographics (FY 20-21)

	White		Black		Other		Total	
Age Group	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Total	Percent
13-18	1	4	-	32	1	5	43	<1%
19-21	23	145	20	437	1	49	675	7%
22-25	76	383	61	761	11	85	1,377	15%
26-30	256	580	73	1,055	10	73	2,047	22%
31-35	302	655	87	785	13	49	1,891	20%
36-40	246	509	43	482	7	41	1,328	14%
41-45	145	369	30	344	2	27	917	10%
46-50	106	196	17	188	2	7	516	5%
51-55	52	150	24	141	1	5	373	4%
56-60	17	64	6	100	.	1	188	2%
61-65	2	22	5	41	.	1	71	1%
66-70	1	3	.	14	.	.	18	<1%
71+	.	.	.	5	.	.	5	<1%
All	1,211	3,377	504	4,959	92	471	10,614	100%

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

During the FY 20-21, 13,383 mandatory and optional services were rendered to RRS clients.

Table 5: Recidivism Reduction- Mandatory Service Outcomes (FY 20-21)

	Completed		Not Completed		Non- Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		
Mandatory Services	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Total
Education	2,407	70%	803	23%	158	5%	2	<1%	54	2%	3,424
Employment Services	2,528	70%	840	23%	184	5%	2	<1%	60	2%	3,614
Health/Nutrition	2,366	68%	883	25%	165	5%	1	<1%	60	2%	3,475
Total	7,301	69%	2,526	24%	507	5%	5	<1%	174	2%	10,513

Note: Clients can receive multiple services.

Table 6: Recidivism Reduction - Optional Service Outcomes (FY 20-21)

Optional Services	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Child Care Services	41	95%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	0	<1%	43
Family Counseling	668	49%	603	44%	73	5%	1	<1%	19	1%	1,364
Parenting Classes	692	47%	668	46%	84	6%	1	<1%	18	1%	1,463
Total	1,401	49%	1,272	44%	158	6%	2	<1%	37	1%	2,870

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 20-21)

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	Count
Employed	2,320	623	170	3,113
Unemployed	1,048	1,941	253	3,242
Unknown	60	103	2,931	3,094
Total	3,428	2,667	3,354	9,449

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

Table 8: Recidivism Reduction Services - Supervision Outcomes (FY 20-21)

Supervision Outcomes	Count	Percent
Active	3,857	41%
Completed	2,366	25%
Revoked	989	10%
Terminated	1,771	19%
Moved to Unsupervised	272	3%
Other*	193	2%
Total	9,448	100%

*Other Includes offenders that have died or failed to comply

(2) Community Intervention Centers (CIC)

The CIC contracts were initially awarded in six 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, 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. 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. While there were no operational CIC programs during FY 20-21, the Department continues to explore appropriate options.

(3) 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 20-21, the Department had 175 transitional housing beds using nine vendors across the state. Additionally, there were 464 admissions (an individual staying at least one night). The average length of stay was 62 days. Offenders typically reside in TH for up to 90 days but that period can be extended up to 120 days under unique circumstances. The average daily population was 136 individuals in transitional housing for FY 20-21.

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- \$ 3,250,745

Total expenditures - \$2,205,225.00

c. The supervision type by offenders served

Table 9: Transitional and Temporary Housing by Supervision Type (FY 20-21)

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	103
Parole	3
Post-Release	249
Total	355

d. The risk level of the offenders served

Table 10: Transitional and Temporary Housing by Risk Level (FY 20-21)

Risk Level	Count
R1	127
R2	106
R3	65
R4	10
R5	0
Not Leveled	47
Total	355

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

Table 11: Transitional and Temporary Housing - Core Service Outcomes (FY 20-21)

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
CBI Group Therapy	9	20%	35	80%	44
Regular Outpatient Substance Treatment	43	73%	16	27%	59
CBI Booster Sessions	61	59%	42	41%	103
Total	113	36%	198	64%	311

Beginning in FY 17-18, 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 20-21)

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	.	11	.	10	.	1	22	6%
19-21	.	1	.	10	.	.	11	3%
22-25	1	6	1	15	.	1	24	7%
26-30	6	18	.	14	.	3	41	12%
31-35	8	27	2	16	.	2	55	15%
36-40	9	33	1	16	.	3	62	17%
41-45	4	19	.	13	1	.	37	10%
46-50	.	10	.	13	.	.	24	7%
51-55	2	18	.	20	.	.	40	11%
56-60	.	10	2	11	.	.	23	6%
61-65	.	2	.	11	.	.	13	4%
66-70	1	.	.	2	.	.	3	1%
All	31	155	6	151	1	11	355	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 20-21)

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	Count
Employed	33	3	0	36
Unemployed	162	119	11	292
Unknown	0	0	27	27
Total	195	122	38	355

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

Table 14: Transitional and Temporary Housing - Supervision Outcomes (FY 20-21)

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active	90	25%
Completed	172	48%
Revoked	56	16%
Terminated	32	9%
Moved to Unsupervised	2	1%
Other*	3	1%
Total	355	100%
<i>*Other includes offenders who died or failed to comply</i>		

(4) 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 20-21, LRCs across the state served 2,803 clients in 19 counties to 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 Monthly Data Collection 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 - \$2,700,000.00*

Total expenditures - \$2,053,429.14*

*LRC contract terms may overlap fiscal years; however, in this report, the expenditures are presented for FY 20-21 only.

c. The supervision type for population served

Table 15: Supervision Type (FY 20-21)

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	862
Post-Release	692
Parole	123
Dual Supervision	26
N/A	781
Total	2,506

d. The risk level of the population served

Table 16: Risk Level (FY 20-21)

Risk Level*	Count
High	361
Medium	1,497
Low	834
Total	2,692

* 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 20-21)

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

Supportive Services	Count
Transportation	2,888
Employment ¹	2,123
Basic Needs	3,409
Housing	1,972
Life Skills	787
Mental Health Referral	597
Vocational Skills	557
Substance Abuse Referral	318
Education	372
Documentation ²	1,179
Child Care	22
Mentorship	1,937
Total³	16,161

¹ Employment activities include job search and job placement.

² Documentation activities include assisting participants with obtaining items such as a social security card, birth and marriage certificates, and state issued identification.

³ Service total includes multiple contacts with individual participants.

f. The demographics of the population served

Table 18: Age at Intake (FY 20-21)

Age Group	Total
Under 20	31
20-29	573
30-39	837
40-49	682
50+	669
Total	2,792

Table 19: Gender at Intake (FY 20-21)

Gender	Percent
Male	2,269
Female	523
Transgender	9
Total	2,801

Table 20: Race/Ethnicity at Intake (FY 20-21)

Race/Ethnicity	Percent
Black/African American	1,647
White/Caucasian	777
American Indian/Alaska Native	242
Other	70
Indian	51
Asian	9
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Island	2
Total	2,798

Table 21: Marital Status at Intake (FY 20-21)

Marital Status	Count
Single	2,132
Married	189
Divorced	184
Separated	99
Widowed	44
Other	27
Total	2,675

Table 22: Ethnicity at Intake (FY 20-21)

Ethnicity	Count
Non-Hispanic /Latino	2,616
Hispanic	54
Total	2,670

g. Hourly Wages Received of population served

Table 23: Hourly Wage (FY 20-21)

Starting Hourly Wage	Total
Unemployed	839
Minimum Wage	37
Min. Wage+ - \$9.00	89
\$9.01 - \$10.00	168
\$10.01 +	897
Total	2,030

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

Table 24: (4) h. Most Recent Outcome Status (FY 20-21)

Supervision Outcome	Total
Successfully Completed	964
Quit/Terminated	207
Non-Compliant	180
Moved Away	92
Re-arrest	66
Deceased	19
Transferred to Another LRC	5
Total	1,533

Summary

Across the state, 12,716 justice-involved individuals received services under the TECSP during FY 20-21. In some instances, offenders may have been enrolled in multiple programs during the reporting period.

FY 20-21 was the sixth 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 20-21, the number of transitional/temporary beds increased to 175 beds in eight counties. 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 20-21, there were 17 LRC's 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 in order for programs to be effective and have an impact on recidivism.

