



# North Carolina Department of Public Safety

## Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

Pat McCrory, Governor  
Frank L. Perry, Secretary

W. David Guice, Commissioner

### MEMORANDUM

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

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

RE: Alternatives to Commitment Report

DATE: March 1, 2016

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

[www.ncdps.gov](http://www.ncdps.gov)



**OFFICE LOCATION:**  
512 N. Salisbury St.  
Raleigh, NC 27604  
Telephone: (919) 733-2126  
Fax: (919) 715-8477

*An Equal Opportunity employer*



**Alternatives to Commitment Programs  
Annual Evaluation Report  
March 2016**

---

**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 2014-2015 that delivered services to youth in Level III disposition (commitment), youth in Level II disposition (intermediate) who were at risk of a Level III disposition, and youth reentering the community after youth development center commitment (post-release supervision). In FY 2014-2015, 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, cognitive behavior training and mentoring. 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 113 youth and exits from the programs totaled 73 during FY 2014-2015. Of the 73 youth who exited the programs in FY 2014-2015, 54 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 2014-2015, the average annual cost (based on actual expenditures) per youth in Alternatives to Commitment Programs was \$6,109 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$126,481.

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 at the local level to address 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 provides wrap-around services to the juvenile and family continue to be effective and cost-efficient programs. Programs funded in FY 2014-2015 as Alternatives to Commitment continued to provide those services.

By statute, there are three disposition levels for adjudicated youth in North Carolina: Level I, Community Disposition; Level II, Intermediate Disposition; 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 2014-2015. 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 (6) and twelve (12) month recidivism rates. The projects are identified by the host county.

### Youth Served and Adjudication Status

In FY 2014-2015 projects served a total of 113 youth. Table 1 below identifies the number of youth served and their adjudication status at admission.

**Table 1. Youth Served and Adjudication Status**

Host County	Petition Filed	Adjudicated Delinquent Disposition Pending	Probation	Commitment	Post Release Supervision	Total
Burke	0	0	7	0	7	14
Cumberland	0	0	6	0	4	10
Dare	0	0	7	0	2	9
Davidson	0	3	6	0	2	11
Durham	1	0	3	2	2	8
Onslow	0	0	23	0	3	26
Rockingham	0	0	24	0	2	26
Wayne	0	0	6	3	0	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>113</b>

## Services and Treatments Provided

Through the development of program agreements, the program 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, cognitive behavioral training and mentoring. 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 2014-2015. 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**

<b>Host County (Sponsoring Agency)</b>	<b>Counties Served</b>	<b>Services Provided</b> (includes 24/7 staff availability)	<b>Capacity</b>
<b>BURKE</b> (Barium Springs Home for Children)	Burke, Caldwell and Catawba	<b>Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building</b> Family Specialist utilizes teaching interactions to develop social and life skills in one-on-one sessions with youth. Parent training in one-on-one sessions with Family Specialists teaches parents behavior management skills and parental supervision skills.	<b>2</b>
<b>CUMBERLAND</b> (Cumberland County CommuniCare, Inc.)	Cumberland	<b>Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building</b> Intensive Services Network uses a multidisciplinary approach in providing empirically supported interventions that build upon the strengths of the youth/family to redirect problem behaviors and to learn important skills.	<b>5</b>
<b>DARE</b> (Dare County Schools)	Dare	<b>Program Type: Home Based Family Counseling</b> Primary service is in-home family counseling, with parent/family skill building, individual counseling, and interpersonal skill building provided in home, school and community settings to achieve goals established in treatment plan.	<b>8</b>
<b>DAVIDSON</b> (Family Services of Davidson County, Inc.)	Davidson	<b>Program Type: Mentoring</b> Professional mentoring services with behavioral contracting and mixed counseling as supplementary services, as needed.	<b>10</b>
<b>DURHAM</b> (Exchange Clubs' Child Abuse Prevention Center)	Durham	<b>Program Type: Home Based Family Counseling</b> The Parenting of Adolescents program provides evidence-based Multidimensional Family Therapy to youth and the parent/caregiver primarily in their home setting.	<b>7</b>
<b>ONslow</b> (Onslow County Government (DSS) - Youth Services)	Onslow and Sampson	<b>Program Type: Home Based Family Counseling</b> Intensive in-home services that include: counseling; interpersonal skills training; an array of structured intervention techniques and plans; and employing protective factors to build resiliency, which will redirect inappropriate behavior.	<b>8</b>

<b>Host County (Sponsoring Agency)</b>	<b>Counties Served</b>	<b>Services Provided</b> (includes 24/7 staff availability)	<b>Capacity</b>
<b>ROCKINGHAM</b> (Rockingham County Youth Services)	Rockingham, Stokes, and Surry	<b>Program Type: Home Based Family Counseling</b> Program provides home-based family counseling, cognitive behavioral therapy, group counseling, parenting classes and therapeutic enrichment.	<b>8</b>
<b>WAYNE</b> (Methodist Home for Children)	Wayne, Lenoir and Greene	<b>Program Type: Home Based Family Counseling</b> The Families First Model of Care provides flexibility to incorporate positive leisure activities, face to face family sessions 3-8 hours per week, coaching and practicing identified goals/skills, and family/parent work on discipline and behavior management techniques.	<b>3</b>

### 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 17 days to 596 days. The statewide average length of stay was 155 days.

**Table 3. Days in Program**

<b>Host County</b>	<b>Average Length of Stay</b>	<b>Number of Terminations</b>
Burke	117	11
Cumberland	172	7
Dare <sup>1</sup>	458	3
Davidson	167	6
Durham	54	4
Onslow	179	17
Rockingham	125	19
Wayne	139	6
<b>Average</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>73</b>

### Program Cost

As legislatively mandated, no one program received more than \$100,000 of DACJJ funds. Table 4 illustrates the total youth served, actual program expenditures, and annual cost for FY 2014-2015 which averaged \$6,109 per youth. Two programs (in Burke and Wayne counties) spent additional funds that were secured by the sponsoring agency from other funding sources.

<sup>1</sup> Two of the three terminated juveniles had Level II probation terms extended and services were requested to continue.

**Table 4. Program Cost**

<b>Host County (Program Type)</b>	<b>Total Youth Served</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure</b>	<b>Cost Per Youth</b>
Burke (Parent/Family Skill Building)	14	\$91,463	\$6,533
Cumberland (Parent/Family Skill Building)	10	\$88,801	\$8,880
Dare (Home Based Family Counseling)	9	\$88,718	\$9,857
Davidson (Mentoring)	11	\$86,022	\$7,820
Durham (Home Based Family Counseling)	8	\$40,127	\$5,015
Onslow (Home Based Family Counseling)	26	\$92,663	\$3,563
Rockingham (Home Based Family Counseling)	26	\$99,155	\$3,813
Wayne (Home Based Family Counseling)	9	\$103,459	\$11,495
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>\$690,408</b>	<b>\$6,109</b>

**Exit from Program**

Table 5 illustrates the 73 youth who exited the projects in FY 2014-2015. Fifty-four youth (74%) 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**

<b>County</b>	<b>Successful Completion</b>	<b>Satisfactory Completion</b>	<b>Unsuccessful Completion</b>	<b>Non-compliance</b>	<b>Total</b>
Burke	6	0	5	0	<b>11</b>
Cumberland	1	5	1	0	<b>7</b>
Dare	1	1	1	0	<b>3</b>
Davidson	1	1	3	1	<b>6</b>
Durham	1	1	2	0	<b>4</b>
Onslow	15	1	0	1	<b>17</b>
Rockingham	5	11	3	0	<b>19</b>
Wayne	2	2	2	0	<b>6</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>73</b>

Table 6 illustrates the living arrangements for those 73 youth upon exit from the program which shows 59 youth (80.8%) were living in the community with their parent(s) or guardian; ten youth (13.7%) were in a treatment facility; two youth (2.7%) were in a youth development center, detention or county jail; and another two youth (2.7%) had some “Other” living arrangement.

**Table 6. Youth Living Arrangement at Exit**

County	At Home with Parent(s) or Guardian	Treatment Facility	YDC / Detention / County Jail	Other	Total
Burke	11	0	0	0	<b>11</b>
Cumberland	6	1	0	0	<b>7</b>
Dare	2	0	1	0	<b>3</b>
Davidson	6	0	0	0	<b>6</b>
Durham	4	0	0	0	<b>4</b>
Onslow	11	5	0	1	<b>17</b>
Rockingham	15	2	1	1	<b>19</b>
Wayne	4	2	0	0	<b>6</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>73</b>

### Recidivism

Table 7 illustrates youth who exited the projects during the past two fiscal years (FY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015) and incurred additional delinquent complaints in the juvenile justice system.

**Table 7. Recidivism Measure 1**

Youth Receiving an Additional Juvenile Complaint Post-Discharge		
Measure	0 to 6 Months	0 to 12 Months
Distinct Youth who had at Least 6 or 12 Months in the Community	153	124
Distinct Youth with Additional Delinquent Complaints	16	17
<b>Percentage of Youth with Additional Delinquent Complaints</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>14%</b>

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

**Table 8. Recidivism Measure 2**

Youth Receiving a Juvenile Adjudication or Adult Conviction Post-Discharge		
Measure	0 to 6 Months	0 to 12 Months
Distinct Youth who had at Least 6 or 12 Months in the Community	153	124
Distinct Youth with Juvenile Delinquent Adjudications	13	13
Percentage of Youth with Delinquent Adjudications	8%	10%
Distinct Youth with Adult Convictions	7	13
Percentage of Youth with Adult Convictions	5%	10%
Distinct Youth with Juvenile Adjudication(s) or Adult Conviction(s) <sup>2</sup>	19	25
<b>Juvenile Adjudications + Adult Convictions</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>20%</b>

<sup>2</sup> At 6 months, 1 juvenile had a juvenile adjudication and an adult conviction; at 12 months, 1 juvenile had a juvenile adjudication and an adult conviction.

In comparison, according to the most recent NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission's (SPAC) *Juvenile Recidivism Study: Sample FY 2010/11*, 36.0% 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-seven percent (97%) of the youth exiting the projects were in a non-secure living arrangement while only three percent (3%) of the youth exiting the projects were committed to a youth development center or were placed in county jail.
- Seventy-four percent (74%) of the youth exiting the projects completed their programming at a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals.
- Twelve percent (12%) of the distinct juveniles who could be followed for a full 6 months post-discharge received a delinquent adjudication or an adult conviction while 20% received a delinquent adjudication or an adult conviction at 12 months post discharge.
- The average cost per youth in the Alternatives for Commitment Programs was \$6,109 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$126,481. 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.