



North Carolina Department of Public Safety

Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

Roy Cooper, Governor
Erik A. Hooks, Secretary

W. David Guice, Chief Deputy Secretary

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Erik A. Hooks, Secretary *EAH*
W. David Guice, Chief Deputy Secretary *WDG*

RE: Annual Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Report

DATE: March 1, 2017

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

- (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. (2011-145, s. 19.1(h), (k); 2011-192, s. 6(b); 2012-83, s. 56; 2014-100, s. 16C.7(b); 2016-94, s. 17C.4.)*

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 not-to-exceed (ceiling) of all RRS contracts. This derived figure is 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. As such, the budget for RRS in FY 15-16 was \$6,756,768 and expenditures were \$3,326,691 which translates to 49% of the budget being spent during last fiscal year.



**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, 2017

Roy Cooper
Governor

W. David Guice
Chief Deputy Secretary

Erik A. Hooks
Secretary

I. Legislation

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.
- (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. (2011-145, s. 19.1(h), (k); 2011-192, s. 6(b); 2012-83, s. 56; 2014-100, s. 16C.7(b); 2016-94, s. 17C.4.)

II. Introduction

The Justice Reinvestment Act was signed into law in June of 2011 (SL 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 and treatment services, and essentially represents an “umbrella” of funding. Under TECS, 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 80 counties during FY 15-16. The core services offered to offenders include cognitive behavioral interventions with 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)

CIC is offered 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.

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)

Local Reentry Councils (LRC) are organized networks of individuals and agencies that provide supervision and coordination of innovative responses to the reintegration of offenders/formerly incarcerated individuals in the local community. The LRC brings all the stakeholders together to assist with resources in helping formerly incarcerated individuals to become productive citizens,

reduce recidivism and victimization. Service Providers consist of local and faith-based community organizations that offer direct services such as housing assistance, employment services, food, clothing, vocational training, transportation, substance abuse and mental health treatment, mentoring programs and any other supportive services.

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, life skills, crisis planning, disease and recovery management, and treatment support activities for those with physical disability, co-occurring mental illness, and developmental differences.

The following sections provide specific information about the status of each program funded under TECSP during FY 15-16.

(1) Recidivism Reduction Services (RRS)

a. The 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. The 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. Generally speaking, 64% of the population under community supervision are 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 targets 20,822 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 15-16 was the first 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. Contracts for service were issued after the start of the fiscal year, and covered 9 months of operations. In addition, Vendors did experience some challenges in entering program data correctly which resulted in lower payments during the time period than expected. Additionally, the performance-based contracts included an upfront payment equaling, on average, 25% of the contract total (the amount a vendor could possibly earn providing services). However, these upfront payments were not allowed and vendors received the bonus award in monthly increments. Subsequent legislation has changed this

important aspect of the performance-based contracts. Expenditures are expected to be much higher in future years as Vendors become more comfortable with the RRS performance-based contracting approach.

Total amount of contracts - \$10,088,000

Total Expenditures - \$2,407,543

d. The supervision type.

Table 1: (1) d. Recidivism Reduction Services Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	7,138
Post-Release	1,259
Parole	37
Total	8,434

e. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 2: (1) e. Recidivism Reduction Services Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Risk Level	Count
R1	1,652
R2	2,675
R3	3,147
R4	851
R5	89
Not Leveled	20
Total	8,434

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

Table 3: (1) f. Recidivism Reduction Core Service Outcomes for Offenders Served FY 15-16

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
CBI Group Therapy	1,919	34%	1,649	30%	1,558	28%	156	3%	288	5%	5,570
Regular Outpatient Substance Treatment	404	34%	453	38%	231	20%	63	5%	28	2%	1,179
Intensive Outpatient Substance Abuse	28	26%	79	74%	0	>1%	0	>1%	0	>1%	107
CBI Booster Sessions	974	83%	85	7%	79	7%	7	1%	32	3%	1,177
ROP Aftercare	161	59%	69	25%	30	11%	10	4%	5	2%	275
CBI Computer Lab	42	44%	54	56%	0	>1%	0	>1%	0	>1%	96
Total	3,528	42%	2,389	28%	1,898	23%	236	3%	353	4%	8,404

**Successful completion mean 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: (1) g. Recidivism Reduction Demographics of Population Served FY 15-16

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	18	131	15	196	7	39	406	5%
19-21	98	328	61	604	12	99	1,202	14%
22-25	186	529	124	984	13	80	1,916	23%
26-30	248	506	126	795	13	48	1,736	21%
31-35	223	358	60	446	10	33	1,130	13%
36-40	148	204	59	339	11	16	777	9%
41-45	103	149	29	175	4	18	478	6%
46-50	65	123	28	133	2	6	357	4%
51-55	41	70	29	112	3	5	260	3%
56-60	12	36	10	55	0	5	118	1%
61-65	1	10	3	21	1	2	38	>1%
66-70	0	5	0	9	0	0	14	>1%
71+	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	>1%
Total	1,143 (14%)	2,451 (29%)	544 (6%)	3,869 (46%)	76 (1%)	351 (4%)	8,434	

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

Table 5: (1) h. i. Recidivism Reduction Mandatory Service Outcomes Population Served FY 15-16

Mandatory Services	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Health/Nutrition	431	72%	46	8%	95	16%	15	2%	14	2%	601
Employment Services	337	63%	45	8%	117	22%	17	3%	15	3%	531
Education	246	62%	33	8%	92	23%	13	3%	15	4%	399
Total	1,014		124		304		45		44		1,531

Table 6: (1) h. ii. Recidivism Reduction Optional Service Outcomes Population Served FY 15-16

Optional Services	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Parenting Classes	73	76%	8	8%	11	11%	3	3%	1	1%	96
Family Counseling	55	74%	3	4%	11	15%	3	4%	2	3%	74
Child Care Services	6	75%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	8
Total	134		11		24		6		3		178

- i. Employment status at entry and exit.

Table 7: (1) i. Recidivism Reduction Employment Status at Entry & Exit Population Served FY 15-16

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	
Employed	1,875	810	89	2,774
Unemployed	888	2,447	318	3,653
Unknown	48	161	1,798	2,007
Total	2,811	3,418	2,205	8,434

- j. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination

Table 8: (1) j. Recidivism Reduction Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 15-16

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	3,153	37%
Completed	1,342	16%
Revoked	1,432	17%
Terminated	1,944	23%
Moved to Unsupervised	389	5%
Other	174	2%
Total	8,434	

Other includes offender died and failed to comply

(2) 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 are 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 and were not renewed. During FY 15-16 contracts expired for Buncombe, Durham and Mecklenburg on October 9, 2015, therefore expenditures during this fiscal year only reflect CIC services in 3 counties (Forsyth, Guilford, and Pitt).

- a. The target population

Includes high risk and high need male and female adult (18 years or older) offenders under probation and/or post release/parole supervision and at risk for revocation.

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

Total amount of contract - \$1,345,444

Total Expenditures - \$352,290

c. The supervision type.

Table 9: (2) c. Community Intervention Centers Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	495
Post-Release	57
Parole	5
Total	557

d. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 10: (2) d. Community Intervention Centers Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Risk Level	Count
R1	84
R2	189
R3	232
R4	50
R5	2
Not Leveled	84
Total	557

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

Table 11: (2) e. Community Intervention Centers Core Service Outcomes for Offenders Served FY 15-16

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Regular Outpatient Substance Treatment	119	23%	400	77%	0	0%	1	>1%	0	0%	520
CBI Group Therapy	118	23%	401	77%	0	0%	1	>1%	0	0%	520
CBI Booster Sessions	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8
Total	243	23%	803	77%	0		2	>1%	0		1,048

**Successful completion mean 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*

**Offenders are counted in the services attended, and therefore may be counted more than once*

f. The demographics of the population served.

Table 12: (2) f. Community Intervention Centers Demographics of Population Served FY 15-16

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	0	3	1	22	0	2	28	5%
19-21	1	15	7	63	0	7	93	17%
22-25	4	15	12	129	0	1	161	29%
26-30	5	7	11	82	2	0	107	19%
31-35	2	8	4	38	0	2	54	10%
36-40	6	8	3	23	0	0	40	7%
41-45	2	7	0	25	0	0	34	6%
46-50	0	1	2	16	0	0	19	3%
51-55	0	0	2	12	1	0	15	3%
56-60	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	1%
61-65	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0%
66-70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
71+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	20 (4%)	64 (11%)	42 (8%)	416 (75%)	3 (1%)	12 (2%)	557	

g. Supervision outcomes, including completion, revocation, and termination

Table 13: (1) g. Community Intervention Centers Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 15-16

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	255	46%
Completed	61	11%
Revoked	62	11%
Terminated	144	26%
Moved to Unsupervised	23	4%
Other	12	2%
Total	557	

Other includes offender died and failed to comply

(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 confirmed home plan, and do not have any family or community resources willing to provide suitable living arrangements.

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. Contracts were in place for non sex offender housing and for sex offender housing during the FY 15-16. However, during the reporting period, the Department decided to end the sex offender housing contracts due to concerns raised by community residents in proximity to the housing locations.

Total amount of contract for non sex offender housing- \$1,380,895

Total Expenditures - \$1,085,930

Total amount of contract for sex offender housing - \$158,410

Total Expenditures - \$17,143

c. The supervision type.

Table 14: (3) c. Transitional and Temporary Housing Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	165
Post-Release	208
Parole	2
Total	375

d. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 15: (3) d. Transitional and Temporary Housing Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Risk Level	Count
R1	119
R2	120
R3	104
R4	23
R5	9
Not Leveled	119
Total	375

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

Table 16: (3) e. Transitional and Temporary Housing Core Service Outcomes for Offenders Served FY 15-16

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
CBI Group Therapy	79	31%	172	69%	251
Regular Outpatient Substance Treatment	4	5%	71	95%	75
Total	83	25%	243	75%	326

f. The demographics of the population served.

Table 17: (3) f. Transitional and Temporary Housing Demographics of Population Served FY 15-16

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	0	2	0	5	0	0	7	2%
19-21	0	19	0	14	0	0	33	9%
22-25	6	34	1	33	0	2	76	20%
26-30	10	30	0	22	0	0	62	17%
31-35	7	33	1	22	0	0	63	17%
36-40	6	16	0	13	0	3	38	10%
41-45	1	12	0	16	0	0	29	8%
46-50	2	8	1	18	0	0	29	8%
51-55	0	13	0	10	0	1	24	6%
56-60	0	6	0	3	0	1	10	3%
61-65	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	1%
Total	32 (9%)	174 (46%)	3 (1%)	159 (42%)	0	7 (2%)	375	

g. The employment status at entry and exit.

Table 18: (3) g. Transitional and Temporary Housing Employment Status at Entry & Exit Population Served FY 15-16

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	
Employed	59	4	0	63
Unemployed	192	111	4	307
Unknown	0	2	3	5
Total	251	117	7	375

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

Table 19: (3) h. Transitional and Temporary Housing Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 15-16

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	113	30%
Completed	130	35%
Revoked	100	27%
Terminated	27	7%
Moved to Unsupervised	3	1%
Other	2	1%
Total	375	

Other includes offender died and failed to comply

(4) **Local Reentry Councils (LRC)**

a. The target population.

The primary target population are offenders currently under community supervision including Probation, Post-Release, or Parole. In FY 15-16, the LRCs in Buncombe, Mecklenburg, Pitt, Nash/Edgecombe/Wilson and Hoke/Scotland/Robeson served 969 individuals. However, any individual in the Reentry Council community who has been involved in the criminal justice system or recently released from local confinement or the federal system are eligible for reentry services through the Local Reentry Council. Therefore, 149 non DPS individuals also received LRC services. The core services include housing assistance, employment assistance, transportation assistance, child care assistance, and referrals to substance abuse and mental health services.

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

Total amount of contracts - \$850,000.00

Total Expenditures - \$684,510.84

c. The supervision type.

Table 20: (4) c. Local Reentry Councils Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	826
Post-Release	116
Parole	27
Total	969

d. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 21: (4) d. Local Reentry Councils Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 15-16

Risk Level	Count
R1	102
R2	161
R3	216
R4	90
R5	13
Not Leveled	387
Total	969

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

Table 22: (4) 3. i. Credential Completed Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 15-16

Type of Credential	Number Completed
Vocational	54
Educational	36
Total	90

Table 23: (4) 3. i. Local Reentry Council Activities Provided FY 15-16

Active Type	Services Provided
Educational	190
Vocational	1,258
Job Search	2,617
Job Placement	798
Develop Partnerships	32

Count of reentry activities includes multiple contacts with participants

Table 24: (4) 3. i. Local Reentry Council Supportive Services Provided FY 15-16

Supportive Services	Services Provided
Employment	852
Clothing/Food	586
Vocational Training	500
Transportation	406
Housing	246
Academic Education	92
SA/MH Treatment	6
Family Support	1

Count of reentry activities includes multiple contacts with participants

- f. The demographics of the population served.

Table 25: (4) f. i. Gender and Age at Intake of Offender's Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 15-16

Age Group	Males	Females	Total
13-18	19	2	21
19-21	72	9	81
22-25	154	31	185
26-30	174	41	215
31-35	149	46	195
36-40	105	22	127
41-45	103	21	124
46-50	68	12	80
51-55	56	5	61
56-60	17	6	23
61-65	6	0	6
Total	923	195	1,118

Table 26: (4) f. i. Education Level of Offender's Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 15-16

Education Level	Count
High School or Less	416
High School Diploma or Equivalency	598
Some College	63
Unknown	56
Associates' Degree	4
Bachelor's Degree	2
Total	1,139

g. The employment status at entry and exit including, wherever possible, the average wage received at entry and exit.

Table 27: (4) g. Employment Status at Intake of Offender's Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 15-16

Employment Status	Count
Not Employed	1,031
Employed	102
Unknown	6
Total	1,139

The average starting salary for offenders served by Local Reentry Councils is \$10.80/hour.

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

Table 28: (4) h. Local Reentry Council Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 15-16

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	210	22%
Completed	205	21%
Revoked	293	30%
Terminated	213	22%
Moved to Unsupervised	40	4%
Other	8	1%
Total	969	

Other includes offender died and failed to comply

(5) **Intensive Outpatient Services.** – The Department did not have any contract(s) for this service during FY 15-16.

Summary

Across the state, 10,335 offenders received services under the TECSP, and in some instances offenders may have been enrolled in multiple programs during the reporting period.

In 2015, the Department changed the RRS program to a performance based concept which presented some challenges. The RRS programming did not actually begin until late September 2015 or early October 2015 in some counties. Initially, there were 80 counties awarded in September, 2015. By December 2015 we had lost services in six counties. The early spending was very low as the Vendors learned the new way of invoicing and the importance of utilizing engagement techniques to reach the desired outcomes. The highest payout to the vendors occurs at the 60 and 90 day milestones. However, the Vendors were losing many offenders during the first 30 days. The learning curve was much steeper than the Department anticipated and it has taken more time for Vendors to recognize the importance of working hard in the beginning to keep the offender engaged in the treatment process in order to be successful. Overall, RRS has proven to be effective with the high risk/high need offender population.

In addition to the core services of CBI and regular outpatient substance abuse treatment, offenders participated in support services such as education, employment, health/nutrition education, child care services, parenting classes and family counseling. The automation of the RRS referral process has reduced the time between referral, program intake, and receipt of services thereby increasing the opportunity for successful completion. This process has improved communication and information sharing between the assessing agency (TASC), Community Corrections, and RRS providers further strengthening the continuum of care for the RRS priority population of high risk offenders.

The Department faced other challenges during the fiscal year with the CIC program. Originally, there were 6 contracts in Buncombe, Durham, Forsyth, Guilford, Mecklenburg and Pitt. The decision to not renew the contracts in Buncombe, Durham and Mecklenburg was due to low participation numbers for the contract period. However, the contracts in Forsyth, Guilford and Pitt were extended until October 9, 2016.

While non sex offender housing has been consistently utilized throughout the fiscal year, the Department faced significant opposition to providing sex offender transitional housing even though it is the most critical need the agency faces in terms of supervising this population. The Department continues to look for solutions to addressing the housing and related treatment needs of the sex offender population to ensure public safety. However, finding a solution will require stakeholders to commit to educate, communicate, and legislate effective public policy regarding this issue.

In conclusion, the Department continues to work with community partners in developing effective, evidence-based programming for offenders in the care and custody of the agency. We are working to ensure that DPS staff and vendors not only understand the research on correctional interventions but also understand the importance of delivering quality programs in a consistent manner. And the ongoing challenge will be to keep the high risk offender engaged in services. Correctional research and practice dictates that in order for the program to be effective and have an impact on recidivism, offenders must remain engaged for a longer period of time and receive the appropriate dosage of services.