



North Carolina Department of Public Safety

Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice

Roy Cooper, Governor
Erik A. Hooks, Secretary

Reuben Young, Interim Chief Deputy Secretary

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Erik A. Hooks, Secretary *EAH*
Reuben Young, Interim Chief Deputy Secretary *RY*

RE: Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Report

DATE: March 1, 2018

Pursuant to G. S. 143b-1155(c), the Department of Public Safety, Community Corrections Section, shall report by March 1 of each year to the Chairs of the Senate and House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety on the status of the programs funded through the Treatment for Effective Community Supervision Program. The report shall include the following information from each of the following components:

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

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



An Equal Opportunity Employer

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

- (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.)*



**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, 2018

**Roy Cooper
Governor**

**Erik A. Hooks
Secretary**

I. 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, treatment, and reentry-related 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 97 counties during FY 16-17. 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)

Due to Justice Reinvestment, the Department is also more focused on providing reentry services to the growing number of individuals released from prison on post-release supervision. Local Reentry Councils (LRC) is 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 16-17.

(1) Recidivism Reduction Services (RRS)

a. Method by which offenders are referred to the program:

All referrals are generated through the automation process on the Offender Case Plan. Offenders can also be recommended by TASC Care Managers as a result of the TASC Assessment.

b. Target population:

The eligible pool of offenders for RRS programming is the population of offenders in each county who have been assessed as Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 in terms of supervision level. Generally speaking, 60.87% of the population under community supervision is 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 20,742 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 16-17 was the second 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 second 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 FY equaling 25% of the contract total (the amount a vendor could possibly earn providing services).

Expenditures for FY 16-17 increased by 75% compared to last fiscal year due to the Vendors becoming more familiar and comfortable with the RRS performance-based contracting approach as well as the department awarding contracts to 17 additional counties. The upward trend is anticipated to continue as we strive to have all 100 counties with RRS by the end of the current fiscal year. The Department is currently considering an increase in the percentage payout structure of the RRS contracts as an incentive to achieve successful outcomes (reducing recidivism).

Total amount of contracts - \$11,408,628.25

Total Expenditures - \$4,210,455.85

Note: The legislative report asks specifically about the total amount of contracts and total expenditures for the RRS program. Since these are performance-based contracts, the total amount of contracts is a derived figure based on the assumption that each vendor achieves all milestones with all offenders and is used by Purchasing for contractual purposes only. It is a separate and distinct figure that is derived for the purpose of creating a purchase order with each vendor. Therefore, it is not appropriate to compare this derived figure with the budget or the expenditures for this program.

d. The supervision type:

Table 1: (1) d. Recidivism Reduction Services Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 16-17

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	6,798
Post-Release	1,547
Parole	23
Total	8,368

e. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 2: (1) e. Recidivism Reduction Services Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 16-17

Risk Level	Count
R1	2,039
R2	2,788
R3	2,740
R4	712
R5	78
Not Leveled	21
Total	8,368

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 16-17

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
CBI Group Therapy	1,715	33%	551	11%	2,199	40%	328	6%	605	12%	5,217
ROP Treatment	345	29%	163	14%	442	37%	146	12%	89	8%	1,185
CBI Booster Sessions	1,294	83%	67	4%	113	7%	24	2%	63	4%	1,561
ROP Aftercare	200	62%	24	7%	53	16%	19	6%	26	8%	322
Total	3,554	43%	805	10%	2,626	32%	517	6%	783	9%	8,285

**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 16-17

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	16	126	22	208	2	34	408	5%
19-21	70	291	57	641	6	80	1,145	14%
22-25	149	468	100	911	8	75	1,711	20%
26-30	260	555	94	832	7	61	1,809	22%
31-35	212	437	66	459	12	31	1,217	15%
36-40	140	257	39	320	12	20	788	9%
41-45	93	183	38	169	3	7	493	6%
46-50	62	142	36	122	3	9	374	4%
51-55	30	77	23	108	2	10	250	3%
56-60	9	29	7	62	2	1	110	1%
61-65	3	8	2	36	0	2	51	1%
66-70	0	5	0	4	0	0	9	<1%
71+	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	<1%
Total	1,044	2,581	484	3,872	57	330	8,368	
	(12%)	(31%)	(6%)	(46%)	(1%)	(4%)		

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 16-17

	Completed		Open/Ongoing		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Mandatory Services											
Health/Nutrition	160	12%	1,158	87%	0	-	0	-	6	<1%	1,332
Employment Services	93	9%	977	90%	2	0%	0	-	1	<1%	1,082
Education	65	10%	569	88%	0	-	0	-	2	<1%	643
Total	318		2,704		2		0		9		3,057

Table 6: (1) h. ii. Recidivism Reduction Optional Service Outcomes Population Served FY 16-17

	Completed		Open/Ongoing		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Optional Services											
Parenting Classes	19	8%	229	92%	1	<1%	0	-	0	-	249
Family Counseling	6	2%	260	98%	0	-	0	-	0	-	266
Child Care Services	0	-	36	100%	0	-	0	-	0	-	36
Total	25		525		1		0		0		551

*Open/Ongoing represents offenders continuing to receive those services at the end of the FY or awaiting those registered services.

i. Employment status at entry and exit:

Table 7: (1) i. Recidivism Reduction Employment Status at Entry & Exit Population Served FY 16-17

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	
Employed	1,693	704	63	2,460
Unemployed	838	2,275	179	3,292
Unknown	41	136	2,439	2,616
Total	2,572	3,115	2,681	8,368

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

Table 8: (1) j. Recidivism Reduction Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 16-17

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	3,446	41%
Completed	1,273	15%
Revoked	206	2%
Terminated	1,656	20%
Moved to Unsupervised	1,501	18%
Other	286	3%
Total	8,368	

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 during FY 15-16 and they were not renewed after August 2016. This model of programming has been phased out and new programming options are being considered.

- 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 - \$457,931.00

Total Expenditures - \$65,351.05

c. The supervision type.

Table 9: (2) c. Community Intervention Centers Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 16-17

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	148
Post-Release	18
Total	166

d. The risk level of the offenders served.

Table 10: (2) d. Community Intervention Centers Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 16-17

Risk Level	Count
R1	38
R2	51
R3	52
R4	22
R5	1
Not Leveled	2
Total	166

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 16-17

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Non-Compliance		Inappropriate Referral		Other		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
ROP Treatment	32	24%	104	76%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	136
CBI Group Therapy	32	22%	113	78%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	145
CBI Booster Sessions	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5
Total	67	23%	219	77%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	286

**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 16-17

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	0	0	0	3	0	1	4	2%
19-21	0	2	2	20	0	0	24	14%
22-25	2	7	3	33	0	1	46	28%
26-30	1	4	5	26	0	0	36	22%
31-35	0	1	4	15	0	0	20	12%
36-40	2	0	1	15	0	0	18	11%
41-45	1	0	1	5	0	0	7	4%
46-50	1	1	1	2	0	0	5	3%
51-55	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1%
56-60	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	2%
61-65	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1%
66-70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
71+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	7 (4%)	16 (10%)	17 (10%)	124 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	166	

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

Table 13: (1) g. Community Intervention Centers Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 16-17

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	60	37%
Completed	24	15%
Revoked	30	19%
Terminated	43	27%
Moved to Unsupervised	4	2%
Other	5	3%
Total	166	

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.

Total amount of contract for non sex offender housing- \$1,263,880.00

Total Expenditures - \$1,246,020.00

c. The supervision type:

Table 14: (3) c. Transitional and Temporary Housing Supervision Type of Offenders Served FY 16-17

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	157
Post-Release	203
Total	360

d. The risk level of the offenders served:

Table 15: (3) d. Transitional and Temporary Housing Risk Level of Offenders Served FY 16-17

Risk Level	Count
R1	114
R2	134
R3	76
R4	21
R5	15
Not Leveled	114
Total	360

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 16-17

Core Service	Completed		Not Completed		Total
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
CBI Group Therapy	92	37%	155	63%	247
Regular Outpatient Substance Treatment	0	0%	31	100%	31
Total	92	33%	186	67%	278

f. The demographics of the population served:

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

Age Group	White		Black		Other		Total	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Count	Percent
13-18	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	1%
19-21	1	12	0	21	0	2	36	10%
22-25	4	23	1	15	0	0	43	12%
26-30	8	42	0	35	0	3	88	24%
31-35	10	25	1	18	0	1	55	15%
36-40	6	16	1	18	1	1	43	12%
41-45	1	9	0	11	0	2	23	6%
46-50	2	15	0	19	0	1	37	10%
51-55	1	3	0	10	0	0	14	4%
56-60	0	6	0	7	0	0	13	4%
61-65	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	1%
66-70	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	<1%
Total	33 (9%)	154 (43%)	3 (1%)	159 (44%)	1 (<1%)	10 (3%)	360	

g. The employment status at entry and exit:

Table 18: (3) g. Transitional and Temporary Housing Employment Status at Entry & Exit Population Served FY 16-17

Employment Status at Entry	Employment Status at Exit			Total
	Employed	Unemployed	Unknown	
Employed	48	9	0	57
Unemployed	141	148	5	294
Unknown	3	1	5	9
Total	192	158	10	360

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

Table 19: (3) h. Transitional and Temporary Housing Supervision Outcomes Population Served FY 16-17

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	101	28%
Completed	97	27%
Revoked	123	34%
Terminated	30	8%
Moved to Unsupervised	7	2%
Other	2	1%
Total	360	

Other includes offender died and failed to comply

(4) Local Reentry Councils (LRC)

a. The target population:

The primary target population is offenders currently under community supervision including Probation, Post-Release, or Parole. In FY 16-17, five (5) LRCs across the state served 941 individuals. These sites include Buncombe, Mecklenburg, Pitt, Nash/Edgecombe/Wilson, and Hoke/Scotland/Robeson. During this fiscal year, a new automated case management system called Community Automated Reentry Tool (CART) was implemented for Local Reentry Councils to utilize for case planning, case management and tracking reentry services and outcomes. CART was available to the sites as of November 2016, and this report covers services rendered between January-June 2017. The LRCs served a total of 941 individuals during FY 16-17 as tracked in CART and 584 were previously or currently under NCDPS care and supervision. 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. The core services include housing assistance, employment assistance, transportation assistance, child care assistance, and referrals to substance abuse and mental health services.

To report on requested supervision outcomes, these data are based on 439 individuals with complete information as tracked by CART (of the 584 served by LRCs) who was either recently released from a state prison or on community supervision during FY 16-17.

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

Total amount of contracts - \$627,032.00

Total Expenditures - \$592,783.00

c. The supervision type:

Table 20: (4) c. CART Clients by Supervision Type during FY 16-17

Supervision Type	Count
Probation	234
Post-Release	201
Parole	4
Total	439

d. The risk level of the offenders served:

Table 21: (4) d. Risk Level of Offenders Served Through CART during FY 16-17

Risk Level	Count
R1	101
R2	126
R3	131
R4	33
R5	1
Not Leveled	19
Total	411

** Risk Level Information available for 411 offenders out of a total of 439 client ID matches between CART and OPUS*

e. The number of supportive services provided:

Count of reentry activities includes multiple contacts with participants

Table 22: (4) e. Local Reentry Council Supportive Services Provided FY 16-17

Supportive Services	Total
*Employment	627
Clothing/Food/Hygiene	127
Vocational Training	8
Transportation	199
Housing	113
Academic Education	28
SA/MH Treatment	17
**Documentation	4
Life Skills	1
<u>Child Care</u>	<u>1</u>
	1,127

**Employment activities include job search and job placement.*

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

f. The demographics of the population served:

Table 24: (4) f. Age at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 16-17

Age Group	Total
16-20	46
21-29	318
30-39	269
40-49	181
50+	119
Not Recorded	8
Total	941

Table 25: (4) f. Gender at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 16-17

Gender	Total
Female	184
Male	754
Transgender	3
Total	941

Table 26: (4) f. Marital Status at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 16-17

Marital Status	Total
Single	831
Married	51
Divorced	33
Separated	13
Common Law	1
Domestic Partner	2
Widowed	8
Not Recorded	2
Total	941

Table 27: (4) f. Race at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 16-17

Race	Total
African American	618
Asian	5
Bi-Racial	5
Caucasian	158
Latino	8
Multi-Racial	1
Native American	129
Other	17
Total	941

Table 28: (4) f. Ethnicity at Intake of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils FY 16-17

Ethnicity	Total
Hispanic	13
Non-Hispanic	928
Total	941

g. Hourly Wages Received:

Table 29: (4) g. Hourly Wage of Offenders Served by Local Reentry Councils during FY 16-17

Starting Hourly Wage	Count
Minimum Wage	40
Min. Wage - \$8.00	34
\$8.01-\$9.00	67
\$9.01-\$10.00	76
\$10.00+	122
Total	339

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

Table 30: (4) h. Most Recent Outcome Status of Offenders Served Through CART during FY 16-17

Supervision Outcome	Count	Percent
Active Supervision	131	30%
Absconded	5	1%
Completed	141	32%
Revoked	87	20%
Terminated	54	12%
Moved to Unsupervised	11	3%
Other	10	2%
Total	439	100%

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 16-17 but could have possible contracts in the future.

Summary

Across the state, 9,835 offenders received services under the TECSP, and in some instances offenders may have been enrolled in multiple programs during the reporting period.

FY 16-17 was the first full year of services under the RRS programming as a performance based model. The RRS providers were trained throughout the fiscal year in implementing the new concept and given opportunities to share ideas with each other for stronger incentives on program engagement. By the end of the fiscal year, providers were starting to understand the model much better and learning to work harder on meeting the needs of each individual offender. High risk offenders are a difficult population to serve and therefore the providers had to be creative in motivating a change in behavior in order for the offender to see the benefits of RRS. The Department has worked closely with educating the providers on data entry and monitoring the 30 day milestones throughout the program assignment to increase completion rates and reduce the recidivism rate for the high/risk offender population.

By the end of FY 2017, 99 counties were under RRS contracts and the only remaining county without service was Hyde County. An existing vendor has expressed an interest in contracting services for Hyde and this would bring statewide coverage to all 100 counties.

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 RRS referral process has been enhanced through the case plan automation, making it easier for the supervising officer to reduce the time between referral, program intake, and receipt of services thereby increasing the opportunity for successful completion. This process continues to improve communication and information sharing between the assessing agencies (TASC), Community Corrections, and RRS providers further strengthening the continuum of care for the RRS priority population of high risk offenders.

While non sex offender housing contracts have increased and continue to be utilized throughout the state, the Department still faces significant opposition in providing sex offender housing. 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 promote legislative 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.

