



N.C. Department of Public Safety

Division of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

FY 2025-2026 Intensive Intervention Services Request for Proposals

Introduction and Scope of Services

The Department of Public Safety, Division of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Community Programs Section (hereafter, Department) ensures that every community in North Carolina has access to a continuum of services for its juvenile population. The continuum of services includes those services titled Intensive Intervention Services under Session Law 2020-83 (<https://www.ncleg.gov/Sessions/2019/Bills/House/PDF/H593v7.pdf>).

Intensive Intervention Services are evidence-based or research-supported community-based or residential services that are necessary for a juvenile in order to (i) prevent the juvenile's commitment to a youth development center or detention facility, or (ii) facilitate the juvenile's successful return to the community following commitment. Intensive Intervention Services shall be used for the purpose of providing intensive intervention services for juveniles of any disposition level, based on the needs of the juvenile, as ordered pursuant to G.S. 7B-2506.

With the Raise the Age Legislation (<https://www.ncdps.gov/our-organization/juvenile-justice/key-initiatives/raise-age-nc>) in effect, an increasingly important piece of the continuum in Juvenile Justice is intensive intervention services. All adjudicated juveniles ages 10 and up, including juveniles who are ages 18 to 21 and still under the jurisdiction of juvenile court, may be accepted by Intensive Intervention Services, as appropriate for the proposed model.

The Department reserves the right to release Request for Proposals (RFP) that are location or program type specific based on identified priority needs.

The Department has identified program priorities within this RFP for the Intensive Intervention Services funding stream for Fiscal Year 25-26. These priorities are based on gaps and needs that have been identified for the Juvenile Justice population through various avenues. Applicants responding to this RFP are not limited to these program priorities in their response. Details regarding the prioritized programs are included in this posting. All requirements of this RFP posting must be met in order to be eligible for funding.

Priorities

Under this RFP, priority will be given to applications proposing programming which:

- a) Provide Substance Abuse Treatment (**identified by Juvenile Justice as the highest priority**),
- b) Serve the required target population (see below, **Target Population, Proposed Programming and Service Area**),
- c) Provide evidence-based/evidence-supported programming which will reduce recidivism for youth served,
- d) Deliver intensive intervention services (see **Attachment B: Priority Services and Definitions** for acceptable service types),
- e) Provide the identified services by Judicial District(s) and are regional programs that are delivered through the collaborative efforts of two or more Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils; and
- f) Include on-going collaboration with Juvenile Court Services personnel and other community partners.

Target Population

Target Population includes juveniles who meet the below criteria. This juvenile population will, hereafter, be referred to as the "target population".

- a) All adjudicated juveniles ages 10 and up, including juveniles who are ages 18 up to age 21 and still under the jurisdiction of juvenile court, may be accepted by Intensive Intervention Services as appropriate for the proposed model and the needs of the juvenile.
- b) Youth in need of substance abuse treatment.
- c) Youth in need of re-entry services (step-down services from residential placement or other community placement).
- d) Youth can only be referred by juvenile justice staff by coordination through the Juvenile Court Counselor.
- e) The primary target populations for the identified services are juveniles who have received a Level II Disposition and their parent(s)/guardian(s) of those juveniles. Level III juveniles on community commitment and/or transitioning from a Youth Development Center are also eligible.
- e) Identified Diverted and/or Level I adjudicated juveniles, with a Medium/High Risk or a Medium/High Needs Score may be referred as an exception but only with prior approval by the Chief Court Counselor of the referring county and by the Community Programs Section.

Additional target population descriptions (*juveniles charged with sex offenses or identified problematic sexual behavior*) are included in **Attachment D: Prioritized Programs**. Unless otherwise stated, the target population described in this RFP also applies to the target population of the prioritized programs.

Proposed Programming must:

- a) Include evidence-based/supported approaches for residential services, only for juveniles with high level of care needs and/or community-based intensive services and/or re-entry services (step-down services from residential placement) for target population juveniles and their families.
- b) Fill a gap in the service delivery continuum within the local community (services that are a duplication of efforts already being undertaken in the local community will not be considered for funding);
- c) Serve only the target population;
- d) Offer a service component that is therapeutic and family-focused; and
- e) Address the needs of the target population.

Service Area

If the program serves more than a single county, the service area must:

- a) Encompass the area as defined by a Judicial District(s), identifying a lead county for which the disbursement of awarded funds will be delivered through the local county finance office; and/or
- b) Be regional and the provider must engage collaboratively with two or more Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils within or among Judicial District(s) to provide the identified dispositional alternatives for juveniles within that/those Judicial District(s).

See Attachment A: DPS Area Counties and Judicial Districts

Program Priorities

The Department has identified program priorities for Intensive Intervention Services funding in Fiscal Year 25-26. These priorities are based on gaps and needs that have been identified for the Juvenile Justice population through various avenues. Applicants responding to this RFP are not limited to these program priorities in their response.

The program priorities are as follows:

- a) Programming:
 - i. to provide **substance abuse treatment** to juveniles in all areas of the state (**highest priority**); and
 - ii. to assess and treat juveniles with **sex offenses or identified problematic sexual behavior**, particularly a resource need in the Central and Eastern areas.
- b) Enhanced Assessments for those juveniles that are adjudicated with a suspicion of a Severe Emotional Disturbance/Severe Mental Illness/Intellectual and Developmental Disability/Developmental Delay diagnosis and meet the criteria for Youth Development Centers or Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities.

See Attachment D: Prioritized Programs for programmatic requirements for these priority areas.

The Department is requiring that any vendor applying for funding for any program or service type identified as "Foster Care" in Attachment B: Priority Services and Definitions, must be willing to take crisis placement youth from any county across the state of North Carolina. This requirement must be clearly described in the application.

Eligibility

All applicants must:

- a) Be a public agency or private non-profit organization (14B NCAC 11B.0201);
- b) Submit proposals that clearly align with identified and documented service needs as assessed through the local Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) or via collaboration of two or more JCPCs that have established a need for residential (only for juveniles with high level of care needs) and/or non-residential community-based intensive services for the target population, and can provide evidence-based services that can clearly support targeted needs;
- c) Demonstrate a proven track record of implementing residential and/or community-based intensive services for the youth described in this RFP, effective fiscal oversight, and collaboration with Juvenile Court Services;
- d) Demonstrate organizational capacity for fiscal, programmatic, and administrative accountability and the ability to begin operations quickly and efficiently; and
- e) Collaborate with Juvenile Court Services personnel and other community partners to develop 24-hour supervision plans when providing services to all Level III/PRS youth and, to Level II youth as needed.

NOTE: Level III/PRS, Community Commitment youth receiving services on community commitment placement require a 24-hour supervision plan developed by the provider, court services, youth, family, and any other collaborating partners. This process must be clearly described in the program application.

Funding Period

The funding period for this RFP is July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2026, and contingent upon available funds.

Proposal Requirements and Submission Process

To be considered for funding, applicants must:

- a) Show that the proposed services meet an identified service need within the proposed geographic area(s) of service delivery to the target population;
- b) Complete and submit an online application in NCALLIES **no later than 11:59 p.m. on February 26, 2025**. The application can be accessed by [clicking here](#) and following the directions listed on the webpage. All applicants must submit an application under the funding source, "Intensive Intervention" in NCALLIES; and
- c) Choose a promising or effective program(s) from:

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Model Programs Guide <http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg>

OR

Office of Justice Programs (OJP) CrimeSolutions.gov <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/>

OR

Results First Clearinghouse Database

<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2015/results-first-clearinghouse-database>

OR

Thoroughly demonstrate how proposed services are evidence-supported and reduce recidivism for the targeted population;
and

- d) Upload (**not for profit organizations ONLY**) the following documents into NCALLIES:

Forms must be uploaded into NCALLIES in order for the application to be considered for funding.

- 1) No Overdue Tax Form (**must be notarized**);
- 2) DPS Conflict of Interest Policy Statement (**must be notarized**)
- 3) Non-profit agency's Proof of 501(c)(3) status; and
- 4) Non-profit agency's Conflict of Interest policy.

NOTE: #1 and #2 listed above can be accessed by [clicking here](#)

- e) Upload a letter of approved support into NCALLIES from the host county JCPC, or a copy of an email, offering support from the JCPC Chair (or member of the JCPC executive committee). The letter of support *must* be uploaded into NCALLIES prior to the State Review Team meeting to review applications (mid-March 2025) in order for the application to be considered for funding. The JCPC Chairperson Directory may be found by [clicking here](#)

NOTE: Letters of support must state, at a minimum, how the proposed services will:

- **Address the targeted population,**
- **Fill a gap in the service delivery continuum within the local community/geographic region;**
and
- **Not duplicate efforts already being undertaken in the local community.**

- f) Incorporate the Core Components, **see Attachment C: Core Components**, in application responses.

Evaluation

Pursuant to Session Law 2020-83 HB 593, "The Department of Public Safety shall conduct an annual evaluation of intensive intervention services. Intensive intervention services are evidence-based or research-supported community-based or residential services that are necessary for a juvenile in order to (i) prevent the juvenile's commitment to a youth development center or detention facility or (ii) facilitate the juvenile's successful return to the community following commitment. In conducting the evaluation, the Department shall consider whether participation in intensive intervention services results in a reduction of court involvement among juveniles. The Department shall also determine whether the programs are achieving the goals and objectives of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act, S.L. 1998-202.

The Department shall report the results of the evaluation to the Chairs of the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Justice and Public Safety and the Chairs of the Senate and House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety by March 1 of each year."

Review Criteria for Proposals

The Department will review each proposal for:

- a. Evidence-based or best practices and research-supported interventions appropriate to the target population proposed.
- b. Appropriateness of the program to address the needs of the target population identified.
- c. Services that fill a gap in the continuum within the local community/geographic region and do not duplicate efforts already being undertaken in the local community.
- d. Presentation of a budget that matches the proposed service. Budgets must have a clear and accurate calculation for each line item that shows how each cost was determined.
- e. Evidence of the agency's capacity to administer a DPS funded program, including ability to comply with reporting and accountability requirements in a timely manner.

The Department may consider the following:

- a. Programs that meet the criteria outlined for service types in **Attachment B: Priority Services and Definitions**.
- b. The commitment rates or frequency with which the court orders commitment as a disposition for the juveniles served.
- c. The criminogenic needs of the juveniles served.
- d. Programs that target juveniles in rural areas.
- e. Diverse geographical representation across the State.
- f. Programs that utilize collaboration among counties.
- g. Demonstration of community support with cash or in-kind resources, including but not limited to, county appropriations or Medicaid reimbursements. (Proposals that include community cash or in-kind resources in the project budget must include documentation of the intent to provide that support and justification of the value claimed.) **NOTE: Intensive Intervention Services funding requires no local match.**
- a. Programs that have historically met and exceeded program goals/measurable objectives when providing services to this population.

Selection process

The Department's State Office Review Team will review, and rate proposals based on the information provided in the application matching the requirements of this RFP and will present funding decisions to Division management for a final funding approval.

Timeline for RFP and Program Implementation

January 22, 2025 – February 26, 2025	Request for Proposals Advertised
January 29, 2025	RFP questions due to DJJDP Juvenile Community Programs, must be submitted no later than 11:59 pm
February 4, 2025	Answers posted to DJJDP RFP website no later than 11:59 pm
February 26, 2025 by 11:59 p.m.	Application Deadline <i>(Application <u>must be submitted</u> in NCALLIES along with any applicable required documents uploaded.)</i>
April 4, 2025	Anticipated notification of funding to applicants.
May 1, 2025	Revised/edited Program Application completed in NCALLIES.
July 1, 2025	Funding begins <i>(Contingent upon the completion of the required signatures in NCALLIES).</i>

Contact Information

NCALLIES Issues or Questions


Please contact the Area Consultant assigned to the host county applying for funds **on or before 5:00 pm on February 26, 2025**, see **Attachment E: DPS Area Consultant and County Assignments**.

RFP Questions

Upon review of the RFP documents, applicants may have questions to clarify or interpret the RFP in order to submit the best proposal possible. To accommodate the proposal questions process, applicants must submit questions by the above due date to **denise.briggs@ncdps.gov**.

Applicants must enter "IIS RFP Questions" in the subject line of the email and reference the RFP section for each question in the body of the email.

ATTACHMENT A: DPS Area Counties and Judicial Districts



☆ Chief Court Counselor
 ☆ Area Administrator

- Western Area 7 Districts, 28 Counties
- Piedmont Area 7 Districts, 19 Counties
- Central Area 8 Districts, 21 Counties
- Eastern Area 8 Districts, 32 Counties

ATTACHMENT B: Priority Services and Definitions

RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS

Programs where services are delivered in a residential setting.

Residential Services only for juveniles with high level of care needs.

Group Home Care: Provides twenty-four-hour care for a residential placement lasting six to eight months in a therapeutic or structured family-like environment for youth. Includes intervention with client's family during and after placement and targets a reduction in offending behavior and recidivism.

(Length of Stay= 90+ days, Frequency of Contact=NA)

Temporary Shelter Care: Provides group home care and shelter (up to 90 days) for juveniles who need to be temporarily removed from their homes during a family crisis.

(Length of Stay= up to 90 days, Frequency of Contact=NA)

Runaway Shelter Care: Provides shelter care for juveniles who have run away from home, are homeless or otherwise need short term care (15 days or less) while arrangements are made for their return home.

(Length of Stay= up to 15 days, Frequency of Contact=NA)

Specialized Foster Care: Provides care for youth with serious behavioral or emotional problems through foster parents whose special training is designed to help them understand and provide needed support for children who are placed in their care.

(Length of Stay= flexible, Frequency of Contact=NA)

Temporary Foster Care: Provides short-term (up to 60 days) emergency foster care for diverted or adjudicated juveniles who need to be temporarily removed from their home during a family crisis. Foster parents have been specially trained to understand and support the youth placed in their care.

(Length of Stay= up to 60 days, Frequency of Contact=NA)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Individual Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Group Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours=40)
- Mixed Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=25)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Contracting/Management

- Family Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=20, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Family Crisis Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=4, Optimal Target hours=8)
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)
- Behavior management (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours= 72) – The total programming structure and activities of the program are all tied into a behavior management environment which consists of earning points or tokens to achieve previously set goals. A behavior management classification should not be given to programs which merely use periodic rewards or incentives to increase motivation.

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Mentoring, Mixed Counseling, or Remedial Academic Program

- Social Skills Training (Optimal Target Weeks=16, Optimal Target hours=24)
- Remedial Academic Program (Optimal Target Weeks=26, Optimal Target hours=100)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Job Training, Work Experience, Vocational Counseling

COMMUNITY DAY PROGRAMS

Juvenile Structured Day Programs: Programs that offer well supervised and highly structured program of service to youth. Such service may enable youth to remain in the community. Clients may be long-term suspended from school or have behavior that might otherwise result in placement in detention. Typically, this type structure serves youth who are court involved and referrals are made from juvenile court counselors. Programs can either be full day or partial day (emphasis on service in the afternoon/after school hours). It is desirable for programs to have both treatment and educational components, such as, Individual and/or Family Counseling, Substance Abuse Education/Treatment, Restitution/Community Service, Tutoring, Alternative Education, Vocational Development and Structured Activities.
(Length of Stay= Not to exceed one year without detailed documentation of need, Frequency of Contact=NA)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Individual Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Group Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours=40)
- Mixed Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=25)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Contracting/Management

- Family Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=20, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Family Crisis Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=4, Optimal Target hours=8)
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)
- Behavior management (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours= 72) – The total programming structure and activities of the program are all tied into a behavior management environment which consists of earning points or tokens to achieve previously set goals. A behavior management classification should not be given to programs which merely use periodic rewards or incentives to increase motivation.

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Mentoring, Mixed Counseling, or Remedial Academic Program

- Remedial Academic Program (Optimal Target Weeks=26, Optimal Target hours=100)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Job Training, Work Experience, Vocational Counseling

ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

Clinical Assessments or Psychological Evaluations: Clinical Evaluations and Assessments, including Psychological Evaluations to help court counselors and judges recommend the most appropriate consequences and treatment for court involved youth.

(Length of Stay= depends upon time needed to complete the assessment activity,
Frequency of Contact=Not Specified)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- None

CLINICAL TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Programs in which a professional helps a juvenile and/or his or her families solve problems through goal directed planning. It may include individual, group, family counseling or a combination. It may have a particular focus such as sex offender treatment or substance abuse treatment. Services may be community or home based.

Counseling: A treatment technique based on one-on-one (individual) or group meetings with a therapist or counselor focusing on individual psychological and/or interpersonal problems. May include cognitive skills/life skills. Category includes family, individual, and group counseling.

(Length of Stay=Not Specified, Frequency of Contact= no less than every two weeks)

Individual Counseling

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Individual Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Mixed Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=25)

Could have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Contracting/Management

- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)

Group Counseling

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Group Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours=40)
- Mixed Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=25)

Could have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Contracting/Management

- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)

Family Counseling

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Family Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=20, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Family Crisis Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=4, Optimal Target hours=8)
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)

Home Based Family Counseling: Provides short term, intensive services focusing on family interactions/dynamics and their link to delinquent behavior. Involves the entire family and is typically conducted in the home. May also include the availability of a trained individual to respond by phone or in person to crisis. The goal is to prevent delinquent and undisciplined behavior by enhancing family functioning and self-sufficiency.

(Length of Stay=six weeks to nine months, Frequency of Contact= at least three hours weekly)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Family Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=20, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Family Crisis Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=4, Optimal Target hours=8)
- Mixed Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=25)

Could have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Contracting/Management

Substance Abuse Treatment: In/Out-patient therapeutic services provided to juvenile offenders targeting substance abuse issues, including chemical dependency, alcoholism, and habitual or experimental use of other controlled substances. Personnel providing treatment must be licensed or certified to provide these services.

(Assumed to be the same as Counseling Services: Length of Stay=Not Specified, Frequency of Contact= no less than every two weeks)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Individual Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Group Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours=40)
- Mixed Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=25)

Could have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Contracting/Management

- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)

Sexual Offender Treatment: Provides outpatient assessment and/or therapeutic services to juvenile offenders targeting inappropriate sexual conduct and offending behavior with clear focus on rehabilitation and accountability of the offender. Practiced primarily in groups, has a family focus, has designated follow-up procedures and is generally legally mandated.

(Length of Stay=1 ½ to 2 years, Frequency of Contact= weekly with declining frequency as the course of treatment concludes)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Individual Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=30)
- Group Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours=40)
- Mixed Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=25)

Could have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Contracting/Management

- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)

Note: *The target weeks and target hours for the above listed counseling approaches may not be sufficient for Sex Offender Treatment.*

RESTORATIVE PROGRAMS

Programs that offer immediate and short-term involvement with juveniles to focus on negative and/or offending behaviors with the aim of resolution of the presenting problem and extinction of behavior.

Restitution/Community Service

Restitution: Programs that provide opportunities for offender to be accountable for their actions to the community and/or victim(s) through forms of payments or community service work that earns money to repay the victim(s).

Community Service: A court-ordered dispositional alternative for a delinquent juvenile, consistent with the requirements of G.S. 7A-649, and entailing, on the juvenile's part, for purposes of this definition either community service to redress an injury to any person or entity that has suffered loss or damage as a result of the offense committed by the juvenile. Services should be provided for diverted and/or adjudicated youth.

(Length of Stay: Diverted youth and Teen Court referrals= no more than 6 months,

Court supervision = one year unless otherwise ordered; Frequency of Contact= minimum twice per month and no less than 8 hours per month)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Restitution/Community Service (Optimal Target Weeks= 9, Optimal Target hours= 38)

STRUCTURED ACTIVITIES PROGRAMS

Any non-residential program that provides a structured service plan of learning for the purpose of improving an individual's identified need(s) and with the purpose of improving the juveniles' (or parent's) skills or expanding their knowledge in a particular area or enhancing academic performance.

Mentoring: Provides opportunities for adult volunteers to be matched with delinquent or at-risk youth on a one-on-one basis. The mentor is an individual providing support, friendship, advice, and/or assistance to the juvenile. After recruitment, screening and training, the mentor spends time with the juvenile on a regular basis engaged in activities such as sports, movies, helping with homework, etc.

(Length of Stay= Minimum 1 year, Frequency of Contact= should average 2 hours per week)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Mentoring (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours=78)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Behavioral Management

- Behavior management (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours= 72) – The total programming structure and activities of the program are all tied into a behavior management environment which consists of earning points or tokens to achieve previously set goals. A behavior management classification should not be given to programs which merely use periodic rewards or incentives to increase motivation.

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Mentoring, Mixed Counseling, or Remedial Academic Program

Parent/Family Skill Building: Services that focus on interactional or interpersonal issues faced by a parent(s)/family of a juvenile. This service works to develop parenting skills, communication skills, discipline techniques, and other related skills. May include sessions for parents only and/or sessions for parents and their child(ren).

(Length of Stay= Minimum 12 weeks unless implementing a model program & following model specifications, Frequency of Contact= no less than 2 hours weekly)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Social Skills Training (Optimal Target Weeks=16, Optimal Target hours=24)

NOTE: If ONLY parents are the recipients of this service, then it cannot be SPEP classified. If the service includes the parent and child, drill down to see if the service is a Social Skills Training service or a Family Counseling service.

Interpersonal Skill Building: Services that focus on developing the social skills required for an individual to interact in a positive way with others. The basic skill model begins with an individual's goals, progresses to how these goals should be translated into appropriate and effective social behaviors, and concludes with the impact of the behavior on the social environment. Typical training techniques are instruction, modeling of behavior, practice and rehearsal, feedback, reinforcement. May also include training in a set of techniques, such as conflict resolution or decision making, that focus on how to effectively deal with specific types of problems or issues that an individual may confront in interacting with others.

Length of Stay= Minimum 12 weeks unless implementing a model program & following model specifications, Frequency of Contact= no less than 2 hours weekly)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Social Skills Training (Optimal Target Weeks=16, Optimal Target hours=24)
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Optimal Target Weeks=15, Optimal Target hours=45)
- Behavior management (Optimal Target Weeks=24, Optimal Target hours= 72) – The total programming structure and activities of the program are all tied into a behavior management environment which consists of earning points or tokens to achieve previously set goals. A behavior management classification should not be given to programs which merely use periodic rewards or incentives to increase motivation.

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Mentoring, Mixed Counseling, or Remedial Academic Program

Experiential Skill Building: Services that provide opportunities to juveniles using activities to develop skills. The activities may be highly related to the acquisition of the skill (i.e. Independent living skills training taught by having juveniles practice life skills such as laundry, washing dishes, balancing a checkbook) or may include adventure activities (such as rock climbing, rafting, backpacking, etc.) aimed at increasing self-esteem and building interpersonal skills to promote more appropriate behavior.

(Length of Stay= Minimum 12 weeks unless implementing a model program & following model specifications, Frequency of Contact= no less than 2 hours weekl

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Challenge Programs (Optimal Target Weeks = 4, Optimal Target hours=60)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Group Counseling

Tutoring/Academic Enhancement: Services intended to supplement full time academic program by providing assistance with understanding and completing schoolwork and/or classes. May also provide trips designed to be an enrichment of or supplemental experience beyond the basic educational curriculum.

(Length of Stay= Minimum of 20 weeks, Frequency of Contact= No less than 2 hrs/week.)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Remedial Academic Program (Optimal Target Weeks=26, Optimal Target hours=100)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Job Training, Work Experience, Vocational Counseling

Vocational Development: The overall emphasis focuses on preparing the juvenile to enter the work force by providing actual employment, job placement, non-paid work service (non-restitution based), job training or career counseling. These programs provide training to juveniles in a specific vocation, career exploration or career counseling, and/or job readiness.

(Length of Stay= Minimum 12 weeks unless implementing a model program & following model specifications, Frequency of Contact= no less than 2 hours weekly)

POSSIBLE SPEP PRIMARY SERVICE CLASSIFICATIONS

For services which may be provided in the above types. Consider the following SPEP service types whether or not the service meets the optimal dosage.

- Vocational Counseling (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours = 40)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Remedial Academic Services

- Job Training (Optimal Target Weeks=25, Optimal Target hours=400)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Remedial Academic Services

- Job Placement (Optimal Target Weeks=26, Optimal Target hours=520)

Could also have possible qualifying Supplemental Service of Remedial Academic Services

ATTACHMENT C: Core Components

NOTE: IMPORTANT!!! Requirements outlined in this attachment are “scored” reflecting if the requirements in this attachment were met by the applicant.

- 1. Defined protocol for program services and delivery.** In **Section IV. #2 Operation** of the program application, the applicant must briefly describe either a manual or protocol that designates the method and manner of service delivery including the suggested number of sessions, content, and flow. Evidence of the said manual, or protocol, may include treatment/intervention outline, curriculum, workbook/instructor’s manual, lesson plan(s), or, a script. Individual Service/Treatment Plans are expected to show evidence of involvement of the juvenile and family in planning and are to include the client- specific concerns to be addressed, the intervention strategies to be utilized by the program staff to address those issues, and the planned/recommended frequency/duration of contact. Interventions, strategies, curriculum, frequency, and duration should clearly be consistent with the manual/protocol.
- 2 Staff Training.** The applicant must comply with **DPS JCPC and Community Programs Section Funded Programs Minimum Standards Policy that’s specific to the program type of services to be delivered**, in regard to staff and volunteer orientation and training. Direct program service staff must possess the necessary training requirements that include licenses when applicable, degrees, credentials, and certifications required for this program type. Training sessions in program service delivery, clinical supervision when applicable, case staffing and/or consultation sessions are to be documented and maintained. The policy manual can be accessed by [clicking here](#).
- 3. Internal Program Monitoring and Corrective Action.** In **Section IV. #3 Staff Positions** of the program application, the applicant must briefly describe an established process by which a specified staff member monitors the delivery of program services for the purpose of examining how closely actual implementation matches the model/ protocol. Deviations from the model/protocol are to be addressed through written corrective actions. All Corrective Action findings are to be specified in writing, monitored, documented, and addressed accordingly.
- 4 Staff Evaluation.** In **Section IV. #3 Staff Positions** of the program application, the applicant must briefly describe how staff will be evaluated on a specified schedule for compliance with the program/JCPC policies and model/protocol. Staff development plans are to be documented and implemented to address deviations and violations of program policies, models, or protocols. Overall work performance is to be formally and specifically appraised. Areas of improvement are to be identified including the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for enhancing program service delivery including, but not limited to customer service.
- 5. Program Effectiveness.** In **Section IV. #8 Intervention/Treatment** of the program application, the applicant must briefly describe program protocol for determining and evaluating the effectiveness of its delivery of program services with all accepted referrals. This protocol must include a standardized approach for collecting, maintaining, and sharing effectiveness data.

ATTACHMENT D: Prioritized Programs

- 1) Programming to provide Substance Abuse Treatment to juveniles charged with a substance related offense or identified with a substance abuse problem.
- 2) Programming to assess and treat juveniles charged with sex offenses or identified problematic sexual behavior:

Target Population:

- a) Juveniles under this program priority shall be adjudicated of sexual offense;
OR
- b) Charged with a sexual offense in pre-adjudication status when appropriate;
OR
- c) Have identified or suspected problematic sexual behavior that requires an assessment or that behavior has been previously assessed.

Applicants must include in their response detailed narratives addressing how their program will:

- a) Include evidence-based practices or evidence supported approaches for juveniles who have displayed problematic sexual behaviors or who have been adjudicated of sexual offense.
 - Provide information regarding formal or informal training successfully completed, addressing the clinical treatment of juveniles with a history of problematic sexual behaviors (PSB), specifying training programs/faculty and treatment modalities.
- b) Complete clinically driven, holistic, developmentally sensitive, and comprehensive assessments of a juvenile prior to initiating treatment and upon completion of treatment.
 - Provide information regarding formal or informal training successfully completed, addressing the clinical assessment of juveniles with a history of problematic sexual behaviors (PSB), specifying training programs/faculty and assessment strategies.
- c) Complete ongoing assessments and clinically monitor juvenile's progress throughout treatment.
- d) Offer a service component that focuses on family engagement and education about problematic sexual behaviors (PSB), PSB treatment, PSB treatment goals and expectations of caregivers during treatment.
- e) Engage in existing multi-disciplinary teams within the communities or provide a plan to create or participate in those multi-disciplinary teams. (Child and Family Teams are not the targeted example of a team for this multidisciplinary team reference.)
- f) Engage with Youth Development Centers, Group Homes, or Residential Treatment providers to help safely and efficiently transition juveniles to their home or to the community.
- g) Include the program's plan for ensuring fidelity and measuring effectiveness of the program.
- h) Submit data to the department, upon request, regarding the juveniles they serve to include juvenile and caregiver participation in services relative to clinical intervention requirements, clinical performance, clinical outcomes (pre and post treatment clinical assessment measures), and child welfare involvement.

Applicants must not:

- a) Utilize approaches that are identified as treatment with the adult sexual offender population; including but not limited to, conducting polygraphs or plethysmographs
- b) Only complete risk assessments regarding the behavior or utilize standardized assessments. Although often these types of assessments are required for the Juvenile Justice population, they cannot be the only assessment used to measure a juvenile's progress in treatment.

Data for this priority programing follows. **Note: Data for FY 24-25 YDC commitments and admission to JJ funded programs is not yet available.

System Flow of Sex Offenders

Juvenile Resident County	FY 21-22				FY 22-23				FY 23-24			
	Distinct Juveniles with Sex Offense (SO) Complaints	Distinct SO Juveniles Admitted to Detention within 90 days of Complaint Received and Detained Reason was not for YDC	Distinct SO Juveniles Committed to YDC after SO Complaint Received for the same or a new SO complaint	Distinct SO Juveniles Admitted to JJ Funded Programs in the year	Distinct Juveniles with Sex Offense (SO) Complaints	Distinct SO Juveniles Admitted to Detention within 90 days of Complaint Received and Detained Reason was not for YDC	Distinct SO Juveniles Committed to YDC after SO Complaint Received for the same or a new SO complaint	Distinct SO Juveniles Admitted to JJ Funded Programs in the year	Distinct Juveniles with Sex Offense (SO) Complaints	Distinct SO Juveniles Admitted to Detention within 90 days of Complaint Received and Detained Reason was not for YDC	Distinct SO Juveniles Committed to YDC after SO Complaint Received for the same or a new SO complaint	Distinct SO Juveniles Admitted to JJ Funded Programs in the year
County	585	60	4	168	588	49	9	173	533	52	7	140
Alamance	9	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	12	0	0	5
Alexander	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
Alleghany	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Anson	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Ashe	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	2	1	0	1
Avery	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0
Beaufort	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	1	0	1
Bertie	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bladen	6	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	2	1	0	0
Brunswick	12	2	0	0	7	1	0	0	6	0	0	1
Buncombe	9	2	0	3	9	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Burke	10	1	0	6	6	0	1	4	3	0	1	3
Cabarrus	20	1	0	6	13	1	0	2	5	1	0	2
Caldwell	2	2	0	2	4	0	0	5	1	0	0	1
Camden	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carteret	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	0

Caswell	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Catawba	9	2	0	0	9	0	0	5	9	2	0	1
Chatham	4	0	0	2	12	0	0	5	3	0	0	1
Cherokee	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Chowan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cleveland	10	5	0	2	10	0	0	1	9	0	0	0
Columbus	7	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	6	2	0	0
Craven	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	2
Cumberland	28	2	0	14	27	3	0	12	26	7	0	14
Currituck	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Dare	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Davidson	18	0	0	4	4	1	0	1	16	1	0	2
Davie	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Duplin	5	0	0	2	4	1	0	1	6	0	0	2
Durham	14	0	0	3	13	1	1	1	4	2	0	1
Edgecombe	3	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	2
Forsyth	15	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	11	0	0	1
Franklin	3	1	0	0	9	0	0	1	9	0	0	1
Gaston	12	3	0	3	14	5	0	2	6	1	0	0
Gates	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graham	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Granville	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Greene	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilford	27	3	0	12	23	1	0	9	35	7	1	9

Halifax	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Harnett	10	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	15	0	0	8
Haywood	1	1	0	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	1
Henderson	9	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
Hertford	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Hoke	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	1
Hyde	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iredell	16	2	0	18	29	3	0	31	13	0	0	33
Jackson	3	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
Johnston	12	1	0	0	11	1	0	0	12	0	0	0
Jones	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Lee	6	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	5	0	1	0
Lenoir	9	2	0	5	6	0	0	3	1	0	0	1
Lincoln	5	1	0	2	17	0	0	10	5	1	1	0
Macon	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Madison	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	0	2
Martin	3	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
McDowell	4	1	0	1	6	3	0	3	6	0	0	2
Mecklenburg	27	4	0	3	24	2	0	3	27	5	0	2
Mitchell	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Montgomery	4	0	0	6	2	0	0	2	3	2	0	2
Moore	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	1	0	0
Nash	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	5	0	0	1
New Hanover	8	2	0	6	12	4	0	11	15	0	0	12
Northampton	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Onslow	9	0	0	1	12	1	0	5	6	0	0	1
Orange	8	0	0	2	8	2	0	4	3	1	0	0
Pamlico	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Pasquotank	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1
Pender	5	0	0	5	7	1	0	1	4	0	0	1
Perquimans	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Person	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	1
Pitt	15	3	2	2	22	3	2	9	8	2	0	2
Polk	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Randolph	9	0	0	3	8	0	0	1	8	1	1	4
Richmond	9	2	0	2	4	0	0	2	10	0	0	5
Robeson	6	0	0	1	5	1	0	1	8	2	0	1
Rockingham	13	0	0	2	7	1	2	0	5	1	0	2
Rowan	4	0	0	0	14	0	0	4	7	1	0	0
Rutherford	6	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Sampson	10	0	0	5	11	0	0	2	5	0	0	0
Scotland	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Stanly	3	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	0
Stokes	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0
Surry	7	0	0	5	5	0	0	1	4	0	0	0
Swain	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Transylvania	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Tyrrell	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Union	14	0	0	5	13	0	0	1	18	0	0	1
Vance	4	1	0	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	0

Wake	41	5	1	15	36	2	1	12	50	3	0	11
Warren	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watauga	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Wayne	4	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	2	1	1	0
Wilkes	3	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	5	1	0	0
Wilson	10	0	0	2	7	1	0	0	6	0	0	0
Yadkin	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	4	4	0	0	1
Yancey	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	3	0	0	0

Top 5 Juvenile Sex Offense Complaints Received FY 21-22	Top 5 Juvenile Sex Offense Complaints Received FY 22-23*	Top 5 Juvenile Sex Offense Complaints Received FY 23-24
Sexual Battery (25%)	Third degree sexual exploitation of a minor	Sexual Battery (22%)
First-degree statutory sexual offense: person engages in a sexual act with a victim who is a child less than 13 years old and the defendant is at least 12 years old and greater than or equal to 4 years older than the victim. (11%)	Sexual battery	First-degree statutory sexual offense: person engages in a sexual act with a victim who is a child less than 13 years old and the defendant is at least 12 years old and greater than or equal to 4 years older than the victim (11%)
Indecent liberties between children (9%)	Second degree sexual exploitation of a minor-knowing the character/content of the material - distributes, transports, exhibits, receives, sells, purchases, exchanges, or solicits material that contains a visual representation of a minor engaged in sexual activity.	Indecent liberties between children (10%)
Second degree sexual exploitation of a minor-knowing the character/content of the material - distributes, transports, exhibits, receives, sells, purchases, changes, or solicits material that contains a visual representation of a minor engaged in sexual activity. (8%)	First-degree statutory sexual offense: person engages in a sexual act with a victim who is a child less than 13 years old and the defendant is at least 12 years old and greater than or equal to 4 years older than the victim.	Second degree sexual exploitation of a minor-knowing the character/content of the material - distributes, transports, exhibits, receives, sells, purchases, exchanges, or solicits material that contains a visual representation of a minor engaged in sexual activity (8%)
Third degree sexual exploitation of a minor (7%)	Indecent liberties between children	Third degree sexual exploitation of a minor (7%)

**A few juveniles were charged with large numbers of Third-degree sexual exploitation of a minor complaint. Excluding percentages in FY 22-23 report out due to skewed nature of data.*

3) Enhanced Assessments for those juveniles that are adjudicated with a suspicion of an SED/SMI/IDD/DD diagnosis and meet the criteria for Youth Development Centers or Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities.

Target Population

a) Juveniles being served under this program priority are already adjudicated and are waiting on their disposition hearing

AND

b) Are identified as needing an enhanced assessment before an appropriate disposition can be decided and an order for possible commitment to the most secure facilities in the juvenile justice system, Youth Development Centers or Psychiatric Residential Facilities.

NOTE: This target population was created by Senate Bill 207.

Assessment Description

Assessments under this program priority are intended to be more in depth than a Comprehensive Clinical Assessment (CCA). CCAs are typically a snapshot assessment at a point in time of what is happening for a juvenile. For juveniles in this targeted population the assessment shall be a comprehensive assessment of the juvenile's history which will guide the judicial decision-making process as to whether the diagnosis significantly contributed to the behaviors exhibited by the juvenile for which the juvenile is being adjudicated and upon which the disposition is being rendered in the juvenile court system.

Providers must already be completing these types of assessments in the community and be recognized in network with an identified MCO(s).

Assessments proposed under this program priority must include:

- a) A trauma screening
- b) An IDD/DD screening or rule out ability
- c) A TBI Flagging Question or Questions
- d) The required elements of the assessment under MCO Medicaid Funding
- e) The SED Checklist can be [found here](#)
- f) Specific wording guiding a judge on whether a juvenile has an SED or SMI or whether an IDD/DD or TBI is suspected and should be assessed further
- g) Assessments under this program priority must take a multidisciplinary approach to assessments to include but not limited to assessment on the following domains: School and Educational, Medical, Hospitalizations (Mental, Medical, etc), Trauma events and impacts, Mental Health, Developmental

NOTE: Applicants responding to this prioritized programming should include a blank sample of their assessment if possible.

IDD/DD and TBI

All providers funded under this program priority will be required to flag potential rule out of IDD/DD or TBI for the juvenile being assessed and support with referrals to ongoing appropriate assessments as needed.

Allowable Cost

This prioritized program is intended to increase the targeted population's ability to access an enhanced and appropriate assessment to ensure a holistic and complete version of the juvenile is being presented in juvenile court. It is the Department's intent to increase this access through Intensive Intervention Services funding.

All applicants responding to this prioritized program shall already have the ability to bill MCO Medicaid for the described assessment when appropriate. The following bullets describe the allowable invoicing costs under this prioritized programming:

- Juvenile Community Programs will negotiate a reimbursement rate with awarded applicants per assessment, in full or in part for coverage. If MCO Medicaid has covered the cost of the assessment and the provider is invoicing for additional cost associated with court appearance or the like (described in a following bullet), then the reimbursement from MCO Medicaid must be attached to the partial invoice.
- All providers requesting reimbursement for the full cost of the assessment from Juvenile Justice Community Programs must submit evidence that other reimbursement routes were attempted and denied first OR that the juvenile is uninsured or underinsured and does not qualify for Medicaid or other coverage.
- Providers may bill Juvenile Justice Community Programs the difference in cost between the assessment cost reimbursed by MCO Medicaid and assessment activities deemed necessary for the juvenile's assessment. Those activities include:
 - required court appearances for the juvenile assessed, participation in court ordered care reviews for the juvenile assessed,
 - collateral contacts deemed necessary for the assessment, and/or
 - extensive travel to conduct face-to-face assessments.

Data for this prioritized programming follows. **The data includes Cardinal in the MCO list, but responding applicants should account for county realignment in their projected numbers to serve

Level II and Level III Distinct Juveniles: FY 21-22, FY 22-23 and FY 23-24

Data Notes: Below, Level II juveniles are those with a Class A1 or higher most serious offense in the Level II disposition (complaint or violation disposed). Juveniles who were Level II and became Level III are counted in both the Level II and Level III columns. Level III designation is defined as juveniles with a Commitment or Post-Release Supervision (PRS) that began, ended or spanned the FY.

County	FY 21-22		FY 22-23		FY 23-24	
	Level II Distinct Juveniles	Level III Distinct Juveniles	Level II Distinct Juveniles	Level III Distinct Juveniles	Level II Distinct Juveniles	Level III Distinct Juveniles
Alamance	48	6	47	5	42	5
Alexander	3	2	2	3	3	1
Alleghany	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anson	3	2	1	1	2	1
Ashe	3	0	0	0	0	0
Avery	1	0	0	0	0	0
Beaufort	4	6	7	5	6	3
Bertie	1	0	1	0	0	1
Bladen	3	0	6	1	2	1
Brunswick	5	3	9	3	6	2
Buncombe	4	5	16	7	16	8
Burke	9	2	3	5	5	7
Cabarrus	15	7	12	6	9	7
Caldwell	11	7	8	4	11	4
Camden	0	0	4	0	0	0
Carteret	6	3	1	5	0	3
Caswell	0	1	2	0	4	0
Catawba	10	5	12	7	8	4
Chatham	2	1	2	1	3	2
Cherokee	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chowan	2	1	0	0	1	1
Clay	0	0	0	0	1	1
Cleveland	10	6	14	1	12	2
Columbus	6	3	5	2	3	1
Craven	8	10	13	6	12	2
Cumberland	56	17	81	18	130	30
Currituck	1	0	0	0	0	0
Dare	0	0	2	0	1	0
Davidson	17	3	11	4	8	7
Davie	3	0	3	0	2	0
Duplin	9	3	6	3	5	0
Durham	18	3	16	1	14	5
Edgecombe	12	4	12	8	17	9
Forsyth	41	13	42	11	22	8
Franklin	1	0	7	2	8	1
Gaston	28	6	14	8	12	7
Gates	0	0	0	0	0	0

Graham	0	0	0	0	1	0
Granville	3	1	3	1	9	3
Greene	5	0	4	0	2	0
Guilford	85	48	73	48	86	51
Halifax	8	6	7	7	7	7
Harnett	21	6	5	7	11	6
Haywood	6	0	5	2	2	2
Henderson	0	2	3	2	1	3
Hertford	7	0	6	2	2	4
Hoke	7	2	9	2	3	2
Hyde	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iredell	15	8	22	6	21	5
Jackson	0	0	2	0	2	1
Johnston	9	9	12	7	4	6
Jones	0	0	0	0	1	1
Lee	9	10	8	10	7	9
Lenoir	23	8	27	7	21	5
Lincoln	5	1	2	0	5	1
Macon	0	1	1	1	1	1
Madison	2	0	2	0	1	0
Martin	2	5	1	0	0	0
McDowell	4	2	7	2	2	3
Mecklenburg	65	25	44	24	46	26
Mitchell	1	0	1	0	0	0
Montgomery	5	1	5	2	3	2
Moore	8	2	14	3	15	2
Nash	7	6	11	8	18	5
New Hanover	35	17	29	16	22	15
Northampton	1	2	4	2	2	1
Onslow	21	13	27	13	25	21
Orange	8	1	6	2	10	6
Pamlico	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pasquotank	6	3	2	3	2	3
Pender	5	0	5	0	3	0
Perquimans	0	1	1	0	0	0
Person	4	1	1	0	5	2
Pitt	41	26	47	28	37	33
Polk	2	0	2	0	0	0
Randolph	6	3	11	6	17	6
Richmond	14	1	16	0	11	2
Robeson	3	4	22	3	14	2
Rockingham	24	10	18	4	28	8
Rowan	19	3	12	2	23	2
Rutherford	5	1	2	2	2	3
Sampson	10	2	17	4	4	3

Scotland	2	0	9	0	5	2
Stanly	4	1	2	1	5	0
Stokes	4	5	5	4	3	3
Surry	14	3	7	7	4	7
Swain	0	0	1	0	3	0
Transylvania	0	1	1	1	6	0
Tyrrell	0	0	3	0	0	0
Union	24	8	17	8	20	5
Vance	4	2	9	7	9	10
Wake	70	27	38	28	72	21
Warren	0	0	2	0	1	1
Washington	3	2	2	1	0	1
Watauga	3	0	1	0	2	0
Wayne	16	17	23	15	16	10
Wilkes	14	6	8	5	2	7
Wilson	21	6	17	9	30	14
Yadkin	6	2	2	1	8	2
Yancey	1	2	3	1	2	1
State Total	1,020	403	1,002	403	1,022	432

YDC Commitments, Detention Admissions and Distinct Juveniles Detained

County	FY 21-22 YDC Commitments by County	FY 22-23 YDC Commitments by County	FY 23-24 YDC Commitments by County	FY 21-22 Detention Admissions by County	FY 22-23 Detention Admissions by County	FY 23-24 Detention Admissions by County	FY 21-22 Distinct Juveniles Detained by County	FY 22-23 Distinct Juveniles Detained by County	FY 23-24 Distinct Juveniles Detained by County
Alamance	2	1	2	68	68	45	48	50	33
Alexander	0	1	0	4	6	5	4	5	5
Alleghany	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	3	1
Anson	2	1	0	11	6	5	6	5	4
Ashe	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	3
Avery	0	0	0	4	0	1	4	0	1
Beaufort	1	2	0	23	26	24	18	21	19
Bertie	0	0	1	3	5	9	2	5	7
Bladen	0	1	0	9	12	7	7	8	7
Brunswick	2	1	0	7	27	14	6	24	12
Buncombe	3	1	1	47	53	31	35	42	26
Burke	0	4	2	11	26	22	7	19	18
Cabarrus	1	4	1	30	30	31	25	27	27
Caldwell	2	2	1	15	17	12	12	15	11
Camden	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0
Carteret	1	4	1	16	7	11	10	6	10
Caswell	1	0	0	4	3	6	4	2	5
Catawba	2	5	0	38	37	28	26	35	22
Chatham	0	0	1	6	7	9	5	7	7
Cherokee	0	0	0	2	4	2	2	4	2
Chowan	0	0	1	2	5	3	2	2	3
Clay	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0
Cleveland	1	0	2	25	43	53	20	31	40
Columbus	2	1	0	18	24	27	14	20	18
Craven	3	0	1	21	28	21	19	23	20
Cumberland	4	8	19	168	154	263	124	120	186
Currituck	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0

Dare	0	0	0	8	5	7	8	5	7
Davidson	2	2	6	24	27	15	20	24	12
Davie	0	0	0	3	4	5	3	4	3
Duplin	2	0	0	6	7	10	4	7	9
Durham	0	1	2	69	93	151	50	74	100
Edgecombe	0	3	4	24	46	32	20	34	30
Forsyth	5	0	4	100	123	122	85	93	100
Franklin	0	1	0	4	8	15	4	6	12
Gaston	0	4	1	79	72	90	61	62	62
Gates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graham	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Granville	1	0	2	8	16	23	8	14	19
Greene	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	4
Guilford	19	18	19	258	263	293	187	173	206
Halifax	3	3	2	18	23	11	18	21	9
Harnett	1	2	1	11	21	27	11	19	23
Haywood	0	2	0	9	11	11	6	11	9
Henderson	1	0	0	9	9	15	6	6	9
Hertford	0	2	2	13	16	11	9	16	8
Hoke	1	1	0	11	16	12	10	13	11
Hyde	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iredell	4	2	1	41	70	48	35	56	41
Jackson	0	0	1	3	5	7	2	3	5
Johnston	5	2	0	23	11	14	20	9	14
Jones	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	1
Lee	3	2	3	13	9	6	11	8	6
Lenoir	4	2	4	31	33	28	29	27	23
Lincoln	0	0	1	15	16	15	13	11	13
Macon	1	0	1	4	2	9	4	2	7
Madison	0	0	0	3	3	11	2	2	6
Martin	0	0	0	6	15	1	5	14	1
McDowell	0	0	2	5	18	12	5	16	9
Mecklenburg	7	8	6	378	460	450	252	276	262

Mitchell	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Montgomery	1	0	0	3	8	8	3	8	7
Moore	0	2	0	7	14	17	6	13	13
Nash	4	2	2	22	29	46	22	26	43
New Hanover	7	7	6	68	52	78	53	41	63
Northampton	0	0	0	7	1	5	7	1	5
Onslow	4	8	11	40	46	40	32	35	37
Orange	1	0	4	22	17	18	16	15	17
Pamlico	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Pasquotank	2	1	2	9	10	6	8	9	6
Pender	0	0	0	5	10	2	4	10	2
Perquimans	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	1
Person	0	0	2	11	12	15	7	12	10
Pitt	8	14	13	73	89	82	54	71	62
Polk	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Randolph	2	4	2	13	13	25	11	12	18
Richmond	0	0	2	19	31	13	19	29	13
Robeson	1	0	0	33	47	62	31	41	58
Rockingham	3	2	7	22	23	18	21	22	17
Rowan	2	0	0	15	15	19	14	14	16
Rutherford	0	2	1	12	11	6	11	9	6
Sampson	1	2	0	13	16	13	11	15	12
Scotland	0	0	2	20	28	21	19	19	20
Stanly	0	0	0	6	7	11	6	7	10
Stokes	4	1	1	9	6	3	7	5	2
Surry	2	5	2	15	14	16	13	14	14
Swain	0	0	0	3	0	2	3	0	2
Transylvania	0	0	0	1	5	4	1	5	4
Tyrrell	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
Union	2	2	1	36	35	30	32	28	25
Vance	1	6	3	25	22	10	23	19	10
Wake	10	8	0	172	165	183	134	132	134
Warren	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3	1

Washington	1	1	0	8	4	4	7	3	4
Watauga	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Wayne	6	7	2	20	26	24	17	19	21
Wilkes	3	2	5	45	18	17	34	16	10
Wilson	3	6	11	32	60	71	23	51	59
Yadkin	0	0	1	10	15	17	10	13	16
Yancey	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	1
Total	155	173	176	2,522	2,857	2,986	1,912	2,142	2,184

Distinct Juveniles with a Level II Disposition - FY 20-21 through FY 22-23

District	County	FY 20-21	FY 21-22	FY 22-23
15	Alamance	48	60	58
22	Alexander	4	5	5
23	Alleghany	0	0	1
20	Anson	3	6	2
23	Ashe	0	4	0
24	Avery	0	2	0
2	Beaufort	16	14	15
6	Bertie	0	1	1
13	Bladen	1	3	6
13	Brunswick	19	6	12
28	Buncombe	20	15	20
25	Burke	31	22	27
19	Cabarrus	17	14	19
25	Caldwell	13	14	17
1	Camden	0	0	4
3	Carteret	4	10	2
9	Caswell	2	0	5
25	Catawba	34	29	34
15	Chatham	6	4	5
30	Cherokee	2	0	3
1	Chowan	4	1	0
30	Clay	0	2	1
27	Cleveland	18	13	18
13	Columbus	9	7	11
3	Craven	12	13	13
12	Cumberland	71	59	104
1	Currituck	2	2	0
1	Dare	5	4	5
22	Davidson	13	20	15
22	Davie	1	5	7
4	Duplin	6	8	8
14	Durham	21	20	16
7	Edgecombe	17	16	17
21	Forsyth	45	51	54
9	Franklin	7	2	8
27	Gaston	27	34	23
1	Gates	0	0	0
30	Graham	0	0	0
9	Granville	3	7	5
8	Greene	5	6	4
18	Guilford	100	84	93

6	Halifax	13	9	11
11	Harnett	22	19	9
30	Haywood	3	7	6
29	Henderson	20	1	4
6	Hertford	3	8	7
16	Hoke	14	8	10
2	Hyde	0	1	0
22	Iredell	25	24	28
30	Jackson	1	1	4
11	Johnston	33	23	20
4	Jones	3	0	0
11	Lee	15	8	11
8	Lenoir	22	26	32
27	Lincoln	8	13	6
30	Macon	3	1	4
24	Madison	1	2	6
2	Martin	10	10	3
29	McDowell	8	14	22
26	Mecklenburg	40	70	51
24	Mitchell	0	1	2
19	Montgomery	8	5	6
19	Moore	11	15	17
7	Nash	12	12	19
5	New Hanover	47	37	40
6	Northampton	2	4	5
4	Onslow	27	32	38
15	Orange	14	10	7
3	Pamlico	0	1	1
1	Pasquotank	10	7	3
5	Pender	5	6	7
1	Perquimans	2	1	1
9	Person	6	6	1
3	Pitt	59	54	57
29	Polk	5	5	4
19	Randolph	18	11	18
20	Richmond	21	18	23
16	Robeson	19	5	26
17	Rockingham	24	33	36
19	Rowan	19	17	17
29	Rutherford	14	8	6
4	Sampson	13	14	20
16	Scotland	6	2	12
20	Stanly	3	4	3
17	Stokes	11	7	6
17	Surry	8	22	15

30	Swain	1	0	1
29	Transylvania	7	2	1
2	Tyrrell	1	0	3
20	Union	27	28	25
9	Vance	8	6	10
10	Wake	103	90	64
9	Warren	2	0	2
2	Washington	2	4	2
24	Watauga	5	3	6
8	Wayne	27	17	26
23	Wilkes	26	34	22
7	Wilson	30	30	32
23	Yadkin	4	11	13
24	Yancey	3	1	3
	State Total	1,433	1,360	1,462

ATTACHMENT E: DPS Area Consultant County Assignments

EASTERN	CENTRAL	PIEDMONT	WESTERN
<p>Pam Stokes, Area Manager pamela.stokes@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New Hanover 2. Pender 	<p>Lance Britt, Area Manager lance.britt@ncdps.gov</p>	<p>Ronald Tillman, Area Manager ronald.tillman@ncdps.gov</p>	<p>Regina Arrowood, Area Manager regina.arrowood@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Polk 2. Henderson
<p>Trenee Townes trenee.townes@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Camden 2. Chowan 3. Currituck 4. Dare 5. Gates 6. Pasquotank 7. Perquimans 8. Pitt 	<p>Eddie Crews walter.crews@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Caswell 2. Durham 3. Franklin 4. Granville 5. Johnston 6. Person 7. Vance 8. Warren 	<p>Rich Smith rich.smith@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forsyth 2. Rockingham 3. Stokes 4. Surry 	<p>Megan Webster megan.webster@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alleghany 2. Ashe 3. Burke 4. Caldwell 5. Catawba 6. McDowell 7. Rutherford 8. Wilkes 9. Yadkin
<p>Nancy Hodges nancy.hodges@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carteret 2. Craven 3. Duplin 4. Greene 5. Jones 6. Lenoir 7. Pamlico 8. Wayne 	<p>David Carter david.r.carter@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alamance 2. Chatham 3. Orange 4. Wake 	<p>P. Scott Stoker p.scott.stoker@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alexander 2. Davidson 3. Davie 4. Iredell 5. Mecklenburg 	<p>Lorraine Williams melissa.g.johnson@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buncombe 2. Cherokee 3. Clay 4. Graham 5. Haywood 6. Jackson 7. Macon 8. Swain 9. Transylvania
<p>James Ward james.h.ward@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beaufort 2. Hyde 3. Martin 4. Tyrrell 5. Washington 	<p>Crystal Bennett crystal.bennett@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cumberland 2. Harnett 3. Lee 4. Sampson 	<p>Daniel Sevigny daniel.sevigny@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cabarrus 2. Montgomery 3. Moore 4. Randolph 5. Rowan 	<p>Melissa Johnson melissa.g.johnson@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avery 2. Cleveland 3. Gaston 4. Lincoln 5. Madison 6. Mitchell 7. Watauga 8. Yancey
<p>David Nunnery david.nunnery@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bertie 2. Edgecombe 3. Halifax 4. Hertford 5. Nash 6. Northampton 7. Wilson 	<p>Kelly Cribb kelly.cribb@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bladen 2. Brunswick 3. Columbus 4. Hoke 5. Onslow 6. Robeson 7. Scotland 	<p>Sherri Hill sherri.s.hill@ncdps.gov</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stanly 2. Union 3. Guilford 4. Anson 5. Richmond 	

END OF RFP