



**Alternatives to Commitment Programs
Annual Evaluation Report
March 2013**

Session Law 2004-124, Section 16.7

**Submitted by:
Department of Public Safety
Division of Administration
Community Programs Section**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is required by Session Law 2004-124, Section 16.7 to provide alternatives to juvenile commitment services through the Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils. This report focuses on the youth served in programs for FY 2011-2012 that delivered services to youth in Level III disposition (commitment) and youth in Level II disposition (intermediate) who were at risk of a Level III disposition. In FY 2011-2012, the General Assembly allocated \$750,000 for these services.

Statewide, the Alternatives to Commitment Programs delivered somewhat similar intensive case management services that “wrapped services around” the juvenile and family. Typical services included home-based family counseling, individual counseling, tutoring, interpersonal skill-building, behavior management and cognitive behavior training. Projects coordinated a 24 hour a day, 7 days per week adult supervision plan for each Level III youth. Program providers and court counselors supported and planned for youth as they integrated into the community. The programs also managed referrals to a variety of other community services including such education programs as structured day, after-school programming, and tutoring. On occasion, court counselors used electronic monitoring as a support for supervision of youth.

Alternatives to Commitment Programs served 131 youth and exits from the programs totaled 89 during FY 2011-2012. Of the 89 youth who exited the programs in FY 2011-2012, 67 youth completed the program meeting the goals of the program with a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals.

For FY 2011-2012, the average annual cost (based on actual expenditures) per youth in Alternatives to Commitment Programs was \$5,830 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$126,401.

This report is in response to the legislation and provides a description of the programs, the number of youth served, their adjudication status at the time of service, services and treatments provided, the length of service, the total cost per youth, and the six (6) and twelve (12) month recidivism rates for youth after the termination of program services. In this report, data support the need for the continued development and delivery of Alternatives to Commitment Programs for committed youth at the local level to addresses unmet gaps in the continuum of services within the communities.

Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Alternatives to Commitment Programs

Project Background

Session Law 2004-124, Section 16.7 made available \$750,000 to establish community programs for youth who otherwise would be placed in a youth development center. This legislation required that funded programs provide residential and/or community-based intensive services to juveniles who have been adjudicated delinquent and have been given a Level III or Level II disposition or juveniles who are re-entering the community after receiving commitment programming in a youth development center. Data since the implementation of services since FY 2004-2005 confirm that intensive case management that provide wrap-around services to the juvenile and family continue to be effective and cost-efficient programs. Services provided in FY 2011-2012 as Alternatives to Commitment Programs continued to provide those services.

By statute, there are three disposition levels for adjudicated youth in North Carolina: Level I, Community Dispositions; Level II, Intermediate Dispositions; and Level III, Commitment. The intent of the 2004 legislation was that programs be established to serve youth who were at either a Level II or Level III disposition.

Program Data

The following tables provide detailed data of the eight (8) Alternatives to Commitment Programs funded in FY 2011-2012. These tables include the number of youth served, adjudication status at the time of service, the services/treatments provided, average length of service, funding level, total cost per youth, status when exiting the program, living arrangements after exit, and the six and twelve month recidivism rates. The projects are identified by the host county.

Youth Served and Adjudication Status

In FY 2011-2012 projects served a total of 131 youth. Table 1 identifies the adjudication status of those youth.

Table 1: Youth Served and Adjudication Status

Host County	Level II	Level III	Post Release Supervision	Total Served
Alamance	37	0	0	37
Burke	4	0	5	9
Cumberland	12	0	2	14
Dare	18	0	1	19
Davidson	7	0	3	10
Onslow	13	0	0	13
Rockingham	22	0	0	22
Wayne	5	0	2	7
Total	118	0	13	131

Services and Treatments Provided

Through the development of program agreements, the service providers worked to match the services they provided to services that are identified through research to be characteristic of effective services. Statewide, the programs delivered somewhat similar intensive case management services that “wrapped services around” the youth and family. Typical services included family counseling, individual counseling, tutoring, mentoring, interpersonal skill-building, behavioral management, and cognitive behavioral training. Projects coordinated a 24 hour a day, 7 days per week adult supervision plan for each Level III youth. Program providers and court counselors supported and planned for youth as they integrated into the community. On occasion, court counselors used electronic monitoring as a support for supervision of youth.

Table 2 describes the services and treatments provided by the Alternatives to Commitment Programs in FY 2011-2012. The host county, sponsoring agency, the counties receiving services, and the number of youth who could be served at one time (capacity) are identified.

Table 2: Program Services and Treatments

Host County (Sponsoring Agency)	Counties Served	Services Provided (includes 24/7 staff availability)	Capacity
ALAMANCE (Alamance County Dispute Settlement and Youth Services)	Alamance	Program Type: Structured Day Intensive wraparound services including educational alternatives as well as tutoring.	5
BURKE (Barium Springs for Children, Inc.)	Burke, Caldwell and Catawba	Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building Intensive wraparound in-home services for youth and families.	3
CUMBERLAND (Cumberland County CommuniCare, Inc.)	Cumberland	Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building Intensive home-based services including individual and family counseling, mentoring, and community service.	5
DARE (Dare County Schools)	Dare	Program Type: Counseling Substance abuse assessments, individual and group counseling, intensive home-based family counseling, substance abuse education, and interpersonal skills development.	12
DAVIDSON (Family Services of Davidson County, Inc.)	Davidson	Program Type: Counseling Intensive family wraparound services including family and individual counseling.	4
ONslow (Onslow County Youth Services)	Onslow and Sampson	Program Type: Structured Day Intensive wraparound services including alternative education activities, life skills groups, and family counseling.	9
ROCKINGHAM (Rockingham County Youth Services)	Rockingham, Stokes, and Surry	Program Type: Home-Based Family Counseling Intensive home-based counseling and cognitive behavioral group counseling.	10
WAYNE (Methodist Home for Children)	Wayne, Lenoir and Greene	Program Type: Home-Based Family Counseling Intensive home-based individual and family therapy.	3

Length of Service

Alternatives to Commitment Programs continued to serve youth who were high risk and in need of intensive interventions for a considerable length of time. Table 3 illustrates youth being served by a program for an average length of stay ranging from 75 days to 365 days. The statewide average length of stay was 167 days.

Table 3: Days in Program

Host County	Average Length of Stay
Alamance	75
Burke	120
Cumberland	138
Dare	365
Davidson	127
Onslow	334
Rockingham	186
Wayne	136
Average	167

Program Cost

As legislatively mandated, no one program received more than \$100,000. Table 4 illustrates the total youth served, actual program expenditures, and annual cost for FY 2011-2012 which averaged \$5,830 per youth. Three programs spent additional funds that were secured by the sponsoring agency from other funding sources.

Table 4: Program Cost

Host County (Program Type)	Total Youth Served	Actual Expenditure	Cost per Youth
Alamance (Structured Day)	37	\$111,443	\$3,011
Burke (Parent/Family Skill Building)	9	\$85,181	\$9,464
Cumberland (Parent/Family Skill Building)	14	\$103,495	\$7,392
Dare (Counseling)	19	\$90,396	\$4,757
Davidson (Counseling)	10	\$113,207	\$11,320
Onslow (Structured Day)	13	\$73,516	\$5,655
Rockingham (Home-Based Counseling)	22	\$95,273	\$4,330
Wayne (Home-Based Counseling)	7	\$91,253	\$13,036
Total	131	\$763,764	\$58,965

Exit from Program

Table 5 illustrates the 89 youth who exited the projects in FY 2011-2012. Seventy-five (75%) of youth completed their programming at a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals. Program completion was categorized as successful, satisfactory, unsuccessful, or non-compliance. Table 6 illustrates the living arrangements for those 89 youth upon exit from the program which shows ninety-seven (97%) youth were in a non-secure living arrangement while only three percent (3%) of youth were committed to a youth development center.

Table 5: Status of Youth at Exit

Host County	Successful Completion	Satisfactory Completion	Unsuccessful Completion	Non-Compliance	Total
Alamance	6	8	6	4	24
Burke	3	2	0	2	7
Cumberland	2	1	0	5	8
Dare	4	5	0	1	10
Davidson	6	2	0	2	10
Onslow	3	2	0	1	6
Rockingham	11	7	0	1	19
Wayne	2	3	0	0	5
Totals	37	30	6	16	89

Table 6: Youth Living Arrangement at Exit

Host County	Group Home	Home	Relatives	Secure Custody	YDC	Other	Total
Alamance	0	23	1	0	0	0	24
Burke	0	5	1	0	0	1	7
Cumberland	0	5	0	0	3	0	8
Dare	0	9	0	0	0	1	10
Davidson	1	4	1	0	0	4	10
Onslow	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
Rockingham	1	14	3	0	0	1	19
Wayne	0	4	0	0	0	1	5
Totals	2	70	6	0	3	8	89

Recidivism

Table 7 illustrates youth who exited the projects during FY 2011-2012 who had further involvement with the juvenile justice system.

Table 7: Recidivism Measure 1

Recidivism Measure 1: Juveniles Receiving an Addition Juvenile Complaint Post-Discharge		
Distinct Juveniles with Termination Dates	117	
	6 months	12 months
Distinct Juveniles who had at Least 6 Months Post-Discharge to be Studied	96	43
Distinct Juveniles with Delinquent Complaints	9	5
Percentage of Juveniles with Additional Complaints	9.4%	11.6%

Table 8 shows the percentage of youth who recidivated by receiving an adjudication or conviction post discharge from the programs.

Table 8: Recidivism Measure 2

Recidivism Measure 2: Youth Receiving an Adult Conviction or Juvenile Adjudication Post-Discharge		
	0 to 6 months	6 to 12 months
Number of Distinct Juveniles in the Study	96	43
Distinct Juveniles with Complaints Adjudicated	7	4
Distinct Juveniles Adjudication Recidivism	7.3%	9.3%
Adult Convictions (Distinct Juveniles)	3	4
Adult Recidivism (Percentage of Distinct Youth Convicted of an Adult Crime)	3.1%	9.3%
Distinct Youth with Adjudications or Convictions	10	8
Juvenile Adjudications + Adult Convictions	10.4%	18.6%

In comparison, according to the NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission's (SPAC) *Juvenile Recidivism Study: Sample FY 2006/07*, 38.4% of juveniles who were both adjudicated and disposed received an additional adjudication or conviction within 36 months. Although the time horizon for the Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission's study was longer than the recidivism study conduct by the Department, the (SPAC) recidivism study shows that the average juvenile will recidivate within the first 12 months.

Summary and Conclusion

Alternatives to Commitment Programs served high-risk youth who were in need of intensive interventions to be successfully served in the community. Without the programs these youth may have been served in a more costly youth development center. Noteworthy outcomes of the programs are:

- Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the youth exiting the projects were in a non-secure living arrangement while only three percent (3%) of the youth exiting the projects were committed to a youth development center.
- Seventy-five percent (75%) of the youth exiting the projects completed their programming at a high or acceptable level of participation and achievement of behavior improvement goals.
- The average annual cost per youth in the Alternatives for Commitment Programs was \$5,830 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$126,401. The data indicate that Alternatives to Commitment Programs continue to be effective and cost-efficient programs that develop and deliver programming for committed youth at the local level while addressing unmet gaps in the continuum of services within communities.