



**Alternatives to Commitment Programs  
Annual Evaluation Report  
March 2011**

---

**Special Provision: S.L. 2005-276  
Section 16.11 (c)**

Submitted by:  
Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

**Linda Wheeler Hayes, Secretary**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is required by S.L. 2005-276, Special Provision 16.11 of the 2005 North Carolina General Assembly regarding the implementation of Demonstration Projects to provide alternatives to juvenile commitment services through the Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils. This report focuses on the youth served in programs for FY 2009-2010. Programs 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.

The Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (hereinafter referred to as Department) was directed by the 2004 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly to make \$500,000 available to Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils (JCPCs) to establish community programs for youth who otherwise would be placed in a youth development center. The 2005 General Assembly appropriated an additional \$250,000 to expand the Demonstration Projects and to build on this programmatic concept. In FY 2009-2010, the funding allocated by the General Assembly remained at \$750,000 for programming.

Since the implementation of “demonstration” projects from Special Provision 16.11 of the 2005 North Carolina General Assembly, data confirm that intensive case management providing wrap around services to the juvenile and family continue to be effective and cost-efficient programs.

The award process for FY 2009-2010 continued funding for established programs. Awards were made based on the previously funded projects’ outcome data, the services provided to the population identified by this Special Provision, and the state and local support for these programs to continue. Eight (8) programs were selected for continued funding. The selected sponsoring agency submitted program agreements to contract with the Department and a county to provide the proposed intermediate and commitment 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 family counseling, individual counseling, tutoring, mentoring, 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 91 youth during FY 2009-2010. During that time period, new admissions totaled 59 and exits from the program totaled 67. Recidivism rates at six and twelve months after termination for youth served in the Alternatives to Commitment Programs were lower than the research predicts for Level III and most serious Level II dispositions. Of the 67 youth who exited the programs in FY 2009-2010, 56 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 2009-2010, the average annual cost (based on actual expenditures) per youth in Alternatives to Commitment Programs was \$7,064 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$102,854. [NOTE: Youth Development Center amounts represent costs to the Department for FY 2008-2009.]

This report provides information about the funding process for the programs, as well as technical support, the response to the legislation, 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 address unmet gaps in the continuum of services within the communities.

# **Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Alternative to Commitment Programs**

## **Project Background**

The Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was directed by the 2004 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly to make \$500,000 available to Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils (JCPCs) to establish community programs for youth who otherwise would be placed in a youth development center. The 2005 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated \$250,000 to the Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to expand the demonstration projects. 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 this concept for program services in FY 2004-2005 confirm that intensive case management providing wrap around services to the juvenile and family continue to be effective and cost-efficient programs. Services provided in FY 2009-2010 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.

## **Funding Process**

The 2004 session of the General Assembly directed the Department to develop a competitive process for funding selection. The process was to provide consideration of the history of commitments of a community, of services to youth in rural areas, of services being provided in all geographic areas of North Carolina and collaboration among counties with no project receiving more than \$100,000. Selected programs contracted with a county and the Department through JCPC program agreements that specified program objectives, services, activities and budgets.

In response to the legislation, the Department developed and executed a process to offer every county and Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) the opportunity to develop a demonstration project. Training, technical assistance, and oversight processes were developed for the selected projects. The Department also established protocols for monitoring project operations to insure that programs serve targeted youth and families and demonstrate desired outcomes.

The Department defines a program structure as a setting, context or framework within which a service is delivered. In reviewing program agreements, the following program structures were prioritized for funding consideration:

- Community Day Programs - A multi-component, community-based, non-residential program structure that provides closely supervised intervention and prevention services;

- Structured Activities Programs - Programs that offer skill-building activities in a non-residential setting. Programs may offer these skills to juveniles and/or their parents for the purpose of enhancing their personal enrichment, skills or abilities in a particular area:
  - Mentoring
  - Parent/Family Skill-building
  - Interpersonal Skill-building
  - Experiential Skill-building
  - Tutoring/Academic Enhancement
  - Vocational Development
  - Psycho-education/Supportive Counseling
- 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 the behavior.
  - Mediation/Conflict Resolution
  - Restitution
  - Teen Court
- Clinical Treatment Programs - Programs that offer professional help to a juvenile and/or his or her family to 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
  - Home-Based Family Counseling
  - Crisis Counseling
  - Substance Abuse Treatment
  - Sexual Offender Treatment
- Residential Treatment Programs - Programs that offer services in a residential setting.
  - Group Home Care
  - Temporary Shelter Care
  - Runaway Shelter Care
  - Specialized Foster Care
  - Temporary Foster Care

Based on the projects' outcome data from FY 2008-2009, the services provided to the target population, and the state and local support for these projects, eight (8) projects were selected for continued funding for the period beginning July 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010. The selected projects submitted program agreements to contract with the Department and a county to provide the proposed intermediate and commitment services. (See Table 1.)

**Table 1**

**Project Level Funding**

<b>Area of the State</b>	<b>Host County (Sponsoring Agency)</b>	<b>12 Month Funding July 2009-June 2010</b>	<b>Counties Served</b>
<b>Eastern</b>	<b>WAYNE</b> (Methodist Home for Children)	\$89,927	Wayne, Lenoir and Greene
	<b>DARE</b> (Dare County Schools)	\$40,017	Dare
	<b>ONSLow</b> (Onslow County Youth Services)	\$86,828	Onslow
<b>Piedmont</b>	<b>DAVIDSON</b> (Family Services of Davidson County, Inc.)	\$87,250	Davidson
	<b>ROCKINGHAM</b> (Rockingham County Youth Services)	\$100,000	Rockingham, Stokes and Surry
<b>Central</b>	<b>ALAMANCE</b> (Alamance County Dispute Settlement and Youth Services)	\$90,486	Alamance
	<b>CUMBERLAND</b> (Cumberland County CommuniCare, Inc.)	\$95,000	Cumberland
<b>Western</b>	<b>BURKE</b> (Appalachian Family Innovations)	\$73,242	Burke, Caldwell and Catawba
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$662,750</b>	<b>14 Counties</b>

## **Technical Support for Projects**

Because serving Level III youth in a community setting has proven to be an effective and cost-efficient way to deliver services in North Carolina, the Department continued to provide considerable technical assistance for program providers and community stakeholders. Development of 24-hour plans for providing adult supervision for each youth is a requirement for Level III programming that ensures appropriate safety mechanisms were in place. The Department required monthly client progress reports from program providers. Juvenile Court Counselors, Chief Court Counselors, and Department Clinical Services staff reviewed reports and provided written feedback.

## **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, 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 education programs such as structured day, after-school programming and tutoring. 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 2009-2010. 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 Description**

<b>Host County (Sponsoring Agency)</b>	<b>Counties Served</b>	<b>Services Provided</b> (includes 24/7 staff availability)	<b>Capacity</b>
<b>ALAMANCE</b> (Alamance County Dispute Settlement and Youth Services)	Alamance	<b>Program Type: Mentoring</b> Intensive wraparound services including individual and family counseling as well as mentoring and tutoring.	<b>5</b>
<b>BURKE</b> (Appalachian Family Innovations)	Burke, Caldwell and Catawba	<b>Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building</b> Intensive wraparound in-home services for youth and families.	<b>3</b>
<b>CUMBERLAND</b> (Cumberland County CommuniCare, Inc.)	Cumberland	<b>Program Type: Parent/Family Skill Building</b> Intensive home-based services including individual and family counseling, mentoring and community service.	<b>5</b>
<b>DARE</b> (Dare County Schools)	Dare	<b>Program Type: Counseling</b> Substance abuse assessments, individual and group counseling, intensive home-based family counseling, substance abuse education and interpersonal skills development.	<b>4</b>
<b>DAVIDSON</b> (Family Services of Davidson County, Inc.)	Davidson	<b>Program Type: Counseling</b> Intensive family wraparound services including family and individual counseling.	<b>4</b>
<b>ONslow</b> (Onslow County Youth Services)	Onslow	<b>Program Type: Structured Day</b> Intensive wraparound services including residential placement, alternative education activities, life skills groups, family counseling, mentoring and tutoring.	<b>6</b>
<b>ROCKINGHAM</b> (Rockingham County Youth Services)	Rockingham, Stokes, and Surry	<b>Program Type: Home-Based Family Counseling</b> Intensive home-based counseling and cognitive behavioral group counseling, and mentoring.	<b>8</b>
<b>WAYNE</b> (Methodist Home for Children)	Wayne, Lenoir and Greene	<b>Program Type: Home-Based Family Counseling</b> Intensive home-based individual and family therapy.	<b>3</b>



## Adjudication Status

On July 1, 2009, there were 32 youth receiving services in Alternatives to Commitment Programs. During FY 2009-2010, 59 youth were admitted. The projects served a total of 91 youth. Table 3 identifies the disposition level for all 91 youth served. Table 4 identifies the adjudication status at the time of admission of the 59 youth.

**Table 3**

**Disposition Level of FY 2009-2010 Youth Served**

Host County	Level II		Level III		Post-Release Supervision		Total Youth Served
	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	
Alamance	14	100.0%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	14
Burke	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	3	37.5%	8
Cumberland	8	72.8%	3	27.2%	0	0.00%	11
Dare	8	100.0%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8
Davidson	5	50.0%	2	20.0%	3	30.0%	10
Onslow	9	100.0%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	9
Rockingham	24	100.0%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	24
Wayne	4	57.1%	1	14.2%	2	28.5%	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15.3%</b>	<b>91</b>

**Table 4**

**Disposition Level of FY 2009-2010 Admissions**

Host County	Level II		Level III		Post-Release Supervision		Admissions
	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent	
Alamance	8	100.0%	0	0.00%	0	0.0%	8
Burke	2	33.3%	1	16.6%	3	50.0%	6
Cumberland	5	83.3%	1	16.6%	0	0.0%	6
Dare	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
Davidson	4	57.1%	1	14.2%	2	28.5%	7
Onslow	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
Rockingham	14	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14
Wayne	4	57.1%	1	14.2%	2	28.5%	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>81.3%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>59</b>

## Program Data

The following tables provide detailed data of the eight (8) Alternatives to Commitment Programs for FY 2009-2010. These tables include the number of youth served, adjudication status at the time of service, average length of service, funding level, actual expenditure and total cost per youth. The projects are identified by the host county.

## Program Cost

Table 5 identifies the funding level, total youth served and cost per youth for FY 2009-2010. The actual expenditures differ from the funding level for the eight (8) programs. Five (5) programs spent less than the approved funding level, and they returned unused funds to the Department. Three (3) of the programs spent additional funds that were secured by the sponsoring agency from other funding sources.

**Table 5**

<b>Program Cost</b>					
<b>Host County</b>	<b>Funding Level</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure</b>	<b>Total Youth Served</b>	<b>DJJDP Cost per Youth</b>	<b>Total Cost per Youth</b>
Alamance	\$90,486	\$112,483	14	\$6,463	\$8,034
Burke	\$73,242	\$76,571	8	\$9,152	\$9,571
Cumberland	\$95,000	\$94,972	11	\$8,636	\$8,633
Dare	\$40,017	\$35,789	8	\$5,002	\$4,473
Davidson	\$87,250	\$101,790	10	\$8,725	\$10,179
Onslow	\$86,828	\$44,215	9	\$9,647	\$4,912
Rockingham	\$100,000	\$87,153	24	\$4,166	\$3,631
Wayne	\$89,927	\$89,927	7	\$12,846	\$12,846
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$662,750</b>	<b>\$642,900</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>\$7,282</b>	<b>\$7,064</b>

## Length of Service

Alternatives to Commitment Programs continued to serve youth who were high risk and in need of intensive interventions for a considerable length of time. Youth were served by a program for an average length of stay ranging from 25 days to 465 days. The statewide average length of stay was 194 days.

**Table 6**

<b>Days in Program</b>	
<b>Host County</b>	<b>Average Length of Stay</b>
Alamance	194
Burke	140
Cumberland	262
Dare	207
Davidson	172
Onslow	223
Rockingham	202
Wayne	103
<b>Average</b>	<b>194</b>

## Exit from Program

Table 7 illustrates the 67 youth who exited the projects in FY 2009-2010. 56 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 (see definitions below).

- Successful Completion Indicates a high level of youth participation in program activities and achievement of behavior improvement goals.
- Satisfactory Completion Indicates an acceptable level of youth participation and behavior improvement even though the youth did not complete all program activities and did not meet all behavior goals.
- Unsuccessful Completion Failure to meet specific goals and requirement or make sufficient progress in the program.
- Non-Compliance Unexcused absences or refusing to participate in treatment activities.

**Table 7**

### Assessment at Exit

Host County	Successful Completion	Satisfactory Completion	Unsuccessful Completion	Non-Compliance	Total
Alamance	3	6	0	1	<b>10</b>
Burke	3	2	1	1	<b>7</b>
Cumberland	5	1	0	3	<b>9</b>
Dare	3	1	0	1	<b>5</b>
Davidson	5	1	0	2	<b>8</b>
Onslow	3	4	0	0	<b>7</b>
Rockingham	11	3	1	0	<b>15</b>
Wayne	2	3	1	0	<b>6</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>67</b>

## Recidivism

Table 8 illustrates the 67 youth who exited the projects during FY 2009-2010 and were tracked for recidivism in the juvenile and adult systems. Ten juveniles did not have a full 12 months to be studied after termination.

Although the recidivism numbers are higher than reported in previous years, the Department has sought a more thorough data analysis which captures a greater number of youth reoffending; however, the recidivism rates for youth served in Alternatives to Commitment Programs are still lower than the research predicts for Level III and most serious Level II dispositions.

**Table 8**

**Recidivism Data for Youth at 6 and 12 Months After Termination**

	6 Month	Percent	12 Month	Percent
Adult Warrants	11	16.42%	17	25.4%
Juvenile Complaints	7	10.45%	9	13.4%
No Complaints or Warrants	49	73.13%	41	61.2%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data Sources: North Carolina On-line Information Network (NC-JOIN), and CJ Leads databases.

## 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:

- At six and twelve months after exiting the Alternatives to Commitment Programs, recidivism rates for youth served in the programs were lower than the research predicts for Level III and most serious Level II dispositions.
- Eighty-three percent (83%) 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 \$7,064 while the average annual cost per youth in a youth development center was \$102,854. [NOTE: Youth Development Center amounts represent costs to the Department for FY 2008-2009.]

The data indicate that Alternative 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.