

JCPC
PROGRAM
EFFECTIVENESS:

FY 2018
SAMPLE

EFFECTIVENESS
OF PROGRAMS
FUNDED BY
JUVENILE CRIME
PREVENTION
COUNCILS:
YOUTH EXITING
JCPC PROGRAMS
IN FY 2018

MAY 1, 2021

SUBMITTED PURSUANT
TO N.C. GEN. STAT. §
164-49 (2020)

THE HONORABLE CHARLIE BROWN
CHAIRMAN

MICHELLE HALL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



WWW.NCSPAC.ORG

NC SENTENCING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Hon. Charlie Brown, Chairman
Chief District Court Judge

Frances Battle
NC Victim Assistance Network

Art Beeler, Jr.
NC Lieutenant Governor's Appointee

Sheriff James Clemmons, Jr.
NC Sheriffs' Association

Hon. Warren Daniel
State Senator

Louise Davis
NC Community Sentencing Association

Danielle Marquis Elder
NC Attorney General's Office

Hon. Sherri Elliott
NC District Court Judges' Association

Hon. John Faircloth
State Representative

Hon. Milton "Toby" Fitch, Jr.
State Senator

Willis Fowler
NC Post-Release Supervision & Parole Commission

Lindsey Granados
NC Advocates for Justice

Hon. R. Gregory Horne
NC Conference of Superior Court Judges

Susan Katzenelson
Private Citizen, Governor's Appointee

Chief Henry King, Jr.
NC Association of Chiefs of Police

Hon. Tammy Lee
NC Association of County Commissioners

Dr. Harvey McMurray
Academic Member

Hon. Allen McNeill
State Representative

Hon. James Mixson, III
NC Association of Clerks of Superior Court

Luther Moore
NC Retail Merchants' Association

Timothy Moose
NC Department of Public Safety

Hon. Fred Morrison, Jr.
Justice Fellowship

Hon. William Richardson
State Representative

Hon. Bob Steinburg, Sr.
State Senator

Calvin Suber
Commission Chairman's Appointee

Hon. Michael Waters
NC Conference of District Attorneys

Patrick Weede
NC Bar Association

Hon. Valerie Zachary
NC Court of Appeals

NC SENTENCING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMISSION STAFF

Michelle Hall
Executive Director

John Madler
Associate Director for Policy, Staff Attorney

Ginny Hevener
Associate Director for Research

Tamara Flinchum
Senior Research & Policy Associate

John King
Senior Research & Policy Associate

Meghan Boyd Ward
Research & Policy Associate

Melissa Lugo
Research & Policy Associate

Jennifer Lutz
Research & Policy Associate

Becky Whitaker
Research & Policy Associate

Shelley Kirk
Administrative Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
2021 JCPC EFFECTIVENESS STUDY	i
FY 2018 JCPC EXIT SAMPLE	i
JCPC Program Profile and Recidivism	i
JCPC Participant Profile and Recidivism	ii
CONCLUSIONS.....	iii
CHAPTER ONE: JCPC EFFECTIVENESS STUDY DIRECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
HISTORY OF COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMMING PRIOR TO JCPC PROGRAMS	1
ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF JCPCS.....	2
The JCPC Process	3
Planning and Funding	3
Monitoring and Evaluation.....	4
DESCRIPTION OF THE JCPC POPULATION AND PROGRAMS	4
JUVENILE JUSTICE REINVESTMENT ACT (RAISE THE AGE)	6
COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM	6
JCPC EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH DESIGN.....	7
Sample.....	7
Defining Recidivism	9
Recidivism and Jurisdiction	10
JCPC Program Categorization	11
JCPC Program Selection.....	11
Data Sources.....	11
ANALYSIS AND REPORT OUTLINE.....	12
CHAPTER TWO: JCPC PROGRAM PROFILE AND RECIDIVISM	13
JCPC PROGRAM CATEGORIES	13
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS.....	14
PRIOR JUVENILE JUSTICE CONTACTS	16
PROGRAM PROFILE.....	17
Legal Status	17
Prior JCPC Admissions	18
Risk Level	19
Problem Behaviors	19
Time in Program	21
Program Completion	21
JUVENILE AND ADULT RECIDIVISM	21
In-Program Recidivism	22
Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	22
Personal Characteristics and Recidivism	24
Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts and Recidivism	25
Program Profile and Recidivism	26
Legal Status	27
Prior JCPC Admissions	27
Risk Level and Problem Behaviors.....	28
Program Completion	28

Type of Problem Behavior and Recidivism.....	29
Time in Program and Recidivism	30
STANDARDIZED PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL (SPEP).....	31
Programs with SPEP Scores.....	31
Determining SPEP Scores	31
Juveniles Exiting Programs with SPEP Scores.....	32
Programs with SPEP Scores of Less than 50 Points.....	32
Recidivism for Juveniles in Programs with SPEP Scores of Less than 50 Points.....	34
Programs with SPEP Scores of 50 Points or More.....	35
Recidivism for Juveniles in Programs with SPEP Scores of 50 Points or More.....	37
SUMMARY.....	38
CHAPTER THREE: JCPC PARTICIPANT PROFILE AND RECIDIVISM	40
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS.....	40
PRIOR JUVENILE JUSTICE CONTACTS	41
RISK ASSESSMENTS AND PROBLEM BEHAVIORS	42
IN-PROGRAM PROFILE	44
Prior JCPC Admissions	44
Time in Program.....	44
Program Completion	45
JUVENILE AND ADULT RECIDIVISM	46
In-Program Recidivism	46
Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	47
Personal Characteristics and Recidivism	48
Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts and Recidivism	49
Prior JCPC Admissions and Recidivism	50
Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Recidivism.....	50
Program Completion and Recidivism	52
PROGRAM CATEGORY AND LEGAL STATUS.....	52
Statistical Profile.....	53
In-Program Recidivism	55
Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	56
SUMMARY.....	57
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSIONS	59
NEW RESEARCH DESIGN	59
SUMMARY.....	59
TRENDS	60
CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS.....	62
APPENDIX A: JUVENILE DISPOSITION CHART AND DISPOSITIONAL ALTERNATIVES.....	65
APPENDIX B: JCPC PROGRAM COMPONENT TYPES	68
APPENDIX C: NORTH CAROLINA ASSESSMENT OF JUVENILE RISK OF FUTURE OFFENDING COMMUNITY PROGRAMS VERSION	73
APPENDIX D: NC DPS JUVENILE JUSTICE/JCPC REFERRAL FORM	76

APPENDIX E: STANDARDIZED PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL (SPEP) SCORE SHEET	79
--	-----------

APPENDIX F: ADDITIONAL RECIDIVISM DATA	82
---	-----------

TABLES

Table 1.1: Recidivism Defined.....	9
Table 2.1: Referral Source by Program Category.....	14
Table 2.2: Personal Characteristics by Program Category.....	15
Table 2.3: Program Profile by Program Category.....	18
Table 2.4: Recidivism Rates by Program Category: In-Program.....	22
Table 2.5: Recidivism Rates by Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	23
Table 2.6: Recidivism Rates by Personal Characteristics and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	25
Table 2.7: Recidivism Rates by Program Profile and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	27
Table 2.8: Recidivism Rates by Type of Problem Behavior and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	29
Table 3.1: Personal Characteristics by Legal Status.....	40
Table 3.2: Average Length of Participation by Age at Program Entry and Legal Status.....	45
Table 3.3: Recidivism Rates by Legal Status: In-Program.....	46
Table 3.4: Recidivism Rates by Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	47
Table 3.5: Recidivism Rates by Personal Characteristics and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	48
Table 3.6: Recidivism Rates by Type of Problem Behavior and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	51
Table B.1: JCPC Programs and Participants.....	69
Table F.1: Juvenile Adjudications and Adult Convictions by Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	83
Table F.2: Juvenile Adjudications and Adult Convictions by Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	83

FIGURES

Figure 1: Summary of Recidivism Rates for JCPC Programs.....	ii
Figure 2: Summary of Recidivism Rates for At-Risk and Court-Involved Juveniles.....	iii
Figure 1.1: JCPC Program Categories.....	5
Figure 1.2: A Timeline Comparison of Prior and Current Recidivism Research Designs.....	7
Figure 1.3: JCPC Exit Sample by Legal Status at JCPC Entry.....	8
Figure 1.4: Legal Jurisdiction during Recidivism Periods.....	10
Figure 2.1: JCPC Exits by Program Category.....	14
Figure 2.2: Age at Program Exit by Program Category.....	16
Figure 2.3: Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts by Program Category.....	17
Figure 2.4: Type of Problem Behaviors by Program Category.....	20
Figure 2.5: Recidivism Rates by Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	23
Figure 2.6: Number of Recidivist Events by Crime Category for Juveniles with Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	24
Figure 2.7: Recidivism Rates by Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	26
Figure 2.8: Recidivism Rates by Program Category and Prior Complaints: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	26
Figure 2.9: Recidivism Rates by Risk Level and Problem Behaviors: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	28
Figure 2.10: Recidivism Rates by Direct Service Hours Provided and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	30
Figure 2.11: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs.....	32
Figure 2.12: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Program Category and Legal Status: Less than 50 Points.....	33

Figure 2.13: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by SPEP Scores and Program Category: Less than 50 Points.....	33
Figure 2.14: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Risk Level and Program Category: Less than 50 Points	34
Figure 2.15: Recidivism Rates by SPEP Points and Program Category (Less than 50 Points): Two-Year Follow-Up	34
Figure 2.16: Recidivism Rates by Risk Level and Program Category (Less than 50 Points): Two-Year Follow-Up	35
Figure 2.17: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Program Category and Legal Status: 50 Points or More.....	35
Figure 2.18: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by SPEP Scores and Program Category: 50 Points or More.....	36
Figure 2.19: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Risk Level and Program Category: 50 Points or More	36
Figure 2.20: Recidivism Rates by SPEP Points and Program Category (50 Points or More): Two-Year Follow-Up	37
Figure 2.21: Recidivism Rates by Risk Level and Program Category (50 Points or More): Two-Year Follow-Up	37
Figure 2.22: Summary of Recidivism Rates for JCPC Programs	38
Figure 3.1: Age at Program Entry and Program Exit by Legal Status	41
Figure 3.2: Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts by Legal Status.....	42
Figure 3.3: Risk Level and Number of Problem Behaviors by Legal Status.....	43
Figure 3.4: Type of Problem Behaviors by Legal Status.....	43
Figure 3.5: Prior JCPC Admissions.....	44
Figure 3.6: Program Completion by Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Legal Status.....	46
Figure 3.7: Recidivism Rates by Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	47
Figure 3.8: Number of Recidivist Events by Crime Category for Juveniles with Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up	48
Figure 3.9: Recidivism Rates by Age at Program Exit and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	49
Figure 3.10: Recidivism Rates by Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up	49
Figure 3.11: Recidivism Rates by Prior JCPC Admissions and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up	50
Figure 3.12: Recidivism Rates by Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Legal Status	50
Figure 3.13: Recidivism Rates by Program Completion and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up	52
Figure 3.14: Distribution of Exits by Program Category and Legal Status	53
Figure 3.15: Risk Level by Program Category and Legal Status	54
Figure 3.16: Number of Problem Behaviors by Program Category and Legal Status	55
Figure 3.17: Recidivism Rates by Program Category and Legal Status: In-Program.....	56
Figure 3.18: Recidivism Rates by Program Category and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up	56
Figure 3.19: Summary of Recidivism Rates for At-Risk and Court-Involved Juveniles.....	58
Figure 4.1: A Comparison of FY 2016 and FY 2018 JCPC Samples	61
Figure 4.2: A Comparison of Recidivism Rates for the FY 2016 and FY 2018 Samples: Two-Year Follow-Up	62
Figure 4.3: Recidivism Rates by Prior Complaints and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	63
Figure 4.4: Recidivism Rates by Program Completion and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up	63
Figure 4.5: Recidivism Rates by Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up.....	64
Figure E.1: Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Program Score.....	81
Figure F.1: Summary of Recidivism Rates for FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample.....	84

ACRONYMS

CBA	Community-Based Alternatives
CCH	Computerized Criminal History
DACJJ	Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice
DHHS	Department of Health and Human Services
DJJDP	Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
DPS	Department of Public Safety
DYS	Division of Youth Services
FY	Fiscal Year
G.S.	General Statute
JCPC	Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils
JJRA	Juvenile Justice Reinvestment Act
NCALLIES	A Local Link to Improve Effective Services
NC-JOIN	North Carolina Juvenile Online Information Network
PRS	Post-Release Supervision
RtA	Raise the Age
SBI	State Bureau of Investigation
SPEP	Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol
YASI	Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument
YDC	Youth Development Center

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2021 JCPC EFFECTIVENESS STUDY

In the 2009 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly, the legislature amended Chapter 164 of the General Statutes to direct the North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission to prepare biennial reports on the effectiveness of programs receiving Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) funds. The 2021 report, which marks the sixth biennial report, employed the same methodology as the 2019 report by using an exit sample with juveniles tracked for recidivism (i.e., delinquent complaints and/or adult arrests) during their participation in a JCPC program, in addition to a fixed two-year period following their JCPC program exit.¹

Raise the Age (RtA) and the COVID-19 pandemic did not affect the current study; future reports will be able to examine the effects of both on the system. The recidivism rates presented in this report will serve as a baseline for subsequent reports, particularly in examining the impact of RtA and the pandemic on recidivism. The Executive Summary highlights the key findings and conclusions from the 2021 report.

FY 2018 JCPC EXIT SAMPLE


JCPC Program Profile and Recidivism

- The report examined 14,184 juveniles who exited from one of seven JCPC program categories in FY 2018: evaluation or assessment; clinical treatment; residential services; restitution/community service; teen court/mediation/conflict resolution; structured activities; and community day programs.
- Almost half (46%) of juveniles were referred to their JCPC programs by the Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice (DACJJ). The largest proportion exited from structured activity programs (40%), followed by restitution (21%) and teen court (18%) programs.
- Overall, 6% of the sample recidivated during program participation, 19% during the two-year follow-up, and 22% during either or both time periods (see Figure 1).
- Juveniles in restitution programs had the highest in-program recidivism rate (12%). Juveniles in assessment and residential programs had the highest recidivism rates during the two-year follow-up (36% and 32% respectively); clinical, teen court, and structured activity programs had the lowest (13%, 15%, and 14% respectively). The profile of juveniles served by each program differed (e.g., age, risk level, legal status) and should be considered when comparing recidivism rates.
- Program completion rates ranged from a low of 74% (clinical) to a high of 100% (assessment). Across all program categories, juveniles who completed their JCPC programming had much lower rates of recidivism than those who did not complete their program.
- The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™) is a scoring system used by the DACJJ to estimate the impact of JCPC programs on reducing recidivism; programs with scores of 50 or better

¹ Direct comparisons between the recidivism rates presented in this report and reports prior to 2019 cannot be made due to the differences in sample selection and time periods studied.

should be more likely to reduce recidivism. Most juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points were at-risk and in the lowest two risk levels. Among programs with SPEP scores of at least 50 points, a majority were court-involved and nearly three-fourths were in RL3, RL4, or RL5. Consistent with their risk levels, juveniles in programs with SPEP scores of 50 points or more had higher recidivism rates (22%) than those in programs with less than 50 points (11%).

Figure 1
Summary of Recidivism Rates for JCPC Programs




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

JCPC Participant Profile and Recidivism

- The report also examined the 14,184 juveniles who exited from JCPC programming in FY 2018 in terms of their legal status at program entry – 56% were at-risk (i.e., not currently involved with the juvenile justice system) and 44% were court-involved.
- Over three-fourths (76%) of court-involved juveniles had a prior delinquent complaint before entering a JCPC program; only a small percentage of at-risk juveniles had a prior complaint.
- Generally, at-risk juveniles had lower risk scores than court-involved juveniles. Over 80% of the at-risk group was assessed in RL1 (lowest risk level) through RL3. Conversely, over 80% of the court-involved group was assessed in RL3 through RL5 (highest risk level).
- Overall, at-risk juveniles had longer lengths of participation in JCPC programs than court-involved juveniles in terms of face-to-face days and direct service hours.
- As shown in Figure 2, 3% of at-risk juveniles and 10% of court-involved juveniles recidivated during their JCPC programming. During the two-year follow-up, 28% of court-involved juveniles recidivated compared to 12% of at-risk juveniles. Thirteen percent (13%) of at-risk juveniles and 33% of court-involved juveniles recidivated during either or both time periods.
- Juveniles in clinical and structured activity programs had the lowest recidivism rates among the at-risk group. Juveniles in teen court and clinical programs had the lowest recidivism rates among the

court-involved group. At-risk and court-involved juveniles in teen court programming recidivated at nearly the same rate.

Figure 2
Summary of Recidivism Rates for At-Risk and Court-Involved Juveniles



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

CONCLUSIONS

- Although court-involved juveniles had higher recidivism rates compared to the at-risk group, when examining outcomes by prior contact with the juvenile justice system (i.e., prior complaint, no prior complaint), the difference in the rates of recidivism between these groups was minimal. These findings point to the strong association between both prior contact and deeper involvement in the system with recidivism. These results are also consistent with research suggesting the least invasive intervention should be used in response to delinquent behavior, as deeper involvement in the system tends to lead to worse outcomes.
- JCPC program completion was associated with lower levels of recidivism, with completers having much lower rates overall compared to their non-completing counterparts. This finding held for all programs and regardless of whether juveniles were at-risk or court-involved. Efforts to ensure program completion may continue to yield positive outcomes for program participants.
- Lower recidivism rates were generally found for juveniles who participated in programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points, even when controlling for risk. Upcoming research will examine quality of service scores for SPEP Programs in order to provide a greater understanding of the relationship between risk level, SPEP scores, quality of service scores, and recidivism.
- The findings of this report also featured the importance of the accurate assessment of risk. Regardless of program intervention or legal status, juveniles with higher levels of assessed risk had higher recidivism rates, a finding that indicates the validity of the assessment tool in its prediction of future behavior.
- This study found low rates of recidivism for juveniles exiting JCPC programs. Such low rates of recidivism for both at-risk and court-involved juveniles should be considered a success for both JCPC programs and the juvenile justice system.

The Sentencing Commission looks forward to working collaboratively with the DACJJ to further understand the effectiveness of JCPC programs and combining any lessons learned to make improvements to the delivery of services for juveniles in North Carolina.

CHAPTER ONE

JCPC EFFECTIVENESS STUDY DIRECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1998 specified that only effective Juvenile Crime Prevention Council (JCPC) programs should receive state funding.¹ In the 2007 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly, the North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission (hereinafter “Sentencing Commission”) was mandated to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of measuring the effectiveness of JCPC programs (G.S. 164-49). The JCPC Feasibility Study, which was submitted to the General Assembly on May 1, 2009, recommended an exploratory study to evaluate the relationship between JCPC participants’ characteristics, program participation, and subsequent juvenile and adult justice system contacts.

As a result of the feasibility study, the Sentencing Commission was directed during the 2009 Session of the General Assembly to prepare biennial reports on the effectiveness of programs receiving JCPC funds:

§ 164-49. Biennial report on effectiveness of JCPC grant recipients.

The Judicial Department, through the North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Commission, shall conduct biennial studies on the effectiveness of programs receiving Juvenile Crime Prevention Council grant funding in North Carolina. Each study shall be based upon a sample of juveniles admitted to programs funded with JCPC grants and document subsequent involvement in both the juvenile justice system and criminal justice system for at least two years following the sample admittance. All State agencies shall provide data as requested by the Commission.

The Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission shall report the results of the first effectiveness study to the Chairs of the Senate and House of Representatives Appropriations Committees and the Chairs of the Senate and House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittees on Justice and Public Safety by May 1, 2011, and future reports shall be made by May 1 of each odd-numbered year.

The first report was delivered to the General Assembly on May 1, 2011. The current study, based on juveniles who exited at least one JCPC program during FY 2018, is the sixth biennial report prepared by the Sentencing Commission in compliance with the legislative directive.

HISTORY OF COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMMING PRIOR TO JCPC PROGRAMS

Before 1975, community-based programming for youth involved in the juvenile justice system or those who were presenting school- or home-based problems was limited and was not organized systematically. In 1975, the General Assembly passed legislation establishing a framework for community-based programs referred to as “Community-Based Alternatives (CBA).” Administration for

¹ N.C. Gen. Stat. (hereinafter G.S.) 143B-1104(a)(1).

CBA was housed under the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in its Division of Youth Services (DYS), which also provided oversight for the confinement facilities for court-involved youth (i.e., training schools and detention centers). This marked the first major effort at the state level to bring about a more structured approach to establishing and maintaining programs in local communities for court-involved juveniles or youth who were at risk by their behavior to become involved in the juvenile justice system. CBA also marked the beginning of a new approach, with the state and counties partnering in their efforts to create resources specific to the particular needs of a county. The process for CBA funding involved the county submission of funding proposals for programs in their respective locales to the state-level CBA office. Funding for approved proposals was disbursed to counties, which then provided oversight of their respective CBA programs through local advisory councils known as Youth Services Advisory Councils. These Councils, composed of community leaders and representatives from youth-related and law enforcement agencies, had the primary responsibilities of planning and overseeing CBA-funded programs. CBA operated in this manner, with few changes, for over 25 years.

ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF JCPCS

The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1998 brought about the next change in community programming, which culminated in the system that currently exists. As a result of this legislation, the two entities housing the majority of services for delinquent and undisciplined juveniles in the state, the aforementioned DYS and the Juvenile Services Division within the Administrative Office of the Courts, were combined to create a single cabinet-level agency, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (which, in 2000, became the Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention – DJJDP). Through this consolidation of services, the DJJDP was authorized to coordinate and administer all services associated with the juvenile justice system, including community-based programming. With the DJJDP assuming more of a leadership and oversight role than had previously existed under the DYS, operations for programming became more centralized. With the 2012 reorganization of the Department of Public Safety (DPS), the responsibilities of the DJJDP were assumed by DPS's Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice (DACJJ).

Community-based programming was redefined and expanded statutorily by the reform. The previous legislative intent of community programming directed that program services be targeted at court-involved juveniles (i.e., delinquent and undisciplined youth), and especially those who were in jeopardy of being committed to training school (currently known as Youth Development Centers or YDCs). With the enactment of the new juvenile laws, the intent of the General Assembly for community-based services went beyond the previous mandate of targeting court-involved youth by adding juveniles who are at risk for delinquency. This intent, reflected in G.S. 143B-845, states the following:

It is the intent of the General Assembly to prevent juveniles who are at risk from becoming delinquent. The primary intent of this Part is to develop community-based alternatives to youth development centers and to provide community-based delinquency, substance abuse, and gang prevention strategies and programs. Additionally, it is the intent of the General Assembly to provide noninstitutional dispositional alternatives that will protect the community and the juveniles.

The new laws retained local advisory councils but changed the name to Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils. Statutory adjustments gave the councils a more structured process for member appointments and extended their powers and duties. Each JCPC is capped at 26 members, all of whom are to be

appointed by the local board of county commissioners. The membership composition of the JCPC is legislatively mandated, and specifies representatives from local government entities (e.g., schools, social services), courts, law enforcement, business and faith communities, nonprofit agencies, as well as private adult and youth citizens.

In general, the statutorily-defined primary powers and duties of JCPCs are threefold. First, each council must go through an annual planning process in order to produce a plan of action for the expenditure of JCPC funds.² Second, it is the responsibility of each county council to ensure that appropriate intermediate dispositional sanctions are available and that funding is prioritized for adjudicated youth receiving Level 1 and Level 2 dispositions.³ These dispositional options must meet minimum standards adopted by the DACJJ.⁴ Additionally, JCPCs are charged with fulfilling other specified duties on an ongoing basis (e.g., assessing the needs of juveniles in the community and determining whether resources are available to meet those needs).⁵

The JCPC Process

Planning and Funding

Each of North Carolina's 100 counties has a JCPC. On an annual basis, each council is responsible for determining, planning, and developing services that are needed within its local community to address and prevent juvenile delinquency. This process ultimately results in the programs to be funded in the county for that year. All counties receive a legislative allocation that consists of the same across-the-board base allocation coupled with an allocation that is proportionate to the population of youth aged 10-17 in the county. The DACJJ administers the funding for JCPC programs. Additionally, counties must provide a local cash and/or in-kind match of 10%, 20%, or 30%, depending on the poverty level of the county. In general, councils begin the annual planning process by studying data related to the risk and needs of juveniles in their counties. For this task, a JCPC relies on information from the risk and needs assessments completed on all juveniles who have received a complaint in the local juvenile court.⁶ Based on this information, a JCPC can identify and prioritize the resources needed to serve juveniles in their county who are court-involved and those who are at risk to become involved in the juvenile justice system. To identify any gaps in programming, the JCPC compares services that are needed to ones that are currently in operation in the particular county.

Once this annual plan is developed, requests for proposals for programs to address the defined needs are solicited. The council reviews all incoming proposals, approving those that are qualified and meet the identified resource needs. Upon selecting programs to receive funding in view of the county's predetermined allocation, the funding recommendations and the plan for the upcoming year are submitted for approval to the board of county commissioners. The JCPC plan and the certification that the recommended programs have met DACJJ standards are then forwarded to the DACJJ for approval.

² G.S. 143B-851(a). In 2020, the General Assembly amended the statute to make the planning process a biennial process rather than an annual process (see North Carolina Session Law (hereinafter S.L.) 2020-83, s. 4).

³ See Appendix A for detailed information about the Juvenile Disposition Chart and Dispositional Alternatives.

⁴ G.S. 143B-851(b).

⁵ G.S. 143B-851(c).

⁶ The DACJJ implemented a new risk and needs assessment tool, the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI), effective January 1, 2021.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Once a JCPC has fully executed processes to commit its county allocation to fund identified program types and recommended programs have received full approval through local- and state-level processes, JCPCs are required to evaluate the performance of funded programs.⁷ Each JCPC appoints a monitoring committee charged with making on-site, annual visits to each funded program to review compliance with the current or last approved program agreement. The monitoring committee reports its findings back to the JCPC, program providers, and the DACJJ and determines continued funding for the current fiscal year and/or continuation funding for the following fiscal year.

Program monitoring and evaluation is a shared responsibility set forth by statute and DACJJ's policy. DACJJ staff monitor JCPC funded programs both programmatically and fiscally. The Juvenile Community Programs section provides ongoing technical assistance and training to local councils and funded program sponsoring agency personnel through the work of area consultants. Currently, there are 14 area consultants assigned to counties within the Eastern, Central, Piedmont, and Western regions of the state. By policy, area consultants are responsible for monitoring contract compliance for both newly funded and existing JCPC programs. For new programs, area consultants also provide orientation training, review program implementation, offer technical assistance through on-site visit(s), and review compliance with program-specific standards of operation. For existing programs, area consultants continue to offer technical support and review program compliance.

Area consultants make on-site formal monitoring visits to existing programs at least once every three years. Any time an area consultant determines that a program has violated provisions of its contract, funding may be suspended, terminated, or corrective actions may be used to address violations. Additionally, the DACJJ ensures that funded programs align with evidence-based program practices using the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP), which allows for the examination of how specific programs perform compared to the effective practices for that service type. This research-based process provides guidance toward modeling program practices that have the greatest impact on the reduction of recidivism.

DESCRIPTION OF THE JCPC POPULATION AND PROGRAMS

As previously noted, the language in the statutes governing JCPCs defines the population of juveniles to be served by JCPC programs. JCPC participants fall into one of two categories. The first category consists of youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system at some level. This group includes juveniles who have received a delinquent or undisciplined complaint that resulted in either a diversion from court or a decision to refer the case for a juvenile court hearing.⁸ The second category consists of youth who are displaying behaviors that place them at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Youth who are referred to JCPC programs are typically between the ages of 6 and 17, but programs can serve youth over 17 and as young as 5. Priority for JCPC services is given to juveniles who are involved in the juvenile justice system. The majority of referrals originate from juvenile court and school personnel, but referral sources can also include parents and law enforcement. Juveniles can be referred to and participate in more than one community-based program at a time.

⁷ G.S. 143B-851(c)(2).

⁸ Delinquent complaints include criminal actions or infractions under State law or under an ordinance of local government, including violation of motor vehicle laws.

During FY 2018, over 500 JCPC programs were funded in counties across the state.⁹ Listed in Figure 1.1 are the six broad groups into which each program-based service is categorized.¹⁰ All funded JCPC program services must meet the DACJJ’s minimum standards for their design, implementation, and operation. (See Appendix B for a more detailed description of individual program services.)

Figure 1.1
JCPC Program Categories

<p>Evaluation or Assessment</p> <p>Programs that offer one or more particular evaluation or assessment services to provide diagnosis and treatment intervention recommendations for youth. Psychological assessments can assist court counselors and judges in recommending the most appropriate consequences and treatment for court-involved youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical Assessments or Psychological Evaluations 	<p>Clinical Treatment</p> <p>Programs that offer professional help to a juvenile and/or the juvenile’s family to solve problems through goal-directed planning. Treatment may include individual, group, and family counseling, or a combination. It may have a particular focus such as sex offender or substance abuse treatment. Services may be community- or home-based.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counseling • Sex Offender Treatment • Home-Based Family Counseling
<p>Residential Services</p> <p>Programs where services are delivered in a residential setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group Home Care • Temporary Shelter Care • Runaway Shelter Care • Specialized Foster Care • Temporary Foster Care 	<p>Restorative¹¹</p> <p>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 elimination of the behavior.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teen Court • Mediation/Conflict Resolution • Restitution/Community Service
<p>Structured Activities</p> <p>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 personal enrichment, skills, or abilities in a particular area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring • Interpersonal Skill Building • Parent/Family Skill Building • Experiential Skill Building • Tutoring/Academic Enhancement • Vocational Skills Development 	<p>Community Day Programs</p> <p>A multi-component, community-based, non-residential program structure that provides closely supervised intervention and prevention services for delinquent, undisciplined, diverted at intake, and at-risk youth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Structured Day

⁹ See <https://www.ncdps.gov/Juvenile-Justice/Community-Programs> for more information.

¹⁰ See DPS’s *Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Report* (https://files.nc.gov/ncdps/documents/files/JCPC_Annual_Report_-_2019.pdf) for additional information.

¹¹ Historically, the restorative category has been the largest of all JCPC program categories. In order to provide more nuanced analyses in this report, restorative programs have been divided into two categories. Teen court, mediation, and conflict resolution programs (shortened to “Teen Court” for the sake of brevity) comprised one category. Restitution/community service programs (shortened to “Restitution” for the sake of brevity) comprised the other category.

During FY 2018, there were 10,951 at-risk and 10,297 court-involved juveniles admitted to JCPC programs for a total of 21,248 youth served.¹² The largest numbers of admissions were to programs having the components of restorative services (e.g., restitution, community service, and teen court) and structured activities (e.g., interpersonal skill building).¹³

JUVENILE JUSTICE REINVESTMENT ACT (RAISE THE AGE)

In 2017, the North Carolina General Assembly passed the Juvenile Justice Reinvestment Act (JJRA).¹⁴ The JJRA increases the age of juvenile jurisdiction so that most 16- and 17-year-olds facing criminal charges may have their cases disposed through the juvenile justice system rather than the adult criminal justice system.¹⁵ In addition, the JJRA includes other provisions intended to affect who comes in contact with the juvenile justice system, such as school-justice partnerships designed to reduce school-based referrals to juvenile courts and juvenile justice training for law enforcement officers.¹⁶ Raising the age of juvenile jurisdiction (RtA) will increase the number of youth in the juvenile justice system by adding a new population of 16- and 17-year-olds and by extending the number of years available for youth to be under the jurisdiction of the system. While the FY 2018 sample was under the old law regarding age of juvenile jurisdiction (6 to 15 years of age), 29% of the sample turned 16 on or after December 1, 2019 and were eligible to continue under juvenile jurisdiction due to the change in the law. This primarily occurred during the end of the follow-up period.

COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic beginning in March 2020 had immediate effects on the justice system. In response to the public health crisis, many juvenile justice processes were temporarily halted, dramatically slowed, or altered to accommodate emergency directives put in place by the Governor and Chief Justice. In addition, schools (a major referral source for juvenile complaints) were initially closed and then shifted to virtual learning in response to emergency directives. For this report, however, the pandemic occurred during the final months of the two-year recidivism follow-up period for the FY 2018 sample and had no impact on the sample itself (due to timing) and no discernible impact on the recidivism rates reported. As the pandemic continues to affect the juvenile justice system, future reports will offer the opportunity to examine its effects on the samples and on recidivism rates.

¹² DPS, *supra* note 9, at 5.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ North Carolina S.L. 2017-57, s. 16D.4. Additional information can be found at: https://www.nccourts.gov/assets/inline-files/JuvenileReinvestmentFactSheet_05012017.pdf.

¹⁵ The increase in the age of juvenile jurisdiction applies to 16- and 17-year-olds at the time of their alleged offense who have no prior adult convictions. Juveniles charged with Class A - G felonies are transferred to adult court while juveniles charged with Class H or Class I felonies or non-motor vehicle misdemeanors may remain in juvenile court (motor vehicle offenses are excluded). This change in jurisdiction applies to offenses committed on or after December 1, 2019.

¹⁶ S.L. 2017-57, s. 16D.4.(aa) and (bb).

JCPC EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH DESIGN


This is the second biennial report to employ a different methodology than previous reports. The current research approach included:

- using an exit sample of all juveniles (at-risk or court-involved) who exited from a JCPC program from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018 (FY 2018),
- tracking those juveniles during their participation in a JCPC program (i.e., in-program recidivism) and for a fixed two-year follow-up period following their JCPC program exit (i.e., two-year follow-up recidivism), and
- defining recidivism as all delinquent complaints and adult arrests during each independent time period examined.

This methodology allows juveniles to be tracked during two distinct periods of time and, importantly, separates the JCPC participation from the follow-up period. This allows for the examination of the timing of recidivism - did it occur while a juvenile participated in a JCPC program or did it occur following his/her exit from a program? Differences that exist between recidivism that occurs during JCPC programming compared to after JCPC programming can also be examined. Most importantly, the ability to control for the order and timing of recidivist events allows for greater understanding of the effect of the totality of system involvement (i.e., all interventions and programs) on recidivism.

With the incorporation of this methodology, direct comparisons between the recidivism rates presented in this report and the 2019 report can be made; however, direct comparisons between recidivism rates cannot be made with reports prior to the 2019 report due to the differences in sample selection and time periods studied (see Figure 1.2 for a comparison of the different methodologies).

Figure 1.2
A Timeline Comparison of Prior and Current Recidivism Research Designs




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Sample

The study sample included 14,184 juveniles identified in the DACJJ’s A Local Link to Improve Effective Services (NCALLIES) database as having exited from at least one JCPC program in FY 2018 (see Figure 1.3). These juveniles were matched into the DACJJ’s North Carolina Juvenile Online Information Network

Figure 1.3
JCPC Exit Sample by Legal Status at JCPC Entry



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

At-Risk at JCPC Entry

No Juvenile Justice Involvement: A juvenile who has: a) not been adjudicated delinquent or undisciplined; and b) demonstrated significant inappropriate or anti-social behavior that would suggest a high probability of court involvement; and/or c) one or more identified risk factors for delinquency.

Court Counselor Consultation: Parents or other interested parties of an at-risk youth who informally consult with a juvenile court counselor regarding possible courses of action in response to the youth's negative behavior. A consultation stops short of the formal action of bringing a delinquent or undisciplined complaint against a juvenile.

Court-Involved at JCPC Entry

Diversion Plan/Contract: Intervention services delivered to a delinquent or undisciplined juvenile when a complaint is not approved for filing as a petition.

a) Diversion Plan: Court Counselor monitors an agreement between a Court Counselor, juvenile, and the juvenile's family that specifies terms to which the juvenile and the juvenile's family agree.

b) Diversion Contract: Court Counselor monitors a written agreement between a Court Counselor, juvenile and the juvenile's family that specifies terms to which the juvenile and the juvenile's family agree. All parties sign this agreement.

Petition Filed: The determination by a juvenile court counselor during the intake process that a complaint should be filed as a petition and scheduled for a court hearing.

Deferred Prosecution: A defendant and prosecutor agree to specific terms in lieu of prosecution. (Note: can include 16- and 17-year-olds referred from District Court.) Typically, the terms include participation in an alternate service (such as counseling/treatment, community service hours, teen court). If the defendant breaks this agreement, the prosecutor can refile original charges in court. If referred to a JCPC program as part of the deferred prosecution agreement, the client's legal status is to be entered in NCALLIES as deferred prosecution.

Adjudicated: The finding by a judge during a court hearing that the allegation in a delinquent petition has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt. In a case involving an undisciplined petition, the allegation must be proved by clear and convincing evidence.

Protective Supervision: The status of a juvenile who has been adjudicated undisciplined and is under the supervision of a juvenile court counselor.

Probation: The status of a juvenile who has been adjudicated delinquent and is subject to specified conditions under the supervision of a juvenile court counselor. The juvenile may be returned to the court for violation of those conditions during the term of probation. (Includes post-release supervision after discharge from YDC.)

YDC Commitment: The most restrictive dispositional alternative available. Commitment to a YDC, a secure residential facility authorized to provide long-term treatment, education, and rehabilitative services for delinquent juveniles, is available to the court for any juvenile who is at least 10 years old and subject to a Level 3 (YDC commitment) disposition.

Post-Release Supervision (PRS): A type of juvenile court supervision that begins following a juvenile's release from a YDC. This supervision lasts a minimum of 90 days up to a year, based on the juvenile's specific PRS plan. If referred to a JCPC program during this post-release planning or supervision period, the client's legal status is to be entered in NCALLIES as PRS.

Continuation Services: A period of voluntary continuation of juvenile court supervision services beyond the period required by disposition. The juvenile/family may request to continue so that the client can complete specific services or to secure other needed services. This legal status is used in NCALLIES when the client is referred to a JCPC funded service during this period of voluntary continuation of supervision services.

(NC-JOIN) database to obtain juvenile complaint and adjudication data.¹⁷ The sample was also matched into the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation’s (SBI) database, the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system, for recidivism information on fingerprinted adult arrests and convictions.

As also shown in Figure 1.3, comparisons are made between at-risk (n=7,978) and court-involved (n=6,206) juveniles who exited at least one JCPC program in FY 2018. Sample juveniles were categorized as at-risk (i.e., not currently involved with the juvenile justice system) or court-involved based on their legal status at the time they entered their JCPC program. Overall, 56% of juveniles in the sample were at-risk at the time they entered their JCPC program, while 44% were court-involved. Court-involved juveniles entered their JCPC program from a variety of stages in the juvenile justice system, most frequently following the creation of a diversion plan or contract (44%) or a probation disposition (40%). Definitions of each of the legal status categories are also provided in Figure 1.3.

Defining Recidivism

The primary outcome measure of recidivism was defined as having a delinquent juvenile complaint and/or an adult arrest either during JCPC program participation or within the two-year follow-up period. Although the juvenile complaint and/or adult arrest had to occur within the follow-up period examined, the date that the alleged offense occurred could have been prior to the start of follow-up.¹⁸ Additional measures of recidivism included the offense severity of recidivist events, as well as adjudications and convictions (see Appendix F). Data on infractions, local ordinances, process offenses and misdemeanor traffic offenses were excluded from all recidivism measures. Table 1.1 summarizes the recidivism measures.

**Table 1.1
Recidivism Defined**

Recidivism	Definition	Data Source
• Juvenile Complaint	• Offense referred to the DACJJ	• DACJJ’s NC-JOIN
• Adult Arrest	• Fingerprinted arrest in NC that occurred after juvenile reached the age of criminal majority	• SBI’s CCH
• Juvenile Adjudication	• Adjudication in juvenile justice system	• DACJJ’s NC-JOIN
• Adult Conviction	• Conviction resulting from fingerprinted arrest	• SBI’s CCH

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

¹⁷ The original data from NCALLIES included information on 14,755 juveniles who exited from a JCPC program in FY 2018. The match of juvenile data between NCALLIES and NC-JOIN revealed some instances of individual juveniles in one database being linked to multiple juveniles in the other database; this is not unusual as matching algorithms are imperfect. To resolve this issue, these juveniles were excluded from the sample.


¹⁸ The term “recidivism” in this report refers to having a delinquent juvenile complaint, an adult arrest, or both during the follow-up periods examined. Whether a juvenile had one or more complaints and/or adult arrests during follow-up, the juvenile will be counted as a recidivist. This also applies to recidivism rates for adjudications and/or convictions. In calculating total number of recidivist events, only one complaint and only one adult arrest were counted per day if multiple complaints or arrests occurred on the same day.

Recidivism and Jurisdiction

As mentioned previously, recidivism for each juvenile in the sample was examined during their JCPC program participation and for a fixed two-year follow-up period following their last exit from JCPC programming in FY 2018.

As shown in Figure 1.4, depending on the juvenile’s age during the time periods examined, recidivism was tracked in the juvenile justice system, criminal justice system, or both. For juveniles in the sample who turned 16 on or after December 1, 2019 (29%), the time available to be under jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system was extended due to the change in the law, thereby increasing the portion of follow-up that occurred in the juvenile justice system for those juveniles.

During their JCPC program, 73% of juveniles were under 16 years of age for the entire period with recidivism tracked solely in the juvenile justice system, while 20% were 16 years of age or older and tracked solely in the criminal justice system. The remaining 7% who turned 16 years of age during their JCPC program were tracked in both the juvenile justice system and the criminal justice system. A greater proportion of at-risk juveniles were under 16 during JCPC programming compared to court-involved juveniles (75% and 70% respectively). Both groups had nearly the same proportion of juveniles 16 and older during their JCPC programs (21% at-risk and 20% court-involved).



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Given that the juveniles were older during the two-year follow-up period, a higher percentage were tracked in the criminal justice system for at least a portion of this time period (61% in both the juvenile justice system and criminal justice system, 23% in the criminal justice system solely). Half (50%) of the at-risk and 75% of the court-involved juveniles were tracked in the criminal justice system for at least some portion of the two-year follow-up.

JCPC Program Categorization

Throughout this report, references to all seven JCPC program categories have been shortened for the sake of brevity. In particular, mentions of restitution programs also include community service programs and references to teen court programs also include mediation and conflict resolution programs.

Program Category	Shortened To:
Evaluation or Assessment	Assessment
Clinical Treatment	Clinical
Residential Services	Residential
Restitution/Community Service	Restitution
Teen Court/Mediation/Conflict Resolution	Teen Court
Structured Activities	Structured Activity
Community Day Programs	Community Day

JCPC Program Selection

Over 80% (n=11,514) of the 14,184 juveniles in the JCPC exit sample exited from one program in FY 2018. When juveniles exited from more than one program in FY 2018, the exit selected for analysis was typically the last JCPC exit in the year, with two adjustments. First, juveniles were only assigned to the assessment program category if that was their only exit in FY 2018.¹⁹ Second, if a participant had more than one exit on the last exit date in FY 2018, then the exit with the greatest number of direct service hours was selected.²⁰

Data Sources

The following automated data sources were used to provide comprehensive information for the JCPC exit sample:

- NCALLIES, the DACJJ's management information system for JCPC data, was used to identify juveniles in the FY 2018 exit sample and to obtain information on their demographic characteristics, legal status (at-risk or court-involved), risk level, problem behaviors, program participation, and, where applicable, the program's SPEP score.²¹
- NC-JOIN, the DACJJ's management information system for juvenile justice contains data on all juveniles brought to court with delinquent and undisciplined complaints received in a juvenile court counselor office. This database was used to provide information about prior, current, and subsequent involvement in the juvenile justice system (i.e., complaints and other juvenile court actions).

¹⁹ While important, assessments do not involve the same level of services as other JCPC programs; therefore, their selection was given the lowest priority for analysis. If all admissions were for assessments, then the study included the latest.

²⁰ Direct service hours refer to time spent engaging in an intervention, activity, or strategy designed to develop or reinforce new insights, skills, and/or behaviors with the juvenile and/or family. Direct service hours do not include time spent completing intake forms, signing consents, etc.

²¹ SPEP scores are only available for certain JCPC programs (e.g., counseling, tutoring, restitution/community service) and are not available for JCPC structures (e.g., assessments and teen courts). For more information, see Chapter Two.

- CCH, SBI's management information system was used to provide information on fingerprinted adult arrests and convictions. All felony arrests and certain misdemeanor arrests are fingerprinted (G.S. 15A-502).

A case profile was constructed for each juvenile based on the data obtained from all three data sources. The final data set for this study consists of over 250 items of information (or variables) for the sample of 14,184 juveniles exiting a JCPC program between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018 and followed both during their program participation and for two years after their program exit.

ANALYSIS AND REPORT OUTLINE

This report marks the sixth biennial report on JCPC program effectiveness and continues the methodology implemented in the 2019 report. The study follows a sample of 14,184 juveniles who exited from a JCPC program in FY 2018 to determine whether involvement in the juvenile justice system and/or criminal justice system (i.e., recidivism) occurred.

Chapter Two presents a statistical profile of the seven broad categories of JCPC programs that includes personal characteristics, prior juvenile justice contacts, risk assessments, and problem behaviors. Recidivism for each category of JCPC programs is also examined. The chapter concludes with an analysis of SPEP scores and recidivism.

Chapter Three provides additional analyses of the sample in terms of their legal status (i.e., at-risk or court-involved). The chapter includes a statistical profile of these two groups (including personal characteristics, prior juvenile justice contacts, risk assessments, and problem behaviors), as well as a summary of any recidivist involvement in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. The chapter concludes with analyses that integrate data on JCPC program categories – the focus of Chapter Two – with data on legal status to provide a more comprehensive examination of JCPC programming.

Finally, Chapter Four summarizes the findings of the report and offers some policy implications and conclusions.

CHAPTER TWO

JCPC PROGRAM PROFILE AND RECIDIVISM

Chapter Two profiles a cohort of juveniles who exited from at least one JCPC program between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018 by program category. The chapter presents a statistical profile of the seven broad categories of JCPC programs.²² Juvenile justice and criminal justice outcomes for each category of JCPC programs are also examined, with a focus on complaints and/or adult arrests that occurred during two periods of time – while juveniles participated in a JCPC program (i.e., in-program) and for two years following their exit from a JCPC program (i.e., two-year follow-up).

JCPC PROGRAM CATEGORIES

Throughout this report, references to the seven JCPC program categories have been shortened for the sake of brevity. In particular, mentions of restitution programs also include community service programs and references to teen court programs also include mediation and conflict resolution programs.


Program Category	Shortened To:
Evaluation or Assessment	Assessment
Clinical Treatment	Clinical
Residential Services	Residential
Restitution/Community Service	Restitution
Teen Court/Mediation/Conflict Resolution	Teen Court
Structured Activities	Structured Activity
Community Day Programs	Community Day

Figure 2.1 shows the distribution of exits from JCPC programs by program category. Structured activity programs represented the largest proportion of exits (40%), followed by restitution (21%) and teen court (18%) programs. Together, these three program categories comprised almost 80% of all JCPC exits in the sample.

Table 2.1 examines the entity that referred juveniles to JCPC programming. Overall, the DACJJ referred 46% of the sample to JCPC programs. Schools were the second most frequent source of referrals (31%), followed by parent/guardian (10%). The DACJJ initiated nearly all of the referrals to restitution and assessment programs (97% and 90% respectively). The DACJJ also made the largest percentage of referrals to clinical programs (48%). Schools initiated a majority of referrals to community day and teen court programs (82% and 57% respectively). Referrals to residential and structured activity programs were more evenly distributed among the DACJJ, the DHHS, and parent/guardian.

²² As described in Chapter One, there are six broad categories of JCPC programs. However, to enable a more nuanced analysis, the restorative category, which includes restitution, community service, teen court, mediation, and conflict resolution was divided into two categories.

Figure 2.1
JCPC Exits by Program Category



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Table 2.1
Referral Source by Program Category

JCPC Program Category	N	% Referral Source					
		DACJJ	DHHS	School	Law Enforcement	Parent/Guardian	Self/Other
Assessment	464	90	8	1	--	<1	1
Clinical	1,116	48	8	16	<1	19	9
Residential	436	32	41	1	2	17	7
Restitution	2,901	97	--	1	1	--	1
Teen Court	2,601	31	<1	57	9	<1	3
Structured Activity	5,616	31	6	32	2	21	8
Community Day	1,050	7	1	82	3	3	4
Total	14,184	46	5	31	3	10	5

Note: Referrals from the DHHS consist of referrals from social services and mental health agencies. Referrals from school include referrals from both school personnel and school resource officers.

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Table 2.2 presents the composition of each program by several personal characteristics of the juvenile participants. Overall, 65% of juveniles in the sample were male. Restitution programs had the greatest proportion of males (77%). Forty-eight percent (48%) of all juveniles were black. Black juveniles comprised at least 50% of the juveniles in assessment, structured activity, and community day programs, while white juveniles accounted for over half of juveniles in clinical programming (54%).

Hispanic juveniles comprised at least 10% of all program categories. Overall, the average age of juveniles at program entry was 14. The greatest proportion of juveniles was between the ages of 13 and 14 years old at program entry (32%), followed by 15-year-olds (22%). The youngest juveniles, between the ages of 5 and 10 years old, made up 10% of the sample, but were more highly represented in structured activity (17%) and clinical (16%) programs. Similarly, juveniles 16 and older made up 20% of the sample, but were more highly represented in residential, community day, and teen court programs (39%, 36%, and 30% respectively).

Table 2.2
Personal Characteristics by Program Category


Personal Characteristics	Assessment n=464 %	Clinical n=1,116 %	Residential n=436 %	Restitution n=2,901 %	Teen Court n=2,601 %	Structured Activity n=5,616 %	Community Day n=1,050 %	Total N=14,184 %
Gender								
Male	73	56	56	77	61	61	70	65
Female	27	44	44	23	39	39	30	35
Race²³								
White	33	54	37	37	40	28	27	34
Black	50	28	48	48	43	51	55	48
Hispanic	11	11	10	10	13	13	13	12
Other/Unknown	6	7	5	5	4	8	5	6
Age at Program Entry								
5-10 years	7	16	2	1	4	17	1	10
11-12 years	11	13	9	10	14	23	11	16
13-14 years	33	30	28	38	32	31	27	32
15 years	34	20	22	33	20	16	25	22
16+ years	15	21	39	18	30	13	36	20

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

The distribution of age at program exit by program category is shown in Figure 2.2. Age at program exit indicates juveniles' ages at the beginning of the two-year follow-up period. The average age of juveniles at program exit was 14. Overall, 27% of juveniles were 16 years old or older at program exit. Over one-third of juveniles in residential, community day, and teen court programming were 16 years old or older at program exit. While 8% of juveniles were between the ages of 5 and 10 at program exit, juveniles in this age category were more highly represented in structured activity and clinical programs (16% and 13% respectively).

²³ Due to low percentages, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian, and multi-racial juveniles were combined with unknown into the Other/Unknown category.

Figure 2.2
Age at Program Exit by Program Category



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

PRIOR JUVENILE JUSTICE CONTACTS


It is important to examine whether juveniles in the sample had contact with the juvenile justice system prior to their entry into a JCPC program to gain an understanding of the juveniles' frequency of interaction with the system. Measures of prior juvenile justice contacts may include the contact(s), if any, that resulted in the JCPC program referral analyzed in this study.²⁴ Figure 2.3 provides the percentage of juveniles with juvenile justice contacts prior to entering the JCPC program analyzed in this study. Overall, 39% had a prior delinquent complaint; 18% had a prior adjudication; and 6% had a prior confinement.²⁵

Over 70% of juveniles in restitution and assessment programs had prior complaints (80% and 73% respectively). A large percentage of juveniles in restitution programming also had a prior adjudication (45%). The residential and assessment program categories had the highest proportions of juveniles with a prior confinement (20% and 18% respectively).

²⁴ Juveniles with any prior contacts may have had more than one in their prior history.

²⁵ A prior confinement could be a detention center admission or a YDC commitment or both. Generally, juveniles who had a YDC commitment also had a detention center admission.

Figure 2.3
Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts by Program Category



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

PROGRAM PROFILE

Table 2.3 presents a profile of several different aspects (e.g., legal status and risk level of participants) of each JCPC program category. Each aspect is examined individually in the following sections.

Legal Status

As introduced in Chapter One, juveniles are identified as being either at-risk or court-involved at the time they enter a JCPC program. Overall, 56% of the FY 2018 JCPC exit sample were at-risk at referral. Community day, structured activity, and teen court programs had the highest percentages of at-risk juveniles (86%, 73%, and 72% respectively). Restitution and assessment programs had the highest percentages of court-involved juveniles (94% and 87% respectively). Clinical programs were nearly evenly split between at-risk and court-involved juveniles.

Table 2.3
Program Profile by Program Category

Program Profile	Assessment n=464	Clinical n=1,116	Residential n=436	Restitution n=2,901	Teen Court n=2,601	Structured Activity n=5,616	Community Day n=1,050	Total N=14,184
Legal Status	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
At-Risk	13	52	68	6	72	73	86	56
Court-Involved	87	48	32	94	28	27	14	44
Prior JCPC Admissions	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
No Prior Admission	72	65	53	60	85	70	62	69
Prior Admission	28	35	47	40	15	30	38	31
Risk Level	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
RL1 (lowest)	10	14	12	4	10	13	20	11
RL2	11	28	18	17	37	28	29	27
RL3	31	29	26	35	39	38	26	36
RL4	34	25	32	32	13	18	20	21
RL5 (highest)	14	4	12	12	1	3	5	5
Problem Behaviors	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	8	14	11	10	32	25	56	24
2-3	23	31	27	29	36	32	20	30
4+	69	55	62	61	32	43	24	46
Time in Program	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.
Days Enrolled	22	175	25	114	110	140	31	117
Face-to-Face Days	1	16	24	10	5	25	13	16
Direct Svc Hours	3	18	383	32	15	68	65	54
Program Completion	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Completion	100	74	82	88	88	84	89	86
Non-Completion	--	26	18	12	12	16	11	14

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Prior JCPC Admissions

Overall, 31% of the sample had a prior JCPC admission. Residential programs had the highest proportion of juveniles with a prior JCPC admission (47%); teen court had the lowest (15%). Roughly 30-40% of juveniles served in the other program categories had a prior JCPC admission.

Risk Level

Typically, DACJJ juvenile court counselors administer risk assessments for court-involved juveniles referred to JCPC programs. For at-risk juveniles, a modified assessment of risk is administered by JCPC program providers at program entry.²⁶ The purpose of the risk assessment is to evaluate the risk of future delinquency. All juveniles in the FY 2018 JCPC exit sample received a risk score and had a risk level assigned.

As shown in Table 2.3, 84% of the sample were assessed in the middle three risk levels (RL2, RL3, RL4). Assessment programs had the greatest percentage of juveniles (14%) assessed at the highest risk level (RL5), with nearly half (48%) in either RL4 or RL5. Juveniles in residential and restitution programs also had high percentages of RL4 and RL5 juveniles (44% each). Community day and teen court programs had the greatest proportions of juveniles assessed at RL1 or RL2 (49% and 47% respectively). The distributions of risk level for clinical and structured activity programs were similar to the sample as a whole.

Problem Behaviors


Similar to administration of the risk assessment, problem behaviors for juveniles referred to JCPC programs are identified either by DACJJ juvenile court counselors (for court-involved juveniles) or JCPC program providers (for at-risk juveniles). Determining problem behaviors allows for the identification of the areas of need that JCPC programs are designed to address. Juveniles may be identified as having up to as many as 31 problem behaviors (e.g., bullying, substance use and abuse, truancy).²⁷ Overall, juveniles had an average of 4 problem behaviors with 46% having 4 or more at program entry. Assessment, residential, and restitution programs had the highest proportions of juveniles with 4 or more problem behaviors (69%, 62%, and 61% respectively). Community day and teen court programs had the highest percentages of juveniles with 1 problem behavior (56% and 32% respectively).

Figure 2.4 further details the problem behaviors shown in Table 2.3 and shows the percentage of juveniles who presented with each type of problem behavior. Overall, problem behaviors involving the individual juvenile (e.g., bullying, fighting, impulsivity) were the most common (80%), followed by problems involving school behavior (e.g., truancy, disruptive in class, behind grade level) at 55%. Problem behaviors related to community were the smallest percentage overall (19%) compared to the other categories. Generally, juveniles in assessment, clinical, and residential programs indicated problems across multiple dimensions more so than juveniles in other program categories.

²⁶ At-risk juveniles are assessed using the DACJJ's Community Programs Version of the North Carolina Assessment of Juvenile Risk of Future Offending (see Appendix C). At-risk juveniles are asked 4 fewer questions, which pertain to prior juvenile justice involvement, than court-involved youth.

²⁷ See Appendix D for a copy of the North Carolina DPS Juvenile Justice/JCPC Referral Form which outlines all 31 problem behaviors. Problem behaviors were identified for every juvenile in the sample.

Figure 2.4
Type of Problem Behaviors by Program Category



Note: Juveniles can be identified as having multiple problem behaviors and, therefore, may be represented in more than one problem behavior category. Due to low representation (n=1), the Other problem behavior category was excluded from this figure. The DACJJ reports that "other" problem behaviors are often closely related to one of the other six types of problem behaviors.

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Time in Program

The time juveniles spent in JCPC programs was measured three different ways. Days enrolled refers to the length of time between when juveniles entered and exited their JCPC programs. Face-to-face days refer to the number of days within JCPC program enrollment that juveniles received services from JCPC program providers. Finally, direct service hours refer to the number of hours juveniles and/or their families spent engaging in interventions, activities, or strategies designed to develop or reinforce new insights, skills, and behaviors. Differences in the amount of time juveniles spent in their programs are to be expected as programs are designed differently to meet the various needs of the juveniles they serve.

Across all program categories, the average number of days enrolled was 117 (see Table 2.3). Juveniles in clinical and structured activity programs had the greatest number of days enrolled on average (175 and 140 respectively); residential and assessment programs had the shortest (25 and 22 respectively).²⁸ Overall, the average number of face-to-face days was 16. Structured activity and residential programs had the greatest numbers of face-to-face days (25 and 24 respectively), while teen court and assessment programs had the fewest (5 and 1 respectively). The average number of direct service hours provided to the sample was 54. Residential programs offered the greatest number of direct service hours at 383 on average, followed by structured activity and community day programs at 68 and 65 hours respectively.

Program Completion

The DACJJ uses three indicators to identify juveniles who completed their JCPC programming: (1) successful completion, meaning the juvenile had a high level of participation and completed most of his/her goals; (2) satisfactory completion, meaning the juvenile had an acceptable level of participation and met some of his/her goals; and (3) higher level of care required, meaning JCPC program providers did everything they could to address the needs of their juvenile participants. For this analysis, these three outcomes were combined to indicate program completion. Reasons a participant did not complete the program can either reflect negative behavior by the juvenile (e.g., failure to comply with program rules) or an administrative or other neutral reason for termination (e.g., removed by parents). As shown in Table 2.3, 86% of the sample completed their JCPC program. The majority of juveniles completed their JCPC program regardless of program category. Program completion rates ranged from 74% for clinical to 100% for assessment.

JUVENILE AND ADULT RECIDIVISM

As described in Chapter One, juveniles in the sample were tracked during their JCPC program and for a two-year follow-up period from their program exit to determine whether involvement with the juvenile justice and adult criminal justice systems occurred. A combined measure of juvenile complaints and/or adult arrests was compiled to indicate any recidivist involvement in either system (i.e., “recidivism”). Recidivism rates are only reported for juveniles when there are more than 25 juveniles in a specific category.²⁹

²⁸ Residential programs include group home care, shelter care, and foster care. The most frequently used residential programs for juveniles in the FY 2018 sample were temporary shelter care (32 days enrolled on average) and runaway shelter care (8 days enrolled on average).

²⁹ As described in Chapter One, evaluation and assessment services provide diagnosis and treatment intervention recommendations for youth. Psychological assessments can assist court counselors and judges in recommending the most appropriate consequences and treatment for court-involved youth. While recidivism rates are reported for juveniles who

In-Program Recidivism

In-program recidivism refers to the percentage of juveniles who had at least one delinquent complaint and/or arrest while participating in JCPC programming. The in-program recidivism rate was 6% for the entire sample (see Table 2.4). Juveniles in the restitution program had the highest in-program recidivism rate of all program categories (12%), followed by juveniles in clinical programming (8%). The in-program recidivism rates for the remaining five programs were 5% or less. For those juveniles with at least one in-program delinquent complaint and/or arrest, the first recidivist event occurred an average of 2 months after program entry. Overall, 65% had a misdemeanor as their most serious recidivist offense.

Table 2.4
Recidivism Rates by Program Category: In-Program

JCPC Program Category	N	In-Program Recidivism		Months to Recidivism Avg.	Most Serious Recidivist Offense:	
		#	%		Felony %	Misdemeanor %
Assessment	464	20	4	1	35	65
Clinical	1,116	84	8	3	24	76
Residential	436	14	3	1	36	64
Restitution	2,901	340	12	2	40	60
Teen Court	2,601	88	3	2	23	77
Structured Activity	5,616	267	5	2	37	63
Community Day	1,050	39	4	2	21	79
Total	14,184	852	6	2	35	65

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up

Just as with in-program recidivism, a similar combined measure of juvenile delinquent complaints and/or adult arrests was compiled to indicate recidivist involvement in either system during the two years following completion of a JCPC program. Juvenile adjudications and/or adult convictions were also examined as a supplementary measure of recidivism.³⁰


Figure 2.5 and Table 2.5 examine recidivism rates by program category during follow-up. Overall, 13% of the sample had at least one delinquent complaint and/or arrest during the one-year follow-up and 19% during the two-year follow-up. Juveniles who exited from assessment and residential programs had the highest recidivism rates within one year of follow-up (27% and 25% respectively) and after two years of

received assessments, it is important to note that these programs do not involve the same level of services as other JCPC programs. Assessments function as interim assignments that may lead to additional referrals of longer duration and with greater potential to bring about positive change in the participant's behavior.

³⁰ See Appendix F for recidivism rates based on juvenile adjudications and/or adult convictions.

follow-up (36% and 32% respectively). Clinical, structured activity, and teen court had the lowest recidivism rates (13%, 14%, and 15% respectively).

Figure 2.5
Recidivism Rates by Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Table 2.5
Recidivism Rates by Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up


JCPC Program Category	N	# with Any Recidivism	Total # Recidivist Events	Months to Recidivism Avg.	One-Year Follow-Up %	Two-Year Follow-Up %
Assessment	464	165	452	7	27	36
Clinical	1,116	146	295	9	9	13
Residential	436	141	309	7	25	32
Restitution	2,901	850	1,779	8	20	29
Teen Court	2,601	392	735	9	9	15
Structured Activity	5,616	786	1,637	10	9	14
Community Day	1,050	214	400	9	13	20
Total	14,184	2,694	5,607	9	13	19

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

For those juveniles with at least one delinquent complaint and/or arrest, the first recidivist event occurred an average of 9 months after exiting their JCPC program. Juveniles who participated in structured activity recidivated slightly later than all other program categories (10 months). Overall, juveniles with a recidivist event averaged 2 recidivist events during follow-up; the average number of recidivist events for most program categories was 2, but juveniles who exited from an assessment program averaged 3 recidivist events.

Overall, 51% had a misdemeanor as their most serious recidivist event; however, over half of juveniles who exited from assessment and restitution programs had a felony as their most serious recidivist event

(53% and 54% respectively). Overall, the most common recidivist event was a property offense. This finding held for each program category as well (see Figure 2.6). Drug offenses were the least common for both the entire sample and each program category.



Note: Multiple crime categories may be linked to a recidivist event. As a result, the number of recidivist events by crime category cannot be added together to equal the total number of recidivist events.

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Personal Characteristics and Recidivism

Table 2.6 provides recidivism rates during the two-year follow-up by personal characteristics and program category. Overall, males had higher recidivism rates than females (23% and 12% respectively) and black juveniles had higher recidivism rates than other race categories. These findings generally held across all program categories. Juveniles 13-14 years old and juveniles aged 15 at program exit had the highest recidivism rates (23% and 22% respectively) compared to juveniles in other age categories. Generally, this finding held across all program categories. Juveniles aged 5-10 at program exit had the lowest recidivism rates, both overall (3%) and across all program categories.

Table 2.6
Recidivism Rates by Personal Characteristics and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up

Personal Characteristics	Assessment n=464 %	Clinical n=1,116 %	Residential n=436 %	Restitution n=2,901 %	Teen Court n=2,601 %	Structured Activity n=5,616 %	Community Day n=1,050 %	Total N=14,184 %
Gender								
Male	38	17	39	32	17	17	24	23
Female	29	9	24	19	11	9	12	12
Race³¹								
White	22	9	27	22	12	12	16	15
Black	50	23	37	36	20	16	26	24
Hispanic	19	5	27	23	10	11	9	13
Other/Unknown	19	21	--	29	12	12	8	16
Age at Program Entry								
5-10 years	21	3	--	19	4	2	--	4
11-12 years	37	18	18	33	18	11	23	17
13-14 years	43	17	36	32	18	19	21	23
15 years	35	14	44	27	13	18	22	22
16+ years	27	12	28	27	13	18	17	19
Age at Program Exit								
5-10 years	22	1	--	23	4	2	--	3
11-12 years	33	13	19	29	18	10	21	15
13-14 years	44	17	33	33	18	18	22	23
15 years	36	14	47	26	13	19	22	22
16+ years	27	14	28	29	14	18	18	19
Total	36	13	32	29	15	14	20	19


SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts and Recidivism

Figure 2.7 provides a comparison of recidivism rates for juveniles with and without prior juvenile justice contacts. Across all measures, juveniles with prior complaints, adjudications, or confinements had substantially higher recidivism rates than those with no priors. A similar pattern was found when examining recidivism rates by program category for juveniles with and without prior complaints (see Figure 2.8).


³¹ Due to low percentages, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian, and multi-racial juveniles were combined with unknown into the Other/Unknown category.

Figure 2.7
Recidivism Rates by Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure 2.8
Recidivism Rates by Program Category and Prior Complaints: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Program Profile and Recidivism

Recidivism rates by program profile are explored in Table 2.7. Overall, recidivism rates were higher for juveniles who were court-involved, who had at least one prior JCPC admission, who had higher risk levels, who had more problem behaviors, and who did not successfully complete their JCPC program.

Table 2.7
Recidivism Rates by Program Profile and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up

Program Profile	Assessment n=464 %	Clinical n=1,116 %	Residential n=436 %	Restitution n=2,901 %	Teen Court n=2,601 %	Structured Activity n=5,616 %	Community Day n=1,050 %	Total N=14,184 %
Legal Status								
At-Risk	22	7	27	19	14	9	16	12
Court-Involved	38	19	43	30	17	27	45	28
Prior JCPC Admissions								
No Prior Admission	32	10	26	25	13	12	14	15
Prior Admission	46	19	39	36	25	20	31	27
Risk Level								
RL1 (lowest)	23	3	18	9	9	5	21	9
RL2	27	5	22	13	10	7	13	10
RL3	28	12	29	25	16	14	17	17
RL4	39	24	39	37	30	27	30	31
RL5 (highest)	58	40	50	52	--	44	45	49
Problem Behaviors								
1	13	8	23	15	11	8	17	11
2-3	23	9	24	22	15	12	22	15
4+	42	17	38	35	20	19	28	26
Program Completion								
Completion	36	12	30	27	13	12	19	17
Non-Completion	--	17	42	49	31	23	34	29
Total	36	13	32	29	15	14	20	19

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Legal Status

As shown in Table 2.7, court-involved juveniles generally had higher recidivism rates than at-risk juveniles (28% compared to 12%). This finding held across all program categories. At-risk juveniles in clinical and structured activity programs had lower recidivism rates (7% and 9%) than at-risk juveniles overall (12%). Court-involved juveniles in teen court, clinical, and structured activity programs had lower recidivism rates (17%, 19%, and 27% respectively) than court-involved juveniles overall (28%).


Prior JCPC Admissions

Overall, juveniles with a prior JCPC admission had higher recidivism rates than those with no prior JCPC admission (27% and 15% respectively). The recidivism rates for those with a prior JCPC admission were nearly two times higher for most program categories.

Risk Level and Problem Behaviors

Across the entire sample, recidivism rates increased as risk level increased, ranging from 9% for juveniles in RL1 to 49% for juveniles in RL5 (see Table 2.7 and Figure 2.9). Generally, this finding held across all program categories. Assessment programs generally had the highest recidivism rates for each risk level compared to other program categories, followed by residential programs. Clinical and structured activity programs generally had the lowest recidivism rates within each risk level compared to other programs.

Figure 2.9
Recidivism Rates by Risk Level and Problem Behaviors: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Similar to increases in risk level, recidivism rates increased as the number of problem behaviors juveniles presented at program entry increased (see Table 2.7 and Figure 2.9). Overall, 11% of juveniles with 1 problem behavior recidivated during follow-up, 15% of juveniles with 2 or 3 problem behaviors recidivated, and 26% of juveniles with 4 or more problem behaviors recidivated. Residential programs had the highest recidivism rates among juveniles with 1 problem behavior (23%) compared to other program categories, while assessment programs had the highest recidivism rates among juveniles with 4 or more problem behaviors (42%). Generally, clinical and structured activity programs had the lowest recidivism rates compared to other programs regardless of the number of problem behaviors.

Program Completion

As shown in Table 2.7, juveniles who completed their JCPC programming had lower recidivism rates (17%) than those who did not complete their program (29%). This finding held across program categories. The largest difference in recidivism rates between completers and non-completers was among restitution programs where 27% of the completers recidivated during follow-up compared to 49% of non-completers, a difference of 22 percentage points. Teen court programs had a similarly large difference in recidivism rates between completers and non-completers (18 percentage points).

Type of Problem Behavior and Recidivism

Table 2.8 examines recidivism by program category for juveniles who presented a certain type of problem behavior at program entry. Overall, juveniles who presented with a specific type of problem behavior had higher recidivism rates than those who did not present that same behavior. Generally, this finding held across program categories, with the exception of (1) mental health problem behaviors for juveniles referred to clinical and residential programs, (2) family problem behaviors for juveniles referred to residential programs, and (3) community problem behaviors for juveniles referred to structured activity programs.

Table 2.8
Recidivism Rates by Type of Problem Behavior and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up


Problem Behavior	N	Assessment %	Clinical %	Residential %	Restitution %	Teen Court %	Structured Activity %	Community Day %	Total %
Individual									
No	2,852	12	3	17	19	10	6	20	8
Yes	11,332	37	16	38	30	16	18	21	22
Mental Health									
No	9,971	32	17	37	27	14	12	19	17
Yes	4,213	39	11	30	33	22	18	28	23
Family									
No	9,564	29	11	37	25	14	13	19	17
Yes	4,620	43	15	31	36	20	16	29	24
Peer									
No	10,147	29	10	24	25	14	11	19	15
Yes	4,037	45	25	49	35	20	22	28	29
School									
No	6,337	20	9	26	21	12	11	15	14
Yes	7,847	42	17	41	34	19	16	24	23
Community									
No	11,459	28	11	31	28	15	15	20	19
Yes	2,725	62	25	37	38	20	11	23	21
Total	14,184	36	13	32	29	15	14	20	19

Note: Juveniles can be identified as having multiple problem behaviors and, therefore, may be represented in more than one problem behavior category. Due to low representation (n=1), the Other problem behavior category was excluded from this table.
SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Time in Program and Recidivism

Figure 2.10 presents recidivism rates in the context of direct service hours provided while juveniles participated in their JCPC programming. Variations in recidivism rates were found based on time in program. Juveniles who received 8 or fewer hours of direct service recidivated at the highest rate (23%), while juveniles with between 9 and 20 hours of direct service recidivated at the lowest rate (16%). When considering the relationship between program category, direct service hours, and recidivism, the number of hours that yielded the lowest recidivism rates differed across programs. This finding may be explained by the different composition of juveniles (e.g., age, risk levels, problem behaviors) in each program. Little variation in recidivism rates by direct service hours was found for juveniles in residential programs. Juveniles in restitution and community day programming recidivated at their lowest rates (22% and 15% respectively) after receiving between 9 and 20 direct service hours. The lowest recidivism rates for juveniles in clinical, teen court, and structured activity programming came from juveniles who received more than 40 hours of direct service (10%, 13%, and 10% respectively).

Figure 2.10
Recidivism Rates by Direct Service Hours Provided and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

STANDARDIZED PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL (SPEP)

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™) is a scoring system used by the DACJJ to estimate the impact of JCPC programs on reducing recidivism. The SPEP is a data-driven tool designed to compare JCPC programs against each other and against evidence-based practices. The scoring system is based on a meta-analysis of juvenile justice programs that reduce recidivism among court-involved youth and has been adopted in 9 states. SPEP scores are only available for programs that offer certain evidence-based treatment services (e.g., counseling, social skills training, restitution/community service).

With data available on SPEP scores beginning in FY 2015, this is the second JCPC effectiveness report to include information on the SPEP. This study offers an examination of the relationship between programs' SPEP scores and the recidivism rates of the juveniles in those programs.

Programs with SPEP Scores

The FY 2018 JCPC exit sample included data on 521 programs; however, SPEP scores are not available for all JCPC programs. As noted above, SPEP programs must provide treatment services.³² Of the 521 programs, 71% (n=371) had SPEP scores available, with 109 programs having provisional scores.³³ The following analysis focuses on the 262 programs with non-provisional SPEP scores. These 262 programs offered SPEP services to 8,942 juveniles or 63% of the 14,184 juveniles in the sample.

Determining SPEP Scores³⁴

SPEP scores are based on a total of 100 possible points. Points are assigned for program performance on several different metrics. First, points are assigned for the type of programming and the quality of service provided. For each type of program, targets are established for juvenile participation both in terms of weeks and hours. Programs earn additional points based on the percentage of juveniles who meet these duration (weeks) and contact (hours) targets; higher percentages earn greater points. A third way programs earn points is by serving juveniles in higher risk levels (RL3 and above). Points are awarded for the percentage of juveniles served in RL3, RL4, and RL5 (i.e., Risk Tier 1 points) and for the percentage of juveniles served in RL4 and RL5 (i.e., Risk Tier 2 points). Higher percentages of juveniles served in each of the Risk Tiers earn greater points. A SPEP score is the sum of the points programs earn in each of these areas.

DACJJ field consultants work with JCPC program providers on an ongoing basis to help programs increase their SPEP scores. Field consultants conduct on-site assessments of JCPC programs at least every 3 years, primarily to update the SPEP quality of service scores and develop program enhancement plans. The DACJJ updates SPEP scores annually as new data on program performance become available, particularly with regard to targets for duration and hours and percentage of high risk juveniles served.

³² Programs offering clinical assessments or psychological evaluations and teen courts are examples of programs ineligible for SPEP scoring. These programs provide a "structure" for services, but do not provide treatment. Mediation and conflict resolution programs became ineligible for SPEP scoring in FY 2018.

³³ SPEP scores are considered provisional when they are based on fewer than 10 exits.


³⁴ See the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) for Services to Juvenile Offenders® in Appendix E for a worksheet that shows how SPEP points are calculated, as well as the distribution of juveniles exiting SPEP programs by program score.

The developers of the SPEP scoring system found that programs with scores of 50 or better (out of 100 possible points) are shown to be effective in reducing recidivism.³⁵ As a result, analyses in this section focus on several program groupings based on the 50 point threshold.

Juveniles Exiting Programs with SPEP Scores

Of the 8,942 juveniles who exited a program with non-provisional SPEP scores in FY 2018, over half (54%) were in structured activity programs (see Figure 2.11). Restitution programs constituted the second largest group (32%). Over 75% of juveniles in programs with SPEP scores exited from programs with SPEP scores of at least 50 points.

Figure 2.11
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Programs with SPEP Scores of Less than 50 Points

Among programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points, over 60% of juveniles were in a structured activity program (see Figure 2.12). Of the 2,025 juveniles who exited from a program with a SPEP score of less than 50 points, 72% were at-risk and 28% were court-involved. Clinical and structured activity programs served predominantly at-risk juveniles (82% and 91% respectively), while court-involved juveniles comprised the vast majority of juveniles in restitution programs (88%).

³⁵ For further information, see Center for Juvenile Justice Reform’s *Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Programs: A New Perspective on Evidence-Based Practice* at https://njin.org/uploads/digital-library/CJJR_Lipsey_Improving-Effectiveness-of-Juvenile-Justice_2010.pdf. Published December 2010.


Figure 2.12
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Program Category and Legal Status: Less than 50 Points



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure 2.13 examines the percentage of juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of 39 or less points compared to juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores between 40 and 49 points. Overall, 62% of juveniles exited from programs with scores between 40 and 49 points. A majority of juveniles in clinical, restitution, and structured activity programs were in programs that had SPEP scores between 40 and 49 points (55%, 82%, and 56% respectively).

Figure 2.13
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by SPEP Scores and Program Category: Less than 50 Points




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure 2.14 shows the risk level distribution of juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points.³⁶ Overall, 28% of juveniles were in RL1, 35% were in RL2, 26% were in RL3, and 11% were in RL4 or RL5. The risk level distribution for clinical and structured activity programs was similar to that of the group overall. Restitution programs had a greater proportion of RL4 and RL5 juveniles than the other programs (27%) and a lower proportion of RL1 juveniles (6%).

³⁶ Throughout this SPEP section, juveniles in RL4 and RL5 have been combined due to low numbers in these risk categories.

Figure 2.14
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Risk Level and Program Category: Less than 50 Points




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Recidivism for Juveniles in Programs with SPEP Scores of Less than 50 Points

Figure 2.15 shows the recidivism rates of juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of 39 or less compared to those whose SPEP scores were between 40 and 49 points. Overall recidivism rates by program category for programs with 50 points or more are also provided. Recidivism rates were nearly the same for the 39 or less group (10%) and the 40-49 group (11%). Regardless of program category, recidivism rates were generally lower for the 40-49 group than the 39 or less group.


Figure 2.15
Recidivism Rates by SPEP Points and Program Category (Less than 50 Points): Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

The recidivism rates of juveniles who exited from programs that had SPEP scores of less than 50 points are presented by risk level in Figure 2.16. Overall, recidivism increased as risk level increased with the largest increase occurring between juveniles in RL3 (14%) and RL4 or RL5 (33%). A similar pattern was observed when examining recidivism by program category. Regardless of risk level, recidivism rates were lower for juveniles in clinical and structured activity programs compared to restitution programs.

Figure 2.16
Recidivism Rates by Risk Level and Program Category (Less than 50 Points): Two-Year Follow-Up




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Programs with SPEP Scores of 50 Points or More

Among programs with SPEP scores of 50 points or more, a majority of juveniles (52%) were in a structured activity program (see Figure 2.17). Of the 6,917 juveniles who exited from a program with a SPEP score of at least 50 points, 56% were court-involved and 44% were at-risk. Residential, structured activity, and community day programs served predominantly at-risk juveniles (70%, 68%, and 70% respectively), while court-involved juveniles comprised the vast majority of juveniles in restitution programs (95%). A majority of juveniles in clinical programs were court-involved (57%).

Figure 2.17
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Program Category and Legal Status: 50 Points or More




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure 2.18 examines the percentage of juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of 50-59 points compared to juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of 60 points or more. Overall, 52% of juveniles exited from programs with scores of at least 60 points. All juveniles in residential and community day programs were in programs that had SPEP scores of at least 60 points. Juveniles in

clinical, restitution, and structured activity programs were generally evenly split between programs with SPEP scores between 50 and 59 points and SPEP scores of 60 points or more.


Figure 2.18
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by SPEP Scores and Program Category: 50 Points or More



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure 2.19 shows the risk level distribution of juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of at least 50 points. Overall, 5% of juveniles were in RL1, 22% were in RL2, 39% were in RL3, and 34% were in RL4 or RL5. Residential programs served the greatest proportion of RL1 juveniles (12%) and the second largest proportion of RL4 and RL5 juveniles (45%). Restitution programs had the greatest percentage of RL4 and RL5 juveniles (47%). The risk level distributions for clinical and structured activity programs were similar to those of the group overall. Nearly all community day juveniles were in RL3 (58%) or RL4 and RL5 (39%).

Figure 2.19
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Risk Level and Program Category: 50 Points or More




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Recidivism for Juveniles in Programs with SPEP Scores of 50 Points or More

Figure 2.20 shows the recidivism rates of juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of 50-59 points compared to those whose SPEP scores were 60 points or more. Overall recidivism rates by program category for programs with 50 points or more are also provided. Overall, recidivism rates were nearly the same for the 50-59 group (21%) and the 60 points or more group (23%). Similar recidivism rates were observed among point categories for clinical and restitution programs. Juveniles in structured activity programs who exited from programs with 60 points or more had slightly higher recidivism rates (18%) than those in the 50-59 group (15%).


Figure 2.20
Recidivism Rates by SPEP Points and Program Category (50 Points or More): Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

The recidivism rates of juveniles who exited from programs that had SPEP scores of at least 50 points are presented by risk level in Figure 2.21. Overall, recidivism increased as risk level increased with the largest increase in recidivism occurring between juveniles in RL3 (18%) and RL4 or RL5 (36%). A similar pattern was observed when examining recidivism by program category. Regardless of risk level, clinical programs generally had the lowest recidivism rates compared to the over program categories. Restitution and structured activity programs also had low recidivism rates with juveniles in RL1 and RL2.

Figure 2.21
Recidivism Rates by Risk Level and Program Category (50 Points or More): Two-Year Follow-Up




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

SUMMARY

Chapter Two examined the FY 2018 JCPC exit sample by program category. Almost 80% of the sample exited from one of three program categories: structured activity, restitution, and teen court. Over three-fourths of juveniles were referred to their JCPC programs by either the DACJJ or school officials.

JCPC programs were profiled in several ways (e.g., age, legal status, and risk level of participants) that demonstrated the differences in composition between each program category. These compositional differences provide important context when considering the recidivism rates of each program. Recidivism rates were calculated for two periods of time: in-program and two-year follow-up. Overall, 6% of the sample had at least one delinquent complaint and/or adult arrest while participating in JCPC programming. Upon exit from JCPC programming, 13% of the sample recidivated within one year and 19% recidivated within two years.

Figure 2.22 provides the recidivism rates for each program category based on whether the recidivism occurred during JCPC participation or during the two-year follow-up. A combined measure, referred to as overall recidivism, is also presented that indicates the percentage of juveniles who recidivated during either time period or both time periods. Overall, 22% of the sample recidivated during their program and/or during the two-year follow-up. Most recidivism occurred during the two-year follow-up, a finding that is not surprising considering the average time juveniles were in a program was less than 4 months (117 days). Juveniles in assessment, residential, and restitution programs had the highest recidivism rates based on the combined measure of recidivism (37%, 34%, and 34% respectively); these programs also had the greatest proportions of juveniles in the two highest risk levels (48%, 44%, and 44% in RL4 and RL5 respectively).



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Finally, this chapter offered an examination of programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points and programs with SPEP scores of 50 points or more. Overall, the recidivism rate was 11% for juveniles who exited programs with scores of less than 50 points compared to 22% for those who exited programs with scores of 50 points or more, likely related to the risk levels of juveniles served by the programs. Most juveniles who exited from programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points were at-risk and in the lowest two risk levels. Among programs with SPEP scores of 50 points or more, a majority of juveniles were court-involved and nearly three-fourths were in RL3, RL4, or RL5. Juveniles who exited restitution programs had similar recidivism rates, regardless of whether they exited from programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points or from programs with 50 points or more (27% and 30% respectively).

CHAPTER THREE

JCPC PARTICIPANT PROFILE AND RECIDIVISM

Chapter Three provides additional analyses on the same cohort of juveniles that was examined in Chapter Two, i.e., juveniles who exited from at least one JCPC program between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018. However, this chapter examines the JCPC exit sample by their legal status at JCPC entry (i.e., at-risk or court-involved) and offers a statistical profile of the sample that includes personal characteristics, delinquency history, risk assessments, and problem behaviors. Juvenile justice and criminal justice outcomes for the sample are also examined, with a focus on complaints and/or adult arrests for two periods of time – while juveniles participated in a JCPC program (i.e., in-program) and for two years following their exit from a JCPC program (i.e., two-year follow-up).

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Overall, 56% of the JCPC exit sample were at-risk at referral and 44% were court-involved. Table 3.1 contains information on the sample in terms of personal characteristics by legal status. Overall, 65% of juveniles were male. Court-involved juveniles had a higher percentage of males (72%) compared to at-risk juveniles (59%). Nearly half (48%) of the juveniles in the sample were black, 34% were white, 12% were Hispanic, and 6% were identified as other or unknown. The racial composition of the two groups were similar, but nonwhite juveniles comprised a larger portion of the at-risk group (69%) compared to the court-involved group (62%).

Table 3.1
Personal Characteristics by Legal Status


Personal Characteristics	At-Risk n=7,978 %	Court-Involved n=6,206 %	Total N=14,184 %
Gender			
Male	59	72	65
Female	41	28	35
Race/Ethnicity³⁷			
White	31	38	34
Black	49	46	48
Hispanic	13	11	12
Other/Unknown	7	5	6

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

³⁷ Due to low percentages, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian, and multi-racial juveniles were combined with unknown into the Other/Unknown category.

Figure 3.1 shows the distribution of the juveniles' ages at JCPC program entry and exit. Overall, about one-third of the sample were 13-14 years old at JCPC program entry. The 13-14 age category also had the greatest proportion of juveniles at program exit (30%). Over one-third (36%) of the at-risk group were aged 12 or younger at program entry compared to 12% of the court-involved group. Over two-thirds (68%) of the court-involved group were between 13 and 15 years of age at program entry. By program exit, 90% of the court-involved group were over 12 years of age.

Figure 3.1
Age at Program Entry and Program Exit by Legal Status



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

PRIOR JUVENILE JUSTICE CONTACTS


In order to understand the frequency of interaction with the system, Figure 3.2 examines the percentage of juveniles with prior juvenile justice contacts. Measures of prior juvenile justice contacts may include the contact(s), if any, that resulted in the JCPC program referral analyzed in this study. Overall, 39% of the sample had at least one delinquent complaint prior to entering a JCPC program, 18% of the sample had at least one prior adjudication, and 6% had a prior confinement.³⁸

For all three measures of prior juvenile justice contacts examined, the court-involved group had more prior contacts with the juvenile justice system than the at-risk group. Court-involved juveniles had a substantially higher percentage with a prior complaint (76%) than at-risk juveniles (10%).³⁹

³⁸ A prior confinement could be a detention center admission or a YDC commitment or both. Generally, juveniles who had a YDC commitment also had a detention center admission.

³⁹ As mentioned in Chapter One, legal status was determined at the time juveniles entered the JCPC program. At-risk juveniles may have had prior complaints as part of their juvenile justice history but were not court-involved at the time they entered the JCPC program analyzed in this study.

Figure 3.2
Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts by Legal Status



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

RISK ASSESSMENTS AND PROBLEM BEHAVIORS

As mentioned in Chapter Two, DACJJ juvenile court counselors typically administer risk assessments for court-involved juveniles referred to JCPC programs. For at-risk juveniles, a modified risk assessment is administered by JCPC program providers at program entry. The purpose of the risk assessment is to evaluate the risk of future delinquency.⁴⁰ Risk scores were computed for each juvenile in the sample, placing the juvenile in one of five levels of risk from RL1 (the lowest risk) to RL5 (the highest risk).

Similar to administration of the risk assessment, problem behaviors for juveniles referred to JCPC programs are identified either by DACJJ juvenile court counselors (for court-involved juveniles) or JCPC program providers (for at-risk juveniles). Determining problem behaviors allows for the identification of the areas of need that JCPC programs are designed to address. Juveniles may be identified as having up to as many as 31 problem behaviors (e.g., bullying, substance use and abuse, truancy).⁴¹ All juveniles in the sample were identified as having at least 1 problem behavior.

Figure 3.3 shows the risk level and problem behavior distributions for both groups and for the entire sample. Overall, the risk level distribution followed a bell-shaped curve with the highest proportion of juveniles assessed at RL3 (36%). Generally, at-risk juveniles had lower risk scores than court-involved juveniles. Over 80% of the at-risk group was assessed in RL1 through RL3. Conversely, over 80% of the court-involved group was assessed in RL3 through RL5.


Generally, at-risk juveniles had fewer problem behaviors identified. A majority (67%) of at-risk juveniles were identified as having 3 or fewer problem behaviors at referral. Conversely, a majority (61%) of

⁴⁰ See Appendix C for a copy of the DACJJ's Community Programs version of the North Carolina Assessment of Juvenile Risk of Future Offending.

⁴¹ See Appendix D for a copy of the North Carolina DPS Juvenile Justice/JCPC Referral Form which outlines all 31 problem behaviors. Problem behaviors were identified for every juvenile in the sample.

court-involved juveniles were identified as having 4 or more problem behaviors at referral. At-risk juveniles averaged 3 problem behaviors, while court-involved juveniles averaged 5 problem behaviors.


Figure 3.3
Risk Level and Number of Problem Behaviors by Legal Status



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

The 31 problem behaviors were assigned to seven categories. Figure 3.4 shows the distribution of the categories of problem behaviors identified at referral.⁴² Problem behaviors involving the individual juvenile (e.g., bullying, fighting, impulsivity) were the most common among both the at-risk and court-involved groups (68% and 95% respectively). Problems involving school behavior (e.g., truancy, disruptive in class, behind grade level) were the second most frequent (48% of at-risk juveniles and 65% of court-involved juveniles). Generally, court-involved juveniles had higher proportions of each type of problem behavior than at-risk juveniles.

Figure 3.4
Type of Problem Behaviors by Legal Status



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample


⁴² Juveniles can be identified as having multiple problem behaviors and, therefore, may be represented in more than one problem behavior category. Due to low representation (n=1), the Other problem behavior category was excluded from this figure. The DACJJ reports that “other” problem behaviors are often closely related to one of the other six types of problem behaviors.

IN-PROGRAM PROFILE

Using an exit sample allows for the analysis of JCPC juveniles' recidivism while in JCPC programming and recidivism during a two-year follow-up period. Assessing recidivism at both time points provides insight on behavior occurring during program participation, as well as long-term outcomes following program exit. This section profiles the characteristics of the sample during the time they participated in JCPC programming (i.e., in-program profile).

Prior JCPC Admissions

Figure 3.5 shows the distribution of prior JCPC admissions for both groups and for the entire sample. Overall, 31% of the sample had a prior JCPC admission. A greater proportion of the court-involved group had a prior JCPC admission compared to the at-risk group (40% and 24% respectively).



Time in Program

As explained in Chapter Two, three measures of duration of program participation – days of enrollment, face-to-face days, and direct service hours – were examined and are presented in Table 3.2.

For at-risk juveniles, the youngest juveniles (juveniles aged 5-10 years) had the longest average participation, while the oldest juveniles (juveniles aged 16+) had the shortest. On average, at-risk juveniles aged 5-10 years had the longest lengths of program participation of the entire sample with 142 days of enrollment, 31 face-to-face days, and 93 direct service hours.

Table 3.2
Average Length of Participation by Age at Program Entry and Legal Status

Legal Status	N	Average Length of Participation		
		Days		Hours
		Enrolled	Face-to-Face	Direct Service
At-Risk	7,978	114	18	58
5-10 Years	1,234	142	31	93
11-12 Years	1,654	124	22	67
13-14 Years	2,258	111	15	47
15 Years	1,200	102	13	39
16+ Years	1,632	94	13	53
Court-Involved	6,206	120	13	49
5-10 Years	117	113	17	49
11-12 Years	645	121	12	35
13-14 Years	2,296	119	13	50
15 Years	1,899	121	14	51
16+ Years	1,249	121	13	52
Total	14,184	117	16	54


SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Program Completion

As also described in Chapter Two, program completion was defined as when JCPC program providers indicated one of three outcomes occurred at a juvenile’s exit from JCPC programming: (1) successful completion, meaning the juvenile had a high level of participation and completed most of his/her goals; (2) satisfactory completion, meaning the juvenile had an acceptable level of participation and met some of his/her goals; and (3) higher level of care required, meaning JCPC program providers did everything they could to address the needs of their juvenile participants.

Overall, 86% of the sample completed their JCPC program, with at-risk and court-involved juveniles completing their program at nearly the same rate (86% and 85% respectively). Figure 3.6 shows program completion rates in the context of risk level and number of problem behaviors for at-risk and court-involved juveniles. Overall, completion rates decreased as juvenile risk levels and number of problem behaviors increased. Except for RL5, at-risk and court-involved juveniles completed their JCPC programs at nearly the same rates. At-risk and court-involved juveniles completed their JCPC programs at nearly the same rates regardless of problem behaviors.

Figure 3.6
Program Completion by Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Legal Status



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

JUVENILE AND ADULT RECIDIVISM

As described in Chapter One, juveniles in the sample were tracked for two periods of time – during their participation in a JCPC program (i.e., in-program) and for two years following their exit from a JCPC program (i.e., two-year follow-up) – to determine whether involvement with the juvenile justice or adult criminal justice systems occurred. A combined measure of juvenile complaints and/or adult arrests was compiled to indicate any recidivist involvement in either system (i.e., “recidivism”).⁴³

In-Program Recidivism

Table 3.3 examines recidivism rates by legal status during JCPC programming. Overall, 6% of the sample had at least one delinquent complaint and/or arrest while participating in a JCPC program. Court-involved juveniles had a higher in-program recidivism rate than at-risk juveniles (10% compared to 3%). For those juveniles with at least one delinquent complaint and/or arrest, the first recidivist event occurred an average of 2 months after beginning their JCPC program. For those juveniles with a recidivist event, 65% had a misdemeanor as their most serious recidivist offense.

Table 3.3
Recidivism Rates by Legal Status: In-Program

Legal Status	N	In-Program Recidivism		Months to Recidivism Avg.	Most Serious Recidivist Offense:	
		#	%		Felony %	Misdemeanor %
At-Risk	7,978	218	3	2	24	76
Court-Involved	6,206	634	10	2	38	62
Total	14,184	852	6	2	35	65

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

⁴³ Juvenile adjudications and/or adult convictions were also included as a supplementary measure of recidivism. See Appendix F for recidivism rates based on juvenile adjudications and/or adult convictions.

Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up

Figure 3.7 and Table 3.4 examine recidivism rates by legal status during the two-year follow-up. Overall, 19% of the sample had at least one delinquent complaint and/or arrest during the two-year follow-up. Court-involved juveniles had higher recidivism rates than at-risk juveniles (28% and 12% respectively).



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

For those juveniles with at least one delinquent complaint and/or arrest, the first recidivist event occurred an average of 9 months after exiting their JCPC program. The timing of the first recidivist event was 10 months for at-risk juveniles and 8 months for court-involved juveniles. Compared to at-risk juveniles with a recidivist event, a larger percentage of court-involved juveniles had a delinquent complaint and/or arrest within 12 months (63% and 72% respectively).

Table 3.4
Recidivism Rates by Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up


Legal Status	N	# with Any Recidivism	Total # Recidivist Events	Months to Recidivism Avg.	One-Year Follow-Up %	Two-Year Follow-Up %
At-Risk	7,978	956	1,730	10	7	12
Court-Involved	6,206	1,738	3,877	8	19	28
Total	14,184	2,694	5,607	9	13	19

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Overall, the 2,694 juveniles with recidivism accounted for 5,607 recidivist events; both at-risk and court-involved juveniles averaged 2 recidivist events during follow-up. For those juveniles with a recidivist event, 51% had a misdemeanor as their most serious recidivist offense, with a smaller percentage of court-involved juveniles recidivating with a misdemeanor (48%) compared to at-risk juveniles (58%). Property and person offenses were the most common crime categories for both court-involved juveniles and at-risk juveniles (see Figure 3.8).⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Overall, 52% of recidivist person offenses were misdemeanors and 48% were felonies. Among at-risk juveniles, 62% of recidivist person offenses were misdemeanors; among court-involved juveniles, the majority were felonies (53%).

Figure 3.8
Number of Recidivist Events by Crime Category for Juveniles with Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up



Note: Multiple crime categories may be linked to a recidivist event. As a result, the number of recidivist events by crime category cannot be added together to equal the total number of recidivist events.

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Personal Characteristics and Recidivism

Table 3.5 provides recidivism rates during the two-year follow-up by the juvenile’s personal characteristics. Overall, males had higher recidivism rates than females (23% and 12% respectively). Black juveniles had the highest recidivism rates at 24%, followed by juveniles identified as other or unknown, white juveniles, and Hispanic juveniles. These findings were true for both groups.

Table 3.5
Recidivism Rates by Personal Characteristics and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up


Personal Characteristics	N	At-Risk	Court-Involved	Total
		n=7,978 %	n=6,206 %	N=14,184 %
Gender				
Male	9,191	15	31	23
Female	4,993	8	20	12
Race⁴⁵				
White	4,859	9	21	15
Black	6,737	15	37	24
Hispanic	1,722	9	19	13
Other/Unknown	866	10	27	16
Age at Program Entry				
5-10 Years	1,351	2	23	4
11-12 Years	2,299	12	30	17
13-14 Years	4,554	15	31	23
15 Years	3,099	15	26	22
16+ Years	2,881	14	25	19
Total	14,184	12	28	19

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

⁴⁵ Due to low percentages, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian, and multi-racial juveniles were combined with unknown into the Other/Unknown category.

Overall, the youngest juveniles, aged 5-10 at program exit, had the lowest recidivism rates (see Figure 3.9). Recidivism rates peaked for juveniles aged 13-14 (23%) and declined slightly for juveniles aged 15 (22%). Court-involved juveniles had higher recidivism rates than at-risk juveniles across all age groups. Court-involved juveniles aged 13-14 at program exit had the highest recidivism rates of the entire sample (31%).

Figure 3.9
Recidivism Rates by Age at Program Exit and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts and Recidivism

Figure 3.10 provides a comparison of recidivism rates for at-risk and court-involved juveniles with and without prior juvenile justice contacts. Across all measures, juveniles with prior complaints, adjudications, or confinements had substantially higher recidivism rates than those with no priors.

Figure 3.10
Recidivism Rates by Prior Juvenile Justice Contacts and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Prior JCPC Admissions and Recidivism

Overall, juveniles with at least one prior JCPC admission had higher recidivism rates than juveniles without a prior JCPC admission (27% and 15% respectively) (see Figure 3.11). This finding held for both at-risk and court-involved juveniles.

Figure 3.11
Recidivism Rates by Prior JCPC Admissions and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Recidivism

As shown previously in Figure 3.3, the majority of juveniles in the sample were assessed in the middle three risk levels (84%), and most juveniles were identified as having between 1 and 3 problem behaviors (54%). Figure 3.12 explores the relationship between risk level, number of problem behaviors, and recidivism. As expected, RL1 (lowest risk) juveniles had the lowest recidivism rates (9%) compared to RL5 (highest risk) juveniles (49%), with an incremental progression of recidivism rates between the middle three risk levels (RL2 to RL4). Across all five risk levels, court-involved juveniles had higher recidivism rates than at-risk juveniles.

Figure 3.12
Recidivism Rates by Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Legal Status



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Similar findings in recidivism rates were seen when examining the relationship between the number of problem behaviors and recidivism (i.e., complaints and/or adult arrests). Juveniles with 1 problem behavior had the lowest recidivism rates (11%) and those with 4 or more problem behaviors had the highest recidivism rates (26%). Court-involved juveniles had higher recidivism rates than at-risk juveniles regardless of the number of problem behaviors.

Table 3.6 examines the differences in recidivism rates by type of problem behavior identified at the time of referral to a JCPC program. Juveniles with problem behaviors had higher recidivism rates than juveniles without problem behaviors. Overall, juveniles identified as having a problem behavior with peers had the highest recidivism rates (29%) followed by those with family problem behaviors (24%). Among court-involved juveniles, those with community problem behaviors had the highest recidivism rates (38%) followed by those with peer (35%) and family (34%) problem behaviors. Among at-risk juveniles, those with peer problem behaviors had the highest recidivism rates (17%) followed by those with individual (14%), mental health (14%), and school (14%) problem behaviors.

Table 3.6
Recidivism Rates by Type of Problem Behavior and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up

Problem Behavior	N	At-Risk n=7,978 %	Court-Involved n=6,206 %	Total N=14,184 %
Individual				
No	2,852	7	22	8
Yes	11,332	14	28	22
Mental Health				
No	9,971	11	27	17
Yes	4,213	14	30	23
Family				
No	9,564	12	24	17
Yes	4,620	13	34	24
Peer				
No	10,147	11	23	15
Yes	4,037	17	35	29
School				
No	6,337	11	21	14
Yes	7,847	14	32	23
Community				
No	11,459	13	26	19
Yes	2,725	10	38	21
Total	14,184	12	28	19


Note: Juveniles can be identified as having multiple problem behaviors and, therefore, may be represented in more than one problem behavior category. Due to low representation (n=1), the Other problem behavior category was excluded from this table.

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Program Completion and Recidivism

As mentioned previously, program completion occurs when a juvenile successfully or satisfactorily completes a JCPC program or a higher level of care is required. Figure 3.13 examines recidivism in the context of juveniles who completed their JCPC program versus those who did not. Overall, juveniles who completed JCPC programs had a lower recidivism rate than non-completers (17% compared to 29% respectively). A similar pattern was found by legal status, although the difference in recidivism rates was greater for court-involved juveniles.

Figure 3.13
Recidivism Rates by Program Completion and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

PROGRAM CATEGORY AND LEGAL STATUS


Previous analyses have focused on the FY 2018 JCPC exit sample either by program category (Chapter Two) or by legal status (Chapter Three). This section offers analyses incorporating both program category and legal status for a more in-depth examination of JCPC programs.

As outlined in previous chapters, references to all seven JCPC program categories have been shortened for the sake of brevity. In particular, mentions of restitution programs also include community service programs and references to teen court programs also include mediation and conflict resolution programs.

Program Category	Shortened To:
Evaluation or Assessment	Assessment
Clinical Treatment	Clinical
Residential Services	Residential
Restitution/Community Service	Restitution
Teen Court/Mediation/Conflict Resolution	Teen Court
Structured Activities	Structured Activity
Community Day Programs	Community Day

Statistical Profile

A distribution of the sample by program category and legal status is shown in Figure 3.14. A majority (51%) of at-risk juveniles were in structured activity programs, followed by teen court (24%). The greatest proportion of court-involved juveniles were in restitution programs (44%), followed by structured activity (25%).




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure 3.15 provides the risk level distribution of juveniles served within each program category by legal status. Over half (52%) of at-risk juveniles were in the lowest two risk levels (RL1 or RL2) compared to 19% of court-involved juveniles. The at-risk group had a greater proportion of juveniles in RL1 in all program categories except teen court.


The distribution of problem behaviors by program category and legal status is presented in Figure 3.16. Overall, juveniles had an average of 4 problem behaviors with 33% of at-risk juveniles having 4 or more problem behaviors at program entry and 61% of court-involved juveniles having 4 or more problem behaviors at program entry. In all program categories, the court-involved group had a greater proportion of juveniles with 4 or more problems.

Figure 3.15
Risk Level by Program Category and Legal Status



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure 3.16
Number of Problem Behaviors by Program Category and Legal Status




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

In-Program Recidivism

In-program recidivism rates by program category and legal status are presented in Figure 3.17. Overall, court-involved juveniles had higher in-program recidivism rates than at-risk juveniles (10% compared to 3%) and this finding generally held across program categories. However, court-involved juveniles in assessment and teen court programming had in-program recidivism rates that were close to, or lower than, the at-risk recidivism rates for those same programs.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ As described in Chapter One, evaluation and assessment services provide diagnosis and treatment intervention recommendations for youth. Psychological assessments can assist court counselors and judges in recommending the most appropriate consequences and treatment for court-involved youth. While recidivism rates are reported for juveniles who

Figure 3.17
Recidivism Rates by Program Category and Legal Status: In-Program




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Recidivism: Two-Year Follow-Up

Figure 3.18 presents the recidivism rates during the two-year follow-up by program category and legal status. Across all categories of JCPC programming, the recidivism rates for court-involved juveniles were higher than the recidivism rates for at-risk juveniles.

Figure 3.18
Recidivism Rates by Program Category and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

received assessments, it is important to note that these programs do not involve the same level of services as other JCPC programs. Assessments function as interim assignments that may lead to additional referrals of longer duration and with greater potential to bring about positive change in the participant’s behavior.

SUMMARY

Chapter Three examined the FY 2018 JCPC exit sample by legal status. Overall, 56% of juveniles in the sample were at-risk at the time they entered their JCPC program (i.e., not currently involved with the juvenile justice system), while 44% were court-involved. Sixty-five percent (65%) of the sample were male. Males comprised a greater proportion of the court-involved group (72%) than the at-risk group (59%). The court-involved group was older than the at-risk group.

Higher percentages of court-involved juveniles had prior juvenile justice contacts and were assessed in higher risk levels than at-risk juveniles. Over half of the court-involved juveniles were identified as having at least 4 problem behaviors compared to less than one-third of the at-risk juveniles. Both groups completed their JCPC programming at nearly the same rate (86% for at-risk and 85% for court-involved juveniles).

Recidivism rates were calculated for two periods of time: in-program and two-year follow-up. Regardless of time period, court-involved juveniles recidivated more frequently than at-risk juveniles. Ten percent (10%) of court-involved juveniles recidivated during their JCPC program compared to 3% of at-risk juveniles. After two years of follow-up, 28% of court-involved juveniles had recidivated compared to 12% of at-risk juveniles.

The chapter concluded with analyses aimed at combining the program category information presented in Chapter Two with the legal status information from Chapter Three. Just over half (51%) of at-risk juveniles exited from structured activity programs. Court-involved juveniles were most likely to have participated in restitution programs (44%).


Risk and problem behaviors by program category and legal status were examined to provide context to recidivism rates. Among the at-risk group, juveniles who participated in assessment and residential programs had the highest recidivism rates. Juveniles in assessment, residential, and community day programming had the highest recidivism rates among the court-involved group. These programs with the highest recidivism rates had large proportions of juveniles in the highest risk levels and with at least 4 problem behaviors.

Among the at-risk group, juveniles in clinical and structured activity programs had the lowest recidivism rates. Juveniles in teen court and clinical programs had the lowest recidivism rates among the court-involved group. At-risk and court-involved juveniles in teen court programming recidivated at nearly the same rate. Teen court programs had large percentages of at-risk and court-involved juveniles in the lowest two risk levels, as well as sizable proportions of at-risk and court-involved juveniles with 1 problem behavior. (See Appendix F, Figure F.1 for a summary of recidivism rates by legal status and program category.)

Figure 3.19 provides recidivism rates by legal status based on whether recidivism occurred during JCPC participation or during the two-year follow-up. A combined measure of recidivism, referred to as overall recidivism, is also presented that indicates the percentage of juveniles who recidivated during either time period or both time periods. Overall, 22% of the sample recidivated during their program and/or during the two-year follow-up. Most recidivism occurred during the two-year follow-up, a finding that is not surprising considering the average time juveniles were in a program was less than 4 months (117

days). Over one-third of court-involved juveniles recidivated during their JCPC program and/or during the two-year follow-up compared to 13% of at-risk juveniles.

Figure 3.19
Summary of Recidivism Rates for At-Risk and Court-Involved Juveniles



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS

During the 2009 Session, the North Carolina General Assembly directed the Sentencing Commission to prepare biennial reports on the effectiveness of programs receiving JCPC funds (G.S. 164-49), with the purpose of analyzing and presenting recidivism outcomes for JCPC program participants. This report is the sixth report, submitted to the legislature on May 1, 2021. The study followed a sample of (at-risk or court-involved) who exited from a JCPC program in FY 2018. Contacts with the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems were tracked for recidivism both during their JCPC program participation and for two years following their program exit.

NEW RESEARCH DESIGN

This year's report continues the use of a new methodology, first employed in the 2019 report. The new methodology differed from previous reports by using an exit sample. This methodology allows juveniles to be tracked during two distinct periods of time (i.e., during their JCPC program and for two years after exiting their program). Comparisons between the recidivism rates presented in this report and the 2019 report can be made; however, direct comparisons to reports published prior to 2019 cannot be made due to the differences in sample selection and time periods studied.

SUMMARY

Of the 14,184 juveniles who exited from at least one JCPC program in FY 2018, 56% were identified as at-risk (n=7,978) and 44% were identified as court-involved (n=6,206) at program entry. Although juveniles may have participated in more than one JCPC program, each juvenile was assigned to one of seven JCPC program categories⁴⁷ for analysis: assessment, clinical, residential, restitution, teen court, structured activity, or community day. Almost 80% of the sample exited from one of three program categories: structured activity, restitution, and teen court.

Sixty-five percent (65%) of the sample were male; nearly half (48%) were black and 12% were Hispanic. The average age of the sample at program entry was 14. The risk level distribution of the sample followed a bell-shaped curve with the greatest number of juveniles assessed in RL3. The greatest proportion of juveniles had at least 4 or more problem behaviors (46%) and the lowest had 1 problem behavior (24%). The most common problem behaviors involved individual (80%) and school problems (55%). Overall, 86% of the sample completed their JCPC program.

The primary outcome measure of recidivism was defined as having either a delinquent juvenile complaint and/or an adult arrest either during a JCPC program (i.e., in-program) or within the two-year follow-up period (i.e., two-year follow-up). At-risk juveniles generally had lower recidivism rates than court-involved juveniles regardless of time period.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ See Chapter One for further description of program categories. Mentions of restitution programs also include community service programs and references to teen court programs also include mediation and conflict resolution programs.

⁴⁸ See Appendix F, Figure F.1 for a summary of recidivism rates by legal status and program category.

While recidivism rates alone are informative, they should be considered in context with a number of other factors examined in this report. For example, while in-program recidivism rates were markedly lower than two-year follow-up recidivism rates, part of this difference can be explained by the length of JCPC program participation. The average length of time juveniles were enrolled in JCPC programming was less than 4 months (117 days), ranging from an average of 22 days for assessment to 175 days for clinical programs. Simply, the “window of opportunity” for recidivism while in a JCPC program was far smaller than during the two-year follow-up.

Differences in key factors (e.g., risk level, problem behaviors, prior contact with the juvenile justice system) can explain some of the differences in recidivism found between at-risk and court-involved juveniles. Court-involved juveniles were, on average, more than a year older, were higher risk, had more problem behaviors, and had more extensive prior contact with the juvenile justice system than at-risk juveniles.

Understanding the variations in recidivism rates between program categories involves examining the differences between the juveniles that typically participate in each program. Two of the program categories with the highest recidivism rates, regardless of legal status, were assessment and residential programs. High recidivism rates for these two particular programs were not surprising given that over half of the juveniles in these programs were assessed in the highest two risk levels and over 60% presented 4 or more problem behaviors at referral. Although they comprised only 6% of the sample, these juveniles are challenging populations for the DACJJ due to these factors.⁴⁹

Regardless of legal status, clinical, structured activity, and teen court programs had the lowest recidivism rates during the two-year follow-up. Juveniles in all three program types were typically low risk, although they varied in terms of problem behaviors. While juveniles in structured activity and teen court programs had a limited number of problem behaviors, over 50% of juveniles in clinical programs had 4 or more problem behaviors.


Finally, this is the second JCPC effectiveness report to offer an examination of the relationship between SPEP scores and recidivism. The developers of the SPEP scoring system found through meta-analysis of court-involved juveniles that SPEP scores of 50 or better are shown to be effective in reducing recidivism. In this report, lower recidivism rates were generally found for juveniles who participated in programs with SPEP scores of less than 50 points, even when controlling for risk. Upcoming research will augment this report by examining quality of service scores for programs with SPEP scores. This may provide greater understanding of the relationship between risk level, SPEP scores, the quality of service scores, and recidivism.

TRENDS

While two data points do not represent a trend, comparisons between the first two samples under the new methodology can be made. Figure 4.1 compares the FY 2016 JCPC sample with the current FY 2018 sample. Overall, there was a 4% decrease in sample size from FY 2016 to FY 2018, primarily driven by a 9% decrease in court-involved juveniles. For both samples, the greatest proportion of juveniles exited structured activity programs; there were very few differences in the distribution by program category.

⁴⁹ As noted previously, assessments function as interim assignments that may lead to additional referrals of longer duration and with greater potential to bring about positive change in the participant’s behavior.


Figure 4.1
A Comparison of FY 2016 and FY 2018 JCPC Samples



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 Juvenile Recidivism Exit Sample

Notably, the overall recidivism rate decreased from the FY 2016 sample to the FY 2018 sample (see Figure 4.2). Both at-risk and court-involved juveniles recidivated at lower rates in the current study. Additionally, recidivism rates also decreased for juveniles across all JCPC program categories, with the largest decreases occurring for juveniles in assessment, residential, and community day programs. Several possible factors may help explain the lower rates of recidivism for the current sample: the percentage of court-involved juveniles in the sample decreased; the percentage of juveniles in the sample with prior complaints decreased; the proportion of juveniles in the highest risk levels decreased; and program completion increased slightly.

Figure 4.2
A Comparison of Recidivism Rates for the FY 2016 and FY 2018 Samples: Two-Year Follow-Up




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 Juvenile Recidivism Exit Sample

CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

By definition, court-involved juveniles have deeper involvement in the juvenile justice system compared to at-risk juveniles. The data indicated that juveniles in the court-involved group also had more prior contact with the juvenile justice system, both in terms of prior complaints and prior adjudications. Court-involved juveniles also had higher recidivism rates compared to the at-risk group. However, when examining outcomes by prior contact (i.e., prior complaint, no prior complaint), the difference in the rate of recidivism by legal status was minimal (see Figure 4.3). These findings point to the strong association between both prior contact and deeper involvement in the system with recidivism. The results of these analyses are also consistent with research suggesting the least invasive intervention should be utilized in response to delinquent behavior, as deeper involvement in the system tends to lead to worse outcomes.


Figure 4.3
Recidivism Rates by Prior Complaints and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

One particularly noteworthy finding in this report was the high rates of completion for juveniles admitted to JCPC programs. Program completion rates ranged across program categories from a low of 74% to a high of 100%; the lowest completion rate still indicated a majority of juveniles completed. Achieving such high levels of completion should be considered a significant success to programs. Perhaps of even greater importance was the relationship between completion and recidivism. As the analysis in this report indicated, program completion was associated with lower levels of recidivism, with completers having much lower rates overall compared to their non-completing counterparts. This finding held for all programs (see Figure 4.4), and regardless of legal status. Efforts to ensure program completion may continue to yield positive outcomes for program participants.

Figure 4.4
Recidivism Rates by Program Completion and Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up




SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

The findings of this report also featured the importance of the accurate assessment of risk and the value of the risk assessment tool for predicting recidivism. Regardless of program intervention, juveniles with higher levels of assessed risk had higher recidivism rates, a finding that indicates the validity of the assessment tool in its prediction of future behavior. Juveniles assessed in the highest risk level (RL5), had

recidivism rates ranging from a low of 40% (clinical programs) to a high of 58% (assessments). Similarly, increases in the number of problem behaviors indicated an increased likelihood for recidivism, again, regardless of program category. This finding also holds true when examining juveniles by legal status (see Figure 4.5); juveniles in RL5 and with 4 or more problem behaviors had higher rates of recidivism. Notably, the differences between the rates of at-risk and court-involved juveniles became more pronounced as risk level increased.

Figure 4.5
Recidivism Rates by Risk Level, Problem Behaviors, and Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up



SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

This study has built upon the Commission’s previous reports on JCPC effectiveness and is now more comprehensive due to the inclusion of risk data for at-risk juveniles, problem behavior data for all juveniles, and SPEP data. As noted above, the overall recidivism rates for juveniles exiting JCPC programs in FY 2018 decreased from the previous study, with several explanations offered. Such low rates of recidivism for both at-risk and court-involved juveniles should be considered a success for both JCPC programs and the juvenile justice system.

The Sentencing Commission looks forward to working collaboratively with the DACJJ to further understand the effectiveness of JCPC programs and combining any lessons learned to make improvements to the delivery of services for juveniles in North Carolina.

APPENDIX A

JUVENILE DISPOSITION CHART AND DISPOSITIONAL
ALTERNATIVES

Juvenile Disposition Chart

Offense Classification	Delinquency History Level		
	Low 0-1 point	Medium 2-3 points	High 4 or more points
Violent Class A-E felonies	Level 2 or 3	Level 3	Level 3
Serious Class F-I felonies Class A1 misdemeanors	Level 1 or 2	Level 2	Level 2 or 3
Minor Class 1-3 misdemeanors	Level 1	Level 1 or 2	Level 2

Offense Classification (G.S. 7B-2508)

Violent – Adjudication of a Class A through E felony offense.

Serious – Adjudication of a Class F through I felony offense or a Class A1 misdemeanor.

Minor – Adjudication of a Class 1, 2, or 3 misdemeanor.

Delinquency History Levels (G.S. 7B-2507)

Points

For each prior adjudication of a Class A through E felony offense, 4 points.

For each prior adjudication of a Class F through I felony offense or a Class A1 misdemeanor offense, 2 points.

For each prior adjudication of a Class 1, 2, or 3 misdemeanor offense, 1 point.

If the juvenile was on probation at the time of the offense, 2 points.

Levels

Low – No more than 1 point.

Medium – At least 2, but not more than 3 points.

High – At least 4 points.

**Dispositional Alternatives for Delinquent Juveniles
(G.S. 7B-2502 and G.S. 7B-2506)**

Level 1 Community	Level 2 Intermediate	Level 3 Commitment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation and treatment • In-home supervision • Custody of parent, guardian, etc. • Custody of DSS • Excuse from school attendance • Community-based program • Intensive substance abuse treatment program • Residential treatment program • Nonresidential treatment program • Restitution up to \$500 • Fine • Community service up to 100 hours • Victim-offender reconciliation • Probation • No driver's license • Curfew • Not associate with specified persons • Not be in specified places • Intermittent confinement up to 5 days • Wilderness program • Supervised day program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation and treatment • Wilderness program • Residential treatment facility • Intensive nonresidential treatment program • Intensive substance abuse program • Group home placement • Intensive probation • Supervised day program • Regimented training program • House arrest • Suspension of more severe disposition w/conditions • Intermittent confinement up to 14 days • Multipurpose group home • Restitution over \$500 • Community service up to 200 hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 month minimum confinement • Minimum 90 days post-release supervision

APPENDIX B

JCPC PROGRAM COMPONENT TYPES

**Table B.1
JCPC Programs and Participants**

Program Category Program Type	Programs		Participants	
	n	%	n	%
Assessment	29	6	464	3
Clinical Assessments or Psychological Evaluations	29	6	464	3
Clinical	57	11	1,116	8
Counseling	33	6	965	7
Home Based Family Counseling	16	3	99	1
Sex Offender Treatment	8	1	52	<1
Residential	29	6	436	3
Group Home Care	2	1	44	1
Runaway Shelter Care	4	1	169	1
Specialized Foster Care	5	1	21	<1
Temporary Foster Care	1	<1	1	<1
Temporary Shelter Care	17	3	201	1
Restitution	95	18	2,901	21
Restitution/Community Service	95	18	2,901	21
Teen Court	81	15	2,601	18
Teen Court	53	10	2,225	16
Mediation/Conflict Resolution	28	5	376	2
Structured Activity	216	41	5,616	40
Experiential Skill Building	13	2	403	3
Interpersonal Skill Building	105	20	2,730	19
Mentoring	25	5	422	3
Parent/Family Skill Building	46	9	935	7
Tutoring/Academic Enhancement	21	4	1,085	8
Vocational Skills Development	6	1	41	<1
Community Day	14	3	1,050	7
Juvenile Structured Day	14	3	1,050	7
TOTAL	521	100	14,184	100

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Essential Elements of JCPC Program Service and Structure Types⁵¹

Evaluation or Assessment Components:

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

Clinical Treatment Components:

- Counseling: Professional, clinical treatment with a licensed counselor or therapist. Counseling services may be individual, family, group or substance abuse counseling. The focus of counseling is to resolve any of a range of problems including but not limited to interpersonal relationships, problem behavior, or substance use or abuse.
- Home-Based Family Counseling: 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 crises. The goal is to prevent delinquent and undisciplined behavior by enhancing family functioning and self-sufficiency.
- Sex Offender Treatment: Outpatient assessment and/or therapeutic services to juvenile offenders targeting inappropriate sexual conduct and offending behavior with a clear focus on rehabilitation and accountability of the offender. Practiced primarily in groups, the treatment is family focused, has designated follow-up procedures, and is generally legally mandated.

Residential Services Components:

- Group Home Care: Twenty-four hour care for a residential placement lasting six to eight months. The placement is therapeutic and may have a 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.
- Runaway Shelter Care: 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.
- Specialized Foster Care: 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.
- Temporary Foster Care: Short-term (up to 90 days) emergency foster care for diverted or adjudicated juveniles who need to be temporarily removed from their homes during a family crisis. Foster parents have been specially trained to understand and support the youth placed in their care.
- Temporary Shelter Care: Group home care and shelter (up to 90 days) for juveniles who need to be temporarily removed from their homes during a family crisis.

⁵¹ See DPS's *Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Report* (https://files.nc.gov/ncdps/documents/files/JCPC_Annual_Report_-_2019.pdf) for additional information.

Restorative Components:

- Restitution/Community Service: Services that provide supervised worksites in which juveniles are held accountable for their actions that have affected the community and/or victim(s). Through supervised, assigned work, a juvenile earns credit towards payment of monetary compensation for victims (if required) and performs work for the benefit of the community as a consequence of his offense. Juveniles are supervised by adult staff or trained adult volunteers.
- Teen Court: Services that provide diversion from juvenile court where trained adult and youth volunteers act as officials of the court to hear complaints. Recommended sanctions include, but are not limited to community service and restitution (if applicable) for youth who have admitted committing minor delinquency and undisciplined complaints. Professional adult staff provides supervision of the court proceedings and any subsequent community service and/or restitution.
- Mediation/Conflict Resolution: Services offering a private process of negotiation conducted by a neutral, third party person, a mediator. These programs offer immediate and short-term involvement with youth to focus on resolving negative and/or offending behaviors. Mediation is a consensual decision-making process by parties who work towards a mutual understanding to resolve a problem or dispute. Mediators do not counsel or give advice but facilitate communication among parties as they work to reach their own decisions regarding resolution of their conflict.

Structured Activities Components:

- Experiential Skill Building: Services that provide activities to juveniles as a basis to develop skills. Activities may be highly related to the acquisition of the skill (i.e., Independent living skills training taught through life skills practice such as balancing a checkbook, laundry) or activities may include adventure, physical or challenging activities aimed to instruct, demonstrate, and allow the practice of effective interpersonal, problem-solving, and/or communication skills in an effort to build pro-social interpersonal skills and behaviors.
- Interpersonal Skill Building: Curriculum-based programming that assists juveniles with 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, and 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.
- Mentoring: Services that provide opportunities for matching of adult volunteers with delinquent or at-risk youth on a one-on-one basis. After recruitment, screening and training, the mentor spends time with the juvenile on a regular basis and engages in activities such as sports, movies, and helping with homework. The mentor provides support, friendship, advice, and/or assistance to the juvenile.
- Parent/Family Skill Building: Services that focus on psychological, behavioral, emotional, or interpersonal issues faced by a parent(s) or guardian(s) of a juvenile engaging in problem behaviors or delinquent acts. This service provides parenting skills development, including communication and discipline techniques. May include sessions for parents only and/or sessions for parents and family members.

- Tutoring/Academic Enhancement: Services that assist juveniles with understanding and completing schoolwork and/or classes. May assist juveniles and parents with study skills and structure for studying and completing academic assignments. May also provide trips designed to be an enrichment of or supplemental experience beyond the basic educational curriculum.
- Vocational Skills Development: Services that focus on preparing the juvenile to enter the work force through actual employment opportunities, 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.

Community Day Programs:

- Juvenile Structured Day: Services that provides a highly structured and supervised setting for juveniles who are short-term or long-term suspended from school or are exhibiting behaviors that might otherwise result in placement in detention. Typically, these components serve youth who are court-involved and referrals are made from juvenile court counselors. These components may operate on a full or partial day schedule. Interventions include individual and/or family counseling, substance abuse education/treatment, restitution/community service, tutoring, alternative education, vocational development and structured activities.

APPENDIX C

NORTH CAROLINA ASSESSMENT OF JUVENILE RISK OF FUTURE
OFFENDING
COMMUNITY PROGRAMS VERSION

Risk Assessment

NORTH CAROLINA ASSESSMENT OF JUVENILE RISK OF FUTURE OFFENDING COMMUNITY PROGRAMS VERSION, APRIL 2016

Juvenile Name (F, M, L):	DOB:
County of Residence:	
Juvenile Race: <input type="checkbox"/> White <input type="checkbox"/> Black <input type="checkbox"/> Native American <input type="checkbox"/> Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Asian <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-racial <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Juvenile Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Date Assessment Completed:	Completed by:

Instructions: For each item, check the single response that most accurately applies to the juvenile. Next, enter the corresponding numeric value for that item in the Score column on the right. Total the item scores and enter the sum in R10. In the "Select Risk Level" section, check the appropriate Risk Level box based upon the "Total Risk Score" in R10. Items R1, R3-R5, and R8 require additional entries. Enter zero (0) on Assessment items R1 to R4 for clients with no juvenile court involvement. Assessment item R5 is historical in nature and should be answered based on the juvenile's lifetime. Items R6 and R7 should be evaluated over the 12 months prior to the assessment. R8-R9 should be evaluated as of the time of the assessment. **Use the Comments section at the end as needed for additional information or clarification.**

		Score
R1.	Age when first delinquent offense alleged in a complaint: Check appropriate score and enter the actual age	
	a. Age 12 or over or no delinquent complaint	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Under age 12	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	Actual age: _____	_____
R2.	Number of undisciplined or delinquent referrals to Intake (Referrals are instances of complaints coming through the Intake process. A referral may include multiple complaints; for example, breaking or entering and larceny, or multiple larcenies or other offenses that occur at one time.)	
	a. Current referral only	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. 1 Prior referral	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
	c. 2-3 Prior referrals	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	d. 4+ Prior referrals	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
R3.	Most serious prior adjudication(s). Enter the actual number of prior adjudications for each class of offense shown in b through e then check the score for <u>only</u> the most serious offense for which there has been a prior adjudication. The maximum possible score for this item is 4.	
	a. No Prior Adjudications	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Prior Undisciplined # of adjudications: _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Prior Class 1-3 misdemeanors # of adjudications: _____	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Prior Class F-I felonies or A1 misdemeanors # of adjudications: _____	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Prior Class A-E felonies # of adjudications: _____	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
R4.	Prior Assaults: "Assault" is defined as any assaultive behavior, whether physical or sexual, with or without a weapon as evidenced by a prior delinquent complaint. Record the number of complaints for each assault category shown. Then check the score for the assault category with the highest numerical score. The maximum possible score for this item is 5.	
	a. No assaults	0 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Involvement in an affray # of complaints: _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Yes, without a weapon # of complaints: _____	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Yes, without a weapon, inflicting serious injury # of complaints: _____	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Yes, with a weapon # of complaints: _____	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
	f. Yes, with a weapon inflicting serious injury # of complaints: _____	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

- R5. Runaways (from home or placement):** "Runaway" is defined as absconding from home or any placement and not voluntarily returning within twenty-four (24) hours as evidenced by a complaint, motion for review, or from reliable information. Check appropriate score. **Score**
- a. No 0 _____
 b. Yes 2 _____
- Actual number of runaway incidents: _____
- R6. Known use of alcohol or illegal drugs during past 12 months:** Do not include tobacco in scoring this item. Check appropriate score.
- a. No known substance use 0
 b. Some substance use, need for further assessment 1
 c. Substance abuse, assessment and/or treatment needed 3 _____
- R7. School behavior problems during the prior 12 months: Check appropriate score.**
- a. No problems (Enrolled, attending regularly) 0
 b. Minor problems (attending with problems handled by teacher/school personnel, or 1-3 unexcused absences/truancy) 1
 c. Moderate problems (4 to 10 unexcused absences /truancy, or 1 or more in-school suspensions or 1 short-term suspension – up to 10 days) 2
 d. Serious problems (more than 1 short-term suspension, or 1 or more long-term suspension, or more than 10 unexcused absences or expelled/dropped out) 3 _____
- R8. Peer relationships:** Check appropriate score. Put check in the line following appropriate information
- a. Peers usually provide good support and influence 0
 b. Youth is rejected by pro-social peers , or youth sometimes associates with others who have been involved in delinquent/criminal activity but is not primary peer group 1
 c. Youth regularly associates with others who are involved in delinquent/criminal activity 3
 d. Youth is a gang member or associates with a gang 5 _____
- R9. Parental supervision:** (Score the current responsible parental authority) Check appropriate score.
- a. Parent, guardian or custodian willing and able to supervise 0
 b. Parent, guardian or custodian willing but unable to supervise 2
 c. Parent, guardian or custodian unwilling to supervise 3 _____

R10.	TOTAL RISK SCORE
-------------	-------------------------

Select Risk Level:

- RL 1 (0 points) RL 2 (1-2 points) RL 3 (3-5 points) RL 4 (6-12 points) RL 5 (13+ points)

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX D

NC DPS JUVENILE JUSTICE/JCPC REFERRAL FORM

JCPC Referral Form

NC DPS JUVENILE JUSTICE/JCPC REFERRAL FORM

(Please print or type)

Date of Referral:	- - (MM - DD - YYYY)	NC-JOIN ID:	
Program:		County:	

Client Name:		DOB:		SSN: xxx-xx-	Gender: M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>
Hispanic/Latino <input type="checkbox"/>	Race:		School/Grade:		
Legal Guardian:				Phone:	
Legal Guardian's relationship to client:					
Physical Address:			City:		Zip:
Mailing Address:			City:		Zip:

Is there Juvenile Justice Involvement?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>				
Is participation in this program court ordered?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>				
Is participation in this program a part of a diversion plan/contract?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>				
Court Counselor:		Phone:		Email:	
Client Risk Score/Level:			Client Needs Score/Level:		

Current Legal Status:	Problem Behaviors \ Risk Indicators:		
<input type="checkbox"/> NA/No Juvenile Justice Involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Court Counselor Consultation <input type="checkbox"/> Diversion Plan/Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Petition Filed <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred Prosecution <input type="checkbox"/> Adjudicated Undisciplined Disposition Pending <input type="checkbox"/> Adjudicated Delinquent Disposition Pending <input type="checkbox"/> Protective Supervision <input type="checkbox"/> Probation <input type="checkbox"/> Commitment <input type="checkbox"/> Post Release Supervision <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Services	INDIVIDUAL <input type="checkbox"/> Bullying Behavior <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Labeling/Bullied <input type="checkbox"/> Crime/Delinquency (unreported & reported) <input type="checkbox"/> Fighting/Assault/Aggressive Behavior <input type="checkbox"/> Fire Setting <input type="checkbox"/> Impulsive/Risk Taking <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health Issues/Depression/Anxiety/Temper Tantrums <input type="checkbox"/> Poor Social Skills/Anti-social <input type="checkbox"/> Run Away from Home <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Mutilation <input type="checkbox"/> Sexually Active <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Offense <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual/Physical/Mental Abuse/ Victimization/ Trauma	INDIVIDUAL (continued) <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Use (alcohol or drugs) <input type="checkbox"/> Suicide Attempts <input type="checkbox"/> Suicidal Ideation/Threats FAMILY <input type="checkbox"/> Excessive Dependence on Parents <input type="checkbox"/> Family Conflict <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of Discipline by Parent or Child is Ungovernable <input type="checkbox"/> Siblings or Parent/Guardian on Probation or Incarcerated <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Use in Home SCHOOL <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Failure/Behind Grade Level for Age <input type="checkbox"/> Behavior Problems: Disruptive in Class/ Referrals to Office/ Suspensions	SCHOOL (continued) <input type="checkbox"/> Truancy/Skipping School PEER <input type="checkbox"/> Gang Associate or Member; or Gang Involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Peer Associations/ Association with Aggressive Peers <input type="checkbox"/> Typically Associates with Negative Older Persons COMMUNITY <input type="checkbox"/> Availability or Perceived Access to Drugs <input type="checkbox"/> Disadvantaged/ Disorganized/ Impoverished Neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Feeling Unsafe in Home Neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> High Crime Rate in Home Neighborhood

Additional Client Information:	
Does the client speak English? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	What is the primary language spoken in the household?
Does the client have an Exceptional Designation (EC or IEP)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
List any current medical problems:	
List all current medications:	
Does client have private medical insurance?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Does client have Medicaid/ Health Choice?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If "No," has parent/guardian applied for Medicaid or Health Choice?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Enter the number of problems the client has experienced over the previous 12 months:	
Number of Runaways	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
Number of Short-Term Suspensions	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
Number of Long-Term Suspensions	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
Number of Expulsions	<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
Additional Comments:	

Name of Person Making Referral:	
Title:	
Phone:	
Email:	
Describe the reason you're referring this client to this Program:	
Date Referral Received by Program:	- - (MM - DD - YYYY)


APPENDIX E

STANDARDIZED PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL (SPEP)
SCORE SHEET

SPEP Score Sheet

Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) for Services to Juvenile Offenders® <small>Recalibrated version, 2013</small>			
		Possible Points	Points Received
Primary and Supplemental Service Types [Identified according to definitions derived from the research]			
SPEP Primary Service Points Group 1 services (5 points) Group 4 services (25 points) Group 2 services (10 points) Group 5 services (30 points) Group 3 services (15 points)	SPEP Primary Group ___ Service	30	
SPEP Supplemental Service Points Program has a qualifying supplemental service: Provided – 5 points/ Not Provided – 0 points No qualifying supplemental service – 5 automatic points		5	
Quality of Service Points [Determined from a systematic assessment of the relevant features of the provider and provider organization]		20	
Duration Points Percentage of youth with Target Weeks Met 0% (0 pts) 60% (6 pts) 20% (2 pts) 80% (8 pts) 40% (4 pts) 90% (10 pts)	Target Weeks of Service met: __%	10	
Contact Hours Points Percentage of youth with Target Hours Met 0% (0 pts) 60% (6 pts) 20% (2 pts) 80% (8 pts) 40% (4 pts) 90% (10 pts)	Target Hours of Service met: __%	10	
Risk Tier 1 Points Based on % of youth with risk scores 3-30 0% (0 pts) 75% (7 pts) 30% (2 pts) 85% (10 pts) 50% (5 pts) 95% (12 pts)	Risk Tier 1: __%	12	
Risk Tier 2 Points Based on % of youth with risk scores 6-30 0% (0 pts) 25% (8 points) 15% (3 pts) 30% (10 points) 20% (5 pts) 35% (13 points)	Risk Tier 2: __%	13	
Total SPEP Score		100	
POP Score Percentage (Basic Score/Max Score by Group)			___%

**Figure E.1
Juveniles Exiting SPEP Programs by Program Score**



Note: Program SPEP score point values with no juvenile exits are not displayed.

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL RECIDIVISM DATA

Table F.1
Juvenile Adjudications and Adult Convictions by Program Category: Two-Year Follow-Up

JCPC Program Category	N	Months to Recidivist Event	# with Any Recidivism	Total # Recidivist Events	One-Year Follow-Up %	Two-Year Follow-Up %
Assessment	464	6	132	200	22	28
Clinical	1,116	8	83	107	5	7
Residential	436	8	76	100	13	17
Restitution	2,901	9	490	652	11	17
Teen Court	2,601	10	183	226	4	7
Structured Activity	5,616	10	386	512	4	7
Community Day	1,050	9	101	136	6	10
Total	14,184	9	1,451	1,933	7	10

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Table F.2
Juvenile Adjudications and Adult Convictions by Legal Status: Two-Year Follow-Up

Legal Status	N	Months to Recidivist Event	# with Any Recidivism	Total # Recidivist Events	One-Year Follow-Up %	Two-Year Follow-Up %
At-Risk	7,978	11	375	474	3	5
Court-Involved	6,206	8	1,076	1,459	12	17
Total	14,184	9	1,451	1,933	7	10

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Figure F.1
Summary of Recidivism Rates for FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample

Total N=14,184			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	3%	12%	13%
Court-Involved	10%	28%	33%
Total	6%	19%	22%

Assessment n=464			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	7%	22%	25%
Court-Involved	4%	38%	39%
Total	4%	36%	37%

Clinical n=1,116			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	4%	7%	10%
Court-Involved	11%	19%	26%
Total	8%	13%	18%

Residential n=436			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	1%	27%	27%
Court-Involved	8%	43%	47%
Total	3%	32%	34%

Restitution n=2,901			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	2%	19%	20%
Court-Involved	12%	30%	35%
Total	12%	29%	34%

Teen Court n=2,601			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	3%	14%	16%
Court-Involved	4%	17%	19%
Total	3%	15%	17%

Structured Activity n=5,616			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	3%	9%	10%
Court-Involved	10%	27%	32%
Total	5%	14%	16%

Community Day n=1,050			
	In-Program	2-Year Follow-Up	Overall
At-Risk	2%	16%	17%
Court-Involved	13%	45%	51%
Total	4%	20%	22%

SOURCE: NC Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission, FY 2018 JCPC Exit Sample