

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

FORMULA GRANT FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2008



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR CONTINUATION AND NEW PROJECTS

Applications due by: March 6, 2008, 5:00 P.M.

SC Department of Public Safety □ Office of Justice Programs

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Purpose	3
III.	Eligible Applicants	3
IV.	Eligible Standard Program Areas	4
V.	Funding Period	4
VI.	Distribution of Formula Funds	4
VII.	Matching Requirement	5
VIII.	Guidelines for the Use of Formula Grant Funds	6
IX.	Application Review and Evaluation Process	6
X.	Evaluation Plan	8
XI.	Grant Application and Review Schedule	10
XII.	Grant Application/Proposal Review Check List	11
XIII.	Appendices	12
	A. Grant Application Proposal Scoring Form	
	B. JJ Formula Grant Standard Program Areas	
	C. FY2006-2008 Funding Priorities	
	D. Sample Detention Alternatives Programs	

JUVENILE JUSTICE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM

FFY 2008 Application Guidelines and Procedures

I. Introduction

The SC Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), has been designated to administer the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Formula Grant Program reauthorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended (the Act). The purpose of the Formula Grant Program is to assist states and units of local government in carrying out specific programs which offer a high probability of improving the functioning of the juvenile justice system and to assist states and local communities to prevent youth from entering the juvenile justice system.

In accordance with Section 223(a)(5) of the Act, the states may award formula grant funds to state agencies, units of general local government or private nonprofit agencies (only if such private agency requests funding after it has applied for and been denied funding by any unit of general local government). Formula grants may provide personnel, equipment, training, travel, technical assistance, supplies and information systems for projects within 34 standard program areas (see Appendix B for a listing of the Standard Program Areas).

II. Purpose

This document provides new applicants and current subgrantees eligible to reapply with program criteria and eligibility information so that formal application proposals may be prepared.

The application must be completed and submitted electronically via the Internet through the OJP website, www.scdps.org/ojp. Signatures are not necessary for electronic submissions.

The deadline for submittal of applications is 5:00 p.m. on March 6, 2008. No applications will be accepted after this time.

Please contact Laura Whitlock (803-896-8713 or laurawhitlock@scdps.net) or Cheryl Anderson (803-896-8711 or cherylanderson@scdps.net) in the Office of Justice Programs for programmatic questions or Peggy McBride (803-896-8414 or peggymcbride@scdps.net) in Accounting-Grants for any financial questions.

III. Eligible Applicants

Formula grant awards may be made to state agencies, units of general local government or private nonprofit agencies (only if such private agency requests funding after it has applied for and been denied funding by any unit of general local government). A "unit of general local government" is defined as a city, county, or town. School districts are not considered as units of local government and cannot apply directly. However, they may serve as the implementing agency. In addition, the following points should be noted regarding eligible applicants:

- A. Police departments and sheriffs' offices are not eligible to apply directly. A city or county would be the eligible applicant and recipient of funds on behalf of the department.
- B. State courts are eligible to apply for funds. However, local courts, similar to police departments, would have to apply through their local units of government.
- C. Private, non-profit agencies are eligible to be funded directly. However, to be eligible, the project must be consistent with the state plan, and direct funding shall be permitted only if such agency requests funding after it has applied for and been denied funding by any unit of general local government. A project may also be implemented by a non-profit organization where a unit of government serves as the grantee and enters into a competitively bid contract with the non-profit organization.
- D. Solicitor's Offices are considered state agencies and are eligible to apply directly.
- E. A local Public Defender's Office is not eligible to apply directly. A city, county, or state agency would be the eligible applicant and recipient of funds on behalf of the Public Defender's Office.

IV. Eligible Standard Program Areas

Pursuant to the requirements of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, a state Multi-year Plan has been developed to ensure that federal assistance is coordinated and integrated with existing state and local efforts and that the maximum impact on juvenile justice problems in the state is achieved. In the development of the plan, the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Council (GJJAC) involved key law enforcement, judicial, and juvenile justice personnel on the local, state and federal levels. Research was conducted to analyze the historical demands on the state's juvenile justice system, its current efforts, and projected resource needs. From this research, the eligible program areas authorized by the federal legislation were compared to the state's needs. The following is the priority program area for FY2006-2008: Alternatives to Detention (Area #2). Applications that provide alternatives to secure detention will be given priority consideration for funding.

V. Funding Period

The grant period will be October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009. Projects may reapply and be funded on a yearly basis for up to three years based on an annual evaluation of current-year grant performance. **If you are applying for second or third year continuation, your application should include details about the progress and accomplishments of your program to date.** Funding is contingent upon continuation of the Formula program at the federal level.

VI. Distribution of Formula Funds (refer to Appendix C for additional detail)

FY2008 funds available for award will be approximately \$600,000. In FY2008, it is likely that South Carolina will be found to be in compliance with the Act's DSO requirement, but may be out of compliance with the Jail Removal mandate. If South Carolina is determined to be out of compliance with the Jail Removal mandate, the state will lose 20% percent of its Formula grant

funds. The priority area of Alternatives to Detention will support compliance with both DSO and Jail Removal as well as a third mandate and state priority, Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). As a part of South Carolina's detention reform efforts, the Children's Law Office (CLO) at the University of South Carolina School of Law has collected data on the use of secure detention by each county and provides technical assistance to counties and communities to help interpret this data and develop strategies to address the issue. Jurisdictions that work with the CLO will be given priority consideration for grant funding.

The Alternatives to Detention program area will support the implementation of the programs in categories such as (listed from least restrictive to most restrictive) home confinement, electronic monitoring, attendant care/holdover centers, day and evening reporting centers, case management/advocates, and residential alternatives. A list of sample detention alternative programs is located in Appendix D. Note that Disturbing Schools is now the most common referral to SCDJJ, and programs to provide alternatives to detention may be tailored for this population.

Because the decision to detain rests solely with law enforcement in South Carolina, applications for detention alternatives **must** include a letter of support from all applicable local law enforcement agencies. A letter of support must also be provided by a Family Court judge, who should lead detention reform efforts at the local level. These agencies should be consulted throughout the developmental stages of the application, not just at the end. SCDJJ and Solicitor's Offices are also important partners.

Note that the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is expected to issue a determination that tours of adult jails and correctional facilities, which are components of many "Scared Straight" type programs, are violations of the Jail Removal mandate of the JJDP Act, even if participation is a voluntary diversion from court involvement. Therefore, applicants are strongly discouraged from including such a component in any program, whether grant-funded or not. Tours of juvenile facilities (Liberty juvenile holdover facility, Richland County Juvenile Detention Center, Charleston County Juvenile Detention Center, DJJ Detention Center, and DJJ institutions) are acceptable.

A minimum of 66.7 percent of South Carolina's allocation of formula grant funds (other than funds made available to the state advisory group under Section 222(d) of the Act) is required to be awarded to local programs. This allocation is referred to as the "pass-through requirement," but may be waived where services for delinquent or other youth are organized primarily on a state-wide basis. South Carolina has been granted this waiver in previous years, and plans to request it again this year. The Office of Justice Programs welcomes comments in favor of or against this pass-through request.

VII. Matching Requirement

There is no matching requirement for the Juvenile Justice Formula grant program. If cash or in-kind services will be made available to assist the project, they may be considered informally by mentioning them in the budget narrative on page 5 of the application. **Do not show match on pages 1-4 of the grant application.**

VIII. Guidelines for the Use of Formula Grant Funds

A. Allowable Expenses:

1. Personnel, training as a component of an overall program, operating expenses, equipment, and supplies are allowable expenses if they are related to the programs that address the authorized program areas. Program-related conferences and travel are also authorized. The cost of space used for the benefit of the program is allowable subject to some special conditions. Printing, publishing, duplication and other operating expenses are allowed. All expenditures must be related to the implementation of an actual program that is defined in the program narrative sections of the application.

2. Grant-funded personnel must have one hundred percent of their on-site time dedicated to grant activities. (See also all non-supplanting provisions in the Grant Terms and Conditions.)

3. Audit fees can be included in project budgets to cover the costs associated with an audit of the project.

B. Unallowable Expenses:

1. Any expenditures that are not a part of an approved program or project (within the authorized program areas) are not allowable;

2. Formula grant funds may not be used to supplant or replace existing state or local criminal or juvenile justice funds. Any expenditures must increase the existing amount of funds available for eligible activities;

3. The purchase of land is not an allowable expense;

4. Formula grant funds for construction projects are prohibited, except when facilities to be constructed are non-secure, innovative, community-based facilities for less than 20 people which the federal Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has judged as necessary. This determination of necessity by OJJDP would have to be completed prior to grant application, and is, therefore, very unlikely. If construction in accordance with the requirements above is approved, a 50/50 cash match is required. The Administrator of OJJDP may waive cash matching requirements for construction projects and allow in-kind match for private agencies meeting specific conditions.

IX. Application Review and Evaluation Process

The following factors will be considered in the evaluation of applications:

A. Budget – Proposed expenditures are reasonable, adhere to the guidelines, equipment and personnel are documented as necessary each expenditure is explained in detail in the budget narrative.

- B. Problem Statement – Is clearly defined and based upon facts, a needs assessment, or statistics. The data should include the most current available and should be specific to the area to be served by the project.
- C. Needs Assessment – Clearly outlines how needs were determined and includes how cooperation needs were gathered from other agencies or jurisdictions. It includes information concerning any grant funds the applying agency currently receives or has received in the past two years concerning juveniles and families.
- D. Project Description – Tells the reader exactly what the project plans to do. It is clear to the reader that the project has been well thought out, excellent planning is evident, and chances of success are documented as good. It documents what counties will be served with this project. Includes evaluation component.
- E. Objectives – Are relevant, specific and **measurable**. They specify what outcomes the program will accomplish in concrete terms. Each objective corresponds to each performance indicator. Objectives outline who will do what by when and with what desirable result. Good ways to measure results include percentage increases or decreases, numerical increases or decreases and surveys administered at the beginning and end of the project that measure participants’ changes in attitudes and/or increases in knowledge. Academic improvement may be measured by letter grades, standardized test scores and promotions to the next grade level. Some process, or output, objectives should also be included, such as number of treatment hours or number of training hours.
- F. Performance Indicators – The indicators match objectives exactly and state how each objective will be measured to assess the effectiveness of the project.
- G. Project Continuation Potential – A clear plan for pursuing project independence is evident and probability of success is good.
- H. Target Population or Service Delivery Area – The target population is described in terms of demographics and geographical area to be served; Definition of geographic boundaries of the project’s neighborhood or community; in order to develop geographic information system (GIS) strategic planning capacity, the federal government now requires geographic information for each subgrant. Such information should contain the following two items of information on the geographic area(s) that the subgrant recipient will serve using the format specified below:

Physical address: If the mailing address is a PO box, specify the physical address(es) of the location(s) where the subgrantee will provide services. If the mailing address is in a rural area with no street address, include the nearest street intersection. If the subgrant program has multiple service areas, include the required information for each.

(Example with street address)

ABC Associates
 123 First Street
 Shrewsbury, SC 29361

(Example with no street address)
ABC Associates
First Street and Holiday Drive
Shrewsbury, SC 29361

Map and street description: Provide a road map (with local detail) with the service area(s) clearly depicted. State applicants should mark the map with information identifying the federal formula/block award number it is tied to, including state name, and subgrantee contact name and phone number. Also include a written description of streets bounding the service area. If GIS files are available, submit these to SCDPS electronically.

- I. Project Abstract – The abstract will be used in recommendations to officials who will not see the entire application. It should be clear, concise and tell the story in a short paragraph.
- J. Other Relevant Factors and Requirements – All continuation applications must include information from their most recent progress report. The application must contain all relevant documentation.

The Juvenile Justice Formula grant program uses a multi-step application review and evaluation process. It begins with consideration by Juvenile Justice Program staff and the Grants Committee of the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Council (GJJAC). They determine which applications are best qualified, fully qualified or unqualified. Continuation applications rated fully qualified or best qualified move forward in the process. Limited funding for new grant proposals usually determines that only those applications rated as best qualified will proceed further in the new-grant consideration process.

The recommendation list is subjected to further programmatic and financial staff review to determine compliance with federal and state programmatic and financial guidelines. After review by the full GJJAC, the recommendations are reviewed at the Department level before going to the South Carolina Public Safety Coordinating Council for approval.

X. Evaluation Plan

- A. Each successful application will be required to contract with a consultant to evaluate the project. The evaluation component should be included in the budget as well as the project description, but no specific names/organizations should be stated in the application unless they are providing the service free of charge. If the application is awarded funds, state procurement regulations must be followed when soliciting and selecting an evaluator. Successful applicants selecting an evaluator should require that the evaluator have substantive experience in program and/or social science research methods and statistical analysis, and should be selected on the basis of an open, competitive process as required by State law.

Several options are available to meet this requirement. One is by utilizing staff employed with area colleges or universities. Graduate students and doctoral candidates are also a possibility when looking for someone to evaluate your program. The reason graduate students may be used is because they are usually supervised by a university staff member

who has the necessary experience to oversee an evaluation of this type. Although many evaluators are paid for their service, there are individuals employed in higher education and other agencies that will provide this evaluation free of charge and provide the evaluation as a service to their community. In cases where individuals are providing the evaluation to the program free of charge, the project director should obtain the proposed evaluator's resume/vita and a letter detailing what services the individual plans to provide the program. In addition, this letter should document the name of the program, date the evaluation is to be completed and how many copies of the evaluation are going to be disseminated. Be sure that the state-funding agency (South Carolina Department of Public Safety) receives two copies of this document. If there are other services that you would like to see, be sure that these too are detailed in this letter. Because there is not a contract that is required for individuals that are donating their time, this letter will be the only documentation that details what will be accomplished by the evaluator.

Another option to complete the required evaluation is through a bidding process. In this case, the program plans to pay for a professional evaluation. The amount that you wish to pay for this evaluation is left up to the project's administration, but should be reasonable for the task outlined in the contract. Project directors that are interested in paying for an evaluation should first obtain three bids. These bids should include the individual's resume/vita and a letter detailing the work that is to be performed. This letter should include, but not be limited to, the information required for evaluators that are performing a service free of charge. Once the project director has obtained three bids, the project director should forward the packet of information to the SC Department of Public Safety's Grants Accounting Office. Projects that submit complete evaluator packets are responded to more quickly than incomplete evaluator packets. Packets that are not complete hinder the evaluation process by reducing the amount of time that an evaluator has to study and analyze the project.

Project directors should also keep in mind that evaluators should be individuals that are not associated with the project, have some evaluation experience, or at the minimum, can demonstrate that they have the statistical and methodological background to perform program evaluations. However, the South Carolina Department of Public Safety's Office of Justice Programs (SCDPS/OJP) reserves the right to deny an evaluator's bid. Bids that are denied are most often based on past poor performance with the Office of Justice Programs. In the event that a bid is rejected, our office will contact the Project Director for another bid.

The South Carolina Department of Public Safety's Office of Justice Programs places its faith in the abilities of those who have been chosen to evaluate its programs. As a result of the time constraints of grant personnel employed in the Office of Justice Programs, it is impractical for its personnel to spend a large amount of time with each project. Therefore, dictating which methodology should be used at different sights is also impractical. Different programs may require different approaches to evaluation. Realizing these limitations, our office provides the evaluator with the flexibility and the freedom to evaluate the program as they feel is necessary. Different programs may require different interventions to maximize the intended goal. In this case, our office seeks to focus on the impact the program has had on the community it has served.

The evaluation stage of the grant should be seen as an opportunity to learn from the project's strengths and weakness. It should be seen as a necessary part of sustainability and project efficiency and effectiveness. The second goal of the evaluation from the standpoint of the Office of Justice Programs is to ultimately provide the program with data that can show trends. If a project is funded for three years, the evaluation can be utilized to sell the project to other funding sources.

- B. Identify by position who will be responsible for collecting data and preparing quarterly progress reports. This may be done on page 11 (performance indicators) of the application or as a separate explanation, using a continuation on plain bond paper.
- C. Explain what quantitative and qualitative information will be collected and how this information will be maintained (e.g., manual or electronic log). Quantitative information is a numerical measurement such as number of referrals, number of diverted from court, number placed in alternative treatment, number of adjudications or number of sentences. Qualitative information is information that is harder or impossible to define numerically. It includes such things as survey comments, improvement in a neighborhood's environment or improved communication between residents, police officers and juvenile justice officials. Qualitative information can be documented through photos, interviews, observation, media reports or community reaction to expansion of a project. An explanation must be provided that details how information will be collected and what measures exist to ensure that a reliable, foolproof system has been developed to collect needed project information.
- D. Discuss how this information will be analyzed to determine success (e.g., comparison to prior year or baseline year, compilation of survey results, etc.). Each objective must be constructed to show success through data analysis and by compiling qualitative information. If an objective cannot be measured or proven successful through collection and analysis of quantitative or qualitative information, it must be deleted or rewritten so it can be measured. Similar periods of time must be compared to show improvements (in other words, calendar year 2005 should be compared to calendar year 2006, or fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2006). Prior year or baseline data should be compiled and included as part of the problem statement. Obviously, it is impossible to document improvement or increases or decreases in crime rates or trends as a result of the project if prior year or baseline data was never collected. Applicants are strongly encouraged to include some objectives and performance indicators that can be measured at intervals throughout the grant period, not just at its conclusion.

XI. Grant Application and Review Schedule

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| November 7, 2007 | Grant Application Workshop, Columbia |
| March 6, 2008
5:00 p.m. | Deadline for completed FFY2008 new and continuation applications to SCDPS |

April 2008	Grants Committee review
June 2008	Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Council review
July 2008	Public Safety Coordinating Council review
August 2008*	Grant award notices mailed
September 2008	FFY2008 Grants Financial Workshop
October 1, 2008	FFY2008 Formula grant period begins

* This date is contingent upon the date the federal award is received by the state.

XII. Grant Application/Proposal Review Check List

In order to avoid common mistakes, applicants should answer the following questions when reviewing their completed application:

- Do the budget figures on pages 1-5 add up correctly?
- Are all sections of the application completed?
- Have you included the evaluation component?
- Are the objectives quantifiable?
- Is there a corresponding performance indicator for each objective?
- Do the data in the Needs Assessment/Problem Statement include the most current available? Are they specific to the target area?
- If the applicant is a private, nonprofit (501c3), have you included a letter from a unit of general local government denying funding for the project?
- If you are applying for a continuation, have you included detailed information about program progress and accomplishments to date? Have you included information from your most recent progress report?

APPENDIX A

Grant Application Proposal Scoring Form

Formula Proposal Scoring Sheet

Grant Application Number 1J080 ___ ___ ___ (from application, p.1, upper left)

This scoring sheet will be used for Grant Committee scoring of continuation and new FY2008 Juvenile Justice Formula applications. You may use fractions of a point. Please provide comments in the margins of the score sheet. Applications must score at least 8.5 to be eligible for funding.

Problem Statement and Needs Assessment (pp. 7-8 of grant application)

- 0 Problem and need are not adequately described, or are outside of JJ purview
- 1 Problem and need are understandable
- 2 Problem and need well stated and important

Project Description (p. 9 of grant application)

- 0 Project description inadequate or outside JJ purview; ***strategy has been demonstrated not to work or does not address the problem***; no outside evaluation component
- 1 Goals hard to understand; plan vague; evaluation component included; provides an alternative to secure detention
- 2 Goals easily understood; plan shows excellent promise; evaluation component is included; letters of support from judge and law enforcement; work with Children’s Law Office; provides an alternative to secure detention

Objectives and Performance Indicators (pp. 10-11 of grant application)

- 0 Objectives inadequate or outside JJ purview
- 1 Objectives unmeasurable or not in a priority program area
- 2 Objectives not clear, or not directly related to the problem
- 3 Objectives clear and related to the problem
- 4 Objectives very clear, quantifiable, important, and directly related to the problem

Budget (pp. 1-5 of grant application)

- 0 No budget, or clearly inconsistent w/project description; indirect costs are excessive (over 20%)
- 3 Budget consistent w/ project description, but unclear, inadequate, or excessive for project described
- 6 Budget clear and consistent with project described; evaluation is included in the budget

APPENDIX B

JJDP Formula Grant Program Areas

34 PROGRAM AREAS

01 Aftercare/Reentry. Programs to prepare targeted juvenile offenders to successfully return to their communities after serving a period of secure confinement in a training school, juvenile correctional facility, or other secure institution. Aftercare programs focus on preparing juvenile offenders for release and providing a continuum of supervision and services after release.

02 Alternatives to Detention. Alternative services provided to a juvenile offender in the community as an alternative to incarceration.

03 Child Abuse and Neglect Programs. Programs that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law.

04 Children of Incarcerated Parents. Services designed to prevent delinquency or treat delinquent juveniles who are the children of incarcerated parents.

05 Community Assessment Centers (CAC). Centers that lead to more integrated and effective cross-system services for juveniles and their families. CACs are designed to positively impact the lives of youth and divert them from a path of serious, violent, and chronic delinquency. Using a collaborative approach, CACs serve the community in a timely, cost-efficient, and comprehensive manner.

06 Compliance Monitoring. Programs, research, staff support, or other activities designed primarily to enhance or maintain a state's ability to adequately monitor jails, detention facilities, and other facilities, to assure compliance with Sections 223(a)(11), (12), (13), and (14) of the JJDP Act of 2002.

07 Court Services. Programs designed to encourage courts to develop and implement a continuum of pre and post adjudication restraints that bridge the gap between traditional probation and confinement in a correctional setting. Services include expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, translation services and similar programs, and secure community-based treatment facilities linked to other support services.

08 Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders. Programs, research, or other initiatives designed to eliminate or prevent the placement of accused or adjudicated status offenders and non-offenders in secure facilities, pursuant to Section 223(a)(11) of the JJDP Act of 2002.

09 Delinquency Prevention. Programs, research, or other initiatives designed to reduce the incidence of delinquent acts and directed to the general youth population thought to be "at risk" of becoming delinquent. This category includes what is commonly referred to as "primary prevention" (e.g., parent education, peer counseling, etc.). This program area excludes programs targeted at youth already adjudicated delinquent, and those programs designed specifically to prevent gang-related or substance abuse activities that are undertaken as part of program areas 12 and 32.

10 Disproportionate Minority Contact. Programs, research, or other initiatives designed primarily to address the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system, pursuant to Section 223(a)(22) of the JJDP Act of 2002.

11 Diversion. Programs to divert juveniles from entering the juvenile justice system.

12 Gangs. Programs, research, or other initiatives designed primarily to address issues related to juvenile gang activity. This program area includes prevention and intervention efforts directed at reducing gang-related activities.

13 Gender-Specific Services. Services designed to address needs unique to the gender of the individual to whom such services are provided.

14 Graduated Sanctions. A system of sanctions that escalate in intensity with each subsequent, more serious delinquent offense.

15 Gun Programs. Programs (excluding programs to purchase from juveniles) designed to reduce the unlawful acquisition and illegal use of guns by juveniles.

16 Hate Crimes. Programs designed to prevent and reduce hate crimes committed by juveniles.

17 Jail Removal. Programs, research, or other initiatives designed to eliminate or prevent the placement of juveniles in adult jails and lockups, as defined in Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act of 2002.

18 Job Training. Projects to enhance the employability of juveniles or prepare them for future employment. Such programs may include job readiness training, apprenticeships, and job referrals.

19 Juvenile Justice System Improvement. Programs, research, and other initiatives designed to examine issues or improve practices, policies, or procedures on a system wide basis (e.g., examining problems affecting decisions from arrest to disposition, detention to corrections, etc.).

20 Mental Health Services. Services include, but are not limited to, the development and/or enhancement of diagnostic, treatment, and prevention instruments; psychological and psychiatric evaluations; counseling services; and/or family support services.

21 Mentoring. Programs designed to develop and sustain a one-to-one supportive relationship between a responsible adult age 18 or older (mentor) and an at-risk juvenile (mentee), which takes place on a regular basis.

22 Native American Programs. Programs designed to address juvenile justice and delinquency prevention issues for American Indians and Alaska Natives.

23 Planning and Administration. Activity related to state plan development, other pre-awarded activities, administration of the Formula Grant Program, including evaluation and monitoring, pursuant to Section 222 (c) of the JJDP Act of 2002 and the OJJDP Formula Grant Regulation.

24 Probation. Programs to permit juvenile offenders to remain in their communities under conditions prescribed by the juvenile court.

25 Restitution/Community Service. Programs to hold juveniles accountable for their offenses by requiring community service or repayment to the victim.

26 Rural Area Juvenile Programs. Prevention, intervention, and treatment services in an area located outside a metropolitan statistical area as designated by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

27 School Programs. Education programs and/or related services designed to prevent truancy, suspension, and expulsion. School safety programs may include support for school resource officers and law-related education.

28 Separation of Juveniles from Adult Inmates. Programs that ensure that juveniles will not be detained or confined in any institutions where they may come into contact with adult inmates, pursuant to Section 223(a)(12) of the JJDP Act of 2002.

29 Serious Crime. Programs, research, or other initiatives designed to address serious and violent criminal-type behavior by youth. This program area includes intervention, treatment, and reintegration of serious and violent juvenile offenders.

30 Sex Offender Programs. Programs to support the assessment, treatment, rehabilitation, supervision, and accountability of juvenile sex offenders.

31 State Advisory Group Allocation. Activities related to carrying out the State Advisory Group's responsibilities under Section 223(a)(3) of the JJDP Act of 2002.

32 Substance Abuse. Programs, research, or other initiatives designed to address the use and abuse of illegal and other prescription and nonprescription drugs and the use and abuse of alcohol. Programs include control, prevention, and treatment.

33 Youth Advocacy. Projects designed to develop and implement advocacy activities focused on improving services for and protecting the rights of youth affected by the juvenile justice system.

34 Youth Courts. Youth courts (also known as teen courts) are juvenile justice programs in which peers play an active role in the disposition of the juvenile offender. Most youth courts are used as a sentencing option for first-time offenders charged with misdemeanor or nonviolent offenses who acknowledge their guilt. The youth court serves as an alternative to the traditional juvenile court.

APPENDIX C

FY2006-2008 Funding Priorities

Formula Grant Program Area 02: Alternatives to Detention Program Goals/Objectives/Performance Indicators

1	FG FUNDS AWARDED FOR SERVICES	Increase organizational capacity	The amount of Formula Grants funds in whole dollars that are awarded for detention alternative services during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred data source.	FG funds awarded to program for services
3	NUMBER OF PROGRAM SLOTS AVAILABLE	Increase organizational capacity	The number of client service slots available during the reporting period of the program. If slots were lost over the reporting period, please report a negative number. Program records are the preferred data source.	Number of client service slots available during the reporting period
8	NUMBER OF DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM OPTIONS AVAILABLE	Increase organizational capacity	The number of detention alternative programs created during the reporting period. If programs were lost over the reporting period, please report a negative number. Program records are the preferred data source.	Number of detention alternative program options.
13	NUMBER OF PROGRAM YOUTH SERVED	Improve program activities	An unduplicated count of the number of youth served by the program during the reporting period. Definition of the number of youth served for a reporting period is the number of program youth carried over from previous reporting period, plus new admissions during the reporting period. In calculating the 3-year summary, the total number of youth served is the number of participants carried over from the year previous to the first fiscal year, plus all new admissions during the 3 reporting fiscal years. Program records are the preferred data source.	Number of program youth carried over from the previous reporting period, plus new admissions during the reporting period.
1	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PROGRAM YOUTH WHO OFFEND OR REOFFEND	Reduce delinquency	The number and percent of program youth who were rearrested or seen at juvenile court for a new delinquent offense. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source.	A. Number of program youth with a new offense B. Number of youth in program C. Percent (A/B)
3	PERCENT CHANGE IN THE ADP IN SECURE DETENTION	Improve system effectiveness	The percent change in the average daily population (ADP) of preadjudicated and postadjudicated juveniles in secure detention. Official records are the preferred data source.	A. ADP of juveniles in detention in the current year B. ADP of juveniles in detention in the previous year C. Percent change (A-B/B)
4	Percent change of ALOS in secure detention	Improve system effectiveness	The percent change in the average length of stay (ALOS) in days that juveniles reside in a secure juvenile detention facility. Official records are the preferred data source.	A. Average length of stay in detention in the current year B. Average length of stay in the previous year C. Percent change (A-B/B)
6	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PROGRAM YOUTH COMPLETING PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS	Increase accountability	The number and percent of program youth who have successfully fulfilled all program obligations and requirements. Program obligations will vary by program, but should be a predefined list of requirements or obligations that clients must meet prior to program completion. Program records are the preferred data source.	A. Number of program youth who exited the program having completed program requirements B. Number of youth who left the program C. Percent (A/B)

APPENDIX D

Sample Detention Alternative Programs

Alternatives to Juvenile Pre-trial Detention

Home or Community Detention

- **Program Generally**
 - these programs started in the late 1970s
 - either public employees or community-based non-profit agencies run these programs
- **Program Elements**
 - many programs enter into a written agreement between the youth and his parents to establish clear behavioral expectations
 - these contracts clarify where the youth may go and expectations for school and employment
 - the responsibilities of the parent are also outlined
 - many program use electronic monitoring in 1 of 2 situations:
 - as a more restrictive option for youth who have failed to comply with standard program rules (this should be in addition to face-to-face contacts – not in their place); or
 - as a means to release youth who might not otherwise meet routine program eligibility criteria
- **Target Population**
 - youth who can safely reside in their own homes or with relatives
 - the youth observe a weekday curfew (e.g., 6:00 p.m.) and must restrict their movement outside of home to pre-approved activities (including location & time of these activities)
- **Staff**
 - home detention staff provides frequent, random, unannounced face-to-face community supervision to monitor youth's behavior
 - staff keeps in contact with the youth through frequent telephone calls
 - a violation does not necessarily result in return to secured detention – staff first considers increased supervision
- **Capacity**
 - the capacity varies depending on the program, but the average capacity is just under 200 youth
- **Length of Stay**
 - this varies depending on the program, but the average length of stay is between 30 and 45 days
- **Cost**
 - they are more cost-efficient than secure detention – on average \$10 per day per youth
- **Successful Completion Rate**
 - they have remarkable success rates: 90% - 95% make all of their court appearances and remain arrest-free
- **Sample Location: Multnomah County**
- **Program Generally**
 - all youth are started at the same contact levels, but alters supervision levels weekly depending on compliance with the program (i.e., a youth's curfew may be eased or he may be able to attend a special activity)

- **Staff**
 - hourly workers from Volunteers of America work with the detention program
- **Program Elements**
 - Week 1
 - 4 calls per day from the youth
 - 2 face-to-face daily
 - 2 face-to-face curfew checks a week
 - 5 curfew phone checks
 - Week 2
 - 3 calls per day from the youth
 - 1 face-to-face daily
 - 2 curfew checks a week
 - Week 3
 - 2 calls per day from the youth
 - 3 face-to-face contacts a week
 - Week 4
 - 1 call per day from the youth
 - 2 face-to-face contacts a week
- **Sample Location: Sacramento County**
 - **Staff**
 - the probation department operates this program
 - **Program Elements**
 - the officers conduct unannounced home and school visits, make collateral contacts and install electronic monitoring devices when needed
 - **Capacity**
 - 160 youth are supervised daily
 - **Cost**
 - daily costs for supervision is approximately \$16 per youth
- **Sample Location: Cook County**
 - **Staff**
 - probation staff operate this program
 - each team of probation officers (2 officers make up a team) is responsible for 25 cases
 - **Program Elements**
 - at least 3 weekly face-to-face contacts in youth's home
 - random telephone conversations
 - youth restricted to home except for school and church and other approved activities
 - collateral contacts to check on school attendance and other activities
 - electronic monitoring as needed
 - the parent must be willing and cooperative
 - **Target Population**
 - secure detention-eligible youths with no more than 1 outstanding arrest warrant and no previous failures on home confinement
 - willing and cooperative parent
 - **Length of Stay**

- the length of stay in program is generally 30 – 45 days
- **Cost**
 - daily costs for supervision is approximately \$10 per youth
- Capacity**
 - the program has a capacity of 225 youths
 - on average, between 180 and 200 youths make up the average daily population
- **Successful Completion Rate**
 - 91% of participants remain arrest-free and make their court hearings during their time in the program
- **Sample Location: Philadelphia Youth Advocate Program**
 - **Staff**
 - non-profit, private agency trains community residents to operate this program
 - a staff member supervises no more than 4 youth at a time
 - **Program Elements**
 - 15 – 30 hours a week of face-to-face supervision in the community
 - youths are referred to recreational, educational, and vocational opportunities in the community
 - daily checks on school attendance and curfews
 - electronic monitoring as needed
 - staff accompany all youth to court appearances
 - **Target Population**
 - secure detention-eligible youths referred by court
 - **Cost**
 - 15 supervised hours a week costs \$225 per week, per youth
 - 30 supervised hours a week costs \$325 per week, per youth
 - **Successful Completion Rate**
 - 92% of participants remain arrest-free and make their court hearings during their time in the program

Day and Evening Reporting Centers

- **Program Generally**
 - non-secure community programs that provide 6 to 12 hours of daily supervision and structured activities for youth
 - these youth require more intensive oversight than an in-home program can provide because they are often not enrolled in school at the time of their release from detention
 - the community is protected by the center's intensive daily supervision of each youth
 - electronic monitoring is used as needed
- **Length of Stay**
 - the length of stay for youths is approximately 30 days
- **Cost**
 - the cost for supervision is between \$32 and \$35
- **Sample Location: Broward County, FL**
 - **Program Generally**
 - day reporting is used in conjunction with non-secure residential placements
 - youth participate in educational and recreational programming at the day reporting center that could not be offered at their group home
- **Sample Location: Cook County**
 - **Program Generally**
 - this county created a system of evening reporting centers that provide structure and supervision for youth between 3:00 P.M. and 9:00 P.M.
 - over 60% of the referrals to the evening reporting centers would have been sent to secure detention if the evening reporting centers did not exist
 - **Program Elements**
 - 6 hours of daily supervision, tutoring, counseling and recreation
 - curfew checks
 - evening meals and transportation home
 - youths are referred for additional recreational, educational, and vocational opportunities in the community
 - collateral checks on school attendance and school work
 - program supervision can be enhanced by linking participants to home confinement program and/or electronic monitoring
 - **Target Population**
 - secure detention-eligible youths
 - chronic VOPs
 - **Staff**
 - non-profit, community-based service organizations train community staff
 - each staff member supervises no more than 5 youth
 - **Length of Stay**
 - the length of stay for youths is approximately 21 – 30 days
 - **Cost**
 - the cost for supervision is \$33 per youth per day
 - **Successful Completion Rate**
 - 90% of youth make their court hearings, remain arrest-free while in the program

Residential Alternatives

- **Program Generally – Shelter Program**
 - a non-secure residential facility staffed to provide time-limited housing
 - this alternative provides age-specific services including education, recreation, tutoring, and life skill training
 - some students attend education at the shelter whereas others attend public school
 - shelters are staffed to handle emergency medical situations
- **Target Population**
 - this is for youth who need 24-hour supervision to be considered for release from secure detention
- **Staff**
 - youth are supervised by staff 24 hours a day, 7 days a week – staff must report even when shelter population is low and should represent the ethnic diversity of the shelter’s population
- **Length of Stay**
 - the length of time in a shelter generally does not exceed 30 days
- **Cost**
 - the cost is \$90 - \$130 per youth, per day
- **Sample Location: New York**
 - **Program Generally**
 - it is the most restrictive detention alternative within the detention continuum
 - **Target Population**
 - this program is directed towards higher risk youth
 - **Staff**
 - requires a minimum direct staffing ratio of 1 staff per 6 youth
 - an on-site director and case manager must always be on site
- **Sample Location: Cook County**
 - **Program Generally**
 - many youth stay in the shelter while they await a slot in non-secure residential treatment alternative
 - **Program elements**
 - 24-hour residential supervision
 - educational instruction
 - independent living skills
 - individual and group counseling
 - transportation to court & other required appointments
 - probation outreach to arrange return to parental custody
 - **Target Population**
 - lower risk youth for whom no family member has been identified or is available
 - youth designated by judicial order as “release upon request”
 - **Staff**
 - non-profit community-based agency trains professional and non-professional staff
 - **Capacity**
 - this program holds up to 20 youths

- **Length of Stay**
 - a youth's stay does not exceed 30 days and is generally only a few days
- **Sample Location: Sacramento County**
 - **Program Generally**
 - rather than developing a separate shelter, this program contracts with existing group care providers to reserve beds for youth
 - a downside is that mixing pre-trial youth with another client population does not work too well because the existing program is not equipped to handle the challenges these youth present
 - **Cost**
 - this is cost-efficient and administratively convenient because they avoid start-up costs and early-program dilemmas

Foster Care

- **Program Generally**
 - foster care is used to supplement the non-secure residential program
 - foster parents are given special training about youth referred by the juvenile justice system and have access to staff resources for help
- **Target Population**
 - this program targets younger children, girls, lower-risk cases, and other youth who are not suitable for a group care facility
 - younger children in particular are better suited for foster care
- **Sample Location: Multnomah County**
 - this program contracts with the Boys and Girls' Society, a private child care agency, for individualized host home slots, paying on an as-used basis