OCFS-2121 (6/2014)

NEW YORK STATE
OFFICE OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

SUPERVISION AND TREATMENT SERVICES FOR JUVENILE PROGRAM (STSJP)
SFY 2014-2015 ANNUAL PLAN

STSJP Plans are due to the Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) by 8 / 1 / 2014

Plans should be submitted to: ocfs.sm.stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov

Please ensure that the title **"Supervision and Treatment Services for Juveniles Plan"** and your county name in the subject field to facilitate the timely review of your STSJP Plan.

Please direct any STSJP Plan questions to either;

Johne.Johnson@OCFS.ny.gov PH. 518-486-4665 Cara.Korn@OCFS.ny.gov PH. 518-408-3999

COUNTY INFORMATION

NAME OF APPLICANT COUNTY, COUNTIES OR JURISDICTION: Cayuga County	
LEAD AGENCY FOR STSJP SUBMISSION: Health and Human Services	NAME OF CONTACT PERSON: Ray Bizzari
CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER: 3152531076	CONTACT PERSON'S E-MAIL ADDRESS: rbizzari@cayugacounty.us

STSJP SFY 2014 - 2015	
SFY 2014-2015 Starting County Detention Allocation amount	$ 248,606
SFY 2014-2015 County STSJP Allocation amount	[illegible]
SFY 2014 -2015 County Detention Allocation being shifted	[illegible]
Total SFY 2014-2015 STSJP Reimbursement Allocation amo	[illegible]00
Maximum STSJP Reimbursement amount for a 2014-2015 P	[illegible]00
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP State Share amount	[illegible]00
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP County Share amount	[illegible]
SFY 2014-2015 Revised County Detention Allocation amount	[illegible]06
TOTAL COUN	[illegible]06

Detention Allocation=248,606
STSJP Allocation=40,000
Plan AMT=170,000
65,400 to be shifted from Detention to STJP
New STSJP Allocation=105,400
State Share= 105400=new STSJP Allocation
County Share 64,600

SECTION ONE – Analysis of Communities

Provide an analysis that identifies the neighborhoods or c[illegible] greatest number of juvenile delinquents and persons in need of supervision (PINS) are [illegible]sidentially placed. Note any communities or neighborhoods that are different than in last y[illegible]t your identification of target areas or populations is clearly highlighted in your plan.

14 juveniles were remanded to detention during the time fram[illegible]uburn, 1 from Moravia and 1 Union Springs spending 65 secure detention days and 212[illegible]. !0 were male and 4 were females 8 were JD's and 8 were PINS (2 juveniles were JD[illegible] detained were subsequently placed.

SECTION TWO – Description of Services and Programs to be Funded

List the **name of each service and program** who you expect will received STSJP funds, along with the **projected amount of STSJP funds** to be used for each: As a Guide to providing the information needed to properly review your plan, please provide programmatic information in the format listed below;

- Provide the Name of the Provider of the Service/Program.
- The Amount of any Juvenile Detention Services funds projected to be spent for STSJP Services.
- The communities and types of youth targeted.
- The projected number of youth that will be served.
- Answer a series of Demographic questions

"Please enter each program individually, and if you have more programs than the form accounts for, please

use the addendum supplied with this document."

OCFS-2121 (6/2014)

STSJP Program One	Respite	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	ATD
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			$ 100,000
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target? The City of Auburn has the greatest number however, we will target all juveniles at risk for detention and the identified pressure points: police intervention, Family Court appearances and foster care disruptions.			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program? 15			
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to section "STSJP Program Two".			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds? July 1, 2013			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds? 15			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service? 5			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014? 4			
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:			
1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed) 5			
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so 0			
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court 0			
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court) 1			
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent: 1			

STSJP Program Two	Juvenile Special Supervision Program	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	ATD/ATP
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			$ 70,000
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target? Cayuga County			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program? 80			
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to section "STSJP Program Three".			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds? NA			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds? NA			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service? NA			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014? NA			
For programs intended as alternatives to detention, how many youth in the program experienced each of these outcomes:			
1. Successfully completed the program (not re-arrested and appeared in court as directed)			
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so			
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court			
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court)			

SECTION THREE – Disproportionality

Provide available information (use objective data or, if none exists, you may provide anecdotal or other information) indicating whether the use of detention or residential placement in your service area shows a significant racial or ethnic disproportionality. What, if any, differences are there from what was noted in last year's plan? Additionally if NO data exists, what measures will your jurisdiction implement to monitor disproportionality? We have not seen disproportianaiity in the county however we will continue to track this by comparing the rate of detention to the population at large as well as the population charged as JD or PINS

- If such disproportionality exists, describe how the service/programs proposed for funding will address the disproportionality:

SECTION FOUR – Efficacy of the Programs and Services

Provide a description of the proposed services and programs that explain the four listed elements

Please answer the questions below for each of the programs highlighted in Section Two

1. How they will reduce the number of youth who are detained or residentially placed: The respite program provided by Cayuga Centers is a 21 day alternative to detention available to the courts, probation, law enforcement and the department. Successful use of the DRAI determines eligibily and suitability. While respite was successfully used on a few occasions, we believe more juveniles are eligible and will make a point of institutionalizing it's use. Respite reduceds reliance on detention by provding a supervised alternative that does not typically lead to placement. Juvenile Special Supervison Program was originally created for use in Onondaga County where it experienced outstanding results in terms of avoiding detention. While not part of last years plan, it's impact on detention and placement is positive. The program served 41 juveniles refererred by Family Court. None of the referred juveniles were detained and paced. This community based supervision program with assigned levels of risk and contacts, home and school visits provides support to familes, supervision to juveniles and comfort for Family Court Judges. Including it in this year's plan will help us create and manage a continuum of services to further impact detention and out of home placements.
2. How they are family –focused: Both programs begin by meeting the family where they are at and can connect families with any resources they may need. amiles are part of the decision process and supervision plans
3. Whether the services/programs are capable of being replicated across multiple sites: Both have. Respite models exist in all jurisdictions and Special Supervision is promoted by Vera. This writer created that program in Onondaga County.
4. If the same plan was used last SFY, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes. While not the same plan, respite was and respie diverted 80% of participants from detention.
5. What were the barriers if not met? We need to make this work more of a priority by creating the opportunity for alternatives to detention and placement to be the beginning of every conversation.

SECTION FIVE – Justification for the Proposed Programs and Services

The purpose of STSJP finds is to establish supports and services for youth who, absent these services, are likely to be detained or placed. Funds should therefore be clearly targeted to meet the needs of the types of youth who in the past have been admitted to detention or residentially placed. With this specific purpose in mind, describe the demonstrated effectiveness of the proposed services and programs, or provide (in the form) other justification of why you are proposing these services/programs for funding. Please answer the questions below for each of the programs highlighted in Section Two. Both proposed programs have good track records of effectiveness in diverting juveniles from detention and placement. Absent these services, juvenile justice pressure points such as the courts, law enforcement agencies and probation have no alternative but to detain. Respite successfully diverted 4 out 5 juveniles from detention and further penetration of the juvenile justice system and Special Supervision successfully managed 41 juveniles referred by Family Court is a way that obviated detention or placement. Our challenge, as previously stated, is to insure these remain first choices.

SECTION SIX – Performance Outcomes

For 2014-2015, provide the projected performance outcomes for your proposed services and programs, being sure to include:

- An estimate of the anticipated reductions in detention utilization and residential placements: To reduce the number of detentions from 14 to 8 and number of days from 303 to 100.

- Other projected positive outcomes for youth who participate in the services and programs: Detention and residential placements are loaded with adverse outcomes for kids and familes and there is a good body of research demonstrating that. Keeping kids in their community and schools, supporting familes and building resiliency in kids leads to better outcomes. Positive outcome can include increased school attendance, avoiding further juvenile justice contact and imporved family functioning.

SECTION SEVEN – Assessment of Success Achieving Previous Performance Outcomes

Although performance outcome data for 2013-2014 may be incomplete because many jurisdictions were unable to implement programs until late in the year and data-producing structures are not yet in place, we are asking you to provide available data on your STSJP programs for each of the following parameters for 2013-2014 year. The inclusion of that information will help establish local and state baseline information on SSJP programs and may be useful in informing discussions about potential improvements to be made in your STSJP Plan.

- What were your projected performance outcomes in your 2012-2013 STSJP Plan for your proposed services and programs: Placement at Cayuga Centers respite outcome in last year's plan was avoiding detention and out of home placement and 4 out of 5 (80%) did in fact avoid detention/placement.

- Were there other positive outcomes for youth participating in STSJP services and programs? Staying at home and in their community.

Please provide the following information for your county or the jurisdiction served by your STSJP programs for 2013-2014, indicating if the geographic area is anything other than countywide: The jurisidiction is countywide.

TTL number of youth under 16 arrested: 82

TTL number of youth admitted to detention programs: 14

Secure detention:	3
Non-Secure detention	11

TTL Number of youth placed out of their home as part of a disposition in a JD and/or PINs case:

Number of JDs placed with OCFS or LDSS:	8
Number of PINs placed:	10
TTL Number of youth who received service and programs as a result of STSJP funding:	5

COMMENTS

Please assess whether the services and programs in your 2013-2014 STSJP Plan achieved the projected reductions in detention utilization and residential placements and other performance outcomes. If they did not, what were the barriers?

For the individuals referred, therespite ATI program had good success but overall, we believe it was underutinized. The underutilization should be corrected in 2104-2015 as we make this a priority on our service delivery.

Are there any changes in allocations or practices planned for 2014-2015 based on experiences in 2013-2014? Please list those changes.

We added a second program to the plan and will develop a single decision point for all cases where detention and placement is considered. Coordinated work with the contract agencies and integration with county mental health should result in greater success at diversions.

SECTION EIGHT – Cooperative Applications Submitted Jointly by Two or More Counties *(Complete this section only if this is a joint application)*

Two or more eligible local jurisdictions (counties) may join together to establish, operate, and maintain supervision and treatment services for juveniles programs and may make and perform agreements in connection therewith . Counties submitting such applications must provide the following information:

- Describe the provisions for the proportionate cost to be borne by each county:
- Describe the manner of employment of personnel across and between counties in the cooperative:
- Identify whether a single fiscal officer shall be the custodian of the funds made available for STSJP:

SECTION NINE– Additional Comments

APPROVAL OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

As Chief Executive Officer of the applicant municipality named on Page 1, I certify that I approve of this Supervision and Treatment Services for Juveniles Program Plan.

Michael Chapman — Name (Please Print)

7/30/14 — Date

X Michael H. Chapman — Signature

INSTRUCTIONS:

Instructions for properly processing an STSJP plan.

a. Once you have opened a copy of the OCFS-2121 form, please immediately use the "Save As" function in Microsoft Word to save a copy of the document on your computer.
b. Please save your STSJP plan using the following format; (Somewhere County 2014-2015 STSJP Plan)
c. Work from the "saved" county plan document using it to record all of your county's information.
d. Once you have satisfactorily completed entering the required data, save the document, print the plan.
e. Then have the person named in the plan as the CEO sign the hard copy of the document.
f. Upload the signed copy of the plan and send it to OCFS via the STSJP email address at