

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 07 / 11 / 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: Franklin County	
LEAD AGENCY FOR STSJP SUBMISSION: Franklin County Dept of Social Services	NAME OF CONTACT PERSON: Lisa R. Griffin
CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER: (518)481-1615	CONTACT PERSON'S E-MAIL ADDRESS: 16a341@dfa.state.ny.us

STSJP SFY 2014 - 2015	
SFY 2014-2015 Starting County Detention Allocation amount	\$ 56,624
SFY 2014-2015 County STSJP Allocation amount	\$ 40,000
SFY 2014 -2015 County Detention Allocation being shifted	\$ 0
Total SFY 2014-2015 STSJP Reimbursement Allocation amount	\$ 40,000
Maximum STSJP Reimbursement amount for a 2014-2015 Plan	\$ 64,516
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP State Share amount	\$ 40,000
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP County Share amount	\$ 24,516
SFY 2014-2015 Revised County Detention Allocation amount	\$ 56,624
TOTAL COUNTY OBLIGATION:	\$ 24,516

SECTION ONE – Analysis of Communities

Provide an analysis that identifies the neighborhoods or communities from which the greatest number of juvenile delinquents and persons in need of supervision (PINS) are remanded to detention or residentially placed. Note any communities or neighborhoods that are different than in last year's plan. Please ensure that your identification of target areas or populations is clearly highlighted in your plan.

Juvenile delinquents and PINS youth who were remanded to detention or residentially placed were not from any particular neighborhoods or communities. Therefore, all of Franklin County will be targeted for this initiative.

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.”

STSJP Program One	Youth Advocate Programs, Inc.	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	ATD
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$ 34,500
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target? All of Franklin County			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program? 6-8			
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? 5			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service? 4-6 months			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014? 10-12			
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) 75%			
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so 0			
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court 1			
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court) 0			
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent: 0			

STSJP Program Two	Franklin County Probation-Electronic Home Monitoring System	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	ATD
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$ 5,000
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target? All of Franklin County with the exception of the St. Regis Mohawk Tribe			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program? 5-10			
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?			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?			
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)			

5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:

STSJP Program Three	Franklin County Probation-MEDTOX Rapid Drugs of Abuse Testing System	Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	ATP
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$ 500
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target? all of Franklin County with the exception of the St. Regis Mohawk Tribe			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program? 50-60			
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 Four".			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?			
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)			
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:			

STSJP Program Four		Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?			
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 Five".			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?			
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)			
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:			

STSJP Program Five		Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?			
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 Six".			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?			
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)			
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:			

STSJP Program Six		Type of Program (ATD/ATP)	
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			\$
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target?			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program?			
Did the program listed above receive STSJP funds for 2013-2014? If so, provide answer the questions below. If not, please proceed to Section Three.			
1. When did the program start using 2013-2014 STSJP funds?			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds?			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service?			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014?			
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)			
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent:			

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? Franklin County's CFSR and detention placement data indicates no significant racial or ethnic disproportionality.

- 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

How they will reduce the number of youth who are detained or residentially placed:

A. Youth Advocate Programs Inc. (YAP):

Upon receiving a referral YAP staff will meet with the youth and family that same day either at the detention facility, at court or the Probation Department. From this meeting YAP staff will begin to schedule services to begin immediately and develop service plans to address the needs of the youth.

Service plans for this population will include personal crisis and safety plans for each youth, as well as community safety plans that will be developed within 24 hours of services beginning. The plans can be adapted and changed as services progress, but initial plans will be essential to keeping the youth home and safe. A community supervision plan will be created within 48 hours of services beginning to ensure the youth is supervised and does not receive any further arrests or violations.

Within the first week of services, a restorative justice plan will be created for the youth that will match the offense. Restorative Justice is an increasingly common alternative for juveniles who commit crimes. Studies have shown that youth who participate in restorative justice activities are significantly less likely to recidivate. These same studies have also shown that victims are often more satisfied with the restorative justice approach than with typical courtroom adjudication and a restorative justice activity will measure success differently than a punitive action. The restorative justice approach measures how much harm is repaired or prevented instead of how much punishment is inflicted. The development of safety plans for the individual, family and the community is the highest priority (completed within twenty four hours of beginning services). Safety concerns are identified for the home, school and community in each case and provisions are made to prevent, or at a minimum safely manage each situation without re-arrest. The restorative justice plan will be created within a week of services beginning to ensure the youth is making amends with the victim and the community. The Individualized Services Plan will be created within two weeks of services beginning. All members of the Child and Family Team will receive copies of these plans and wherever possible, informal community, family and school resources are drawn upon to safely manage and de-escalate crises. The rationale is that these resources will remain consistent and involved with families long after formal YAP services end.

B. Franklin County Probation- Electronic Home Monitoring: Since 2013, the Franklin County Probation Department has used Electronic Home Monitoring (EHM) for adjudicated juveniles in an effort to keep them in the community, while simultaneously promoting public safety. Thus far, the program has been used as a condition of probation for both Juvenile Delinquency (JD) and Person in Need of Supervision (PINS) matters.

In one instance, this was used for a JD at the time of disposition. The other three cases resulted in EHM being ordered as a consequence of a VOP proceeding. These juveniles were restored to probation with a condition to participate in the Franklin County Probation Department Electronic Home Monitoring Program.

Franklin County Probation owns equipment through Behavioral Interventions (BI). The present rate is \$2.25 per day for the cost of monitoring. The rate for SCRAMx monitoring is \$9.00 per day. That equipment is owned by Continuous Monitoring Solutions (CMS) and is used for the purpose of transdermal alcohol monitoring with an EHM component. Upon receiving a Court Order directing a respondent to be on EHM or SCRAMx, Probation investigates the feasibility of such. Our goal is to be judicious in the use of EHM for any youth. We do a thorough investigation with the parents and household to make sure this would not cause more harm. Concerns would be conveyed to the Family Court.

Once Probation is able to determine that EHM would not pose a significant safety factor for the youth or family, they confirm that a functioning land line is in the home. Thereafter, they install the equipment and commence monitoring. Participants are granted permission to be outside of their homes for the purpose of reporting to Probation, school, employment, treatment, medical appointments, church attendance, legal appointments and/or Court. Emergency situations are considered on a case by case basis.

Through Probation's partnership with DSS, DSS has agreed to fund EHM for juveniles as long as they have an open Preventive Services case. Adjudicated youth have a standard condition of probation to cooperate with any DSS program to which they are referred. Probation confirms that DSS will pay for this service and then send them a monthly bill for monitoring of the applicable BI clients and in turn we pay that company for the service. In SCRAMx cases, DSS pays CMS directly.

Franklin County Probation Department presently does not use devices with GPS capability. If this is ordered by the Court, they would explore renting such a unit from BI (which would be an increased cost) or check with the Franklin County Sheriff's Department to see if they would allow use one of their units with that type of technology. DSS would then reimburse the Sheriff's Department for any costs incurred. Franklin County Probation Department believes that using STJSP funds to pay for EHM relative to adjudicated juveniles makes good fiscal sense. It can be a very effective tool to keep juveniles in the community. When one considers the cost of foster care, residential placement, or OCFS placement (ATD), this type of sanction can be well worth the investment. However, we caution that EHM is not appropriate for all cases. Safety needs for the youth, family, and other community members must be considered when weighing this option.

C. Franklin County Probation- Rapid Drug Screening: The Franklin County Probation Department drug tests juveniles either as a condition of probation, pre-dispositional supervision, or our informal Diversion Program. This encompasses adjudicated Juvenile Delinquent (JD) and Person in Need of Supervision (PINS) matters, and respondents alleged to be a JD or PINS without formal Family Court involvement.

In formal supervision cases, the Family Court orders a pre-dispositional investigation. Among other things, Probation's subsequent report outlines the youth's prior legal history, presenting problem/offense, and

social history. They address any known or alleged substance abuse involvement, as well as the respondent's treatment record, if applicable. Standard drug conditions are typically ordered at the time a youth is placed under probation supervision. This generally includes a directive to abstain from the use/purchase/possession of alcohol and/or illegal drugs, submit to drug testing at the respondent's own expense, and if so directed, participate in/complete a substance abuse evaluation and any treatment that is recommended.

Informal Diversion cases have similar conditions imposed as deemed appropriate. Substance abuse issues are not necessarily evident at the time of case opening, but an informal PINS complaint could be based upon a Unlawful Possession of Marijuana charge or be part of a parental or police complaint that alleges illegal alcohol or drug use/possession on the part of the respondent. Those cases would be readily identified for a substance abuse referral and would be subject to random drug testing from the onset. In other instances, if substance abuse concerns are raised by parents, service providers, schools, law enforcement, or concerned community members during the course of the informal case, such would be a basis to add standard substance abuse conditions after the fact.

Regardless if the case involves a formal adjudication or not, we endeavor to keep families intact by safely maintaining at risk youth in the community. Drug testing is one of many tools used by the Probation Department to accomplish these means. The Probation Department administers on-site observed rapid urine drug screens purchased through Medtox and currently charges \$8.00 per test. Over the years, they've had difficulty with drug testing accounts not being paid in full. For some families, this is cost prohibitive. There can be a variety of other extenuating factors that result in the obligations being left unsatisfied. They have also seen a pool of people who have the ability to pay but choose not to take care of this debt. When an informal PINS or JD case is otherwise appropriate for a discharge, they usually do not seek such unless the bill has been paid.

As part of Probation's partnership with DSS, they have sought permission to use their drug test kits on a youth when there is an open DSS Preventive case. This removes the financial stigma from the family and reduces the monetary burden from the Probation Department for cases that have unpaid drug test fees. Drug testing keeps our respondents accountable, promotes public safety, and helps inform treatment decisions. Addressing substance abuse issues before they escalate is crucial in preventing our respondents from delving deeper into the Juvenile Justice or Criminal Court system.

In 2013, the Franklin County Probation Department tested approximately 50 youth using their own drug test kits, some multiple times, per a condition of their formal probation supervision case or the informal Diversion program. A minimum of \$400.00 was billed in the administration of these tests.

Allocating a portion of STSJP funds to pay for juvenile drug tests would be a fiscally intelligent use of those monies. Such testing can be a very effective tool to help keep our at risk juveniles in the community. It also has the added benefit of allowing both Departments to focus their attention on implementing a service plan for each case and relieve the responsibility of bill collection for drug tests. A small investment in this area

could reap huge dividends for the County as an ounce of prevention on the front end would contribute to reduced placements.

How they are family –focused:

A. YAP Inc.:

Parents and guardians are treated as equal partners in all aspects of service planning. YAP staff follows a non-judgmental, non-blaming approach in working with families. Staff/consumer relationships are built on mutual respect and trust.

A Child and Family Team Meeting will be held within the first two weeks of services to develop the Individualized Service Plan (ISP) which will incorporate all elements mentioned above. The plan will be presented to the Probation Department and Family Court as an alternative disposition option.

By providing this level of service it is expected that the youth will make all court appointments, any other appointments and will remain arrest free.

YAP staff will work with the parents/guardians to set up any mental health and/or counseling appointments that are needed within the first week of beginning services and any substance abuse treatment that may be deemed necessary by the family and service providers. Securing appointments for these services within the first week will be important to ensure the youth is receiving the treatment necessary and recommended as quickly as possible.

After initial services are orchestrated during the first two weeks following the referral, YAP staff will hold Child and Family Team Meetings on a monthly basis to address accomplishments, concerns, additions and deletions to any plan created (crisis, safety, supervision, restorative justice) and to update all parties to progress, concerns and needs. YAP staff will provide monthly updates to probation and courts unless the request is made for more frequent updates.

B &C: Franklin County Probation- Electronic Home Monitoring(EHM) and Rapid Drug Screening System:

Franklin County Probation and Franklin County DSS work closely with the parents of our youth in planning for services and treatment of our local youth. The EHM system will allow youth to remain in their home and community while awaiting their court appearance. It will allow for uninterrupted education, therapy(individual and family) and other services which are in place to support both the youth and family system's success. The Rapid Drug Screening capability will assist the family and service providers to assess and plan for the youth's underlying conditions which will increase the efficacy of treatment planning for the youth which could reduce out of home placement or shorten the length to allow for appropriate treatment of the condition in lieu of reacting to the behavior.

1. Whether the services/programs are capable of being replicated across multiple sites: All three Programs listed in Section Two of this application are capable of being replicated across multiple sites.
2. If the same plan was used last SFY, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes. Yes
3. What were the barriers if not met?

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. The YAP Detention Alternative Program provides a safe, community-based, family focused program tailored to the unique needs and strengths of every referred young person and their family so they can live in their home community, attend school or work, appear at all scheduled court proceedings, and remain arrest free. While all aspects of this program are important, YAP will have an initial intense focus on the first 30 days with the youth to ensure youth remain arrest free, have zero violations or re-arrests and that all youth return to their future court appointments eliminating the need for placement services outside their home. After the initial 30 days YAP will continue to build on plans initially created and expand the wrap around service goals for the youth/family to increase their community integration and family functioning.

Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. (YAP) is a 501(c)3 agency founded in 1975 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania by Tom Jeffers. Since that time YAP has expanded to operate more than 130 programs in 18 states, including programs in 25 major metropolitan areas such as Washington D.C., Philadelphia, Newark, Chicago, Mobile, Baltimore, Atlantic City, Las Vegas, Dallas, and Ft. Worth. YAP employs approximately 2,400 staff serving 12,000 youth, adults and families annually.

For over 35 years Youth Advocate Programs has been a nationally recognized leader in the restorative justice field providing services to the most "hard to serve" youth, including those least likely to be accepted by other agencies. YAP traditionally serves both "high-risk and "high need" populations in multiple systems. While YAP began by serving the juvenile justice population, the agency has expanded to serve youth, adults and families in the child welfare, mental/behavioral health, developmental disability, adult justice, school, drug and alcohol and other public systems.

Advocate programs operate on the premise that even the most troubled youth and families have strengths and capabilities that can and must be fostered in order to achieve success. The driving force behind the program is assisting families to develop their capabilities so they can function positively in their homes and communities.

YAP incorporates elements of the wraparound model of service planning and implementation. These services include a mix of individualized in-home and community based interventions developed around each family's unique circumstances. Services include traditional intervention such as counseling and case management as well as non-traditional services such as mentoring, job coaching, and recreational and free time management.

Empowerment of individuals, families and communities is central to the wraparound approach. The wraparound intervention shifts power from agencies to families and communities. While wraparound intervention addresses immediate needs, it also acts as a catalyst in creating permanency, independence and self-sufficiency.

Franklin County Probation and Franklin County DSS work collaboratively with one another to ensure best practice and establish a cooperative plan for services and supports for the youth and families in our jurisdiction. The EHM system will allow youth to remain in their home and community while awaiting their court appearance. It will allow for uninterrupted education, therapy(individual and family) and other services which are in place to support both the youth and family system's success(ie: the aforementioned YAP services). The Rapid Drug Screening capability will assist the family and service providers to assess and plan for the youth's underlying conditions which will increase the efficacy of treatment planning for the youth which could reduce out of home placement or shorten the length of stay to allow for appropriate treatment of the condition in lieu of reacting to the symptomatic behavior.

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: The expected Outcomes of the Detention Alternatives Program are:

- 85% will be successful in remaining intact with no out of home placements.
- 80% will demonstrate a positive outcome as defined by YAP's Outcome Measurement Survey.
- 80% will be successful in avoiding further legal involvement leading to adjudication.

Other projected positive outcomes for youth who participate in the services and programs:

- 100 % will have a community service or restorative justice project completed during services.
- 100 % will make all court appearances as scheduled

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:
 - 85% will be successful in remaining intact with no out of home placements
 - 80% will demonstrate positive outcomes as defined by YAPs Outcome Measurement Survey
 - 80% will be successful in avoiding further legal involvement leading to adjudication
 -
- Were there other positive outcomes for youth participating in STSJP services and programs?

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: countywide

TTL number of youth under 16 arrested: 17

TTL number of youth admitted to detention programs: 4

Secure detention:	3
--------------------------	---

Non-Secure detention	1
-----------------------------	---

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:	4
---	---

Number of PINs placed:	1
------------------------	---

TTL Number of youth who received service and programs as a result of STSJP funding:	13
---	----

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?

Although it has been assessed that the Franklin County service and program in our 2013/2014 STSJP Plan has achieved the projected reduction in placement numbers, with closer look at the detention placements a trend seems to stand out. Out of Franklin County's three youth placed in secure detention in 2013, two of them had been previously placed in an OMH Residential Treatment Facility by way of approval of a PACC Referral and had been unsuccessfully discharged from such due to their criminal behavior in that setting. One youth went to secure detention directly from an RTF and one shortly after his return home to the community. This seems to be a barrier for our county in that our most mentally ill children are the youth being detained in secure detention due to their inability to control their impulses and behavior in this controlled setting.

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

The allocation change planned for in the 2014-2015 year is the addition of the collaboration with Franklin County Probation in using funding for the Electronic Home Monitoring System to allow for youth to be monitored in the community as an alternative to detention and the additional allocation for funding of MEDTOX EZ Screen Rapid Drugs of Abuse Testing system, which will allow for random drug testing of youth on Probation suspected of drug use as an alternative to placement initiative to better plan for treatment of the underlying condition rather than placement in response to the behavior.

**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.

Thomas J. Lertz

Name (Please Print)

7/1/14

Date

X



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 ocfs.sm.stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov
-