OCFS-2121 (6/23/2014)

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 7 / 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: Steuben County		
LEAD AGENCY FOR STSJP SUBMISSION: Department of Social Services		NAME OF CONTACT PERSON: Kathryn A. Muller, LCSW-R
CONTACT PERSON'S PHONE NUMBER: 607-664-2444	CONTACT PERSON'S E-MAIL ADDRESS: kathryn.muller@co.steuben.ny.us	

STSJP SFY 2014 - 2015	
SFY 2014-2015 Starting County Detention Allocation amount	$ 263,579
SFY 2014-2015 County STSJP Allocation amount	$ 52,573
SFY 2014 -2015 County Detention Allocation being shifted	$ 15,396
Total SFY 2014-2015 STSJP Reimbursement Allocation amount	$ 67,969
Maximum STSJP Reimbursement amount for a 2014-2015 Plan	$ 109,627
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP State Share amount	$ 67,969
SFY 2014-2015 STSJP County Share amount	$ 41,658
SFY 2014-2015 Revised County Detention Allocation amount	$ 248,183
TOTAL COUNTY OBLIGATION:	$ 41,658

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.

Steuben County covers roughly 1600 square miles with a population of approximately 97,000 people living in rural agricultural areas, small towns and villages, and two small cities. There are three main population centers in the county and these include the cities of Corning and Hornell as well as the Village of Bath. Steuben County is divided into 32 towns, 14 villages and is governed by a Board of Legislators comprised of 17 elected officials. There are 13 School Districts throughout Steuben County.

Services for Persons In Need of Supervision(PINS) and Juvenile Delinquency are provided county wide. While a few cases may be shared with the Department of Social Services, the majority of the juvenile delinquency matters are served by the Steuben County Probation Department. PINS Adjustment matters are initiated at the Probation Department with case management services being provided by the Department of Social Services and Probation. All PINS Adjustment cases and some juvenile delinquency cases are opened with preventive services; this includes cases

managed by Probation officers. Services provided are in accordance with preventive standards and all cases are opened in Connections. All Family Court matters are presided over by Steuben County Family Court which is responsible for the remand of youth to secure and non-secure detention facilities.

Youth services in Steuben County have generally been coordinated through a cooperative effort between county and community agencies. With the support of County government, treatment services for youth have increased over the past decade to meet the challenges of the youth in our community in an effort to provide alternatives to placement and detention remands. These services include PINS and Delinquency education programs, anger management and mediation services, mental health and substance abuse treatment services, Youth Wrap Around Alternative Program (WRAP) and a county wide summer day program targeting the pre- PINS and Delinquency population.

The most populated areas of the county make up the majority of PINS and JD referrals for services. The three most populated towns of Hornell, Corning, and Bath produced the majority of all PINS and juvenile delinquency referrals. The placement data from 2013 shows there were 15 youth placed in foster care from this population. Placements included 5 PINS and 10 juvenile delinquents. While the placement numbers have fluctuated slightly over the past 5 years it is consistent that the majority of placements are from the main three population centers located within the county.

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. If you have more programs than the form allows for, please use the addendum OCFS-2121-1 which will allow you to enter more programs."

OCFS-2121 (6/23/2014)

STSJP Program One	Youth WRAP Around Alternative Program	**Type of Program (ATD/ATP)**	ATP
The amount of STSJP funds that your jurisdiction will devote to the services from this program?			109,627
1. What geographic areas has your analysis suggested you target? Population centers in the county i.e. Hornell, Bath, and Corning.			
2. What is your Jurisdiction's Projected Number of Youth that will be served by this STSJ Program? 45			
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? April 1, 2013			
2. How many slots were created in the program with STSJP funds? 45			
3. What was the average length of stay for youth in the program or service? 6 months			
4. How many youth received services in the program during 2013-2014? 53			

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) N/A
2. Did not appear in court when directed to do so N/A
3. Were re-arrested before appearing in court N/A
4. Moved to detention because of non-compliance with the program or any reason (other than re-arrest or failure to show at court) N/A
5. What amount of last SFY allocation for this STSJP Service Program was left unspent: N/A

STSJP Program Two	N/A	**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 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	N/A	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 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	N/A	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	N/A	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	N/A	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?

The data for Steuben County provided within the STSJP packet identifies that in 2013 racial disproportionality was not a factor in remands to non-secure detention. The data presents that 88% of those youth remanded were white with 6% Black, 3% Hispanic and 3% described as Other. The 2010 census.gov site reports Steuben County as a whole to be 94.1% White (not Hispanic or Latino), 1.6% Black or African-American and 1.5% Hispanic or Latino. While there is a small discrepancy in these percentages it would seem to be not statistically significant and non-indicative of racial disproportionality. Secure admissions for Steuben in 2013 identified a total of three (3) for the year. These three admissions represent one male and one female with two admissions. This also could prove to be an area of change to watch. All secure admissions were of White, non-Hispanic or Latino, youth.

Local placement data from 2012 shows that fourteen (14) youth were placed in the Department's custody and this included thirteen (13) caucasian and one (1) bi-racial youth. Data from 2013 identifies fifteen (15) youth being placed in custody, with 14 (fourteen) caucasian and one (1) Latino youth. Residential placements do not show disproportionality relative to race. Of the fifteen (15) placements last year, ten (10) were Juvenile Delinquents and five (5) were PINS.

Over the last couple of years an interesting trend is the narrowing in the gender gap relative to detention remands in Steuben County. In 2009 there were 10 females remanded to non-secure detention from Steuben County and this represented approximately 27 % of all youth placed in detention. In 2013 the overall numbers of placements have gone down but the numbers of female admissions are at 13 females detained which constitutes approximately 38% of the total non-secure remanded population.

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

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:

The WRAP program, which utilizes STSJP funding, is part of a County supported effort to reduce the number of referrals to detention and placement services, and shorten the number of care days for those who are detained. Also efforts include an increase in communication with other county and contract agencies relative to youth being considered for detention. Where possible community based services will be offered to support youth remaining at home. Efforts to achieve this goal will include the participation of the Department of Social Services, Probation, and Law Department as well as the Family Court system. The WRAP program of Pathways Inc. is utilized as a part of these efforts to offer intensive community based supports to assist in maintaining youth in their homes, both prior to placement as well as for the youth returning home from placement.

Over the past decade, the County Departments noted above have worked in a coordinated effort to provide effective PINS and Delinquency services. This effort has resulted with a significant reduction in the numbers of youth placed in custody of the Department of Social Services. The addition of a number of preventive

services for youth has greatly aided in this outcome. Finally, participation with New York State sponsored initiatives, including working with the Vera Institute, prior STSJP initiatives, and now use of the DRAI has provided direction and assisted in focused outcomes relative to a reduction in detention useage and residential placements.

The WRAP program was established in 2002 and has been engaging with families to provide the youth of Steuben County an alternative to detention and placement services. Success rates, defined as those youth who were diverted from placement, have traditionally been in the 90 % range since the inception of the program. The program is enhanced by the close working relationships between the WRAP staff and the employees of the county Probation and Social Services staff. Services are offered county wide and available for referral from Social Services and Probationary staff. Face to face case reviews are held every two weeks between WRAP and county staff to ensure continued case progress and discussions to address barriers. In 2013 WRAP provided services to 53 youth throughout Steuben County. Of those engaged and receiving services 85% were considered successful closures. Overall 33 youth were discharged from the program in 2013 with only 1 youth entering DSS custody for placement purposes, a 97% successful diversion rate. The program also with the preventive caseworkers worked with the youth's family in 4 other situations for alternative placement with family members. Furthermore, the WRAP 2013 year end outcomes identify that 91% of youths and families engaged demonstrated improved social skills, school/family interactions and parenting skills. These successes translate into fewer placements and reduce time in detention.

WRAP services include multiple face to face contacts monthly to include family counseling and support, child and family education, school interventions and advocacy, parenting education, respite services in the community, skill building, and after hours crisis interventions allowing for staff availability 24/7. To provide a good foundation for services the initial meetings between WRAP and families is spent developing an in depth strength based assessment. WRAP uses Master Level Counselors and Bachelor Level Skill Builders in an effort to support these families. WRAP staff made nearly 1600 contacts with the youth and families during 2013.

WRAP OUTCOME SUMMARY 2013

- Number of youths and families enrolled in 2013 : 53
- Percentage of successful discharges: 85%.
- Percentage of placements diverted: 97%
- Youth in families with improved social skills, school/family interactions and parenting skills: 91%
- Social skill contacts : 757. Average of 3.52/month.
- Counselor contacts : 826. Average of 3.52/month with youth and 3.72/month with adult/parent

1. How they will reduce the number of youth who are detained or residentially placed? The WRAP Program provides intensive contact with the youth and family in a variety of settings i.e. home, community & school.

The program is staffed with a clinical and behavioral team which work to address what Steuben has identified in recent years as the key areas of concern with our JD and PINS youth which is mental health and high risk behaviors. The team is available 24/7 to the youth and family and with that flexibility provides services as they are needed in order to decrease the need for the youth to be remanded or residentially placed.

2. How they are family –focused: After receipt of the referral WRAP begins the family engagement process with a strength based assessment. The assessment includes information and planning for all members of the household. Goals can reflect and identify both family and individual needs depending on case circumstances. Services are offered to all family members and siblings of the identified youth can participate with the program as well.
3. Whether the services/programs are capable of being replicated across multiple sites: The WRAP Progam operates county wide in all communites and school districts in the county. It is replicated across the county and could also be replicated elsewhere.
4. If the same plan was used last SFY, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes. The WRAP Program was utilized in last SFY as well. The four performance outcomes were achieved and details can be found in Section Seven.
5. What were the barriers if not met? N/A

SECTION FIVE – Overall Strategy and Justification for the Proposed Programs 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 strategy devised by your county's collaborative to address the STSJP Funding objective through the programs chosen in Section Two. Please discuss in the section below.

As noted in the narrative above the WRAP program, established in 2002, has a successful history of dealing with youth who have been involved with Family Court, Residential Services, Detention, and Articles 3 and 7 of the Family Court Act. WRAP services include multiple face to face contacts monthly to include family therapy, child and family education, school interventions and advocacy, parenting education and support, respite services in the community, skill building, and after hours crisis interventions. To provide a good foundation for services the initial meetings between WRAP and families is spent developing an in depth strength based assessment. WRAP uses Master Level Therapists and skill builders in an effort to support these families. WRAP staff made nearly 1600 contacts with the youth and families during 2013.

In recent years the youth who have been detained or placed residentially have had ever increasing mental health concerns as well as exhibiting significant behavioral risks. The WRAP Program employs two Masters Level Clinicians as well as two Bachelors Level Skill Builders in an attempt to meet the mental health and behavioral needs of the youth. The 24/7 availability and flexibility of the program allows for the staff to respond to crisis as they arise and de-escalate the situation in order to decrease the potential for out of home placement or use of detention. WRAP has proven to be effective in preventing more restrictive outcomes such as detention or placement of the youth involved with the program.

Success rates, defined as those youth who were diverted from placement, have traditionally been in the 90 % range since the inception of the program. The program is enhanced by the close working relationships between the WRAP staff and the employees of the county Probation and Social Services staff. Services are offered county wide and available for referral from Social Services and Probationary staff. Face to face case reviews are held every two weeks between WRAP and county staff to ensure continued case progress and discussions to address barriers. In 2012 WRAP provided services to 47 youth throughout Steuben County. Of those engaged in services 87% were considered successful closures and diverted from placement. Furthermore, the WRAP 2012 year end outcomes identify that 94% of youths and families engaged demonstrated improved social skills, school/family interactions and parenting skills. These successes translate into fewer placements and reduce time in detention.

The programs involved with the STSJP funding are being considered in a County supported effort to reduce the number of referrals to detention and placement services, and shorten the number of care days for those who are detained. Also efforts include an increase in communication with other county and contract agencies relative to youth being considered for detention. Where possible community based services will be offered to support youth remaining at home. Efforts to achieve this goal will include the participation of the Department of Social Services, Probation, and Law Department as well as the Family Court system. In addition the WRAP program of Pathways Inc. will be utilized to offer intensive community based supports to assist in maintaining youth in their homes, both prior to placement as well as for the youth returning home.

Over the past decade, the County Departments noted above have worked in a coordinated effort to provide effective PINS and Delinquency services. This effort has resulted with a significant reduction in the numbers of youth placed in custody of the Department of Social Services. The addition of a number of preventive services for youth has greatly aided in this outcome.

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:

Outcome 1:

Target: Of the 45 cases referred to WRAP, (90%) will demonstrate their improved proficiency in social skills and school / family interactions, and enhance their competency in parenting skills. Participant PINS and Delinquent youth & families will be given skills to avoid involvement with the Family Court or Detention Systems.

Outcome 2:

Target: Of the 45 participants involved with WRAP, 45 (100%) will be seen minimally 3.5 times per month by the program therapists and skill builders. Participant PINS and Delinquent youth will be given skills to avoid involvement with the Family Court or Detention Systems.

Outcome 3:

Target: Length of stay for youth remanded to non-secure detention will be reduced by 5% in 2014.

Outcome 4:

Target: The number of youth remanded to non-secure detention will be reduced by 5% in 2014.

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

Outcome 5:

The number of youth placed in out of home placements will be reduced by 5% in 2014.

The well being of the designated youth will be improved in the home, community and the school setting. WRAP interventions will provide supports and education to all family members to address crisis related situations and ultimately increase communication and improve the relationships between family members.

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:

Outcome 1:

Target: Of the 45 cases referred to WRAP, (90%) will demonstrate their improved proficiency in social skills and school / family interactions, and enhance their competency in parenting skills. Participant PINS and Delinquent youth will be given skills to avoid involvement with the Family Court or Detention Systems.

Outcome Achieved: During 2013 91% of youths and families demonstrated improved proficiency in social skills, school/family interactions & parenting skills.

Outcome 2:

Target: Of the 45 participants involved with WRAP, 45 (100%) will be seen minimally 3.5 times per month by the program therapists and skill builders. Participant PINS and Delinquent youth will be given skills to avoid involvement with the Family Court or Detention Systems.

Outcome Achieved: In 2013 the WRAP Program reports on average 3.5 sessions were provided monthly with the Skill Builder as well as the Counselor to the family and teen. Youth and families in the program are seen multiple times per week by the counselor and skill builder in order to improve their skills and to avoid further involvement with Family Court or Detention which could result in out of home placement.

Outcome 3:

Target: Length of stay for youth remanded to non-secure detention will be reduced by 15% over the next 12 months.

Outcome Achieved: The 2012 average length of care days for youth remanded to detention was 32 days per youth as reported in last years report. The OCFS supplied data for 2013 reports Steuben to have decreased to an average of 16 days for length of stay in non-secure detention. This represent s a 50% decrease.

Outcome 4:

Target: The number of youth remanded to non-secure detention will be reduced by 5% over the next 12 months.

- Outcome Achieved: OCFS data reports in 2012 that 29 youth were remanded to non-secure detention in Steuben County. In 2013 it is found that 25 unique youth were remanded to detention for a total of 34 admissions. Nine youth had multiple remands in 2013 as the County worked to keep them successfully in their families and communities. This represents a 15% decrease in unique youth being remanded to non-secure detention.

- Were there other positive outcomes for youth participating in STSJP services and programs?
- The well being of the designated youth was improved in the home, community and the school setting as well as the parenting skills of the guardian. WRAP interventions supports and educates all family members to address crisis related situations and ultimately increase communication and improve the relationships between family members.

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: 92

TTL number of youth admitted to detention programs: 25 unique youth

Secure detention:	2 (1 youth with 2adm's)
Non-Secure detention	25 (9 with 2 adm's)

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:	10
Number of PINs placed:	5
TTL Number of youth who received service and programs as a result of STSJP funding:	53

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?

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

Steuben does not plan to make changes to the allocations and will continue to utilize the funds to support the WRAP Program. The Probation Department in 2014 has started to utilize pre-dispositional supervision with this population and finding further success with this practice. It is is aniticpated that the County will explore the use of GPS units for community supervision in 2015 as another way to decrease requests for detention remands as well as placements.

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.

Mark R. Alger, County Manager
Name (Please Print)

7/10/2014
Date

X Mark R Alger
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