

JCP BUDGET REDUCTIONS, PLAN UPDATE

Resource Materials for November 25, 2002 PJJC Meeting

Packet Description

The most recent Special Session of the Oregon Legislature adopted reductions to the Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan budget resulting in an \$89,502 reduction in JCP Prevention funds for Lane County for January 1 – June 30, 2003. PJJC considered these reductions at the October 24 committee meeting. The PJJC High Risk Subcommittee had recommended that PJJC adopt the following recommendation to PSCC:

- Early Intervention and Treatment Program budget be reduced by their remaining allocation as of January 1, 2003 (\$1,562)
- The remaining reduction be spread evenly across the allocation for Basic Services and Prevention Programs as of January 1, 2003.

PJJC rejected this recommendation. Action must be taken at the committee's November 25 meeting for the item to be forwarded to the PSCC Policy Committee and Board of County Commissioners in December so providers can be notified and prepared to make reductions in program budgets effective January 1. The committee requested three types of information to assist in developing a recommendation:

- Related Budget Reduction Information – Information from Oregon Youth Authority, Department of Youth Services, Mental Health, and Department of Human Services on adopted and potential reductions throughout the system of services which prevent and intervene in high risk youth behavior.
- JCP Plan Background Information – Information from LCOG staff concerning JCP Plan intent, requirements, definitions.
- Impact of Potential JCP Reductions on Children & Youth – Information from contractors about specific JCP funded programs including their target population, cost per child/youth, program description in lay terms, what the program does for children/youth, impact if the program is reduced, and which funds are tied to match.

The requested information is attached on the following pages:

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| ○ Related Budget Reduction Information | Pages 2-4 |
| ○ JCP Plan Background | Page 5 |
| ○ Impact of Potential JCP Reductions on Children & Youth | Pages 6-16 |

Please note that page 13 is a letter from Center for Family Development recommending that their Family Support and Skill Building program be eliminated in order to help keep the other programs whole. They are asking only that a small amount of the funds be transferred to the Department of Youth Services to support the Community Resource Bank.

Related Budget Reduction Information

Lisa Smith prepared the description below for Department of Youth Services of potential reductions. She included a description of Oregon Youth Authority reductions and the impact they may have on DYS and Lane County. John Radich said the Oregon Department of Human Services is in the process of preparing an analysis of potential reductions which includes county-level detail. If it is available prior to the November 25 meeting, it will be Emailed to you and copies will also be brought to the meeting. We are trying, also, to have information available at the meeting on reductions in the mental health system.

Department of Youth Services Impact of Reductions and Potential Impacts of Further Reductions

1. What reductions in funding for high-risk children/youth and families within Department of Youth Services have already been adopted and will be implemented January 1?

The Department of Youth Services has lost eight juvenile counselor positions since 2001 in both the intake and supervision units. We have previously implemented a cut from the JCP cuts implemented earlier in 2002 that funds the assessment positions and the shelter program.

2. What impact will these reductions have on children/youth, families, services, the system, and the community?

The loss of eight juvenile counselor positions has resulted in larger caseloads and delay in time from referral to assessment for youth and families. The reduction of JCP funds have required that the Department of Youth Services reduce staff training funds in order to maintain positions and cover funding of the shelter from the previous cut. The Department of Youth Services has minimal staff training funds and this reduction means that the number of staff that receives quality training will be significantly restricted. This is occurring at a critical time of our service delivery. Our more experienced workforce is retiring and we are faced with a younger, less skilled, work force without the funds to adequately train them.

3. What reductions in funding for high-risk children/youth and families within the Department of Youth Services are anticipated if the ballot measure fails in January?

A \$45,000 reduction in JCP Basic Services funds would result in the loss of 7 of 14 beds at the Transitional Shelter and Assessment Center. The \$38,000 reduction of JCP Diversion funds would result in the loss of 2.0 FTE juvenile counselor positions that work with approximately 50 juvenile sexual counselors per calendar year.

Another anticipated reduction would be the termination of the current OYA lease and supervisor contract. This would result in the loss of approximately \$130,000 in revenues to the Department of Youth Services and would relocate OYA employees that currently are housed at the Lane County Department of Youth Services. The contract also pays for the salary of one supervisor that, while an employee of Lane County, provides supervision for OYA staff. \$18,000 of the revenue from this contract goes to support some of the activities of court school.

4. What impact will these reductions have on children/youth, families, services, the

system, the community?

The loss of 7 shelter beds will mean that detention resources will be decreased and OYA youth will move directly from the facilities to their homes without the benefit of a supervised transition period. The loss of the 2.0 juvenile counselor positions will increase already stressed caseloads for other juvenile counselors. It will also mean that those youth will be seen less frequently, potentially putting the community at greater risk of additional crimes.

5. What are the core services of the Department of Youth Services? Please describe the impact, if any, on core services of reductions to specific services currently funded by the Lane County Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan.

All of these reductions impact the core services of the Department of Youth Services. Assessment, supervision and detention will all be significantly challenged in incorporating these reductions into the day to day functioning of the Department. Assessment is a required activity. The loss of resources means that youth and families will wait longer periods of time until an assessment occurs and services begin. Supervision will be less frequent with fewer counselors to handle the caseload responsibilities. Also, the juvenile counselors working with the juvenile sexual offenders are specially trained to respond to the special needs and issues of the population. The loss of their expertise will result in diminished quality of service and increased risk to the community. Detention services will be significantly impacted. With only 32 beds of detention, only the most serious of offenders are being placed in secure detention. After a period of stabilization, they are placed at the shelter. This has freed up valuable detention space for other youth who pose risk to the community. With the loss of 50% of the shelter beds, these youth will continue in detention placement or return to the home before stabilization has occurred. The result – fewer other delinquent youth will have access to limited detention beds.

6. Are there other potential budget reductions which PJJC should take into consideration as part of their process of allocating JCP funding reductions?

The OYA projected budget cuts will have serious impact on the Department of Youth Services. The projected cuts with the failure of the January 28 ballot measure would mean:

- As many as 38 youth now housed in Oak Creek and transition camp programs will return to Lane County.
- An average of 72 Lane County youth per year will remain in the community because of the reduction to the cap for Lane County. These youth would have been committed to OYA in the past. In addition, these are youth who have failed at community-based treatment and require a more secure setting. The community will absorb the negative impact (more juvenile crime) by having these offenders remain at home.
- Six girls receiving specific services in shelter will return to the community.
- Twenty-four female residents will be denied shelter services per calendar year.
- In addition to loss of closed custody beds, an average of 10 offenders in Lane County will also lose access to residential beds per year. These offenders have historically had less serious criminal offenses but significant mental health issues.
- OYA caseload sizes will increase an average of 12% due to a reduction in parole officers statewide.

Another factor to consider is Lane County's own projected budget shortfall of \$1.6 million and its

implications for the Department of Youth Services.

All of this ultimately means that the Department of Youth Services will be doing more with less, a lot less. Both quality and quantity of service will be affected and, ultimately, community safety will be compromised.

JCP Plan Background

The following is an excerpt from the October 11, 2000 cover letter for the “Juvenile Crime Prevention Planning Guidelines – 2001-03 Biennium”. The cover letter was signed by the Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee Chair, Oregon Youth Authority Director, Oregon Criminal Justice Commission Executive Director, and the Oregon Commission on Children and Families Director. It helps describe the intent of the funds at that point in time.

A potentially significant change to many county juvenile crime prevention plans will be as a result of a stronger JCPAC focus on identifying and providing services to youth before they become delinquent. Waivers¹ granted to counties for the 1999-2001 biennium will not be continued into the next biennium. Exceptions to this focus may be made for minimum grant counties. The JCPAC will look at these exceptions on a case by case basis, asking for information about other funding sources available to serve youth along the service continuum. The JCPAC may need to revisit this policy depending on factors that impact the state budget. We will keep you informed as we move through the budget process.

While the JCPAC intends to ensure that a continuum of services are provided with a focus on preventing initial delinquent behavior among high risk youth, the JCPAC also recognized that basic services are a critical component in reducing juvenile crime by providing accountability to youth who have exhibited delinquent behavior.

The following definitions are from the Guidelines, page 1.

Basic Services Definition

Basic services are defined as juvenile department services delivered to any youth for an offense. Basic services consist of a continuum of graduated sanctions including shelter care, detention, treatment, after care, and other juvenile department services.

High-Risk Prevention Services Definition

Prevention services are defined as services delivered to youth who fit the juvenile crime prevention target population, regardless of legal status, and which have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing risk factors and preventing initial or continuing delinquent behavior among high-risk youth.

The best practices framework for the JCP Plan is reflected in the targeting of the services, also from page 1 of the Guidelines.

Target Population

For JCP Basic Services and Prevention Services, youth who are:

- 10 through 17 years of age
- with more than one risk factor
- clearly demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of government or community agencies, schools, or law enforcement and will lead to imminent or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system within two years

¹ Waivers granted during the previous biennium allowed counties to use some of their Prevention funds for Basic Services. Lane County was one of the counties who received a waiver for 1999-2001.

Impact of Potential JCP Reductions on Children & Youth

Biennial budgets for all JCP funded programs and their total current allocation for the period January 1 – June 30, 2003 are in the spreadsheet below.

Contract	JCP 01-03 24 months	Current Allocation 01/01/03 - 06/30/03
Basic Services		
Shelter - DYS/LG	789,282	197,321
JJIS Data Support - DYS	71,369	17,842
Monitoring & Evaluation - LCOG	44,925	11,231
Prevention Services		
Assessment - DYS	261,265	65,316
Family Support, Skill Building - LG	145,684	36,807
Family Support, Skill Building - CFD	263,287	65,436
Student Assistance Program - CFD	399,297	99,824
Treatment Foster Care - OSLC	298,588	74,647
Court School - DYS	49,561	12,390
Early Identification & Treatment - DYS	6,248	1,562
Monitoring & Evaluation - LCOG	74,703	18,676
Total	2,404,209	601,052

To gather information as requested by the committee, the questions below were forwarded to JCP contractors.

Using no more than **one page per program**, please provide the following information on each program your agency provides funded with Juvenile Crime Prevention funds:

1. Describe the program in lay terms. What does it do for children/youth? Who is the target population?
2. What will be the impact to children, families, the community if your agency does not continue to provide this program?
3. What will be the impact to your program's level of services of reductions at the following levels - 15%, 20%, 30%? Also address at what percent reduction your program becomes unable to function effectively.
4. In your current budget for this program, which funds are tied to match for other services or for an expansion of these same services?

Contractors also provided information on cost per child/youth. All contractors responded and their responses are on the following pages.

JCP Information - Requested by PJJC

Name of Program	Shelter Care – Youth Services
Funding Source	JCP Basic Services – see attached Excel sheet for funding information including cost per unit
What does funding pay for	Operational costs to run the shelter care program – a 14 bed residential shelter
Target Population	Juvenile offenders between 12-17 years old – avg. age is 15

1. **Describe The Program** – TSAC works with high risk adolescent male offenders who are referred by the Department of Youth Services. The majority of these youth have been identified as needing out of home placement. They come from secure detention or Oak Creek (a state run secure facility). The length of stay ranges from 2-4 months. Youth referred to TSAC have a high number of risk factors and very few protective factors. Some have alcohol and drug problems and major mental health issues. Most have had multiple stays in detention and many have run from previous placements.

The services provided while at TSAC are strength based and include a treatment plan which responds to the individual needs of each youth, structured supervised living environment, individual and family counseling, alcohol and drug (A&D) treatment, an educational component, and cognitive behavioral interventions. Services support the goal to transition youth either to home, residential treatment or independent living. Long term after-care services are available to youth and their families after they return home. They include family counseling, parenting skills, assistance in getting to appointments i.e. A&D treatment, after school activities, etc. Services are provided in the home. 79 percent of youth have not been referred to DYS for criminal behavior one year after the program.

2. **Impact If We Do Not Continue This Program** – If TSAC reduces capacity to 7 beds due to budget cuts the following will occur: a) 50 less youth will be served a year (from 100 to 50). Youth will remain longer in detention which reduces the secure bed space for other offenders; b) other youth from TSAC will prematurely be released back into the community which increases juvenile crime; and c) youth from Oak Creek will return directly to the community with no transition time for them to stabilize prior to returning. In addition, TSAC provides an intensive alcohol and drug intervention that enables youth to go home while receiving outpatient A&D services. If this service is reduced, more youth will need more expensive residential treatment for alcohol and drugs.

3. **Impact of 15%, 20%, and 30%** - Any reduction would reduce TSAC capacity from 14 to 7 beds. This is because of the mandated staff to client ratio. This would not reduce expenses by 50% as building costs i.e. utilities and maintenance would remain the same.

4. **Budget For This Program Tied To Match / Expansion Of These Same Services** – Local dollars generate federal BRS match (Behavior Rehabilitation Services – Title XIX Funds) for shelter care. Local funds generate a BRS match of \$217,934 which is 27.9% of the total cost of shelter care.

JCP Information - Requested by PJJC

Name of Program	JJIS Data Support – Youth Services
Funding Source	JCP Basic Services – see attached Excel sheet for funding information including cost per unit
What does funding pay for	Funds support the total cost of the research assistant at Youth services to ensure data integrity on the new information system.
Target Population	N/A

1. **Describe The Program** – Youth Services moved all juvenile corrections data to a statewide Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Since that migration, there have been on-going issues with data integrity. These issues are based on several factors including; a) the very large statewide information system had some technical problems with converted data; b) staff have on-going training needs – usually resulting after a new version of the system is released; c) Youth Services decentralized data entry resulting in different staff entering different types of data; and d) staff computer literacy varies greatly among workers. All these conditions lead to problems with data integrity. Youth Services’ JJIS data support has one of the most fluent understandings of JJIS in the state. The audit work form Lane County has found problems with the system that affected each juvenile department in Oregon. In addition, this work has helped Youth Services assess where it needs to provide additional training and support to staff.
2. **Impact If We Do Not Continue This Program** – Reducing, or not supporting, this effort will greatly compromise data integrity. Youth Services ability to validate data supports local and statewide efforts, including JCP, to conduct program evaluations - data which contribute to those efforts would become under suspect.
3. **Impact Of 15%, 20%, And 30%** – Any reduction would reduce staff time to audit data and provide reports for evaluations.
4. **Budget From This Program Tied to Match or Expansion of These Same Services** – This service provides support for internal evaluation, evaluation efforts with local research organizations, statewide evaluations such as JCP, and federal projects.

Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation - Lane Council of Governments

1. Describe the program in lay terms. What does it do for children/youth? Who is the target population?

This is not a direct service function but supports direct services to all the children and youth served by JCP funds. It is part of the 15% total administration allowed. Planning, monitoring, evaluation, and administration services provided by LCOG help the PSCC meet State JCP contract requirements as well as PSCC statutory requirements:

- Develop and recommend a plan for the use of state resources to serve the local juvenile offender population which must coordinate community wide services involving prevention, treatment, and intervention strategies;
- Coordinate local juvenile justice policy among affected criminal justice entities; and
- In consultation with the Commission on Children and Families, develop and recommend a plan aimed at crime prevention and to prevent criminal involvement by youth (JCP Plan)

JCP funds for planning, monitoring, and evaluation pays for LCOG staff to:

- Administer JCP funds coming to Lane County; manage the \$2.4 million JCP budget
- Conduct the contracting process, prepare and process nine contracts and amendments to those contracts as needed; provide fiscal administration of contracts
- Collect outcome, output information, analyze it, and compile it into quarterly reports
- Facilitate planning and write the JCP Plan and its updates
- Provide planning and clerical staff support to four committees: PSCC/CCF Prevention and Juvenile Justice Committee, PJJC High Risk Subcommittee, PJJC School Safety Subcommittee, Juvenile Sex Offender Management Planning Team
- Write grants, leverage resources, obtain technical assistance

2. What will be the impact to children, families, the community if your agency does not continue to provide this program?

Some level of planning, monitoring, and evaluation are required in order to develop and write JCP plans, manage the budget and contracts, prepared required reports to the state, and participate as required in the state evaluation. Loss of this function would also reduce ability to leverage other resources.

3. What will be the impact to your program's level of services of reductions at the following levels - 15%, 20%, 30%?

Funds are prorated between Basic Service and Prevention funds and purchase .51 FTE planning and research staff plus clerical support, fiscal support, minutes recording, other support included in indirect. 15% reduces FTE to .43, 20% to .41 FTE, 30% to .36 FTE.

4. In your current budget for this program, which funds are tied to match for other services or for an expansion of these same services?

\$39,789 provides match for the \$49,148 Sex Offender Management Planning Grant. \$6,512 is match for \$438,678 of JAIBG funds. Grantwriting for partner agencies leveraged ten grants worth \$19,760,840 for children and youth in Lane County since 1997 (does not include JCP, JAIBG, or other allocated funds).

JCP Information - Requested by PJJC

Name of Program	Assessment Services – Youth Services
Funding Source	JCP Prevention – see attached Excel sheet for funding information including cost per unit
What does funding pay for	1.82 FTE to conduct assessments. Description below
Target Population	Juvenile offenders between 10-17 years old (general age group) – may get younger youth.

1. **Describe The Program** – Youth Services uses a validated, statewide, assessment tool called the “risk assessment.” Every youth seen at Youth Services receives a risk assessment. It identifies the number and type of risks factors associated with delinquent behavior. It measures youth’s risk on criminal items, school issues, family functioning, alcohol and drug issues, and peer association. It is used for a couple of reasons including:
 - Measures a youth’s risk to re-offend (commit a new crime in the next 12 months) – JCP requires the use of this tool to screen for JCP eligibility.
 - Shows what risk indicators (risk items) they have – this information is used to identify what services they need. For example, if school drop out is identified, probation staff work to link youth to educational support programs.
 - It is also a screening tool for alcohol and drug problems, mental health issues, and violence tendencies. If juvenile offenders screen for these items, they are referred to appropriate resources for a more in depth assessment.
 - There are numerous national research studies showing the need for standardized, validated tools to help juvenile justice providers identify high, medium and low risk youth. The goal is to target appropriate services based on type of crime and on risk items. The research indicates that the tool is more accurate than clinical assessments (worker subjective judgment).

2. **Impact If We Do Not Continue This Program** – Discontinuing this service is not an option. A reduction in funds impacts the “level” at which this service can be provided. There are several consequences of reducing the number of staff providing assessments including; a) there will be a significant back up of youth and families waiting for their intake interviews (when they receive the assessment). That could mean months between the time a crime is committed and when they see staff at Youth Services; b) additional crimes may be committed while youth wait for the intake interview and subsequent interventions, increasing the risk to community safety; c) reduce the number of youth appropriately screened for JCP services.

3. **Impact Of 15%, 20%, And 30%** - 15% reduces .33 FTE; 20% reduces .44 FTE; and 30% reduces .67 FTE. These are based on strict mathematical calculations. Obviously, we cannot cut away a partial person. Even at 15% reduction, we’re looking at reducing staff.

4. **Budget For This Program Tied To Match / Expansion Of These Same Services** – A total reduction in JCP funded FTE for assessments reduces youth assessed by 170 per year.

Looking Glass Family Support/Skill Building Program

1. Describe the program in lay terms. What does it do for children/youth? Who is the target population?

The Looking Glass Violence Intervention Project (VIP) targets non-offending runaway and homeless youth who have begun to act out violently at home, at school, and in the community. Referrals for the project come primarily from our Station 7 Program that serves youth and families in crisis. About 65% of youth referred to VIP have funding through the Oregon Health Plan (OHP). JCP provides the funding for the remaining 35% who have no other funding. To date, JCP has funded services for 34 youth for which other funding was not available. Youth referred to the project are among the highest risk youth in our community, as they are typically away from their homes, not enrolled in public school or are attending school sporadically, are on Individualized Education Plans (IEP), have anti-social peers that are also runaway/homeless and not in school, and have escalating substance abuse issues. Youth referred to VIP score extremely high on the JCP Screening tool; 46% have all five of the five risk domains identified as concerns and another 36% have four risk domains identified. The VIP provides a comprehensive, family-centered, team approach to working with this population of runaway at-risk youth. Youth and families receive multiple services each week in their homes, in schools, and in the community. The project model is based on the best practice model of multisystemic therapy.

2. Impact to children, families, the community if your agency does not continue this program?

Runaway and homeless youth are among the most at-risk and invisible youth in our community. Prior to inevitable law violations and involvement with the Department of Youth Services, these youths largely go unnoticed by our social service system. Early intervention is the key to preventing these youth from continuing their path towards disengagement with their families, further involvement with anti-social peers, withdrawal from education, escalating substance abuse, and predictable criminal behavior. JCP is the only funding source that is available to fund the comprehensive, community-based services these youth and families need. Without JCP funding, runaway and homeless youth without OHP will not receive services. This will result in increased delinquency and a much more expensive system response.

3. What will be the impact to your program's level of services of reductions at the following levels – 15%, 20%, 30%? Also address at what percent reduction your program becomes unable to function effectively.

As funding reductions occur, the number of youth who receive services is reduced proportionally. The program can function and remain viable with less funding, but may require staff FTE reductions.

4. In your current budget for this program, which funds are tied to match for other services or for an expansion of these same services?

Runaway and homeless youth that are eligible for OHP receive services fully funded by OHP. Sometimes the youth and family are not initially eligible for OHP, begin services with the VIP funded by JCP, and then becomes eligible for OHP. Funding is then switched fully to OHP. Other families are eligible for OHP, begin services with OHP funding, but then lose their coverage and are able to continue services with JCP funding. The ability to switch and blend funding is essential to providing services to this population.

5. Cost per client - The average cost per client is \$3,652.

Center for Family Development – Family Support and Skill Building

1. Describe the program in lay terms. What does it do for children/youth? Who is the target population?

The Center for Family Development's Family Support/Skill-Building program, Adolescent Risk Intervention Program (ARI), uses a Multisystemic Therapy (MST) model of treatment. MST is one of the few evidence-based models that demonstrates effectiveness in the treatment of delinquent and substance abusing youth. Three factors differentiate the MST approach from other non-validated interventions. The model is comprehensive, involving simultaneous, coordinated interventions in three major systems that impact the youth, (i.e., family, school, and peer group). It is intensive, involving multiple weekly contacts that vary in duration, frequency, and timing, as needed by the youth and family, rather than a predetermined notion of "therapeutic dosage." Finally, it is flexible, involving the willingness to "go anywhere, anytime, to meet with anyone," as dictated by the needs of the situation.

To date, we have treated over 100 families using an MST/BSS model and the most recent outcomes show an 89% non-arrest rate, exceeding the criteria of 65% set by the grant. ARI has provided services to middle and high school, at-risk students. Services have been in both rural and urban settings, and often provided within the home. Basic services were family therapy, the use of Behavioral Support Specialists (skill builders) and coordinating activities between the school and parents.

2. What will be the impact to children, families, the community if your agency does not continue to provide this program?

This represents a loss of an effective, efficient service to at-risk youth and their families.

3. What will be the impact to your program's level of services of reductions at the following levels - 15%, 20%, 30%? Also address at what percent reduction your program becomes unable to function effectively.

We do not believe that the program would be viable with additional cuts. Please see attached letter from the Program Manager making a request to preserve dollars for the Community Resource Bank, which is devoted to at-risk youth within the Department of Youth Services.

4. In your current budget for this program, which funds are tied to match for other services or for an expansion of these same services?

We currently have no matching funds.

5. Please also include a cost per youth.

The cost per student for ARI from 7/01/01 through 9/30/02 is \$3136.

November 13, 2002

Dear Susan and members of the Public Safety Coordinating Council:

As we observed the LCOG committee meetings last month, the overwhelming implications of the budget cuts that our county is facing became painfully obvious to us. After considerable deliberation, we have concluded that, while maintaining our belief that our Family Support/Skill-Building program is a valuable resource and has done an effective job, we cannot advocate for its continuance in the face of the current threat to the most essential services. As a result, we are asking that the committee cut our Family Support/Skill-Building program and dedicate its funds to the maintenance of these essential services.

We would, however, make a small request for the committee's consideration. A small part of the Family Support/Skill-Building budget is dedicated to the support of the Community Resource Bank. This project presents a partnership between the Center for Family Development, Committed Partners for Youth, and Oregon Social Learning Center. In addition to the funds received through the Skill-Building grant, it has been supported through collaborative funding sources including Meyer Memorial Trust, LaneCare, Oregon Social Learning Center, and the Student Assistance Program. Most recently, it is receiving a small amount of additional funds as part of the Psychological Services contract that was awarded to CFD by the Department of Youth Services. The focus of the Community Resource Bank is to build protective factors for at-risk youth by involving the business and non-profit community in donating resources and providing pro-social contexts to support at-risk youth. Over the initial year of the project, the Community Resource Bank accumulated \$26,000 worth of donations, most of which are renewable and can be used multiple times for at-risk youth. These resources are directly integrated into the services delivery systems of the partner agencies through the direct participation of the Community Resource Developer, Susan Montana, in the clinical decision-making process. In this contest, specific protective needs are identified that relate to the interests and talents of each specific youth and Susan goes out and arranges for them. The resource bank includes athletic clubs, sports opportunities, horseback riding stables, art classes, creative writing coaches, voice and music lessons, rock-climbing, and a multitude of other activities and volunteer opportunities.

What we are asking of the committee is to dedicate \$2,000 to \$5,000 to be transferred to the Department of Youth Services to increase their support of the Community Resource Developer and her ability to serve more DYS youth as an integrated part of the DYS mental health services program.

We appreciate the committee's consideration of this matter and would be available to provide further information to aid in your decision.

Sincerely,

Mitch Schwartz, M.A.
Clinical Supervisor
Center for Family Development

Center for Family Development – Student Assistance Program

1. Describe the program in lay terms. What does it do for children/youth? Who is the target population?

The Center for Family Development's Student Assistance Program (SAP) is a middle school based prevention program targeting at-risk students in 10 middle schools around Lane County. Those schools include two in Springfield, two in the 4J district, one in Bethel, and five rural schools in Lowell, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Oakridge and Junction City. The program is designed to connect with the school's existing resources that target at-risk students and enhance the resources through increased community connections. Schools help our program by identifying at-risk students and our coordinators create interventions around targeted behaviors with input from school, parents, and students. These interventions range from school-based services such as IEPs and contracting, to counseling and outside tutoring services, to basic need services such as telephone, electricity, and gas. SAP has assisted 291 students over the last 2 ½ years.

2. What will be the impact to children, families, the community if your agency does not continue to provide this program?

It is our judgment that the impact on the schools and community would be profound in being able to support at-risk youth if this program is discontinued. Most of the schools have little to no counseling services, and the services that exist tend to be stretched thin. Most of the rural communities are in desperate need of continued interventions from our program. We've touched approximately 2% to 4% of the total number of students in the schools that might otherwise go untouched and create continued problems for the school and their families.

3. What will be the impact to your program's level of services of reductions at the following levels - 15%, 20%, 30%? Also address at what percent reduction your program becomes unable to function effectively.

We would propose to maintain the major functions of SAP at the 15 % level. In order to accomplish this outcome, we would discontinue a major valued resource to parents and providers of contacting parents weekly to assess progress (Parent Weekly Report). Additionally, we would propose to stop services of the coordinators as of May 31, 2003 as opposed to the end of June.

At a 20% level, 2 to 3 schools would need to be taken off the roster and personnel reduced in addition to the above proposed cuts.

At a 30% level, 5 schools would be taken off the roster in addition to the above cuts. The selection of these schools would be done on the basis of effectiveness and the most efficient use of the existing resources.

\$ 5512.50 PWR
\$ 6000.00 Coordinators
\$ 1151.25 Payroll tax
\$ 1979.25 Contractual Services
\$14643.00

- 15% cut: Remain in all 10 schools ending coordinators one month early (May 31st, 2003).
 - 20% cut: would reduce probably 3 schools and all contractual services money in addition to previous cuts.
 - 30% cut: would likely cut 3 or 4 more schools in addition to previous cuts.
- (These numbers are not exact and may be different in January.)

4. In your current budget for this program, which funds are tied to match for other services or for an expansion of these same services?

We currently have no matching funds, although we are seeking outside donations for assistance.

5. Please also include a cost per youth. The cost per student for SAP from 7/01/01-9/30/02 is \$1112.

OSLC COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

JCP Budget Reductions

1. *Describe the program in lay terms. What does it do for children/youth? Who is the target population?*

What it does: Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) provides placement and treatment for youth who have a history of chronic and severe criminal offending. Youth are placed with community families who are recruited, trained, and supported to provide them with close supervision and consistent mentoring and limit setting. Youth receive intensive mental health treatment as part of the MTFC model.

Who it serves: MTFC serves girls and boys who are designated by the court as being in need of out-of-home placement due to chronic problems with delinquency. Boys have had an average of 14 previous offenses, girls have had an average of 12.

2. *Impact to children, families, the community if your agency does not continue to provide this program.*

Because of their chronic level of previous offending, youth served by MTFC would most probably be held in a locked setting or placed in Group Care. Both of these alternatives are more costly than MTFC. MTFC has a strong base in research and has been designated as one of 10 National Blueprint for Violence Prevention programs by OJJDP. MTFC was highlighted in two recent Surgeons General reports (on mental health and youth violence) as a cost-effective model for reducing violence and delinquency.

3. *Impact to level of services by reductions of 15%, 20%, 30%? Also address at level program becomes unable to function effectively.*

Number of Unduplicated youth served between 7/1/01 and 9/30/02	8
Number of New youth enrolled in MTFC between 7/1/01 and 9/30/02	6
Number of Aftercare youths served between 7/1/091 and 9/30/02	5
(3 enrolled in this contract period, 2 enrolled in previous contract period)	
Allocation spent to date	193,546
Cost per case (193,546 / 8)	24,193

Because components of the TFC package cannot be easily cut, costs per client increase as the adp drops. Our program can absorb a 15% cut with only minor adjustment to the overall adp during the months remaining on the contract. A 20% cut would require a much steeper reduction in the overall adp. With a 30% cut, our program would no longer be viable and we would only be able to continue a few services for the youths in aftercare.

4. *In your current budget, which funds are tied to match for other services or for an expansion of these same services?*

OYA pays for 5 additional MTFC beds that can be accessed by Lane County.

THE CENTENNIAL EDUCATION CENTER (Court School)

1. Describe the program in lay terms. What does it do for children/youth? Who is the target population?

The Centennial Education Center/Court School began as a pilot program in the spring of 1998 and began its fifth full year of operation in September. Although delayed in beginning this school year because of moving and construction, the school is still a much-needed resource. It has served hundreds of kids who otherwise would not have attended school. Centennial Education Center/Court School serves youth who have been suspended or expelled from their traditional school and/or alternative program in their district. This is often the last opportunity for young people to have success and complete school. We use a high teacher-to-student ratio, using combined staff of the Lane Educational Service District, Department of Youth Services, GED teacher from LCC supplemented by interns from Lane Community College and the University of Oregon. We serve youth ages eleven through twenty-three. In addition to the populations mentioned, one other is the unique population of Oregon Youth Authority youth over the age of eighteen without a GED, job, or technical skills.

2. What will be the impact to children, families, the community if your agency does not continue to provide this program?

There would be an increased risk of delinquency and recidivism from youth. As the court school population by definition cannot go to school anywhere else, these youth will be at large in the community during the day. It is highly likely that these youth who were not successful in school, will continue to struggle to find their place in the community. They will lack basic education and essential behavior management skills necessary to find and retain employment. In terms of burdens to families, increased supervision means that they will be left with the same resources they currently have to handle very difficult and disturbing youth.

3. What will be the impact to your program's level of services of reductions at the following levels – 15%, 20%, 30%? Also address at what percent reduction your program becomes unable to function effectively.

This program has sustained reductions earlier in the year and continued reductions will limit the ability to serve as many youth, and to offer less support and supervision for those youth. In addition, any incentives or coping skill programs, which might assist them in handling school better in the future and eventually work situations better, would be eliminated. We would have less opportunity to work with youth to help them in their ability to deal with anger, make good decisions under stress. We also would have less opportunity to support their probation or parole program. 15%=\$3750.=cut the art program; 20%=\$5000.=no M&S funds for the job skills program; 33%=\$8250.= loose both the art program and the M&S for the job skills program.

4. In your current budget for this program, which funds are tied to match for other services or for an expansion of these same services?

None of the budgeted funds match other funds. Last year we lost LCC as a partner. We have secured video lottery funds from Lane County and use those to provide an afternoon job skills/life program.

*LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLAS086\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLKF8VCP BUDGET
REDUCTIONS INFORMATION.DOC
Last Saved: November 18, 2002*