

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE  
MONITORING OF PREVENTION  
AND DIVERSION CONTRACT PROVIDERS



PERFORMANCE AUDIT  
ISSUED FEBRUARY 5, 2014

**LOUISIANA LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR  
1600 NORTH THIRD STREET  
POST OFFICE BOX 94397  
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9397**

**LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR**  
DARYL G. PURPERA, CPA, CFE

**FIRST ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR**  
**AND STATE AUDIT SERVICES**  
PAUL E. PENDAS, CPA

**DIRECTOR OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT SERVICES**  
NICOLE B. EDMONSON, CIA, CGAP, MPA

**FOR QUESTIONS RELATED TO THIS PERFORMANCE AUDIT, CONTACT  
GINA V. BROWN, PERFORMANCE AUDIT MANAGER,  
AT 225-339-3800.**

Under the provisions of state law, this report is a public document. A copy of this report has been submitted to the Governor, to the Attorney General, and to other public officials as required by state law. A copy of this report is available for public inspection at the Baton Rouge office of the Louisiana Legislative Auditor.

This document is produced by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor, State of Louisiana, Post Office Box 94397, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9397 in accordance with Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513. Seven copies of this public document were produced at an approximate cost of \$34.58. This material was produced in accordance with the standards for state agencies established pursuant to R.S. 43:31. This report is available on the Legislative Auditor's website at [www.la.gov](http://www.la.gov). When contacting the office, you may refer to Agency ID No. 9726 or Report ID No. 40130012 for additional information.

In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance relative to this document, or any documents of the Legislative Auditor, please contact Elizabeth Coxe, Chief Administrative Officer, at 225-339-3800.



LOUISIANA LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR  
DARYL G. PURPERA, CPA, CFE

February 5, 2014

The Honorable John A. Alario, Jr.,  
President of the Senate  
The Honorable Charles E. "Chuck" Kleckley,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Dear Senator Alario and Representative Kleckley:

This report provides the results of our performance audit on the Office of Juvenile Justice (OJJ). The purpose of this report was to evaluate whether OJJ effectively monitors prevention and diversion contract providers.

The report contains our findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Appendix A contains OJJ's response to this report. I hope this report will benefit you in your legislative decision-making process.

We would like to express our appreciation to the management and staff of OJJ for their assistance during this audit.

Sincerely,

Daryl G. Purpera, CPA, CFE  
Legislative Auditor

DGP/ch

OJJ PREVENTION AND DIVERSION 2014

---

# Louisiana Legislative Auditor

Daryl G. Purpera, CPA, CFE, Legislative Auditor



## Office of Juvenile Justice Monitoring of Prevention and Diversion Contract Providers

February 2014

Audit Control # 40130012

---

## Introduction

This performance audit evaluates whether the Office of Juvenile Justice (OJJ) effectively monitors prevention and diversion contract providers. The purpose of prevention and diversion programs is to help prevent youth from entering into the juvenile justice system. These youth are typically charged with a misdemeanor crime or have received behavioral citations and been recommended by either their school or the courts for placement into a prevention and diversion program. Prevention and diversion programs include a variety of services, such as providing family therapy, violence and conflict resolution classes, and life skills training.<sup>1</sup> OJJ contracts with various providers to offer prevention and diversion services to youth. Our objective was as follows:

### **Does OJJ effectively monitor prevention and diversion contract providers?**

Overall, we found that OJJ does not effectively monitor prevention and diversion contract providers. Appendix A contains OJJ's response to this report and Appendix B details our scope and methodology.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to OJJ's prevention and diversion contracts, other services include character building classes, in-home counseling, parenting sessions, and early intervention social skills training.

## Does OJJ effectively monitor prevention and diversion contract providers?

Overall, OJJ does not effectively monitor prevention and diversion contract providers. We found that:

- OJJ cannot ensure that its program specialists are adequately monitoring the specific services of each contract provider. While OJJ has developed a standardized monitoring tool, this tool is not specific to each type of prevention and diversion program.
- OJJ does not ensure providers submit annual reports showing their performance in specific areas as required by their contracts. For fiscal year 2013, only 30 (71%) of the 42 providers submitted an annual report and of the 30, 26 (87%) were incomplete.
- OJJ does not evaluate the effectiveness of prevention and diversion programs as required by state law. From fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2014, OJJ decreased its prevention and diversion contracts by 57% (from 42 to 18) without evaluating which programs were the most effective.

Our results are discussed in more detail below.

---

### **OJJ cannot ensure that its program specialists are adequately monitoring the specific services of each contract provider. While OJJ has developed a standardized monitoring tool, this tool is not specific to each type of prevention and diversion program.**

OJJ's monitoring of prevention and diversion contract providers is conducted quarterly at the regional level by program specialists. Currently, OJJ's monitoring checklist is standardized and only addresses areas such as the number of OJJ youth in attendance for that day, the number of new employees, and if there were any negative discharges.<sup>2</sup> Appendix C shows an example of a completed checklist. However, each type of prevention and diversion program has different service requirements. For example, the Young Marine Program curriculum focuses on teaching youth to actively choose alternatives to criminal activity, whereas the Functional Family Therapy Program focuses on family communication and parental involvement with the youth. Without a monitoring tool specific to each of these programs, OJJ cannot ensure that program specialists are adequately monitoring the specific services of each prevention and diversion provider.

---

<sup>2</sup> A negative discharge can result from a provider being unable to contact a youth, a youth not showing up for the program, and a youth being non-compliant with the provider.

According to OJJ, it is in the process of developing new monitoring tools that are specific for each prevention and diversion provider. Also, the fiscal year 2014 prevention and diversion contracts outline specific service deliverables, such as life skills, family counseling, and anger management classes, that each of the providers are required to offer to youth. Appendix D lists all providers, along with the services they offer for fiscal year 2014. The contracts from previous fiscal years contained general information and did not outline specific service deliverables for each type of prevention and diversion program. OJJ should use the service deliverables listed in the new contracts when developing the monitoring tool for each prevention and diversion provider. After OJJ finalizes the new monitoring tool, it should develop a system to track the results in order to identify patterns of noncompliance among providers.

**Recommendation 1:** OJJ should create a monitoring checklist specific to the required services of each prevention and diversion provider.

**Recommendation 2:** OJJ should revise its monitoring process to include reviewing youth files, observing actual services being provided, and verifying the information on the monitoring checklists reported by providers as part of its monitoring visits.

**Recommendation 3:** OJJ should develop a system to track the results of each provider's monitoring visit. OJJ should then use these results to determine if any providers have repeat deficiencies, which could result in sanctions.

**Summary of Management's Response:** OJJ agrees with all of these recommendations. See Appendix A for OJJ's full response.

---

### **OJJ does not ensure providers submit annual reports showing their performance in specific areas as required by their contracts.**

In addition to the quarterly monitoring conducted by program specialists, providers are required by their contracts to submit annual reports showing their performance in specific areas at the end of each fiscal year. The annual reports contain performance and outcome information such as the number of youth who successfully completed the program and the number of youth who did not enter the juvenile justice system at 6, 12, and 18 months following completion of the program. For fiscal year 2013, only 30 (71%) of the 42 providers submitted an annual report.

In addition, we reviewed the 28<sup>3</sup> of the 30 annual reports submitted by providers for fiscal year 2013 and found that 26 (87%) were incomplete because providers did not report all of the required information. For example, six (21%) of 28 providers did not report the percentage of youth who successfully completed their programs, and 17 (61%) of 28 providers did not report the percentage of youth who entered the juvenile justice system 6 months after completing the program. Exhibit 1 shows the number and percentage of outcome measures the 28 providers failed to report. Without complete information, OJJ cannot monitor the performance of providers.

---

<sup>3</sup> Two providers were not required to report all measures; therefore, the percentages are out of 28 providers, not 30.

<b>Exhibit 1</b>		
<b>Number of Providers Who Failed to Report Required Outcome Measures Fiscal Year 2013</b>		
<b>Outcome Measure</b>	<b>Number of Providers Who Failed to Report Measure (Out of 28* Providers)</b>	<b>%</b>
1. Number of youth served	0	0%
2. Number and percent of youth who successfully complete program	6	21%
3. Number and percent of youth referred to court while attending the program	12	43%
4. Number and percent of youth who did not receive a new adjudication while attending the program	12	43%
5. Number and percent of youth whose charges were dismissed as a result of program completion**	13	48%
6. Number and percent of youth who report benefitting from the program as evidenced by satisfaction surveys	15	54%
7. Number and percent of families who report benefitting from the program as evidenced by satisfaction surveys	15	54%
8. Number and percent of youth who demonstrate increased knowledge of pro-social behavior/attitudes as evidenced by pre- and post- testing	15	54%
9. Number and percent of youth who did not enter the juvenile justice system for 6 months following successful completion of the program	17	61%
10. Number and percent of youth who did not enter the juvenile justice system for 12 months following successful completion of the program	17	61%
11. Number and percent of youth who did not enter the juvenile justice system for 18 months following successful completion of the program	19	68%
* Two providers were excluded from this analysis as they were required to report different measures.		
** Evaluative and Development Services, Inc. was not required to report this measure.		
<b>Source:</b> Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using provider annual reports.		

**Recommendation 4:** OJJ should ensure providers submit complete annual reports as required by their contracts. OJJ should use these reports to monitor the performance of providers.

**Summary of Management's Response:** OJJ agrees with this recommendation. See Appendix A for OJJ's full response.

---

### **OJJ does not evaluate the effectiveness of prevention and diversion programs as required by state law.**

According to R.S. 46:1905, OJJ is required to evaluate data relating to the effectiveness of programs designed to prevent or reduce delinquency of youth. However, OJJ does not collect sufficient information to evaluate whether prevention and diversion programs are reducing the

number of youth who enter into the state juvenile justice system. The annual reports are supposed to contain information on the number of youth who completed a prevention and diversion program during a given fiscal year. However, as stated previously, not all providers submit the report and not all reports are complete. In addition, OJJ does not require providers to include in their annual reports identifying information such as the name, social security number, or birthdate of each youth who completed a program. If OJJ had this information, OJJ could compare it to information it already has in its Juvenile Electronic Tracking System (JETS) and identify those youth who completed a program, but still entered into the state juvenile justice system. OJJ could then use this data to calculate entry rates for each program and evaluate their effectiveness as required by state law.

We requested the name, social security number, and date of birth for each youth who completed a prevention and diversion program during fiscal year 2012. Of the 59 active contracts at that time, 26 providers submitted the data. Based on our analysis of this data, we found that the entry rates of youth one year after completing a prevention and diversion program ranged from 0% to 71%. Exhibit 2 shows the 10 providers with the lowest one-year entry rates<sup>4</sup> and Appendix E shows the entry rates for all 26 providers who submitted data fiscal year 2012.

<b>Exhibit 2</b>		
<b>Ten Lowest One-Year Entry Rates</b>		
<b>Fiscal Year 2012 Prevention and Diversion Programs</b>		
<b>Contract Provider</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>One-Year Entry Rate</b>
1. 15th Judicial District Court	Families in Need of Services (FINS) Family Empowerment Counseling	0.00%
2. Calcasieu Police Jury*	Calcasieu Juvenile Mental Health Community Treatment Program	0.00%
3. 32nd Judicial District Attorney's Office*	Family Services Unit - Youth Intervention Program	0.00%
4. Sabine Parish School Board	PALS After-School & Summer Program	0.74%
5. Caddo Parish Commission*	Restorative Justice	1.43%
6. Ron Anderson, LLC*	Project Reclaim	2.38%
7. Lafayette Teen Court, Inc.	Family & Adolescents Services Program - Life Skills	3.79%
8. 31st Judicial District Court*	Families in Need of Services (FINS)	4.00%
9. Youth Service Bureau of St. Tammany*	Families in Need of Services (FINS)	4.04%
10. Rutherford House, Inc.	Caddo Adolescent Truancy Center and Misdemeanor Referral Center	4.65%
*Indicates providers that were not renewed for fiscal year 2014.		
<b>Source:</b> Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information from the 26 (out of 59) fiscal year 2012 prevention and diversion providers who provided complete information.		

<sup>4</sup> The one year entry rate measures the percentage of youth who completed a prevention and diversion program during fiscal year 2012 and had entered into the state juvenile justice system by the end of fiscal year 2013 (June 30, 2013).

By calculating the entry rates of each program, OJJ could better determine which contracts to renew for subsequent years. For example, from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2014, OJJ had to decrease its prevention and diversion contracts by 57% (from 42 contracts to 18) due to both budget cuts and Louisiana's move toward providing youth services through the Coordinated System of Care.<sup>5</sup> However, OJJ decided which contracts to renew/not renew without evaluating which programs were most effective at preventing entry into the juvenile justice system. As illustrated in Exhibit 2, OJJ did not renew six (60%) of the 10 programs with the lowest entry rates (less than 5%) for fiscal year 2014; two of which had a 0% entry rate. In addition, of the 18 contracts OJJ renewed for fiscal year 2014, 10 (56%) had a one-year entry rate greater than 5%. Appendix D shows the entry rates for the fiscal year 2014 contracts. Exhibit 3 summarizes the number of contracts, the total contract amount, and the number of youth slots for fiscal years 2012 through 2014.

<b>Exhibit 3</b>			
<b>OJJ Prevention and Diversion Contracts</b>			
<b>Fiscal Years 2013 through 2014</b>			
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Number of Contracts</b>	<b>Total Contract Amount</b>	<b>Total Number of Youth Slots</b>
2012	59	\$3,934,890*	10,842
2013	42	\$2,516,245*	6,539
2014	18	\$963,953	2,535
*Total expenses OJJ paid to prevention and diversion providers for the fiscal year.			
Source: Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information obtained from OJJ.			

**Recommendation 5:** OJJ should require prevention and diversion providers to submit identifying information for the youth who completed their program either with their annual reports, or separately, in order to calculate the entry rate for these programs. This would allow OJJ to evaluate which programs are most effective at reducing youth entry into the state juvenile justice system.

**Recommendation 6:** OJJ should evaluate which services are the most effective at reducing youth entry into the juvenile justice system and use the information to determine which programs to renew each year.

**Summary of Management's Response:** OJJ agrees with both of these recommendations. See Appendix A for OJJ's full response.

<sup>5</sup> Louisiana contracts with Magellan Health Services to provide services through the Coordinated System of Care.

## **APPENDIX A: MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**



BOBBY JINDAL, Governor

# Office of Juvenile Justice

MARY L. LIVERS, Ph.D., MSW, Deputy Secretary

January 22, 2014

Daryl G. Purpera, CPA, CFE  
Louisiana Legislative Auditor  
P. O. Box 94397  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9397

Dear Mr. Purpera:

Please accept the attached as our response to the draft report of the performance audit, conducted by your agency, of the Office of Juvenile Justice's monitoring of prevention and diversion contract providers. Also attached is the Checklist for Audit Recommendations provided by your agency.

The feedback and recommendations provided by your audit staff are greatly appreciated. We concur with all of the findings cited in the report and have provided comments. OJJ has already taken steps to address many of the concerns noted by your staff in this report.

An exit conference is not necessary for this follow-up audit. We would like to express our thanks to your staff for their professionalism and cooperation with the agency while conducting this audit.

We will consider all factors outlined in the recommendations provided by your office as we continue to make improvements in the monitoring process of prevention and diversion contracts within the Office of Juvenile Justice.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mary L. Livers", is written over a light blue circular stamp.

Mary L. Livers, Ph.D., MSW  
Deputy Secretary

MLL:et

c: Nicole B. Edmonson, CIA, CGAP, MPA

attachments

Youth Services  
Office of Juvenile Justice  
Response to 2013 Performance Audit – Monitoring of Prevention/Diversion Contracts

**Recommendation 1: OJJ should create a monitoring checklist specific to the required services of each prevention and diversion provider.**

Agree. Checklists have been created for each individual prevention and diversion contract, specific to the services named in the contract. These checklists will be reviewed during the next month and implemented for use shortly thereafter.

**Recommendation 2: OJJ should revise its monitoring process to include reviewing youth files, observing actual services being provided, and verifying the information on the monitoring checklists reported by providers as part of its monitoring visits.**

Agree. A checklist tool has already been developed for the monitors to use when reviewing youth files and observing services, as indicated in this recommendation. This tool will be implemented following training for the monitors on its use.

**Recommendation 3: OJJ should develop a system to track the results of each provider's monitoring visit. OJJ should then use these results to determine if any providers have repeat deficiencies, which could result in sanctions.**

Agree. This system has been discussed, and a meeting is scheduled for the near future to continue these discussions. We will explore a uniform method of reporting and storing data from monitoring visits.

**Recommendation 4: OJJ should ensure providers submit complete annual reports as required by their contracts. OJJ should use these reports to monitor the performance of providers.**

Agree. As indicated in #3 above, there is a meeting scheduled to discuss storing of data for monitoring of prevention/diversion contracts. In addition, there will be discussion on the best method to format and capture annual report data.

**Recommendation 5: OJJ should require prevention and diversion providers to submit identifying information for the youth who completed their program either with their annual reports, or separately, in order to calculate the entry rate for these programs. This would allow OJJ to evaluate which programs are most effective at reducing youth into the state juvenile justice system.**

Agree. This will also be a part of the discussion on data component of this project.

**Recommendation 6: OJJ should evaluate which services are the most effective at reducing youth entry into the juvenile justice system and use the information to determine which programs to renew each year.**

Agree. It is our plan that once a data collection method is established, then appropriate reports can be generated which allow examination of data to determine programs to be renewed.

## APPENDIX B: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

We conducted this performance audit under the provisions of Title 24 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended. The audit focused on OJJ's monitoring of prevention and diversion contract providers. Our audit covered prevention and diversion contracts active during fiscal year 2012, fiscal year 2013, and fiscal year 2014. The audit objective was to answer whether OJJ effectively monitors prevention and diversion contract providers.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. To answer our objective, we reviewed internal controls relevant to the audit objective and performed the following audit steps:

- Obtained and reviewed prevention and diversion contracts and funding applications for fiscal years 2012 through 2014 to determine the contract limits, youth served, and services provided.
- Obtained, reviewed, and analyzed prevention and diversion expense data from Business Objects for fiscal years 2012 through 2013 to determine the total amount of expenses paid to each provider during these fiscal years.
- Obtained and reviewed the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and provider contracts to determine prevention and diversion monitoring requirements.
- Interviewed OJJ staff to determine how prevention and diversion programs are monitored and how OJJ ensures quality services are provided to youth.
- Attended two prevention and diversion monitoring visits to Teen Court Lafayette and Teen Court Baton Rouge to observe how OJJ conducts quarterly monitoring visits.
- Obtained and reviewed the prevention and diversion annual reports for fiscal years 2012 through 2013 to determine how OJJ uses these reports to measure the effectiveness of prevention and diversion services.
- Requested the name, birth date, and social security number of youth who completed a prevention and diversion program during fiscal year 2012 from all providers.

- Used the requested data from providers to match youth who completed a prevention and diversion program during fiscal year 2012 to the Juvenile Electronic Tracking System (JETS) to determine how many youth had entered/not entered into the state juvenile justice system by the end of fiscal year 2013 (June 30, 2013).
- Met with OJJ management to confirm that they agreed with our methodology for determining the entry rate of prevention and diversion programs and the terminology used for stating the entry rate in the report.

# APPENDIX C: PREVENTION AND DIVERSION MONITORING CHECKLIST



## Youth Services Prevention / Diversion Quality Assurance Audit Tool

1.	Number of OJJ youth in attendance day of visit.	0
2.	Number of non-OJJ youth in attendance day of visit.	124
3.	Average percent of participation in the past 30 days.	_____
4.	Number of youth/families to be served per contract.	_____
5.	Number of staff.	2
6.	Number of staff vacancies (identify vacant positions)	0
	a. _____	
	b. _____	
7.	Number of new employees.	0
	a. _____	
	b. _____	
8.	Criminal background check completed on all new hires.	n/a
	(yes or no) If no, please explain: _____	
9.	Negative discharges. (yes, no) if applicable # of discharges _____	
	Reasons for discharge: Unable to contact: 27; No Show: 1; Non-Compliant: 1; Partial Completion: 2; Relocated: 2; Return Case to D.A.: 10; No Transportation: 1; Successful Completion: 6	
10.	Events this reporting period – brief statement	_____
11.	Challenges this reporting period – brief statement	Transportation
12.	Evidence Based Curriculum (yes, no) _____	
	If yes identify type of curriculum Teen Court – Adult Judge Model	
10.	Events –	
	A.) Hearing Dates – 01/14/13, 01/28/13, 02/04/13, 02/19/13, 03/11/13 (5 total)	
	B.) Weekly Group Sessions – 3/7/13, 3/14/13, 3/21/13	
	C.) Training Session – 3/2/13	
	D.) Community Service Activities	

## APPENDIX D: PREVENTION AND DIVERSION PROVIDERS FISCAL YEAR 2014

	<b>Provider</b>	<b>Services Offered</b>	<b>Number of Youth Slots in Contract</b>	<b>Contract Amount</b>	<b>One-Year Entry Rate for Youth Who Completed Program in Fiscal Year 2012*</b>
1	15th Judicial District Court	Assessments, Pre-Testing, In-Home Counseling	13	\$16,702	0.00%
2	Sabine Parish School Board	PALS Program, Family Engagement Services, Recovery Classes, Early Intervention Social Skills Training, Community Services, Counseling & Wraparound, Minimum Wage Employment for 10 Students	400	74,588	0.74%
3	Lafayette Teen Court, Inc.	Life Skills Training Program, Active Parenting of Teens, Drug Screening	225	25,000	3.79%
4	Rutherford House, Inc.	Truant & Misdemeanor Offense Apprehension, Summer Work Opportunities, Recreation, Tutoring, Counseling, Job Readiness, Follow-Up Contacts	350	68,024	4.67%
5	4th Judicial District Attorney's Office	Assessments, Develop Individualized Treatment Plan, Supervision, Mentoring, Career Guidance, Non-Violent Conflict Resolution Skill Building, Healthy Recreation, Counseling, Education	250	51,443	6.25%
6	Baton Rouge Bar Foundation	Intake, Schedules Teen Court Hearings, Group Sessions, Supervision, Community Service Projects, Training Sessions, Maintain File on Each Child, Complete Satisfaction Surveys	60	44,604	7.14%

	<b>Provider</b>	<b>Services Offered</b>	<b>Number of Youth Slots in Contract</b>	<b>Contract Amount</b>	<b>One-Year Entry Rate for Youth Who Completed Program in Fiscal Year 2012*</b>
7	16th Judicial District Attorney's Office - Prosecutor's Early Intervention	Develop Individualized Treatment Plan, Case Management, Assessments, School Based Counseling, Anger Management, Strengthening Families Teens, Mentoring Moms Program, Parenting Wisely, Tutoring, Transportation, Functional Family Therapy	234	\$177,188	10.27%
8	Caddo Parish Commission	Educational Advocacy Services	65	64,108	12.93%
9	Evaluative and Development Services, Inc.	Assessments, Family Counseling, Group Therapy Trainings, Pastoral and Individual Counseling, Parenting Sessions	243	9,720	14.12%
10	16th Judicial District Attorney's Office - Family in Need of Services (FINS)	Develop Informal Service Plan Agreement, Supervision, Mental Health Counseling, Tutoring, Enrollment in Community Service Programs, Enrollment in Recreational Activities	150	74,458	16.22%
11	City Court of Hammond - FINS	Intake Assessment, Individual Family Counseling, Group Family Counseling	75	23,868	28.09%*
12	City Court of Hammond - CAMP	Mentoring Services, Tutoring, Counseling, Anger Management Classes	150	30,311	
13	City of Morgan City	Intake Assessment, Completion of Admission Packet, Program Attendance, Morals/Values & Character Building Classes, Community Service Projects, Transportation to Outside Activities, Maintain File on Each Child	60	26,269	50.00%
14	Orleans Parish Juvenile Court (ODAP)	Intake & Assessment, Casey Life Skills Assessment, Develop Individual Service Plan, Youth & Family Supervision	100	74,588	51.52%
15	Think Change Interventions, Inc.	Development of Individual Treatment Plans, Sibling Education Groups, Monitoring of Academics, Tutoring, Progress Reports to Probation Officers, Aftercare Services	33	95,000	68.75%

	<b>Provider</b>	<b>Services Offered</b>	<b>Number of Youth Slots in Contract</b>	<b>Contract Amount</b>	<b>One-Year Entry Rate for Youth Who Completed Program in Fiscal Year 2012*</b>
16	BeauCare, Inc.	Life Skills Classes, Career Preparation Classes, Community Exploration Trips, Community Service Projects, Structured Recreational Activities, Tutoring, Violence and Conflict Resolution Classes, Community Service Monitoring	20	\$23,602	Provider did not submit complete information to determine entry rate.
17	Lafayette Teen Court, Inc.	Intake Assessment, Pre-Testing, Schedule Trials, Document Progress, Schedule Drug Testing, Supervision, Organize Classes, Locate Community Service Sites, Maintain File on Each Child, Exit Interview	225	25,000	Provider did not submit information to determine entry rate.
18	Bossier Parish Sheriff's Office	Bossier Youth Diversion Program Curriculum, Supervision, Physical Fitness Training	125	59,480	Provider did not submit complete information to determine entry rate.
	<b>Total</b>		<b>2,778</b>	<b>\$963,953</b>	
<p>* The one-year entry rate measures the percentage of youth who completed a prevention and diversion program during fiscal year 2012 and had entered into the state juvenile justice system by the end of fiscal year 2013 (June 30, 2013).</p> <p>**City Court of Hammond submitted youth completion information; however, the provider did not specify which of its two programs the youth completed.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information obtained from OJJ's Lotus Notes database.</p>					

## APPENDIX E: ONE-YEAR ENTRY RATE FISCAL YEAR 2012 PREVENTION AND DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Contract Provider	Program	Number of Youth Completed Program as of June 30, 2012	Number of Youth in State Justice System as of June 30, 2013	One-Year Entry Rate
1. 15th Judicial District Court	Families in Need of Services (FINS) Family Empowerment Counseling	24	0	0.00%
2. Calcasieu Police Jury*	Calcasieu Juvenile Mental Health Community Treatment Program	9	0	0.00%
3. 32nd Judicial District Attorney's Office*	Family Services Unit - Youth Intervention Program	48	0	0.00%
4. Sabine Parish School Board	PALS After-School & Summer Program	1343	10	0.74%
5. Caddo Parish Commission*	Restorative Justice	70	1	1.43%
6. Ron Anderson, LLC*	Project Reclaim	42	1	2.38%
7. Lafayette Teen Court, Inc.	Family & Adolescents Services Program - Life Skills	290	11	3.79%
8. 31st Judicial District Court*	Families in Need of Services (FINS)	25	1	4.00%
9. Youth Service Bureau of St. Tammany*	Families in Need of Services (FINS)	198	8	4.04%
10. Rutherford House, Inc.	Caddo Adolescent Truancy Center and Misdemeanor Referral Center	215	10	4.65%
11. 4th Judicial District Attorney's Office	Juvenile Accountability Based Sanctions (JABS)	48	3	6.25%
12. Baton Rouge Bar Foundation	Teen Court of Greater Baton Rouge	14	1	7.14%
13. YouthTruth (Truth 180, Inc.)*	City Court of Slidell's Pre-Trial Intervention & After-School Program	67	5	7.46%

Contract Provider	Program	Number of Youth Completed Program as of June 30, 2012	Number of Youth in State Justice System as of June 30, 2013	One-Year Entry Rate
14. 16th Judicial District Attorney	Prosecutor's Early Intervention Program	185	19	10.27%
15. Caddo Parish Commission	Education Advocacy Services	116	15	12.93%
16. Evaluative & Development Services, Inc.	Black Family Initiative	87	12	13.79%
17. Caddo Parish Commission*	IDD (Individualized Disposition Docket) Court	19	3	15.79%
18. 16th Judicial District Attorney's Office	FINS Diversion Program Service Expansion	74	12	16.22%
19. Youth Service Bureau of St. Tammany*	Crossroads	285	60	21.05%
20. City Court of Hammond**	Court Appointed Mentor Program (CAMP) & Families in Need of Support (FINS) Counseling	89	25	28.09%
21. Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services*	Correctional Options	9	3	33.33%
22. City Court of Morgan City	Juvenile Group Program	22	11	50.00%
23. Orleans Parish Juvenile Court	Orleans Detention Alternative Program (ODAP)	66	34	51.52%
24. Educational & Treatment Council, Inc.*	Functional Family Therapy (FFT)	16	11	68.75%
25. ThinkChange Interventions, LLC	Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment Program	16	11	68.75%
26. Family Services of Greater Baton Rouge*	Family Preservation	24	17	70.83%

\*Indicates providers who were not renewed for fiscal year 2014.

\*\*City Court of Hammond has two separate contracts for the CAMP and FINS programs, but submitted one group of names for both programs.

**Source:** Prepared by legislative auditor's staff using information from the 26 (out of 59) fiscal year 2012 prevention and diversion providers who provided complete information.