

**Mecklenburg County**  
**Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Regular Meeting**  
**April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021**

**Members Present:** Sonya Harper, Kendra King, Kevin Poirier, Judge Faith Fickling-Alvarez, Russell Price, Heather Taraska, Jessica Davis, Ashley Titus, Wanda Douglas, Denise Steele-Campbell, Dr. Cotrane Penn, Tomika Moore, Tysha Shaw, Lt. Stephen Flatt, Brittney Bogues, Commissioner Pat Cotham, , Janelle Fleck, Phyllis Barnette,

**Staff Present:** Scott Stoker, Elizabeth Swann

**Guests Present:** Shavonda McClure-Tresports, Darryl & Robin Sturdivant-Team Up Connections, Thompson Residential- LaDonte Lee, Thompson Assessment- Dr. Becky Smith-Thompson Court Assessment, Matt Simon- Thompson, Nalo Coban- Achieving Success on Purpose, Cara Evans-Patterson-CMPD Youth Diversion, Reggie McNeil-TYM (SHIFT), Glenn Smith-DASH Life Connections, Darryl Bego- Youth Development Initiatives,, Natalie Allen- Arts Empowerment Project, Leah Crews, Program Coordinator-Arts Empowerment, Valerie Koeppel-Youth Advocate Program, Yacara Mungo- Enlighten Legacy,

*Members Absent:* Jaylen Adams, Dr. Keith Cradle, Heather Johnson, Jason Tryon, Yosan Zerai,

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 p.m. by the Chair Kevin Poirier.

**Review and Approval of April 15<sup>th</sup> Agenda**

Kevin allowed council members to review the agenda. Jessica Davis moved to accept the agenda. Commissioner Pat Cotham seconded. The council unanimously approved the agenda.

**Review and Approval of March 18<sup>th</sup> Minutes**

Kevin allowed council members to review the minutes. Judge Faith Fickling-Alvarez moved to accept the minutes. Heather Taraska seconded. The council approved the minutes.

**Welcome**

JCPC Chair Kevin Poirier took attendance by having the council members say present to keep an attendance log for meeting being virtual. Quorum was established.

**Announcements / Reminders**

The attendance requirement is now 65% of all regularly scheduled committee meetings. The inclusion of special and assigned subcommittee meetings is no longer applicable, its 65% of all regularly scheduled meetings. There are no excused absences. Members cannot miss three consecutive regularly scheduled committee meetings. To have action in the subcommittee meetings there must be a quorum to be able to vote.

**Budget Revisions-Team Up Connections**

Team Up Connections will be replacing line item 120 (Building Security) with line item 120 (Case Manager) and replacing line item 120 (Case Manager) with line item 120 (Administrative Manager). There will be no changes in the total expense.

Line# 120 Decrease \$2,644

(1) Case Manager to provide school attendance monitoring/discipline data, and family outreach (12hrs. weekly. x \$10.50hr. x 13 weeks) The remaining salary for the next 3 months totals \$1638.

Line # 120 Decrease \$1,638

Building security is being replaced with Case Manager position

Line# 120 Increase \$2,644

Admin Manager will also assist in emailing counselors regarding updates. The remaining salary for the next three months is \$2644, replaces the Case Manager salary

Line# 120 Increase \$1,638

This position replaces the Building Security position due to the need of another administrative position; it also replaces the remaining building security salary of \$1638.

Line# 290 Positive Parenting Program provided funds free of charge, which left a surplus of \$2,700 of the materials. The funds assisted with General Liability Insurance Policy, (2) Cell Phones for administrative staff and Mentor/Mentee Social Outings

#### *Discussions:*

*Sonya Harper* asked if the funds were reduced from Parenting Program what sort of impact will that have on the families that are participating in that program?

- *Team-Up Connections*

Most parents chose to participate in the group setting, the Parenting program is basically one on one with the parent and child. Since we are not practitioners at the group level, we use the materials that can be provided at a minimal cost. On April 27<sup>th</sup> we will be trained in group level in Triple P, which will bring the cost back into place with program materials, but only at the group level. As of now there is not a demand for the individual part. If possible, it will start in the new fiscal year with Triple P at the group level and we will be trained for individual and group sessions.

Kevin allowed council members to review the Team-Up Connections budget revision. Sonya Harper moved to accept the budget revision. Denise Steele-Campbell seconded. The council approved the budget revision for Team Up Connections.

#### **Funding Recommendations-FY21-22**

Kevin shared his screen for the council members to view the funding allocation worksheet and the JCPC April monthly program update to gauge where the programs are currently. The Dept of Public Safety is allowing JCPC to either do 1 or 2 yr. funding this year, we can decide as a council which one we will continue. Discussions can be around the types and services of the various programs. The total funds available are \$2,051,713, there are 15 programs to consider. All the funding doesn't have to be used right now, we can allocate part of the funding and revisit later. If the council members know the programs they would like to see funded, decisions can be made at the meeting.

Data to consider:

- Number of youths to serve if funded?
- What is the cost on a "per kid served" basis?

- What is the cost per youth total with the match?
- Type of service?
- Percentage served year to date?

*Discussions:*

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* is concerned about ample opportunity to fully fund programs if possible, which may also lead to reductions in the amounts for other programs.

If the council members know that there has been success with a particular program, we can begin to input numbers. Kevin stated for this meeting their will be a role call voting, nothing will be approved or finalized until voting has been established.

*Sonya Harper* stated we have multiple applications for similar services and other programs where they're the only program for a specific service presented. Should we take into consideration the program for a specific service first or there are discussions in the chat to start with the applications with the top scores that were reported by the funding committee?

*Kevin* mentioned the county recommends us to fund a restitution program, *Scott Stoker* stated the NCDPS doesn't require the council to fund a restitution program however most of the kids that go to juvenile court might have restitution or community service on a diversion contract. Consensus is to start reviewing the programs by types of service

*Kevin* inputted an amount for Arts Empowerment to start discussions.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* remarked that this program was beneficial since it is utilized for kids in foster care, her understanding is that the program is designed for foster care kids not for juvenile delinquency court. Our basis is trying to focus on court involved youth that are in delinquency court, wants to make sure all the funding granted will benefit delinquent youth. *Judge Fickling-Alvarez* would not support the full amount funded, possible a fraction of the amount that was requested.

*Russell Price* expressed his concerns over whether they would be serving youth and family services or a combination? *Russell* recalled the response from the program that it will be mostly youth & family services kids and if there is availability it would include court involved youth.

*Commissioner Pat Cotham* declared the county and city are spending millions on arts especially focusing on our youth, gives credit to Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools because they are trying to help Arts Plus to relocate them into the schools. This is not the only program happening for youths.

- *Natalie Allen, Founder & CEO of Arts Empowerment Project*, conveyed that she can accommodate all court involved youth and has been since inception in 2014. We partner with MCYC at the courts with Judge Lou Trosch and Judge Elizabeth Trosch and have accepted youths from TYM. The program counters is an experiential class that can accommodate any juveniles from the courts that are referred to us. We have had the program geared towards youth and family services, but we can accommodate any court involved kids. Our program is completely free, we also collaborate with Arts Plus & other organizations charge some fees for programs that they serve.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* inquired the amount of youth projected to serve would that number include delinquent kids, or would it also include YFS kids? The number would need to be reflected of delinquent kids.

- *Natalie Allen* said the number could include YFS and juvenile kids. We have historically done partnerships with YFS, we also service juvenile justice kids who are referred to us as well. We

can supplement our paperwork if applicable since this is the first year, we are trying to obtain a grant.

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* noted when discussing court involved youth in relation to JCPC, her understanding is that they are referred to a program by the juvenile court counselor, I feel that they can get to the program any number of ways and be court involved, but this projected number of 20 is that additional kids above and beyond that is being served who are referred by their court counselor? Is that correct? So, if they are already serving court involved youth but they're not necessarily getting to the programs thru the juvenile court counselor, is that what we are looking for? Or is it an additional resource for the court counselors to refer more kids?

*Russell Price* answered the kids are involved with the justice system whether by diversion, a case in court, referred to our office by law enforcement or family comes in for discipline matters.

*Sonya Harper* talked about for the purpose of JCPC funding, we are looking to invest the funds into programs that are going to work with the justice involved kids. The term court involved may mean something different depending on your role in the justice system. Court involved could mean kids coming out of abuse, neglect dependency court and those would be kids involved with YFS which is a different population of kids and based on what I'm hearing that is the group of kids that this program is accustomed to working with.

For JCPC our court involved kids would reflect juvenile justice involved kids who have delinquency or involvement with the justice system, so any funds that we would invest would go towards justice involved youths. With the 20 available slots I'm hearing that we could serve justice involved kids, the terminology that I'm looking for to vote for this program would be all 20 of these slots will go to juvenile justice kids.

- *Natalie Allen* expressed she can make that commitment because they are a small, their mission states they serve court involved youth, Arts Empowerment understand the clarification and in some cases they have had juveniles that have overlap in both systems that are juvenile justice youth and youth & family services. We have done 2 programs in the past as we have been founded as our pilot project, for the community of kids so it's easier for us to complete as long as we have referrals to the program since this is just 1 of 5 programs that can accommodate several different types of court involved youths.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* asked Ms. Allen to confirm that the 20 slots available would be for juvenile justice involved youth, criminal court essential kids.

- *Natalie Allen* stated she can accommodate that if we are provided the funding, the reason we haven't done all kids from Juvenile justice & YFS kids is because of the lack of funding. We have been working with our partnerships to get as many kids thru the system as we can, it only adds to our compacity to service for the youths that are part of our mission which would include the juvenile justice kids who are court involved.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* stated her questions were answered and clarified her concerns if that's the position Arts Empowerment is taking.

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* commented it feels a bit of a change in the youth population as outlined in the application, are we able to makeshift the targeted audience?

*Scott Stocker* addressed the dollar amount can be changed; the way the program is written can be changed to how you want to approve the program.

*Natalie Allen* stated the funds are for administration & to pay the artists, the teachers that come in to offer the experiential classes and sometimes we pay for space, food & transportation.

*Kevin* conveyed that the discussions were helpful in moving forward, even putting the \$34,217 on the allocation worksheet for Arts Empowerment Project doesn't necessarily mean we will be funding the program. We can continue to review the other programs and adjust the funding as it entails.

- ❖ The next program for discussion is Shift Restitution had requested funding for \$314,702, they stated they were serving 250 youth this year.

*Heather Taraska* expressed to fund Shift Restitution at the requested amount because it is the only program that pays victims of crime back. It is the only restitution program offered which is needed in the community. *Russell Price* stated they are involved with other initiatives within the community, the Mecklenburg County Youth Coalition connecting kids with resources that interest them.

- ❖ The next program for discussion is Thompson Assessment which had requested funding for \$221,590 which has increased.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* talked about a case that came out a few years ago requiring judges to order inter disciplinarian evaluations, we instructed Cardinal to do it and whoever Cardinal had their contract with, in order to inform our decisions and disposition, it's supposed to be done at every level of disposition sometimes you would only see it at the 3<sup>rd</sup> level. The assessment that we obtain from Thompson are some of the most comprehensive and what I deemed the most comprehensive assessment that we tend to get could truly be considered an inter disciplinarian evaluation as other agencies do it also. Thompsons also go out of their way by going into the detention center or set up with the detention center to do video as much it could be done or what was deemed appropriate.

*Russell Price* mentioned that insurance is not a problem for Thompson Assessment. *Heather Taraska* said lot of times these assessments are ordered as a condition of a juvenile being release from juvenile detention, I think the courts would shut down if the judges didn't have this as an option, I can't see us continuing without the ability to have juvenile in detention assessed. I feel it is important to consider it as a regular county funded position routinely for the juvenile population, I believe the program certainly needs to be funded.

*Sonya Harper* concurs that they are accessing kids that otherwise doesn't have means to receive these assessments and supports. They are going into the jails and accepting the kids that are not Medicaid eligible to have other means to accept the assessment, she recognizes the value and service in what the program has to offer over the years.

- ❖ The next program for discussion is Achieving Success on Purpose which had requested funding for \$97,263.

*Kendra King* remarked this is the only program that is facilitated by clinician therapist and addiction counselor. This is the only program we have that provided clinical services not from just a mental health focus.

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* comments it's a new program that has done a tremendous job in a pandemic year, the range and amount of service that they provide is a very good value for the cost.

*Lt. Flatt* ask the question are they the only group counseling program, he seem to recall other types of program that do some type of counseling involving the family?

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* stated this was the only mental health service provider, the others may do family meetings or group mentoring sessions, but this is the only clinical group therapist we have.

*Kevin* says there is some consensus about funding ASOP.

- ❖ The next program for discussion is Thompson Residential which had requested funding for \$350,000.

*Sonya Harper* engaged the conversation by stating that temporary shelter care is a service that our juvenile justice partner had express the need for quite some time, however there were a variety of challenges being able to secure such a program 1) number of providers being in a position to do so 2) the cost associated with this type of residential service . The actual price tag that was reported for this service was \$700,000. We had issued an RFP specifically for this service a while back on two separate occasions and it was Thompson who was able to come forward with a viable application to provide the service the group was looking for.

Due to the fact the cost of the service exceeded what the JCPC was able to invest, the County did agree to match the funds. So, the \$350,000 investment from JCPC match by the County to be able to provide the service. We had done that in the previous fiscal yr., and should we fund the program this upcoming year the county has interest in funding the program this year. We had some discussion at the previous meeting about potentially moving into the next fiscal year with the County match and if Thompson has the capacity to potentially broaden the eligibility criteria. What we have found with Raise the Age is we have kids that are called “ bind over kids”, the kids commit offenses but they ultimately end up being charged in the adult system, the way its structured is those kids have to be justice involved and caught in the adult system you technically don’t meet that criteria .

If JCPC is interested in funding this program this year and if Thompson has the capacity we would be able to expand the criteria so this can serve both the justice involved kids and the bind over kids, we are finding that with those groups we have very few placement options available.

*Denise Steele-Campbell* stated in speaking with YFS leadership we also would like to include those YFS involved given the County’s match. When this was brought up to Thompson, they would be willing to amend the criteria to include some of the YFS involved kids.

*Russell Price* indicated that discussions needs to continue regarding leadership to make sure the program is running effectively and efficiently.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* reiterated the advantage of having a temporary care shelter program is not to have kids sit in detention with no access to services. If we are essentially trying to be a model court and want to do the best for juvenile justice, it’s about rehabilitation and treatment. Being able to have this as a transitional way for kids to access resources while they are there is a vital role. Essentially if a parent is unable to provide supervision within the home or the parent has been a victim of the crime, this programs allows for placement, not only are they now justice involved and now YFS involved because the judge has to look at placing them into YFS custody. There are many kids that are dual involved.

Thompson also allows kids another chance to come back into the program after being AWOL or having an incident, there are certain instances where it will not always be the case, but they have been accommodating. This program is unique and needed.

*Kendra King* remarked the cost is exorbitant and tries to understand why is JCPC the only resource to sustain them. The question of funding them if applicable for 2 years would be uncertain.

*Sonya Harper* restated the cost is high, however we are speaking about a residential service that is 24hrs. These services tend to be extremely costly, particularly when you are speaking about housing

delinquent youths. The programs accept kids any time of the day. We do recognize this is a need within our juvenile justice system. There are a limited number of facilities that can provide these services. *Denise Steele-Campbell* mentioned this program has diverted a lot of justice involved juveniles from coming into the custody of Dept of Social Services, there is a need, it has prevented having children to sleep in the offices of the Dept of Social Services

*Wanda Douglas* recapped with having experiences with therapeutic foster care Thompson Residential is essential to have within the community.

- *Matt Simon, Chief of Programs, Thompson Family Services Center* cited that some other residential programs of the same size & similar facilities have an operating budget of \$1.1M to \$1.2M. When Thompson entered this about 2 yrs. ago, we tried to get the cost lowered in order not to compromise safety and integrity, unfortunately the cost is as low as we can go. We would not advocate for a multi-year funding; we think the one-year funding is appropriate. We want to continue to advocate and have discussions around other funding sources

*Kevin* observed there is some consensus about funding Thompson Residential. The council has addressed considerations around the individual type of services for specific programs.

- ❖ The council showed interest in discussing vocational programs. The average cost for funding a vocational program is \$3,000 per child.

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* cited given the high cost of living in our area, there is concern that Enlighten Legacy is costly in comparison to the two currently funded programs. Some of the JCPC council echoed her concerns.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* noted that JCPC funding committee assessed and scored the program applications which is relevant and should be taken into consideration as well.

*Sonya Harper* mentioned that the ultimate end goal is for kids to go thru these programs and develop skills that are transferable for them to be able to secure employment and these programs are designed for older kids. Are there any data/reports as to how many kids are coming out with training certification or being able to transition into jobs?

- *Darryl L. Bego, President/CEO, Youth Development Initiatives* declared that 11 out of 14 graduates at the time went on to transitioned on or qualified for apprenticeship with the vocation contractor, several are still working out of YDI funding. Our focus is to make them employable and besides the vocational training they also receive life skills, in terms of resume writing and interviewing and have completed mock interviews online. We also do GED prep work.
- *Glenn M. Smith, Founder/Executive Director, Life Connections of the Carolinas, Inc* stated he has 3 instructors for the GED program. We had a few kids that have gone to CPCC and gotten their high school equivalency. The focus is education, they require a least a GED to get into the vocational program to receive their training in different areas.

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* mentioned that the discussion is twofold it looks like the number of youths who are being referred to and enrolling in these programs is pretty steady, with one program having met their youth served numbers already and the other coming relatively close given the fiscal year so...

- a) Do we need a 3<sup>rd</sup> program?

- b) If we do, why would we pay \$9,000 instead of getting one of these two currently funded programs to expand

Kevin remarked there is some consensus about placing both vocational programs on the funding allocation sheet.

- *Yacara Mungo, President, Enlighten Legacy* declared that she realized that the cost is the concern of the JCPC council. Looking at whether the program was needed would there be consideration in adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> program? Our program specializes in assisting the youth with PSI certification and getting them fully into the workforce. I would consider taking any recommendations from the JCPC council regarding our staffing which there has been individuals that have worked in social services, some have relationships with DJJ, our teams specialized with working with the at risk youths well as assisting them to transition into a career path.
- ❖ The next programs for discussion are mentoring- DASH Mentoring, Team-Up Connections & Youth Advocate Program. The average cost for funding a mentoring program is \$2,081 per child.  
The agency for YAP had requested that the county waived the 30% match required which is NCDPS requirement and a general statute requirement which cannot be waived. We cannot provide funding for YAP if they don't provide the 30% match.
- *Valerie Koeppel, Regional Director, Youth Advocate Program* stated her program will be able to do the 30% match as required by the state. Kevin asked why the cost per youth is so high vs the state programs for mentoring for YAP?

*Sonya Harper* will abstain from voting reflected of the YAP program, Criminal Justice Service was instrumental in bringing the YAP program to Mecklenburg County to be able to serve kids that are crossing over between juvenile justice youth recovery court and YFS, and due to CJS's heavy involvement in getting them established in Mecklenburg County, it wouldn't be appropriate for me to vote on any decision makings.

*Judge Fickling-Alvarez* will abstain since she resides over youth recovery court which YAP is a part of, she has also written things in support of YAP as it relates to national recognition of them, it wouldn't be appropriate for her to vote on any decision makings.

- *Valerie Koeppel, YAP* stated they work with the highest risk youth, many of the kids have multi system involvement with DJJ & YFS, YAP provides 5-12 hours/week of service for kids and their whole families. We help identify housing, employment for parents as well as kids. We have a workplace site where the kids are essentially employed with YAP. It's a smaller group with Level II and III offenders. We have been self-funded with a partnership from Georgetown University Center for Juvenile Justice reform and have demonstrated we have done some quality work with specific kids and families.
- *Darryl Sturdivant, President, Team-Up Connections* talked about being one of the only groups that continuously met face to face and picked up the kids on a regularly basis every day. We continue to provide advocates for jobs, parenting for the parents, practical mentoring, group



mentoring and court services. We are obtaining great results from the mentoring services we provide.

- *Glenn M. Smith, Founder/Executive Director, Life Connections of the Carolinas*, we have served 61 kids this year when our commitment was 40. DASH Mentoring has proved year after year that we are working with the kids & families, providing services, 95% of the youths came from juvenile court.

*Commissioner Pat Cotham* spoke in support of DASH Mentoring and DASH SFP, Commissioner Cotham has attended their events, they have a great turn out and are very organized, the families are very appreciated. DASH continues to exceed expectations.

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* stated that we have learned that those of us that have been on the JCPC committee for a long time know that if the court counselor doesn't trust the program, they will not receive referrals. The number of cases of referrals DASH mentoring is getting speaks to the trust and value that the court counselors have in the program. There is concern regarding the significant cost per youth for the YAP program and the low number of youths they can accommodate.

*Kendra King* fully supports DASH Mentoring with the level of consistency that they have been able to provide over the past 6 years being funded with JCPC. It's important to base the program over cost per child and take into consideration, this will be Team-Up Connections 2<sup>nd</sup> RFP submitted and to be able to provide a new program with the opportunity even if the amount of funding has to be reduced. It's been difficult for the JCPC to launch new programs.

*Russell Price* clarified that the court counselors have a great relationship with DASH Mentoring & DASH SFP because they do great work. Team Up Connections was serving some of juvenile justice youths prior to being funded with JCPC. The YAP program has done a great job with some of the extremely difficult youths, but the program is costly. *Russell* asked if the per youth cost for YAP can be lowered?

- *Valerie Koeppel*, YAP said we can do 5 hours/week of service and increase the number of kids and whole families to work with. We would be willing to work with the JCPC as a new provider, however our services are meant to be intensive.

*Sonya Harper* reaffirmed a report that show some comparisons and jurisdictions of how many kids we have coming thru our juvenile justice system and how many kids JCPC programs are serving. The data that stood out for Mecklenburg County was that we have the greatest number of kids cycling thru our juvenile courts, but we are one of the programs that are serving the fewest number of kids thru our JCPC.

The mentoring program is a benefit for the kids but we have to keep in mind that the programs we are funding are accessible to kids and families across the city, and we are focusing on one particular program which can create challenges for families in other parts of the city that may not have access to get to. We need to think about do we have other opportunities to be able to fund more programs so that we can spread the service around.

DASH has been with JCPC a long time and have done some great work, but one of the questions we ask the programs every year in our application is about sustainability. DASH has 3 different programs, however all together they have been receiving funding from JCPC for the past 15 + years. Grant funding's are there to get you started, now that we have over \$2M this fiscal year, how and where are we investing those dollars in our community.

For the YAP program, CJS has worked with Georgetown University to secure funding for a pilot project for Mecklenburg County, the pilot was originally for a year but was extended for 18 months. The funding for this pilot will expire in June. YAP has done phenomenal work; they have gone above and beyond for the kids and families. YAP as a pilot is still in that position to secure funding opportunities to work towards a long-term sustainable plan. We recognize that the program has a high cost. Not focusing on YAP particularly when we look at the size of grants we provide, we don't fund as many programs as we could. We need to give some thought as we funding in a manner that families would have access to these different types of services regardless of where they live within our jurisdiction.

Kevin asked it's the same amount of youth to be served this year, however there is a \$50,000 increase from last year?

- *Glenn M. Smith, Founder/Executive Director, Life Connections of the Carolinas* remarked its \$10-\$15,000 more than we applied for last year. We had taken a cut last year for funding. We were the only group that was coming in less than the year before. The amount was brought back up from last year. Proportionally over the years we have not gone up cost per kid. We are consistently fund raising.

*Kendra King* asked if DASH would be eligible to obtain a contract with the county?

- One of the avenues to consider is the Community Service grant program for programs who are interested in funding. There are instances if programs performs well and meets certain metrics and exhibits a need that aligns with the strategic plan of the county there are opportunities where the grants can be renewed for up to 3 years and at the end of the years there are opportunities for those grants to transition into contracts with individual departments. The performance measure are more stringent than what we have with JCPC.

Kevin remarked there is some consensus about placing both DASH Mentoring and Team Up Connections programs on the funding allocation sheet

- ❖ The next programs for discussion are Tresports and CMPD Youth Diversion Program.

*Russell Price* communicated that both are quality programs that serves 2 different populations. CMPD served the youths that are diverted from the court offices. It's a very needed program because it is a true diversion from the court system. Tresports does a good job of serving the court involved youths, they participate in the court hearings and advocate for the youths, they have good relationship with the court counselors.

The numbers from the past year, CMPD youth to serve 400, percentage served 41%, Tresports youth to serve 60, percentage 58%.

Kevin asked CMPD Youth Diversion & Tresports why the increase amount requested for next year?

- *Cara Evans-Patterson, CMPD Youth Diversion* added on programming so we can have not a one type of program fits all, added in were theft, conflict, substance, and academics programs. In the previous years we have only asked to serve 136 youths but adding the additional programs we can add 400 once school gets back into session. Majority of the referrals comes from the school system which is why the numbers are low right now.
- *Tresports, Program Manager, Shavonda McClure*, we are proposing to serve youths 5 days a week as oppose to 3 days per week, so with the reduction in funding we had to do 3 days. We are an afterschool structure interpersonal skill building program and we use evidence-based curriculum positive action.

*Scott Stoker* advised the average cost for funding an interpersonal skill building program is \$1,500 per child. Our minimum standard is around 1x per week/2 hrs. a week., some Mecklenburg programs do more than that which increases the cost.

Kevin remarked there is some consensus about placing both interpersonal skill building programs on the funding allocation sheet.

- ❖ The next programs for discussion are parent family skill building-DASH Strengthening Families and YDI Life Skills Academy and JCPC Admin. The average cost for funding a family skill building program is \$2,057 per child.

The numbers from the past year, DASH/SFP youth served YTD is 31, percentage served 41%, YDI Life Skills Academy youth served YTD is 18, percentage 36%.

*Commissioner Pat Cotham* reiterated attending the events, which were joyful and meaningful. Commissioner Cotham is in full support due to her interaction with DASH/SFP over the years. *Russell Price* noted historically DASH/SFP has done a great job, they have a great relationship with the court counselors.

*Dr. Cotrane Penn* state's we need to be realistic about the number of youth and families they might be able to serve given the conditions that are likely to continue under the pandemic.

*Kevin* deduced that if JCPC wanted to fund DASH/SFP at \$128,275 and YDI Family Life Skills at \$59,992 which puts totals at \$283,676. The funds would have to be found within the funding recommendations. As JCPC members viewed the allocation worksheet sheet Kevin recommended a 13% cut across the board would fund many of the programs listed. *Sonya Harper* recommended keeping the program funding levels at what they currently are at this year and then by the time we moved into FY23, we will have some idea as to whether things will return to normal, since the programs have not impacted their quota and we have 75 days left for the fiscal year, should we decide to fund them again in FY23 then we can look into an increase at that time.

Kevin remarked some consensus is to continue with 1 yr. funding for programs. Kevin also asked if any program couldn't meet the funding obligations that have been allocated on the worksheet thus far

- *Matt Simon, Thompson* stated if they increased their youth to serve projection based on the increase funding would have added, they would not be able to serve the 100 kids, if we have the ability to respond and we are over our number of youths, we will not turn any youths away, we just wouldn't be able to operationalize that many complex assessments within a year, they would have to stay at their current years target which is 72.
- *Tresports, Program Manager, Shavonda McClure*, the program would have to go back to 3 days per week, with the reduction.

Kevin asked for a motion to recommend funding for one year at the amounts listed on the April JCPC meeting FY 21-22 funding allocation worksheet as proposed on the screen. Kendra made a motion to approve the listed amounts for the JCPC funding allocation worksheet for FY 21-22 for one year. Commissioner Pat Cotham seconded. Kevin executed a roll call vote to ensure abstentions were noted. Judge Fickling-Alvarez abstaining from voting on the YAP program

Janelle Fleck did not vote

The JCPC council has 16 votes and the motion passes the funding recommendation which will go to the Board of County Commissioners.

**Committee Reports:**

<b>State</b>	Will send out an email to the programs what was approved at the meeting, then sent to the BOCC for approval
<b>County</b>	The agenda for the BOCC approval is May 18 <sup>th</sup> . Should the BOCC passed the proposed budget, then you will be contacted by the Bus Mgmt. team at CJS to begin the contracting process with the county and also an orientation regarding invoice processing and how to draw down your funds associated with the contract.
<b>Marketing Committee</b>	N/A
<b>Monitoring Committee</b>	N/A
<b>Risk &amp;Needs Committee</b>	N/A
<b>Funding Committee</b>	N/A
<b>By-Laws Committee</b>	N/A
<b>Nominating Committee</b>	N/A
<b>Program Support</b>	N/A
<b>Executive Committee</b>	N/A

Kevin thanked the JCPC council for donating their time and commitment.

Kevin asked for a motion to adjourn, Heather Taraska made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Pat Cotham seconded. Meeting ended at 7:35pm.