

Crime and Delinquency Reduction Programs in the State of North Carolina: A Review of the Crime Solutions Website

Matthew Robinson¹

¹ Professor, Justice Studies, Appalachian State University, Boone, USA

Correspondence: Matthew Robinson, Professor, Justice Studies, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608, USA.

Received: July 22, 2026

Accepted: August 24, 2026

Published: September 1, 2026

doi:10.65343/tpss.v2i3.127

URL: <https://doi.org/10.65343/tpss.v2i3.127>

Abstract

This paper summarizes policies and programs in North Carolina aimed at reducing crime and delinquency that are reviewed for effectiveness on the Crime Solutions website, operated by the US Department of Justice. Studies assessing those programs are also summarized. Nineteen programs in policing, corrections, juvenile justice, and an “other” category are explored. The article illustrates which policies and programs are rated effective, which are promising, and which are ineffective.

Keywords: crime, delinquency, policies, programs, North Carolina

1. Introduction

Criminal justice in North Carolina includes efforts to reduce crime through policing, courts, and corrections. Juvenile justice efforts in the state aim to reduce delinquency. North Carolina's criminal justice system comprises tens of thousands of employees across many different agencies. This includes more than 21,000 police officers (World Population Review, 2026), more than 7,000 judicial branch staff (North Carolina Judicial Branch, 2026), and more than 11,000 correctional officers (North Carolina Department of Adult Correction, 2026). And the North Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (DJJDP) employed 1,742 people in 2023 (North Carolina Department of Public Safety, 2026).

Though we know a good bit about what works in criminal & juvenile justice to reduce crime & delinquency, respectively, as of this writing, no scholar has attempted to examine specific policies and programs carried out by the state of North Carolina's criminal & juvenile justice systems. The website, Crime Solutions (2026), a project of the National Institute of Justice, is available for review. The website allows one to search for any term to locate policies and programs related to that term. For example, it is possible to identify policies and programs unique to the state of North Carolina.

On the website, Crime Solutions rates policies and programs with the following conclusions:

Effective intervention: A preponderance of evidence shows that the program will likely produce the intended outcome. An Effective practice outcome indicates, on average, there is strong evidence that implementing a program encompassed by the practice will achieve the intended outcome;

Ineffective intervention: There is substantial evidence showing that the program is unlikely to achieve the intended outcome. and may result in negative outcomes. An Ineffective practice outcome indicates, on average, there is strong evidence that implementing a program encompassed by the practice will not achieve the intended outcome or may result in a negative outcome; and

Promising intervention: There is limited evidence that the program may result in the intended outcome. A Promising practice outcome indicates, on average, there is some evidence that implementing a program encompassed by the practice will achieve the intended outcome (Crime Solutions, 2025).

Using this rating scale and examining programs and policies from North Carolina allows one to determine what works to reduce crime and delinquency in the state. Yet, according to Robinson (2026), the major problem with the Crime Solutions website is its organization: “One can search and read about individual policies and programs there, but there is no summary that explains all related policies and programs related to one topic in one place.” This paper aims to help overcome this limitation by summarizing the programs and policies in North Carolina that are located on the Crime Solutions website.

2. Methodology

The author of this paper visited the website of Crime Solutions and searched the term “North Carolina.” The search produced seven pages of results, organized into programs and “practices” (aka policies). A review of the practices link revealed that none of the policies there were actually unique to the state of North Carolina, and searches for those practices online confirmed that finding. A review of the programs identified on the website revealed 19 specific programs in the state that have been studied by scholars and included on the Crime Solutions website.

This paper is a summary of those 19 programs, organized into the following topics:

- Policing
- Corrections
- Juvenile justice
- Other

Note that no policies or programs related to the courts pertained to North Carolina on the Crime Solutions website. Yet, a successful courts program that is operated in North Carolina is discussed in the conclusion of this paper.

3. Findings

The paper begins with a review of programs in policing, then moves to corrections, juvenile justice, and then, finally, other programs. There were two programs related to policing, zero to courts, four in corrections, three in juvenile justice, and ten other types of programs.

Policing

The review of programs in policing begins with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, Police Department’s Domestic Violence Unit and then moves on to a discussion of the High Point Drug Market Intervention.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, Police Department’s Domestic Violence Unit. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, Police Department’s Domestic Violence Unit “consists of a specialized police unit, which was designed to prevent recidivism among people convicted of domestic violence offenses and to assist victims of domestic violence through the process of prosecution and recovery” (Crime Solutions, 2011a). The investigative part of the unit works this way:

For those cases chosen for processing by the unit, the police department conducts follow-up interviews with witnesses, identifies and corrects missing information from reports, and prepares case materials for the district attorney. A lead detective is assigned to each case to conduct a thorough investigation, and the suspect is charged based on the evidence collected during the investigation. Aggressive measures are taken to ensure that the person is prosecuted to the full extent of the law. This specialized and focused attention is one of the main factors that differentiates the DV Unit from standard police processing (Crime Solutions, 2011a).

So, the operation amounts to tougher sanctions for those convicted of domestic violence crimes. A victim assistance component of the program also helps walk through the criminal justice process and supports victims. A study of the program found that the treatment group assigned to the unit was about 50 percent less likely to recidivate at a 30-month follow up (Exum, Hartman, Friday, & Lord, 2014). The program is rated Promising, and it illustrates that getting tough on offenders can work (at least in the short term) as long as the right offenders are targeted.

High Point Drug Market Intervention. Drug offenders have also been targeted for law enforcement intervention to reduce violence, for example, in High Point, North Carolina. There, the High Point Drug Market Intervention was found to be effective at reducing violent incidents; specifically, targeted areas had about an 8% decline in violence, compared with about an 8% increase in areas not targeted (Corsaro, Hunt, Hipple, & McGarrell, 2012). According to Crime Solutions (2014a), this program occurred in three phases:

1. *Identification phase:* High-density crime areas that had a strong prevalence of drugs were identified through mapping drug arrests, calls for service, reviewing serious crimes in hot spots to determine a drug connection, and finally analyzing information from various criminal justice agencies. ... Once these areas were identified, the police worked with the community, narcotic investigators, probation officers, and parole officers to add additional surveillance in the areas and began carefully identifying dealers in these neighborhoods. Further, the police reviewed every report associated with potential dealers and their known associates. Once these potential individuals were identified, the Police Department checked their current activities and generated an initial list. From this list, police made

cases against each individual by using undercover officers or confidential informants who made purchases from these individuals that were recorded by digital audio and video surveillance.

2. *Notification phase*: Identified individuals were invited to a “call in” community notification session where key police and prosecution officials notified such persons of the sanctions that were available to criminal justice personnel. Additionally, community members spoke to the them regarding the need for community change and desistance from future offending.
3. *Resource delivery*: Law enforcement spoke with the individuals and had them complete a needs assessment. The law enforcement officers would inform them that if they continued dealing they would be arrested immediately; however, if they chose to stop moving forward no punitive action would be taken against them. This let them know the consequences and know that their chances of being arrested were far greater than they had previously thought (note: this is called the “pulling levers” or “focused deterrence” approach in law enforcement). The individuals in question completed a needs assessment so they could be matched with services in the community for extensive follow-up to assist them in their efforts to stop dealing. They received services such as education, housing, employment, food and clothing, drug and alcohol treatment, and transportation through agencies and volunteer groups in the community. Finally, the resource delivery phase aided in the police community relationship and increased the perception of procedural justice.

Like other pulling levers or focused deterrence efforts in the United States that are also shown to work, (Robinson, 2026), this is another effort that combined traditional law enforcement approaches with community service, and it is rated Effective. In this case, getting tough on offenders produces positive impacts when it is combined with community efforts to help offenders go straight.

Corrections

This section examines policies and programs in corrections. It begins with a discussion of the Changing Course initiative and then moves on to several others.

Changing Course. The *Changing Course* interactive journal is a cognitive-behavioral pre-treatment tool used to address substance abuse and criminal behavior utilized within the North Carolina prison system (Crime Solutions, 2013b). According to Crime Solutions (2013b): “Changing Course is an interactive journal designed specifically for those incarcerated in a local correctional setting (i.e., jail) who have been screened or identified as having a potential substance use disorder. The primary emphasis of the journal is to help inmates make the connection between their substance use and criminal activity. Changing Course was designed as a self-directed resource for inmates to start the process of making positive life changes. It provides inmates with a way to assess the costs and benefits associated with different life choices they might make and helps them develop a plan for changing their behavior following release.”

Crime Solutions (2013b) lays out in good detail how the journal process works: “The journal starts with a checklist of various descriptors that inmates check off if they specifically apply to them. Then inmates must summarize, in their own words, the specific details regarding their arrest and their motivation for committing the offense for which they are currently incarcerated. Next, inmates are provided with an inventory of harmful consequences associated with substance use that cover a wide range of areas, such as relationships, school/work, and finances. Inmates are then presented with another checklist of various behaviors that they may select as they consider making a positive life change (e.g., current level of alcohol or drug use, anger management, relationship changes) and are instructed to indicate which areas apply to them. The journal then provides an outline for evaluating the rewards and costs of up to three specific behavior changes, followed by strategies for inmates to implement the selected changes. Inmates are provided with an area to write down their specific individualized plan for change. Finally, the journal presents inmates with the issue of making the ultimate decision about whether they will seek professional help and/or support groups.”

A study of this program found a lower recidivism rate for inmates who participated in the Changing Course program than a control group (51% versus 66%, respectively) (Proctor, Hoffmann, & Allison, 2012). The program is rated Promising. It is a good example related to other efforts that change the way offenders think and choose that are also shown to reduce crime (Robinson, 2026).

Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Rearrest (STARR). One program aimed at offender supervision officers specifically is rated Promising by Crime Solutions (2012f). The program, called Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Rearrest, or STARR, aimed to “improve one-on-one officer-client interactions to reduce risk and recidivism.” Available in 16 federal districts including in North Carolina, the program trained officers to “use behaviorally based skills during client interactions. STARR teaches officers about a structured cognitive-behavioral supervision approach that seeks to address dynamic risk factors of clients by improving one-on-one officer-client interactions” (Crime Solutions, 2012f). Using the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model, the

program addressed client risk factors, targeted services to clients' needs, and was adjusted based on the learning style of the person it was being applied to.

Crime Solutions (2012f) describes the program in detail, writing that training included "specific strategies for Active Listening, Role Clarification, Effective Use of Authority, Effective Disapproval, Effective Reinforcement, Effective Punishment and Problem Solving, and for Teaching, Applying and Reviewing the Cognitive Model." Skill cards were used "that outline the specific actions and activities that officers should do to successfully deliver each strategy." Further, examples on video "of some of the skills were also presented, while other skills were demonstrated in person." Officers are given opportunities to practice every skill. Finally, officers "also send in audiotaped interactions at designated intervals (one before the training sessions and up to 30 after training is completed) ... "from an initial meeting with a client, another audiotape of an interaction with the client 3 months later, and a third and final audiotape 3 months after that. The audiotapes were used to gain a better understanding of skill development and provide officers with feedback."

A study of the program found importantly that the failure rate for clients of officers who participated in STARR was lower than the failure rate for clients of officers in the control group (26% versus 34%, respectively). Other positive findings include that a higher percentage of STARR officers used reinforcement and disapproval during their meetings with clients (34% versus 17%, respectively), a higher percentage engaged in discussions about cognitions, peers, and impulsivity with clients (44% versus 33%, respectively), and a higher percentage used cognitive techniques (17% versus 1%, respectively) (Robinson, VanBenschoten, Alexander, & Lowenkamp, 2011). Yet, at a two-year follow-up, failure rates between the two groups were not different (Lowenkamp, Holsinger, Robinson, & Alexander, 2014).

Post-Release Employment. An effort to help young male offenders (ages 18-22 years) obtain post-release employment through vocational training and reentry efforts was found to be ineffective; the program did not help with employment or recidivism (Crime Solutions, 2017). The program was offered by the North Carolina Department of Corrections (DOC) at two prisons, including Cameron Morrison Youth Center (CMYC) and Sandhills Youth Center (SYC). According to Crime Solutions (2017), the program "was geared toward 1) working individually with incarcerated persons to identify vocational interests and aptitudes, 2) developing individual plans of study for improving vocational skills, 3) providing the identified training as well as other needed services (i.e., substance abuse and psychological counseling), and 4) helping incarcerated persons secure post-release employment."

This is the type of program that should work, given that it addresses a known protective factor for crime—employment—especially since assignments to educational, vocational, and enrichment programs were individualized based on assessments of each offender (Robinson, 2026). Many efforts were made to help offenders be successful after release, including "training on interview techniques, workplace behaviors, financial management, and hygiene; and job development, including assistance prior to and following release from prison." Further: "A job developmental specialist was responsible for prerelease employment assistance, and the ESC offender specialist assisted the incarcerated person in finding a job once released" (Crime Solutions, 2017). Yet, a study of the program found that time to first arrest and re-incarceration did not differ between the those who participated in the program versus those who did not, and there were no observed differences in postarrest release measures of arrest. Finally, there were no differences in postrelease quarterly wages (Lattimore, Witte, & Baker, 1987). It is likely that the lack of positive outcomes related to crime are due to the lack of positive outcomes in employment, a known protective factor for crime.

National Guard ChalleNGe Program. Another program aimed at addressing protective factors—the National Guard ChalleNGe Program—is also shown to be ineffective by Crime Solutions (2014b). Run in numerous states including North Carolina, the program "is an intensive residential program that provides training and services to promote leadership, academic excellence, job skills, and community service among at-risk youth. The goals of the ChalleNGe Program are to assist youth in obtaining education and employment and in developing positive attitudes and behaviors. The program serves youths ages 16 to 18 who have dropped out of or been expelled from school and are unemployed, drug free, and not heavily involved with the justice system. The program is open to both males and females, and there are no income-based eligibility criteria" (Crime Solutions, 2014b).

A 17-month long program, it runs in three phases: a 2-week PreChalleNGe Phase, a 20-week Residential Phase, and a 1-year Postresidential Phase. According to Crime Solutions, (2014b): "The PreChalleNGe Phase includes assessment and an introduction to the program's rules and expectations, military discipline, and teamwork. Candidates who complete this phase are formally enrolled into the program as 'cadets' and move to the second phase." That phase, the Residential Phase, "includes a curriculum structured around eight core components: Leadership/Followership, Responsible Citizenship, Service to Community, Life-Coping Skills, Physical Fitness, Health and Hygiene, Job Skills, and Academic Excellence. During this phase, the program provides assistance

with preparing for the General Educational Development (GED) exam or with obtaining a high school diploma.” Then, the PreChalleNGe and Residential phases “use military structure, discipline, facilities, and staff to accomplish their objectives. Youths are divided into platoons and squads and live in barracks on a military base. The daily schedule is highly structured, and the military staff closely supervises youths at all times” (Crime Solutions, 2014b).

As part of the Residential Phase, young people “work with the staff to arrange postresidential placement, which may consist of employment, education, or military service. Youths who show competency on the core components and have an acceptable placement lined up successfully complete the Residential Phase and move into the Postresidential Phase. This phase includes a structured one-on-one mentoring component. The goals of the Postresidential Phase are to assist youths with their transition back into the community and to support them in maintaining the new attitudes and behaviors they have learned in the program. Youths nominate their own mentors, drawn from family friends, extended family members, godparents, school personnel, or religious leaders. Program staff members then help youths initiate their mentoring relationships as part of the Residential Phase. During the Postresidential Phase, mentors are required to have a minimum of four contacts with their mentees per month. Staff members contact both youths and their mentors at least monthly to solve problems and monitor youths’ progress” (Crime Solutions, 2014b).

A study of the program found that, although youths who participated in the program were more likely to earn a high school diploma or GED and to be employed, there were no differences in the number of arrests or in reported levels of delinquent behavior, illegal drug use, marijuana use, or psychological distress (Millenky, Bloom, Muller–Ravett, & Broadus, 2011). These findings are surprising given that evidence from other states shows that improving educational and work skills is related to reductions in crime (Robinson, 2026). They likely occurred due to the fact that programs aimed at at-risk youth are more likely to fail in the first place.

Juvenile Justice

This section reviews policies and programs in juvenile justice, starting with the Methodist Home for Children’s Value-Based Therapeutic Environment (VBTE) Model. Then, the analysis moves onto other efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency.

Methodist Home for Children’s Value-Based Therapeutic Environment (VBTE) Model. A program that aims to educate children about alternatives to crime and delinquency is the Methodist Home for Children’s Value-Based Therapeutic Environment (VBTE) Model, which:

is a nonpunitive treatment model that concentrates on teaching juvenile justice-involved youth about prosocial behaviors as alternatives to antisocial behaviors. The VBTE Model is used in juvenile group homes operated by the Methodist Home for Children (MHC) in North Carolina. The MHC homes provide residential services for youth involved in the juvenile justice system who are referred for treatment through the state’s Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (DJJDP) (Crime Solutions, 2012e).

According to Crime Solutions (2012e), “To ensure a consistent approach in the treatment of youth, the VBTE Model provides a common set of values, skills, therapeutic activities, and intervention tools. In addition, an integrated approach is taken to individualized treatment plans for youth that incorporates parents, teachers, and court counselors.”

The program has five treatment components, including:

Service planning, which provides a family and community approach to meet the needs of youths and their families

The skills curriculum, which provides staff with a teaching tool and promotes clear expectation and individualization for youth and their families

Learning theory, which promotes the understanding of individual youth and their behavior, which is critical to creating effective motivation systems

Motivation systems, which provide staff with a daily plan that supports the overall service plan, promotes therapeutic interactions, teaches and reinforces skills, and implements principles of the learning theory

Therapeutic (focused) interactions, which provide youth with structured teaching and reinforcement based on each individual’s service plan and learning levels, and incorporates the motivation system that is modified for each youth (Crime Solutions, 2012e)

Though a study by Strom, Cowell, Dawes, Hawkins, Moore, Wedehase, and Steffey (2010) found no differences at a 16-month follow-up between youth in the program and a control group in new charges or new incarcerations, youth in the treatment group were less likely to be convicted of any new offense (36.4% vs. 45.7%). This

suggests the program has some crime-reduction value, and it is rated as Promising. Indeed, studies show that treatment is generally effective for juveniles when it is well-planned (Robinson, 2026).

Multisystemic Therapy (MST) for Sex Offenders. One program run in North Carolina as well as several other states uses Multisystemic therapy (MST) to address sex offenses. According to Crime Solutions (2011c):

Multisystemic Therapy for Youth with Problem Sexual Behaviors (MST–PSB) is an adaptation of MST aimed at adolescents who have committed sexual offenses and demonstrated other problem behaviors. MST–PSB is designed to reduce problem sexual behaviors, antisocial behaviors, and out-of-home placements. The program targets factors underlying problematic juvenile sexual behavior, primarily by addressing a youth’s socialization processes and interpersonal transactions. Program staff provide treatment within the adolescent’s natural environment—that is, where the youth lives. As a result, program staff members also work directly with the youth’s family and directly or indirectly with others in the youth’s community, such as peers, teachers, or probation officers. One goal of this work with the youth’s family is to empower the parents by providing them the skills and resources needed to raise their adolescent.

The program works with parents to

reduce denial by both parents and child about the sexual offense and its consequences;

enhance parenting knowledge;

remove barriers to effective parenting; and

promote affection and communication among family members (Crime Solutions, 2011c).

Crime Solutions (2011c) notes that the “program components draw on strategies from pragmatic family therapies, behavioral parent training, and cognitive-behavioral therapy [CBT].” Bourdin, Schaeffer, and Heiblum’s (2009) study of the program found the following positive results:

Participants in the program self-reported lower rates of rearrests for person offenses, when compared with a comparison group.

Program participants had 70% fewer arrests for other crimes.

Program participants self-reported lower rates of rearrest for property offenses.

Program participants had 83% fewer arrests for sexual crimes.

These are promising crime-reduction effects, and the program is rated Promising. This is not a surprising finding given the evidence of the efficacy of MST as well as CBT for reducing delinquency (Robinson, 2026).

MST. Another MST program in the state is run by Youth Villages, which focus on intensive, in-home care for youths in need. According to Crime Solutions (2011b), the program “addresses family functioning and parental behavior to reduce child abuse, neglect, and external placement.” Crime Solutions (2011b) writes: “Multisystemic Therapy for Child Abuse and Neglect (MST–CAN) adopts the principles of MST by treating youth, parents, and families with child physical abuse and neglect reports within their home ecology and by intervening in the systems, family, and care-giving environment. Treatment aims to reduce the recurrence of abuse, prevent out-of-home placement, reduce parent-to-child aggression (psychological and physical), and improve parent mental health functioning and parenting skills and behaviors.” Treatment is offered to all family members and includes “cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) for anger management, CBT treatments for the impact of trauma or posttraumatic stress disorder on adults and children, reinforcement-based therapy for adult substance abuse, behavioral family therapy for communication and problem-solving issues, functional analysis for family conflict and the use of force in parenting, and abuse clarification” (Crime Solutions, 2011b).

A study of the program found no differences between those who went through the program and those who did not in terms of abuse, yet improvements were seen in the development of external social support over a 16-month follow-up period, as were reductions witnessed in psychiatric distress. Finally, program children were less likely to have an out-of-home placement and saw improvements in functioning, including internalizing behaviors, posttraumatic stress disorders, child-reported dissociative symptoms, and total symptoms overall (Swenson, Schaeffer, Henggeler, Faldowski, & Mayhew, 2010). The program is rated Promising.

Other programs

This final section of the paper analyzes ten policies and programs not contained within traditional criminal or juvenile justice. Instead, they address efforts in schools and families to reduce delinquency.

Dating Violence Prevention. A school-based program aimed at program for middle and high school students that was “designed to stop or prevent dating violence perpetration and victimization” is rated Effective by Crime Solutions (2011d). Developed within 14 public schools in one county in North Carolina, the program eventually spread to other places in and out of the United States. Crime Solutions (2011d) writes that the “intervention

group showed statistically significant reductions in psychological, physical, and sexual abuse perpetration, and physical abuse victimization, compared with the control group at the 4-year follow up; however, there were no significant differences between groups on sexual abuse victimization.”

The program had ambitious goals including to “change adolescent norms on dating violence and gender-roles, improve conflict resolution skills for dating relationships, promote victims’ and perpetrators’ beliefs in the need for help and awareness of community resources for dating violence, encourage help-seeking by victims and those who commit crimes against them, and develop peer help-giving skills” (Crime Solutions, 2011d).

According to Crime Solutions (2011d), the program had “nine 50-minute sessions, one 45-minute play to be performed by students, and a poster contest. The sessions include:

1. Defining Caring Relationships. Students are introduced to Safe Dates and discuss how they wish to be treated in dating relationships.
2. Defining Dating Abuse. Discussing scenarios and statistics, students clearly define dating abuse.
3. Why Do People Abuse? Students identify the causes and consequences of dating abuse through large- and small-group scenario discussions.
4. How to Help Friends. Students learn why it is difficult to leave abusive relationships and how to help an abused friend through a decision-making exercise and dramatic reading.
5. Helping Friends. Students use stories and role-playing to practice skills for helping abused friends or for confronting abusing friends.
6. Overcoming Gender Stereotypes. Students learn about gender stereotypes and how they affect dating relationships through a writing exercise, scenarios, and small-group discussions.
7. Equal Power Through Communication. Students learn the eight skills for effective communication and practice them in role-plays.
8. How We Feel, How We Deal. Students learn effective ways to recognize and handle anger through a diary and a discussion of “hot buttons,” so that anger does not lead to abusive behavior.
9. Preventing Sexual Assault. Students learn about sexual assault and how to prevent it through a quiz, a caucus, and a panel of peers.”

Efforts were made to involve parents as well as community members to address these issues. A study of the program found reductions in levels of sexual abuse perpetration, psychological abuse perpetration, and moderate physical abuse perpetration, so the program is rated Effective.

Media Ready. Another school-based program developed by Innovation Research & Training (iRT) in North Carolina and used in central locations in the state is called Media Ready, considered Promising by Crime Solutions (2012d). Aimed at middle school kids, the program aimed to reduce drug use through media literacy education and substance use prevention “by increasing students’ critical thinking skills about media messages, particularly those related to alcohol and tobacco products, and to encourage healthy beliefs and attitudes about abstaining from substance use” (Crime Solutions, 2012d).

According to Crime Solutions (2012d): “The Media Ready program has 10 lessons lasting about 45 minutes each that build cumulatively on one another. Each lesson is scripted within a teacher manual to facilitate program implementation. The lessons include interactive activities, hands-on practice, and small group work. Important questions that are discussed in the program include:

1. Is the message positive or negative?
2. Who paid for it?
3. Who is the target?
4. What is the implied message?
5. What was left out?
6. Do I like this message?
7. If I don’t like the message, what can I do about it?”

The program aimed to develop students’ critical thinking skills about advertisements for drugs including alcohol and tobacco. A study, only two weeks out from the conclusion of the program, found no differences in intent to use alcohol but differences in intent to use tobacco (Kupersmidt, Scull, & Benson, 2012).

Media Detective. A similar program, this time for elementary school children, is called Media Detective, and it is based in North Carolina. Also rated Promising by Crime Solutions (2012c), the program “is a media literacy and

substance use prevention program intended for third- through fifth-grade students.” Similar to the Media Ready program reviewed above, Media Detective aims to reduce use of alcohol and tobacco by “increasing students’ critical thinking skills about media messages, particularly those related to alcohol and tobacco products, and to encourage healthy beliefs and attitudes about abstaining from substance use” (Crime Solutions, 2012c).

Crime Solutions (2012c) notes that the program “uses a detective theme to engage students and teach critical thinking skills. Students learn to look for five ‘clues’ when they view an advertisement: 1) the product being sold, 2) the target audience the advertisers are trying to attract, 3) the ad hook used to attract attention, 4) the hidden message, or what the ad is suggesting will happen to a person who uses the product, and 5) the missing information about health consequences from using the product.” Students deconstruct ads and then create their own, more realistic one.

A study of the program found that students who went through the program demonstrated better skills in terms of understanding persuasive intent of ads and using critical thinking when it came to those ads. Importantly, students who went through the Media Detective intervention were less likely to report intention to use alcohol or tobacco in the future (Kupersmidt, Scull, & Austin, 2010).

HOMEBUILDERS. A program aimed at families is called HOMEBUILDERS, developed in Washington but used heavily in North Carolina. According to Crime Solutions (2012b):

HOMEBUILDERS is an in-home, intensive family preservation service (IFPS) and reunification program for families with children (newborn to 17 years old) returning from or at risk of placement into foster care, group or residential treatment, psychiatric hospitals, or juvenile justice facilities. The HOMEBUILDERS model is designed to eliminate barriers to service while using research-based interventions to improve parental skills, parental capabilities, family interactions, children’s behavior, and family safety. The goals are to prevent the unnecessary out-of-home placement of children through an intensive, onsite intervention and to teach families new problem-solving skills to improve family functioning.

According to Crime Solutions (2012b), the program targets

youths and families involved in the child welfare, juvenile justice, and mental health system. For high-risk families involved with the child protective services system, the goal of the program is to remove the risk of harm to the child instead of removing the child. Therapists work with families to teach them new behaviors and help them make better choices for their children, while ensuring child safety. In addition, HOMEBUILDERS also works with youths and their families to address issues that lead to delinquency, while allowing youths to remain in the community. Program staff work with youths to ensure they attend classes regularly, adhere to curfews, comply with the courts, and learn anger management and conflict-resolution skills to avoid getting into more trouble. Finally, the program works with youths so they can avoid the trauma and stigma of psychiatric hospitalization or residential treatment for mental health-related issues by providing crisis intervention and skill building, involving the families in the youths’ treatment, and broadening the continuum of care.

The core components of the program include:

Intervention at crisis point. HOMEBUILDERS therapists work with families when they are in crisis. Families are seen within 24 hours of referral to the program.

Accessibility. Services are provided in the family’s home and community (e.g., school) at times convenient to families, including evenings, weekends, and holidays. Therapists are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for crisis intervention. This accessibility allows close monitoring of potentially dangerous situations.

Flexibility. Intervention strategies and methods are tailored to meet the needs, values, and lifestyles of each family. Services are provided when and where the families wish. Therapists also provide a wide range of services, such as helping families meet the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter; using public transportation; budgeting; and, when necessary, dealing with the social services system.

Time limited and low caseload. Families receive 4 to 6 weeks of intensive intervention, with up to two “booster sessions.” Therapists typically serve two families at a time and provide 80 to 100 hours of service, with an average of 45 hours of face-to-face contact with the family.

Strengths based. Therapists help clients identify and prioritize goals, strengths, and values and help them use and enhance strengths and resources to achieve their goals.

Ecological/holistic assessment and individualized treatment planning. Assessments of family strengths, problems, and barriers to service/treatment and outcome-based goals and treatment plans are completed collaboratively with each family.

Research-based treatment practices. Therapists use evidence-based treatment practices, including motivational interviewing, behavioral parent training, cognitive-behavior therapy strategies, and relapse prevention. Therapists teach family members a variety of skills, including child behavior management, effective discipline, positive behavioral support, communication skills, problem-solving skills, resisting peer pressure, mood management skills, safety planning, and establishing daily routines.

Support and resource building. Therapists help families assess their formal and informal support systems and develop and enhance ongoing supports and resources for maintaining and facilitating changes.

Critical thinking framework. Therapists, supervisors, and managers use a critical thinking framework for assessing, planning, implementing, and evaluating progress and outcomes (Crime Solutions, 2012b).

Research into the program revealed that children whose parents participated in the program spent fewer days in foster care before reuniting with their parents than did kids in the control group, families who participated in the program were more likely to be reunited, and the intensive family preservation services (IFPS) initiated reduced the rate of out-of-home placements for families in the program versus families not in the program (29% vs. 37%, respectively; Fraser, Walton, Lewis, Pecora, & Walton, 1996; Kirk & Griffith, 2003). These outcomes could logically produce crime-reduction benefits in the long term. This program is rated Effective.

Abecedarian Project. Still another school-based program, this time in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, is the Abecedarian Project, an “early education intervention designed to improve cognitive and educational development among low-income children” (Crime Solutions, 2016). The program aimed at two major issues, including “1) the extent to which impoverished children’s intellectual and cognitive development could be changed if given early environmental support and enrichment, and 2) the impact that preschool and primary school treatment could have on school performance ... The overall goal of the project was to combat the impact of poverty on children’s development and educational aptitude” (Crime Solutions, 2016). It was run for five years from infancy to age five.

According to Crime Solutions (2016), the program “was offered in a child care setting and involved year round, full-day child care, 5 days a week for 5 years. The project curriculum included educational games, which fostered cognitive, language, and adaptive behavior skills. The activities were individualized for the child and were adaptive, based on the child’s age. For example, the games for infants involved age-appropriate, adult-child interactions such as talking with the child, showing toys and pictures, and offering the infants a chance to react to certain stimuli (e.g., sights and sounds). As children aged, the educational content became more skill-based and conceptual, and the curriculum was oriented more toward language development. Children also received health care on-site from pediatricians.”

Studies of the program found higher reading scores for the treatment group than control group but no differences in verbal or performance IQ, or math scores. Differences were found between the treatment group and control group in four-year college enrollment (36% versus 14%, respectively), as well as in skilled employment (67% versus 41%, respectively). Differences were also found in the likelihood of becoming a teen parent (26% versus 45%, respectively) and in depression scores, but no differences between the treatment and control groups were found in drug use or incarceration (Campbell, Ramey, Pungello, Sparling, & Miller-Johnson, 2002; McLaughlin, Campbell, Pungello, & Skinner, 2007). The program is rated Promising.

Adults and Children Together (ACT) Raising Safe Kids Program. Another program aimed at families is called Adults and Children Together (ACT) Raising Safe Kids Program, run in many states including North Carolina. Its goal “is to strengthen families and improve or change parenting skills and practices to prevent child maltreatment. The program provides education and resources and seeks to achieve the primary goal by (1) establishing partnerships with a variety of organizations and agencies, and (2) training professionals to take the program to families and caregivers in their communities” (Crime Solutions, 2013). Run by the American Psychological Association with partner agencies, the curriculum “is organized in eight 2-hour interactive group sessions and addresses:

- **Understanding Children’s Behaviors:** This component focuses on helping parents understand what to expect from children at various development stages and how to use skills to guide children’s behavior based on their developmental level, so that parents do not have unrealistic expectations of their children and do not resort to violence when dealing with misbehaviors.
- **Young Children’s Exposure to Violence:** The purpose of this session is to help parents understand (1) how children can be exposed to violence and its consequences; (2) that children learn by observation and imitation; and (3) that their behavior, actions and the environment they provide teach children lessons for life.
- **Anger Management for Parents:** This session is designed to help parents learn skills to understand, control, and manage their own feelings of anger.

- **Understanding and Helping Angry Children:** This session helps parents understand children's angry feelings and how to teach them positive ways to express and control anger. The session also covers helping families teach social problem-solving skills in a home environment based on an understanding of the developmental stages through which children learn social skills.
- **Children and Electronic Media:** This part of the program emphasizes the relationship between time spent on screen and unhealthy behaviors, and between exposure to violent messages and images and aggressive behaviors so that adults can reduce the impact on their children.
- **Discipline and Parenting Style:** This session helps parents understand that their parenting styles have an impact on children's behaviors. Distinctions are also made between punishment and discipline so that parents can respond effectively.
- **Discipline for Positive Behaviors:** This session teaches parents how to prevent challenging behaviors and how to use positive methods to discipline their children.
- **Take the ACT Program with You:** The final session encourages participants to use the learned tools at home and in the community" (Crime Solutions, 2013).

A study of the program found the following results:

- Parents who participated program reported a greater reduction in use of harsh discipline strategies compared to parents who did not participate.
- There were no differences between the two groups of parents in measures of nurturing at a three-month follow up.
- Parents in the treatment group reported more stress between the pretest and the posttest.
- Parents in the treatment group showed higher levels of "developmentally appropriate expectations (e.g., expecting children be able to feed themselves)" than the control group.

The program is rated Promising.

Stewards of Children®. Some programs address very specific problems. For example, *Stewards of Children®* "is an adult-focused prevention training program that centers on improving the awareness of the prevalence, consequences, and circumstances of child sexual abuse (CSA). The training aims to educate adults (primarily child care professionals) to prevent, recognize, and react responsibly to CSA. *Stewards of Children®* was developed by Darkness to Light (D2L), a national non-profit organization that seeks to protect children from sexual abuse" (Crime Solutions, 2013c).

Crime Solutions (2013c) writes: "One of the main goals of the program is primary prevention by teaching child care professionals specific strategies to prevent CSA from occurring the first time (for example, placing limits on or carefully structuring and monitoring one-on-one adult and child contact). Another goal of the training program is secondary prevention which involves teaching adults to identify when abuse is occurring and to respond to children appropriately, in order to keep them safe from future abuse and prevent potential subsequent abuse-related problems."

Conducted in person, via video, and on the web, individuals are encouraged to "respond to true-to-life scenarios in order to focus the training on their particular needs or concerns. The responses trigger alterations in the scenario options in order to create a personalized learning experience" (Crime Solutions, 2013c). A study of the program found no differences between participants in the treatment groups and participants in the control group on child sexual abuse attitudes at a three-month follow up, but a higher level of knowledge regarding the crime and a greater increase in child sexual abuse preventative behaviors (Rheingold, de Arellano, Saunders, & Kilpatrick, 2011). The program is rated Promising.

School Choice. A school-choice policy in Charlotte, North Carolina was evaluated for its impact on crime. After a court-ordered school busing arrangement to assure racial equity in public schools was overturned, a new system was initiated to give parents and their children choice about which school they wanted to attend. According to Crime Solutions (2015), "the school board voted for districtwide open enrollment, also known as School Choice, for the 2002–03 school year. This policy allowed "parents to choose the best public school for their child, regardless of whether the school is in the student's neighborhood. In Charlotte–Mecklenburg, students were guaranteed access to their neighborhood school, and those who wanted to attend a school other than the one in their neighborhood were able to do so by applying for open-enrollment admission. Parents could submit up to three choices of schools, and admission was subject to capacity for each grade level. Parents ranked their three choices of schools in an ordered list."

One scholar—Deming (2011)—compared students who were able to attend their first-choice school with students who did not. At a seven-year follow-up, Deming found that students who were able to attend the school

they chose had “better social costs (e.g., productivity, medical care, quality of life)” than students who did not. They also had “had lower sentence-weights (which weighs crimes by the expected punishment if convicted, while taking into account criminal intent)” (Crime Solutions, 2015c). They also spent less time incarcerated. Yet, there were no differences found in arrests or felony arrests for property, violent, and drug crimes (Deming, 2011). So, the policy is rated as Ineffective. This may reflect the reality that, though school choice is politically popular, there is no evidence that it results in positive outcomes related to crime.

Peer Group Connection (PGC). Still another program run in schools in at least 15 states including North Carolina is the Peer Group Connection (PGC) Program. Considered Ineffective by Crime Solutions (2015b), the program failed to impact student credits earned or graduation, but it did apparently positively impact school attachment. The program is “a high school transition program that targets ninth-grade students (at varying levels of risk for school-related problems) in low-income high schools. The goal of the intervention is to improve high school graduation rates among participating youths by improving their academic achievement, social–emotional skills, school attachment, and relationships with other students across grades” (Crime Solutions, 2015b).

Using 11th and 12th grade students in schools, the program targets younger students (i.e., freshmen) with sessions that “follow an interactive curriculum designed to foster attitudes and skills that will promote behaviors that reduce risk of dropout, with particular emphasis on promoting school attachment; achievement motivation; peer acceptance; social competence; and skills for anger management, decisionmaking, and goal setting” (Crime Solutions, 2015b).

Studies of the program found unimpressive results, including no difference in rates of graduation from high school between students who participated in the program and those who did not, no difference in decisionmaking skills, no difference in reported level of social competence, no difference in credits earned, no difference in rate of promotion to 10th grade, and no difference in growth mindset, but higher scores on school attachment. There were also no differences in disciplinary referrals or weighted GPA (Jenner, Lass, Walsh, Demby, Leger, & Falk, 2021; Johnson, Simon, & Mun, 2014). These results are consistent with findings that other programs featuring young people are change agents also tend to fail, including, for example, teen courts.

Sex Offender Registration. A sex offender registration policy run in 14 states, including North Carolina, is rated Ineffective by Crime Solutions (2015a). The policy “required the registration of people released after serving time for a sex offense, including name, address, sex crime committed, and a photograph.” An effort to make uniform the way released sex offenders were treated by states through the passage of a federal law, the policy established “databases containing information on individuals convicted of a criminal offense against a victim who is a minor. The information included a photograph, name, address, and the crime committed. The objective of the registration requirement was to help law enforcement investigations by providing access to information on known suspects in the community. The registries also allowed for background checks on potential employees and volunteers at child care centers. The goal was to prevent crimes against children” (Crime Solutions, 2015a). A study of the policy found no effect of the law on sex crimes, rates of sex-crime recidivism (including arrests and convictions), or location of sex crimes (Agan, 2011). This is another example of a politically popular program that does not appear to produce positive outcomes.

4. Discussion

This paper reviewed criminal & juvenile justice policies and programs in North Carolina that were rated by the Crime Solutions website. A total of 19 policies and programs were identified on the website that are specifically run in the state. There were two programs related to policing, zero to courts, four in corrections, three in juvenile justice, and ten other type programs. The review illustrates that only three programs and policies were rated Effective, yet ten were considered Promising, and another five were rated Ineffective.

Table 1 shows a summary of the policies and programs reviewed in the paper. The goal of the table is to summarize what was demonstrated to assist with understanding the 19 policies and program reviewed.

Table 1. A Summary of Policies and Programs Reviewed

Policing

- Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, Police Department’s Domestic Violence Unit (specialized police unit focused on domestic violence)
PROMISING—reduced recidivism
- High Point Drug Market Intervention (increased police presence and pulling levers approach)
EFFECTIVE—reduced violent crime

Corrections

- Changing Course
(interactive journal using cognitive behavioral approaches)
PROMISING—reduced recidivism
- Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Rearrest (STARR)
(teaches officers about a structured cognitive-behavioral supervision approach that seeks to address dynamic risk factors of clients by improving one-on-one officer-client interactions)
PROMISING—increased the use of reinforcement and disapproval during meetings, increased discussions about cognitions, peers, and impulsivity with clients, and increased the use of cognitive techniques, reduced failure rates initially but not after two years
- Post-Release Employment
(vocational training and reentry)
INEFFECTIVE—no differences in arrests, time to first arrest and re-incarceration, or wages
- National Guard ChalleNGe Program
(training and services to promote leadership, academic excellence, job skills, and community service)
INEFFECTIVE—increased high school diploma or GED and employment, but no differences in the number of arrests or in reported levels of delinquent behavior, illegal drug use, marijuana use, or psychological distress

Juvenile Justice

- Methodist Home for Children's Value-Based Therapeutic Environment (VBTE)
(educates children about alternatives to crime and delinquency)
PROMISING—no difference in new charges or new incarcerations, reduced convictions for any new offense
- Multisystemic Therapy (MST) for Sex Offenders
(uses MST to address sex offending)
PROMISING—reduced arrests for a wide variety of offenses including sex offenses
- Multisystemic Therapy (MST)
(uses MST and cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) to address family functioning and parental behavior to reduce child abuse, neglect, and external placement)
PROMISING—no differences found in abuse, improvements were seen in the development of external social support over a 16-month follow-up period, as were reductions witnessed in psychiatric distress, program children were less likely to have an out-of-home placement and saw improvements in functioning, including internalizing behaviors, posttraumatic stress disorders, child-reported dissociative symptoms, and total symptoms overall

Other

- Dating Violence Prevention
(school-based program aimed at reducing dating violence)
EFFECTIVE—reduced psychological, physical, and sexual abuse perpetration, and physical abuse victimization, no differences between groups on sexual abuse victimization
 - Media Ready
(educational campaign to teach kids to use critical thinking skills about drug advertisements)
PROMISING—no differences in intent to use alcohol but differences in intent to use tobacco
 - Media Detective
(educational campaign to teach kids to use critical thinking skills about drug advertisements)
PROMISING—reduced intent to use alcohol and intent to use tobacco
 - HOMEBUILDERS
(an in-home, intensive family preservation service and reunification program for families with children returning from or at risk of placement into foster care, group or residential treatment, psychiatric hospitals, or juvenile justice facilities)
EFFECTIVE—associated with fewer days in foster care before reuniting with their parents, families who participated in the program were more likely to be reunited, and the intensive family preservation
-

services reduced the rate of out-of-home placements

- **Abecedarian Project**
(a school-based early education intervention designed to improve cognitive and educational development among low-income children)
PROMISING—associated with higher reading scores, four-year college enrollment, and skilled employment, reduced the likelihood of becoming a teen parent and depression, no differences in drug use or incarceration, verbal or performance IQ, or math scores
 - **Adults and Children Together (ACT) Raising Safe Kids Program**
(provides education and resources to strengthen families and improve or change parenting skills and practices to prevent child maltreatment)
PROMISING—associated with reduction in use of harsh discipline strategies, no differences in measures of nurturing, parents in the treatment group reported more stress but also higher levels of developmentally appropriate expectations
 - **Stewards of Children®**
(sought to educate adults to increase the awareness of the prevalence, consequences, and circumstances of child sexual abuse)
PROMISING—no differences on child sexual abuse attitudes, higher level of knowledge regarding the crime and a greater increase in child sexual abuse preventative behaviors
 - **School Choice**
(gave parents and children choice to go to a specific school)
INEFFECTIVE—children who chose their own schools had better social costs and lower sentence-weights, spent less time incarcerated, no differences found in arrests or felony arrests for property, violent, and drug crimes
 - **Peer Group Connection (PGC)**
(school-based program aiming to improve high school graduation rates among participating youths by improving their academic achievement, social-emotional skills, school attachment, and relationships with other students across grades)
INEFFECTIVE—failed to impact student credits earned or graduation, positively impacted school attachment
 - **Sex Offender Registration**
(requires sex offenders to register after serving time for a sex offense)
INEFFECTIVE—no effects seen on sex crime recidivism
-

It is important to point out that, of course, there are far more policies and program in criminal & juvenile justice in the state that do not appear on the Crime Solutions website. This is a limitation of this analysis. Yet, some programs that do exist in North Carolina are reviewed on the website more generally. One example pertains to courts, and since no courts policies or programs from North Carolina appear on the Crime Solutions website, it is useful to examine one policy here—drug courts. According to the North Carolina Judicial Branch (2026a), 65 problem-solving courts serve more than 30 counties in the state; these include drug courts.

The Multisite Adult Drug Court Evaluation (MADCE) examined 23 drug courts in eight states, including North Carolina. MADCE, a 6-year, NIJ-funded national evaluation of the impact of adult drug courts, attempted to address four primary questions, including how do drug courts work?; for whom do drug courts work best?; do drug courts help participants reduce drug use, criminal activity, and other issues related to their drug use?; and do drug courts generate cost savings?

Its components included those typical of drug courts, including requiring participants to undergo random drug tests, to appear in court before a judge regularly, to adhere to sanctions after committing any violation, and also to receive needed treatment in order to obtain and maintain sobriety (Crime Solutions, 2012a).

A study of these drug court programs found the following positive results:

- The treatment group was less likely than a comparison group at an 18-month follow-up to report being involved in criminal activity.
- The treatment group also had less self-reported drug use and positive oral swab tests.
- Yet, there were no differences in incarceration, mental health outcomes, homelessness, socioeconomic status, or family support (Rossman, Rempel, Roman, Zweig, Lindquist, Green, Downey, Yahner, Bhati, & Farole Jr., 2011).

The program is rated as Promising.

According to Rossman et al. (2011), the following specific results were found for the MADCE:

- **Substance Use:** Drug courts produce significant reductions in drug relapse. Drug court participants were significantly less likely than the comparison group to report using any drugs (56 vs. 76 percent) in the year prior to the 18-month interview, and also less likely to report using “serious” drugs (41 vs. 58 percent), which omit marijuana and “light” alcohol use (fewer than four drinks per day for women or less than five drinks per day for men)...drug court participants were significantly less likely to report using any drugs at both the six- and 18-month follow-up interviews. On the 18-month oral fluids drug test, significantly fewer drug court participants tested positive for illegal drugs (29 vs. 46 percent). Further, among those who tested positive or self-reported using drugs, drug court participants used drugs less frequently than the comparison group.
- **Crime:** Drug courts produce significant reductions in criminal behavior. Drug court participants were significantly less likely than the comparison group to report committing crimes (40 vs. 53 percent) in the year prior to the 18-month interview...drug court participants were significantly less likely to report committing any crime at both the six- and 18-month follow-up interviews. Also, of those who reported criminal activity at the 18-month follow-up, drug court participants reported about half as many criminal acts (43.0 vs. 88.2), on average, in the year prior. Among specific offenses, drug court participation reduced drug possession, drug sales offenses, driving while intoxicated, and property-related crime. Finally, drug courts reduced the probability of an official re-arrest over 24 months (52 vs. 62 percent), but this last effect was not statistically significant.
- **Other Psychosocial Outcomes:** Drug court participants experience select benefits in other areas of their lives besides drug use and criminal behavior. At 18 months, drug court participants were significantly less likely than comparison offenders to report a need for employment, educational, and financial services, suggesting that drug court participation addressed those needs. Further, drug court participants reported significantly less family conflict than comparison offenders. However, there were only modest, nonsignificant differences in 18-month employment rates, income, and family emotional support; and the samples did not differ in reported symptoms of depression or in experiencing homelessness.
- **Durability of the Drug Court Impact:** With respect to substance use and crime, improved outcomes at the 6-month interviews were nearly identical to improvements reported at the 18-month interviews, which includes at least some post-program time for 72 percent of the drug court sample. For instance, drug court participants were significantly less likely to report drug use in the prior six months (41 percent) than the comparison group (62 percent), a gap that was then largely sustained in the six months prior to the subsequent 18-month interview (46 vs. 68 percent)."

Interestingly, Rossman et al. (2011) add that “nearly all categories of offenders benefit comparably from the drug court intervention, suggesting that widespread drug court policies to restrict eligibility to a narrow subpopulation may be counterproductive,” noting that “there were not any subgroup based differences in the rate of positive drug tests, and only 3 of 17 subgroups self reported less drug use at 18 months” (p. 7). Additionally, “those reporting more frequent drug use at baseline showed a particularly large reduction in drug use at the 18-month follow-up. Concerning criminal behavior, offenders with violent histories showed a greater reduction in crime than others at follow-up” (Rossman et al., 2011, p. 7). This is an important finding considering that many drug courts in the United States do not allow violent offenders to participate (Center for Justice Innovation, 2016). The Center for Justice Innovation (2016) also noted smaller reductions in recidivism and drug use in participants with mental health disorders or those whose primary drug of choice was marijuana.

The good news from drug court evaluations such as this one is that these programs are working in North Carolina. Evidence from the Crime Solutions website confirms this.

Future research should identify and evaluate other policies and programs used in North Carolina to address criminal & delinquent behaviors. This author will keep an eye on the Crime Solutions website for further evaluations of policies and programs in the state. Further, other authors should use the Crime Solutions website in order to evaluate programs and policies within additional states.

References

- Agan, A. (2011). Sex offender registries: Fear without function?. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 54(1), 207-39.
- Bourdin, C. M., Schaeffer, C. M., & Heiblum, N. (2009). A randomized clinical trial of multisystemic therapy with juvenile sexual offenders: Effects on youth social ecology and criminal activity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(1), 26-37. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013035>
- Campbell, F., Ramey, C., Pungello, E., Sparling, J., & Miller-Johnson, S. (2002). Early childhood education: Young adult outcomes from the Abecedarian Project. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(1), 42-57. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532480xads0601_05
- Center for Justice Innovation. (2016). Problem-solving courts: An evidence review. Retrieved from <https://justiceinnovation.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2019-03/problem-solving-courts-an-evidence-review.pdf>
- Corsaro, N., Hunt, E., Hipple, N., & McGarrell, E. (2012). The impact of drug market pulling levers policing on neighborhood violence: An evaluation of the High Point Drug Market Intervention. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 11(2), 167-199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2012.00796.x>
- Crime Solutions. (2011b). Program profile: Multisystemic Therapy for Child Abuse and Neglect (MST-CAN). Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/multisystemic-therapy-child-abuse-and-neglect-mst-can#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2011d). Program profile: Safe Dates. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/safe-dates>
- Crime Solutions. (2012c). Program profile: Media Detective. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/media-detective#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2012d). Program profile: Media Ready. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/media-ready#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2012f). Program profile: Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Rearrest (STARR). Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/staff-training-aimed-reducing-rearrest-starr>
- Crime Solutions. (2013a). Program profile: Adults and Children Together (ACT) Raising Safe Kids Program. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/adults-and-children-together-act-raising-safe-kids-program#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2013b). Program profile: Changing Course. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/changing-course>
- Crime Solutions. (2013c). Program profile: Stewards of Children®. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/stewards-children#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2014b). Program profile: National Guard ChalleNGe Program. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/national-guard-challenge-program#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2015a). Program profile: Implementation of federal sex-offender registry requirements in 14 states. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/implementation-federal-sex-offender-registry-requirements-14-states#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2015b). Program profile: Peer Group Connection (PGC) program. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/peer-group-connection-pgc-program#7-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2015c). Program profile: Public school choice lottery (Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C., School District). Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/public-school-choice-lottery-charlotte-mecklenburg-nc-school-district#1-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2016). Program profile: Abecedarian Project. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/abecedarian-project#5-0>
- Crime Solutions. (2017). Program profile: North Carolina Vocational Delivery System. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/north-carolina-vocational-delivery-system>
- Crime Solutions. (2026). Reliable research. Real results. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/>
- Crime Solutions. (2011a). Program profile: Charlotte-Mecklenburg (N.C.) Police Department Domestic Violence Unit. Retrieved from

- <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/charlotte-mecklenburg-nc-police-department-domestic-violence-unit>
- Crime Solutions. (2011c). Program profile: Multisystemic Therapy for youth with problem sexual behaviors (MST-PSB). Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/multisystemic-therapy-youth-problem-sexual-behaviors-mst-psb>
- Crime Solutions. (2012a). Program profile: Adult treatment drug courts (multi-site). Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/adult-treatment-drug-courts-multi-site>
- Crime Solutions. (2012b). Program profile: HOMEBUILDERS. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/homebuilders>
- Crime Solutions. (2012e). Program Profile: Methodist home for children's Value-Based Therapeutic Environment (VBTE) Model. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/methodist-home-childrens-value-based-therapeutic-environment-vbte-model>
- Crime Solutions. (2014a). Program profile: High Point Drug Market Intervention. Retrieved from <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/high-point-drug-market-intervention>
- Deming, D. (2011). Better schools, less crime?. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126, 2063-2115.
- Exum, L., Hartman, J., Friday, P., & Lord, V. (2014). Policing domestic violence in the post-SARPERa: The impact of a domestic violence police unit. *Crime & Delinquency*, 60(7), 999-1032. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128710382345>
- Fraser, M., Walton, W., Lewis, R., Pecora, P., & Walton, W. (1996). An experiment in family reunification: Correlates of outcomes at 1-year follow-up. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 18, 335-361. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-7409\(96\)00009-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-7409(96)00009-6)
- Jenner, E., Lass, K., Walsh, S., Demby, H., Leger, R., & Falk, G. (2021). Effects of cross-age peer mentoring program within a randomized control trial. *New Orleans, La.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2022.2130119>
- Johnson, V., Simon, P., & Mun, E. (2014). A peer-led high school transition program increases graduation rates among Latino males. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 107(3), 186-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2013.788991>
- Kirk, R., & Griffith, D. (2003). Intensive family preservation services: Demonstrating placement prevention using event history analysis. *Social Work Research*, 28, 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/28.1.5>
- Kupersmidt, J., Scull, T., & Benson, J. (2012). Improving media message interpretation processing skills to promote healthy decision-making about substance use: The effects of the middle school Media Ready curriculum. *Journal of Health Communications*, 17(5), 546-563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2011.635769>
- Kupersmidt, J., Scull, T., & Austin, E. (2010). Media literacy education for elementary school substance use prevention: Study of Media Detective. *Pediatrics*, 126, 525-31. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2010-0068>
- Lattimore, P., Witte, A., & Baker, J. (1987). Sandhills Vocational Delivery System Experiment: An examination of correctional program implementation and effectiveness. *North Carolina State University: Center for Urban Affairs, Community Services*. <https://doi.org/10.3886/icpsr09224.v1>
- Lowenkamp, C., Holsinger, A., Robinson, C., & Alexander, M. (2014). Diminishing or durable treatment effects of STARR? A research note on 24-month re-arrest rates. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 37(2), 275-83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648x.2012.753849>
- McLaughlin, A., Campbell, F., Pungello, E., & Skinner, M. (2007). Depressive symptoms in young adults: The influences of the early home environment and early educational child care. *Child Development*, 78(3), 746-756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01030.x>
- Millenky, M., Bloom, D., Muller-Ravett, S., & Broadus, J. (2011). *Staying on course: Three-year results of the National Guard Youth Challenge evaluation*. New York: MDRC.
- North Carolina Department of Adult Correction. (2026). Correctional officers. Retrieved from <https://www.dac.nc.gov/correctional-officers>
- North Carolina Department of Public Safety. (2026). Quick Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.ncdps.gov/our-organization/juvenile-justice/datastatisticsreports/quick-facts>

- North Carolina Judicial Branch. (2026). Adult treatment court. Retrieved from <https://www.nccourts.gov/courts/recovery-courts/adult-treatment-court>
- North Carolina Judicial Branch. (2026). Careers. Retrieved from <https://www.nccourts.gov/about/about-judicial-branch/careers>
- Portwood, S., Lambert, R., Abrams, L., & Nelson, E. (2011). An evaluation of the Adults and Children Together (ACT) Against Violence Parents Raising Safe Kids program. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 32(3/4), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-011-0249-5>
- Proctor, S., Hoffman, N., & Allison, S. (2012). The effectiveness of interactive journaling in reducing recidivism among substance-dependent jail inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56(2), 317-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x11399274>
- Rheingold, A., de Arellano, M., Saunders, B., & Kilpatrick, D. (2011). Child sexual abuse Training for child care professionals: A multi-site randomized controlled trial of stewards of children. *Charleston, S.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-014-0499-6>
- Robinson, C., VanBenschoten, S., Alexander, M., & Lowenkamp, C. (2011). A random (almost) study of Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Rearrest (STARR): Reducing recidivism through intentional design. *Federal Probation*, 75(2), 57-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2066220320976101>
- Robinson, M. (2026). *What works to reduce crime: A policy guide*. Boston, MA: Cengage. <https://doi.org/10.46692/9781847425119.007>
- Rossman, S., Rempel, M., Roman, J., Zweig, J., Lindquist, C., Green, M., ... Farole Jr., D. (2011). *The multisite adult drug court evaluation: The impact of drug courts. Final report* (Vol. 4). Urban Institute.
- Strom, K., Cowell, A., Dawes, D., Hawkins, S., Moore, M., Wedehase, B., & Steffey, D. (2010). Evaluation of the Methodist Home for Children's Value-Based Therapeutic Environment Model: Final report. *RTI International*.
- Swenson, C., Schaeffer, C., Henggeler, S., Faldowski, R., & Mayhew, A. (2010). Multisystemic therapy for child abuse and neglect: A randomized effectiveness trial. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(4), 497-507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020324>
- World Population Review. (2026). Police officers by state 2026. Retrieved from <https://worldpopulationreview.com/state-rankings/police-officers-by-state>

Copyrights

The journal retains exclusive first publication rights to this original, unpublished manuscript, which remains the authors' intellectual property. As an open-access journal, it permits non-commercial sharing with attribution under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), complying with COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) guidelines. All content is archived in public repositories to ensure transparency and accessibility.