AMENDED
BIANNUAL REPORT
MARCH 15, 2011

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA REHABILITATION OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS

Bruce Monfross, Inspector General (A) and Chair

Matthew Cate, Secretary, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Debra Jones, Administrator, Adult Education Programs (Designee for Tom Torlakson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction)

José Millan (Designee for Jack Scott, Chancellor, California Community Colleges)

Director (vacant), California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs

Director (vacant), Department of Mental Health

Susan Turner, Professor, University of California, Irvine (Appointed by the President of the University of California)

Bruce L. Bikle, Professor, California State University, Sacramento (Appointed by the Chancellor of the California State University)

Gary R. Stanton, Sheriff, County of Solano (Appointed by the Governor)

Wendy Still, Chief Adult Probation Officer, City and County of San Francisco (Appointed by the Senate President pro Tempore)

William Arroyo, Regional Medical Director, Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (Appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly)

PREFACE

Pursuant to Penal Code section 6141, the California Rehabilitation Oversight Board (C-ROB or the board) is mandated to regularly examine and report biannually to the Governor and the Legislature regarding rehabilitative programming provided to inmates and parolees by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (the department).

C-ROB held its first meeting on June 19, 2007.

According to statute, C-ROB must submit reports on March 15 and September 15 to the Governor and the Legislature. These biannual reports must minimally include findings on:

- ✓ Effectiveness of treatment efforts
- ✓ Rehabilitation needs of offenders
- ✓ Gaps in rehabilitation services
- ✓ Levels of offender participation and success

As required by statute, this report uses the findings and recommendations published by the Expert Panel on Adult Offender and Recidivism Reduction Programs. In addition, this report reflects information that the department provided during public hearings as well as supplemental materials that it provided directly to C-ROB.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the California Rehabilitation Oversight Board's (C-ROB) eighth biannual report, which examines the progress the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (department) made in implementing and providing rehabilitative programming between July and December 2010.

In 2008 the department developed a comprehensive Master Work Plan for Rehabilitative Programming that detailed an exhaustive list of steps necessary for fully implementing the California Logic Model throughout the correctional system. The third track of the work plan detailed how the department planned to roll out the California Logic Model statewide once it was implemented, tested, and re-tooled through a demonstration project at California State Prison, Solano. Then in fiscal year (FY) 2009/2010—just as the department had transitioned from more than two years of intense planning to implementation of the Solano demonstration project—the Administration proposed and the Legislature approved a $250 million budget cut to Adult Programs in response to an overall departmental budget reduction. It is important to note that national research has produced evidence that for every $1.00 invested in rehabilitative programming for offenders at least $2.50 is saved in correctional costs. The Expert Panel produced the evidence that supported the cost effectiveness of rehabilitative programming; however, the Administration chose to propose a budget reduction decreasing rehabilitative programming opportunities for inmates and thereby potentially decreasing cost avoidance from future years.

To stay within the revised budget, meet the Budget Act reduction guidelines, and maintain the principles of the California Logic Model, the department:

- developed five new academic models and a literacy program that adjusted the number of hours each week an inmate spent in class while maximizing the number of inmates with access to academic education programs;

- reduced its vocational programs by almost 50 percent retaining only those programs that are industry certified, market driven based on employment development outlook data, have a minimum starting pay of $15 an hour, and can be completed within 12 months; and

- reduced in-prison substance abuse treatment to 90 days at nine male and three female institutions. Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility continues to offer its six-month trauma/gender responsive treatment program.

In its last report, the board stated a concern about whether the 90-day substance abuse treatment model is sufficient for adults with long histories of addiction. Because in-prison programs are no longer available at most institutions, the board also raised a concern about whether the department could place inmates with substance abuse programming needs at one of the 12 institutions and the one Community Care Facility providing services given the challenges associated with population movement, the limited number of substance abuse slots, frequent lockdowns, and prison overcrowding. The initial data on in-prison enrollment, utilization, and

program completions are positive indicators for improved outcomes from the new substance abuse models.

During 2010, department educational staff, other stakeholders, and the board raised many concerns about the academic and vocational education programming, including teacher layoffs, increased inmate-to-teacher ratios, reduced instructional hours and teacher contact hours, administrative paperwork, student turnover, wrongly assigned students, inmate homework, and elimination of some vocational education programs. As a result of the input, the department reassessed its academic education models in late Spring 2010 and determined it could adjust the inmate-to-teacher ratios, reduce the number of teaching assistant positions, and add literacy coordinators at each prison while still maintaining program integrity and cost savings. The department was able to reestablish and add teaching positions to what now are called the new academic education models and reduced the inmate-to-teacher ratios by model. Despite these changes, the concerns remained, among them that the new models are loosely built on evidence-based principles and still need to be proven as effective programs. Without expanding resources for rehabilitative programming, the department will be unable to address these concerns and provide rehabilitative programming to all inmates as envisioned by the California Logic Model.

To substantiate the teacher concerns, SEIU Local 1000 conducted an academic education models survey in October and November 2010. The 10-question survey was distributed to approximately 350 teachers assigned to the new academic education models, and 127 teachers responded. The department's Academic Education Leadership Council—which first met in September 2010 to begin its charge to assess and recommend revisions to the new academic education models—also conducted an academic education teacher survey about the new models in December 2010. Over 100 academic teachers responded to the nine-question survey.

Both the Academic Leadership Council and the SEIU academic education teacher survey results corroborated the design and implementation issues academic teachers have raised during the last year. The department has committed to reexamine the underpinnings of the models and, in conjunction with the council and labor union recommendations for improvement, is working on changes to improve functionality and efficiency and address the concerns. One aspect of the new models to which teachers have responded positively is the reduction of programming hours in a day from six and half hours to three hours, and there are no plans to alter this aspect of the service delivery system. The department anticipates implementing improvements to the academic education models by the September 2011 biannual report, and the board will assess at that time whether the implemented changes have been successful in addressing the teachers' major concerns.

In the past, the department has been criticized for making programming changes without the input from those staff responsible for implementation. For the past year, the department has consistently demonstrated its commitment to improve the service delivery system by engaging in active dialogue with academic and vocational education staff through the Academic Education and Career Technical Education leadership councils and labor union discussions, which signals a fundamental, positive shift in the way the department communicates with the institution educators and makes policy decisions. The board will continue to monitor this approach.

For the last 12 months, the department implemented its new rehabilitative programming service delivery system across all institutions without the benefit of testing and evaluating it through a demonstration project as was originally planned. This challenge put an added strain on a system already burdened with change because making any adjustments involves all institutions, staff, and inmates and therefore is more complicated to communicate, implement, monitor and evaluate. Department teaching, treatment, headquarters, and correctional staff should be recognized for the effort that has gone into the planning and implementation of the system-wide changes that originated with the FY 2009/2010 budget cut. However, the board believes there is still significant improvement needed to meet the rehabilitative goals of Assembly Bill 900.

The Board remains concerned about the capacity of the department to deliver the rehabilitation programming envisioned by the Logic Model. That capacity is complicated by the current budget plans, which suggest that a significant number of non-serious, non-violent offenders will remain in county supervision, rather than be sent to prison. As noted in the report, the inmates projected to remain in their counties are essentially the ones targeted by the Logic Model for in-prison and parole programming.

Keeping inmates in their home counties can improve offender outcomes if programs are designed to address the risks and needs of the inmates. Evidence indicates that family support and community linkages improve rehabilitative outcomes when inmates are released from serving their sentences. A stronger connection and community linkage can be achieved when inmates serve their time locally. What is not made clear in the current realignment proposal is how the funding necessary for rehabilitative programming will "follow" these inmates and provide the basis for a successful parole as anticipated by AB 900 and the Logic Model. Further, the board sees no language in the budget proposal which indicates that the State will retain the operational authority for the development, implementation, and funding of the necessary rehabilitative programs to ensure the best chance of success in reducing recidivism.

For some time, department plans to provide rehabilitative programming have been hampered by lack of funding. What should the people of California expect from the realignment proposal that would transfer these inmates and their programmatic needs to counties, which are already struggling with their budgets?

Rehabilitation programming and the attendant reduction in parole recidivism rates will require significant funding outlays that C-ROB cannot envision the State providing based on historical funding patterns for rehabilitative programming. As a board, we have been consistent from the start: the provision of rehabilitative programming for the thousands of California inmates will require significant political will and investment of scarce resources. C-ROB would hope to see adequate funding in the state budget for the implementation of AB 900 rehabilitative programming, whether it is provided by the department, the counties, or both.

BACKGROUND

C-ROB AND ASSEMBLY BILL 900

The California Rehabilitation Oversight Board was established by Assembly Bill (AB) 900, the Public Safety and Offender Rehabilitation Services Act of 2007.[1] C-ROB is a multidisciplinary public board with members from various state and local entities. Pursuant to Penal Code section 6141, C-ROB is mandated to examine and report on March 15 and September 15 to the Governor and the Legislature on rehabilitative programming provided by the department to the inmates and parolees under its supervision. The biannual C-ROB reports must minimally include findings on the effectiveness of treatment efforts, the rehabilitations needs of offenders, gaps in rehabilitation services, and levels of offender participation and success. The board is also required to make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature with respect to modification, additions, and eliminations of rehabilitation and treatment programs by the department and, in doing its work, use the findings and recommendations published by the Expert Panel on Adult Offender and Recidivism Reduction Programs.

Assembly Bill 900 was enacted to address the serious problem of overcrowding in California's prisons and to improve rehabilitative outcomes among California's inmates and parolees. It gave the department the authority and funding to construct and renovate up to 40,000 state prison beds and funding for approximately 13,000 county jail beds. Assembly Bill 900 requires, however, that any new beds constructed must be associated with full rehabilitative programming.[2] Moreover, AB 900 provides funding in two phases: Phase I funding allowed for immediate bed expansion and requires the department to meet certain benchmarks, some of which are related to rehabilitative programming, before the department can obtain the second phase funding.[3] Specifically, AB 900, as set forth in Penal Code section 7021, states that phase II of the construction funding (as outlined in section 15819.41 of the Government Code) may not be released until a three-member panel, composed of the State Auditor, the Inspector General, and an appointee of the Judicial Council of California, verifies that all 13 benchmarks, which are outlined in paragraphs 1 to 13 of Penal Code section 7021, have been met.

There is an assumption by some that the board's mandate is to oversee the implementation of AB 900. However, this is not the case. The board is mandated to examine and report on rehabilitative programming and the implementation of an effective treatment model throughout the department, including programming provided to inmates and parolees, not just rehabilitation programming associated with the construction of new inmate beds.

In performing its duties, C-ROB is required by statute to use the work of the Expert Panel on Adult Offender and Recidivism Reduction Programs.[4] The department created the Expert Panel

---

[1] Assembly Bill 900 (Solorio), Chapter 7, Statutes 2007.

[2] Government Code section 15819.40 (AB 900) mandates that "any new beds constructed pursuant to this section shall be supported by rehabilitative programming for inmates, including, but not limited to, education, vocational programs, substance abuse treatment programs, employment programs, and pre-release planning."

[3] Penal Code section 7021 (AB 900), paragraphs 1 to 13.

[4] Specifically, Penal Code section 6141 requires: "In performing its duties, the board shall use the work products developed for Corrections as a result of the provisions of the 2006 Budget Act, including Provision 18 of Item 5225-001-0001."

in response to authorization language placed in the Budget Act of 2006-07. The Legislature directed the department to contract with correctional program experts to assess California's adult prison and parole programs designed to reduce recidivism.

In addition, the department asked the Expert Panel to provide it with recommendations for improving the programming in California's prison and parole system. The Expert Panel published a report in June 2007, entitled, *A Roadmap for Effective Offender Programming in California* (Expert Panel Report). The department adopted the recommendations of the Expert Panel Report, except for the recommendation and discussion on reducing the offender population. Inmate population reduction is before the Three-Judge Court, which has ordered a plan from the department that would reduce its institution population. This order currently is stayed pending the state's appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

The Expert Panel Report stresses that the well established means of program provision called "Evidence-Based Programming" is essential to the success of these suggested programs. Briefly, evidence-based programming assumes that programs are appropriate to the needs of the offender, that the programs are well conceived, administered and staffed, and that they are continuously evaluated for effectiveness. Not all substance abuse programs, or work preparation programs are alike. Evidence-based programming allows agencies to select the most appropriate and potentially effective programs to meet the needs of offenders under their supervision.

The Expert Panel identified eight evidence-based principles and practices collectively called the California Logic Model. The California Logic Model shows what effective rehabilitation programming would look like if California implemented the Expert Panel's recommendations. The California Logic Model provides the framework for effective rehabilitation programming as an offender moves through the state correctional system.

The eight basic components of the California Logic Model include:

- **Assess high risk**. Target offenders who pose the highest risk to reoffend.

- **Assess needs**. Identify offender's criminogenic needs/dynamic risk factors.

- **Develop behavior management plans**. Utilize assessment results to develop an individualized case plan.

- **Deliver programs**. Deliver cognitive behavioral programs, offering varying levels of duration and intensity.

- **Measure progress**. Periodically evaluate progress, update treatment plans, measure treatment gains, and determine appropriateness for program completion.

- **Prep for reentry**. Develop a formal reentry plan prior to program completion to ensure a continuum of care.

- **Reintegrate**. Provide aftercare through collaboration with community providers.

- **Follow up**. Track offenders and collect outcome data.

In May 2007, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger created two strike teams to assist the department in implementing AB 900. The Facilities Strike Team focused on prison construction issues and the Rehabilitation Strike Team focused on developing and implementing prison and parole programs. The Rehabilitation Strike Team issued a final report in December 2007, entitled, *Meeting the Challenges of Rehabilitation in California's Prison and Parole System* (the Strike Team Report). The report provides a four-pronged strategy for improving rehabilitative programs in the California correctional system:

- Develop an Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Plan (OARP) designed to assess inmates' needs at intake and direct inmates to appropriate rehabilitation programs and services in prison and on parole;

- Identify rehabilitation-oriented training curriculum for correctional and rehabilitation staff, and a method of delivering that curriculum;

- Install a Prison to Employment Program designed to facilitate offenders' successful employment after release; and,

- Implement parole reform based on the structural possibility of earned discharge from parole or "banked" caseloads, and guided by a new risk assessment tool and a parole violation decision-making matrix.

The department developed a comprehensive Master Work Plan for Rehabilitative Programming that detailed an exhaustive list of steps necessary for fully implementing the California Logic Model throughout the correctional system. The Master Work Plan provided the department with three tracks for implementing the California Logic Model.

The first track was aimed at improving utilization of existing programs. The second track established a demonstration project to implement the full scope of the California Logic Model using a selected inmate population in Northern California, as recommended by the Rehabilitation Strike Team. The department chose California State Prison, Solano as the site for the demonstration project. As noted in the October 2007 Rehabilitation Strike Team Report, at least one core program in each of the six major offender programming areas needed to be included in the demonstration project. These programming areas, which were defined in the Expert Panel Report, are:

- Academic, vocational, and financial;

- Alcohol and other drug;

- Aggression, hostility, anger, and violence;

- Criminal thinking, behaviors, and associations;

- Family, marital, and relationships; and

- Sex offending

The third track detailed how the department planned to roll out the California Logic Model statewide once it was implemented, tested, and re-tooled through the Solano demonstration project. The three tracks were not sequential: there were tasks associated with each track that the department planned to pursue simultaneously.

PREPARING THIS REPORT

The scope of this report is based primarily on information received up through the board's meeting on January 12, 2011. This report includes appendices that display various programming data. Because of the lag time between the end of a reporting period and when the department is able to provide data to the board, the data in the appendices is from April 2010 through September 2010.

THE EXPERT PANEL REPORT

OVERARCHING RECOMMENDATIONS
"Reduce overcrowding in its prison facilities and parole offices."

"Enact legislation to expand its system of positive reinforcements for offenders who successfully complete their rehabilitation program requirements, comply with institutional rules in prison, and fulfill their parole obligations in the community."

Both of these recommendations were partially addressed with the passage of Senate Bill (SB) X3 18, which took effect January 25, 2010. The Budget Act and accompanying trailer bills sought to meet the department's $1.2 billion budget reduction through a number of population reduction tactics:

- Granting non-revocable parole to eligible inmates;
- Making credits start post-sentence and not at prison arrival;
- Granting up to six weeks of credit for completing specific rehabilitative programs;
- Updating property crime thresholds;
- Developing community corrections programs;
- Soliciting requests for proposals for seven reentry court sites; and
- Codifying the Parole Violation Decision Making Instrument.

These provisions are expected to reduce the prison population and also reduce the number of parolees a parole agent must supervise.

The following data is preliminary but provides an estimate of the amount of milestone credit weeks earned during the first year of the program (January 25, 2010 to January 25, 2011).

Category	Milestone Credits in Weeks Earned
Substance Abuse	22,279
Academic	19,602
Vocational	9,057
College	4,305
Camp Firefighters	1,452
Out-of-State[5]	900
Core Programs	711
Institution Firefighters	242
Prison Industry Authority	202
Total Weeks of Credit Earned	58,750

---

[5] Milestones unique to out-of-state inmates; out-of-state inmates also awarded milestones in other main categories.

Due to staffing and data limitations, the department is unable at this time to provide sufficient detail on the average daily population and fiscal savings associated with the milestone credits. It is critical that the department provide the cost savings associated with milestone credits so that the board and Legislature can assess the return on investment for the department's rehabilitative programming.

Determining inmate eligibility for milestone credits is a labor intensive manual process involving teachers, inmate assignment offices, and case records. For the next report, the department hopes to be able to provide:

- credit earnings for program completions by benchmark and institution;

- the number of Non-Revocable Parole eligible inmates who paroled early because of milestone completion credits; and

- the learning gains associated with the milestone completions.

CALIFORNIA LOGIC MODEL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

This section of the report describes the progress the department made during the reporting period in implementing the California Logic Model.

Assess High Risk

The department continued to use the California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) tool to assess an inmate's risk to reoffend. Data provided by the department indicates that as of January 2011, 95.9 percent of inmates and 97 percent of parolees have CSRA scores. Those figures have increased from June 2010 by 10.9 percent and two percent respectively.[6]

Assess Needs

The department adopted the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) as the needs assessment tool to determine offender rehabilitation treatment programming needs. As of January 2011:

- 79,507 Core COMPAS assessments have been completed for incoming inmates;

- 32,473 inmates (20 percent) have a Core COMPAS; and

- 79,429 parolees (65.4 percent) have a Reentry COMPAS.

Core COMPAS training for all General Population institution counselors began in January 2011 and training is scheduled to be completed by April 2011. Each institution will begin to conduct the Core COMPAS assessments in the next reporting period. It is critical that the institutional classification committees begin to consistently use completed COMPAS assessments for programming decisions.

In its September 2010 report, the board stated a concern about inmates without COMPAS assessments receiving last priority for academic education programming. At the September 2010 board meeting, the department stated that it uses Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) scores for placement of inmates in academic programming and that lack of a COMPAS assessment should not affect an inmate's priority placement in programming. During the last six months, no one has reported to the board that lack of COMPAS scores has been a barrier to enrollment.

---

[6] An inmate may not have an automated CSRA score for a variety of reasons: county law enforcement data may have errors; the criminal investigation and identification (CII) number is inaccurate; or the time lag in data transfer prevented the department from having the CII at the time the inmate is at the Reception Center.

COMPAS assessments across all institutions, including the out-of-state facilities indicates that:

- 56.98 percent of inmates have a moderate-to-high need in the academic/vocational domain, and

- 64.7 percent of inmates have a moderate-to-high need in the substance abuse domain.

The percent of out-of-state inmates with moderate/high needs in select COMPAS domains remains roughly comparable to the percent of the total CDCR population (including the out-of-state offenders) with moderate/high needs.

Moderate/High Need	Academic/ Vocational			Substance Abuse			Anger			Criminal Thinking			Family Criminality		
	7/09	6/10	1/11	7/09	6/10	1/11	7/09	6/10	1/11	7/09	6/10	1/11	7/09	6/10	1/11
Out-of-State	n/a	54.6%	57.0%	n/a	60.3%	57.4%	n/a	47.5%	53.5%	n/a	55.5%	51.1%	n/a	33.3%	32.8%
All Institutions*	53.9%	56.0%	56.9%	67.5%	65.6%	64.7%	44.1%	47.2%	50.5%	50.4%	49.4%	47.6%	35.9%	34.8%	33.0%
Parole[7]	54.0%	54.3%	54.8%	70.5%	64.7%	63.3%	40.0%	42.2%	44.5%	48.8%	48.6%	48.1%	36.0%	36.7%	36.2%

*The *All Institutions* category includes data from the out-of-state facilities. See Appendices A2 and A3.

As the board stated in the September 2010 biannual report, once rehabilitative programming functions at full operational capacity and reaches a maintenance phase with stable service delivery, the board would expect reductions in the percentage of inmates with moderate/high needs when they are reassessed before they parole. C-ROB will be looking for long-term longitudinal COMPAS data on offenders to assess the impact of rehabilitative programs on the recidivism of parolees.

Develop a Case Plan

Case planning affects how the department prioritizes program enrollment for inmates, many with multiple needs. Because case management is a resource-driven endeavor, the department has had to take a different approach to case management than originally planned. While the department is still developing the revised case management process, it is managing cases by assessing inmates' needs at reception centers and using a new assignment process with priority placements (risk, need, time left to serve), Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) scores, and the inmates' classification levels to make program placements. This year, the department will begin using or increasing the use of COMPAS assessments as part of program assignments once the general population institutions have implemented COMPAS. The department is developing implementation plans for a more integrated case management process that it plans to test at six pilot institutions in January 2012.

The Board is concerned that the Governor's January 2011 proposed budget calling for inmates to be shifted from state to county supervision could well make the case management planning under

---

[7] Parole data includes an additional two COMPAS domains: Family Support (68.0% moderate/high need) and Sex Offending (66.5% moderate/high need). See Appendix A3.

development by the Department and due for piloting in January 2012 out of step with action taken by the Legislature. The Board strongly suggests that case management of the inmate population be a statewide coordinated effort that:

- facilitates the delivery of programs to offenders whether they are in county or state institutions; and

- provides supervision in a carefully planned manner that maximizes the opportunity for offenders to get the programming they need when they need it, and also provides continuity in both pre-release programming and preparation and post-incarceration supervision.

The management of felony offenders is a state responsibility. Assigning inmates to county supervision and programs has much to be said for it, but at the same time, it is critical that the state's interest in an overall increase in parole success and reduction of the recidivism rates envisioned by the Logic Model be adequately coordinated and funded to maximize the desired outcomes.

At a minimum, there needs to be a carefully drawn plan to provide for county/state cooperation in the areas of offender classification and needs assessment, program planning and development, program content, program assessment and evaluation as well as a coordinated plan for post-incarceration supervision (parole). It should go without saying that adequate funding of case management will be critical to its success.

Based on the above, it seems that the department should immediately begin the development of a case management plan for the state that recognizes the impact of the plans for the supervision of offenders envisioned by the Governor's January 2011 proposed budget.

Deliver Programs

In 2008 the department developed a comprehensive Master Work Plan for Rehabilitative Programming that detailed an exhaustive list of steps necessary for fully implementing the California Logic Model throughout the correctional system. The third track detailed how the department planned to roll out the California Logic Model statewide once it was implemented, tested, and re-tooled through the Solano demonstration project.

Then in fiscal year (FY) 2009/2010—just as the department had transitioned from more than two years of intense planning to implementation of the Solano demonstration project—the department's budget for adult rehabilitative programs was cut by $250 million. The Budget Act outlined specific guidelines for the reduction:

- Prioritize the preservation of rehabilitative programs based on evidence that they are effective in reducing recidivism;

- Prioritize the elimination of vacancies;

- Maximize the use of federal or other funds;

- Achieve savings through more efficient operation;

- Maximize the number of offenders who have access to programs; and

- Prioritize program placement based on risk, need, and time left to serve.

To stay within the revised budget, meet the Budget Act reduction guidelines, and maintain the principles of the Logic Model, the department:

- Developed five new academic models and a literacy program that adjusted the number of hours each week an inmate spent in class while maximizing the number of inmates with access to academic education programs. It is important to note that the educational models are not evidence-based due to the inmate-to-teacher ratios and program configurations.

- Reduced its vocational programs by almost 50 percent retaining only those programs that are industry certified, market driven based on employment development outlook data, have a minimum starting pay of $15 an hour, and can be completed within 12 months.

- Reduced in-prison substance abuse treatment to 90 days at nine male and three female institutions. Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility continues to offer its six-month trauma/gender responsive treatment program.

For the last 12 months, as a result of the budget reductions, the department implemented its new rehabilitative programming service delivery system across all institutions without the benefit of testing and evaluating it through a demonstration project as was originally planned. This challenge put an added strain on a system already burdened with change because making any adjustments involves all institutions, teachers, and inmates and therefore is more complicated to communicate, implement, monitor and evaluate. Department teaching, treatment, headquarters, and correctional staff should be recognized for the effort that has gone into the planning and implementation of the system-wide changes that originated with the FY 2009/2010 budget cut. At the same time the department should be accountable for improving rehabilitative outcomes of which significant progress has not been made as envisioned with the passage of Assembly Bill 900.

TARGET POPULATIONS FOR PROGRAMMING

During the reporting period there has been no change to priority placement within each program, which is based on risk as measured by CSRA scores, need, and time left to serve.

- For education programs, need is based on TABE scores, and inmates with 12-24 months left to serve are given priority. Lifers[8] are prioritized within 24 months of a parole suitability hearing.

---

[8] Lifers are inmates with a life sentence and the possibility of parole.

- For vocational programs, inmates are given priority if they already have school diplomas/GEDs and are within 12-24 months left to serve. Lifers are prioritized within 24 months of a parole suitability hearing.

- For substance abuse treatment programs, need is based on COMPAS assessment scores, and inmates are given priority when they have 5 to 6 months left to serve. Lifers are prioritized within 5 to 12 months of a parole suitability hearing.

Inmates who do not meet the target criteria are lowest on the priority lists and depending on enrollment may be assigned to programming. In August 2010, the department provided clarification to its institutions that the priority placement criteria is not exclusionary and does allow for Lifers to be prioritized and participate in programming as long as they meet the criteria.

The Governor's proposed January 10, 2011 budget for FY 2011/12 includes proposals that could have a direct and indirect effect on the department's population and therefore, the target population for programs. If the Governor's proposals are enacted, local jurisdictions would become responsible for some portion of non-serious, non-violent, non-sex offenders. Those offenders are a significant portion of the priority population for rehabilitative programming. Department data from August 2009 indicates that 49 percent of the non-serious, non-violent inmates have a high risk to recidivate, and their sentences are likely to be within the timeframe to receive priority placement. Conversely, 47 percent of serious and/or violent inmates have a low risk to recidivate, much longer prison sentences, and therefore, do not fall into the highest priority for placement. With limited resources available at both the state and local levels, offenders who become the responsibility of local jurisdictions will need rehabilitative programming. How this shift in population from state to local jurisdiction affects funding and therefore rehabilitative programming service delivery models in prisons remains to be seen. Simply transferring the non-serious, non-violent offender supervision responsibilities to local jurisdictions without providing adequate rehabilitative service funding and program capacity would not produce the desired reduction in recidivism.

CAPACITY FOR NEW PROGRAMMING MODELS

The annual capacity breakdown by program is listed below. The capacity is the number of inmates who can be served in each program area in a year.

Adult Rehabilitative Programs	Pre-2010 Capacity	August 2010 Capacity	February 2011 Capacity
Academic Education	47,900	38,768	37,152
Vocational Education	9,300	4,800	4,914
In-Prison Substance Abuse	12,200	8,500	8,186
Community Substance Abuse	8,200	4,900	4,689

STAFFING

In July 2010, the department had 524 teacher positions and 173 teaching assistant positions for academic education and vocational programming. There were 53 vacant teacher positions (10

percent vacancy) and 117 vacant teaching assistant positions (67 percent vacancy) that institutions were recruiting to fill.

As of December 2010, the department has 572 teacher positions and 147 teaching assistant positions for educational and vocational programming. There were 56 vacant teacher positions (10 percent vacancy) and 59 vacant teaching assistant positions (40 percent vacancy). Because of the state's severe budget crisis, departments are precluded from hiring. Since teaching vacancies have a negative effect on academic education and vocational capacity and enrollment, the board recommends that minimally in the short run the department reduce its stated capacity to reflect positions it cannot fill. The two institutions with the highest academic education teacher vacancies (44 percent and 66 percent) have some of the lowest enrollment (37.5 percent and 12.5 percent). If the department is unable to fill vacancies at those institutions, is it practical—given the state's civil service rules—to recommend a transfer of teachers from neighboring institutions or that the department eliminate academic education programming altogether at institutions with chronically low enrollment?

ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING

Overview
As a result of input received from teachers and other stakeholders during Winter and Spring 2010, the department reassessed the service delivery models and determined it could adjust the inmate-to-teacher ratios, reduce the number of teaching assistant positions, and add literacy coordinators at each prison while still maintaining program integrity and cost savings. The department was able to reestablish 33 teacher positions as literacy coordinators, add 30 additional teaching positions to what are now called the new academic education models, and reduce the inmate-to-teacher ratios by model as indicated below.

Academic Models: March 2010

Model #	Educational Program	Total Inmates per Teacher
1	Literacy	195
2	ABE I, II & III	135
3	ABE I, II & GED	162
4A	GED-Independent Study (voluntary)	120
4B	GED-Independent Study (assigned)	120
5i	ABE I, II & GED	84-108
5ii	ABE I, II & GED	84-108

New Academic Education Models: May 2010

Model #	Educational Program	Total Inmates per Teacher
1	Literacy, ABE I	54
2	ABE II & III	108
3	ABE I, II & GED	108
4	GED	120
5	High Security (programming is set by inmates' needs)	42-84

Classes using the new models began in May 2010 followed by a two month adjustment period for each institution to assess whether the numbers of sessions of each model still met inmate needs.[9] In May and June, institution principals submitted model change requests to headquarters for approval with the new academic education models implemented at all institutions by the middle of July.

Academic Education Program Capacity, Enrollment, and Utilization
Prior to 2010 the annual academic education program capacity was 47,900. Capacity is the number of inmates who can be served in a year. In March 2010, the annual academic education program capacity was 44,600. After the program adjustments were made in Spring 2010, the new academic education program capacity was 38,768, and in February 2011, because of additional model changes, the annual capacity was revised to 37,152. The department has reaffirmed repeatedly that it is committed to maximizing the number of offenders who have access to programs. However, as the department has revised the service delivery model to reflect inmate needs, it has had to decrease capacity. The board believes it is essential that the department have the flexibility to reduce the annual capacity if that results in better service delivery and ultimately better outcomes.

In its September 2010 biannual report, the board reported that enrollment for June 2010 was 35.9 percent of capacity and stated a concern about whether low enrollment was the result of program start-up, a broader systemic concern, or concentrated at specific institutions. The table below displays the academic education enrollment percent of capacity by month, which shows a 67 percent growth between June and November 2010, and the academic education program utilization percent for the same time period. Utilization is the percentage of available program hours an inmate spends in programming.

Month	Capacity	Enrollment %	Utilization %
July	38,768	48.6	64.8
August	38,768	56.5	69.3
September	38,768	57.0	73.6
October	38,768	59.6	69.2
November	38,768	59.5	66.8

There are a number of factors that negatively affect capacity and therefore enrollment that the department is working to improve:

- As of December 31, 2010, the department has 390 academic education teacher positions and 147 teaching assistant positions. There were 42 vacant teacher positions (10 percent vacancy) and 59 vacant teaching assistant positions (40 percent vacancy), which have a direct effect on capacity and therefore enrollment. For November 2010, the enrollment after adjusting capacity for teacher vacancies, teaching assistant vacancies, and inactive positions was 75.4%. This is an increase of more than 15 percent from the enrollment percentage the department reported formally for November 2010, and more in line with the board's expectations for enrollment expressed in its September 2010 biannual report.

---

[9] Inmate needs at individual institutions change because of population movement among institutions between the time that the Office of Correctional Education assigns the models and when they are implemented.

- Fire code restricts classroom occupancy at four institutions below the department's allocated capacity for the models assigned to the affected classrooms. The department has reduced the capacity at those institutions to reflect the occupancy restrictions, which should increase the enrollment percentages.

- According to the department, the new academic education models # 2, #3, and #4 as currently configured pose administrative challenges not least of which are difficulties associated with assignment offices placing inmates at different learning levels in the right programs.

- The table below displays the program model, inmate-to-teacher ratio, and hours/week by learning level. After receiving feedback from the Academic Education Leadership Council and other teachers, the department has begun working to adjust and streamline the models. The department expects to implement these changes in the next reporting period.

New Academic Education Models

Model #	Educational Program	Total Inmates per Teacher	Inmates in Class at Once	Inmate Class Hours/ Week	Teaching Assistants
2	ABE II & III	108	27	ABE II-6 ABE III-9	1
3	ABE I, II & GED	108	27	ABE I-15 ABE II-9 GED-3	1
4	GED	120	12	3	0

- Without adjusting capacity for teaching vacancies, the statewide enrollment data for October and November 2010 is 59.6 percent and 59.5 percent respectively, with not much movement among institutions.

  o There were four institutions with enrollment above 80 percent and none of them had teacher vacancies.

  o There were three institutions with enrollment below 30 percent and all of them had teacher vacancies.

- Of the 12 institutions that have reception center inmates, 7 of them had enrollment under 60 percent, 3 of those 7 had enrollment under 40 percent, and each of those three had teacher vacancies. There is no programming for Reception Center inmates; however, each of those institutions has rehabilitative programming available for its general population inmates, many of whom are low level inmates performing key jobs associated with running the institution, i.e., janitors, groundskeepers, office assistants, etc. Those inmates often choose work assignments instead of programming, which contributes to low enrollment. The department has reported that it is working on a solution so that inmates can participate in dual assignments.

After reviewing the enrollment data and discussing the issues identified above with department staff and some teachers, it appears that the low enrollment figures from May and June 2010 were a reflection of program start-up and not a broader systemic concern. The board requests that the department make the adjustments described in bullets one and two above so that enrollment data reflects available capacity and report it both ways to the board in the future.

According to department testimony at the January 2011 board meeting, the academic education program utilization is higher than it has ever been historically, and the department remains committed to continuing to improve it. Academic education program utilization is affected by different factors: teacher absences (the department does not have substitute teachers, and if a teacher is absent, class is cancelled); inmate illness, medical appointments, and other excused absences; custody reasons like fog and lockdowns; and unexcused absences. The department is now able to track these categories and provides monthly data to each institution for review to make adjustments where possible.

The board will continue to follow enrollment and utilization closely.

Academic Achievements and Program Completions
Between May and October 2010, the academic achievements for all institutions were:

CASAS Benchmarks   6,561
TABE Achievements   6,149
GED Sub-Tests Passed   8,941
GED Completions   1,935
High School Diplomas   22

The board will use these achievements as a baseline by which to measure progress in achievements during the next reporting period.

Prior to May 2010, the department tracked academic education program exits and completions as the number of inmates who completed programming, paroled, or transferred to another institution. Beginning with the new academic education model implementation in May 2010, the department redefined program completions to reflect whether the program exit included a learning gain. According to the department, most programs take approximately 12 months to complete. By the C-ROB September 2011 biannual report, the department should be able to provide a year's worth of data on learning gains associated with program exits from the new academic education models. Initial data shows that from May through September 2010, there were 95 program completions in ABE I; 67 program completions in ABE II, and 71 program completions in ABE III.

Literacy Model
The literacy coordinator(s) at each institution are responsible for coordinating volunteer literacy services, which includes identifying and training community volunteers and inmate tutors. As of February 1, 2011, after the model changes, there are a total of 68 literacy coordinator positions of which 12 are vacant (18 percent vacant). The annual capacity for the literacy program is 8,106. Enrollment in November 2010 was 46 percent. Enrollment is low because of delays in program

start-up related to hiring the literacy coordinators and other implementation issues: 34 percent of capacity is affected by teacher vacancies and 20 percent is affected by implementation issues. The board requests that the department adjust the stated capacity to reflect the teacher vacancies and report it both ways to the board in the future.

The literacy coordinators recruit inmate tutors for the programs. Typically, the literacy coordinator advertises for volunteer tutors, holds interviews, and selects those most qualified. Tutoring is done in the housing units, libraries, and classrooms. The inmate tutors pay starts at 11 cents an hour and tops out at 18 cents an hour. Literacy coordinators agreed that the work is mentally exhausting for the inmate tutors.

Programming eligibility for inmate students is based on:

- An inmate TABE reading and/or math score below 9.0, or

- An inmate TABE reading and/or math score above 9.0 with no GED and no programming.

Lifers who are ineligible for the other academic education models can go to literacy programming. Inmates participating in the literacy program are eligible to take the GED, which should eliminate the concerns about the department's policy requiring programming participation to take the GED.

Inmate students are tested regularly for education gains. TABE testing is done every six months in line with the curriculum testing protocols, and CASAS testing is done in accordance with CASAS testing protocols and takes place after an average of 40 hours of instruction.

At one institution, the literacy coordinator interviewed 200 candidates, hired 38 inmate tutors, provided 15-20 hours of initial training, meets every four to six weeks as a group, and meets one-on-one with tutors as needed. Capacity is 120 inmate students, and in December 2010 there were 130 assigned to the program with most tutors having between three and five inmates and one tutor with as many as 10. Although enrollment exceeds capacity, the literacy coordinator believes that eligible inmate students should be accommodated if possible. Inmate students are assigned from academic education model waitlists, those enrolled in academic models who need additional help, and inmates not assigned to any academic education model programming.

Once the department has key performance indicator data for the specific academic education models, the board will be very interested to see how the literacy model outcomes compare to those from the other academic models. At a minimum, the literacy model offers educational opportunities to inmates who otherwise are ineligible for academic programming. It does this at relatively low cost because of the high inmate-to-teacher ratio. If the literacy model shows better outcomes for academic improvement and recidivism than the other academic models, the department will need to consider expanding the literacy program and reducing the use of other models that may not be performing as well.

Academic Education Leadership Council
In Summer 2010, the department convened an academic education leadership council, comprised of academic teachers with minimal representation from principals and the Office of Correctional Education. The purpose of the council is to promote and facilitate constructive communication between the Superintendent of Correctional Education and the academic education faculty. The Office of Correctional Education recruited council members system-wide and selected teachers to represent a sample of institutions and academic education models. In addition to the council members, the department has also recruited a representative from each institution to help facilitate the communication between headquarters and institutions and among institutions because the teachers are not on a system-wide network.

The council first met in September 2010 and its initial priorities were to review and assess the new academic education models as implemented in the institutions and recommend model revisions to improve functionality and efficiency. To facilitate the assessment, during Fall 2010, the council focused on an academic teacher survey that it administered in December 2010. Over 100 academic teachers responded to the survey, which is discussed in more detail in the next section of the report.

Teacher Concerns about the New Academic Education Models
In the September 2010 biannual report, the board noted a number of teacher concerns with the new academic education models, including increased class size, reduced time in class, administrative paperwork, student turnover, wrongly assigned students, and inmate homework.

To substantiate the teacher concerns, SEIU Local 1000 conducted an academic education models survey in October and November 2010. The 10 question survey was distributed to approximately 350 teachers assigned to the new academic education models, and 127 teachers responded. The survey results revealed that:

- Almost half of the teachers responding were assigned to Model 4 followed by 21 percent in Model 1 and 20 percent in Model 2. This translates to almost half of the students assigned to those respondents are in Model 4 and receiving three hours of classroom instruction a week.

- Depending on the type of completions, between 70 and 88.6 percent of teachers said their students had less learning gains than in the prior year.

- Depending on the model taught, between 33 and 54 percent of teachers did not have a teaching assistant assigned.

- 80 percent responded that students were placed in models incorrectly and 76 percent said that the misplaced students were not reassigned quickly.

- Just over half responded that they did not have textbooks for all students; however, almost 89 percent said they had the needed supplies.

- Overall, 46 percent said their classes were full.

- Almost all said they had access to a computer but only 31 percent had the software to produce needed reports.

- Most said they had access to a copy machine but only half said the copier has the capacity/reliability to print homework paperwork.

- Over 93 percent said the teacher preparation time allocated is inadequate to complete administrative paperwork.

- In Model 1, 56 percent of the teachers said they spend the majority of their time on records, paperwork, and homework. Model 4, with the most teachers assigned, had 82 percent responding that the majority of time was spent on records, paperwork, and homework.

- 63 percent responded that 10 percent of their time is spent at trainings and meetings.

- 89 percent responded that the new models are not working with only 5 percent responding that the models are working well.

- When asked to identify the biggest problems with the new models 48 teachers said too much paperwork, 42 teachers said not enough student contact, 18 teachers said lack of administrative support, 15 teachers said homework, and 14 said curriculum not appropriate.

- The most common suggestions to improve the models were to use Model 1 to increase student contact, improve the inmate assignment process, reduce paperwork or increase prep time, make homework optional, and change the curriculum.

The Academic Education Leadership Council—which first met in September 2010 to begin its charge to assess and recommend revisions to the new academic education models—also conducted an academic education teacher survey about the new models in December 2010. Over 100 academic teachers responded to the survey. There were nine questions and the responses also confirmed the teacher concerns and identified areas for improvement:

- Almost half of the teachers responded that their monthly student turnover was more than 20 percent, and one-quarter of the teachers responded that their monthly student turnover was between 21 and 40 percent.

- 64 percent disagreed/strongly disagreed that the models are effective, that the curriculum is appropriate, and that student placement is correct; 53 percent disagreed/strongly disagreed that homework is effective.

- Just over 39 percent responded that they could better serve their students by changing the number of assigned students, hours in class, the days students are in class; and increasing flexibility with curriculum materials.

- Just over 67 percent had no teaching assistant assigned.

- In a typical day, teachers responded that they spend 24.5 percent of their time on class preparation, 25 percent on class recordkeeping, 30 percent on instruction, and 21 percent on student assessment.

- 68.5 percent responded that between zero and 25 percent of their students are able to complete all competencies for the adopted curriculum.

- Almost 54 percent responded that their students had achieved zero to 10 CASAS/TABE or GED milestones since May 2010 and 14.6 percent responded that there were more than 50 milestone achievements.

- Teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the biggest impediments to program success are lockdowns (50 percent), student turnover (58 percent), lack of classroom materials (62.5 percent), wrongly assigned students (68.6 percent), and paperwork (87.5 percent). The council reported that low student contact time would have been the biggest impediment to success if it had been a choice in that question.

Both the Academic Education Leadership Council and the SEIU 1000 academic education teacher survey results verified the design and implementation issues academic teachers have raised during the last year with the new academic education models. The department has committed to reexamine the underpinnings of the models and, in conjunction with the council and labor union recommendations for improvement, is working on changes to improve functionality and efficiency and address the concerns. One positive aspect of the new models to which teachers have responded positively is the reduction of programming hours in a day from six and half hours to three hours. The department has no plans to change this aspect of the service delivery system.

In the interim, the department has continued the process for institutions to request changes—at six month intervals—to the types of models appropriate to meet the needs of their changing populations. The Office of Correctional Education received the change requests in December 2010 and the approved requests took effect in February 2011. In Fall 2010, according to the department, 32 percent of teachers were responsible for Model 4 programming. After the change requests, approximately 20 percent of teachers are teaching Model 4. Change requests to Model 1 increased the number of teachers assigned to that model by 25 percent. Since the inmate-to-teacher ratios are different between Models 1 and 4, the resulting capacity has been reduced; conversely more inmates will now participate in academic education programming three hours a day, five days a week instead of three hours a week. Most of the issues raised by the teachers—student contact time, student turnover, homework, and paperwork/testing—are exacerbated by the structure of Model 4.

The survey responses also reflected teacher concerns about the inappropriateness of the academic education model curricula, which has remained the same throughout the programming model changes and has not been reviewed in many years. The department has committed to convening a curriculum review committee as well as a superintendant school improvement council, comprised of institution academic education administrators working together to ensure consistency system-wide in administrative and training issues.

In the past the department has been criticized for making programming changes without the input from those staff responsible for implementation. For the last year, the department has consistently demonstrated its commitment to improve the service delivery system by engaging in active dialogue with academic education staff through the leadership councils and labor union discussions, which signals a fundamental, positive shift in the way the department communicates with the institution educators and makes policy decisions.

VOCATIONAL PROGRAMMING

The department eliminated many of its longstanding vocational training programs in response to the budget cut in FY 2009/10. Vocational programs that were retained meet three criteria: they are industry certified, market driven, and completed within 12 months. Market driven is defined as over 2,000 entry level jobs annually and a starting pay rate of at least $15 per hour. Below is the department's list of those programs retained or cut. The 15 vocational course offerings meet for six hours, five days a week, and each course can accommodate 27 students.

Prior to the budget cuts in FY 2009/2010, vocational education program capacity was 9,300. The current capacity is 4,800 inmates with 182 teacher positions of which 14 are vacant (eight percent vacancy). The table below displays the vocational education enrollment percent of capacity by month, which shows a six percent growth between July and November 2010, and the vocational education program utilization percent for the same time period. Utilization is the percentage of available program hours an inmate spends in programming.

Month	Capacity	Enrollment %	Utilization %
July	4,800	79.9	58.3
August	4,800	82.3	57.1
September	4,800	85.7	59.1
October	4,800	87.1	60.7
November	4,800	85.0	56.2

Adjusting capacity to reflect teacher vacancies translates to just over 90 percent enrollment. The board requests that the department make this adjustment and report enrollment both ways in the future. Given the capacity cut that these programs took last year, enrollment is where the board expected it to be. The institutions should be acknowledged for the achievement: after adjusting capacity to reflect teacher vacancies, there are 17 institutions with enrollment over 95 percent and another seven with enrollment between 85 and 94 percent.

Like academic education programming, vocational education programming utilization is affected by teacher absences (the department does not have substitute teachers, and if a teacher is absent, class is cancelled); inmate illness, medical appointments, and other excused absences; custody reasons like fog and lockdowns; and unexcused absences. In the event of lockdowns, vocational education classes must be cancelled completely because—unlike some academic education model programming—inmates cannot participate in programming outside the classroom spaces

devoted to vocational education.[10] As with academic educational programming, the department is committed to improving vocational education program utilization,[11] and the board will continue to follow utilization closely. From April through September 2010, there were 478 vocational education program completions and 2,353 certifications awarded.[12]

In Fall 2010, the department convened a Career Technical Education Leadership Council to annually review the vocational programs available and determine if any meet the vocational program criteria of industry certified, market driven, and completed within 12 months. In the short run, the department is looking to the council for feedback on the models and specific recommendations on how to adjust programming to optimize results. In planning for the future, the department has recognized that its vocational education programs need to include basic education skills. The department is working toward this combination by using the Career Technical Education Council to establish and develop criteria for career technical programs so that when additional resources become available, there will be guidelines to expand programming in keeping with industry changes.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMMING

The new substance abuse treatment (SAT) program model serves 8,186 inmates per year and 4,689 parolees in community-based aftercare. Programming contracts took effect in January 2010 with full implementation in March 2010. The new 90 day in-prison model is available at nine male and three female institutions. Civil addicts at the California Rehabilitation Center and the California Institute for Women complete a six-month program. Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility continues to offer its six-month trauma/gender responsive treatment program. There were no changes to substance abuse programming during the reporting period. During the reporting period, the Lifer Mentor Certification at Valley State Prison for Women graduated its first class of mentors.

---

[10] In some lockdown situations, custody staff works with programming staff to administer programming in the inmates' cells. Vocational programming requires hands-on experience that cannot occur in a lockdown situation, but inmates can still receive academic programming while on lockdown.

[11] According to the department, at least 70 percent of California's prisons have some sort of modified program on a daily basis. The department uses its COMPSTAT (comparative statistics) data to analyze whether certain institutions utilize fewer hours for programming than others. If utilization appears low, department staff look to see if the institution experienced a large amount of lockdowns or some other factor that negatively influenced inmates' participation in programming.

[12] An inmate doe not have to complete a program to obtain a license or certification.

The table below displays the substance abuse program enrollment percent of capacity by month, which shows a static enrollment between July and November 2010, and the substance abuse program utilization percent for the same time period. Utilization is the percentage of available program hours an inmate spends in programming.

Month	Capacity	Enrollment %	Utilization %
July	8,500	93.7	86.2
August	8,500	97.2	89.9
September	8,500	94.6	88.7
October	8,500	94.4	84.8
November	8,500	93.6	88.9

Enrollment from March to October 2010 averaged 93.9 percent and utilization averaged 88.2 percent, which means the department has exceeded the AB 900 benchmark for utilization of 75 percent. From April through September 2010, there were:

- 3,441 substance abuse program exits at in-state institutions with 88.9 percent due to program completions; and

- 6,099 substance abuse program exits from contracted community programs for parolees with 53.2 percent due to program completions.

In the September 2010 biannual report, the board stated a concern about whether the 90-day model is sufficient for adults with long histories of addiction. Because in-prison programs are not available at every institution, the board also raised a concern about whether the department could place inmates with substance abuse programming needs at one of the 13 institutions providing services given the challenges associated with population movement: the limited number of substance abuse slots, frequent lockdowns, and prison overcrowding. The initial data on in-prison enrollment, utilization, and program completions are positive indicators for improved outcomes from the new substance abuse models.

Prep for Reentry/Reintegration

Office of Community Partnerships
The department's office of Community Partnerships is responsible for volunteer support in the institutions, employment transition services, and community support. Each institution has a community resource manager who serves as the critical link between the department and the community by coordinating volunteer-based and self-help programming, manages the citizens advisory group, supervises the chaplains and religious programs, and provides monthly data reporting.

The volunteer advisory task force—made up of volunteer stakeholders and department representatives—was created in 2010 and assists the wardens and the community resource managers with how to most effectively use volunteers for inmate programming needs. There are four subcommittees that cover volunteer access, increased programs, use of volunteers, and volunteer training.

The office manages the visitor center contract and the family liaison services contract. Each institution is required by law to have a visitor center, which is run through a contract with a non-profit agency. In addition to operating the visitor center, the contractor coordinates visitor transportation from local public transportation to the institution, provides activities for the children of visitors, and provides clothing for visitors whose clothes do not meet the department's requirements. The family liaison services contract, which the department expects to finalize in April 2011, will place a family liaison services coordinator at each institution to assist inmates and family members with reentry referrals, counseling services, reunification, and locating lost relatives to help ensure that inmates have close ties to their communities when paroled.

The office developed and maintains the *Community Resource Directory*: a listing of community organizations with contact information, services provided, and the regions served to help parolees with reentry. At the request of the board, the office has added a feature to the directory that allows it to add links to county resource guides.

The office also is responsible for the programs described below.

California Transition Program
This classroom-based, federally funded employment training program is offered to inmates within 60-120 days to parole. The 70 hour curriculum is taught by employment specialists from the local workforce investment boards and is presented in three and a half hour sessions, five days a week for four weeks. There are morning and afternoon sessions to allow flexibility for inmates with job assignments or who are programming to participate. The focus is on effective job search methods, assistance with resumes and applications, interviewing techniques, financial literacy, and other life skills training. Paroling inmates who complete the program receive appointments at local one-stop career centers for employment services and job referrals.

The department piloted the program at California State Prison, Folsom, which has a class capacity of 200 and has graduated 143 inmates since March 2010. In September 2010, the department expanded the program to California State Prison, Solano; Valley State Prison for Women; and RJ Donovan Correctional Facility, and estimates serving 2,000 inmates total.

California New Start
The department manages this community based, federally funded program in partnership with the Employment Development Department and the California Workforce Investment Board. The program focuses on reintegrating parolees into their local communities though one-stop career centers that provide employment services to all Californians, including parolees. Services include job skill seminars, supportive services, job referral and placement services, and job retention follow-up services one year after employment. In October 2010, the department implemented a data collection process so that the local workforce investment boards are able to submit monthly data reports. As of January 2011, the program has enrolled 2,805 parolees and provided 593 job placements with an average hourly wage of $10.05.

California Identification Project
In partnership with the Prison Industry Authority and the Department of Motor Vehicles, the department is administering a 12 month pilot project at nine institutions to issue driver's licenses or identification cards to inmates who are within 120-180 days of parole. The goal of the project is to deliver 10,000 cards to paroling inmates in the pilot project year before expanding it to other institutions (depending on funding availability). To date, 4,100 inmates are eligible; over 3,000 are participating in the project; and 2,169 inmates will receive their driver's license or identification card when they parole. Round two of this program is now underway.

Secure Reentry Program Facilities
The department is authorized to construct, establish, and operate secure reentry program facilities throughout the state that will house up to 6,000 inmates within one year of being released from custody and which must be approved through the State Public Works Board process. There are 12 counties that have entered into agreements with the department to site eight secure facilities, two of which will be regional. Adult Programs established a reentry team that has defined the program models for the secure reentry facilities and now is refining them with what works.

Pre-Parole Process Benefits Program
In collaboration with the U.S. Social Security Administration, the California Department of Health Care Services, and the U.S. Veteran's Affairs, the department has entered into formal agreements for a pre-release benefits application and eligibility determination process for potentially eligible inmates.

The Division of Adult Parole Operations manages the program and uses 60 contract benefits workers within the prisons to apply for and secure federal and state benefit entitlements prior to an inmate's reentry into the community. Benefits include Social Security, Medi-Cal, and Veteran's Affairs Benefits. Inmate participation is voluntary except for inmates who doctors certify are incompetent or physically unable to authorize or refuse participation. The target population is inmates within 120 days of parole who are medically, mentally, or developmentally disabled. There are approximately 15,000 inmates released annually who were either in the Correctional Clinical Case Management System (10,000) or Enhanced Outpatient Program (5,000). The majority of those who potentially qualify for the program are Enhanced Outpatient Program inmates, and more than 4,000 of those inmates had Supplemental Security Income applications submitted during 2010.

The department is working to identify issues that are slowing the application process. Inconsistent data capture and eligibility determinations made months after release are among the barriers to measuring eligibility outcomes. New data collection processes are being established along with the development of performance indicators for the Transitional Case Management Program contractors.

Applications and their outcomes by benefit type for 2010 are listed below.

Social Security Application
Refused to Apply   790
Submitted   4,375
Pending/Unknown   2,231

Outcomes: Approved   972
               Denied   879

Medi-Cal Applications
Submitted   430
Pending/Unknown   370

Outcomes: Approved   12
               Denied   48

Veteran's Affairs Applications
Submitted   54
Pending/Unknown   21

Outcomes: Approved   25
               Denied   7

Measure Progress and Follow Up

Measuring Progress
Inmates need for programming will be based on the initial Core COMPAS assessment. A moderate or high score in the academic, vocational, or academic education domains indicates criminogenic need, and an inmate can show need in more than one area. Inmates will be counted as needing programming for each area in which s/he has a criminogenic need.

Each month, the department will have data that contains a list of inmates with criminogenic need(s), based on their core COMPAS assessments. The list will be matched with inmates enrolled in programming. The chart below will be populated, and Headquarters program managers and institution staff will review the results to measure their progress at the local level.

Enrolled in Programming				
Current Inmate Population Need	# with Need*	# with Need Currently Enrolled	# with Need Previously Enrolled	% of Need Served
Mod/High Academic				
Mod/High Vocational				
Mod/High Substance Abuse				

*Within two years of release

When the revised case management process is in place, the department will review progress by reassessing inmates at their annual reviews. As of January 2010, individual learning gains, GEDs, vocational certificates, and other program completions are being tracked for program milestone credits under SB X3 18.

Data Solutions
For academic programming, although information exists on paper in an inmate's file, the existing data system does not capture information at the individual student level. The long-term solution is the Strategic Offender Management System (SOMS), which is being developed in phases, with the phase affecting Adult Programs unavailable until Spring 2012. The design specifications for programming have been completed with updates made to accommodate the new academic education models and credit earning components.

The department has been working on an interim data solution to provide individual level data: the Education Classroom and Attendance Tracking System (EdCATS). The department is completing the final program edits, training staff, and performing system tests. EdCATS is scheduled for release in April 2011 but the date could change depending on the schedule for revising the academic education models. Once implemented, EdCATS will capture individual inmate level data for both academic and vocational education. Data will include enrollment, attendance, achievement, and completion information.

Follow Up
Last year the department developed definitions for four key performance indicators (KPI) within each program area. The KPIs are assignment, utilization, completion, and recidivism and are described in the C-ROB September 15, 2010 biannual report. Recidivism data will not be available until Fall 2012. The department analyzes program assignment, utilization, and completion data monthly to identify trends and locate potential problems. The department also continuously monitors implementation issues through weekly executive reviews of key issues, monthly executive reviews of key performance indicators, and quarterly headquarters and field team statistical reviews.

CONCLUSION

The Governor's budget for FY 2011/2012 proposed in January 2011 would have a direct effect on the department's rehabilitative programming target population and would require a reassessment of the priority placement criteria. If the Governor's original proposals are enacted, local jurisdictions will be responsible for non-serious, non-violent, non-sex offenders with no prior serious/violent/sex offenses. Currently, those offenders make up a significant percentage of the priority population for in-prison rehabilitative programming. Department data from August 2010 indicates that 49 percent of the non-serious, non-violent inmates have a high risk to recidivate, and their sentences are likely to be within the timeframe to receive priority placement. Conversely, 47 percent of serious and/or violent inmates have a low risk to recidivate, much longer prison sentences, and therefore, do not fall into the highest priority for placement.

A shift in population from state to local jurisdictions would affect funding for in-prison and community-based rehabilitative programming service delivery models. Limited resources at both the state and local levels means that comprehensive case management becomes that much more important in ensuring that offenders' needs are assessed correctly and there is a process to place them in the right program at the right time whether they remain in prison or become the responsibility of local jurisdictions. Until the state budget is resolved, the board will continue to monitor and evaluate the department's progress to provide the best rehabilitative programming with the available resources.

Appendix A1:Summary Identifying the Rehabilitative Needs of Offenders

Location	Total Population[1]	Risk to Recidivate (CSRA)[2]		Academic/Vocational[3]		Substance Abuse[3]		Anger[3]		Criminal Thinking[3]		Family Criminality[3]		Sex Offending[4]	
		Total	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High
All Institution's Total	161,147	155,807	96,471	43.1%	56.9%	35.3%	64.7%	49.5%	50.5%	52.4%	47.6%	67.0%	33.0%	*	*

[1] The Institution Population is 161,147 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011 as of September 30, 2010. The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 5,791. The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,175, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 1, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 2, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 53, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 65, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUPM) 49, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 32, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consumnes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 485, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 903, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 5,791. Total inmate population. for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 166.938 as of September 30. 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] Criminogenic needs were extracted from 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset January 12, 2011.

[4] Programming for institution's population not available at this time.

Location	Total Parole Population[1]	Risk to Recidivate (CSRA)[2]		Academic/Vocational[3]		Substance Abuse[3]		Anger[3]		Criminal Thinking[3]		Family Criminality[3]		Family Support[3]		Sex Offending[4]	
		Total	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High
All Parole Region's Total	121,378	117,907	90,407	45.2%	54.8%	36.7%	63.4%	55.5%	44.5%	51.9%	48.1%	63.8%	36.2%	31.9%	68.1%	*	*

[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] Needs assessment was derived from the 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset January 12, 2011.

[4] Programming for institution's population not available at this time.

Appendix A2: Institution Identifying the Rehabilitative Needs of Offenders

Location	Total Population [1]	Risk to Recidivate (CSRA) [2]		Academic/Vocational [3]		Substance Abuse [3]		Anger [3]		Criminal Thinking [3]		Family Criminality [3]		Low Family Support [4]		Sex Offending [4]	
		Total	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High
COCF and All institution's Total	161,147	155,807	96,471	43.1%	56.9%	35.3%	64.7%	49.5%	50.5%	52.4%	47.6%	67.0%	33.0%	*	*	*	*
ASP	6,343	6,098	2,926	44.6%	55.4%	31.3%	68.7%	49.1%	50.9%	55.3%	44.7%	68.0%	32.0%	*	*	*	*
CAL	4,205	4,065	2,213	45.2%	54.8%	49.1%	50.9%	49.8%	50.2%	45.7%	54.3%	68.8%	31.2%	*	*	*	*
CCC	5,591	5,559	4,486	54.0%	46.0%	25.8%	74.2%	58.7%	41.3%	60.8%	39.2%	69.6%	30.4%	*	*	*	*
CCF-Leo Chesney	313	313	220	57.8%	42.2%	25.1%	74.9%	77.2%	22.8%	68.8%	31.2%	61.2%	38.8%	*	*	*	*
CCI	5,943	5,815	3,999	39.9%	60.1%	34.7%	65.3%	47.9%	52.1%	53.3%	46.7%	67.4%	32.6%	*	*	*	*
CCWF	3,835	3,781	1,886	49.1%	50.9%	31.4%	68.6%	62.6%	37.4%	56.3%	43.7%	70.3%	29.7%	*	*	*	*
CEN	4,145	4,013	2,406	41.9%	58.1%	50.1%	49.9%	45.8%	54.2%	43.4%	56.6%	71.2%	28.8%	*	*	*	*
CIM	5,029	4,939	3,955	37.8%	62.2%	34.3%	65.7%	44.4%	55.6%	48.4%	51.6%	64.6%	35.4%	*	*	*	*
CIW	2,395	2,203	1,309	51.1%	48.9%	32.3%	67.7%	68.2%	31.8%	52.7%	47.3%	66.9%	33.1%	*	*	*	*
CMC	6,578	6,249	3,429	49.1%	50.9%	37.0%	63.0%	51.6%	48.4%	54.1%	45.9%	73.1%	26.9%	*	*	*	*
CMF	2,636	2,478	1,136	35.6%	64.4%	36.6%	63.4%	41.9%	58.1%	47.1%	52.9%	62.8%	37.2%	*	*	*	*
COCF	9,745	9,614	6,574	43.0%	57.0%	42.6%	57.4%	46.5%	53.5%	48.9%	51.1%	67.2%	32.8%	*	*	*	*
COR	5,120	4,933	2,882	42.3%	57.7%	35.4%	64.6%	50.5%	49.5%	48.5%	51.5%	67.2%	32.8%	*	*	*	*
CRC	4,365	3,810	2,401	44.9%	55.1%	38.5%	61.5%	51.4%	48.6%	53.5%	46.5%	71.7%	28.3%	*	*	*	*
CTF	6,464	6,185	2,789	46.9%	53.1%	31.7%	68.3%	47.1%	52.9%	55.0%	45.0%	68.2%	31.8%	*	*	*	*
CVSP	3,498	3,396	1,455	54.2%	45.8%	41.9%	58.1%	59.1%	40.9%	60.5%	39.5%	74.4%	25.6%	*	*	*	*
DVI	3,987	3,894	3,302	36.7%	63.3%	27.6%	72.4%	39.4%	60.6%	51.8%	48.2%	57.3%	42.7%	*	*	*	*
FOL	3,538	3,399	2,307	41.3%	58.7%	38.5%	61.5%	44.0%	56.0%	48.2%	51.8%	62.1%	37.9%	*	*	*	*
HDSP	4,332	4,244	2,934	38.8%	61.2%	33.1%	66.9%	43.5%	56.5%	49.1%	50.9%	54.5%	45.5%	*	*	*	*
ISP	3,974	3,823	2,208	44.3%	55.7%	46.6%	53.4%	52.2%	47.8%	48.7%	51.3%	68.2%	31.8%	*	*	*	*
KVSP	4,584	4,475	2,894	40.1%	59.9%	35.7%	64.3%	42.4%	57.6%	42.9%	57.1%	59.8%	40.2%	*	*	*	*
LAC	4,524	4,414	2,994	44.3%	55.7%	40.1%	59.9%	50.9%	49.1%	50.0%	50.0%	68.7%	31.3%	*	*	*	*
MCSP	3,737	3,595	1,423	44.0%	56.0%	44.3%	55.7%	48.6%	51.4%	53.5%	46.5%	60.4%	39.6%	*	*	*	*
NKSP	5,451	5,346	4,339	41.4%	58.6%	36.4%	63.6%	51.7%	48.3%	57.4%	42.6%	75.1%	24.9%	*	*	*	*
PBSP	3,241	3,105	1,777	38.9%	61.1%	37.9%	62.1%	50.0%	50.0%	47.5%	52.5%	62.0%	38.0%	*	*	*	*
PVSP	4,685	4,432	2,432	41.4%	58.6%	42.5%	57.5%	44.0%	56.0%	46.7%	53.3%	64.9%	35.1%	*	*	*	*
RJD	4,424	4,311	2,911	40.2%	59.8%	28.6%	71.4%	55.5%	44.5%	51.6%	48.4%	67.0%	33.0%	*	*	*	*
SAC	2,956	2,876	1,635	35.4%	64.6%	47.0%	53.0%	45.5%	54.5%	48.2%	51.8%	61.4%	38.6%	*	*	*	*
SATF	6,513	6,313	3,120	42.3%	57.7%	41.9%	58.1%	46.0%	54.0%	51.0%	49.0%	66.8%	33.2%	*	*	*	*
SCC	5,430	5,357	3,928	52.0%	48.0%	37.1%	62.9%	59.7%	40.3%	58.8%	41.2%	71.8%	28.2%	*	*	*	*
SOL	5,078	4,877	2,093	43.9%	56.1%	36.6%	63.4%	44.7%	55.3%	49.6%	50.4%	64.8%	35.2%	*	*	*	*
SQ	5,242	4,980	3,276	38.5%	61.5%	36.7%	63.3%	50.8%	49.2%	51.1%	48.9%	64.6%	35.4%	*	*	*	*
SVSP	3,791	3,648	2,000	33.2%	66.8%	36.3%	63.7%	40.4%	59.6%	42.8%	57.2%	63.9%	36.1%	*	*	*	*
VSPW	3,446	3,395	1,842	45.5%	54.5%	26.7%	73.3%	55.0%	45.0%	50.6%	49.4%	62.4%	37.6%	*	*	*	*
WSP	6,009	5,872	4,990	38.4%	61.6%	30.9%	69.1%	46.0%	54.0%	52.0%	48.0%	66.8%	33.2%	*	*	*	*

[1] The Institution Population is 161,147 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011 as of September 30, 2010. The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 5,791. The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,175, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 1, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 2, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 53, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 65, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUPM) 49, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 32, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consumnes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 485, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 903, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 5,791. Total inmate population, for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 166,938 as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] Criminogenic needs were extracted from 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset January 12, 2011.

[4] Programming for institution's population not available at this time.

Appendix A3: Parole Identifying the Rehabilitative Needs of Offenders

Location	Total Parole Population [1]	Risk to Recidivate (CSRA) [2]		Academic/Vocational [3]		Substance Abuse [3]		Anger [3]		Criminal Thinking [3]		Family Criminality [3]		Family Support [3]		Sex Offending [3]	
		Total	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High	Low	Mod/High
All Parole Region's Total	**121,378**	**117,907**	**90,407**	**45.2%**	**54.8%**	**36.7%**	**63.3%**	**55.5%**	**44.5%**	**51.9%**	**48.1%**	**63.8%**	**36.2%**	**31.9%**	**68.1%**	**34.4%**	**65.7%**
Parole Region I	28,619	27,505	21,409	43.3%	56.7%	30.7%	69.3%	53.2%	46.8%	52.9%	47.1%	56.5%	43.5%	32.2%	67.8%	36.7%	63.3%
Parole Region II	22,775	22,197	17,336	45.9%	54.1%	33.3%	66.7%	54.7%	45.3%	52.9%	47.1%	61.9%	38.1%	33.1%	66.9%	31.4%	68.6%
Parole Region III	31,980	31,226	22,958	43.9%	56.1%	44.9%	55.1%	55.8%	44.2%	49.8%	50.2%	70.5%	29.5%	31.3%	68.7%	30.1%	69.9%
Parole Region IV	38,004	36,979	28,704	47.5%	52.5%	36.5%	63.5%	57.6%	42.4%	52.2%	47.8%	65.4%	34.6%	31.4%	68.6%	37.8%	62.2%

[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] Needs assessment was derived from the 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset January 12, 2011.

Appendix B: Determining Gaps in Rehabilitative Services

All Institutions	Institution Population[1]	CSRA Score Low[2]	CSRA Score Mod/High High[2]	0-6 Months to Serve[2] #	%	7-12 Months to Serve[2] #	%	13-24 Months to Serve[2] #	%	25-36 Months to Serve[2] #	%	Over 36 Months to Serve[2] #	%
Total	161,147	59,336	96,471	18,847	19.5%	11,354	11.8%	11,997	12.4%	6,394	6.6%	24,597	25.5%
Serious or Violent[3]	99,242	47,807	47,690	5,476	11.5%	3,993	8.4%	5,870	12.3%	4,113	8.6%	20,797	43.6%
Sex Registrants[3]	23,460	15,351	7,011	920	13.1%	550	7.8%	715	10.2%	433	6.2%	2,276	32.5%
Enhanced Out-Patients (EOPs)[3]	5,734	2,409	3,147	504	16.0%	306	9.7%	372	11.8%	207	6.6%	864	27.5%
Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE) holds[3]	16,855	10,656	5,763	1,146	19.9%	683	11.9%	764	13.3%	499	8.7%	2,001	34.7%
Inmates Serving a Life Sentence[3,3a]	29,365	21,888	5,936	237	4.0%	244	4.1%	437	7.4%	271	4.6%	3,165	53.3%
Inmates with Needs Assessments[4]	61,272	8,562	34,501	15,337	44.5%	7,090	20.6%	5,304	15.4%	2,208	6.4%	4,562	13.2%

Rehabilitative Program Areas (I-VII)	A Assessed Need COMPAS	B Treatment Slots	C Average Length of Program	D Annual Capacity	E Potential Participants
I. Academic/Vocational Programs [5,6]	54,921	43,774	12 months	43,823	
Traditional Education Programs					
Model 1		3,424	12 Months	3,424	
Model 2		6,816	12 Months	6,816	
Model 3		4,380	12 Months	4,380	
Model 4		15,000	12 Months	15,000	
Model 5		3,360	12 Months	3,360	
Literacy		5,880	12 Months	5,880	
Vocational Programs					
AUTO BODY		378	12 Months	349	
AUTO MECHANICS		459	12 Months	275	
BUILDING MAINTENANCE		270	12 Months	540	
CARPENTRY		216	12 Months	324	
ELECTRONICS (C-TECH)		594	12 Months	38	
ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION (WORK)		243	12 Months	162	
MACHINE SHOP (PRACTICAL)		108	12 Months	185	
MANICURING		108	12 Months		
MASONRY		162	12 Months	252	
OFFICE SERVICES & RELATED TECHNOLOGIES		1,134	12 Months	1,300	
PLUMBING		243	12 Months	365	
REFRIGERATION (HVAC)		243	12 Months	112	
SHEET METAL WORK		54	12 Months	72	
SMALL ENGINE REPAIR		162	12 Months	278	
WELDING		540	12 Months	711	
II. Substance Abuse Programs [7]	62,446	2,350	150 days	8,550	
In-Prison Substance Abuse		1,875	90 days	7,500	
Civil Addict Program		325	180 days	750	
Leo Chesney		150	180 days	300	
III. Criminal Thinking, Behavior, Skills, & Associations [8]	45,901				
Thinking for a Change (T4C)					
Sub Total Criminal Thinking					
IV. Aggression, Hostility, Anger & Violence [8]	48,708				
CALM					
Sub Total Anger					
V. Family Criminality [9]	31,845				
Sub Total Family Criminality					
VI. Family Support [9]	*				
Sub Total Family Support					
VII. Sex Offending [9]	*				
Sub Total Sex Offending					

Appendix B: Determining Gaps in Rehabilitative Services

SUMMARY

[1] The Institution Population is 161,147 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011 as of September 30, 2010.   The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 5,791.   The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,175, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 1, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 2, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 53, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 65, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUPM) 49, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 32, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consumnes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 485, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 903, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 5,791. Total inmate population, for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 166,938 as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] Criminogenic needs were extracted from 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset January 12, 2011. At the time the data was extracted, 15.79% of the population did not have a projected release date calculated for only those designated Moderate/High CSRA. Projected release dates are contingent upon a variety of factors that may change. Please note that the offender's central file is the most accurate source for release dates.

Footnotes

[1] The Institution Population is 161,147 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.   The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.   At the time the data was extracted 3.3% of the population did not have a projected release date calculated for only those designated Moderate/High CSRA. Projected release dates are contingent upon a variety of factors that may change. Please note that the offender's central file is the most accurate source for release dates.

[3] Some offenders may be represented in more than one program/placement criteria.

[3a] Lifers are defined as: committed to a Life sentence, sentence of death, a sentence of Life without the possibility of parole, .

[4] 61,272 Assessments were completed. Assessments were completed on the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) dataset on January 12, 2011.

[5] Average Length of Program: Factors such as Institutional setting, lockdowns, Academic calendar year, etc. are factored in to the pacing scales. Academic program pacing was not calculated for individual programs. An average of 12 months per program was used for all educational programming.

[6] Annual Capacity is based on the number of treatment slots multiplied by the estimated program length.

[7] As of January 1, 2010, the capacity for all Substance Abuse Programs (SAPs) is 2,350. Of this total, 1,875 are general program slots with a program length of 90 days, 325 are Civil Narcotic Addict program slots with a program length of 180 days, and 150 are Leo Chesney program slots with a program length 180 days. .

[8] Program has been contracted, but not implemented.

[9] Rehabilitation Program has not been implemented. Data has not been collected at this time.

Columns (A-D)

Column A: 'Assessed Need COMPAS' This number was derived from the Target Population as of September 30, 2010 (Target Population is defined as: Projected Release date of between 7 and 36 months with a CSRA Score of Moderate/High ONLY) Total number, per program, was extrapolated by the percentage of those that had been assessed with a Moderate/High need multiplied to the total Target population. Column A was derived from the 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset on January 12, 2011.

Note: Program information does not include COCF Data. COCF programs are similar, but are not exactly the same as California State Institutions.

Column B: Treatment Slots : Based on the budgeted program plan

Column C: Average Length of Program : VocEd average length of program is 12 months. SAP average length of program is 90 days as of January 1, 2010.

Column D: Annual Capacity : is determined by two different formulas, monthly and weekly.   **1.** (Monthly) 12(months of the year)/(divided by) number of program months (*) times capacity. **2.** (Weekly) 52 (weeks in a year) /(number of weeks in the program) (*)times capacity.

Column E: 'Potential Participants' is determined by subtracting the number of students in Column D:Enrolled/Assigned from Column A: Assessed Need COMPAS. These totals are listed within each Rehabilitative Program section.

Data Source: September 2010 Education Monthly Report and OSATS Population Report, Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS)

All Parole Regions I-IV	Parole Population [1]	CSRA Score Low [2]	CSRA Score Mod/High [2]
Totals	121,378	27,500	90,407

Rehabilitative Program Areas (I-IV) [3]	A	B
	Capacity (Quota) [10]	Enrolled/Assigned
I. Residential Programs		
Residential Multi-Service Centers [4]		
Total RMSC	540	979
Parolee Service Centers [5]		
Total PSC	764	2,308
Total Residential Programs	1,304	3,287
II. Day Center Programs		
Day Reporting Centers [6]		
Total DRC	500	1,043
Community-Based Coalition [7]		
Total CBC	450	422
Total Day Center Programs	950	1,465
III. Substance Abuse Program		
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [8]		
Total STAR	521	4,755
Total Substance Abuse Program	521	4,755
IV. Education Program		
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [9]		
Total CLLC	375	1,775
Total Education Program	375	1,775

[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the community. All data for programs was provided by the Division of Adult Parole Operations.

[4] RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[5] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

[6] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing.

[7] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental heal services.

[8] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[9] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[10] Capacity total does not include expired contracts, only currently active contracts.

Parole Region I	Parole Population [1]	CSRA Score Low [2]	CSRA Score Mod/High [2]
Totals	28,619	6,096	21,409

	A	B
Rehabilitative Program Areas (I-IV) [3]	**Capacity (Quota) [10]**	**Enrolled/Assigned**
I. Residential Programs		
Residential Multi-Service Centers [4]		
New Directions	25	48
New Directions	20	15
New Directions	25	44
Turning Point Kennemer	25	101
Turning Point Kennemer I	65	59
West Care	85	160
Cache Creek	25	41
Sub-Total RMSC	270	468
Parolee Service Centers [5]		
Turning Point Bakersfield	79	291
Turning Point Visaila	25	38
Turning Point Fresno	75	322
Shasta Sierra	12	33
Sub-Total PSC	191	684
II. Day Center Programs		
Day Reporting Centers [6]		
Behavioral Interventions - Stockton	100	232
Sub-Total DRC	100	232
Community-Based Coalition [7]		
Sacramento County Office of Educ.	100	266
Sub-Total CBC	100	266
III. Substance Abuse Program		
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [8]		
[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the	175	1,595
certain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.	175	1,595
IV. Education Program		
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [9]		
Contra Costa Office of Education	108	384
Sub-Total CLLC	108	384

[1] Derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on September 7, 2010, as of August 31, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of September 30, 2010 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the community. All data for programs was provided by the Division of Adult Parole Operations.

[4] RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[5] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

[6] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing.

[7] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental heal services.

[8] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[9] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[10] Capacity sub-total does not include expired contracts, only currently active contracts.

Parole Region II	Parole Population [1]	CSRA Score Low [2]	CSRA Score Mod/High [2]
Totals	22,775	4,861	17,336

	A	B
Rehabilitative Program Areas (I-IV) [3]	**Capacity (Quota) [10]**	**Enrolled/Assigned**
I. Residential Programs		
Residential Multi-Service Centers [4]		
Allied Fellowship Services	40	84
Sub-Total RMSC	40	84
Parolee Service Centers [5]		
GeoCare San Francisco	60	108
Turning Point Salinas	45	144
VOA Elsie Dunn	48	158
VOA Oakland West	72	222
Sub-Total PSC	225	632
II. Day Center Programs		
Day Reporting Centers [6]		
Walden House	100	287
Santa Barbara Police Department	100	60
Sub-Total DRC	200	347
Community-Based Coalition [7]		
East Palo Alto Police Dept. (Expired 7-1-10)	50	8
Sub-Total CBC	50	8
III. Substance Abuse Program		
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [8]		
Contra Costa County Office of Education	85	789
Sub-Total STAR	85	789
IV. Education Program		
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [9]		
Contra Costa County Office of Education	16	97
Sub-Total CLLC	16	97

[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the community. All data for programs was provided by the Division of Adult Parole Operations.

[4] RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[5] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

[6] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing.

[7] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental heal services.

[8] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[9] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[10] Capacity sub-total does not include expired contracts, only currently active contracts.

Parole Region III	Parole Population [1]	CSRA Score Low [2]	CSRA Score Mod/High [2]
Totals	31,980	8,268	22,958

Rehabilitative Program Areas (I-IV) [3]	A Capacity (Quota) [10]	B Enrolled/Assigned
I. Residential Programs		
Residential Multi-Service Centers [4]		
Amistad De Los Angeles	100	189
Weingart Foundation	95	152
Sub-Total RMSC	195	341
Parolee Service Centers [5]		
Behavioral Systems SW Orion	100	318
Behavioral Systems SW Hollywood	63	184
CEC, Inc	45	61
Hoffman House	15	53
Sub-Total PSC	223	616
II. Day Center Programs		
Day Reporting Centers [6]		
None Established	0	0
Sub-Total DRC	0	0
Community-Based Coalition [7]		
Human Potential Consultants, LLC - Los Angeles	300	148
(Expired 7-1-10)		
Sub-Total CBC	300	148
III. Substance Abuse Program		
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [8]		
Contra Costa County Office of Education	120	1122
Sub-Total STAR	120	1122
IV. Education Program		
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [9]		
Contra Costa County Office of Education	152	697
Sub-Total CLLC	152	697

[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[4] RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[5] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

[6] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing.

[7] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental heal services.

[8] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education.   STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[9] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[10] Capacity sub-total does not include expired contracts, only currently active contracts.

Parole Region IV	Parole Population [1]	CSRA Score Low [2]	CSRA Score Mod/High [2]
Totals	38,004	8,275	28,704

	A	B
Rehabilitative Program Areas (I-IV) [3]	**Capacity (Quota) [10]**	**Enrolled/Assigned**
I. Residential Programs		
Residential Multi-Service Centers [4]		
VOA Southwest	35	86
Sub-Total RMSC	35	86
Parolee Service Centers [5]		
National Crossroads	40	97
W&B Facilities	40	155
VOA San Diego	45	124
Sub-Total PSC	125	376
II. Day Center Programs		
Day Reporting Centers [6]		
Human Potential Consultants, LLC - Riverside	100	238
Behavioral Interventions - San Diego	100	226
Sub-Total DRC	200	464
Community-Based Coalition [7]		
None Established	0	0
Sub-Total CBC	0	0
III. Substance Abuse Program		
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [8]		
Contra Costa County Office of Education	141	1249
Sub-Total STAR	141	1249
IV. Education Program		
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [9]		
Contra Costa County Office of Education	99	597
Sub-Total CLLC	99	597

[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the

[4] RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[5] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

[6] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing.

[7] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental heal services.

[8] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[9] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[10] Capacity sub-total does not include expired contracts, only currently active contracts.

Appendix C: Determining Levels of Offender Participation and Offender Success
Academic
Reporting Period: May 2010 till September 2010

Academic[1]	Budgeted slots at start of reporting period (May 1, 2010 Capacity)[2]	Beginning student population (as of May 1, 2010)[3]	Admissions during reporting period (May 2010 through September 2010)[4]	Program exits during reporting period (May 2010 through September 2010)			Ending population as of September 30, 2010[7]	# of program hours per period (XSEA)[8]	Participant hours per period (X-Time)[9]	Participation Rate (Monthly Average of X/XSEA Time for this period)[10]
				Total Number of Program Exits[5]	Number of Completions[6]	% of Program exits due to Completions				
COCF with All Institution's Total	35,731	12,643	23,389	16,692	1,815	10.9%	21,241	4,896,637	3,168,236	64.7%
All Institution's Total	33,248	10,907	22,000	15,800	1,598	10.1%	19,008	3,795,481	2,574,045	67.8%
ASP	1,452	375	1,393	1,720	38	2.2%	1,138	191,077	125,121	65.5%
CAL	972	239	283	93	27	29.%	880	155,549	75,626	48.6%
CCC	1,164	430	1,141	911	129	14.2%	467	78,047	48,367	62.%
CCI	1,250	300	517	367	38	10.4%	682	104,049	70,384	67.6%
CCWF	456	301	537	244	56	23.%	338	190,919	165,919	86.9%
CEN	1,422	208	536	248	36	14.5%	628	113,859	89,812	78.9%
*CIM	642	233	474	302	43	14.2%	389	56,049	44,317	79.1%
CIW	552	114	411	325	131	40.3%	256	46,787	38,274	81.8%
CMC	1,478	110	1,197	528	31	5.9%	870	156,064	85,050	54.5%
CMF	750	248	192	393	12	3.1%	272	52,269	27,430	52.5%
COCF [11]	2,483	1,736	1,389	892	217	24.3%	2,233	1,101,156	594,191	54.%
COR	1,632	480	752	456	81	17.8%	638	143,225	106,670	74.5%
CRC	1,302	769	1,012	705	64	9.1%	790	172,476	111,800	64.8%
CTF	1,952	1,285	1,156	634	101	15.9%	1,628	310,426	266,171	85.7%
CVSP	792	357	507	258	33	12.8%	562	134,312	109,524	81.5%
*DVI	120	89	106	134	50	37.3%	31	10,613	10,613	100.%
FOL	1,390	898	883	749	227	30.3%	857	170,422	140,169	82.2%
HDSP	1,218	334	1,028	411	79	19.2%	955	182,942	50,848	27.8%
ISP	1,446	27	605	177	13	7.3%	823	70,269	48,082	68.4%
KVSP	1,464	335	709	517	10	1.9%	699	106,376	59,181	55.6%
*LAC	772	0	254	40	33	82.5%	237	45,671	37,377	81.8%
MCSP	846	396	276	412	27	6.6%	375	86,321	65,375	75.7%
*NKSP	268	0	121	145	14	9.7%	0	9,393	5,642	60.1%
PBSP	720	141	341	173	18	10.4%	297	63,028	46,238	73.4%
PVSP	1,422	311	810	339	14	4.1%	809	147,125	96,176	65.4%
*RJD	984	177	146	161	19	11.8%	223	27,366	12,185	44.5%
SAC	798	111	490	174	18	10.3%	429	62,784	46,014	73.3%
SATF	1,904	1,273	1,591	1,993	8	0.4%	1,186	325,313	197,572	60.7%
SCC	1,138	338	2,118	1,650	90	5.5%	774	211,924	168,020	79.3%
SOL	1,014	257	681	418	57	13.6%	651	95,273	50,876	53.4%
*SQ	386	212	399	296	56	18.9%	292	49,088	36,393	74.1%
SVSP	882	466	304	252	43	17.1%	460	106,113	52,662	49.6%
VSPW	606	93	1,011	565	2	0.4%	362	115,753	82,397	71.2%
*WSP	54	0	19	10	0	0.0%	10	4,601	3,763	81.8%

Academic Footnotes

[1] Academic programs include traditional programs (i.e ABE I, ABE II, ABE III, and GED). Prior to May 2010, enrollment data for academic and vocational education was reported based on the capacity associated with active classrooms (quota). Beginning in May 2010, the definitions were changed to reflect the full budgeted capacity including vacant positions. Historical capacity data using the new definition is not available.

[2] The Budgeted Capacity is the total number of students who may be assigned/enrolled that is approved by the "Office of Correctional Education". The Budgeted Capacity would include all Active and In-Active classes regardless of vacant positions.

[3] Derived from the EMR Metric Analysis: Data Element "acaSA No Students Enrolled".

[4] Derived from the EMR Metric Analysis: Data Element "acaSA No Students Adds".

[5] Total Number of Program Exits include those who have completed the program and therefore exited and are drived from the EMR Metric Analysis: Data Element "acaSA No Students Drops".

[6] Program Completions are deemed as a program exit since the student is unassigned upon completion of a program. This figure includes those who have completed a traditional academic program and are derived from the EMR Metric Analysis: Data Element "aca1A Total Program Completions".

[7] Derived from the EMR Metric Analysis; data element "acaSA Ending No Students".

[8] Total hourly attendance for this time period is illustrated through XSEA-time. XSEA-time is defined as the following: The combined hourly total of X-time, Total S-time, E-time, and A-time. Each hour an inmate spends in a classroom or academic program represents a particular programming type and is catalogued in X,S,E, or A-times (or hours). Terms and definitions of XSEA-time are defined in the following: S-time: the total number of hours of programming lost due to circumstances that prevented students to attend class. This includes teacher illnesses, institutional lock-downs, medical/dental issues, attorney visits, remove to out-to-court status, program modifications, late-feeding, inclement weather, or any other event that restricts regular inmate programming. (Source: Title 15 § 3045.3). E-time: 3045.2 Excused time off is defined as an excused time for the inmate for personal reasons, i.e., family visitations, special religious functions, etc. (Source: EMR Counting Rules). A-time: allocates unexcused inmate attendance. (Source: EMR Counting Rules; Title 15 § 3041 Performance & § 3040 Participation)

[9] X-time is the total amount of actual hours and time an inmate attends the classroom they are assigned (Data Source: EMR Counting Rules

[10] X/XSEA-time is the actual programming hours an inmate spent in class divided by the combined total of hours lost due to other circumstances (SEA-time). This formula calculates actual program participation (i.e., utilization).
*Note: Institutions designated as Reception Centers are CIM, DVI, LAC, NKSP, RJD, SQ and WSP. Reception Centers have higher rates of inmate turnover as these Institutions are designated with the task of placing incoming inmates in appropriate level Institutions. As such there are generally few Academic programs functioning in these Institutions due to the dynamic environment.

[11] COCF- CDCR-RECOGNIZED ACADEMIC PROGRAMS INCLUDE:
- Adult Basic Education
- English as a Second Language
- General Educational Development Preparation
- Adult Education in Spanish Programs

Appendix C: Determining Levels of Offender Participation and Offender Success
Vocational
Reporting Period: April 2010 till September 2010

Vocational[1]	Budgeted slots at start of reporting period (April 1, 2010 Quota)[2]	Beginning student population (as of April 1, 2010)[3]	Admissions during reporting period (April 2010 thru September 2010)[4]	Program exits during reporting period (April 2010 thru September 2010)				Ending population as of September 30, 2010 [7]	# of program hours per period (XSEA)[8]	Participant hours* per period (X-Time)[9]	Participation Rate (Monthly Average of X/XSEA Time for this period)[10]
				Total Number of Program Exits[5]	Number of Completions (Termination Code - 1A)[6]	Number of Course (Partial) Completions (Termination Code - 1B)[6]	% of Program exits due to partial and full Completions				
COCF with All Institution's Total	5,797	4,328	6,247	3,894	877	831	43.9%	5,174	2,809,283	1,621,276	57.7%
All Institution's Total	4,887	3,655	5,536	3,411	597	778	40.3%	4,273	2,373,698	1,362,604	57.4%
ASP	405	296	226	241	46	14	24.9%	360	188,310	136,313	72.4%
CAL	108	65	28	46	38	0	82.6%	81	28,380	12,031	42.4%
CCC	189	162	184	188	19	98	62.2%	162	97,166	54,203	55.8%
CCI	243	214	154	142	25	42	47.2%	215	132,384	78,010	58.9%
CCWF	81	153	2,059	115	16	27	37.4%	110	64,162	44,968	70.1%
CEN	270	217	206	142	17	45	43.7%	257	141,301	54,193	38.4%
*CIM	81	27	113	303	19	118	45.2%	52	41,535	23,292	56.1%
CIW	162	50	39	42	12	12	57.1%	48	25,715	20,829	81.%
CMC	216	162	119	118	17	28	38.1%	189	109,786	68,230	62.1%
CMF	54	64	43	54	7	4	20.4%	56	35,982	18,637	51.8%
COCF [11]	910	673	711	483	280	53	68.9%	901	435,585	258,672	59.4%
COR	162	101	138	120	14	77	75.8%	120	59,552	35,555	59.7%
CRC	243	189	147	122	6	37	35.2%	210	116,435	73,957	63.5%
CTF	162	156	100	97	62	2	66.%	108	66,724	39,855	59.7%
CVSP	216	160	87	66	34	16	75.8%	187	98,740	64,086	64.9%
*DVI	0		0	0	0	0			0	0	
FOL	216	186	151	140	7	51	41.4%	189	121,194	81,256	67.%
HDSP	54	48	38	52	4	12	30.8%	44	31,791	7,991	25.1%
ISP	270	250	217	190	39	26	34.2%	331	134,291	65,412	48.7%
KVSP	162	24	155	78	8	1	11.5%	97	56,889	23,659	41.6%
*LAC	54		49	26	24	0	92.3%	54	24,237	7,563	31.2%
MCSP	135	133	60	66	31	15	69.7%	129	74,761	57,126	76.4%
*NKSP	0		0	0	0	0			0	0	
PBSP	27	9	2	4	2	0	50.%	8	6,112	3,348	54.8%
PVSP	270	83	240	129	3	26	22.5%	226	115,310	43,813	38.%
*RJD	81		108	104	21	0	20.2%	66	32,779	23,020	70.2%
SAC	81	69	39	30	6	0	20.%	79	40,904	34,311	83.9%
SATF	351	315	298	291	29	14	14.8%	327	195,398	114,672	58.7%
SCC	162	133	166	161	41	67	67.1%	157	93,033	54,079	58.1%
SOL	216	186	150	116	8	0	6.9%	216	114,813	48,906	42.6%
*SQ	54	41	60	59	14	8	37.3%	60	30,222	18,734	62.%
SVSP	0		0	0	0	0			0	0	
VSPW	162	162	160	169	28	38	39.1%	135	95,796	54,561	57.%
*WSP	0		0	0	0	0			0	0	

Vocational Footnotes

[1] Traditional Vocational is any adult rehabilitative program or class instructing vocational trades in the Office of Correctional Education (OCE) or the Division of Education, Vocation, for Offenders Program (DEVOP) in Adult Programs.

[2] The Budget Capacity is the total number of students who may be assigned/enrolled that is approved by the "Office of Correctional Education". The Budget Capacity would include all active and in-active classes regardles of vacant positions.

[3] Derived from the EMR Metric Analysis; data element"vBeginning Assignments".

[4] Derived from the EMR Metric Analysis; data element"vStudents Added During Month".

[5] Total Number of Program Exits include those who have completed the program and therefore exited. Derived from the EMR Metric Analysis; data element "vStudents Dropped During Month".

[6] OCE has determined the need to include both partial and full program completion as Vocational programs include multiple course and/or components which can be taught and certified individually. Students completing a course may still obtain skills and certification necessary for specific jobs. Termination Code 1A represents the full program completion; Termination Code 1B represents course (partial) completion of a program. OCE acknowledges potential discrepancies that may exist as Vocational Instructors are unfamiliar with Termination codes. Prior Education Monthly Reports did not require teachers to list the termination code used for a student exit. This item will be brought forth in future training sessions to insure all teachers understand and report termination codes in a consistent manner

[7] Derived from the EMR Metric Analysis; data element "vEnding Student Assignment".

[8] Total hourly attendance for this time period is illustrated through XSEA-time. XSEA-time is defined as the following: The combined hourly total of X-time, S-time, E-time, and A-time. Each hour an inmate spends in a classroom or academic program represents a particular programming type and is catalogued in X,S,E, or A-times (or hours). Terms and definitions of XSEA-time are defined in the following: S-time: the total number of hours of programming lost due to circumstances that prevented students to attend class. This includes teacher illnesses, institutional lock-downs, medical/dental issues, attorney visits, remove to out-to-court status, program modifications, late-feeding, inclement weather, or any other event that restricts regular inmate programming. (Source: Title 15 § 3045.3). E-time: 3045.2 Excused time off is defined as an excused time for the inmate for personal reasons, i.e., family visitations, special religious functions, etc. (Source: EMR Counting Rules). A-time: allocates unexcused inmate attendance. (Source: EMR Counting Rules; Title 15 § 3041 Performance & § 3040 Participation).

[9] X-time is the total amount of actual hours and time an inmate attends the classroom they are assigned (Data Source: EMR Counting Rules).

[10] X/XSEA-time is the actual programming hours an inmate spent in class divided by the combined total of hours lost due to other circumstances (SEA-time). This formula calculates actual program participation (i.e., utilization).

*Note: Institutions designated as Reception Centers are CIM, DVI, LAC, NKSP, RJD, SQ and WSP. Reception Centers have higher rates of inmate turnover as these Institutions are designated with the task of placing incoming inmates in appropriate level Institutions. As such there are few if any Vocational programs functioning in these Institutions due to the dynamic environment. DVI, NKSP and WSP has no Vocational programs.

[11] **COCF** CDCR-RECOGNIZED VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS INCLUDE:

• AutoCAD
• Braille
• Carpentry
• Computers
• Kentucky Workplace Essentials/Life Skills
• Horticulture
• Electrical
• Masonry
• Painting
• Plumbing
• Core
• Barbering

Appendix C: Determining Levels of Offender Participation and Offender Success
Substance Abuse Programs
September 2010

SAP[1]	Activated slots at start of reporting period (April 1, 2010 Quota)[2]	Beginning population as of April 1, 2010[3]	Admissions during reporting period (April 1, 2010 to September 30, 2010)[3]	Program exits during reporting period (April 1, 2010 through September 30, 2010)[3]			Ending population as of September 30, 2010[5]	# of program hours per period (XSEA)	Participant hours* per period (X-Time)	Participation Rate (Monthly Average of X/XSEA Time for this period)
				Total Number of Program Exits[3]	Number of Completions[4]	% of Program exits due to Completions[4]				
COCF with All Institution's Total	3,006	2,693	3,894	3,647	3,090	84.7%	2,938	1,535,874	1,241,514	80.8%
All Institution's Total	2,350	2,228	3,527	3,441	3,060	88.9%	2,314	834,341	720,497	86.4%
ASP	200	200	360	364	311	85.4%	196	64,410	54,124	84.%
CAL										
CCC										
CCI	160	160	314	313	294	93.9%	161	62,275	57,738	92.7%
CCWF	175	175	348	350	326	93.1%	173	58,466	52,142	89.2%
CEN										
CIM	150	150	304	299	253	84.6%	155	46,433	38,491	82.9%
CIW	175	175	130	128	99	77.3%	177	61,468	56,740	92.3%
CMC	150	75	275	281	249	88.6%	69	54,979	50,401	91.7%
CMF										
COCF	656	465	367	206	30	14.6%	624	701,533	521,017	74.3%
COR										
CRC	225	225	117	63	33	52.4%	279	94,576	80,218	84.8%
CTF	150	104	228	234	212	90.6%	98	52,816	46,044	87.2%
CVSP	150	150	221	244	210	86.1%	127	58,090	54,350	93.6%
DVI										
FOL										
HDSP										
ISP										
KVSP										
LAC										
MCSP										
NKSP										
PBSP										
PVSP										
RJD										
SAC										
SATF[6]	340	340	506	586	557	95.1%	260	105,593	84,920	80.4%
SCC										
SOL	150	150	241	231	210	90.9%	160	44,549	31,200	70.%
SQ										
SVSP										
VSPW[6]	175	175	300	168	163	97.0%	307	63,001	51,628	81.9%
WSP										
Leo Chesney[6]	150	149	183	180	143	79.4%	152	67,687	62,502	92.3%

SAP Footnotes

[1] SAP is a Substance Abuse Program. As of January 1, 2010, the Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Services had 13 Substance Abuse Programs in 12 institutions and 1 Community Correctional Facility.

[2] Counts taken from Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Population Report March 29, 2010 - April 2, 2010.

[3] Beginning population matches CROB data reported for "Ending Population as of March 31, 2010", Appendix C SAP.

[4] Program admissions and exit data obtained from the Offender Substance Abuse Treatment (OSAT) database, version 12/29/2010. Data quality is subject to the accuracy and completeness of data submitted by OSATS contracted treatment providers. Admissions and exits are calculated as one admit and one exit per participant per program for the specified time period.

[5] Ending population is a derived figure taken from adding the beginning population and the admissions and subtracting program exits.

[6] September 2010 data missing or incomplete for contracted treatment provider Walden House (SAPs at SATF, VSPW, Leo Chesney).

Appendix C: Determining Levels of Offender Participation and Offender Success
Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (OSATS) Contracted Community Programs
September 2010

OSATS program (by individual programs or aggregated)[1]	Activated slots at start of reporting period (April 1, 2010 Quota)[2]	Beginning population as of April 1, 2010[3]	Admissions during reporting period (April 1, 2010 till September 30, 2010)[4]	Program exits during reporting period (April 1, 2010 to September 30, 2010)[4]			Ending population as of September 30, 2010[5]	# of program hours per period (XSEA)[6]	Participant hours per period (X-Time)[6]	Participation Rate (Monthly Average of X/XSEA Time for this period)[6]
				Total Number of Program Exits	Number of Completions	% of Program exits due to Completions				
All Parole Regions		4,539	6,334	6,099	3,244	53.2%	4,774			
Parole Region I		2,042	2,058	2,038	1,309	64.2%	2,062			
Parole Region II		688	957	913	486	53.2%	732			
Parole Region III[7]		853	1,983	1,772	807	45.5%	1,064			
Parole Region IV		956	1,336	1,376	642	46.7%	916			
Rehabilitation Programs not yet implemented:										
Alcohol and other drugs (by individual programs or aggregated)										
Aggression, hostility, anger, and violence (by individual programs or aggregated)										
Criminal thinking, behaviors, and associations (by individual programs or aggregated)										
Family, marital, and relationships (by individual programs or aggregated)										
Sex Offending (by individual programs or aggregated)										

Community-based SAP Footnotes

[1] Community-based substance abuse programs are managed by Substance Abuse Service Coordination Agencies (SASCA). There is one SASCA for each parole region.

[2] OSATS does not maintain a specific number of community-based treatment slots. They are allocated by the SASCA as parolees enter community-based treatment. OSATS is required to maintain funding for an amount of community-based slots equal to 50% of the number of in-prison SAP clients served annually.

[3] Beginning population matches CROB data reported for "Ending Population as of March 31, 2010", Appendix C OSATS.

[4] Program admission and exit data obtained from the Offender Substance Abuse Treatment (OSAT) database version 12/29/2010. Data quality is subject to the accuracy and completeness of data submitted by

[5] Ending population is a derived figure taken from adding the beginning population and the admissions and subtracting program exits

[6] OSATS is unable to track hourly utilization for community-based programs at this time.

[7] September 2010 data may be missing or incomplete for Contracted Treatment Provider Walden House, Region 3.

PAROLE REGION I	Capacity [1]	Beginning Pop. [1] Apr. 1, 2010	Referrals [1, 2] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Enrollments [1, 3] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Exits [1, 4] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Ending Pop. [1, 11] Sep., 30, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers [5]						
New Directions	25	24	80	48	47	25
New Directions	20	20	43	15	10	25
New Directions	25	25	62	44	49	20
Turning Point Kennemer	25	25	257	101	101	25
Turning Point Kennemer	65	63	184	59	60	62
West Care	85	78	269	160	155	83
Cache Creek	25	23	91	41	59	5
Sub-Total RMSC	270	258	986	468	481	245
Parolee Service Centers [6]						
Turning Point Bakersfield	79	66	414	291	273	84
Turning Point Visalia	25	27	29	38	43	22
Turning Point Fresno	75	72	452	322	319	75
Shasta Sierra	12	12	63	33	33	12
Sub-Total PSC	191	177	958	684	668	193
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers [7]						
Behavioral Interventions - Stockton	100	0	267	232	152	80
Sub-Total DRC	100	0	267	232	152	80
Community-Based Coalition [8]						
Sacramento County Office of Educ.	100	228	841	266	254	240
Sub-Total CBC	100	228	841	266	254	240
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [9]						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	175	190	1,699	1,595	1,634	151
Sub-Total STAR	175	190	1,699	1,595	1,634	151
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [10]						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	108	213	411	384	402	195
Sub-Total CLLC	108	213	411	384	402	195

[1] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the community. All data for programs was provided by the Division of Adult Parole Operations.

[2] Referrals - The total number of verifiable voluntary and remedial sanction placements inquiries received by the program.

[3] Enrollments - The number of voluntary and remedial sanction parolees placed/enrolled into the program.

[4] Exits - The number of parolees who have completed the program or left for voluntary or involuntary reasons.

[5] RMSC numbers are by site location. All other categories are by contract. RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[6] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

There may be more beds at the facility that is utilized as overflow, but contract dollars may not be exceeded. The programs duration is 90 days to 1 year.

[7] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing. DRC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and Conditional Use Permits (CUP). The DRCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. DRC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[8] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental health services. CBC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and CUP. The CBCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. CBC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[9] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[10] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[11] Exited participants are occasionally readmitted to the respective program but not necessarily counted as a new enrollment. Thus, the ending population does not equate to the exact methodology of "Beginning Pop + Enrollments - Exits = End Pop"

Determining Gaps in Rehabilitative Services
April 2010 - September 2010
Region II

PAROLE REGION II	Capacity [1]	Beginning Pop.[1] Apr. 1, 2010	Referrals [1, 2] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Enrollments [1, 3] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Exits [1, 4] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Ending Pop. [1, 11] Sep., 30, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers [5]						
Allied Fellowship Services	40	30	113	84	76	38
Sub-Total RMSC	40	30	113	84	76	38
Parolee Service Centers [6]						
GeoCare San Francisco	60	62	142	108	125	45
Turning Point Salinas	45	45	241	144	147	42
VOA Elsie Dunn	48	48	90	158	158	48
VOA Oakland West	72	72	222	222	225	69
Sub-Total PSC	225	227	695	632	655	204
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers [7]						
Walden House	100	18	290	287	199	106
Santa Barbara Police Department	100	0	114	60	13	47
Sub-Total DRC	200	18	404	347	212	153
Community-Based Coalition [8]						
East Palo Alto Police Dept. (Expired 7-1-10)	50	34	8	8	50	0
Sub-Total CBC	50	34	8	8	50	0
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [9]						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	85	87	788	789	792	84
Sub-Total STAR	85	87	788	789	792	84
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [10]						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	16	36	108	97	107	26
Sub-Total CLLC	16	36	108	97	107	26

[1] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the community. All data for programs was provided by the Division of Adult Parole Operations.

[2] Referrals - The total number of verifiable voluntary and remedial sanction placements inquiries received by the program.

[3] Enrollments - The number of voluntary and remedial sanction parolees placed/enrolled into the program.

[4] Exits - The number of parolees who have completed the program or left for voluntary or involuntary reasons.

[5] RMSC numbers are by site location. All other categories are by contract. RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[6] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

There may be more beds at the facility that is utilized as overflow, but contract dollars may not be exceeded. The programs duration is 90 days to 1 year.

[7] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing. DRC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and Conditional Use Permits (CUP). The DRCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. DRC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[8] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental health services. CBC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and CUP. The CBCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. CBC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[9] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[10] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[11] Exited participants are occasionally readmitted to the respective program but not necessarily counted as a new enrollment. Thus, the ending population does not equate to the exact methodology of "Beginning Pop + Enrollments - Exits = End Pop"

PAROLE REGION III	Capacity [1]	Beginning Pop.[1] Apr. 1, 2010	Referrals [1,2] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Enrollments [1,3] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Exits [1,4] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Ending Pop. [1,11] Sep., 30, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers [5]						
Amistad De Los Angeles	100	98	282	189	192	95
Weingart Foundation	95	95	262	152	153	94
Sub-Total RMSC	195	193	544	341	345	189
Parolee Service Centers [6]						
Behavioral Systems SW Orion	100	82	706	318	290	110
Behavioral Systems SW Hollywood	63	61	412	184	181	64
CEC, Inc	45	45	284	61	59	47
Hoffman House	15	16	121	53	54	15
Sub-Total PSC	223	204	1,523	616	584	236
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers [7]						
None Established	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total DRC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community-Based Coalition [8]						
Human Potential Consultants, LLC - Los Angeles (Expired 7-1-10)	300	186	198	148	334	0
Sub-Total CBC	300	186	198	148	334	0
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery [9]						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	120	155	1,120	1,122	1,151	126
Sub-Total STAR	120	155	1,120	1,122	1,151	126
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [10]						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	152	213	608	697	666	244
Sub-Total CLLC	152	213	608	697	666	244

[1] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the community. All data for programs was provided by the Division of Adult Parole Operations.

[2] Referrals - The total number of verifiable voluntary and remedial sanction placements inquiries received by the program.

[3] Enrollments - The number of voluntary and remedial sanction parolees placed/enrolled into the program.

[4] Exits - The number of parolees who have completed the program or left for voluntary or involuntary reasons.

[5] RMSC numbers are by site location. All other categories are by contract. RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[6] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

There may be more beds at the facility that is utilized as overflow, but contract dollars may not be exceeded. The programs duration is 90 days to 1 year.

[7] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing. DRC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and Conditional Use Permits (CUP). The DRCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. DRC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[8] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental health services. CBC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and CUP. The CBCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. CBC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[9] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[10] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[11] Exited participants are occasionally readmitted to the respective program but not necessarily counted as a new enrollment. Thus, the ending population does not equate to the exact methodology of "Beginning Pop + Enrollments - Exits = End Pop"

PAROLE REGION IV	Capacity [1]	Beginning Pop.[1] Apr. 1, 2010	Referrals [1,2] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Enrollments [1,3] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Exits [1,4] Apr '10 - Sep'10	Ending Pop. [1,11] Sep., 30, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers [5]						
VOA Southwest	35	35	184	86	86	35
Sub-Total RMSC	35	35	184	86	86	35
Parolee Service Centers [6]						
National Crossroads	40	39	99	97	100	36
W&B	40	38	221	155	155	38
VOA San Diego	45	43	255	124	126	41
Sub-Total PSC	125	120	575	376	381	115
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers [7]						
Human Potential Consultants, LLC - Riverside	100	0	489	238	100	138
Behavioral Interventions - San Diego	100	114	356	226	233	107
Sub-Total DRC	200	114	845	464	333	245
Community-Based Coalition [8]						
None Established	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total CBC	0	0	0	0	0	0
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery						
Contra Costa County Office of Education [9]	141	143	1,098	1,249	1,254	138
Sub-Total STAR	141	143	1,098	1,249	1,254	138
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers [10]						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	99	213	608	597	578	232
Sub-Total CLLC	99	213	608	597	578	232

[1] All programs are accessible to mentally ill parolees. Participants must meet the program requirements for participation, and must be capable of functioning effectively and independently in the program. Reasonable accommodations will be made based on the need and evaluated on a case by case basis. Division of Adult Parole Operation provides both interdisciplinary and holistic life skills to assist Parolees to cope in the community. All data for programs was provided by the Division of Adult Parole Operations.

[2] Referrals - The total number of verifiable voluntary and remedial sanction placements inquiries received by the program.

[3] Enrollments - The number of voluntary and remedial sanction parolees placed/enrolled into the program.

[4] Exits - The number of parolees who have completed the program or left for voluntary or involuntary reasons.

[5] RMSC numbers are by site location. All other categories are by contract. RMSC provides housing, drug counseling, literacy training, job preparation/placement, anger management, and counseling.

[6] PSC provides employment assistance, substance abuse, stress management, victim awareness, computer supported literation, and life skills.

There may be more beds at the facility that is utilized as overflow, but contract dollars may not be exceeded. The programs duration is 90 days to 1 year.

[7] DRC provides substance abuse education, anger management, domestic violence awareness, life skills, parenting, money management, GED preparation, transitional housing. DRC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and Conditional Use Permits (CUP). The DRCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. DRC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[8] CBC provides substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, domestic violence, general education, parenting for fathers, mental health services. CBC capacity is based on the total number of parolee-participants that may receive services at the facility at one time based on local jurisdiction health and safety codes and CUP. The CBCs must serve a minimum number of parolees annually; however, there is no limit to the maximum number served. CBC enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation at different times during the day.

[9] STAR provides substance abuse education including addiction/recovery, 12-step methodology, relapse prevention, community transition, healthy relationships, and health education. STAR enrollments may exceed capacity due to parolee participation exceeding designated capacity.

[10] CLLC provides a computer assisted instructional program focusing on basic proficiency in reading, writing, and computational skills. CLLC enrollments may exceed capacity due to open entry/open exit program and multiple parolees may utilize the same work station in one day.

[11] Exited participants are occasionally readmitted to the respective program but not necessarily counted as a new enrollment. Thus, the ending population does not equate to the exact methodology of "Beginning Pop + Enrollments - Exits = End Pop"

APPENDIX D: PROGRAM COMPLETION
Reporting Period April 2010 till September 2010

	April	May	June	July	August	September	Totals
Academic Program Completion[1]:							
ELD	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
ABE I	7	27	16	11	11	30	102
ABE II	4	6	19	9	8	25	71
ABE III	8	2	5	3	18	43	79
Certifications/Diplomas:							
GED[2]	133	307	330	170	360	325	1,625
High School Diploma	9	5	1	3	12	4	34
Vocational Program Completion[3]:							
Total	42	69	74	67	110	116	478
Certifications[4]:							
Total	556	257	425	410	297	408	2,353

Datasource: Education Monthly Report; Counting Rules; Monthly Accomplishment Reports

Footnotes:

[1]The student has completed the program when all requisite assignments have been passed, and the student is promoted to the next level of instruction. Data collected from the Monthly Accomplishment Reports (MAR).

[2]GED or General Education Development certificate, is viewed as an adult equivalent to a high school diploma.

[3]The For the month of April 2010, data elements used: Total No. of NCCER Program Completion and Total No. of Program (Non-NCCER) Completion. Due to changes in the data elements being collected from May 2010 thru September 2010 the data element used is "vocTotal No Program Completions".

[4]Totals include: Total number of NCCER Certifications awarded to inmates during the reporting month. (For Example: Building Maintence, Carpentry, Drywall Installer/Taper, etc.) Total number of Industry Certifications awarded to inmates during the reporting month. (For example: Automotive Service Excellence (ASE), C-Tech I, C-Tech II, C-Tech III, Electronics Technicians Association (ETA), Microsoft Office Specialist (MOS), American Welding Society (AWS) (do not include NCCER-issued AWS), etc.) Total number of professional licenses awarded inmates during the reporting month by the Board of Barbering and Cosmetology, Department of Pesticide Regulations, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and Environmental Protection Agency. Note: A student does not have to complete a program to obtain a license or certification.

APPENDIX D: PROGRAM COMPLETION
Reporting Period April 2010 till September 2010

	April	May	June	July	August	September	Totals
Academic Program Completion[1]:							
ELD/ESL	15	16	6	0	5	0	42
ABE I	6	10	2	9	5	1	33
ABE II	9	0	17	5	13	6	50
ABE III	8	0	28	3	15	5	59
INEA Primaria [2]	24	8	17	6	10	4	69
INEA Secundaria [2]	18	16	6	5	5	3	53
Certifications/Diplomas:							
GED[3]	0	26	63	26	10	39	164
High School Diploma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vocational Program Completion:							
NCCER[4]	9	32	5	4	28	5	83
Non-NCCER[5]	35	64	58	74	38	59	328
Certifications:							
NCCER Certifications[6]	29	51	37	7	24	12	160
Industry Certifications[7]	24	26	14	1	13	5	83
Professional Licenses[8]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Datasource: Education Monthly Report; Counting Rules
Footnotes:

[1]The student has completed the program when all requisite assignments have been passed, and the student is promoted to the next level of instruction.

[2] (INEA) Instituto Nacional para la Educación de los Adultos (INEA) Primaria is the equivalent of 1st-6th grade. Secundaria is the equivalent of 7th -9th grade

[3]GED or General Education Development certificate, is viewed as an adult equivalent to a high school diploma.

[4]The total number of students who have completed all required the National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER) components during the reporting month. (Example: If the program has 5 components and the student had completed 4 components prior to this month and he/she completed the last required component this month, this would constitute 1 NCCER Program Completion).

[5]A student has completed the program when all required courses have been passed.

[6]The total number of NCCER Certifications awarded to inmates during the reporting month. For Example: Building Maintence, Carpentry, Drywall Installer/Taper, etc. Note: A student does not have to complete a program to obtain certification.

[7]The total number of Industry Certifications awarded to inmates during the reporting month. For example: Automotive Service Excellence (ASE), C-Tech I, C-Tech II, C-Tech III, Electronics Technicians Association (ETA), Microsoft Office Specialist (MOS), American Welding Society (AWS) (do not include NCCER-issued AWS), etc. Note: A student does not have to complete a program to obtain a certification.

[8]The total number of professional licenses awarded inmates during the reporting month by the Board of Barbering and Cosmetology, Department of Pesticide Regulations, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and Environmental Protection Agency. Note: A student does not have to complete a program to obtain a license.

Appendix E: Totals for Appendix A (Institution)

Location	Academic/Vocational [1,2]	Substance Abuse [1,2]	Criminal Thinking [1,2]	Anger [1,2]	Family Criminality [1,2]	Sex Offending [3]
All Institution's Total	51,825	61,272	48,483	34,818	51,756	*
ASP	1,900	2,278	1,826	1,406	1,900	*
CAL	750	860	707	488	750	*
CCC	2,762	3,121	2,689	2,166	2,761	*
CCF-Leo Chesney	166	171	157	57	165	*
CCI	2,479	2,825	2,373	1,881	2,479	*
CCWF	1,551	1,829	1,468	438	1,532	*
CEN	843	1,147	806	541	843	*
CIM	3,000	3,383	2,566	1,672	3,000	*
CIW	1,155	1,265	1,068	507	1,132	*
CMC	1,551	2,058	1,509	1,152	1,551	*
CMF	382	601	359	246	382	*
COCF	2,067	2,321	2,039	1,541	2,067	*
COR	1,016	1,290	973	639	1,016	*
CRC	1,309	1,679	1,237	905	1,309	*
CTF	1,450	1,809	1,393	1,060	1,450	*
CVSP	1,137	1,357	1,089	787	1,137	*
DVI	2,907	3,120	2,623	2,048	2,907	*
FOL	1,105	1,439	1,058	845	1,105	*
HDSP	1,319	1,501	1,242	901	1,319	*
ISP	871	1,117	838	573	871	*
KVSP	766	976	735	460	766	*
LAC	1,620	1,915	1,399	846	1,620	*
MCSP	336	591	299	173	336	*
NKSP	3,586	3,793	3,418	3,062	3,586	*
PBSP	519	646	488	330	519	*
PVSP	951	1,146	905	663	951	*
RJD	1,763	2,021	1,561	999	1,763	*
SAC	376	555	359	246	376	*
SATF	1,345	1,649	1,289	916	1,345	*
SCC	1,885	2,407	1,829	1,314	1,885	*
SOL	1,080	1,362	1,052	871	1,080	*
SQ	2,134	2,521	1,845	1,196	2,134	*
SVSP	416	593	400	213	416	*
VSP	1,082	1,423	971	489	1,057	*
WSP	4,246	4,503	3,913	3,187	4,246	*

[1] The Institution Population is 161,147 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011 as of September 30, 2010. The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 5,791. The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,175, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 1, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 2, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 53, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 65, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUPM) 49, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 32, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consumnes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 485, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 903, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 5,791. Total inmate population, for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 166,938 as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] Criminogenic needs were extracted from 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset January 12, 2011.

Appendix F: Totals for Appendix A (Parole)

Location	Academic/Vocational [1,2]	Substance Abuse [1,2]	Criminal Thinking [1,2]	Anger [1,2]	Family Criminality [1,2]	Low Family Support [1,2]	Sex Offending [3]
All Regions	**72,362**	**78,404**	**49,406**	**16,581**	**71,308**	**34,741**	**8,446**
Region I	18,074	19,283	13,026	4,795	17,902	8,387	2,231
Region II	13,340	14,286	9,094	2,427	13,210	6,274	1,966
Region III	18,485	20,277	12,210	3,958	18,184	9,139	1,828
Region IV	22,463	24,558	15,076	5,401	22,012	10,941	2,421

[1] The Parole Population is 121,378 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on January 13, 2011, as of September 30, 2010.

[2] The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of January 13, 2011 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

[3] Needs assessment was derived from the 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset January 12, 2011.