



C-ROB



California Rehabilitation Oversight Board

BIANNUAL REPORT SEPTEMBER 15, 2010

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA REHABILITATION OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS

David R. Shaw, Inspector General and Chair

Matthew Cate, Secretary, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Debra Jones, Administrator, Adult Education Programs (Designee for Jack O'Connell, State Superintendent of Public Instruction)

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

Renée Zito, Director, California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs

Stephen Mayberg, Director, 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.....	1
Background	6
The Expert Panel Report.....	9
The California Logic Model Implementation Progress	10
Assess High Risk	
Assess Needs	
Develop a Case Plan	
Deliver Programs	
Prep for Reentry/Reintegration	
Measure Progress and Follow Up	
Conclusion.....	39

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Identifying the Rehabilitative Needs of Offenders	
Appendix B: Determining Gaps in Rehabilitative Services	
Appendix C: Determining Levels of Offender Participation and Offender Success	
Appendix D: Determining the Effectiveness of Rehabilitative Programming	
Appendix E: Totals for Appendix A (Institution)	
Appendix F: Totals for Appendix A (Parole)	
Appendix G: Summary of Concerns Found Throughout Report	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Last fiscal year, the department received a \$250 million budget cut to Adult Programs. In response, the department:

- developed new academic models with decreased program frequency, duration, and options while maximizing the number of inmates with access to 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
- cut in-prison substance abuse treatment to 90 days with the reduced programming available at nine male and three female institutions. Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility continues to offer its six-month trauma/gender responsive treatment program.

The changes to both educational and vocational programming resulted in the elimination of 712 teacher positions: 450 academic teachers and 262 vocational teachers. Of the 712 eliminated teacher positions, 118 teachers were laid off: 62 academic teachers and 56 vocational teachers. The remaining eliminated positions included retirements, voluntary resignations, and redirection/demotions within the department.¹

From January to June 2010, the department was faced with the enormous challenge of implementing its new programming models system-wide without the benefit of testing and evaluating the service delivery through a demonstration project. This report details the progress the department made in implementing the California Logic Model components during the reporting period and the issues the board will monitor carefully through site visits to institutions and data analysis over the next six months.

In preparing this report, C-ROB recognized that a collaborative spirit, which is vital to sustainable change, is taking hold between the custody and programming divisions at the department's headquarters. As the Expert Panel noted in its June 2007 report, changing the way a corrections agency does business requires energetic leadership that includes an equal focus on collaboration within the organization. Full implementation of the California Logic Model will require the collaborative culture that C-ROB sees emerging.

Assess Needs

In August 2009, after the riot at the California Institution for Men, the department temporarily suspended administering the Core Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) assessment at the male reception centers and resumed in March 2010. In its March 2010 report, the board stated its concern that the seven-month hiatus—from August

¹ Refer to the March 15, 2010 C-ROB Biannual Report for a complete description of programmatic changes.

2009 to March 2010—in administering the COMPAS assessment could have the potential to negatively affect the department’s priority placement of inmates in rehabilitative programming.

The Office of Rehabilitative Program Planning and Accountability has begun to initiate the deployment of Core COMPAS to the general population institutions and anticipates completing training of all staff by Spring 2011. Once the training has been completed, each institution will begin to conduct the Core COMPAS assessments. C-ROB will track the department’s progress closely because, according to some education principals, inmates without COMPAS assessments fall at the bottom of the priority placement list for programming even though they may have a moderate-to-high need. Some principals indicated that lack of COMPAS assessments hinders enrollment in academic programs and creates additional work for classification committees. Some teachers expressed a need for the department to provide other assessment tools in the interim that could assist them in better placement of inmates in programs. According to the department, lack of COMPAS assessments does not preclude inmates from programming, and inmates can be placed into academic programs using their Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) scores. C-ROB will report further on this concern in its March 2011 biannual report.

For the first time, Appendix A to this report includes COMPAS data for inmates in the out-of-state facilities. The percent of out-of-state inmates with moderate/high needs in select COMPAS domains is roughly comparable to the percent of the total in-state inmate population (including the out-of-state offenders) with moderate/high needs. There is no other data available for out-of-state inmates, and the board requests that the department start collecting outcome data on this population.

Develop Case Plans

Case planning affects how the department prioritizes program enrollment for inmates 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), California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) scores, COMPAS scores, TABE scores, and the inmates’ classification levels to make program placements. According to the department, expanding beyond this form of case management requires budget decisions that are currently pending.

The board notes that careful planning both of programs, at the larger level that demonstrate a higher probability of success (evidence-based programs), and of the individual case plans drawn up for each offender based on needs and abilities is critical to the successful implementation of the Logic Model and the provisions of Assembly Bill 900. Given the current budget situation in California, the successful implementation of the Logic Model will be delayed until adequate resources are provided for both the global program array and the equally important case plans that provide offenders with a logical and ordered pathway to address their program needs.

Deliver Programs

During the reporting period, the department received input on the new academic models at the February and March 2010 C-ROB meetings, at its legislative budget hearings, and directly from teachers and other interested stakeholders. As a result of that information, the department reassessed its academic models and determined it could adjust the teacher-to-inmate 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 and added 30 additional teaching positions to the new, revised academic models. Academic program implementation at all institutions began mid-July 2010; vocational programming resumed intake on March 31, 2010 with implementation of three new programs in May 2010; and the new substance abuse program contracts became effective in January 2010 with full implementation in March 2010.

For June 2010—the end of the reporting period for this report—for all institutions with programs,² the enrollment for:

- academic programming was 35.9 percent of capacity;
- vocational programming was 75.6 percent of capacity; and
- substance abuse programming was 97.5 percent of capacity

C-ROB is monitoring enrollment to determine if low enrollment in academic programming is simply a result of programming start-up as the department asserts, a broader systemic concern, or is concentrated at select institutions. The board will report on this issue in its March 2011 biannual report. Low academic enrollment system-wide may require a reassessment and expansion of the priority placement criteria.

As of July 1, 2010, the department has 524 teacher positions and 173 teaching assistant positions. There are 53 vacant teacher positions (10 percent vacancy) and 117 vacant teaching assistant positions (67 percent vacancy) that institutions are recruiting to fill. The department states that the teacher vacancies are due to normal attrition; however it seems incongruous that vacancies still exist after the massive teacher layoffs last winter. Full program implementation cannot be achieved until both the teacher and teaching assistant positions are filled. In the absence of teaching assistants, teachers must complete all the administrative work themselves, which is a time consuming task and, according to some education principals and teachers, cannot be accomplished within the teaching preparation hours allocated by the department. Teachers with teaching assistants have a 27:1 student-to-teacher ratio and teachers without teaching assistants have a 20:1 student-to-teacher ratio, which should help with the volume of administrative work. C-ROB is monitoring teaching vacancies and will provide an update in its March 2011 biannual report.

For the first time, the department has convened an academic leadership council and a vocational leadership council, comprised predominately of teachers with minimal representation from principals and the Office of Correctional Education. The academic council is charged with reviewing how the different academic models are working at individual institutions and system-wide from the teachers' perspective and recommending changes at six-month intervals. The vocational council is responsible for annually reviewing the vocational programs available and determining whether they meet the implementation criteria. In the past, the department has been criticized for making decisions without seeking input from those responsible for implementation. C-ROB supports the department in taking this vital step to solicit regular input from teachers at the institutions and acknowledges that it is important to regularly assess the models to determine if they are meeting institutional needs. However, board members are concerned that teachers and

² LAC and KVSP did not report education data for June 2010.

inmates may have difficulty, and not be successful, in an environment that changes every six months. C-ROB will report on the outcomes of the council meetings, changes to the service delivery models, and the ease with which institutions are able to make model adjustments in its March 2011 biannual report.

The new substance abuse treatment (SAT) program model serves 8,500 inmates per year and 4,900 parolees in community-based aftercare. The in-prison model is available at nine male and three female institutions. Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility continues to offer its six-month trauma/gender responsive treatment program. The new substance abuse program contracts include increased measures for accountability. Providers must report regularly on utilization and must prepare individualized plans for participants within 10 days of program entrance and transition plans as participants exit. The department has developed program completion definitions required for inmate credit earnings and has implemented accountability reviews that allow the department's staff to evaluate performance measures. Implementation was at the end of March 2010, and there is only one month's worth of data for the reporting period in this report. In the March 2010 report, C-ROB questioned whether the new 90-day substance abuse programming model is sufficient for adults with long histories of addiction, and the program duration remains a concern for the board.

Because the in-prison substance abuse programs are not available at every institution, the board has also been concerned about how the department manages placement of inmates with moderate/high COMPAS substance abuse needs. The department explained that when inmates move from reception centers to institutions, staff takes into consideration the Logic Model placement criteria. If inmates are paroling within a year, staff try to ensure that they are sent to institutions with substance abuse programs. Inmates with longer times to serve may be sent to institutions without substance abuse programs. At their annual reviews, those inmates who still meet the Logic Model criteria and are within one year of parole may be transferred to prisons with substance abuse programs. The board questions whether this population movement can be accomplished given the limited number of substance abuse slots, frequent lockdowns, and prison overcrowding.

Prep for Reentry/Reintegration

During the reporting period, the Division of Adult Parole Operations worked with the Center for Effective Public Policy to create a new parole model that is grounded on evidence-based practices. On August 1, 2010, the department launched a pilot of the California Parole Supervision and Reintegration Model at four parole units in Bakersfield, Santa Rosa, San Gabriel Valley, and Tri-City. The board has requested that the department provide a detailed presentation on the new parole model at its September 2010 meeting.

Measure Progress and Follow Up

Currently, there is a four-month delay between the end of a reporting period and when the department can provide rehabilitative programming data to C-ROB. This lag time when coupled with rehabilitative programming implementation dates means there is little useful data available from vocational and substance abuse programming and no data available from the new academic models. Furthermore, the data available for C-ROB's next biannual report in March 2011 will cover April-September 2010. Since the revised academic program implementation began in earnest the second week of July 2010, and the department does not expect to reach program capacity until late Fall 2010, the board

will receive minimal data from the new academic models for its next report. Although it is unrealistic to expect that data be available any sooner given the implementation date, it is with great frustration that the board acknowledges once again that “without accurate and timely data, C-ROB cannot evaluate service delivery and program success.”³

To further compound the data availability problems, the department’s existing educational data system does not capture information at the student level. The long-term solution is the Strategic Offender Management System (SOMS), which the department is developing in phases, with the phase affecting Adult Programs unavailable until Spring 2012. The department has been working on an interim data solution to provide individual level data and expects it to be available Fall 2010.

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. In addition, the board is requesting that by January 2011, the department use the FY05-06 release cohort that formed the basis of its recent recidivism study to examine whether inmate participation in/completion of programming correlates with recidivism outcomes.

In its March 2010 biannual report, C-ROB questioned whether the department could “realistically provide rehabilitative programming resulting in reduced recidivism”⁴ after the \$250 million unallocated budget cut forced it to restructure its rehabilitative programming model before data was available for C-ROB to evaluate the demonstration project at California State Prison, Solano. C-ROB remains concerned about the lack of evidence-based programming models, data, and the demonstration project fidelity review reports. The board believes that the department cannot afford to lose six more months trying to test service delivery system-wide with inmates, who as K-12 students, did not succeed and now can ill-afford service delivery upheaval.

The concerns found throughout the report, which are summarized in Appendix G, were synthesized from the January, February, March, and July 2010 C-ROB meetings; discussions with approximately 100 teachers over many months; and site visits to five institutions that included meetings and informal discussions with principals, teachers, and custody staff. C-ROB will follow up on these concerns in its March 2011 biannual report.

³ C-ROB Biannual Report, March, 15, 2010, page 4.

⁴ C-ROB Biannual Report, March 15, 2010, page 1.

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 2007.⁵ 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸ The department created the Expert Panel in response to authorization language placed in the Budget Act of 2006-07. The Legislature

⁵ Assembly Bill 900 (Solorio), Chapter 7, Statutes 2007.

⁶ 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."

⁷ Penal Code section 7021 (AB 900), paragraphs 1 to 13.

⁸ 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."

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. The inmate population reduction issue was placed before the Three-Judge 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 has developed a comprehensive Master Work Plan for Rehabilitative Programming that details an exhaustive list of steps necessary for fully implementing the California Logic Model throughout the correctional system. The Master Work Plan provides the department with three tracks for implementing the California Logic Model.

The first track is 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 details how the department intends to roll out the California Logic Model statewide once it is implemented, tested, and re-tooled through the demonstration project. The three tracks are not sequential: there are tasks associated with each track that are being pursued simultaneously by the department.

PREPARING THIS REPORT

The scope of this report is based primarily on information received up to the board's report subcommittee meeting on July 28, 2010. This report includes appendices that display various programming data.

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 Administration and department have proposed to meet the \$1.2 billion FY 2009/10 budget reduction made by the Legislature through a number of population reduction tactics. The package is expected to reduce the average daily prison population by:

- Granting non-revocable parole to eligible inmates;
- Making credits now start post sentence and not at prison arrival;
- Granting up to 6 weeks of credit for completing programs;
- Updating property crime thresholds;
- Developing community corrections programs;
- Soliciting requests for proposals for 7 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 board requests that the department provide evidence related to the impact of SB X3 18 on inmates and parolees for its March 2011 biannual report.

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 85% of inmates and 95% of parolees have a CSRA score.⁹

Assess Needs

Over two years ago the department adopted the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) as the risk assessment tool to determine offender rehabilitation treatment programming needs. Last year the department completed a statewide rollout of COMPAS at all male Reception Centers.¹⁰

In August 2009, after the riot at the California Institution for Men, the department temporarily suspended administering COMPAS at the male reception centers and resumed in March 2010. In Winter 2010, the department deployed laptops to the reception center correctional counselors so that assessment data can be entered as it is administered. This eliminates the redundancy of administering the assessment and then entering the information later on a computer in the office. Since then, the Correctional Counselors have administered 13,193 core COMPAS assessments for a total of 62,412 since 2007.

In its March 2010 report, the board stated its concern that the seven-month hiatus—from August 2009 to March 2010—in administering the COMPAS assessment could have the potential to negatively affect the department's priority placement of inmates in rehabilitative programming. The Office of Rehabilitative Program Planning and Accountability has begun to initiate the deployment of Core COMPAS to the general population institutions and anticipates completing training of all staff by Spring 2011. Once the training has been completed, each institution will begin to conduct the Core COMPAS assessments. C-ROB will track the department's progress closely because, according to some education principals, inmates without COMPAS assessments fall at the bottom of the priority placement list for programming even though they may have a moderate-to-high need. Some principals indicated that lack of COMPAS assessments hinders enrollment in academic programs and creates additional work for classification committees. Some teachers expressed a need for the department to provide other assessment tools in the interim that could assist them in better placement of inmates in programs. According to the department, lack of COMPAS assessments does not preclude inmates from programming, and inmates can be placed into academic programs using their TABE scores. C-ROB will report further on this concern in its March 2011 biannual report.

⁹ An inmate may not have a 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.

¹⁰ The department implemented the COMPAS Reentry tool for parolees in 2006 and the COMPAS Female instrument in 2007.

For the first time, Appendix A to this report includes COMPAS data for inmates in the out-of-state facilities. The percent of out-of-state inmates with moderate/high needs in select COMPAS domains is 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	7/09	6/10	7/09	6/10	7/09	6/10	7/09	6/10
COCF	n/a	54.6%	n/a	60.3%	n/a	47.5%	n/a	55.5%	n/a	33.3%
All Institutions*	53.9%	56.0%	67.5%	65.6%	44.1%	47.2%	50.4%	49.4%	35.9%	34.8%
Parole ¹¹	54.0%	54.3%	70.5%	64.7%	40.0%	42.2%	48.8%	48.6%	36.0%	36.7%

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

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 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), the CSRA link described above, TABE scores, and the inmates' classification levels to make program placements. According to the department, expanding beyond this form of case management depends on budget decisions that are currently pending.

The board notes that careful planning both of programs, at the larger level that demonstrate a higher probability of success (evidence-based programs), and of the individual case plans drawn up for each offender based on needs and abilities is critical to the successful implementation of the Logic Model and the provisions of AB 900. Given the current budget situation in California, the successful implantation of the Logic Model will be delayed until adequate resources are provided for both the global program array and the equally important case plans that provide offenders with a logical and ordered pathway to address their program needs. In the meantime, the continuing recycling of inmates into and out of the prisons will continue at the current dismal rates.

¹¹ 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.

Deliver Programs

As a result of the \$250 million budget cut to Adult Programs in FY 2008/09, the department:

- developed new academic models, which may not be evidence-based, with decreased program frequency, duration, and options while maximizing the number of inmates with access to 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
- cut in-prison substance abuse treatment to 90 days with programming available at nine male and three female institutions. Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility continues to offer its six-month trauma/gender responsive treatment program.

The changes to both educational and vocational programming resulted in the elimination of 712 teacher positions: 450 academic teachers and 262 vocational teachers. Of the 712 eliminated teacher positions, 118 teachers were laid off: 62 academic teachers and 56 vocational teachers. The remaining eliminated positions included retirements, voluntary resignations, and redirection/demotions within the department.¹²

In Spring 2010, the department revised its new academic programming models and added 63 teaching positions. Implementation began mid-July 2010. Vocational programming resumed intake on March 31, 2010 with new program implementation in May 2010. The new substance abuse program contracts became effective in January 2010 with full implementation in March 2010. The new models—education as well as substance abuse—acknowledge the important role of inmate tutors (or mentors in the case of substance abuse programs).

For the first time, the department has convened academic and vocational leadership councils, comprised predominately of teachers with minimal representation from principals and the Office of Correctional Education. The academic council is charged with reviewing how the different academic models are working at individual institutions and system-wide from the teachers' perspective and recommending changes at six-month intervals. The vocational council is responsible for annually reviewing the vocational programs available and determining whether they meet the implementation criteria. In the past, the department has been criticized for making decisions without seeking input from those responsible for implementation. C-ROB supports the department in taking this vital step to solicit regular input from teachers at the institutions and acknowledges that it is important to regularly assess the models to determine if they are meeting institutional needs. However, board members are concerned that teachers and inmates may have difficulty, and not be successful, in an environment that changes every six months. Furthermore, the effects of service delivery changes on data comparability cannot be underestimated. C-ROB will report on the outcomes of the council meetings, changes to the service delivery models, and the ease with which institutions are able to make model adjustments in its March 2011 biannual report.

¹² Refer to the March 15, 2010 C-ROB Biannual Report for a complete description of programmatic changes.

TARGET POPULATIONS FOR PROGRAMMING

Priority placement within each program is based on risk (measured by CSRA), need, and time left to serve.

- For education programs, need is based on the TABE score, and inmates with 12-48 months left to serve are given priority. Lifers¹³ are prioritized within 24 months of a parole suitability hearing.
- For vocational programs, inmates are given priority if they already have high school diplomas/GEDs and are within 12-48 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 5-6 months left to serve. Lifers are prioritized within 5-12 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 education principals that the priority placement criteria is not exclusionary and does allow for Lifers to participate in academic programming even if they are not within 5-12 months of their parole suitability hearings as long as space is available.

When asked about academic program enrollment, some principals responded that enrollment is low system-wide because the target population criteria are too narrow. Those principals stated that they or their designees participate in multiple classification committee meetings every week to find inmates who fit the priority population. At one institution, each meeting typically results in one inmate who meets the eligibility criteria. According to the principal at that institution, the narrow eligibility criteria problem is further compounded by inmates without COMPAS assessments who fall into the lowest category on the priority lists but in actuality may have a moderate/high need. That principal said that other principals are putting Lifers (who are not part of the target population but are eligible to participate based on priority placement criteria) in academic programs in an effort to increase enrollment. That principal also said that because the enrollment is low enough—with no foreseeable increase in sight barring a change to the target population criteria—inmate to teacher ratios could have been kept at 27:1 with programming at five days a week, six hours a day.

At other institutions, some teachers stated that enrollment (mid-August 2010) was under 50 percent with some classes having no inmates assigned. According to many teachers at two institutions, inmates are only being assigned to academic programming at their annual review or “until they are close to being released.” Conversely, when classification committees and/or assignment offices assign inmates incorrectly into programming because of inaccurate placement data, inmates must remain in the wrong classes until they can be reassigned, which at three different institutions takes three months or longer. At one institution, Inmate Assignments will only reassign an inmate if the teacher finds another place for the student. At another institution, if inmates are assigned incorrectly they must wait until their annual review to be reassigned. According to the educational programming staff, the incorrectly placed inmates are taking up

¹³ Lifers are inmates with a life sentence and the possibility of parole.

valuable seats and causing additional work for the teachers who must plan separate work for these inmates.

For June 2010, for all institutions with programs,¹⁴ the enrollment for:

- academic programming was 35.9 percent of capacity;
- vocational programming was 75.6 percent of capacity; and
- substance abuse programming was 97.5 percent of capacity.

C-ROB is monitoring enrollment to determine if low enrollment in academic programming is simply a result of programming start-up as the department asserts, a broader systemic concern, or is concentrated at select institutions. The board will report on this issue in its March 2011 biannual report. Low academic enrollment system-wide may require a reassessment and expansion of the priority placement criteria.

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	New Model Capacity
Academic Education	47,900	Approx 40,000
Vocational Education	9,300	4,800
In-Prison Substance Abuse	12,200	8,500
Community Substance Abuse	8,200	4,900

STAFFING

As of July 1, 2010, the department has 524 teacher positions and 173 teaching assistant positions for educational and vocational programming. There are 53 vacant teacher positions (10 percent vacancy) and 117 vacant teaching assistant positions (67 percent vacancy) that institutions are recruiting to fill. The department states that the teacher vacancies are due to normal attrition; however it seems incongruous that vacancies still exist after the massive teacher layoffs last winter. Full program implementation cannot be achieved until both the teacher and teaching assistant positions are filled. C-ROB is monitoring teaching vacancies and will provide an update in the March 2011 biannual report.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING

Overview

During the reporting period, the department received input on the new academic models at the February and March 2010 C-ROB meetings, at its legislative budget hearings, and directly from teachers and other interested stakeholders. As a result of that information, the department reassessed its academic models and determined it could adjust the teacher-to-inmate 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

¹⁴ LAC and KVSP did not report education data for June 2010.

reestablish 33 teacher positions as literacy coordinators and added 30 additional teaching positions to the new, revised academic models.

The literacy coordinator(s) at each institution are credential teachers who are responsible for coordinating volunteer literacy services, which includes identifying and training community volunteers and inmate tutors. The department reports that the use of inmate tutors is optional and based on need and approval by local institutions' education administrations and executive teams. According to the department, because of unforeseen complications with the re-employment process, there has been a delay in hiring some literacy coordinators, which in turn has delayed the use of inmate tutors for literacy programs. In addition, a literacy coordinator at one institution is concerned that the department's Literacy Plan mandates the use of ProLiteracy materials, which includes a certification by the ProLiteracy organization. That coordinator stated that the department has not allocated funds for certifications.

The department implemented the revised academic program models at all institutions beginning mid-July 2010. Total programming capacity is approximately 40,000. In June 2010, enrollment was 35.9 percent of capacity with utilization at 65.5 percent.¹⁵ Below is a table comparing the new academic models as of March 2010 to the new, revised ones implemented in May 2010.

Academic Models: March 2010

Model #	Educational Program	Total Inmates per Teacher	Total Inmates in Class at Once	Inmate Class Hours/Week	TAs	Inmate Tutors
1	Literacy	195	39	6	1	26
2	ABE I, II & III	135	27	6	2	Optional
3	ABE I, II & GED	162	27	ABE-15 GED-3	2	Optional
4A	GED-Independent Study (voluntary)	120	12	3	1/2	Optional
4B	GED-Independent Study (assigned)	120	12	3	1/2	Optional
5i	ABE I, II & GED	84-108	6-12	3 or 4.5	1/2	Optional
5ii	ABE I, II & GED	84-108	6-12	3 or 4.5	1/2	Optional

Revised Academic Models: May 2010

Model #	Educational Program	Total Inmates per Teacher	Total Inmates in Class at Once	Inmate Class Hours/Week	TAs
1	Literacy, ABE I	54	27	15	1
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
5	High Security (programming is set by inmates' needs)	42-84	6-12	Varies	0

¹⁵ The enrollment rate is calculated on the number of participants enrolled divided by the number of available slots. Utilization is the percentage of available program hours an inmate spends in actual programming.

As the chart indicates, under the revised academic models, teachers are responsible for between 54 and 120 student inmates with a maximum of 27 students in class at one time. Time in class varies by model and ranges from three hours a week up to 15 hours a week depending on assessment levels. Inmates with 12-48 months remaining on their sentences are placed in specific programs based on their TABE scores. Therefore, the amount of classroom time an inmate has depends on the TABE score and academic placement level. For instance, an inmate who can read and write at an 11th grade level may only have three classroom hours a week, while an inmate who reads and writes at a 4th grade level may have 12 classroom hours per week. Some teachers reported that program completions and GED earnings have decreased because of reduced time in class.

The department has established the schedule format for academic programming consistently at all institutions. According to some teachers, Friday furloughs affect the schedule format especially for Model 4, which meets for three hours once a week. Those inmates system-wide who are assigned to the Friday section of Model 4 do not attend their once-a-week class on furlough Fridays. C-ROB urges the department to reassess its schedule format in light of the furloughs.

In its March 2010 biannual report, C-ROB stated its concern about the logistics behind the new models and questioned how the department would manage inmate transitions from one program to another. The department explained that it will use waitlists since capacity may not be enough to allow students to move to the next level without waiting for a seat to open. The department gives each institution the task of planning for future needs by taking into consideration the assessment and TABE scores of inmates on the waitlist. Because enrollment is still low (35.9 percent of capacity in June 2010) waitlists are not yet an issue except at the female institutions. C-ROB will continue to monitor enrollment, waitlists, and how inmates transition from one program level to the next. Again, C-ROB is concerned about the lack of evidence-based programming models, data, and the Solano demonstration project fidelity review reports. The board wonders if six more months will be lost trying to test service delivery system-wide with inmates, who as K-12 students, did not succeed and now can ill-afford service delivery upheaval.

Classes under the newly revised academic models began on May 10. Institutions received a two-month adjustment period to determine if the models assigned to the institutions, and the number of sections of each model, still fit inmate needs because of population shifts among institutions between the time the models were assigned and when they were implemented. In May and June, principals submitted change requests to headquarters for approval with all programs implemented by the middle of July.

There is no data available yet from the new academic models. With the department's lag time in data reporting, the data available for C-ROB's March 2011 biannual report will cover April-September 2010. Since program implementation began in earnest the second week of July and the department does not expect to reach program capacity until Fall 2010, the board realizes that it will receive minimal data from the new academic models for its next report. Although it is unrealistic to expect that data be available any sooner given the implementation date, it is with great frustration that the board acknowledges once again that "without accurate and timely data, C-ROB cannot evaluate service delivery and program success."¹⁶

¹⁶ C-ROB Biannual Report, March, 15, 2010, page 4.

Teacher and C-ROB Concerns

At the February, March, and July 2010 C-ROB meetings; during site visits to institutions; and during other informal discussions, many teachers have expressed concerns about why the new models will not work in a correctional setting. Teacher layoffs, increased class size, reduced time in class, administrative paperwork, and inmate homework are among the biggest concerns.

Some teachers feared that generally inmates are not self-motivated students and homework could become a commodity like anything else in prison with inmates paying other inmates to complete the work for them. Teachers were doubtful on whether homework could be done in a prison setting especially in a place like a woman's prison where eight women are housed together. They also worried that inmates would be targeted and attacked by other inmates for doing homework.

Homework is a required component of some classes, but the homework itself does not earn the inmate completion credits under SB X3 18. When asked, no teachers responded that homework has become a commodity or that inmates have been targeted or attacked for doing homework. However, some teachers said that they are not always sure who completed the homework for which the inmate receives S-time. As an example, in Model 4, inmates attend class three hours once a week and receive 12 hours of S-time for homework completed. Teachers at two institutions were especially concerned about the Model 4 schedule because inmates, regardless of learning level, need more direct instruction. These teachers stated that furloughs, lockdowns, and appointments often cause inmates to miss the weekly direct instruction and some inmates must go weeks without attending class. This lack of continuity is extremely disruptive to the learning process. Some teachers are issuing appointment passes (ducats) to their inmate students during other model schedules or teacher preparation time so that the inmates can receive homework assistance and new assignments. According to those teachers, this tactic further exacerbates the dearth of teacher preparation time allotted.

Teachers are now responsible for completing paperwork for the credit earnings under SB X3 18. Some teachers expressed concern that this additional requirement on top of the already magnified paperwork resulting from increased numbers of students would greatly diminish direct instruction with students. Teachers also expressed their concerns about the amount of class preparation time needed to teach multiple models to large numbers of students with different learning levels each week. Model Three includes ABE I, II, and GED students, and some teachers assigned to that model indicated that the amount of preparation time is overwhelming. In addition to preparation time, some teachers have reported that class turnover is high (33 percent a month in one example), which adds to the administrative paperwork teachers must complete. A principal at one institution stated that the paperwork to verify course completions for credit earnings is minimal because it is computerized. That principal went on to say that teachers have two hours a day allocated for administrative work and class preparation time, which, when combined with teaching assistants is adequate and does not cut into teaching time at that institution. However, at three other institutions, principals and teachers all reported that the class preparation time is inadequate with some staff putting in 11-hour days to ensure that inmates receive the required direct instruction and that the administrative paperwork associated with so many students remains overwhelming. As of July 2010, 68 percent of teaching assistant positions were still vacant. Some academic programming staff have stated that it is difficult to recruit for and retain teaching assistants because they are entry-level positions used to gain a "foot in the door," and once filled, teaching assistants "often transfer to higher paying jobs." Again, program implementation at maximum capacity cannot be achieved until both the teacher

and teaching assistant positions are filled. In the absence of teaching assistants, teachers must complete all the administrative work themselves, which is a time consuming task and reportedly cannot be accomplished within the teaching preparation hours allocated by the department. Teachers with teaching assistants have a 27:1 student-to-teacher ratio and teachers without teaching assistants have a 20:1 student-to-teacher ratio, which should help with the volume of administrative work. C-ROB is monitoring teaching vacancies and will provide an update in its March 2011 biannual report.

With the new earned credits from program completions, some teachers were concerned that inmates would intentionally fail their initial TABE and when they are retested and promoted to a new class, they would receive the time credit without actually having received an educational gain. According to a principal at one institution, it is unrealistic to think that inmates would know to fail the initial TABE at the reception center. At three other institutions, principals and teachers said that many inmates “blow” their initial TABEs for multiple reasons including disinterest in taking the test just as they arrive at reception centers as well as working the system to gain undeserved credit earnings. TABE scores also affect inmates’ program placement. Again, some principals and teachers stated that incorrect assignment of inmates to academic models can take three months to resolve. At some institutions, inmates remain in the wrong classes until reassigned taking up seats and causing additional work for teachers. C-ROB requests that the department review its process to reassign inmates who are placed incorrectly in programs and ensure that reassignment is done expeditiously and performed consistently across institutions.

At site visits to several institutions, some teachers raised a concern about the department’s recent policy to limit GED testing to only those inmates assigned to academic programming. In the past, any inmate could request to take the test. Those teachers stated that the new policy restricts inmates’ opportunities “to improve themselves before they parole.” Because it takes time and resources to verify whether an inmate already has a GED, the department implemented the policy to prevent inmates with GEDs from taking the test and earning milestone completion credits before their GED status can be confirmed. Once the department has a streamlined GED verification process in place, C-ROB urges the department to reconsider its policy.

Some teachers also think that there are more inmates with learning disabilities and who are English language learners than the department believes. Teachers voiced that these students would not receive enough classroom attention or one-on-one time to advance in the programs and would essentially stall at the lowest programming level. C-ROB will monitor the key performance indicators, once data is available, for academic programming.

Some teachers expressed concern that the new educational models would not be approved by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). If a school does not have WASC accreditation, its graduates cannot receive financial assistance from the federal government if they pursue higher education. Maintaining WASC accreditation is important to the board because it conveys a standardized measure of accepted organizational capacity, curriculum, and service delivery. The department, as well as some principals and teachers who serve on individual institution’s WASC committees, believes there will be no problem receiving WASC accreditation. C-ROB will provide an update on this issue in its March 2011 biannual report.

At its February 2010 meeting, the board raised the concern about whether the new academic models are evidence-based. In response, the department provided a document¹⁷ that describes the principles of effective practice for the models. However, both the board and department acknowledge that there is a lack of evidence-based research for adult education in a correctional setting. The department states that it designed the revised new models using evidence-based practices from adult basic education and that the revised new models—which are delivery system changes not curriculum changes—are being tested continuously at the institutions. Previously, the department had planned to test the Logic Model implementation, including a fidelity review component, at the Solano demonstration project. C-ROB requests that the department provide information on the status of the Solano demonstration project review. The board will address this in its March 2011 biannual report.

The department has instituted a system-wide academic education leadership committee made up of teachers from the institutions, one assistant principal, and one principal with guidance from the Office of Correctional Education. The department sent a memo system-wide to solicit participation. The committee is charged with reviewing how the different models are working at individual institutions and system-wide from the teachers' perspective and recommending changes. The department will be working with the academic committee and tracking outcomes to see what parts of the service delivery model need to be adjusted and where. The primary performance measures are changes in TABE scores and milestone completions. In August 2010, the Fidelity Unit started assessing quality assurance, beginning with placement criteria, through onsite reviews. The department will use all of this information along with population changes to reassess the programmatic needs of institutions and make adjustments to service delivery at six-month intervals. Practically speaking, this translates to six months for program observation and teacher input; analysis of utilization, waitlist, and completion data; and review of population changes. If a prison determines that it needs one more Model 1 session and one less Model 4 session because of population shifts, the principle will submit a change request to headquarters in December 2010 and implement the change in January 2011. The department clearly stated that the number of teaching positions assigned to an institution will remain constant even though the academic models or session for each model may change at six month intervals. The principal will be responsible for reassigning resources within the institution's allocation to meet the institution's needs. The Office of Correctional Education expects that individual principals will make recommendations on what programs can be shifted within the existing models at the institution and the academic committee will make recommendations for adjustments to the models system-wide to make them more effective. The department asserts that professional development is not an issue for teachers transitioning from one model to another because the curriculum is the same and only the delivery method has changed.¹⁸ However, the Rehabilitation Strike Team's December 2007 report identified a "rehabilitation-oriented training curriculum for correctional and rehabilitation staff, and a method of delivering that curriculum" as one part of the four-pronged strategy to improve California's rehabilitative programs. C-ROB will report on the implementation of this strategy in its March 2011 biannual report.

Principals at three institutions stated that it is not as easy as submitting a change request in December and implementing in January. The principals said that there is a period of adjustment

¹⁷ See C-ROB Biannual Report, March 15, 2010, Appendix I: Research for the New Academic Models.

¹⁸ Professional development for teachers is contractually required at one day a month. In addition, the department reports that principals have been supplied with training materials and are providing ongoing training at the institutions.

every time teachers take on different models. At one institution, a principal said that unless models change at the statewide level (shifting teaching assignments based on the number or types of models/sections at an individual institution versus service delivery requirements system-wide) that institution will work with what it has been assigned. The board acknowledges the need to assess service delivery and make adjustments periodically. However, after talking to some principals, the board is concerned about the possibility of a regular cycle of service delivery instability. This is another area that C-ROB will follow closely and report on in its March 2011 biannual report.

VOCATIONAL PROGRAMMING

The department eliminated many of its longstanding vocational training programs in response to the budget cut. 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. Intake was suspended for vocational programs effective December 18, 2009 to give institutions time to readjust their waiting lists. Inmate assignments began again on March 31, 2010 with implementation at all institutions reached on May 20, 2010. The overall capacity is 4,887 inmates. In June 2010, enrollment was 75.6 percent of capacity with utilization at 57.6 percent.¹⁹ At two female institutions, enrollment was at or exceeded 100 percent.

Programs Retained

Auto Body
 Auto Mechanics
 Building Maintenance
 Carpentry
 Cosmetology became Manicure
 Electronics
 Electrical Works
 HVAC
 Machine Shop Practical
 Masonry
 OSRT
 Plumbing
 Sheet Metal
 Small Engine Repair
 Welding

Programs Cut

Drywall
 Eyewear
 Graphic Arts
 Household Repair
 Janitorial
 Landscape
 Machine Shop Auto
 Mill & Cabinet
 Office Machine Repair
 Painting
 Roofing

It is a real concern to C-ROB that the department eliminated so many vocational programs during these tough economic times. There is a need for both skilled workers and those who work at lower skill jobs because they are unable to master higher level skills. Inmates without job skills who cannot access vocational programs may be set up for failure when they leave their institutions. Therefore, C-ROB is encouraged to report that in Fall 2010, the department is

¹⁹ The enrollment rate is calculated on the number of participants enrolled divided by the number of available slots. Utilization is the percentage of available program hours an inmate spends in actual programming

convening a career technical education leadership council to annually review the vocational programs available and determine if any meet the vocational program criteria. Programs will be reevaluated using the criteria of industry certified, market driven, and completed within 12 months. On August 5, 2010 the department sent a notice system-wide to solicit participation. The council's recommendations may address other issues expressed to C-ROB about the department eliminating vocational programs:

- that some teachers assert could have been modified to fit the 12-month completion criteria; and
- that could have been retained and provided other much needed institutional services like printing (graphic arts), janitorial, and cosmetology that the institutions must now contract for and cannot without a State budget and funding.

Staff at two women's institutions—including a warden, principals, and teachers—expressed the concerns listed below about the cuts to vocational programming.

- Women's programming suffered proportionately higher cuts than men's programming because women have a lower risk to recidivate and therefore do not meet the department's priority placement criteria. Consequently, in June 2010, enrollment was at or exceeded 100 percent for both institutions and waiting lists were long.
- The cosmetology, janitorial, and graphic arts programs all provided direct services that benefited the institutions. Replacing cosmetology with manicure has a direct effect on female inmates that is unique to the women's institutions. In addition, each institution must purchase approximately \$60,000 of manicuring equipment. Both institutions are now without janitorial and printing services but cannot contract for them without a state budget and funding.

Teachers from numerous institutions have suggested that the department reinstate the graphics arts program at least regionally in order to provide the much needed printing services that all institutions require for ongoing operations and to reproduce the enormous volume of homework packets especially for Model 4 (GED), which meets once a week for three hours followed by 12 hours of homework. Many institutions were not equipped to handle the volume of photocopying the new academic models require for homework packets. Some teachers have reported that there is a lack of textbooks or other educational materials and no way to reproduce them.

At one institution, teachers suggested that the reading level required for participation in vocational programs be lowered to a minimal amount so that inmates could learn a vocational skill and strengthen their reading/comprehension skills at the same time.

C-ROB will report on the outcomes of the career technical education leadership council meetings, track changes in vocational program enrollment and utilization, and make recommendations about vocational programming in its March 2011 biannual report.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMMING

Overview

The new substance abuse treatment (SAT) program model serves 8,500 inmates per year and 4,900 parolees in community-based aftercare. The new in-prison model is available at nine male and three female institutions. Leo Chesney Community Correctional Facility continues to offer its six-month trauma/gender responsive treatment program. The new substance abuse program contracts include increased measures for accountability. Providers must report regularly on utilization and must prepare individualized plans for participants within 10 days of program entrance and transition plans as participants exit. The department has developed program completion definitions required for inmate credit earnings and has implemented accountability reviews that allow the department's staff to evaluate performance measures.

Because the in-prison substance abuse programs are not available at every institution, the board has been concerned about how the department manages placement of inmates with moderate/high COMPAS substance abuse needs. The department explained that when inmates move from reception centers to institutions, staff takes into consideration the Logic Model placement criteria. If inmates are paroling within a year, staff try to ensure that they are sent to institutions with substance abuse programs. Inmates with longer times to serve may be sent to institutions without substance abuse programs. At their annual reviews, those inmates who still meet the Logic Model criteria and are within one year of parole may be transferred to prisons with substance abuse programs. The board questions whether this population movement can be accomplished given the limited number of substance abuse slots, frequent lockdowns, and prison overcrowding.

The chart below provides brief descriptions by institution of the program designs, curriculum, frequency, capacity, and enrollment as of July 2010.

Institution	Program Design	Curriculum ²⁰	Frequency	Program Capacity per Cycle	Program Count as of 7/16/10	% Count to Capacity as of 7/16/10
ASP	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	200	195	97.5%
CCI	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	160	160	100.0%
CIM	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	150	149	99.3%
CMC	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	150	150	100.0%
CRC	Civil Addict 6-month	T4C	2 cycles/year	225	217	96.4%
CTF	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	150	136	90.6%
CVSP	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	150	146	97.3%

²⁰ T4C is *Thinking for a Change*, developed by the National Institute of Corrections (Bush, Glick, and Taymans, 2002). DBT is *Dialectical Behavioral Therapy*, developed by M.M. Linehan (1993) in *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder*. New York: Guilford Press. Seeking Safety is a program developed by Najavits, L.M. (2002). *Seeking Safety: A New Psychotherapy for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and Substance Abuse*. In *Trauma and Substance Abuse: Causes, Consequences and Treatment of Comorbid Disorders* (Eds. P. Ouimette & P. Brown). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Institution	Program Design	Curriculum (see fn 20 above)	Frequency	Program Capacity per Cycle	Program Count as of 7/16/10	% Count to Capacity as of 7/16/10
SATF ²¹	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	340	323	95.0%
SOL	90-day	T4C	4 cycles/year	150	150	100.0%
CCWF	90-day	Seeking Safety and DBT	4 cycles/year	175	174	99.4%
CIW	90-day and Civil Addict	Seeking Safety and DBT	4 cycles/year (Felon) 2 cycles/year (Civil Addict)	175 (100 Civil Addict and 75 Felon Slots)	175	100.0%
VSPW	90-day	Seeking Safety and DBT	4 cycles/year	175	175	100.0%
Leo Chesney	6-month Trauma/Gender Responsive	Seeking Safety and DBT	2 cycles/year	150	129	86.0%
Totals as of 7/16/10				2350	2279	97.0%

Inmates in the new 90-Day SAT model meet 3.25 hours per day for five days per week, regardless of their curriculum. Prisons serving male populations utilize the *Thinking for a Change (T4C)* curriculum, and prisons serving female offenders offer both *Seeking Safety* and *Dialectical Behavioral Therapy (DBT)* curricula. The department defines SAT program completion as participation in at least 80 percent of all available treatment days within the 90-day treatment program. While the goal is for inmates to complete all lessons in their programs, institutional logistics (e.g. lockdowns) create instances where full completion of the curriculum is not possible. The overall capacity for in-prison programs is 8,500 inmates. Implementation was in late March 2010, and therefore there is limited data for the reporting period in this report. In June 2010, enrollment was 97.5 percent of capacity with utilization at 89.5 percent.

Justification for New Models

In the March 2010 C-ROB report, the board expressed concern about the length of the new 90-day substance abuse treatment models. In response, the department provided several scholarly studies that support programs lasting at least 90 days in order to obtain positive benefits from treatment participation.²² C-ROB remains concerned that the 90-day model may be insufficient for adults with long histories of addiction.

²¹ SATF is participating in a pilot program with Mental Health to provide substance abuse treatment services to 88 enhanced out-patient (EOP) inmates. Programming for 44 EOP inmates will begin in August 2010 with the final 44 inmates to begin programming in September 2010.

²² The department provided the following publications that support treatment programs lasting at least 90 days: The National Institution on Drug Abuse (NIDA): "Principles of Drug Addiction Treatment: A Research Based Guide (Second Edition);" The NIDA: "Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations – A Research-Based Guide;" The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University: "Behind Bars II: Substance Abuse and America's Prison Population (February 2010);" Faye S. Taxman, et al: "The National Criminal Justice Treatment Practices survey: Multilevel survey methods and procedures (2007);" and Craig E. Henderson, et al: "A Rasch Model Analysis of Evidence-Based Treatment Practices Used in the Criminal Justice System (2008)."

In July 2009, the department met with in-prison substance abuse treatment providers to discuss the viability and appropriateness of a short-term (90-day), intensive substance abuse treatment program. All agreed that a shortened in-prison treatment model administered near the end of an inmate's incarceration would aid the transition to community-based aftercare and thus be the best model to pursue given the budget constraints. A key consideration to the development of this model was therefore the need to maintain the existing infrastructure of community-based aftercare. The resulting program design relied heavily on *A Brief Comprehensive Offender In-Custody Treatment Model* (Koutsenok et al., 2009).

In the text, Koutsenok et al. assert that "research has identified 90-days as the minimum treatment dose to demonstrate any reduction in recidivism rates for moderate to high-risk offenders." Based on this research, CDCR designed a 90-day program with three key components:

- risk-to-recidivate and criminogenic needs assessments (Lipsey and Cullen, 2007);
- specialized treatment tailored to these assessments; and
- a strategic plan that links the initial assessments to participation in community-based aftercare.

Men's Programs

The department selected the National Institute of Corrections' *T4C* curriculum for its men's SAT programs. This evidence-based curriculum was specifically designed for use with the correctional population, and one of its advantages is it can be facilitated by counselors who do not have a Master's level education. The three areas of focus for *T4C* are:

- cognitive restructuring;
- problem solving; and
- social skills interventions.

The department supplements the *T4C* curriculum with other curricula that focus on treatment continuation, relapse prevention, and preparation for transitioning to community-based aftercare. The Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Services has pledged to work with the department's Adult Programs Fidelity Unit to ensure that all supplemental curricula are evidence-based to reduce recidivism.

The capacities for the SAT programs are based on contracting experience with the substance abuse treatment community provider. All SAT programs have at least 150 positions and have predefined inmate-to-counselor programming ratios.

Women's Programs

The department recognizes that female offenders' pathways into crime and their addiction issues are gender specific. Therefore, the department selected *Dialectical Behavioral Therapy (DBT)* and *Seeking Safety* as the two primary cognitive behavioral curricula for women's SAT programs. *DBT* focuses on mindfulness, interpersonal effectiveness, and emotion regulation. *Seeking Safety* targets thinking, behavioral, and interpersonal actions as they relate to substance abuse and trauma, with the ultimate goal of teaching safe coping skills to the participants.

At two women's institutions, programming staff all said the same thing: there are not enough treatment slots and 90 days is not long enough for women with trauma issues because the inmates are completing the program just as they are adjusting to it. The treatment providers are working to implement creative ways of keeping the women connected to recovery so that they are likely to access services when they go back on the non-treatment yards. According to the staff, many women have asked to stay longer in the treatment programs and some have refused non-revocable parole so that they can access aftercare.

Civil Addicts

Civil Addicts are inmates who are ordered by the Board of Parole Hearing to go to community-based aftercare treatment programs. These offenders participate in a six-month substance abuse program prior to their release that uses the same curricula as the 90-day program. The department reinforces the primary curricula with other curricula that focuses on treatment continuation, relapse prevention, and preparation for transitioning to community-based aftercare.

Lifer Mentor Certification Program

The department has implemented a lifer mentor certification program at California State Prison, Solano and at Valley State Prison for Women. Lifers are being certified as alcohol and drug counselors to assist fellow inmates with recovery. Certification requires a four-month training academy followed by a 4,000 hour practicum. At Solano, mentors are trained to facilitate classes in anger management, denial management, domestic violence, conflict management, parenting, Katargeo, substance abuse 12-step, drug addiction video series, life skills, transformational ministries, leadership training program, and marriage for success. Approximately 50 lifers at Solano are certified and eight or ten have received parole dates in the last six months. The lifer mentors at Solano have developed a proposal to expand the certificate program to other men's institutions and as a component of parole. C-ROB will report on this proposal in its March 2011 biannual report. At the women's institution, the lifer mentors have just completed the training portion of the certificate program.

Contract Requirements

Prior SAT contracts did not specify data reporting requirements. All new SAT program contracts now require that by the 15th of each month, providers send the following treatment data about each inmate for the prior month to the department:

- CDCR Number;
- first and last name;
- unique identifier (provided by the contractor);
- unique identifier for the Contractor's program and location (provided by the department);
- beginning date of service;
- ending date of service; and
- treatment exit reason (provided by the department).

These data populate the department's database that contains SAT records for both in-prison programming and community-based aftercare. Additionally, in-prison SAT providers are required to submit weekly program utilization data that contains much of the same information from above and includes credit qualifying time. Collecting these data allow the department to measure its performance toward the 75 percent utilization of programming as required in

California Penal Code, section 7021(5) in order to release funds to build reentry and rehabilitation prison beds.

VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

The allocation for sponsor funding has increased by 50 percent. On June 30, 2010, the department reconvened a volunteer task force, which meets quarterly, to assist in critical policy areas, determine volunteer capacity, lessen past barriers, and streamline policies that will increase volunteer access to inmates. The department is nearing completion of a volunteer inventory list as well as a review of capacity for expansion within the prisons, anticipated to be available in August 2010. A much needed community resource directory will soon be on-line and available to parolees.

PROGRAMMING IMPLEMENTATION AND INSTITUTION OPERATIONAL NEEDS

Some teachers and members of the public have expressed concern that institution operational needs are not coordinated with rehabilitative programming schedules. More specifically, there are concerns that events like rolling lockdowns and medical appointments adversely affect an inmate's participation in the already reduced educational and substance abuse programming under the new educational models. In response to the concerns, the department described how institutions accommodate programming needs within its operations.

At a prison that operates under normal conditions, inmates with early vocational education or jobs are released first to breakfast and then to their assignments by 7:00 a.m. Inmates who require medication (e.g. diabetic or mental health) receive it immediately right before or after breakfast, whichever is medically appropriate.

Inmates are given "ducats," or appointment passes, each day that are tracked by daily movement sheets. Since July, CDCR has begun recording the reasons that inmates are not in their program assignments by differentiating among educational reasons (e.g. a teacher is out sick), medical reasons (e.g. an inmate has a medical appointment), and custody reasons (e.g. an inmate is housed in a building that is on lockdown). In the past, medical and custody reasons were conflated, making it impossible to discern why inmates were not receiving programming.

Medical appointments are coordinated by a utilization and scheduling nurse who works in the medical unit at each prison. This nurse schedules appointments based on when doctors and specialists are available. In the past, inmates would see whichever doctor or medical staff was available. In recent years, medical operations at the prisons has changed dramatically, now resembling a primary care system in which inmates are assigned to a medical unit. The department reports that appointment scheduling is simplified based on the availability of the healthcare professional in the inmate's medical unit. A principal at one institution said that for the first time, medical and education are working together to reduce disruption to inmates' programming. The principal reported that in the past, once an inmate's appointment was finished, the inmate would return to his yard. Now, correctional officers are ensuring that inmates return to class after appointments.

A correctional officer is stationed at every location where programming is conducted. Teachers take attendance and turn it over to the officer. If an inmate is absent, the officer, not the teacher,

is responsible for locating the inmate. The inmate may be in his cell, at an assigned appointment, on route, or unaccounted for, which alerts staff to begin searching.

Teachers take classroom attendance for the purpose of tracking the program hours; correctional staff uses the same information to ensure inmate accountability. Teachers are required to note the reason—education, medical, or custody—why an inmate is absent, but they find this information on the daily movement sheets. The department says this responsibility to explain absences is new but not an unreasonable expectation and is reporting “more cooperation, more communication.”

The deputy director of the Division of Adult Institutions explained past practice by stating, “the two sides of the house—the Divisions of Adult Institutions and Adult Rehabilitative Programs—were typically concerned about their side of the house for many, many years.” He continued to explain that “it would be very easy” to only focus on his specific task of ensuring safety and security. As a result of this past practice, however, he explained that the department lost many opportunities to rehabilitate inmates. Signaling a strong departure from this approach, he reported that his unit now spends a large amount of time coordinating operations with the rehabilitative efforts of the Division of Adult Rehabilitative Programs. Significantly, he noted that this collaborative approach occurs in both the headquarters and prison levels, citing regular, ongoing meetings that between the two divisions help coordinate the implementation of new programs. At California State Prison, Solano, Custody and Programming work well together to ensure that inmates get early release for meals that would otherwise conflict with substance abuse programming.

Prisons are at times faced with security or health concerns that require the lockdown of certain buildings, yards, and/or the whole institution. Any time there is a modified program or special activity on a facility, the institution is required to put together a program status report (PSR). The PSR is distributed to the inmate population and staff and provides an understanding of what programs are going to take place that day. The report explains if educational and vocational programming will be held, and it details all main daily activity in great depth.

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. At two institutions, custody staff expressed concerns about reduced programming leading to more lockdowns. According to some correctional officers, “when you shut down programs, there’s nowhere for the inmates to go. . . inmates are idle, stealing equipment, there have been more lockdowns since May. . . since programming shut down, violence is up.”

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 looks to see if the institution experienced a large amount of lockdowns or some other factor that negatively influenced inmates’ participation in programming.

CALIFORNIA OUT-OF-STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES REHABILITATIVE PROGRAMMING

The California Out-of-State Correctional Facility (COCF) is a unit within the department's Division of Adult Institutions whose mission is to transfer inmates out of state for the purpose of alleviating overcrowding within existing prisons. All facilities currently utilized by COCF are contracted with and managed by the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA). There are currently five COCFs located in Arizona, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. As of June 2010, COCF was budgeted to incarcerate a maximum of 9,054 special needs and general population inmates and was housing 8,718 inmates, or 96% of its budgeted capacity. Population counts of each institution are in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1

	Type of Inmates	Projected Capacity	Budgeted Capacity	Population as of 6/10
Florence Correctional Center (FCC), Arizona	SNY*	880	530	507
La Palma Correctional Center (LPCC), Arizona	SNY and GP**	3060	3060	2762
Red Rock Correctional Center (RRCC), Arizona	GP	1536	968	914
Tallahatchie County Correctional Facility (TCCF), Mississippi	GP	2592	2592	2559
North Fork Correctional Facility (NFCF), Oklahoma	GP	2400	2037	1976

Inmates are assessed through the classification process in California for eligibility to transfer out-of-state. Inmates are not assigned to programming according to the Logic Model placement criteria. Instead, those who have been through reception centers have COMPAS assessments and are placed in COCF programming based on COMPAS-identified needs. For the first time, the department has provided COMPAS scores to the board. There is no other data available for COCF inmates, and the board requests that the department start collecting outcome data on this population.

As of June 2010, the percentages of COCF inmates with moderate/high needs by COMPAS domain were:

- 54.6 percent academic/vocational;
- 60.3 percent substance abuse;
- 47.5 percent anger management;
- 55.5 percent criminal thinking; and
- 33.3 percent family criminality.

These percentages are comparable with the moderate/high needs by COMPAS domains for all institutions.²³

²³ See Appendix A2.

Inmates serving their sentences at COCF are able to participate in a full-range of academic and vocational education. Each institution offers the following academic programs:

- Adult Basic Education I, II, and III;
- General Educational Development (GED);
- English as a Second Language (ESL)/English Language Learners (ELL);
- Instituto Nacional para la Education de los Adultos (INEA) Primaria and Secundaria; and
- College.

The academic education programs do not have established classroom hour requirements, and advancement in programming is based on standardized assessment/testing. The board requested capacity, utilization, and completion data for COCF programming, but the department is unable to provide it yet. The department’s data and performance management team is working to add COCF to its data.

In addition to academic programming, all COCF institutions provide multiple vocational options. Vocational programs at each institution are outlined in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2

Florence Correctional Center (FCC), Arizona	La Palma Correctional Center (LPCC), Arizona	North Fork Correctional Facility (NFCF), Oklahoma	Red Rock Correctional Center (RRCC), Arizona	Tallahatchie County Correctional Facility (TCCF), Mississippi
Computer Assisted drafting	Computers	Braille	Carpentry	Carpentry
Computers	Carpentry	Carpentry	Computer	Computer
Life Skills/Workplace Essentials	Electrical	Computer	Electrical	Electrical
	Horticulture	Electrical	Horticulture	Life Skills/Workplace
	Life Skills/Workplace Essentials	Horticulture	Life Skills/Workplace Essentials	Essentials
	Plumbing	Life Skills/Workplace Essentials		Masonry
		Masonry		Painting
		Painting		Plumbing
		Plumbing		

The CCA provides substance abuse programming at four institutions through its Residential Drug Abuse Treatment Program (RDAP). The RDAP utilizes only evidence-based cognitive-behavioral program components, which have been empirically demonstrated to reduce recidivism in prison-based populations in the 15% range. The RDAP treats inmates on a daily basis in a variety of core areas, including rational thinking, criminal lifestyle, living with others, recovery maintenance, and the transition to society. The program is based on individual progress, and it generally ranges from 9-15 months. Inmates are tested before and after their participation in the program and assessed in six domains related to criminogenic thinking patterns, including justification, entitlement, power orientation, criminal rationalization, cold heartedness, and personal irresponsibility. The testing instrument was developed by the Institute of Behavioral Research at Texas Christian University.

Prep for Reentry/Reintegration

Community-Based Substance Abuse Aftercare Models

The department manages community-based aftercare through four Substance Abuse Services Coordination Agency contractors: one for each parole region. SASCA contractors are responsible for finding treatment capacity in their assigned regions and arranging sub-contracts with providers for the provision of substance abuse treatment services.

Statewide, the four SASCA contractors currently have 994 subcontracts for substance abuse treatment services, broken down into the following three categories:

- residential (532);
- sober living (291); and
- outpatient (171)

All three types of programs are intended to reduce the incidence of both relapse and recidivism and to promote pro-social behavior that will enable parolees to exhibit satisfactory conduct within the facility and on parole, leading to successful integration to the community. Residential programs provide food and shelter in a community-based facility with intensive structured activities, sober living programs provide shelter in a residence that is self-governed by parolee participants who pledge total abstinence from alcohol and illicit drugs, and outpatient programs provide face-to-face interaction with addiction treatment personnel or addiction credential clinicians outside the parolee's residence.

California New Start

In fiscal year 2009/10, the department received an initial allocation of \$8.3 million in Workforce Investment Act funds for community based one-stop career centers that will provide unemployment services to parolees. However, in April 2010, the Workforce Investment Board reduced the amount to \$3.3 million. Recently, the Department of Labor and the Employment Development Department notified the department that it would receive an additional \$6.1 million in the current year. The Department of Labor and the Employment Development Department have allowed the department and the Local Workforce Investment Boards to continue spending the unused fiscal year 2009/10 reduced allocation during the current year. Each Local Workforce Investment Board designates specific one-stop career centers to provide parolees with employment services and job referrals.

The department is using \$880,000 of the fiscal year 2009/10 Workforce Investment Act funds to begin implementing its in-prison transition program. After conducting a pilot program at Folsom, four Local Workforce Investment Boards (Sacramento, Solano, Madera, and San Diego) will begin providing employment services at facilities in their respective counties during the current year.

Secure Reentry Program Facilities

Corrections 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 11 counties that have entered into agreements with Corrections to site eight secure facilities, two of which will be regional. The department is moving forward on the environmental impact report

process for Central Coast Reentry Facility (San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara counties) and Northern California Reentry Facility (Calaveras, Amador, and San Joaquin counties).

The board will be monitoring the implementation progress of the California New Start programs and Secure Reentry Program Facilities.

New Parole Model

During the reporting period, the Division of Adult Parole Operations (DAPO) developed a new parole model, whose goal is twofold:

- protect communities by aligning parole practices with those that have proven to reduce recidivism through effective offender supervision strategies; and
- promote a paradigm and cultural shift where staff openly embrace emerging correctional practices that have shown to facilitate long-term behavioral change within the offender population.

To accomplish this goal, DAPO worked with the Center for Effective Public Policy to create a model grounded on evidence-based practices. The result was the California Parole Supervision and Reintegration Model (CPSRM), which the department launched as a pilot at the following four parole units on August 1, 2010:

- Region I, Bakersfield 7;
- Region II, Santa Rosa 2;
- Region III, San Gabriel Valley 1; and
- Region IV, Tri-City

The department states that CPSRM brings many positive changes to parole. Perhaps the most dramatic of these changes is the reduction of parole agent caseloads from an average of 70 parolees per officer to 48 (excluding parolees on GPS or Enhanced Outpatient Clinic cases). According to the department, reduced caseloads will enable staff to be more involved and invested in their assigned parolees' successes. Agents will be trained to focus primarily on reintegration to society as opposed to returning parolees to prison because protecting public safety is best achieved when parolees make a successful reintegration into society and do not recidivate. District Administrators will manage five instead of eight units, which will allow for more intensive oversight, direction, and enforcement of professional standards throughout the districts.

Also as part of the new model, DAPO plans to:

- utilize active GPS to enhance the monitoring and surveillance of 1,000 gang members by mid-September. As of August 2, 2010, there were 804 gang members on Active GPS;
- establish 1,200 electronic monitoring units for alternative sanctions within the next six months;
- coordinate with various courts to create reentry courts for offenders with substance abuse and mental health issues who need special reentry provisions;
- institute a ten-week field training officer program for new cadets graduating from the Basic Parole Agent Academy as well as the Parole Supervisor's Academy;

- convert Parole Agent II Specialists to Supervisors, allowing them to train and monitor staff in the field; and
- create the California Parole Apprehension Teams (CPAT), which will be intended to focus on returning absconders to parole supervision.

The board has requested that the department provide a detailed presentation on the new parole model at its next meeting. In addition, the board is requesting that the department use the FY05-06 release cohort that formed the basis of its recent recidivism study to examine whether inmate participation in/completion of programming correlates with recidivism outcomes.

Measure Progress and Follow Up

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.

Currently, there is a four-month delay between the end of a reporting period and when the department can provide rehabilitative programming data to C-ROB. This lag time when coupled with rehabilitative programming implementation dates means there is little-to-no data available yet for C-ROB. The board questions how the department will make data-driven decisions in its program model adjustments every six months since there is a four-month lag in data availability.

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 department is working on an interim data solution to provide individual level data and expects it to be available Fall 2010. Without accurate and timely data, C-ROB cannot evaluate service delivery and program success.

Key Performance Indicators

During the reporting period, the department developed definitions for four key performance indicators (KPI) within each program area. The KPIs are assignment, utilization,²⁴ completion, and recidivism and are described in detail in the tables starting on the next page. Recidivism data will not be available until Fall 2012.

The department notes that one problem with looking at completion rates is that it has only recently standardized completion definitions. In the past, some vocational programs required three years to complete. Now all vocational programming must be completed in 12 months or less.

²⁴ Utilization is the percentage of available programming hours an inmate spends in actual programming.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
ADULT PROGRAMS
Key Performance Indicator Definitions

Rate of Assignment / Enrollment

Program Area	Definition	Source of Data	When Available
Academic Programming	The rate is calculated based on the number of participants enrolled divided by the number of available slots.	The source of data is the Education Monthly Report that is populated from the Permanent Classroom Record entered by each teacher. The PCR will be replaced by EdFirst/SOMS in Spring 2012.	Monthly, beginning May 2010 with 1-2 month lag.
Vocational Programming	The rate is calculated based on the number of participants enrolled divided by the number of available slots.	The source of data is the Education Monthly Report that is populated from the Permanent Classroom Record entered by each teacher. The PCR will be replaced by EdFirst/SOMS in Spring 2012.	Monthly, beginning May 2010 with 1-2 month lag.
In-Prison Substance Abuse	The rate is calculated based on the number of participants enrolled divided by the number of available slots.	Reported by Contract staff and summarized in the OSAT database; it is also collected in the DDPS database (Assignment Office data).	Monthly, with 2 month lag.
Community-Based Substance Abuse	The rate is calculated based on the number of participants enrolled divided by the number of budgeted slots.	Reported by Contract staff and summarized in the OSAT database	Not yet determined
Leisure Time Activities	The rate is calculated based on the number of participants divided by the program capacity.	Reported by Institution-based Community Partnership Manager and summarized in monthly report. Also reported by institution in COMPSTAT database.	Monthly, beginning August 2010
Employment Programs	tbd	Reported by the Contractor(s)	Not yet determined
Transition Programs	tbd	Not yet determined	Not yet determined
Assessment	n/a	n/a	n/a
Case Management	n/a	n/a	n/a

August 2010

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
ADULT PROGRAMS
Key Performance Indicator Definitions

Rate of Utilization / Attendance

Program Area	Definition	Source of Data	When Available
Academic Programming	Percentage of the total available program hours (XSEA) an inmate spends in actual programming (X) [-x/xsea]	Reported by Teacher and summarized in the Education Monthly Report	Monthly, beginning May 2009 with 1 month lag.
Vocational Programming	Percentage of the total available program hours (XSEA) an inmate spends in actual programming (X) [-x/xsea]	Reported by Teacher and summarized in the Education Monthly Report	Monthly, beginning May 2009 with 1 month lag.
In-Prison Substance Abuse	Percentage of the total available program hours (XSEA) an inmate spends in actual programming (X) [-x/xsea]	Reported by Contract staff and summarized in the ICATS database	Monthly, with 2 month lag.
Community-Based Substance Abuse	n/a	Data not available. Community-based contractors do not track utilization/attendance	n/a
Leisure Time Activities	The rate is calculated based on the number of meetings that were held divided by the number of meetings scheduled.	Reported by Institution-based Community Partnership Manager and summarized in monthly report.	Monthly, beginning August 2010
Employment Programs	tbd	Reported by the Contractor(s)	Not yet determined
Transition Programs	tbd	Not yet determined	Not yet determined
Assessment	n/a	n/a	n/a
Case Management	n/a	n/a	n/a

August 2010

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
ADULT PROGRAMS
Key Performance Indicator Definitions

Rate of Completion

Program Area	Definition	Source of Data	When Available
Academic Programming	= Participants completing program (as defined by Penal Code 2933) / Total Participants	Reported by Teacher and summarized in the Education Monthly Report	Monthly, beginning May 2009 with 1 month lag.
Vocational Programming	= Participants completing program (as defined by Penal Code 2933) / Total Participants	Reported by Teacher and summarized in the Education Monthly Report	Monthly, beginning May 2009 with 1 month lag.
In-Prison Substance Abuse	= Participants completing program (as defined by Penal Code 2933) / Total Participants	Reported by Contract staff and summarized in the OSAT database	Monthly, with 2 month lag
Community-Based Substance Abuse	= Participants complete program (as defined by provider treatment plan) / Total Participants	Reported by Contract staff and summarized in the OSAT database	Monthly, with 2 month lag.
Leisure Time Activities	n/a	There are no completion rates because these are not assigned programs of a set duration	n/a
Employment Programs	tbd	Reported by the Contractor(s)	Not yet determined
Transition Programs	tbd	Not yet determined	Not yet determined
Assessment	Number of assessment completed / number of incoming inmates		Limited data available; complete data will be available with the implementation of SOMS 1A
Case Management	Number of inmates with case plan / number of case plans needed		Not yet determined

August 2010

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION
ADULT PROGRAMS
Key Performance Indicator Definitions

Rate of Recidivism

Program Area	Definition	Source of Data	When Available
Academic Programming	The percent of inmates who completed the program that were Rearrested and/or Returned to Prison after 1 yr, 2 yrs or 3 yrs. Compared to the general population.	Calculated annually by the CDCR Office of Research based on data collected through EdFirst/SOMS.	Spring 2015 (possibly sooner if TEMS solution provides inmate level data)
Vocational Programming	The percent of inmates who completed the program that were Rearrested and/or Returned to Prison after 1 yr, 2 yrs or 3 yrs. Compared to the general population.	Calculated annually by the CDCR Office of Research based on data collected through EdFirst/SOMS.	Spring 2015 (possibly sooner if TEMS solution provides inmate level data)
In-Prison Substance Abuse	The percent of inmates who completed the program that were Rearrested and/or Returned to Prison after 1 yr, 2 yrs or 3 yrs. Compared to the general population.	Calculated annually by the CDCR Office of Research based on data collected through the OSAT database	1 yr. recidivism data will not be reported until the second year. (2005-06 Data was published in Annual Report)
Community-Based Substance Abuse	The percent of inmates who completed the program that were Rearrested and/or Returned to Prison after 1 yr, 2 yrs or 3 yrs. Compared to the general population.	Calculated annually by the CDCR Office of Research based on data collected through the OSAT database	1 yr. recidivism data will not be reported until the second year. (2005-06 Data was published in Annual Report)
Leisure Time Activities	n/a	n/a	n/a
Employment Programs	The percent of inmates who completed the program that were Rearrested and/or Returned to Prison after 1 yr, 2 yrs or 3 yrs. Compared to the general population.	Will be calculated annually by the CDCR Office of Research; however, the source of data within the program has not yet been determined.	TBD
Transition Programs	The percent of inmates who completed the program that were Rearrested and/or Returned to Prison after 1 yr, 2 yrs or 3 yrs. Compared to the general population.	Will be calculated annually by the CDCR Office of Research; however, the source of data within the program has not yet been determined.	TBD

August 2010

Below is an example of utilization and enrollment data for June 2010. The department reports that currently it is analyzing this type of data to identify trends and locate potential problems. The enrollment rate is calculated on the number of participants enrolled divided by the number of available slots. Utilization is the percentage of available program hours an inmate spends in actual programming. To put the data below in better perspective, the total inmate population in June 2010 was 162,608. Of those inmates, 56 percent had a moderate/high COMPAS need in the academic/vocational domain and 65.3 percent had a moderate/high COMPAS need in the substance abuse domain. Academic programs can serve approximately 40,000 inmates annually; vocational programs can serve a total of 4,800 inmates annually; and substance abuse programs can serve a total of 8,500 inmates annually.

Prison Programming ²⁵ Facility	Substance Abuse		Academic		Voc Ed	
	Util	Enroll	Util	Enroll	Util	Enroll
ASP	79.3%	97.5%	67.4%	36.9%	74.1%	66.4%
CAL	N/A	N/A	32.5%	40.8%	34.5%	45.4%
CCC	N/A	N/A	77.1%	25.6%	52.3%	85.7%
CCI	87.3%	100.0%	45.0%	18.5%	51.3%	89.7%
CCWF	95.3%	100.0%	83.0%	42.0%	62.0%	113.6%
CEN	N/A	N/A	72.8%	28.0%	27.6%	84.4%
CIM	81.4%	99.3%	75.9%	42.8%	43.2%	93.8%
CIW	97.1%	100.0%	71.6%	57.7%	84.9%	33.3%
CMC	96.5%	100.0%	50.8%	42.1%	57.9%	87.5%
CMF	N/A	N/A	48.1%	36.1%	41.1%	111.1%
COR	N/A	N/A	57.2%	17.8%	47.7%	50.0%
CRC	87.6%	97.8%	59.8%	44.9%	70.1%	77.8%
CTF	98.8%	82.7%	84.4%	66.0%	56.6%	64.8%
CVSP	93.0%	97.3%	81.0%	42.1%	69.1%	75.0%
DVI	N/A	N/A	100.0%	21.7%	N/A	N/A
FSP	N/A	N/A	83.9%	53.6%	70.3%	96.3%
HDSP	N/A	N/A	32.8%	44.2%	26.3%	98.1%
ISP	N/A	N/A	64.0%	21.6%	61.7%	80.0%
KVSP	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LAC	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MCSP	N/A	N/A	75.6%	36.5%	68.4%	60.0%
NKSP	N/A	N/A	53.3%	7.2%	N/A	N/A
PBSP	N/A	N/A	63.8%	25.7%	63.2%	37.0%
PVSP	N/A	N/A	49.4%	35.2%	27.6%	63.0%
RJD	N/A	N/A	45.5%	17.5%	69.4%	75.3%
SAC	N/A	N/A	73.5%	17.7%	83.7%	97.5%
SATF	80.5%	95.6%	49.5%	60.2%	64.8%	99.4%
SCC	N/A	N/A	80.6%	70.1%	66.7%	82.7%
SOL	83.4%	100.0%	53.5%	30.7%	48.1%	87.5%
SQ	N/A	N/A	65.5%	32.6%	64.0%	88.9%
SVSP	N/A	N/A	58.6%	41.7%	N/A	N/A
VSPW	94.8%	100.0%	74.7%	41.1%	66.1%	100.0%
WSP	N/A	N/A	63.1%	20.1%	N/A	N/A
Leo Chesney	93.8%	98.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

²⁵ KVSP and LAC did not report Education Data for the June 2010.

Substance Abuse Treatment Performance Reviews

In response to the Office of the Inspector General's February 2007 *Special Review of In-Prison Substance Abuse Programs Managed by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*, the department developed its Performance Accountability Review (PAR) in April 2008, which measures contract compliance on a quarterly basis. The PAR is modeled after the University of Cincinnati's "Correctional Program Checklist" – a validated tool used widely for performance evaluation. The Office of the Inspector General has reviewed 39 program accountability reviews that OSATS conducted during calendar years 2008 and 2009 and confirms that PAR effectively determines if individual treatment programs are adhering to evidence-based practices. Significantly, the department has committed to terminating programs that are unsuccessful in their PAR and fail to conduct appropriate corrective action. The department also established a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) as a forum for sharing best practices with substance abuse treatment providers. According to the department, the PAC meets on "a quarterly basis or as needed," but in practice, the Inspector General's 2010 Accountability Audit indicated that the PAC has only held two meetings since October 2007. The board acknowledges the department for standardizing its review of contracts through its PAR and encourages it to communicate information more frequently through its PAC.

With regard to measuring recidivism, the Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Services has pledged to work with the Office of Research to identify appropriate groups of SAT participants for longitudinal data studies. These studies will track, by program, the recidivism rates (1-year, 2-year, 3-year) to determine if the program under study was effective in reducing recidivism.

Fidelity

The Center for Evidence-Based Corrections at the University of California, Irvine (UCI) and the Center for Effective Public Policy provided guidance to the department in developing methods to achieve quality assurance, perform formal evaluations, and establish quantitative data measurements for rehabilitative programming. The fidelity unit reports that it also uses aspects of the Correctional Program Checklist when performing program reviews.

The fidelity unit suspended its substance abuse programming site reviews because of travel restrictions brought about by the state budget crisis. Instead, the fidelity unit has been conducting teleconference meetings and has reviewed almost all substance abuse treatment programs statewide. If the fidelity unit finds instances where contractors are not using evidence-based curriculum, the department has committed to requiring the contractors to bring their programming into compliance or face termination.

The fidelity unit has not begun evaluating educational programming, but it has worked with UCI to create self-assessments tools, curriculum evaluations, and placement criteria reviews.

The department plans to collaborate with the UCI to assess its progress and perform parole program fidelity reviews. The department stated that only through this collaboration will the Division of Adult Parole Operations ensure it remains aligned with evidence-based practices intended to enhance public safety through long-term positive behavioral change.

The fidelity unit has completed its California State Prison, Solano demonstration project fidelity review reports of CALM and T4C, along with the snapshot of who attended both programs based on risk (CSRA) scores and COMPAS criminogenic needs. According to the department, these reports are critical for quality improvement as the Office of Substance Abuse Treatment implements the new 90-day substance abuse programs. The department planned to publish the reports in March 2010, but they have not yet been released. The board urges the department to make these reports available as soon as possible.

CONCLUSION

After seven biannual reports, the department is not yet able to provide fidelity information on whether its rehabilitative programming is being implemented as planned, nor data by which C-ROB can measure which inmates are receiving services and the impact service delivery has on recidivism. There is no information from the department about the Solano demonstration project and the implementation of the California Logic Model at that institution. Data systems are the major hurdle for this information, and it will be at least 2012 before the department can provide the data C-ROB needs in a systematic way. Without accurate and timely data, C-ROB cannot evaluate service delivery and program success. At the same time, C-ROB recognizes the many challenges the department continues to face in the delivery of rehabilitative services and programs.

As the Expert Panel noted in its June 2007 report,

Changing the way corrections agencies do business is no easy task. Improving rehabilitation programs to reduce recidivism is not simply a matter of identifying those evidence-based programs that produce results. Rather, the greater challenge lies in changing existing systems to support the programs so that they can be effectively implemented. This requires energetic leadership that is willing to place equal focus on:

- *Evidence-based principles in program and service delivery,*
- *Organizational re-engineering, and*
- *Collaboration within and between organizations.*²⁶

*Because correctional change involves often competing (or at least differing) stakeholder—citizens, administrators, offenders, corrections officers, parole officers, families, legislators, etc.—it often takes a long time, at least two to five years, for agencies to achieve consistent and sustainable results. Part of this is due to the amount of time needed to build consensus among all parties. But an even greater contributor to the extended time factor is that rehabilitation involves influencing human behavior. Because of this, correctional agencies need to be deliberate and careful when introducing new rehabilitation programs to their offender populations or when modifying existing programs.*²⁷

In the preparation for this report, the CROB members recognized that the process noted above is taking hold at the department's headquarters. The expressed collaborative spirit between the

²⁶ Expert Panel Report, June 2007, p. 14.

²⁷ Expert Panel Report, June 2007, p. 15.

custody and programming divisions is a vital step toward sustainable change. While the State still has a long and difficult task ahead in the full implementation of the California Logic Model, it is clear that progress toward the goal will be enhanced by the nurturing and support of this collaborative culture that C-ROB sees emerging. C-ROB urges the department to continue to work together across divisional lines to bring the promise of the AB 900 and California Logic Model goals to fruition. In its continued role of monitoring and evaluating the department's progress, and in preparation for the March 2011 biannual report, C-ROB will make site visits during the next six months to institutions to follow up on the concerns expressed throughout this report and summarized in Appendix G.

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	162,608	154,930	99,503	44.0%	56.0%	34.5%	65.5%	52.8%	47.2%	50.6%	49.4%	65.2%	34.8%	*	*

¹ The Institution Population is 162,608 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010 as of March 31, 2010. The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 1,502. The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,415, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 2, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 1, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 71, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 74, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUPM) 63, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 33, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consumes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 364, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 868, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 1,502. Total inmate population, for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 168,525 as of March 31, 2010.

² The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of July 28, 2010 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 June 22, 2010.

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	123,423	118,328	92,076	45.7%	54.3%	35.4%	64.6%	57.8%	42.2%	51.4%	48.6%	63.4%	36.6%	32.0%	68.0%	*	*

¹ The Parole Population is 123,423 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010, as of March 31, 2010.

² The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of July 28, 2010 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 June 22, 2010.

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		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	162,608	154,930	99,503	44.0%	56.0%	34.4%	65.6%	52.8%	47.2%	50.6%	49.4%	65.2%	34.8%	*	*	*	*
ASP	6,482	6,126	3,087	47.0%	53.0%	33.0%	67.0%	54.5%	45.5%	54.1%	45.9%	64.7%	35.3%	*	*	*	*
CAL	4,195	4,051	2,367	46.7%	53.3%	52.3%	47.7%	52.2%	47.8%	46.3%	53.7%	69.7%	30.3%	*	*	*	*
CCC	5,543	5,406	4,409	56.0%	44.0%	27.4%	72.6%	64.4%	35.6%	57.6%	42.4%	67.6%	32.4%	*	*	*	*
CCF-Leo Chesney	271	270	188	55.6%	44.4%	28.9%	71.1%	80.9%	19.1%	68.6%	31.4%	61.4%	38.6%	*	*	*	*
CCI	5,928	5,763	4,079	42.8%	57.2%	32.4%	67.6%	51.4%	48.6%	50.6%	49.4%	64.0%	36.0%	*	*	*	*
CCWF	3,785	3,712	1,934	48.4%	51.6%	30.7%	69.3%	63.6%	36.4%	56.4%	43.6%	71.5%	28.5%	*	*	*	*
CEN	4,526	4,332	2,834	44.1%	55.9%	44.0%	56.0%	52.1%	47.9%	43.9%	56.1%	67.9%	32.1%	*	*	*	*
CIM	5,212	5,028	4,155	39.8%	60.2%	34.3%	65.7%	46.2%	53.8%	46.5%	53.5%	63.5%	36.5%	*	*	*	*
CIW	2,597	2,345	1,428	51.5%	48.5%	30.1%	69.9%	71.6%	28.4%	54.4%	45.6%	67.0%	33.0%	*	*	*	*
CMC	6,726	6,313	3,585	52.3%	47.7%	38.1%	61.9%	55.8%	44.2%	51.3%	48.7%	67.3%	32.7%	*	*	*	*
CMF	2,729	2,446	1,193	38.6%	61.4%	37.0%	63.0%	40.0%	60.0%	43.7%	56.3%	61.2%	38.8%	*	*	*	*
COCF	8,218	8,069	5,393	45.4%	54.6%	39.7%	60.3%	52.5%	47.5%	44.5%	55.5%	66.7%	33.3%	*	*	*	*
COR	5,507	5,249	3,261	43.3%	56.7%	32.5%	67.5%	53.1%	46.9%	49.1%	50.9%	65.1%	34.9%	*	*	*	*
CRC	4,374	3,646	2,370	49.0%	51.0%	42.9%	57.1%	58.2%	41.8%	52.3%	47.7%	68.7%	31.3%	*	*	*	*
CTF	6,222	5,842	2,827	44.1%	55.9%	33.3%	66.7%	54.2%	45.8%	52.0%	48.0%	62.8%	37.2%	*	*	*	*
CVSP	3,487	3,296	1,566	55.8%	44.2%	39.8%	60.2%	62.4%	37.6%	57.8%	42.2%	71.7%	28.3%	*	*	*	*
DVI	3,938	3,810	3,235	39.0%	61.0%	24.5%	75.5%	44.6%	55.4%	50.6%	49.4%	56.5%	43.5%	*	*	*	*
FOL	3,778	3,557	2,534	40.3%	59.7%	38.8%	61.2%	47.1%	52.9%	43.5%	56.5%	62.8%	37.2%	*	*	*	*
HDSP	4,499	4,351	3,149	42.7%	57.3%	34.9%	65.1%	51.6%	48.4%	50.0%	50.0%	57.9%	42.1%	*	*	*	*
ISP	4,186	3,993	2,559	43.5%	56.5%	43.3%	56.7%	58.4%	41.6%	43.9%	56.1%	64.1%	35.9%	*	*	*	*
KVSP	4,842	4,674	3,089	36.3%	63.7%	34.7%	65.3%	40.2%	59.8%	36.6%	63.4%	61.1%	38.9%	*	*	*	*
LAC	4,605	4,440	3,120	39.1%	60.9%	37.1%	62.9%	44.8%	55.2%	44.2%	55.8%	66.1%	33.9%	*	*	*	*
MCSP	3,816	3,598	1,570	43.8%	56.2%	43.2%	56.8%	54.1%	45.9%	50.0%	50.0%	53.8%	46.2%	*	*	*	*
NKSP	5,480	5,340	4,314	44.7%	55.3%	32.3%	67.7%	50.1%	49.9%	55.9%	44.1%	74.5%	25.5%	*	*	*	*
PBSP	3,367	3,227	1,924	36.6%	63.4%	43.2%	56.8%	45.7%	54.3%	44.4%	55.6%	61.6%	38.4%	*	*	*	*
PVSP	4,782	4,493	2,605	41.1%	58.9%	38.9%	61.1%	43.6%	56.4%	45.0%	55.0%	60.5%	39.5%	*	*	*	*
RJD	4,719	4,521	3,161	39.3%	60.7%	26.7%	73.3%	50.4%	49.6%	48.3%	51.7%	65.8%	34.2%	*	*	*	*
SAC	2,947	2,836	1,693	33.1%	66.9%	44.0%	56.0%	51.5%	48.5%	48.0%	52.0%	62.7%	37.3%	*	*	*	*
SATF	6,797	6,438	3,386	41.9%	58.1%	37.7%	62.3%	49.9%	50.1%	47.3%	52.7%	63.3%	36.7%	*	*	*	*
SCC	5,556	5,409	4,101	51.7%	48.3%	35.1%	64.9%	61.1%	38.9%	54.6%	45.4%	66.0%	34.0%	*	*	*	*
SOL	5,150	4,774	2,242	46.4%	53.6%	39.5%	60.5%	49.9%	50.1%	49.3%	50.7%	63.9%	36.1%	*	*	*	*
SQ	4,987	4,608	3,009	37.1%	62.9%	35.2%	64.8%	51.9%	48.1%	50.1%	49.9%	63.0%	37.0%	*	*	*	*
SVSP	3,767	3,626	2,256	36.7%	63.3%	37.4%	62.6%	46.9%	53.1%	40.7%	59.3%	64.2%	35.8%	*	*	*	*
VSPW	3,604	3,510	1,955	46.2%	53.8%	28.1%	71.9%	64.4%	35.6%	54.3%	45.7%	65.4%	34.6%	*	*	*	*
WSP	5,986	5,831	4,925	41.1%	58.9%	30.3%	69.7%	47.2%	52.8%	53.5%	46.5%	66.2%	33.8%	*	*	*	*

¹ The Institution Population is 162,608 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010 as of March 31, 2010. The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 1,502. The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,415, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 2, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 1, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 71, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 74, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUFM) 63, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 33, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consumnes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 364, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 868, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 1,502. Total inmate population, for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 168,525 as of March 31, 2010.

² The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of July 28, 2010 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 June 22, 2010.

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	123,423	118,328	92,076	45.7%	54.3%	35.3%	64.7%	57.8%	42.2%	51.4%	48.6%	63.3%	36.7%	32.0%	68.0%	33.5%	66.5%
Parole Region I	29,456	27,939	22,251	43.8%	56.2%	29.5%	70.5%	55.0%	45.0%	52.3%	47.7%	56.4%	43.6%	32.8%	67.2%	33.9%	66.1%
Parole Region II	23,023	22,118	17,590	46.4%	53.6%	32.1%	67.9%	56.3%	43.7%	52.5%	47.5%	61.8%	38.3%	33.1%	66.9%	30.3%	69.7%
Parole Region III	31,638	30,494	22,840	44.4%	55.6%	43.8%	56.2%	59.3%	40.7%	48.8%	51.2%	69.7%	30.3%	31.9%	68.1%	31.5%	68.5%
Parole Region IV	39,306	37,777	29,395	47.8%	52.2%	35.0%	65.0%	59.5%	40.5%	52.0%	48.0%	64.7%	35.3%	30.8%	69.2%	37.2%	62.8%

¹The Parole Population is 123,423 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010 as of March 31, 2010. ²The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of July 28, 2010, for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice. ³Needs assessment was derived from the 'Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset on June 22, 2010.

Appendix B: Determining Gaps in Rehabilitative Services

All Institutions	Institution Population ¹	CSRA Score Low ²	CSRA Score Medium/High ²	Moderate/High CSRA Scores									
				6-6 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	162,608	55,427	99,903	29,264	29.4%	15,094	15.2%	15,189	15.2%	7,687	7.7%	27,723	27.9%
Serious or Violent	97,931	44,102	48,756	7,411	15.2%	4,864	10.0%	6,589	13.5%	4,680	6.6%	23,209	47.6%
Sex Registrants	23,239	14,478	7,360	2,065	28.1%	752	10.2%	903	12.3%	561	7.6%	2,673	36.3%
Enhanced Out-Patients (EOPs)	5,333	2,047	3,033	915	30.2%	368	12.1%	409	13.5%	222	7.3%	931	30.7%
Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE) holds	17,639	10,349	6,596	1,518	23.0%	929	14.1%	991	14.9%	596	9.0%	2,383	36.2%
Inmates Serving a Life Sentence ^{3,4}	28,881	20,292	6,348	283	4.5%	265	4.2%	516	8.1%	449	7.1%	3,640	57.4%
Inmates with Needs Assessments ⁴	52,011	7,095	43,535	20,958	48.1%	8,073	18.5%	5,682	13.1%	2,242	5.1%	4,358	10.0%

Rehabilitative Program Areas (6-VII)	A	B	C	D	E
	Assessed Need COMPAS	Treatment Slots	Average Length of Program	Annual Capacity	Potential Participants
I. Academic/Vocational Programs ^{4,7}	86,722			110,749	
Traditional Education Programs					
ELD		194	12 Months		
ABE I		2,247	12 Months		
ABE II		2,621	12 Months		
ABE III		2,286	12 Months		
GED		3,477	6 Months		
HIGH SCHOOL		135		742	
COMPUTER LAB		270		3,122	
Alternative Education Delivery Models					
INDEPENDENT STUDY		2,174		16,992	
DISTANCE LEARNING		682		5,542	
Bridging Education Programs		702		84,351	
Vocational Programs					
AUTO BODY		324	10 - 13 Months		
AUTO MECHANICS		432	14 - 20 Months		
BUILDING MAINTENANCE		270	3 - 6 Months		
CARPENTRY		214	5 - 7 Months		
COSMETOLOGY		27	12 - 17 Months		
DRY CLEANING					
DRYWALL INSTALLER/TAPER					
ELECTRICAL CONSTRUCTION (WORK)		216	10 - 18 Months		
ELECTRONICS		435	18 - 21 Months		
EYEWEAR					
GRAPHIC ARTS					
HOUSEHOLD REPAIR					
JANITORIAL					
LANDSCAPE GARDENING					
MACHINE SHOP (AUTOMOTIVE)		27			
MACHINE SHOP (PRACTICAL)		81	7 Months		
MASONRY		135	6 - 9 Months		
MILL & CABINET WORK					
OFFICE MACHINES					
OFFICE SERVICES & RELATED TECHNOLOGIES		1,056	8 - 10 Months		
PAINTING					
PLUMBING		216	5 - 8 Months		
REFRIGERATION		217	18 - 26 Months		
ROOFER					
SHEET METAL WORK		54	6 - 9 Months		
SMALL ENGINE REPAIR		162	5 - 7 Months		
WELDING		507	6 - 9 Months		
II. Substance Abuse Programs ⁸	65,174				
In-Prison Substance Abuse		1,900	90 days	7,600	
Civil Addict Program		300	180 days	600	
Leo Chesney		150	180 days	300	
III. Criminal Thinking, Behavior, Skills, & Associations ⁹	49,154				
Thinking for a Change (TAC)					
Sub Total Criminal Thinking					
IV. Aggression, Hostility, Anger & Violence ¹⁰	46,965				
CALM					
Sub Total Anger					
V. Family Criminality ¹¹	34,627				
Sub Total Family Criminality					
VI. Family Support ¹²	*				
Sub Total Family Support					
VII. Sex Offending ¹³	*				
Sub Total Sex Offending					

Appendix B: Determining Gaps in Rehabilitative Services

SUMMARY

¹ The Institution Population is 162,608 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010 as of March 31, 2010. The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 1,502. The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,415, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 2, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 1, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 71, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 74, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUPM) 63, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 33, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consummes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 364, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 868, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 1,502. Total inmate population, for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 168,525 as of March 31, 2010.

² The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of July 28, 2010 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice.

³ Criminogenic needs were extracted from Corectional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions' (COMPAS) dataset June 22, 2010. At the time the data was extracted, 4.6% 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.

C-ROB Counting Rules

Footnotes

¹ The Institution Population is 162,608 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010, as of March 31, 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 July 28, 2010 for only those that we were able to ascertain criminal record data from the Department of Justice. At the time the data was extracted 4.6% 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 52,011 Assessments were completed. Assessments were completed on the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) dataset on June 22, 2010.

⁵ Treatment Slots: is calculated by adding Fulltime Quota to Halftime Quota

⁶ 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 only calculated for mandatory programs.

⁷ Annual Capacity for those programs without pacing scales are calculated by taking the average turnover rates of the reporting period to estimate for a 12 month cycle. The number of enrolled/assigned students at the beginning of the reporting period are then added in order to obtain the annual capacity for the program.

⁸ As of January 1, 2010, capacity for all SAP programs is 2,350 with program lengths set at 90 days, with the exception of 300 program slots for Civil Narcotic Addicts and Leo Chesney with a program duration of 180 days.

⁹ Program has been contracted, but not implemented.

¹⁰ 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 March 31, 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 July 21, 2010.

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: is calculated by adding Fulltime Quota to Halftime Quota

Column C: Average Length of Program: VocEd average length of program is 9 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 Data Source: September 2009 Education Monthly Report, OSATS monthly contractor reports, Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS),

Appendix C: Determining Levels of Offender Participation and Offender Success

Academic

Reporting Period: October 2009 till March 2010

Academic ¹	Budgeted slots at start of reporting period (October 1, 2009 Quota) ²	Beginning student population (as of October 1, 2009) ³	Admissions during reporting period (October 2009 through March 2010) ⁴	Program exits during reporting period (October 2009 through March 2010)			Ending population as of March 31, 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	16,939	15,577	13,387	19,005	3,301	17.4%	9,416	6,474,475	3,617,000	55.9%
All Institution's Total	14,626	13,613	12,604	17,807	3,030	17.0%	7,867	5,176,317	3,076,657	59.4%
ASP	917	852	1,058	1,030	20	1.9%	770	295,133	167,867	57%
CAL	552	537	203	203	4	2.0%	412	242,747	114,383	47%
CCC	400	310	1,280	1,215	840	69.1%	324	201,106	104,003	52%
CCI	491	469	416	680	82	12.1%	296	143,709	71,025	49%
CCWF	844	772	837	1,233	72	5.8%	171	254,363	138,739	55%
CEN	525	415	209	240	46	19.2%	322	215,127	166,467	77%
*CIM	270	297	243	271	14	5.2%	39	69,962	35,294	50%
CIW	567	573	534	990	120	12.1%	214	140,309	95,304	68%
GMC	452	446	675	719	76	10.6%	431	255,703	173,733	68%
GMF	165	207	88	103	11	10.7%	135	66,857	33,299	50%
COCF	2,313	1,964	783	1,198	271	19.8%	1,549	1,298,158	540,343	42%
COR	540	493	214	321	15	4.7%	348	261,461	173,952	67%
CRC	476	417	789	776	60	7.7%	458	207,986	141,685	68%
CTF	530	460	289	407	40	9.8%	460	236,394	138,141	58%
CVSP	295	262	212	368	8	2.2%	354	107,857	75,450	70%
*DVI	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0%
FOL	387	378	398	406	24	5.9%	305	159,700	125,690	79%
HDSP	648	610	448	694	56	8.1%	263	253,319	160,421	63%
ISP	216	189	123	88	13	14.8%	188	112,631	71,429	63%
KVSP	377	373	160	423	2	0.5%	81	115,803	52,327	45%
*LAC	81	79	27	81	0	0.0%	0	33,036	13,824	42%
MCSP	505	426	196	290	52	17.9%	163	235,251	135,341	58%
*NKSP	27	21	10	13	0	0.0%	0	5,952	1,526	26%
PBSP	160	156	121	164	22	13.4%	132	43,248	32,449	75%
PVSP	595	566	368	645	13	2.0%	204	180,806	86,230	48%
*RJD	282	229	49	161	3	1.9%	78	37,955	19,656	52%
SAC	213	209	219	313	11	3.5%	119	78,095	58,084	74%
SATF	1,512	1,489	1,137	2,182	312	14.3%	504	585,965	354,596	61%
SCC	379	413	1,301	1,447	786	54.3%	390	154,187	105,084	68%
SOL	1,017	791	103	682	7	1.0%	0	91,983	45,875	50%
*SQ	231	205	157	210	35	16.7%	87	68,844	32,486	47%
SVSP	297	277	96	137	1	0.7%	295	116,637	35,195	30%
WSPV	675	670	621	1,283	264	20.6%	324	204,191	117,102	57%
*WSP 11	0	22	23	32	21	65.6%	0	0	0	0%

Academic Footnotes

¹ Academic programs include traditional programs (i.e. ELD, ABE I, ABE II, ABE III, High School, GED, Computer Lab) as well as Supplemental programs (i.e. Pre-Release, CALM, Estelle, BMU, and PFT). Acronyms used: ELD - English Language Development, ABE - Adult Basic Education, CALM - Conflict Anger Lifetime Management, BMU - Behavior Modification Unit, PFT - Physical Fitness Training.

² Office of Correctional Education (OCE) determined Full Time plus Half Time Student figures gives a more accurate picture of the total number of students served rather than the figures for Full Time Equivalent Student. Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 28 (Full Time and Half Time Quota).

³ Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 63 (Beginning Assignments - Full Time and Half Time students).

⁴ Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 64 (Students Added - Full Time and Half Time Students)

⁵ Total Number of Program Exits include those who have completed the program and therefore exited. Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 65 (Students Dropped - Full Time and Half Time Students).

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 program as well as those who have completed a supplemental program (whose rate of completion may be higher). Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 72 (Termination Code 1A - Completion of Program).

⁷ Ending population is a derived figure taken from the last month of the reporting period and adding the beginning population with any student admissions and subtracting program exits.

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).

¹¹ Wasco State Prison does not have any traditional Academic programs, the data entered reflects the Pre-Release class that generates no X times.

*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.

DVI has no Academic programs.

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

SAP ¹	Activated slots at start of reporting period (October 1, 2009 Quota) ²	Beginning population as of October 1, 2009 ³	Admissions during reporting period (October 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010) ³	Program exits during reporting period (October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010) ³			Ending population as of March 31, 2010 ⁵	# of program hours per period (XSEA) ⁶	Participant hours ⁷ per period (X-Time) ⁶	Participation Rate (Monthly Average of X/XSEA Time for this period) ⁶
				Total Number of Program Exits ³	Number of Completions ⁴	% of Program exits due to Completions ⁴				
COCF with All Institution's Total	12,058	9,014	3,575	9,910	1,265	12.8%	2,696	1,565,667	1,306,326	83.4%
All Institution's Total	11,564	8,598	3,240	9,640	1,246	12.9%	2,228	991,655	748,618	75.6%
ASP	700	561	174	535	9	1.7%	200	54,395	34,334	63.1%
CAL										
CCC										
CCI	425	162	173	175	20	11.4%	160	71,142	41,664	58.6%
CCWF	756	452	177	454	13	2.9%	175	97,650	72,776	74.5%
CEN										
CIM	650	378	286	514	167	32.5%	150	41,535	31,931	76.9%
CIW	752	560	192	577	26	4.5%	175	136,277	116,823	85.7%
CMC	180	144	140	209	27	12.9%	75	37,844	30,839	81.5%
CMF										
COCF	494	416	335	270	19	7.0%	443	574,012	557,708	97.2%
COR	190	158	0	158	0	0.0%	0	4,044	64	1.6%
CRC	1,314	1,191	409	1,375	68	4.9%	225	39,712	25,844	65.1%
CTF	458	294	261	451	121	26.8%	104	47,309	29,413	62.2%
CVSP	340	225	219	294	77	26.2%	150	75,175	54,227	72.1%
DVI										
FOL	403	210		265	125	47.2%	0	11,122	10,314	92.7%
HDSP										
ISP										
KVSP	256	231	0	231	4	1.7%	0	6,124	2,264	37.1%
LAC										
MCSP										
NKSP ⁷	0	57	0	57	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0.0%
PBSP										
PVSP	400	262	0	262	4	1.5%	0	8,098	3,623	44.7%
RJD	450	246	0	246	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0.0%
SAC										
SATF	1,878	1,577	493	1,730	250	14.5%	340	134,392	110,574	82.3%
SCC	556	460	98	533	17	3.2%	25	6,096	3,482	57.1%
SOL	900	553	73	476	11	2.3%	150	24,566	19,730	80.3%
SQ										
SVSP										
VSPW	756	666	337	828	131	15.8%	175	126,327	95,532	75.6%
WSP ⁷	0	61	0	61	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0.0%
Leo Chesney	200	150	208	209	176	84.2%	149	69,849	65,187	93.3%

¹ SAP Footnotes

¹ SAP is a Substance Abuse Program.

² 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.

³ Counts taken from Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Population Report October 5, 2009. As of January 1, 2010, the number of activated slots went down to 2,350.

⁴ Beginning population, program admissions, and program exit figures obtained from Offender Substance Abuse Tracking (OSAT) database on June 15, 2010.

⁵ Population counts do not include participants in the Drug Treatment Furlough program.

⁶ Completion or incompletion of a SAP program is reported by the SAP treatment provider to DARS. Completion Percentage is the calculated figure taken from the sums of full and partial program completions divided by total program exits.

⁷ Ending population is a derived figure taken from adding the beginning population and the admissions and subtracting program exits.

⁸ The Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Services began collecting utilization data on its programs on July 1, 2009.

⁹ Substance abuse programming at the NKSP and WSP ended on October 19, 2009.

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

OSATS program (by individual programs or aggregated) ¹	Activated slots at start of reporting period (October 2009 Quota) ²	Beginning population as of October 1, 2009 ³	Admissions during reporting period (October 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010) ³	Program exits during reporting period (October 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010) ³			Ending population as of March 31, 2010 ⁴	# of program hours per period (XSEA) ⁵	Participant hours per period (X-Time) ⁵	Participation Rate (Monthly Average of X/XSEA Time for this period) ⁵
				Total Number of Program Exits ⁵	Number of Completions ⁶	% of Program exits due to Completions				
All Parole Regions		5,584	6,545	7,590	4,787	63.1%	4,539			
Parole Region I		2,256	1,984	2,198	1,541	70.1%	2,042			
Parole Region II		801	1,302	1,415	812	57.4%	688			
Parole Region III		1,226	1,710	2,083	1,244	59.7%	853			
Parole Region IV		1,301	1,549	1,894	1,190	62.8%	956			

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)

OSATS 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 program slots.

³ Beginning population, program admissions, and program exit figures obtained from Offender Substance Abuse Tracking (OSAT) database on June 1, 2010.

Only one treatment admission per individual per program was counted. ICDDTP jail-based admits not counted (i.e. counted admissions into phase 2 of community based treatment and admissions for those who did all 90 days in a community based setting.)

Only one treatment discharge per individual per program was counted. For ICDDTP participants, only discharges from community based phase of treatment was counted.

⁴ Ending population is a derived figure taken from adding the beginning population and the admissions and subtracting program exits.

⁵ OSATS does not have hourly attendance or utilization data for this time period.

⁶ Completion or incompletion of a SAP program is reported by the SAP treatment provider to OSATS. Completion Percentage is calculated by taking the number of full program completions and partial completions during this time period divided by the total number of program exits during the time period.

Appendix C: Determining Levels of Offender Participation and Offender Success
Vocational
Reporting Period: October 2009 till March 2010

Vocational ¹	Budgeted slots at start of reporting period (October 1, 2009 Quota) ²	Beginning student population (as of October 1, 2009) ³	Admissions during reporting period (October 2009 thru March 2010) ⁴	Program exits during reporting period (October 2009 thru March 2010)				Ending population as of March 31, 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	9,996	9,430	4,886	8,606	770	921	19.6%	4,179	3,953,392	2,077,870	52.6%
All Institution's Total	9,226	8,659	4,390	7,924	465	368	10.5%	3,654	3,539,758	1,884,138	53.2%
ASP	556	486	422	541	6	7	2.4%	292	203,600	125,794	61.8%
CAL	297	271	56	215	0	2	0.9%	65	100,600	31,981	31.8%
CCC	243	243	122	154	33	26	38.3%	163	117,335	42,906	36.6%
CCI	448	397	177	361	50	22	19.9%	218	172,700	67,708	39.2%
CCWF	367	356	280	355	0	0	0%	131	147,383	86,416	58.6%
CEN	513	510	238	459	60	19	17.2%	219	204,344	119,787	58.6%
*CIM	162	157	140	66	0	0	0%	37	76,675	42,148	55%
CIW	135	133	68	109	0	0	0%	51	34,410	27,101	78.8%
CMC	276	275	195	256	27	42	27%	162	124,193	89,659	72.2%
CMF	121	121	28	71	3	0	4.2%	62	58,797	27,602	46.9%
COCF	770	771	496	682	305	553	32%	525	413,634	193,732	46.8%
COR	243	219	110	197	16	1	8.6%	101	94,229	55,029	58.4%
CRC	329	311	242	320	0	6	4.7%	189	114,930	62,631	54.5%
CTF	318	229	168	118	0	9	7.6%	156	129,857	85,478	65.8%
CVSP	324	267	132	209	9	43	24.9%	160	125,614	80,288	63.9%
*DVI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
FOL	378	374	167	357	35	1	10.1%	187	140,619	107,146	76.2%
HDSP	54	54	63	70	0	1	1.4%	51	24,003	2,821	11.8%
ISP	513	486	197	339	36	43	23.3%	253	231,592	118,515	51.2%
KVSP	270	249	87	289	7	15	7.6%	25	79,085	29,442	37.2%
*LAC	81	52	15	44	2	0	4.5%	0	25,583	9,276	36.3%
MCSP	270	253	58	87	2	31	37.9%	133	130,166	75,588	58.1%
*NKSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
FBSP	27	15	2	9	1	0	11.1%	9	7,684	5,440	70.8%
FVSP	608	568	181	622	4	4	1.3%	76	174,274	76,019	43.6%
*RJD	101	80	81	87	0	0	0%	63	26,081	41,157	157.8%
SAC	81	79	101	110	6	0	5.5%	69	32,356	23,647	73.1%
SATF	945	934	392	985	52	35	8.8%	273	391,508	194,553	49.7%
SCC	297	276	166	196	6	3	4.6%	134	125,123	75,592	60.4%
SOL	675	656	150	607	3	35	6.3%	170	131,121	55,362	42.2%
*SQ	108	104	52	75	18	1	25.3%	43	44,104	23,615	53.5%
SVSP	54	54	33	65	0	0	0%	0	116,016	11,712	10.1%
VSPW	432	460	267	551	80	22	18.5%	162	155,776	89,724	57.6%
*WSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%

Vocational Footnotes

- 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.
- OCE determined Full Time plus Half Time Student figures gives a more accurate picture of the total number of students served rather than the figures for Full Time Equivalent Student. Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 500 (Full Time and Half Time Quota).
- Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 535 (Beginning Assignments - Full Time and Half Time student).
- Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 536 (Students Added - Full Time and Half Time Student).
- Total Number of Program Exits include those who have completed the program and therefore exited. Derived from the Education Monthly Reports Rollup line 537 (Students Dropped - Full Time and Half Time Students).
- 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.
- Ending population is a derived figure taken from the last month of the reporting period and adding the beginning population with any student admissions and subtracting program exits.
- 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, removal to out-of-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, (Source: EMR Counting Rules). A-time: allocates unexcused inmate attendance. (Source: EMR Counting Rules; Title 15 § 3041 Performance & § 3040 Participation).
- X-time is the total amount of actual hours and time an inmate attends the classroom they are assigned (Data Source: EMR Counting Rule).
- 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.

PAROLE REGION I	Capacity ¹	Beginning Pop. ¹ Oct 1, 2009	Referrals ^{1,2} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Enrollments ^{1,3} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Exits ^{1,4} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Ending Pop. ^{1,11} Mar 31, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers ⁵						
Cache Creek	25	24	60	51	52	24
New Directions	25	25	83	35	35	25
New Directions	25	25	93	20	20	25
New Directions	20	20	39	27	25	20
Turning Point Kennemer I	65	62	241	112	113	61
Turning Point Kennemer IV	25	24	90	75	76	23
West Care	85	80	336	143	147	76
Sub-Total RMSC	270	260	942	463	468	254
Parolee Service Centers ⁶						
Turning Point Bakersfield	79	84	391	231	250	65
Turning Point Visalia	25	26	108	57	27	26
Turning Point Fresno	75	72	387	299	297	74
Shasta Sierra	12	12	60	23	23	12
Sub-Total PSC	191	194	946	610	597	177
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers ⁷						
Behavioral Interventions - Stockton (Expired 3/1/10)	100	80	180	175	255	0
Behavioral Interventions - Fresno	100	115	177	178	197	96
Sub-Total DRC	200	195	357	353	452	96
Community-Based Coalition ⁸						
Sacramento County Office of Educ.	100	219	549	216	206	229
Sub-Total CBC	100	219	549	216	206	229
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery ⁹						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	175	189	1,154	1,555	1,550	194
Sub-Total STAR	175	189	1,154	1,555	1,550	194
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers ¹⁰						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	108	208	429	430	411	227
Sub-Total CLLC	108	208	429	430	411	227

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 literacy, 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 II	Capacity ¹	Beginning Pop. ¹ Oct 1, 2009	Referrals ^{1,2} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Enrollments ^{1,3} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Exits ^{1,4} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Ending Pop. ^{1,11} Mar 31, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers ⁵						
Allied Fellowship Services (Expired 1/10/10)	30	30	61	19	49	0
Allied Fellowship Services	40	40	182	106	117	29
Sub-Total RMSC	40	70	243	125	166	29
Parolee Service Centers ⁶						
CCCI San Francisco	60	60	216	101	99	62
Turning Point Salinas	45	46	234	105	107	44
VOA Elsie Dunn	48	48	379	118	118	48
VOA Oakland West	72	72	184	148	148	72
Sub-Total PSC	225	226	1,013	472	472	226
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers ⁷						
Northern California Service League	100	200	176	88	34	254
Sub-Total DRC	100	200	176	88	34	254
Community-Based Coalition ⁸						
East Palo Alto Police Dept.	50	61	30	42	70	33
Sub-Total CBC	50	61	30	42	70	33
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery ⁹						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	85	107	1,154	830	833	104
Sub-Total STAR	85	107	1,154	830	833	104
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers ¹⁰						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	16	37	429	112	110	39
Sub-Total CLLC	16	37	429	112	110	39

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 literacy, 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 Oct 1, 2009	Referrals ^{1,2} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Enrollments ^{1,3} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Exits ^{1,4} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Ending Pop. ^{1,11} Mar 31, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers ⁵						
Amistad De Los Angeles	100	98	278	174	172	100
Weingart Foundation	95	95	294	162	165	92
Sub-Total RMSC	195	193	572	336	337	192
Parolee Service Centers ⁶						
Behavioral Systems SW Orion	100	95	394	248	260	83
Behavioral Systems SW Hollywood	63	61	268	159	158	62
CEC, Inc	45	45	234	100	100	45
Hoffman House	15	12	98	27	23	16
Sub-Total PSC	223	213	994	534	541	206
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers ⁷						
Human Potential Consultants, LLC - Los Angeles	100	104	148	121	218	7
Behavioral Systems Southwest - Van Nuys	100	99	107	68	142	25
Sub-Total DRC	200	203	255	189	360	32
Community-Based Coalition ⁸						
Human Potential Consultants, LLC - Los Angeles	300	188	667	518	487	219
Sub-Total CBC	300	188	667	518	487	219
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery ⁹						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	120	144	1,154	1,217	1,208	153
Sub-Total STAR	120	144	1,154	1,217	1,208	153
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers ¹⁰						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	152	265	429	671	631	305
Sub-Total CLLC	152	265	429	671	631	305

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 Oct 1, 2009	Referrals ^{1,2} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Enrollments ^{1,3} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Exits ^{1,4} Oct '09 - Mar '10	Ending Pop. ^{1, 10} Mar 31, 2010
I. Residential Programs						
Residential Multi-Service Centers ⁵						
VOA Southwest	35	35	176	58	58	35
Sub-Total RMSC	35	35	176	58	58	35
Parolee Service Centers ⁶						
W & B Facilities	45	40	226	87	86	41
National Crossroads	40	36	113	64	62	38
VOA San Diego	40	41	267	115	118	38
Sub-Total PSC	125	117	606	266	266	117
II. Day Center Programs						
Day Reporting Centers ⁷						
Human Potential Consultants, LLC - Riverside	100	130	507	303	228	205
Behavioral Interventions - San Diego	100	132	275	185	199	118
Sub-Total DRC	200	262	782	488	427	323
III. Substance Abuse Program						
Substance Abuse Treatment & Recovery						
Contra Costa County Office of Education ⁸	141	143	1,154	1,222	1,205	160
Sub-Total STAR	141	143	1,154	1,222	1,205	160
IV. Education Program						
Computerized Literacy Learning Centers ⁹						
Contra Costa County Office of Education	99	146	429	563	489	220
Sub-Total CLLC	99	146	429	563	489	220

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 literacy, 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 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 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 October 2009 till March 2010

	October	November	December	January	February	March	Totals
Academic Program Completion¹:							
ELD	16	11	11	4	12	1	55
ABE I	53	33	22	24	36	24	192
ABE II	43	40	33	15	15	12	158
ABE III	35	41	24	30	22	21	173
Certifications/Diplomas:							
GED ²	277	315	192	202	81	113	1,180
High School Diploma	7	6	1	39	0	5	58
Vocational Program Completion:							
NCCER ³	75	74	82	87	43	46	407
Non-NCCER ⁴	160	169	199	188	23	35	774
Certifications:							
NCCER Certifications ⁵	356	249	210	165	121	286	1,387
Industry Certifications ⁶	241	229	152	132	82	215	1,051
Professional Licenses ⁷	21	26	13	15	2	20	97

Data source: Education Monthly Report; Counting Rules for non-COCF facilities

Footnotes:

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

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

³The 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).

⁴Each non-NCCER program contains a series of four-digit curriculum courses. A student has completed the program when all required courses have been passed.

⁵The total number of NCCER Certifications awarded to inmates during the reporting month. For Example: Building Maintenance, Carpentry, Drywall Installer/Taper, etc. Note: A student does not have to complete a program to obtain certification.

⁶The 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.

⁷The 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
COCF with All Institution's Total	46,350	52,011	39,074	22,492	46,042	*
ASP	1,731	1,932	1,337	685	1,731	*
CAL	852	909	655	341	852	*
CCC	2,180	2,403	1,963	1,235	2,179	*
CCF-Leo Chesney	142	142	137	115	140	*
CCI	2,150	2,370	1,926	1,222	2,150	*
CCWF	1,387	1,532	1,228	751	1,298	*
CEN	859	1,050	710	349	859	*
CIM	2,738	3,101	2,230	926	2,738	*
CIW	1,170	1,224	1,019	682	1,079	*
CMC	1,225	1,545	1,051	550	1,225	*
CMF	428	513	286	145	428	*
COCF	941	1,029	924	463	941	*
COR	915	1,191	821	367	915	*
CRC	1,001	1,299	811	359	1,001	*
CTF	1,144	1,280	835	371	1,144	*
CVSP	985	1,086	854	404	985	*
DVI	2,600	2,775	2,208	1,364	2,600	*
FOL	1,091	1,291	803	454	1,091	*
HDSP	1,317	1,385	1,050	624	1,317	*
ISP	964	1,112	751	327	964	*
KVSP	630	764	580	246	630	*
LAC	1,617	1,738	1,333	487	1,617	*
MCSP	418	481	266	122	418	*
NKSP	3,136	3,347	2,914	2,394	3,136	*
PBSP	580	658	390	184	580	*
PVSP	777	884	669	342	777	*
RJD	1,677	1,807	1,364	712	1,677	*
SAC	432	498	269	103	432	*
SATF	1,209	1,426	1,018	515	1,209	*
SCC	1,372	1,705	1,300	607	1,372	*
SOL	1,263	1,414	1,086	836	1,263	*
SQ	1,823	2,048	1,386	615	1,823	*
SVSP	589	695	452	224	589	*
VSP	1,332	1,517	1,115	825	1,207	*
WSP	3,675	3,860	3,333	2,546	3,675	*

¹ The Institution Population is 162,608 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010 as of March 31, 2010. The data has been collected and reported for only the main institutions. The inmate population that is omitted from this report is: 1,502. The breakout of the omitted population comprises from the following entities: Community Correctional Facilities (CCF) 4,415, Legal Processing Unit (LPU) 2, Legal Processing Unit - 18 (LPU18) 1, LPU/Family Foundation Program (LPUFP) 71, LPU Female Rehabilitative Program (LPUFR) 74, LPU Prisoner Mother Programs (LPUPM) 63, Re-entry Program-Region 1 (RENT1) 4, Re-entry Program-Region 2 (RENT 2) 4, Re-entry Program Region 3 (RENT 3) 33, Re-entry Program Region 4 (RENT 4) 5, Rio Consummes Correctional Facility (RIOCC) 364, Santa Rita County Jail (SRITA) 868, Sacramento Central Office Unit (SACCO) 13, for a total of 1,502. Total inmate population, for both prison institutions and non-prison entities is: 168,525 as of March 31, 2010.

² The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of June 22, 2010 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 June 22, 2010.

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}	Family Support ^{1,2}	Sex Offending ³
All Regions	76,369	76,551	50,649	14,185	75,414	37,656	7,571
Region I	19,138	19,169	13,663	4,079	19,003	8,902	2,109
Region II	13,725	13,754	9,375	1,910	13,617	6,262	1,804
Region III	19,314	19,367	12,191	3,288	19,030	10,004	1,474
Region IV	24,192	24,261	15,420	4,908	23,764	12,488	2,184

¹ The Parole Population is 123,423 this was derived from the Offender Base Information Systems (OBIS) dataset created on June 28, 2010 as of March 31, 2010. ² The risk to recidivate was derived from California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) as of June 22, 2010 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 on June 22, 2010.

Appendix G: Summary of Concerns Found Throughout the C-ROB Report

Concern	3/10 C-ROB Report	9/10 C-ROB Report
Needs Assessment		
COMPAS suspended at male reception centers for six months. How does this affect the department’s priority placement of inmates in the new service delivery model programming? Does a lack of COMPAS assessments hinder enrollment in academic programs and create additional work for classification committees?	p. 9	p. 1, 10, 13
Case Planning		
Because of budget constraints the department is still developing the revised case management process. Currently the department is managing cases by assessing inmates’ needs at reception centers and using risk, need, time left to serve; CSRA, COMPAS, TABE scores; and the inmates’ classification levels to make program placements. Expanding beyond this form of case management requires budget decisions that are currently pending.	p. 9	p. 2, 11
Educational Programming		
New education models developed with little evidence-based research specific to education in prison. The department may have had inadequate guidance for curriculum, dosage, and staffing. C-ROB remains concerned about the lack of evidence-based programming models, data, and the California State Prison, Solano demonstration project fidelity review reports.	p. 13	p. 16, 19, 32, 39
New education models may inadequately address needs of learning disabled and English language learners affecting inmate’s ability to make adequate progress.	p. 15	p. 18
Multiple educational models with larger class sizes, reduced contact hours, students with different learning levels, and documenting credit earnings under SB X3 18 may increase teacher prep time and admin time beyond that allocated. Are teachers spending enough time teaching?	p. 14	p. 17
Is low enrollment in academic programming a result of programming start-up, a broader systemic concern, or concentrated at select institutions? Does the department need to expand its priority placement criteria?	n/a	p. 3, 13, 14
Teacher and teaching assistant vacancies affect full implementation of the revised, new academic models.	n/a	p. 3, 14
Can institutions, teachers, and inmates successfully adapt to changing academic models every six months?	n/a	p. 3, 19
Does incorrect assignment of inmates to academic models take three months to resolve at some institutions? Do inmates remain in wrong classes until reassigned taking up seats and causing additional work for teachers?	n/a	p. 18
The Rehabilitation Strike Team’s report identified a “rehabilitation-oriented training curriculum for correctional and rehabilitation staff, and a method of delivering that curriculum” as one approach to improve California’s rehabilitative programs. How is the department implementing this strategy?	n/a	p. 19
C-ROB is concerned about restricted vocational programming opportunities in the current economic environment and will monitor the outcome of the vocational leadership council charged with reviewing programming and potentially reinstating eliminated voc programs.	n/a	p. 20
Future Programming Needs		
Does institutional capacity exist to determine future programming needs from waitlists?	p. 15	p. 16
Homework		
Some of the education models require focus and self-motivation to complete homework. Has homework become a commodity with inmates paying other inmates to complete the work for them?	p. 16	p. 17

Concern	3/10 C-ROB Report	9/10 C-ROB Report
WASC Accreditation		
Can institutions maintain Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation for the new education models?	p. 16	p. 18
Substance Abuse Programming		
Is the new 90-day substance abuse programming model sufficient for adults with long histories of addiction?	p. 17	p. 4, 23
The board questions whether the department can transfer inmates who meet the priority placement criteria to prisons with substance abuse programs given the limited number of substance abuse slots, frequent lockdowns, and prison overcrowding.	n/a	p. 4, 22
Reentry/Reintegration		
Implementation of one-stop career centers funded last fiscal year to provide unemployment services for parolees has been delayed until the current year. Secure reentry program facilities must be approved through the state Public Works Board process. The board will be monitoring the implementation progress of both.	n/a	p. 30
Measure Progress and Follow Up		
After seven reports, the department is not yet able to provide fidelity information on whether its rehabilitative programming is being implemented as planned nor data by which C-ROB can measure which inmates are receiving services and the impact service delivery has on recidivism. There is no information from the department about the Solano demonstration project and the California Logic Model. Data systems are the major hurdle for this information, and it will be at least 2012 before the department can provide the data C-ROB needs in a systematic way. Without accurate and timely data, C-ROB cannot evaluate service delivery and program success.	n/a	p. 39
The department's data system does not capture information at the individual student level. The department is working on an interim data solution to provide individual level data and expects it to be available Fall 2010.	Pages 2, 11, 15	p. 5, 32
C-ROB requests that the department start collecting outcome data on inmates at the out-of-state facilities.	n/a	p. 2, 28
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.	n/a	p. 11
C-ROB requests that by January 2011, the department use the FY05-06 release cohort that formed the basis of its recent recidivism study to examine whether inmate participation in/completion of programming correlates with recidivism outcomes.	n/a	p. 5, 32
The board requests that the department make the Solano demonstration project fidelity review reports available as soon as possible.	n/a	p. 39