

**California Rehabilitation Oversight Board Minutes
June 3, 2008 Meeting**

The California Rehabilitation Oversight Board met in open session on June 3, 2008, in the Alumni Center at California State University, Sacramento, 6024 State University Drive South, Sacramento, California.

Board members: Present at the meeting was David Shaw, Inspector General (Chairman); Matthew Cate, Secretary, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR); Debra Jones, Administrator, Adult Education Programs (Designee for Superintendent of Public Instruction); José Millan, Vice Chancellor, California Community Colleges (Designee for Chancellor, California Community Colleges); Renée Zito, Director, State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs; Stephen Mayberg, Director, Department of Mental Health; Bruce Bikle, Professor, California State University, Sacramento (Chancellor of California State University appointee); Gary Stanton, Sheriff, Solano County (Governor appointee); Loren Buddress, Chief Probation Officer (Senate Committee on Rules appointee); and William Arroyo, Regional Medical Director, Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (Speaker of the Assembly appointee). Susan Turner, Professor, University of California, Irvine (President of the University of California appointee) was absent from the meeting.

Office of the Inspector General staff members participating: Barbara Sheldon, Chief Counsel; Jennifer Shaffer, C-ROB Executive Director (Acting); and Ann Bordenkircher, Board Secretary.

CDCR staff members participating: Kathy Jett, Undersecretary, Programs; Carole Hood, Chief Deputy Secretary, Adult Programs; Steven Chapman, Assistant Secretary, Office of Research; Thomas Hoffman, Director, Division of Adult Parole Operations; and, Robert Ambrocelli, Deputy Director, Division of Adult Parole Operations.

Item 1. Call to Order

Chairman Shaw called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

Item 2. Introductions and Establish Quorum

Chairman Shaw, having recently been appointed California Inspector General, introduced himself to the board, gave a brief background of his credentials, and stated for the record that a quorum was present. The Chairman also introduced newly appointed member Gary Stanton, Sheriff, Solano County, and welcomed him to the board.

Item 3. Review Agenda

The Chairman reviewed the amended agenda for the meeting. There being no comments from the board, the meeting moved on to the next agenda item.

Item 4. Review and Approval of Prior Minutes

The minutes of the March 11, 2008, board meeting were approved.

Item 5. Progress Report from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Kathy Jett, Undersecretary, Programs, stated that senate and assembly budget hearings went well and that CDCR anticipates receiving all of the resources requested in the May budget discussions.

Further, Ms. Jett expressed that a great deal of work has gone into providing the board with an overview of the extraordinarily complex, inclusive master work plan that includes all of the expectations laid out in the Expert Panel report, AB 900, and work of the Governor's Rehabilitation Strike Team. Ms. Jett believes CDCR is working hard at bringing together programs, documentation, infrastructure, architecture, and policies and procedures that reinforce rehabilitation as a core mission of the Department.

Carole Hood, Chief Deputy Secretary, Adult Programs, utilized a PowerPoint® presentation entitled "Progress Report on Rehabilitative Programming" to enable meeting attendees to follow along with her talk. Ms. Hood briefly covered background information, such as the Expert Panel report, Strike Team reports and AB 900. Ms. Hood stated that CDCR used an integrated approach to project organization and created a foundational document to track the independent efforts going on in the Department. From this document, the master work plan was created. An overview of that plan was shared with the board at the last meeting. Ms. Hood believes that there is starting to be a shared language and framework within the Department. System design documentation is being loaded internally onto SharePoint® with the intent of sharing it throughout the Department and allowing staff to work from the same version of documents. Ms. Hood stated that in terms of project implementation, the Department is focusing on three things: operation (running the day-to-day business), change (implementing the work plan) and communication (both internally and externally about the project).

Ms. Hood brought the Board up-to-date on COMPAS, the instrument being used to assess inmate risk and needs. Over 12,000 assessments have been completed in reception centers since February 2008. It is thought that by 2009, the Department will be able to assess approximately 11,000 inmates coming in monthly and updating the 11,000 leaving. The Department is attempting to determine how to assess the inmates who are already there, those with longer commitments, and those exiting the system. Additionally, the Department is working towards an all-encompassing database (SOMS project) so that whatever information is collected can follow the inmate. Ms. Hood stated that resources have been secured which will allow the Department to conduct secondary assessments. Secondary assessments are a way to acquire more information on criminogenic needs and assist in the development of individualized and refined case plans. The Department is in the process of labor discussions concerning the assessment process. Teachers are currently conducting the assessments, and it is hoped that other groups of staff will be involved in the future.

Ms. Hood spoke about inventorying programs in the prison setting and in the community. The inventory helped sort the programs into categories, such as standard curriculum, mental health, employment, and education programs within the prison and in the community. The University of California, Irvine assisted with the evaluation of these programs.

Ms. Hood advised the board that the Department has selected new core programs and is in the process of purchasing those programs for approved project sites (specifically Solano). The Department is looking at sex offender programming, which is an area where there is little to no programming offered at CDCR. The plan is to have a full menu of programs at every institution. Program deliveries will be contracted out for the Proof Project to get a feel for how they operate and staff qualifications running the programs.

Ms. Hood spoke about the Department's development of some prototypes for integrated rehabilitative treatment models, both in prison and in re-entry facilities. The focus is on a full programming day, with educational and vocational classes.

According to Ms. Hood, the Department has embarked on a prison-to-employment program, which is a requirement of AB 900. The Department has adopted the New Start program, has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Secretary of Labor and Work Force Development, and is entering into an interagency agreement with the same agency and the California Work Force Investment Board.

CDCR is identifying barriers to employment, identifying a list of employers willing to hire ex-offenders, and has begun to use job market data as it looks at vocational programs, project sites, and the job market 10 years out to be able to select the right vocational programs.

Ms. Hood stated the Department is looking at seven community program regions to establish an administrator in each of those areas to create a dialogue with counties and communities regarding re-entry. Resources are included in the budget for a local government liaison. The Department is inventorying current CDCR services with state-funded services in the community for which parolees may be eligible. These services include social services, mental health services, and alcohol and drug programs.

Ms. Hood spoke about the implementation of the master plan, which is divided into three tracks. Track I is to improve what exists. Track II is to build and test repeatable project plans, and Track III is the roll-out of the new rehabilitative programming models and roll-out of the Proof Project design. The Department is currently working on Tracks I and II. As part of Track I substance abuse programming is being expanded by 2,000 slots by the end of this calendar year. The in-custody drug treatment program is being expanded by 1,800 slots (both in jail and community-based beds). Track II is the Proof Project, and Ms. Hood stated it is under way at Solano, with \$5 million being dedicated to the Project.

Next, Ms. Hood addressed organizational readiness, stating this section is divided into three components: (1) staff management changes, including a review of job functions, managerial, supervisory, professional and administrative staff, location, number of employees in each job class and so on; (2) staff training of 62,000 employees, including Board of Parole Hearings and Correctional Standards; and, (3) communication.

Ms. Hood addressed some of the critical challenges encountered by the Department. Some of those barriers mentioned were space needs; inmate transfer requests, which interrupts programming at a critical point; the change process in general, including changing management and training staff to name a few.

Steve Chapman, Assistant Secretary, Office of Research, clarified for the Board that COMPAS contains multiple estimators: one is a static risk estimator and the other is a dynamic risk estimator. He said that the static side is based upon a person's past offense history. The CDCR is working with the Department of Justice (DOJ), which will provide database information on inmate offense history that scores the inmate's risk factor. The Office of Research is receiving additional staff to coordinate the data received from the DOJ and from Programs. With the use of L.S.I.R., a Canadian risk needs assessment tool, data was developed that gives information on whether the inmate is low, moderate or

high risk to re-offend. A UCLA team is working on a validation study of the dynamic side of COMPAS.

Dr. Chapman continued the discussion on program evaluation by stating that it has moved to a more fine-grained approach. The correctional program checklist (CPC) has been used on more than 400 correctional programs and correlates well with recidivism. The Department is very interested in using that tool and has trained 18 staff in its use. The CPC looks at five areas of programming and determines the extent to which the program embraces evidence-based treatments and practices. Dr. Chapman talked about a second phase of training that allows staff to go in to a program for a day or two, assess the program, and then debrief the director and staff on the evaluation. The CPC provides recommendations on how to strengthen areas of weakness and points the direction for making improvements in the program. Dr. Chapman stated that most of the recommendations that come out of the CPC are very consistent with the California Logic Model.

When asked about the definition of recidivism, Dr. Chapman responded that the Department hopes to hold a conference in the near future with stakeholders from the Legislature, C-ROB board members, various academics, and others, to talk about defining recidivism in California's unique setting. Other topics to be discussed at this conference would be educational progress, measurement of substance abuse and its relapse phenomena, and other subjects yet to be identified.

Dr. Chapman stated that the Department is working with UC Davis to develop a team that will go out to each institution to talk to staff conducting programming, determine the data already collected from the COMPAS assessment and then identify baseline measures.

Matt Cate, Secretary, touched briefly on the overcrowding problem. He said that one way to tackle the problem is through reform, such as deciding which parolees go back to prison and which go into local programs, and the other way is through building. The Department has staff working on an integrated overcrowding plan which describes problems and different parts of the solution, such as the receiver's beds, re-entry beds, infill beds, reform programs, gaps between them all, and population projections. That plan should be available in the near future.

Thomas Hoffman, Director, Division of Adult Parole Operations, addressed the Board by giving an overview of the process to build the decision-making matrix. He stated that about a year ago the Department entered into a contract with the Center for Effective Public Policy. The Center has, over the last 20 years, worked with over 30 state and county parole and probation agencies and departments across the nation to develop policies and procedures in response to violations of parole and the commission of new crimes by the parolee and probationer populations. As part of that relationship, the Department is putting together a decision-making matrix to bring consistency and continuity to the decisions made at the agent's level. The Department has approximately 1,800 working parole agents statewide that make decisions every day in response to violations and terms and conditions of parole, or in the commission of new crimes by the parolee. The matrix is about 95 percent ready to go. The team is still fine-tuning severity code ratings for each violation, which will be linked to the Department of Justice crime severity codes. The codes must also mirror the sentencing parameters by the Board of Parole Hearings and what is already legislatively approved to reach continuity in the process.

Mr. Hoffman said the matrix will be piloted in one unit in each of the four regions for 90 days between September 15th and December 15th of this year. A research component is attached to the entire process, which will be coordinated by the Center for Evidence-Based Correction. It is hoped that on completion

of the pilot and day-to-day research, that the project would be rolled out methodically and in a controlled way, one district at a time, starting in February 2009. Use of the matrix will be mandated as part of the revocation process, but there is an override aspect to the tool. Override will only be applied in exceptional cases and supported factually and substantively with information that points to a public safety risk. One of the research outcomes is to understand how often the tool is overridden and for what reasons.

When asked about remedial sanctions available to the parole agents, Mr. Hoffman responded there are about 40 contracts for programming options that are funded and coordinated by the State of California. More community programs are now available to the approximately 127,000 parolees, which include day reporting centers, treatment, counseling, educational help, job placement, or even a meal. More communities are asking how they can come to be part of a day reporting center.

Robert Ambrocelli, Deputy Director, Division of Adult Parole Operations, responded to a question concerning the percentage of technical violations on approximately 180,000 annual parole violations. Mr. Ambrocelli said that the Department looked at about 180,000 violations of parole. Almost half of them were continued on parole at the field level and the other half were referred to the Board of Parole Hearings. Technical violations fell at around 14,000 violations of parole. Technical violation means that a citizen could not go back or be arrested by the police department (such as not reporting to the parole agent, or absconding from parole). The remainder of parole violations were either a combination of technical or nontechnical (such as DUI and not reporting to the parole agent) versus purely violation of law (such as DUI all by itself).

There were other discussions among the panelists and Board members relating to peer counselors, certification, quality assurance reviews, and performance measures.

Item 6. Board Discussion of C-ROB July 15, 2008 Biannual Report

Chairman Shaw advised the Board that a draft of the C-ROB July 15, 2008 report would be available on June 24, 2008, with comments due by close of business on July 1. A final draft would be available on July 3, with a vote to be taken at the July 8, 2008 Board meeting.

Item 7. Future Board Meeting Schedule

The board agreed to meet next on July 8, 2008, at 9:30, with the location to be determined later.

Item 8. Future Agenda Items

It was discussed among the board and panel that there is an interest in inviting the Receiver's office to address the board on its plan concerning building medical and mental health beds and how the Receiver's plan fits with that of the Department. Another matter to discuss at a future date is the state building program and the progress of SB 1684, which will change the C-ROB biannual reporting dates from January and July to March and September. It was also suggested that Secretary Cate discuss the three-judge settlement at C-ROB's next meeting.

Item 9. Public Comment

David Warren, Lobbyist, Taxpayers for Improving Public Safety, who is also a volunteer Jewish chaplain at Folsom CIW and other prisons that do not have Jewish chaplains, stated his concern that without legislative action, approximately 30,000 individuals that currently come into the prisons on a volunteer basis will no longer be able to do so after January 1, because the law that allows them to volunteer will sunset. Mr. Warren also has concerns about the few inmates that are actually COMPAS assessed. He stated that he has calculated that the Department would need 110 employees to complete the COMPAS test on the inmates coming in and another 110 employees to do the COMPAS test when the inmate leave the institution. These positions are not funded, and if the Department relies on CC-1s and CC-2s to do the assessments, those employees would be unable to perform their current jobs duties.

Mr. Warren pointed out to the Board that there does not appear to be sufficient space for religious programming to meet the demand of the inmates. He stated that New York State conducted a study on recidivism among parolees and determined the second lowest rate of recidivism were from those who actively participated in religious activity, yet there is no space allotted for this purpose.

Mr. Warren expressed concern with current visiting operations, stating that inmates and families have no place to visit. Although the former Secretary provided social workers inside the visiting rooms to help family members, they don't have a job description. As a result, they simply pass out games rather than help the family members with reintegration.

Mr. Warren concluded by stating that inmates tell him that all they want is a secure place to attend programs. They want to know that they will not be attacked if they go to class and not be bothered by the contingent of individuals who interrupt programming. Inmates would be helped by a small amount of compensation for participating in progressive activities.

Item 10. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 2:00.

Ann Bordenkircher
Board Secretary

July 8, 2008
Dated

(These Minutes are posted on the web at www.oig.ca.gov.)