

**California Rehabilitation Oversight Board Minutes  
September 25, 2007 Meeting**

The California Rehabilitation Oversight Board met in open session on September 25, 2007 in the Alumni Center at California State University, Sacramento, 6024 State University Drive South, Sacramento, California. The meeting began at 9:45 a.m.

**Board members present:** Matthew Cate, Inspector General; 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 of Mental Health; Bruce Bikle, Professor, California State University, Sacramento (appointee by Chancellor of California State University), Susan Turner, Professor, University of California, Irvine (appointee by President of the University of California); Michael Carona, Sheriff, Orange County (appointee by Governor); Loren Buddress, Chief Probation Officer (appointee by Senate Committee on Rules); and, William Arroyo, Regional Medical Director, Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (appointee by Speaker of the Assembly). Absent from the meeting was Member James Tilton, Secretary, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).

**Office of the Inspector General staff members participating:** Barbara Sheldon (counsel) and Ann Bordenkircher (Board secretary).

**Others participating:** Deborah Hysen, Chair, Governor's Facility Strike Team; Kathryn Jett, Chair, Governor's Rehabilitation Strike Team; Joseph Lehman, CDCR's Expert Panel on Adult Offender and Recidivism Reduction Programming; and, Marisela Montes, Chief Deputy Secretary, Adult Programs, CDCR.

**Item 1. Call to Order**

Chairman Cate called the meeting to order and welcomed the board members who were present, as well as the members of the public.

**Item 2. Introductions and establish quorum**

Each of the Board members and guest panelists introduced themselves and gave a brief history of their credentials. It was noted by the Chair that a quorum was present at the meeting.

**Item 3. Review Agenda**

Chairman Cate gave a brief overview of the agenda items to be covered during the meeting.

**Item 4. Approval of Prior Minutes**

The minutes of the June 19, 2007 Board meeting were reviewed by the Board members and by show of hands, a quorum approved the same.

## **Item 5. Panel Discussions**

Joseph Lehman, a member of CDCR's Expert Panel on Adult Offender and Recidivism Reduction Programming began the panel discussions. He explained the California Logic Model that was provided in the Expert Panel's report to the California State Legislature.<sup>1</sup> That model describes what the system in California would look like if CDCR acts and implements all of the recommendations in the Expert Panel's report. It moves the system from an offense-based to a risk-based model. There are several steps to the Logic Model; risk and needs assessments, behavior management plans (which consists of 6 programs) within the institutions, progress and outcome measurements, community aftercare programs, and finally, follow-up.

Mr. Lehman took questions from the Board members at the conclusion of his presentation. There were discussions concerning the programs in Oregon and Washington, probation, juvenile justice intervention, interagency collaborations, and legislative interventions. On this note, Chairman Cate took the opportunity to remind the Board members that the group should push those natural bounds as hard as possible to effectuate change, that the Board should not rest until they feel like they've gotten to the bottom of the issue, and that the Board has a natural platform in the form of its report to the Governor's office and the Legislature.

After a brief recess, Kathy Jett spoke to the Board concerning the work of the Rehabilitation Strike Team. Ms. Jett began her presentation with a brief overview of the 13 benchmarks contained in Phase One of Assembly Bill 900 (May 3, 2007), charged to CDCR. The Rehabilitation Strike Team was put together to help CDCR do an initial assessment of what it would take for CDCR to implement these benchmarks. The Team created several focus groups. One looked at an instrument called COMPAS that is used to measure the risk and needs of the offender populations coming into an institution and then moving into parole. Another group focused on the classification and endorsement system, which is the key to many of the changes that drive the Logic Model that Mr. Lehman presented earlier. Ms. Jett then spoke about behavior management that begins the day the inmate comes into a reception center. The current classifications are based on risk and do not consider need. Ms. Jett pointed out that that when an inmate leaves the institution, nothing follows them into parole or community programs that explain what program they have been through or what they have accomplished. The Team also looked at major impediments or risks CDCR faces. The Strike Team felt it was important to take the time to really look at the broad system and pick out those things that would impact the Logic Model.

There was a discussion between panel and Board members following Ms. Jett's presentation. Some items discussed were academic and vocational programs, literacy and numeracy skills, job training, parole reform, incentives, outcome measurements, sensitive needs yards, work force mindsets, Senate Bill 618,<sup>2</sup> and data sharing.

After a short recess, Deborah Hysen addressed the Board relating to activities of the Facilities Strike Team. She stated that it is an unprecedented public works project to alleviate overcrowding and free up space for programming. The Team wants to get inmates out of the overcrowding situation and into viable living space and program opportunities. They are mindful of some roadblocks, such as the impact the three-judge panel may have, resources, unsuccessful attempts at accelerated construction and legislation, the federal receiver, and the court system. It is important that the facility is designed to programmatically meet the operational

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the California Logic Model can be viewed at: [http://ucicorrections.seweb.uci.edu/pdf/Expert\\_Panel\\_Report.pdf](http://ucicorrections.seweb.uci.edu/pdf/Expert_Panel_Report.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Senate Bill 618 (Speier); Sentencing: Programs. Chapter 603, 10/6/05; Penal Code section 1203.8

needs. There needs to be collaboration from a design and construction standpoint with the private sector. Ms. Hysen also stated that the Strike Team is taking into consideration work space, vocation space, and treatment space as well as a performance-based duty statement for the inmate that actually have work assignments that becomes somewhat of a vocational training. She wanted the Board to be aware that CDCR's focus is to give the inmates an opportunity to be successful.

There was an interaction between the Panel and Board members that covered immediate relief on overcrowding, inmate transfers, reentry facilities, timelines for construction, and reentry programs.

The final presenter was Marisela Montes on behalf of CDCR. Ms. Montes stated that when she returned as a staff person to CDCR she toured about 16 of the institutions, and saw first-hand the overcrowding in the institutions and the diminution of programming. She stated that she is impressed by the commitment and passion of the staff that have an interest in generating, developing and implementing more programs in the institutions. Ms. Montes then spoke about reentry. Reentry offers an opportunity to make a real difference. A lot can be accomplished in the last twelve months if the target audience is an inmate with a moderate to high risk to reoffend, as recommended by the Expert Panel. Reentry centers will focus on academic and vocational education, drug treatment, job training, cognitive behavioral therapy, family reunification, housing assistance and transitional needs back out to the community. Community will include local law enforcement, elected officials, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, and victim groups.

Ms. Montes stated that behavior management would be designed based on the inmate's specific risk and needs assessment. Community collaborations will be critical as will building a culture of success, one that honors both treatment and programming as much as safety and security.

Ms. Montes concluded her presentation by mentioning that under Phase One 2,000 reentry beds have to be either sited or under construction. Thirteen counties have signed an agreement to cooperate. Several have voted to move forward and enter into dialogue concerning potential sites of a reentry facility.

There was no further discussion with the Panel.

#### **Item 6. Future board meeting schedule**

After discussion, the Board agreed to meet on November 7, 2007.

#### **Item 7. Future agenda items**

Future agenda items were discussed during various presentations at today's meeting.

#### **Item 8. Public comment**

The public was given an opportunity to address the Panel and Board members, but no one stepped to the podium.

**Item 12. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:14 p.m.

*Aimee Bradenbucker*  
Board Secretary

*November 7, 2007*  
(Approved at 11/7/07 Board meeting)

(These Minutes are posted on the web at [www.oig.ca.gov](http://www.oig.ca.gov). Copies of the meeting transcript may be purchased by contacting Esquire Deposition Services at 1-800-610-0505.)