

**Eighth Report on the California
Department of Corrections and
Rehabilitation's Progress
Implementing its
*Future of California Corrections
Blueprint and Update to the Blueprint***



March 2017

**Fairness ♦ Integrity ♦ Respect ♦
Service ♦ Transparency**

Office of the Inspector General

Eighth Report on California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Progress Implementing its *Future of California Corrections Blueprint* and *Update to the Blueprint*



Robert A. Barton
Inspector General

Roy W. Wesley
Chief Deputy Inspector General

Shaun R. Spillane
Public Information Officer

March 2017

FOREWORD

California Penal Code Section 6126 mandates that the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) periodically review the delivery of the reforms identified by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR or the department) in its *Blueprint, The Future of California Corrections: A Blueprint to Save Billions of Dollars, End Federal Court Oversight, and Improve the Prison System* (the *Blueprint*). In January 2016, the department issued *An Update to the Future of California Corrections* (*Update*), which provides a summary of the goals identified and progress made from the initial *Blueprint*, along with its future vision of rehabilitative programming and safety and security.

The OIG performed on-site reviews at each of the department's 35 adult institutions, which included the review and reconciliation of documents, interviews of staff, and program observations. This eighth report is based on information collected from December 1, 2016, through February 10, 2017, except for CDCR population figures and Proposition 57, which is through March 24, 2017. This report evaluates the remaining *Blueprint* components, rehabilitative programs and gang management, and changes following the *Update*, such as rehabilitative program expansion, classification, housing, and population management. Of the five key *Blueprint* components monitored by the OIG, the standardized staffing plan and the inmate classification score system have already been completed, and many of the construction projects have been completed, or are nearing completion.

The OIG found that 82 percent of the academic education and 80 percent of the career technical education programs are operational. As a result of the new statewide rehabilitative programming model, there will be a large increase in program capacity for pre-employment transitions, substance use disorder and cognitive behavior treatment programs in fiscal year 2016–17. However, because the OIG's on-site review occurred during the expansion phase, many of these programs were not yet operational. Thus, at the time of this review, 60 percent of the pre-employment transitions classes are fully operational, 59 percent of the substance use disorder treatment slots are filled, and 52 percent rate of the cognitive behavioral therapy slots are filled.

The OIG found that the Enhanced Programming Facilities (EPFs), which was a pilot project designed to cluster offenders who were focused on rehabilitation and provide incentives for positive behavior, were experiencing varying degrees of success. The lower-level EPFs appear to be more successful than the level IV EPFs, which continue to struggle with non-eligible offenders who are disruptive and engage in illicit behavior. The department reported that its Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Sex Offenders pilot program recently completed its first cohort and new groups were being enrolled in February 2017. The department also added a fourth session of the Offender Mentor Certification Program at California State Prison, Solano, increasing its annual capacity to 144 candidates.

The department has not been able to meet its goal of ensuring that at least 70 percent of offenders who have moderate to high risk and medium to high needs receive evidence-based rehabilitative programming consistent with their criminogenic needs prior to their release. However, as of 2015, the department had achieved its goal of building program capacity for parolees with more than 70 percent of parolees participating in a program consistent with an identified need. Previous reports discussed the difficulties associated with measuring this outcome. The department reported it has developed a new reporting methodology to address the counting rule deficiencies, and the data will be formally tracked and collected beginning in July 2017. This change will provide more reliable data, but may make this goal more difficult for the department to achieve.

The department has recently submitted emergency regulations that are necessary for the implementation of Proposition 57. These include classification changes to allow the department to move offenders to a lower level based on their recent disciplinary history and behavior, milestone credit-earning enhancements, and changes to the parole process for non-violent second-strike offenders. Some changes have already been implemented and others will not be effective until later dates in 2017.

The department has several efforts underway to address housing and population challenges, including the development of a new orientation program for Special Needs Yards (SNY) and the creation of two separate housing options, programming and non-programming SNYs. The department has also initiated non-designated level II programming facilities at Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility and the California Health Care Facility. These facilities are designed to provide a rehabilitative environment for offenders who have demonstrated positive programming efforts and a desire to refrain from violence. The *Ashker* settlement agreement has resulted in a decrease to the number of step-down program (SDP) participants and Security Housing Unit (SHU) population. The OIG found that there were only nine remaining step-down program participants and four SDP Facilitators. Lastly, the department continues to address prison overcrowding by utilizing contract facilities and the alternative custody program, with plans to end out-of-state housing in the future.

We encourage feedback from our readers and strive to publish reports that meet our statutory mandates as well as offer all concerned parties a useful tool for improvement. For more information about the Office of the Inspector General, including all reports, please visit our website at www.oig.ca.gov.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
REHABILITATIVE PROGRAMS	2
In-Prison Target Population	2
Case Management Plan	4
OIG Fieldwork Review	4
Academic Education.....	5
Career Technical Education	5
Pre-Employment Transitions.....	5
Substance Use Disorder Treatment	6
Cognitive Behavioral Treatment	7
Enhanced Programming Facilities.....	7
Sex Offender Treatment Program	8
Long-Term Offender Program	9
California Identification Card Program.....	10
Innovative Programming Grants	10
Measure Progress—Ensure Program Accountability	11
In-Prison Programs	12
Community Programs for Parolees	12
CLASSIFICATION AND HOUSING	14
Housing Plan—Global Benchmarks	14
Proposition 57.....	14
Milestone Credits.....	15
Population Density Levels.....	16
Contract Capacity	17
Alternative Custody Program	18
Sensitive Needs Yards.....	18
Security Threat Group Regulations and the Step-Down Program	19
CONCLUSION.....	21
APPENDICES	24
Appendix A—Statewide Programming Totals.....	25
Appendix B—Core COMPAS Assessments	27

LIST OF TABLES AND CHARTS

Table 1: Risk and Needs Assessment by Target Population.....	3
Table 2: Target Population by Projected Release Date	3
Table 3: Actual Density (Overcrowding) Rates in Comparison to <i>Blueprint</i> Design Beds	16
Table 4: Modified Community Correctional Facilities Capacity and Population	18

INTRODUCTION

In July 2012, the Legislature tasked the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) with monitoring the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR or the department) adherence to *The Future of California Corrections: A Blueprint to Save Billions of Dollars, End Federal Court Oversight, and Improve the Prison System* (the *Blueprint*). California Penal Code Section 6126 mandates the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) periodically review delivery of the reforms identified in the *Blueprint*, including, but not limited to:

1. The establishment of and adherence to the standardized staffing model at each institution;
2. The establishment of and adherence to the new inmate classification score system;
3. The implementation of and adherence to the comprehensive housing plan described in the *Blueprint*;
4. Whether the department has increased the percentage of inmates served in rehabilitative programs to 70 percent of the department's target population prior to the inmates' release; and
5. The establishment of and adherence to the new prison gang management system, including changes to the department's current policies for identifying prison-based gang members and associates and the use and conditions associated with security housing units.

In January 2016, the department issued *An Update to the Future of California Corrections* (*Update*), which includes a summary of goals identified and progress made from the initial report, along with its future vision of rehabilitative programming and safety and security. To assess and monitor these reforms, the OIG identified and researched measurable benchmarks, collected and evaluated data, interviewed numerous CDCR staff, and compared the assessment results with goals identified in the *Blueprint*.

This report represents the results of the OIG's eighth review of CDCR's implementation of the *Blueprint* and the *Update* and is based on information collected from December 1, 2016, through February 10, 2017, except for CDCR population figures and Proposition 57, which is through March 24, 2017. This report is organized into two sections, which represent the key areas monitored by the OIG: rehabilitative programs, and classification and housing. The rehabilitative programs section outlines the CDCR's current processes for determining which offenders should be prioritized for program placement, as well as its program delivery models. It also provides details about the department's various rehabilitative efforts, including its new Rehabilitative Case Plan (RCP) module, sex-offender treatment, long-term offender program, and innovative programming grants. The classification and housing section provides additional information about the department's population management efforts, following the *Update* and the passage of Proposition 57. It also provides details about the status of CDCR's step-down program following the *Ashker* settlement agreement.

REHABILITATIVE PROGRAMS

The department provides rehabilitative programs to adult offenders during incarceration and upon release. In-prison programming includes academic education, career technical education, substance use disorder treatment, cognitive behavioral treatment, transitional services, and employment programs. Upon release, the department provides offenders with substance use disorder treatment, education programs, and employment services.

In the *Blueprint* and the *2010-2015 Strategic Plan*, the department defined its goal to increase the percentage of inmates served in rehabilitative programs to 70 percent of the inmate target population by June 30, 2015, as well as to build program capacity to accommodate 70 percent of parolees who have a need for substance use disorder treatment, employment services, or education within their first year of being released from prison.¹ The department was unable to meet its in-prison rehabilitation goal of 70 percent. The September 2016 California Rehabilitation Oversight Board (C-ROB) report identified a 52 percent rate of accomplishment for in-prison programs. However, the department was successful in building program capacity for parolees; the 2016 C-ROB report identified a 70 percent rate of accomplishment.

IN-PRISON TARGET POPULATION

The department uses concepts identified in the California Logic Model to determine its target population for rehabilitative programs. That model requires the calculation of an inmate's risk to reoffend coupled with an assessment of the inmate's criminogenic needs to determine program placement. The department uses the California Static Risk Assessment (CSRA) to determine an inmate's risk to reoffend and the Core Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) assessment tool to identify an inmate's criminogenic needs.^{2,3} In addition to the risk and need factors, the department prioritizes placement by the offenders' dates of release, focusing on offenders within five years of their earliest possible release date. The department explains that the classification process also considers an offender's needs, interests, and desires and this process may supersede any assessment-based prioritization.

¹ CDCR's revised Strategic Plan identified June 30, 2015, as the date to reach the 70 percent rehabilitation goal.

² The criminogenic need categories can include any of the following: substance abuse, anger, employment problems (incorporated academic and career technical needs), criminal personality (formerly "criminal thinking"), and support from family of origin (formerly "family criminality").

³ Being included in the target population does not necessarily trigger the placement of inmates into specific programs. The results of COMPAS assessments are used for placement into cognitive behavioral treatment and employment programs, but CDCR uses individual case factors for placement into other programs, such as the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) results for placement into academic programs.

Data summarized in the following table indicates that as of January 31, 2017, 99 percent of the population of 130,913 offenders had received a CSRA risk assessment, and 86 percent had received a Core COMPAS assessment. Of those inmates with a CSRA assessment, 65,804 (51 percent) had a high or moderate risk to reoffend. Of those, 58,175 inmates (44 percent) were identified as having a high or medium criminogenic need, thus representing the target population. To reach its rehabilitative goal, the department would need to serve 40,722 out of its target population of 58,175 (70 percent) inmates in rehabilitative programs prior to the inmates' release. It is important to note that these figures only pertain to offenders who receive a COMPAS assessment, and there are many offenders excluded from receiving a COMPAS assessment, such as those designated enhanced outpatient program level of care or higher, life-without-parole, life-term, condemned, and those housed in conservation camps, community correctional facilities, and out-of-state facilities.

Table 1: Risk and Needs Assessment by Target Population⁴

Total inmate population	130,913		
Inmates with CSRA risk assessment	129,279	99%	Percent in relation to inmate population
Inmates with moderate-high CSRA score	65,804	51%	Percent in relation to inmates with CSRA
Inmates with Core COMPAS assessment	112,181	86%	Percent in relation to inmate population
Total target population (with at least one need)	58,175	44%	Percent in relation to inmate population
In-Prison target population (70% goal)	40,722	31%	Percent in relation to inmate population
Percentage of inmates who receive Core COMPAS assessment who become target		52%	Target population divided by COMPAS count

Source: CDCR—Data as of January 31, 2017

As illustrated in the following table, 66 percent (38,389 inmates) of the department's target population is within 60 months of release. The remaining target population, 34 percent (19,786 inmates), are inmates with over 60 months left to serve. As with the table above, these figures only pertain to offenders who received a Core COMPAS Assessment.

Table 2: Target Population by Projected Release Date

Projected Release Timeframe	Inmates	Percent
0-6 Months	9,263	15.9%
7-12 Months	7,304	12.6%
13-24 Months	9,414	16.2%
25-36 Months	5,660	9.7%
37-48 Months	3,854	6.6%
49-60 Months	2,894	5.0%
60-120 Months	8,081	13.9%
Over 120 Months	11,215	19.3%
Unusable Data Regarding Release Date	490	0.8%
Total Target Population	58,175	100.0%

Source: CDCR—Data as of January 31, 2017

⁴ See Appendix B for a breakdown of the percentages of inmates with core COMPAS assessments.

CASE MANAGEMENT PLAN

According to the *Blueprint*, a critical component for successful rehabilitation and reducing recidivism is an effective case management system. A case management plan is an integral part of effective rehabilitative programming. Case management plans help ensure that offenders are assigned to appropriate programs based on their overall risk potential and criminogenic needs. They also help staff determine the type, frequency, and timing of programming an offender should receive to most effectively reduce the likelihood of reoffending. This case plan should also transfer with the offender upon release to parole or to county supervision, as it assists with identifying the most effective follow-up programming.

The department implemented the Strategic Offender Management System's Rehabilitative Case Plan (RCP) in September 2016. The RCP outlines an offender's addressed needs and recommended plans for future programming, providing an incarceration timeline and rehabilitative program recommendations for the offender. This timeline can be reviewed by classification committees or the Board of Parole Hearings to assist with placing the offender in the right program at the right time. The RCP also shows the certificates, diplomas, and milestones earned by the offender and is printable, allowing an offender the ability to maintain a copy upon release to parole or county supervision.

OIG FIELDWORK REVIEW

The OIG obtained rehabilitative programming figures for fiscal year 2016–17 from the department's Division of Rehabilitative Programs (DRP) and Office of Correctional Education (OCE) and performed fieldwork to determine the operational status of the various programs at each institution. In order to determine the operational status of programs, the OIG acquired the rehabilitation authorized position counts per institution from CDCR, discussed any discrepancies with education managers at the institutions, reviewed monthly attendance reports, and conducted spot checks of classrooms. In order to be deemed fully operational, a course needed to have a corresponding instructor, an assigned classroom, and data showing monthly inmate attendance. Solely having an instructor hired does not deem a course as fully operational.

Appendix A provides a statewide summary of the state-provided rehabilitative programs at each institution, identifying the programs as planned for by the department and their operational status from visits occurring in December 2016 and January 2017. In addition to Appendix A, the following section discusses the current status of various programs identified in the *Blueprint* and DRP's fiscal year 2016–17 data. In short, the OIG's fieldwork at all prisons found that 82 percent of the academic programs and 80 percent of the career technical education (CTE) programs are operational. Although this represents a 9 percent decrease in academic programs from the September 2016 C-ROB report, the total number of academic positions increased by 29. The percentage of CTE programs increased by 1 percent from the September 2016 C-ROB

report. For the remaining in-prison programs, 59 percent of the substance use disorder treatment (SUDT) slots are filled, 52 percent of the cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) slots are filled, and 60 percent of the pre-employment transitions (PET) classes are fully operational. While this may appear to be a decrease from the last reporting period, it is important to note that SUDT, CBT, and PET have greatly increased capacity as a result of the new statewide rehabilitative programming model. Therefore, this decrease in operational status is to be expected during the expansion phase, as explained further below.

Academic Education

The department identified a total of 551 academic positions (general population, alternative programming, and voluntary education program) to become operational during fiscal year 2016–17. From December 2016 through January 2017, OIG staff reviewed the institutions’ documents and performed 35 site visits to determine whether 551 academic positions, as provided by DRP, were fully operational, as shown in Appendix A. At the conclusion of the fieldwork, the OIG found 452 of the 551 positions were fully operational, which represents an 82 percent rate of compliance. The total number of academic positions increased by 29 positions from the 522 positions identified in the 2016 C-ROB report. The primary reasons academic courses were not operational were teacher vacancies (long-term sick, workers’ compensation, retirement, recruitment, etc.), and some courses having no enrollments (lack of eligible offenders for Adult Basic Education and General Education Development certification courses).

Career Technical Education

The department identified a total of 289 CTE positions to become operational during fiscal year 2016–17. From December 2016 through January 2017, OIG staff reviewed the institutions’ documents and performed site visits to determine whether 289 CTE positions were fully operational. At the conclusion of the fieldwork, the OIG found 230 of the 289 positions were fully operational, which represents an 80 percent rate of compliance. This represents a 1 percent increase from that identified in the last C-ROB report. CTE courses were not operational mostly due to teacher vacancies similar to the academic vacancies listed above.

Pre-Employment Transitions

The pre-employment transitions (transitions or PET) program is designated to provide offenders employment preparation skills to ensure successful reentry into society, primarily during the last six months of incarceration. Transitions teaches job-readiness and job search skills, and provides offenders with community resources that can help as they transition back into the community. Under the department’s previous reentry hub model, PET was taught by outside contractors and only offered at reentry hub facilities. During fiscal year 2016–17, the department plans to hire up

to 53 academic teachers to provide PET at all 35 institutions and triple the program's annual capacity. According to the department, as of December 19, 2016, 31 of 35 institutions have hired new transitions teachers, and all 35 institutions were planned to be operational by January 31, 2017.

From December 2016 through January 2017, OIG staff reviewed the institutions' documents and performed site visits to determine the operational status of the transitions programs statewide. As shown in Appendix A, the OIG found that 1,485 of the planned 2,463 daily slots were fully operational, which represents a 60 percent rate of compliance and an increase of 10 percent from the last report. These figures also reflect the increased capacity as a result of the new statewide rehabilitative programming model. The capacity for PET has more than tripled since the 2016 C-ROB report in which the department had 745 daily slots and an annual capacity of 6,705 program slots. The transitions program has a budgeted capacity of 2,463 daily slots and 22,167 annual slots. The OIG will be better able to assess PET during the OIG *Blueprint* fieldwork in May and June 2017.

Substance Use Disorder Treatment

The department offers evidence-based substance abuse treatment programs that prepare offenders by developing the knowledge and skills necessary to avoid relapse and successfully integrate back into the community. The department has updated the terminology for these substance abuse treatment programs, which are now referred to as substance use disorder treatment (SUDT). From December 2016 through January 2017, OIG staff reviewed SUDT programs statewide to determine if its treatment slots were fully operational. The OIG found that offenders occupied 2,739 of the 4,660 daily program slots,⁵ which represents a 59 percent rate of compliance. This also represents an increase of 1,912 daily program slots since the 2016 C-ROB report. The annual capacity increased from 6,592 to 11,189 slots.

The OIG found that the department's SUDT enrollment was below its planned capacity during this reporting period primarily because it had just begun implementing its statewide rehabilitative programming model at the end of 2016. Many institutions were planning to begin full implementation of its SUDT programs by January 31, 2017, which in many instances were subsequent to the OIG on-site field visits. The OIG also found that several institutions noted contract staffing issues, such as difficulty in recruiting and retaining counselors. Lastly, SUDT classes are transitioning from an open-enrollment concept to a set-completion date concept, and it is expected that enrollment will decrease further during this transition. Once new SUDT classes begin, they will have a fixed enrollment and completion dates, requiring a minimum of 350 hours and lasting approximately 5 months.

⁵ This data includes SUDT for all institutions (including formerly designated non-reentry hubs, reentry hubs, and long-term offender programs).

Cognitive Behavioral Treatment

Cognitive behavioral treatment (CBT) takes a hands-on, practical approach to problem-solving by working to change patterns of thinking or behaviors. Offenders have access to CBT programs that include criminal thinking, anger management, and family relations modality components. CBT programs are now planned to be available at all 35 institutions.

From December 2016 through January 2017, OIG staff reviewed the institutions' documents and performed site visits to determine whether CBT programs were implemented. The OIG found that 2,818 of the planned 5,388 daily slots were fully operational, which represents a 52 percent rate of compliance, as shown in Appendix A. As part of its statewide program expansion, the department has significantly increased its CBT program capacity. The department's daily slots have increased to 5,388 from 2,352 since the 2016 C-ROB report. The annual capacity has increased to 17,927 annual program slots from 7,824. As explained previously, enrollment was below its planned capacity, primarily because the department began implementing its statewide rehabilitative programming model at the end of 2016. Several institutions were planning to begin full implementation of its CBT programs in February 2017, which was subsequent to the OIG on-site field visits.

Enhanced Programming Facilities

In December 2013, the department piloted enhanced programming facilities (EPFs), ranging in security levels from level II to level IV facilities, including special needs yards. The EPFs were intended to allow the department to cluster offenders who wanted to focus on rehabilitation and positive behavior. EPFs provide increased programming opportunities and additional incentives, such as increased allowable inmate property and yard time. There were 13 EPF institutions, including the 3 female institutions.⁶ Because the level IV EPFs have been the most challenging to implement, the department has now reevaluated and decided to discontinue all EPF designations. However, the department will leave the added privileges as part of behavior-based incentives.

Blueprint site visits from December 2016 through January 2017 revealed that the majority of the enhanced programs facilities made some improvement in spite of significant logistical and population challenges. In general, the level II EPFs appeared to be the most successful. This is likely due to lower-level populations being inherently more prone to positive programming than those housed at higher security levels. Staff at the lower-level EPFs believed additional programming space would allow them to better meet the demand and continue to expand the

⁶ Avenal State Prison; California City Correctional Facility; California Institution for Women; Calipatria State Prison; Central California Women's Facility; Corcoran State Prison; Folsom Women's Facility; High Desert State Prison; Kern Valley State Prison; Pleasant Valley State Prison; California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility and State Prison, Corcoran; Salinas Valley State Prison; and Valley State Prison.

program. Even at the level IV EPFs, staff noted improvements and the positive effect of the incentives, stating offenders are less likely to engage in behavior that would jeopardize their participation in the EPFs. Most staff reported an increase in the number of rehabilitative and self-help programs as well as in program participation, and some staff noted a decrease in violent incidents and generally a more positive environment.

As previously reported, staff at some of the institutions stated the EPF has had little to no effect, and in some facilities violence was actually increasing. At level IV facilities, staff reported that gang activity continued to be challenging. This was particularly true for the higher-security level EPFs that were receiving ineligible inmates. One of the most significant barriers to the success of the EPFs continues to be the inability to transfer disruptive inmates to a different facility. Many inmates do not meet the criteria to be housed in an EPF, but staff are unable to transfer them out, largely due to logistics and infrastructure constraints. This is especially true at the two largest female offender institutions, the Central California Women's Facility and the California Institution for Women, which are responsible for housing over 90 percent of the State's female inmates. If the intent of the EPFs is to cluster inmates who are focused on rehabilitation and making positive behavioral changes, then it is counterproductive to use EPFs to house inmates who do not want to participate in programs and continue to engage in violent and illicit behavior.

SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAM

The *Blueprint* called for the development of services for sex offenders and the piloting of the model at one institution in fiscal year 2013–14. Due to its challenges procuring a contract provider or an inter-agency agreement with the Department of State Hospitals, the department began working toward establishing its own in-prison sex offender treatment program.

The department's Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Sex Offenders (CBI-SO) pilot program is intended to serve offenders who are required to register pursuant to Penal Code Section 290, are within 13 months of their scheduled release date, and will be mandated to participate in the community-based treatment programs upon release. The program is located at the California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility, and State Prison, Corcoran and provides programming for a maximum of 80 offenders.

The department established and filled five new positions, including one supervising psychiatric social worker and four clinical social workers. The department also entered into an agreement with the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute to provide training and coaching in the utilization of its Cognitive Behavioral Treatment for Sexual Offenders curriculum. The program involves individual and group treatment sessions, is delivered up to three hours each day, five days per week, and the average duration of the program is eight months.

The first cohort of 57 offenders of the CBI-SO pilot program completed the program in December 2016. As of March 2017, 30 offenders are enrolled with cohorts 10 starting each month. The pilot program will be in effect for a 24-month period, during which the department intends to conduct an ongoing evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program. According to the department, once a sufficient number of participants are released from prison and a sufficient follow-up period occurs (at least one year in the community), the department will begin an analysis of arrests, convictions, and returns-to-prison to better understand the impact of the program on reoffending behavior after the offender's transition into the community. The department will examine the reason for arrest, conviction, or returns, as well as data on failures to register and new sex crimes, to better understand the types of crimes committed by sex offenders post-release. Evaluation of the program will be consistent with the department's current recidivism measures, which are published annually.

LONG-TERM OFFENDER PROGRAM

The *Blueprint* called for the development of a long-term offender reentry model to be piloted at three institutions projected to have a substantial population of long-term offenders. The Long-Term Offender Program (LTOP) is a voluntary program that provides evidence-based treatment to offenders who are serving long-term sentences. The program was designed based on the reentry hub model to address the following major criminogenic areas: substance use disorder treatment, criminal thinking, anger management, victim impact, family relationships, and transitions. The LTOP was implemented at the California Men's Colony, California State Prison, Solano, and the Central California Women's Facility. The OIG found that 694 of the planned 888 daily slots were fully operational, which represents a 78 percent rate of compliance. This figure was not used for comparison purposes as these slots were grouped with 11 non-reentry hub institutions also providing substance abuse treatment programs. The department is in the process of expanding the LTOP to offer services at each institution that has long-term offenders. This will eliminate the transfer of offenders to other institutions and minimize disruptions to the offenders' programming, similar to the statewide rehabilitative programming model.

The Offender Mentor Certification Program (OMCP) also continues to provide an opportunity for long-term inmates to complete a certification program in alcohol and other drug counseling. Inmates are recruited from various institutions and transferred for training to one of the participating institutions—the Central California Women's Facility, Valley State Prison, or California State Prison, Solano. Once the candidates pass the written California Association for Alcohol/Drug Educators (CAADE) examination, the inmate-mentors are transferred back to their original institutions and are paid to obtain their 4,000 hours of work experience by co-facilitating substance use disorder treatment. During 2016, there were 15 inmates who passed examination and requisite work experience. Currently 37 offenders are mentoring and 62 offenders are serving as interns. The department submitted a budget proposal, which was included in the Governor's Budget released in January 2016, to expand the OMCP from three to four sessions

per year. In February 2017, the department reported that the additional session is now being offered at California State Prison, Solano, allowing up to 36 candidates per session and an opportunity for up to 144 candidates annually.

CALIFORNIA IDENTIFICATION CARD PROGRAM

Additionally, the *Blueprint* stated the California Identification Card program (CAL-ID) would be implemented to assist eligible inmates in obtaining state-issued identification cards to satisfy federal requirements for employment documentation. In November 2013, the Division of Rehabilitative Programs (DRP) entered into a contract with the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), to process CAL-IDs for inmates who are being released from custody. The interagency agreement allowed up to 12,000 identification cards annually with a maximum of 1,000 cards per month.

In September 2014, the Governor signed legislation expanding the CAL-ID program to mandate that all eligible inmates released from custody have valid identification cards. On July 1, 2015, the department entered into an interagency agreement with the DMV in order to comply with Penal Code Section 3007.05 and expand the CAL-ID program to all 35 CDCR institutions. The expansion interagency agreement allows the department to purchase over 20,000 identification cards annually with a maximum of 1,722 cards per month. The department purchases the identification cards at a reduced fee and senior identification cards are provided at no cost. The cards are provided free of charge to all inmates regardless of age.

According to the department, 5,359 applications were sent to the DMV for processing between July 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016. The DMV approved and issued 4,478 identification cards, and of those issued, 3,480 inmates released with an identification card. A main reason for this difference is that the screening of inmates potentially started prior to July 2016 (inmates with approximately 210 days left to serve) and inmates who had identification cards approved may not have been released by December 31, 2016. The department is working to develop a data quality report that will enable communication with institution staff on the number of offenders left to screen in a given month. The department is also determining the feasibility of utilizing parole agents to assist in ensuring identification cards are delivered to paroled individuals.

INNOVATIVE PROGRAMMING GRANTS

In May of 2015, the Legislature provided an innovative programming grant for developing volunteer-based programs at institutions with a low volunteer base. The department provided \$2.5 million in one-year grants to nonprofit organizations and eligible volunteers to encourage innovative programs and volunteerism, resulting in 38 programs at 17 prisons. Of the funds provided by the department, \$2 million came directly from the inmate welfare fund, which is a trust containing all of the proceeds from canteen and hobby shop sales, and the remaining funds

were from the Recidivism Reduction Fund created by Senate Bill 105. In 2016, the department provided an additional \$3 million for a second round of grants.

In August 2016, the department released a request for application for its third round of innovative programming grants. During this grant period, the department focused on increasing funding to programs emphasizing offender responsibility and restorative justice principles, particularly at institutions that have been underserved by volunteers and not-for-profit organizations. The third round of grants were separated into two categories, one- and three-year grants, with the three-year grant period beginning in 2017 and ending in 2020. The one-year grants provide \$5.5 million to innovative programs for inmates serving long and life-term sentences, and the three-year grants provide \$3 million for a three-year period, for a total of approximately \$9 million, to help existing programs expand to other institutions. The OIG had a staff member monitor the grant application merit review and scoring process. The applications went through a technical review process before being approved for a merit review by the evaluation committee in November 2016. Grant applications were scored in the following six areas: needs and benefits of the program; volunteer resources and sustainability; program evaluations and outcomes; implementation plan; project management capability, qualifications, and readiness to proceed; and cost/value effectiveness and budget review. Applicants were also required to provide a proposed budget that included estimated costs for salaries, equipment, travel, training, and program research. The department awarded grants to 26 individuals and organizations to establish 63 programs at 29 institutions, with program offerings ranging from communication and parenting skills to canine training, gardening, family reunification, and computer coding. As a result of the innovative programming grants, the department now funds 188 programs at institutions where they were not previously offered. At the end of the grant period, it is expected the programs will have been implemented, additional volunteer resources will have been developed (i.e. Self-Help Sponsors), and the programs will be sustained by the enhanced volunteer resources or outside funding sources without additional funding by CDCR.

MEASURE PROGRESS—ENSURE PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY

The 2010-2015 Strategic Plan outlined the department's goals to ensure that by June 30, 2015, at least 70 percent of offenders identified as having moderate to high risk and needs would receive evidence-based rehabilitative programming consistent with their criminogenic needs prior to their release, as well as to build program capacity to accommodate 70 percent of parolees who have a need for substance use disorder treatment, employment services, or education within their first year of being released from prison.⁷

⁷ CDCR's revised Strategic Plan identifies June 30, 2015, as the date to reach the 70 percent rehabilitation goal for parolees. The Strategic Plan further defines the target population as "70 percent of parolees identified with moderate-to-high risks [CSRA] and needs [COMPAS] will participate during their first year on parole in appropriate and effective community programming to meet their criminogenic needs."

In-Prison Programs

While the department made progress in implementing some of the benchmarks identified in the *Blueprint*, it was still unable to attain its goal of reaching 70 percent of the in-prison target population as noted in the 2016 C-ROB report. Previous OIG reports outlined the department's challenges reaching this goal as well as deficiencies in the reporting methodology. The department's reporting methodology measures its ability to address an offender's needs by evaluating three categories: all needs addressed, one need addressed, and attended a rehabilitative program. The department considers "all needs addressed" when offenders have participated in rehabilitative services in each of their criminogenic needs. Offenders in the "one need addressed" category may have multiple criminogenic needs, but only participated in a rehabilitative program that was consistent with at least one identified need. The category "attended a program" indicates those offenders who were assigned to a rehabilitative program, regardless of whether or not it was consistent with an assessed need, such as offenders who do not have an assessed academic need, but decide to pursue higher education.

The biggest challenge was that the department's previous reporting methodology measured an inmate's participation in a program regardless of whether the inmate attended only one day of class or completed the entire program. Additionally, the counting rule only included offenders who had received a Core COMPAS assessment and scored all programming towards addressing offender needs. However, since August 2016, the department's Division of Rehabilitative Programs (DRP) has been working to both identify and utilize the most consistent and reliable source data for reporting. The DRP has proposed to address the program participation issue by focusing on what it refers to as, "meaningful participation," which is defined as enrollment in a program for a minimum of 30 calendar days. The department anticipates formally tracking and collecting this data beginning in July 2017. These figures will be provided in the 2017 C-ROB report and in subsequent OIG *Blueprint* reports.

Community Programs for Parolees

The OIG previously reported that the department first achieved its goal of building program capacity for its parolee population in September 2015, as 72 percent of parolees had participated in a program consistent with an identified need. In March 2016, the OIG reported that the department had reached 74 percent of its parolee population, and the September 2016 C-ROB report showed a slight decline to 70 percent of parolees.

However, as stated regarding in-prison programs, whether the inmate attended only one day of a session or completed an entire program, the department counted that attendance as participation. The department does not currently have a tracking mechanism in place to determine the type or number of sessions in which a parolee has participated. The department anticipates formally tracking and collecting its new measurement of "meaningful participation," which is defined as

enrollment in a program for a minimum of 30 calendar days beginning in July 2017. These figures will be reported in the 2017 C-ROB report and in subsequent OIG *Blueprint* reports.

CLASSIFICATION AND HOUSING

The department updated its comprehensive housing plan and incorporated the components identified in the *Blueprint*. Those components included changes to the inmate classification score system, changes in housing and population density levels, construction, renovations, conversions, activations, closures, and changes to contract beds and the fire camp population. The results of the comprehensive housing plan are summarized in Appendix B of the department's *Blueprint* at the institution level and a status was last provided in OIG's *Blueprint* report issued in March 2016.

Released in January 2016, the department's *Update* detailed its shifting focus on offenders' custody designations, and stated it was considering revisions to existing regulations related to custody designations to allow more programming opportunities for those with lower supervision needs. In November 2016, California passed Proposition 57, the California Parole for Non-Violent Criminals and Juvenile Court Trial Requirements Initiative, requiring the department to adopt regulations implementing new parole and sentence credit provisions to enhance public safety, and authorizing the department to award sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, or educational achievements. The department states it has not yet determined the full impact these changes will have on the state prison population, but has projected a reduction of 2,000 offenders in 2017–18, and up to 9,500 by 2021. This section provides additional details about the department's classification, housing, and population management efforts.

HOUSING PLAN—GLOBAL BENCHMARKS

The *Blueprint* noted the department was under federal court order to reduce overall prison overcrowding to 137.5 percent of design capacity. The department had previously met the court-ordered prison population cap of 137.5 percent, as required by February 28, 2016. The department's *Update* noted that the court reaffirmed that CDCR would remain under the jurisdiction of the court for as long as necessary to continue compliance with this benchmark. In the past few years, CDCR has added new bed and programming space at Mule Creek State Prison and Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility and built the new California Health Care Facility in Stockton. However, the department noted as of mid-March 2017, they are only approximately 1,500 inmates below the population cap to meet the required benchmark.

PROPOSITION 57

On March 24, 2017, the department submitted proposed Proposition 57 emergency regulations to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). The regulations plan to provide CDCR inmates with added incentives for good behavior and programming participation, placing the responsibility on an individual offender to participate in their rehabilitation while serving their time in prison.

During the past several months, the department has worked with stakeholders and staff to draft regulations implementing Proposition 57. The department reported several key regulatory changes, including:

- Simplify and expand credit-earning opportunities for the following: Good Conduct Credits; Milestone Completion Credits (from 6 weeks per year to 12 weeks per year); Rehabilitative Achievement Credits (up to 4 weeks per year); and Educational Merit Credits. The increase in credits will be applied prospectively with the exception of the Education Merit Credit, which will apply retrospectively if earned during the inmate's current incarceration. The Good Conduct Credit is planned to be implemented on May 1, 2017, and the remaining credits are planned to take effect on August 1, 2017.
- Expand the non-violent parole process for offenders. Qualifying offenders who complete the full term of their primary sentence, excluding any enhancements or alternative sentences, and meet the behavioral requirements will qualify for parole suitability consideration with the Board of Parole Hearings. The department anticipates the non-violent parole process will become effective July 1, 2017.

The earning of credits may advance an inmate's release date if serving a determinate term or advance an inmate's initial parole suitability consideration hearing if serving an indeterminate term. Credits to be earned are not an entitlement for offenders but rather solely dependent on their participation and behavior; credits can be revoked for bad behavior. Also, all inmates will be eligible for credit earnings, with the exception of condemned inmates and those sentenced to life without possibility of parole.

Milestone Credits

As an offender progresses through the various rehabilitative programs, certain components or "milestones" of the program are completed and varying amounts of credits are awarded upon completion of the programs. These credits can reduce the amount of time the offender spends in prison. Following the passage of Proposition 57, there are several changes in process that will enhance and expand these milestone credits.

To improve the benefits of milestone credits, effective August 1, 2017, the milestone credit-earning eligibility categories will be expanded and credit-earning capacities will be modestly increased. Credit-earning categories are being modified to enable credit-earning by violent offenders, indeterminate sentence offenders, and offenders serving life-term sentences.⁸ Offenders can currently earn a maximum of 6 weeks of credits during a 12-month consecutive period; this limit will be increased to allow offenders to earn up to 12 weeks of credits in a 12-

⁸ Violent-offense lifers and offenders sentenced to life without parole are still ineligible for credit-earning programs.

month consecutive period. Also effective August 1, 2017, is the proposed increase in milestone-earning capacity, which will allow some offenders to earn up to 35 percent more milestone credits. Non-violent offenders housed at fire conservation camps will be eligible for greater credit-earning capacity, up to day-for-day credit.

Additionally, the department has created an education merit credit, which will allow offenders who have earned a high school diploma or equivalency, a college degree, or offender mentor certification while incarcerated to receive a one-time credit of three to six months. This credit will be applied retroactively. The new rehabilitative achievement credit allows offenders who participate in approved self-help programs to earn an additional four weeks of credits per calendar year. The department has determined that for every 52 hours of program participation, one week can be earned with a maximum of 208 hours in a continuous 12-month period. However, any milestone and rehabilitative achievements credits lost as a result of disciplinary behavior will not be restorable.

POPULATION DENSITY LEVELS

Based on the inmate population as of January 31, 2017, the following table compares the actual density (overcrowding) rates to the *Blueprint* goals for six security level bed types for male inmates.⁹ Each of the security level bed types are within the established goal, with the exception of level II and IV beds. Level II beds exceed the *Blueprint* overcrowding goal by 12 percent; however, the figures in the table below do not include level II housing at the Modified Community Correctional Facilities, as they were not included in the *Blueprint* design beds established in 2012. The level IV beds continue to exceed the goal after an increase of 16 percent from August 2015 to January 2017, with the overcrowding rate currently at 190 percent of capacity. This increase is likely attributable to the decrease in the SDP inmate population from the Security Housing Unit (SHU) to level IV housing.

Table 3: Actual Density (Overcrowding) Rates in Comparison to *Blueprint* Design Beds

Bed Type	<i>Blueprint</i> Design Beds	Population as of 8/31/15	Overcrowding Rate as of 8/31/15	Population as of 1/31/17	Overcrowding Rate as of 1/31/17	<i>Blueprint</i> Overcrowding Goal
Level I Dorm	8,283	5,015	61%	5,731	69%	150%
Level II Dorm & Cell	22,908	38,280	167%	37,221	162%	150%
Level III Cell	16,584	18,652	112%	24,126	145%	150%
Level IV Cell	13,124	22,790	174%	24,871	190%	150%
Admin. Segregation Unit	5,601	3,592	64%	2,685	48%	125%
Security Housing Unit	2,934	2,918	99%	504	17%	120%

Source: CDCR—Data as of January 31, 2017

⁹ Female offenders are generally housed together without regard to level (level I to IV) because their propensity for violence is much lower than that of male offenders.

Contract Capacity

The *Blueprint* articulated the department's plan to eliminate out-of-state contracted inmate beds by June 30, 2016. The plan was to reestablish up to 1,225 additional community correctional facility (CCF) beds once the out-of-state inmates returned. The *Blueprint* projected a decrease in the out-of-state inmate population from 9,588 inmates on June 27, 2012, to 4,596 inmates by December 27, 2013. Population reports showed this benchmark was not met, as over 8,800 inmates were housed outside California during this benchmark date. In its most recent update to the *Blueprint* in January 2016, the department reported it planned to reduce the out-of-state inmate population to 4,900 inmates for fiscal year 2016–17 to maintain compliance with the inmate population cap. According to CDCR population figures as of March 22, 2017, the department is below its planned reduction for fiscal year 2016–2017, as 4,254 inmates are housed out-of-state in Arizona (1,803 inmates) and Mississippi (2,451 inmates). The department is currently projecting it will remove inmates from Mississippi by January 2018 and subsequently from Arizona in 2020.

In September 2013, the passage of Senate Bill 105 authorized the department to increase its level of contracted beds both in and out-of-state. The bill provided an immediate measure to avoid early release of inmates and allowed the state to comply with the three-judge court order. The bill authorized the activation of the California City Correctional Facility (CAC), a private prison located in Kern County, which is the first leased facility to be operated by the department. The CAC began receiving offenders in December 2013 and can house 2,400 level II general population inmates in celled housing. As of January 31, 2017, CAC housed 2,149 offenders (at 90 percent of capacity), which is an increase of 295 from the OIG report, published in March 2016.

Housing inmates in public modified community correctional facilities (MCCFs) assists with the reduction of prison overcrowding. In December 2013, the department requested activation of approximately 1,200 contracted beds in the Cities of Delano and Shafter, and in March 2014, the department activated the Taft facility with plans to accommodate up to 600 inmates. The department also activated and increased capacity at several private MCCFs, including Central Valley, Desert View, and Golden State.

The following table shows that, as of January 31, 2017, the department had a total of 3,586 inmates housed in its public and private MCCFs. This was a total increase of 99 inmates from the OIG's last *Blueprint* report, issued in March 2016, when 3,487 inmates were housed in MCCFs.

Table 4: Modified Community Correctional Facilities Capacity and Population¹⁰

MCCF	Type	Bed Capacity	Total Population
Delano, Shafter, & Taft	Public	1,818	1,596
Central Valley, Desert View, & Golden State	Private	2,100	1,990
Totals		3,918	3,586

Source: CDCR—Data as of January 31, 2017

Alternative Custody Program

The department’s Alternative Custody Program (ACP) allows for non-serious, non-violent, non-sex offenders to serve part of their sentences in residential homes, nonprofit residential drug treatment programs, or transitional care facilities. The department’s Office of Legal Affairs drafted amendments to the regulations governing the ACP in conjunction with the Female Offender Programs and Services mission. These amendments expand the availability of ACP to eligible male and female offenders and modify eligibility and exclusionary criteria based on related changes in the law. These amendments were promulgated as an emergency regulation, approved by the Office of Administrative Law on March 29, 2016, and went into effect on that date. The regulations were permanently adopted in October 2016. During 2016, the department had 92 male and 67 female offenders released to the ACP. As of March 2017, the department has 109 male and 52 female offenders participating in the ACP.

In addition to the ACP, the department has other alternative custody programs available to male and female offenders with a relatively short time frame prior to their release date. These programs include the Male Community Reentry Program (MCRP), Custody to Community Transitional Reentry Program (CCTRP), and the Community Prisoner Mother Program (CPMP). During 2016, the department had 328 participants in the CCTRP. As of March 2017, the department has 439 participants in the MCRP, 301 participants in the CCTRP, and 23 participants in the CPMP.

SENSITIVE NEEDS YARDS

Along with changes in classification and housing, the department is considering and implementing changes impacting its Sensitive Needs Yards (SNY) population. The department’s *Update* issued in January 2016 noted that SNY is the fastest growing population within the prison system, with approximately 41,000 SNY offenders. The department’s goals include developing a long-term plan with more stringent criteria for an offender to obtain an SNY designation and consideration of other measures that may be effective with this population.

¹⁰ The figures for the MCCFs do not include the other in-State contract beds, which include the Female Community Reentry Facility (260-bed facility), Female Rehabilitative Community Correctional Center (75-bed facility), and Community Prisoner Mother Program (24-bed facility).

The department has initiated several efforts to address this growing population, including the development of an orientation program for new SNY inmates, which will be facilitated by institution management and other SNY inmates to provide a detailed overview of the program and program expectations. The department stated it is working to provide newly incarcerated offenders with the ability to connect with their families and support systems and is in the process of placing telephones within each housing unit at every reception center in the State. The department believes that providing newly incarcerated offenders the ability to connect with their families and support systems will help ease the transition and alleviate fears about the prison environment. The department believes this may result in fewer offenders seeking SNY placement based solely on their unconfirmed fears of a general population prison environment. These telephones will provide newly incarcerated offenders with the ability to make at least one telephone call within their first seven days at a reception center. Inmates will then be provided a phone call every 30 days until they are transferred. In addition, the department reported it has reconvened its Wardens Advisory Group to develop criteria for two separate SNY housing options, programming and non-programming SNYs. The Wardens Advisory Group also developed recommendations for expedited transfers between yards and institutions that could house non-programming inmates.

Furthermore, the department initiated non-designated programming facilities (PFs) at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility (RJD) in December 2016 and at the California Health Care Facility (CHCF) in February 2017. These institutions have a level II PF that does not use either SNY or general population identifiers. The department stated the focus for PFs is to provide a housing environment for those inmates demonstrating positive programming efforts and a desire to refrain from violence. This change is to allow for greater access to lower level housing and commensurate privileges, along with various rehabilitative programs, including education, vocation, and religious activities. Offenders recommended for transfer to a PF are not required to waive their SNY designation or display a willingness to program before transfer. If an offender refuses a transfer to a PF, they are subject to the department's disciplinary process and may be placed into higher level housing. The OIG will continue to monitor the recent implementation of these programming facilities and report any potential safety and security concerns of department staff and the offender population.

SECURITY THREAT GROUP REGULATIONS AND THE STEP-DOWN PROGRAM

The *Blueprint* identified several measures recommended as a result of a 2007 study performed by the California State University, Sacramento titled *Security Threat Group Identification and Management*. The *Blueprint* stated the department could begin a careful implementation of the recommendations, such as offering graduated housing, a step-down program for inmates, support and education for disengaging from gangs, a weighted point system for gang validation, specific use of segregated housing, and social value programs in preparation for the inmates' return to the

community. The department's step-down program (SDP) was initiated to provide inmates with increased incentives to promote positive behavior and stop participation in Security Threat Group (STG) activities, with the ultimate goal of release from the Security Housing Unit (SHU).

The SDP was implemented at the four SHU institutions in October 2012—California Correctional Institution (CCI), California State Prison, Sacramento (SAC), California State Prison, Corcoran (COR), and Pelican Bay State Prison (PBSP). In December 2015, there were over 1,300 inmates in the SDP. However, in January 2016, the U.S. District Court granted final approval of the settlement agreement for *Ashker*, which involved comprehensive changes to policies and practices for placing, housing, managing, and retaining offenders who have been validated by the department as prison gang members and associates. In March 2016, there were 691 validated offenders in the SHU awaiting a case-by-case review.

As part of the settlement agreement, the department expedited its case-by-case reviews of offenders in SHUs who had been placed in the SDP as a result of an indeterminate SHU term. If an offender had not been found guilty of a SHU-eligible rule violation with a proven STG nexus within the 24 months prior to review, the offender was to be released from the SHU and transferred to a general population level IV 180-design facility, or other general population institution consistent with the offender's case factors. Thus, a substantial decrease of SDP inmates occurred. Based on OIG site visits and figures provided by the department, there were only nine remaining SDP participants who were located at PBSP as of February 2017. Due to the small population size and the decreasing SHU population, the number of SDP Facilitators has been reduced from eight full-time staff, to four full-time staff, as of February 2017. The remaining SDP Facilitators are administering programs at PBSP (one SDP Facilitator) and COR (three SDP Facilitators). There are no SDP Facilitators or SHU inmates at CCI or SAC, and the Security Housing Units no longer exist there. The SDP Facilitator at PBSP provides creative writing and a book club for the 9 SDP inmates and approximately 55 Restrictive Custody General Population inmates. Elective group meetings, such as bible study and communication skills, are offered to all SHU offenders at PBSP, which included approximately 300 offenders as of February 2017. Although no SDP inmates are housed at COR, the three SDP Facilitators provide the evidence-based rehabilitative programs Building Resilience and Bridges to Freedom to approximately 200 offenders in the SHU and debriefing unit. The department is planning to utilize the four vacant SDP Facilitator positions to provide programming to offenders prior to their release from SHU housing.

The OIG will continue to report on the status of Security Housing Units and consult with the department with a shared interest in achieving the goals set out in the *Blueprint* and *Ashker* settlement agreement.

CONCLUSION

The department has met the original *Blueprint* goals regarding the standardized staffing and inmate classification components. For the most part, they have also met most of the construction project goals set in the original *Blueprint*. As a result of the *Ashker* settlement agreement, the security threat group step-down program was accelerated, and but for nine inmates, the remaining Security Housing Unit (SHU) commitments have been stepped down to other housing. The *Update* issued in January 2016 identified new goals and detailed the department's focus on modifying custody regulations to create additional programming opportunities for offenders with lower supervision needs. The passage of Proposition 57 in November 2016 prompted additional changes to the department's inmate classification system and milestone credits. The comprehensive housing plan and establishing exactly how many inmate beds at which level will continue to be a moving target until these developments are played out, but the department has made progress.

The biggest challenge to achieving the *Blueprint* goals continues to be the inability to provide rehabilitative programming to the target population and to track the efficacy of the programs provided once inmates reenter society. In late 2016, the department began replacing its reentry hub program model with a statewide rehabilitative programming model that expanded pre-employment transitions, and substance use disorder and cognitive behavioral treatment to all 35 institutions. Effective January 2017, most of the programming components are providing services statewide. Although the department is implementing rehabilitation programs at all institutions, it has never been able to provide rehabilitative programs to 70 percent of its target population. As the OIG noted in prior reports, even if the department had met this goal, it would lack meaning since their counting rules considered an inmate being in one program for one day as having their needs partially met. As a result, the department has proposed a more meaningful measurement standard, and anticipates it will have the ability to track and collect this new data in July 2017. Although the proposed measurement of "meaningful participation" (30 days in a program) may make it more difficult for the department to achieve its goal of 70 percent, it will allow the department to better evaluate its ability to address the needs of offenders, and they are commended for making the change.

The OIG found a decrease in the percentage of academic programs being operational and a slight increase in the vocational or career technical classes being operational. However, it should be noted that the overall number of programs has also increased. The primary reason academic and CTE courses were not operational is due to teacher vacancies (long-term sick, workers' compensation, retirement, recruitment, long-term disability, etc.).

The statewide rehabilitative programming model significantly increases program capacity for pre-employment transitions, substance use disorder and cognitive behavior treatment programs. However, many of these programs were not yet operational during the OIG's on-site review. The

OIG found that 60 percent of the pre-employment transitions classes are fully operational, 59 percent of the substance use disorder treatment slots are filled, and 52 percent of the cognitive behavioral therapy slots are filled. While full utilization has not been achieved, capacity in all areas is expected to grow the remainder of this fiscal year, and by the next report, utilization percentages should be higher too.

As part of its rehabilitative efforts, the department implemented the Rehabilitative Case Plan in September 2016, and the department's sex offender treatment program completed its first cohort in December 2016. The department also expanded its Offender Mentor Certification Program from three to four sessions per year and continues to ensure offenders obtain a state-issued identification card prior to release. Lastly, the department awarded its third round of innovative programming grants to 26 individuals and organizations to establish 63 programs at 29 institutions. Offenders will now have increased access to programs that focus on offender responsibility and restorative justice. The Rehabilitative Case Plan has been recommended by C-ROB for some time, but it remains to be seen if the concept works in actual practice, and if the department can implement it effectively going forward.

As previously reported, the enhanced programming facilities (EPFs) faced challenges, in large part because EPF placement is not consistently behavior based. This was especially true for the level IV EPFs, due to a lack of available bed space and problem offenders not being referred for transfer and removed from the EPF. Many inmates do not meet the criteria for EPF placement, yet department staff were compelled to utilize the EPFs because of a lack of bed space. Given the intent of the EPFs is to incentivize and reinforce positive life choices, allowing ineligible inmates to be placed in an EPF defeats the purpose of the program. Also, continuing to allow program failures to remain on the EPF after committing rules violations jeopardized the sustainability of EPFs. The department has now decided to end the pilot project and find alternative methods to incentivize positive programming.

The department has submitted emergency regulations to the Office of Administrative Law to implement new parole and sentence credit provisions following the passage of Proposition 57. The department is modifying classifications for the milestone credit eligibility criteria, increasing the milestone credit earning rates, and changing the parole process for non-violent second-strike offenders who have served 50 percent of their sentence. The changes to the parole process and awarding of credits are planned to become effective in July and August 2017, respectively.

The department is also making changes to the Special Needs Yards (SNY) population, has developed a new orientation program, and has created two separate housing options—programming and non-programming SNYs. The department has also initiated non-designated level II programming facilities to provide housing for offenders who have demonstrated positive programming efforts and a desire to refrain from violence.

The *Ashker* settlement agreement resulted in comprehensive changes to the department's policies and practices regarding offenders who have been validated as Security Threat Group members and associates. As a result of these changes, there has been a significant decrease in the Security Housing Unit population and step-down program (SDP) participants. As of February 2017, only two of the four original SHUs were still being utilized and only nine remaining step-down program participants remained. In addition, the SDP Facilitators had been reduced from eight to four staff. The OIG recommends the department utilize the other four vacant positions in concert with the original intent provided by the legislature in funding them. While it was specifically aimed at providing programming to inmates completing the step-down process, the more general goal was to facilitate programming for inmates coming out of SHU. It recognized that inmates locked up in Security Housing do not have the same access to programming as other inmates, and are in fact, perhaps the very ones who need it the most. The department still has hundreds of inmates serving determinate SHU sentences, some who will parole and directly reenter society, and some who will reenter the prison population. It is recommended that these positions continue to facilitate SHU programming assuming the SHU population justifies the workload.

The department's division of rehabilitative programming continues to be in flux. The new Director has responded to the OIG's prior criticisms of the counting rule and is changing the reporting methodology. It will be interesting to see the results of the new system. The implementation of Proposition 57 will also be impacting the demand for programming. The department has taken strides in continuing to expand the support for both traditional and innovative programming opportunities to meet the ever-increasing interests in programs by inmates.

The reduction in recidivism rates is encouraging, but unfortunately, other than general inferences, the department still has not found a good way to determine the cause. For example, what programs are the most beneficial to offenders upon release? What gets them jobs, and what prevents them from re-offending? Although they recognize this gap and have sought more research opportunities, they are still being challenged to determine the efficacy of all their efforts. It is conceded that the better the department gets at impacting the targeted population with evidence-based programs, the better the chance of continuing the possibility for rehabilitation. There are certain programs that already have proven effectiveness, such as education and substance abuse treatment. The challenge now for the department and all program providers is to establish ways to validate the programs' outcomes. Subsequent reports will assess the remaining goals from the initial *Blueprint* and the *Update*, as well as CDCR's efforts to weave the many changing developments into a comprehensive rehabilitation plan that meets the California Logic Model and improves public safety.

APPENDICES

Appendix A—Statewide Programming Totals

Appendix B—Core COMPAS Assessments

APPENDIX A—STATEWIDE PROGRAMMING TOTALS

The information displayed on the following page identifies the statewide operational status of the rehabilitation programs in fiscal year 2016–17, in summary format for each type of rehabilitation program, including academic education, career technical education, pre-employment transitions, as well as the substance use disorder and cognitive behavioral treatment contract programs. The OIG performed fieldwork to assess the operational status of these programs at each institution.

The first set of columns identifies the number of proposed teacher positions and the number of budgeted student capacity, as identified by the department. For the contract programs, the first set displays the budgeted student capacity for each program as well as its budgeted annual capacity. As described earlier, the numbers were allowed to be changed as long as they met the total departmental numbers. The next set of columns displays the results of the OIG fieldwork, identifying the number of programs or program slots that were fully operational when the fieldwork was performed. These columns also display the projected annual capacity for the contract programs based on existing enrollment figures. The third set of columns identifies the differences between the number of courses that were supposed to be operational and corresponding student capacity, and the number of courses found by the OIG to be operational and actual number of students served.

The fieldwork performed in this review was conducted from December 2016 through January 2017. Therefore, the numbers may have changed since the time of the report.

APPENDIX A—STATEWIDE PROGRAMMING TOTALS

Types of Programming	CDCR Figures FY 16-17		Actuals as of 12/1/16 - 1/31/17		Differences (Actuals - Final)	
	Proposed Staff	Budgeted Capacity	Actual Program Staff	Actual Student Capacity	Differences	Differences
Academic Education						
General Population	324	17,101	258	13,410	-66	-3,691
Alternative Programming	13	702	10	540	-3	-162
Voluntary Educ. Program	214	25,200	184	21,929	-30	-3,271
TOTALS	551	43,003	452	35,879	-99	-7,124
Career Technical Education						
Auto Mechanics	18	486	14	378	-4	-108
Auto Repair	15	405	12	324	-3	-81
Building Maintenance	26	702	22	587	-4	-115
Carpentry	16	432	11	297	-5	-135
Computer Literacy	34	1,822	27	1,444	-7	-378
CORE	2	54	0	0	-2	-54
Cosmetology	3	81	3	63	0	-18
Electrical Works	19	513	14	378	-5	-135
Electronics	32	864	24	648	-8	-216
HVAC	13	351	8	216	-5	-135
Landscaping	1	27	0	0	-1	-27
Machine Shop	4	108	2	54	-2	-54
Masonry	14	378	13	351	-1	-27
Office Services and Related Technology (OSRT)	45	1,215	42	1,134	-3	-81
Painting	3	81	2	54	-1	-27
Plumbing	10	270	8	216	-2	-54
Roofing	1	27	1	27	0	0
Sheet Metal	1	27	1	27	0	0
Small Engine Repair	9	243	8	216	-1	-27
Welding	23	621	18	486	-5	-135
TBD	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	289	8,707	230	6,900	-59	-1,807
Employment Programs						
Pre-Employment Transitions (PET)	Program Slots 2,463	Annual Student Capacity 22,167	Actual Students in Program 1,485	Projected Annual Student Capacity 13,365	Differences -978	Differences -8,802
TOTALS	2,463	22,167	1,485	13,365	-978	-8,802
Contract Treatment Programs						
Substance Use Disorder Treatment (SUDT)	Student Capacity (/Program) 4,660	Annual Student Capacity 11,189	Actual Students in Program 2,739	Projected Annual Student Capacity 6,574	Differences -1,921	Differences -4,616
Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment (CBT)	5,388	17,927	2,818	9,376	-2,570	-8,550
TOTALS	10,048	29,116	5,557	15,950	-4,491	-13,166

APPENDIX B—CORE COMPAS ASSESSMENTS

The following table displays the department’s status in completing Core COMPAS assessments for each inmate to assess his or her rehabilitative needs, as of January 31, 2017.

Institution	Inmate Population	Inmates with Core COMPAS	Inmates Without COMPAS	Percent with Core COMPAS
Avenal State Prison	3,364	3,358	6	99.8%
California City Correctional Facility	2,159	2,141	18	99.2%
California Correctional Center	4,247	4,178	69	98.4%
California Correctional Institution	3,729	3,584	145	96.1%
California Health Care Facility	2,505	1,558	947	62.2%
California Institution for Men	3,647	3,367	280	92.3%
California Institution for Women	1,970	1,833	137	93.0%
California Medical Facility	2,491	1,944	547	78.0%
California Men's Colony	3,968	3,626	342	91.4%
California Rehabilitation Center	2,718	2,707	11	99.6%
California State Prison, Los Angeles County	3,447	2,645	802	76.7%
California State Prison, Corcoran	3,502	3,129	373	89.3%
California State Prison, Sacramento	2,250	1,564	686	69.5%
California State Prison, San Quentin	3,997	2,767	1,230	69.2%
California State Prison, Solano	4,225	3,736	489	88.4%
California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility and State Prison, Corcoran	5,522	5,041	481	91.3%
Calipatria State Prison	3,849	3,619	230	94.0%
Centinela State Prison	3,609	3,286	323	91.1%
Central California Women's Facility	2,968	2,234	734	75.3%
Chuckawalla Valley State Prison	2,551	2,543	8	99.7%
Correctional Training Facility	5,300	5,276	24	99.5%
Deuel Vocational Institution	2,238	1,341	897	59.9%
Folsom State Prison	2,467	2,454	13	99.5%
Folsom Women's Facility	412	412	0	100.0%
High Desert State Prison	3,700	3,530	170	95.4%
Ironwood State Prison	3,062	2,798	264	91.4%
Kern Valley State Prison	3,757	3,346	411	89.1%
Mule Creek State Prison	3,604	2,836	768	78.7%
North Kern State Prison	4,541	2,154	2,387	47.4%
Out of State Correctional Facilities-Variou	4,740	4,561	179	96.2%
Pelican Bay State Prison	2,116	1,892	224	89.4%
Pleasant Valley State Prison	3,204	3,006	198	93.8%
Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility	3,273	2,571	702	78.6%
Salinas Valley State Prison	3,438	2,810	628	81.7%
Sierra Conservation Center	4,302	3,993	309	92.8%
Valley State Prison	3,463	3,189	274	92.1%
Wasco State Prison	5,087	2,378	2,709	46.7%
TOTALS	125,422	107,407	18,015	85.6%

* Miscellaneous pertains to special non-state prison housing such as community correctional facilities or special housing programs.

* Miscellaneous-Special Housing / Non-State Prisons	5,491
---	-------



2017 Blueprint
Monitoring Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Robert A. Barton
INSPECTOR GENERAL

Roy W. Wesley
CHIEF DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

March 2017