

**Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee #4
on State Administration, General Government,
Judicial, and Veterans Affairs
and
Assembly Budget Subcommittee #4
on State Administration**

Senator Mark DeSaulnier, Chair
Senator Tom Harman
Senator Gloria Negrete McLeod

Assemblymember Warren Furutani, Chair
Assemblymember Juan Arambula
Assemblymember Julia Brownley
Assemblymember Paul Cook
Assemblymember Kevin Jeffries

Agenda

**Joint Hearing on Budgeting Accountability and
Transparency in the California Department of
Corrections and Rehabilitation**

**Tuesday, March 23, 2010
2:00 p.m.
Room 447**

Consultants:

Brian Brown, Allan Cooper, Matt Osterli, Joe Stephenshaw

| <u>Issue</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Budget Act Programs | 2 |
| 2. Annual Report of Performance and Outcomes..... | 5 |
| 3. Inmate Population Budget Process | 8 |

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals who, because of a disability, need special assistance to attend or participate in a Senate Committee hearing, or in connection with other Senate services, may request assistance at the Senate Rules Committee, 1020 N Street, Suite 255 or by calling 916-324-9335. Requests should be made one week in advance whenever possible.

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (5225)

Departmental Overview. Effective July 1, 2005, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) was created pursuant to the Governor's Reorganization Plan 1 of 2005 and Chapter 10, Statutes of 2005 (SB 737, Romero). All departments that previously reported to the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency (YACA) were consolidated into CDCR and include YACA, the California Department of Corrections, Youth Authority, Board of Corrections, Board of Prison Terms, and the Commission on Correctional Peace Officers' Standards and Training.

According to the department's website, its mission is to "enhance public safety through the safe and secure incarceration of offenders, effective parole supervision, and rehabilitative strategies to successfully reintegrate offenders into our communities."

The CDCR is responsible for the incarceration, training, education, and care of adult felons and nonfelon narcotic addicts, as well as juvenile offenders. The CDCR also supervises and treats adult and juvenile parolees, and is responsible for the apprehension and reincarceration of those parolees who commit new offenses or parole violations. The department also sets minimum standards for the operation of local detention facilities and selection and training of law enforcement personnel, as well as provides local assistance in the form of grants to local governments for crime prevention and reduction programs.

The department operates 33 adult prisons, including 12 reception centers, a central medical facility, a treatment center for narcotic addicts under civil commitment, and a substance abuse facility for incarcerated felons. The CDCR also operates five juvenile correctional facilities, including two reception centers. In addition, CDCR manages 13 Community Correctional Facilities, about 50 adult and juvenile conservation camps, the Richard A. McGee Correctional Training Center, and nearly 200 adult and juvenile parole offices, as well as houses inmates in 6 out-of-state correctional facilities.

Budget Overview. The 2010-11 General Fund budget for CDCR is \$8.5 billion, primarily for adult prison operations. This total is a decrease compared to the current year, primarily because of proposals to reduce spending on inmate health care, make certain felony offenses punishable by local jail instead of prison, and the continued implementation of legislative reforms enacted in the 2009-10 budget. Overall, the Governor's proposed budget provides about 11 percent of General Fund resources to CDCR.

Issue 1 – Budget Act Programs

Background. The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) has the largest, and one of the most complex, state operations budget in state government. The total budget, including reported deficiency needs, will top \$10 billion this year. There are many influences inside and out of the department that complicate the operations. The federal courts have ordered a population reduction to bring available medical care per inmate in

line with a constitutional standard and instituted a federal Receiver. The department is also governed by federal court orders and stipulated agreements in several other areas of operations. Further, the department has to implement recent changes to drastically reduce programs, implement employee layoffs, and reduce the prison population. Meanwhile, CDCR is forced to address normal impediments to progress and a seemingly endless procession of issues and challenges. And with all of these complications, the structure of the CDCR budget has changed little. The level of visibility the Legislature has provided itself remains the almost the same as when funding for CDCR was 1/3 of current levels.

The bulk of CDCR's funding is appropriated in a single budget item. In the Current Year, that appropriation is \$6.2 billion. Within that appropriation sits a single \$5.2 billion line item. If CDCR's reported funding shortfalls are approved and incorporated into that appropriation, that line item will be between about \$5.5 billion and \$5.7 billion. Once appropriated, the administration has control over how the funds are spent, and the visibility to the Legislature on the degree to which funds are actually spent consistent with legislative priorities is limited. This is true of all departments to some extent, but is particularly challenging in a department as large, decentralized, and with as many differing missions as corrections. Therefore, in some cases, the Legislature may not be fully aware that funds are being used for different purposes than originally intended. Many reporting solutions have been tried to track how CDCR spends its budget, but such reports are often after-the-fact and, therefore, limit the Legislature's ability to intervene. For example, in past years the department has used savings from other parts of its budget – particularly from salary savings from vacant positions in administration, institutions, parole, and rehabilitation programs – to cover hundreds of millions of dollars in overtime costs that exceeded its budget authority. However, this occurrence was not readily apparent, in part because of the limited level of detail in the budget act. (It is also worth noting that the Legislature included budget bill language in the 2009-10 Budget Act requiring CDCR to review its overtime usage and provide a plan on how it would reduce those costs. The Governor vetoed this reporting requirement.) To gain increased visibility into, and control over, how CDCR spends the funds the Legislature appropriates, a more proactive approach is required.

By taking a more proactive approach, the process may ultimately lead to something akin to truth in budgeting. It is well known that CDCR routinely moves funding from inmate programs to wherever they are experiencing cost overruns in their budget. If CDCR is required to come forth each year to explain what programs are not being delivered and why; and why those funds should be moved to pay for other activities, eventually an assessment could be made about whether a permanent budget change should be made. As funding for activities begins to look more like spending on activities, the true picture of CDCR operations will become more apparent.

Staff Proposal. One method of achieving increased visibility into and accountability of a budget is to increase the detail in the budget act. That is, break up the enormous appropriations into smaller appropriations and require CDCR to notify the legislature whenever funds are moved between appropriations. This will give the Legislature the ability to designate funds for a specific purpose, be able to see that the funds are budgeted for that purpose, and rest relatively assured that the funds are not used for any other purpose. Any new structure would need to allow the department to move funds between Items, but with legislative notification. This structure would give the department a level of flexibility consistent with current Budget Act provisions, eliminate the large appropriations, and give the Legislature increased visibility into how CDCR spends their budget. It will also provide the opportunity to concur with the actions of the department, or reject requests and put the

department on notice that the direction they are headed is not something the Legislature will be willing to provide funding for. There are several ways to divide up their budget.

1. **Break the budget into multiple Items.** Additional Items would be created to bring the total size of each Item down to a reasonable amount. Rather than a single \$6.2 billion Item, CDCR would have something like 10 Items totaling \$6.2 billion. This will allow the Legislature to appropriate funds for specific types of expenditures, and then see if the funds are spent in those categories. Separate Items could be created for administration, inmate support, education, security, inmate programming, or any other category. The benefit is that in the event CDCR was going to overspend an Item, they would need to come to the Legislature to get permission to move the money from another Item. If a request is submitted for a net funding increase, the Legislature would have the opportunity to examine spending in all Items, and determine if an increase is warranted. Please see Attachment A for an example.
2. **Add additional programs to the Main Item.** Existing programs would be broken into smaller programs. The dollar amounts too would be broken into smaller pieces. CDCR's main item is now comprised of 10 Programs. These ten programs, for funding purposes, would be broken into 20 programs, or 40 programs, or however many would be necessary to get the appropriations down to comfortable levels. Control Section 26.00 allows for intraschedule transfers and requires no transfer over \$200,000 may occur less than 30 days following notification of the budget committees of each house and the JLBC. In these cases, the JLBC may issue a letter to the administration stating whether it concurs with the transfer. This language would govern schedule transfers between the many programs in an expanded CDCR main item. Please see Attachment B for an example.
3. **Fund each institution independently.** This proposal would create either 33 separate Items, or 33 separate programs within several Items, to appropriate an amount of funding specific to each institution. This proposal would have the most drastic effect on budget detail and budget information. If each institution were individually funded for an expanded schedule of programs, the budget of CDCR would very much be under a microscope. This level of information, and the impending requests to move money around would tell a great deal about how the department spends money, how costs of differing locations and inmate levels affect costs, and possibly even which wardens manage better than others. New York budgets their prison system this way. Please see Attachment C for an example.

Staff Comments. The Legislature may write the Budget Bill in any way that provides the funding and controls they desire. The Legislature has the right to expect visibility and accountability with respect to the appropriations they make. Because of the extraordinary size of the appropriations in CDCR's budget, the level of visibility into how funds are spent, and the ability to hold CDCR accountable to spending funds in a way consistent with the will of the legislature is very low. Reporting serves a purpose, but is not proactive. The proposal above will increase visibility and accountability in the budget of CDCR. Finding the right mix of Items and Programs will benefit the Legislature greatly.

Staff Recommendation. Staff should be directed to continue working with the LAO, DOF, and CDCR to find a format that reach the goals of the Legislature. This could include a mix of Item creation and Program proliferation to best achieve that goal. A final proposal should be completed by the first week of May for approval by the subcommittees in each house.

Issue 2 – Annual Report of Performance and Outcomes

Background. The CDCR is a multi-billion dollar General Fund agency with multiple, sometimes competing programs and missions and about 60,000 employees. It is responsible for running 33 state prisons safely and effectively, providing health care treatment for about 170,000 inmates, operating effective education, vocation, and substance abuse programs for tens of thousands of inmates, supervising over 100,000 parolees, holding tens of thousands of parole hearings, monitoring hundreds of service and contract providers, implementing new IT systems costing hundreds of millions of dollars, building new prison facilities costing billions of dollars, reforming the state's juvenile justice facilities to create a more rehabilitative system, monitoring local jail standards for all 58 counties, and administering local grants totaling hundreds of millions of dollars.

Unfortunately, numerous reports from various oversight agencies, commissions, and courts have found significant deficiencies in department performance in many of these areas. In some cases, the deficiencies have been so severe as to result in court findings that the department was violating state and federal constitutional requirements. Efforts to address the deficiencies identified in these reports and court findings have costs the state billions of dollars over recent years. While most would agree that improvements have been made, it has not always been clear how much progress has been made, what is left to be achieved, or whether the state has always taken the most efficient and effective approaches to these remedies.

In response to these concerns, the Legislature has taken steps to attempt to address what is sometimes perceived as a lack of transparency and accountability in this large, complicated agency. Legislative efforts have included instituting various reporting requirements. Probably the most significant of these reporting requirements is Penal Code Section 2063, added in budget trailer bill in 2007. This section requires the department to provide program information by January 10 of each year, coinciding with the release of the Governor's proposed budget. While this effort has successfully produced more regular reporting of information that was not previously available, it is not a perfect approach because it comes in two separate reports, neither of those reports is accessible to the public on the department's website, the reports are not as comprehensive as they could be, and much of the data required are focused more on population counts than performance measures and outcomes.

In 2009, the Senate budget subcommittee #4 directed committee staff, the LAO, CDCR, and DOF to begin working on creating a better annual reporting structure. These parties, as well as staff from the Assembly budget subcommittee #4 and other legislative staff, worked collaboratively in the spring of last year to develop a new approach that could be presented to the Legislature. Unfortunately, it was not possible to complete that process in time to be included as part of the 2009-10 budget. The parties have continued to work on this project, and CDCR and DOF have continued to be supportive partners in this effort, though staff still awaits feedback from CDCR on what it views as the most appropriate outcome measures to track.

Staff Proposal. Committee staff, with the assistance of the department, DOF, and LAO, have drafted a proposed reporting structure that would require CDCR to report annually on its performance in various areas of operations. An example of the reporting requirements

and structure for one area of operations (adult prison programs) is provided as Attachment D. The structure of this report would include the following characteristics:

- **Focus on Key Outcome Measures.** The department would be required to report on key performance indicators. Too often reporting requirements focus on population counts and participation rates rather than outcome measures that present information on the effectiveness of a department or program. Focusing on outcomes is essential to holding departments accountable for performance. The staff proposal also attempts to focus on the most critical outcomes that provide the key barometers of success rather than requiring CDCR to provide so much detail that it becomes overwhelming. Correctly identifying critical outcome measures should provide the Legislature the information necessary to identify when major problems arise, and when that occurs, the Legislature can always request more detailed information and explanations.
- **Linked to Budget Programs.** The report would be sectioned by major budget program which are organized by major areas of operations or mission. As currently drafted, these would include (1) administration, (2) Corrections Standards Authority, (3) adult prison operations, (4) adult prison health care, (5) adult prison programs, (6) adult parole, (7) juvenile facilities operations, (8) juvenile health care, (9) juvenile rehabilitation programs, (10) juvenile parole, and (11) Board of Parole Hearings. (It should be noted that the current draft of this proposal is linked to the *current* budget programs. Any changes made to those programs, as discussed in Issue 1 of this agenda, can be reflected in the final version of this report.) Making this linkage between the budget for various department missions and the outcomes for those operations should better allow the Legislature to analyze program performance and outcomes in light of the resources provided. In this vein, each section would include budget information in the report in addition to the performance outcomes. This budget information would include budget allotments and actual expenditures in prior years, as well as authorized staffing levels.
- **Provide Trend Data.** For each outcome measure, the department will be required to provide data for the prior three years. This will better allow the Legislature to identify positive and negative trends. This will be far more informative than just providing a data for a single year. For example, if the Legislature provides additional resources to address an operational problem (e.g. excessive overtime usage), it would be able to track in subsequent years whether overtime usage has changed in both the direction and magnitude originally estimated.
- **Establish Department Goals.** The report would also require the department to state its goal for each performance measurement. For example, the department might state that its goal is for the average daily attendance in its education programs to be 80 percent of enrollment. By establishing its goals, this provides the Legislature with a better understanding of department priorities, as well as defines to what outcomes the department is managing. Moreover, if the department falls short of (or exceeds) stated goals, this can lead to a conversation of the underlying reasons.
- **Publicly Available on the Website.** Finally, committee staff envision the report be made available to the public as well as the Legislature by requiring it to be posted on the website. As a public agency, particularly one receiving tens of billions of dollars in

General Fund support, information about CDCR's performance should be easily available to the general public.

Benefits of an Annual Report. Staff believe that requiring the type of report described above will make department operations more transparent, better allow the Legislature to make informed budgetary decisions, and hold the department accountable for its performance. This will better enable the Legislature to analyze which operations and programs funded with taxpayer dollars are working as intended, which are failing, and which require improvement. Currently, the size and complexity of this department make it too easy for ineffective programs to go unnoticed, at least until the problems are too big to miss (and sometimes resulting in expensive class action lawsuits).

Standardizing outcomes reporting can instead mean that the Legislature is informed at an earlier stage when programs are not working as intended. This will allow legislators to make more informed decisions about how to address those problems whether that be through greater oversight, eliminating ineffective programs, or improving programs that are evidence-based but poorly implemented. Importantly, standardized reporting can also help to identify what *is* working in the department and, where appropriate, allow the Legislature to target limited resources on those operations.

Annual reporting of performance measures will not by itself result in better department operations and outcomes. That will require ongoing oversight by the Legislature and administration to ensure that the department is managing to achieve improved outcomes. However, such oversight requires quality information, and to the degree that such information is provided and relied upon, it can result in a more cost-effective state corrections system.

Staff Recommendation. Committee staff recommend that the joint committee direct staff, LAO, DOF, and CDCR to finalize the annual performance outcomes report for consideration in each subcommittee in the coming weeks. The CDCR has notified staff that while it continues to support this effort, it would like more time to review the specific performance measures proposed to ensure consistency with its Strategic Plan which is currently being finalized. The department has agreed to provide its feed back by May 3rd, in time for consideration by the subcommittee prior to the release of the May Revision.

Staff would further benefit from direction on the following details:

- **Content and Format.** Committee staff have shared the latest draft of this report with CDCR (as well as the Receiver's Office). The department has been working with their program staff to identify whether they would recommend any changes to the specific outcome measurements based on what they would consider to be the most appropriate measures of outcomes, as well as what data points are currently collected and available for reporting. (For example, in recent years CDCR has used a program called COMPSTAT to standardize the tracking of programs and activities on a statewide basis.) The committee may wish to direct CDCR to finalize this analysis so that any changes they suggest can be considered before the subcommittees make their final decisions.
- **Statutory Mechanism.** What is the best way to enact the requirement for the department to report annually – trailer bill, budget bill, or supplemental report language? Staff recommend the adoption of trailer bill language establishing the

- ***Elimination of Existing Reporting Requirements.*** The CDCR reports that it is currently subject to dozens of existing reporting requirements in statute. Staff would recommend that the committees consider eliminating many of those requirements if it adopts the staff proposal. This will reduce the need for duplicative and unnecessary reports and allow the department to focus on the production of this more comprehensive annual report. Therefore, the committee may want to direct the department to provide a list of the statutory requirements it would recommend for elimination prior to subcommittee hearings.

Issue 3 – Inmate Population Budget Process

Background. The CDCR receives annual budget adjustments to account for changes in caseload, in particular changes in the number of inmates and parolees housed and supervised by the department. These adjustments generally include resources for food, clothing, inmate health care, administration, and security staffing. The Governor’s population budget request also includes funding for other issues, including inmate mental health caseloads, contracted facilities, and the state’s juvenile ward and parolee population.

The CDCR’s process for creating the population budget request is one that takes several months and is completed twice each year as part of the state’s standard budget process. The first time is as part of the Governor’s budget request submitted January 10 of each year, and the second is as part of the May Revision.

The process of identifying necessary budgetary changes begins with the identification of what change in the inmate and parolee populations is likely to occur. To this end, in the summer of each year, CDCR staff analyze data on recent and historical trends that affect inmate and parolee populations, including numbers of court admissions, parole revocations, average time served by offenders in prison, and discharges from parole. Using this data, CDCR projects the inmate and parolee populations over the next several years. Department staff update their projections in the winter to serve as the basis of the May Revision adjustment.

Using the population projections, the department then creates the Institution Activation Schedule (IAS) for the prisons. The IAS takes the inmate population projections, as broken down by gender and security level, and specifies which housing units at each prison will have to activate or deactivate beds each month in order to accommodate the change in population in both the current and budget years.

Once staff at each institution know how many inmates are projected to be sent to them at various points in the year based on the IAS, they identify how many and what type of positions they would need to provide security and operate other services. Similarly, if the IAS shows that there will be fewer inmates sent to the prison in a year than they now hold, the staffing packages identify what positions at that prison will be cut from the budget. Historically, the department provides for changes in staffing levels based on a ratio of about one staff position for each six inmates. Department policy requires that at least 6 percent of those positions included in each staffing package be for health care staff. Most of the remaining positions are for custody staff, particularly correctional officers, though institutions have flexibility to request other classifications if those would better meet their operational needs.

As with all budget proposals, the population budget request must be approved by the Department of Finance (DOF) and is then sent to the Legislature for consideration. The entire population budget request generally fills about four, four-inch binders, but the department provides the Legislature an abridged version that is usually included in two binders.

Staff Proposal. Staff has proposed that, rather than using a blanket ratio of six to one to make population based adjustments, the CDCR develop ratios based on the level of inmate. For example, Reception Center, Level IV, and inmates in Specialized Housing (such as Security Housing Units) generally require greater attention and thus devotion of more resources than Level I, Level II, or even Level III inmates. Due to the varying levels of resources needed for each type of inmate, the ratios used to determine resource need should tie more closely to the population changes by type of inmate. Staff believes that this could be accomplished in a cost neutral manner for the short term.

Staff also has proposed that the CDCR be allowed the ability to allocate resources to institutions as needed and that the department cease developing the IAS for budgeting purposes. This would not only provide the department flexibility in managing resources but also eliminate the significant staff time that is currently devoted to this task.

Challenges with this approach would be determining the appropriate ratios for each type of inmate and establishing the appropriate method to reduce resources when populations within the varying inmate types decline.

LAO Comments. In its analysis of the 2008-09 Governor's Budget, the LAO noted the following concerns with the CDCR's population budgeting process. The LAO has indicated that, for the most part, these concerns continue to exist:

1. Current Process is an Ineffective Approach to Identify Actual Budgetary Needs.

- a) ***Population projections are done too early to be accurate basis for budget request.*** Because the department's process is complicated and requires many steps to complete, the department is forced to start its population projections—the fundamental basis of the population budget request—very early. A less complicated and more streamlined population budgeting process might allow the department to gather several more months of trend data before completing its projections, thereby improving

the likelihood of more accurate projections and, therefore, budget requests that are closer to the funding level the department really needs.

- b) **IAS is inaccurate and potentially unnecessary.** The IAS usually provides little useful information about how the funding provided under the budget would actually be distributed among institutions while making the budget request unnecessarily complicated. After completing the IAS and calculating the corresponding changes in staffing costs, the department makes a “below-the-line” budget adjustment to tie its total funding request to a separately calculated aggregate estimate of the change in spending that will result from the projected changes in the inmate population. This aggregate estimate is based on CDCR’s marginal cost to incarcerate an inmate.
- c) **Fixed staffing ratio unresponsive to operational needs.** As discussed above, in developing the staffing packages that tie to its population budget request, the CDCR has for more than 20 years utilized a fixed ratio that assumes that, for about every six additional inmates projected to come to a prison, that prison will get one additional staff position. The one-size-fits-all fixed staffing ratio currently employed does not recognize the differences in missions among prisons, perhaps resulting in some prisons being overstaffed, while others are comparatively understaffed.
- d) **Many States Do Not Make Population Adjustments at All.** Most other states base staffing levels on regular assessments of what staff is necessary to operate housing facilities and programs.

2. **Inefficient Use of Staff Resources.** The population budget request—produced twice annually—consists of a document that is literally thousands of pages long and requires many hours of CDCR staff time to produce. This includes staff in headquarters and at each institution to develop the IAS, generate and review staffing packages, and produce fiscal estimates. A simpler and more streamlined process might allow the department to reprioritize some of these staff resources for better use, such as providing more time to dedicate to the development and analytical review of policy-driven budget change proposals.

3. Lack of Transparency.

- a) **Length and Complexity Inhibits Careful Review by Administration and Legislature.** The length and complexity of the population budget request make it difficult to understand how individual components of the total request tie back to the population projections upon which they are ultimately based.
- b) **Population Budget Has Historically Included Non-Caseload Funding Requests.** Legislative staff have been concerned that the department has sometimes included funding requests in the population budget that were not directly a result of caseload changes, but rather policy decisions made by decision makers in CDCR headquarters or institutions.

Staff Comments. In fiscal year 2007-08, the Legislature enacted budget bill language directing the CDCR to improve its current population budget request in order to make it a more transparent document for legislative oversight and to present the reformed population document to the Legislature prior to deliberations of the 2008-09 budget. The requirements of this budget act provision were not met and, subsequently, the Legislature included a

similar provision in the 2008-09 budget and, because the requirements of this provision were not satisfied, the 2009-10 budget once again included such a provision.

The CDCR has revised the population budget request to improve the way in which information is presented, including providing more concise descriptions of each issue. Additionally, the CDCR has indicated the intention to develop a base funding need by institution over the next 18 months, which is a process that has the potential to provide information that will improve the understanding of cost drivers. However, at this point, the majority of the larger issues surrounding CDCR's population budget process remain unresolved.

Staff Recommendation. Direct the CDCR to work with staff and the LAO to develop a method to revise the department's population budget request in a manner that more accurately reflects the needs of the inmate population by security level or specialized housing requirement and simplifies the document that is ultimately submitted to the Legislature. This revised methodology should be presented to the subcommittees for consideration at the beginning of May.

EXAMPLE

CDCR Budget Bill Display Revision

Program Creation Method

Currently:

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 5225-001-0001 | | 7,287,426,000 |
| 10-Corrections and Rehabilitation | | |
| (1) Administration | 396,054,000 | |
| (3) 15-Corrections Standards Authority | 11,945,000 | |
| (4) 20-Juvenile Operations | 255,030,000 | |
| 21-Juvenile Education, Vocations, and | | |
| (5) Offender Programs | 13,125,000 | |
| (6) 22-Juvenile Paroles | 33,747,000 | |
| (7) 23-Juvenile Health Care | 82,699,000 | |
| 25-Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation | | |
| (8) Operations | 5,118,266,000 | |
| (9) 30-Parole Operations--Adult | 826,375,000 | |
| (10) 35-Board of Parole Hearings | 126,328,000 | |
| (11) 40-Community Partnerships | 16,629,000 | |
| 45-Education, Vocations, and Offender | | |
| (12) Programs--Adult | 612,378,000 | |
| Distributed Cost | (205,150,000) | |

Legislative Staff Proposed:

| | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 5225-001-0001 | | 412,683,000 |
| 10-Corrections and Rehabilitation | | |
| Administration | 396,054,000 | |
| 40-Community Partnerships | 16,629,000 | |
| 15-Corrections Standards Authority | 11,945,000 | |
| 20-Juvenile Operations | 255,030,000 | |
| 21-Juvenile Education, Vocations, and | | |
| Offender Programs | 13,125,000 | |
| 22-Juvenile Paroles | 33,747,000 | |
| 23-Juvenile Health Care | 82,699,000 | |
| 35.20-Board of Parole Hearings-- | | |
| Juvenile | 1,000,000 | |
| 5225-007-0001 | | 3,204,367,000 |
| (1) 25.05-Reception and Diagnosis | 40,530,000 | |
| (2) 25.10.10-Security--Posted | 3,159,966,000 | |
| (3) 25.10.20-Security--Overtime | 1,000,000 | |
| (4) 25.15Transportation | 2,871,000 | |
| 5225-008-0001 | | 1,375,716,000 |
| (1) 25.20-Inmate Support | 1,375,716,000 | |
| 5225-009-0001 | | 408,877,000 |
| (1) 25.30-County Charges | 20,819,000 | |
| (2) 25.35-CCFs | 115,445,000 | |
| (3) 25.36-Female Rehab CCFs | 56,002,000 | |
| (4) 25.37-OOS Beds | 216,611,000 | |
| 5225-010-0001 | | 447,159,000 |
| (1) 25.40-Admin | 447,159,000 | |
| 5225-011-0001 | | 826,375,000 |
| (1) 30.10-Supervision-Case Services- | | |
| Parole Operations--Adult | 826,375,000 | |
| (2) 30.20.010-Community Based | | |
| Programs | 11,460,000 | |
| (3) | | |
| 30.30-Psychiatric outpatients Services | 1,000,000 | |
| (4) 30.40-Parole Adult Administration | 1,000,000 | |
| 5225-012-0001 | | 126,328,000 |
| (1) 35.10-Board of Parole Hearings-- | | |
| Parole Revocation Hearings | 126,328,000 | |
| (2) 35.30-Narcotics Addicts Evaluation | | |
| Authority | 1,000,000 | |
| (3) 35.40-Board of Parole Hearings | | |
| Administration | 1,000,000 | |
| 5225-013-0001 | | 617,378,000 |
| (1) 45.10-Academic Education-Adult | 612,378,000 | |
| (2) 45.20--Vocational Education-Adult | 1,000,000 | |
| (3) 45.25-Library | 1,000,000 | |
| (4) 45.30-Substance Abuse Program | 1,000,000 | |
| (5) 45.40-Inmate Activities | 1,000,000 | |
| (6) 45.50-Education, Vocation and | | |
| Offender Program Administration | 1,000,000 | |

EXAMPLE

CDCR Budget Bill Display Revision Program Creation Method

Currently:

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 5225-001-0001 | | 7,287,426,000 |
| 10-Corrections and Rehabilitation | | |
| (1) Administration | 396,054,000 | |
| (3) 15-Corrections Standards Authority | 11,945,000 | |
| (4) 20-Juvenile Operations | 255,030,000 | |
| 21-Juvenile Education, Vocations, and | | |
| (5) Offender Programs | 13,125,000 | |
| (6) 22-Juvenile Paroles | 33,747,000 | |
| (7) 23-Juvenile Health Care | 82,699,000 | |
| 25-Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation | | |
| (8) Operations | 5,118,266,000 | |
| (9) 30-Parole Operations--Adult | 826,375,000 | |
| (10) 35-Board of Parole Hearings | 126,328,000 | |
| (11) 40-Community Partnerships | 16,629,000 | |
| 45-Education, Vocations, and Offender | | |
| (12) Programs--Adult | 612,378,000 | |
| Distributed Cost | (205,150,000) | |

Legislative Staff Proposed:

| | |
|--|--|
| 5225-001-0001 | |
| (1) 10-Corrections and Rehabilitation Administration | |
| (3) 15-Corrections Standards Authority | |
| (4) 20-Juvenile Operations | |
| (5) 21-Juvenile Education, Vocations, and Offender Programs | |
| (6) 22-Juvenile Paroles | |
| (7) 23-Juvenile Health Care | |
| (8) 35.20-Board of Parole Hearings--Juvenile | |
| (9) 25.05-Reception and Diagnosis | |
| (10) 25.10.10-Security--COCF | |
| (11) 25.10.15--Security Overtime | |
| (12) 25.10.20-Security--CCF | |
| (13) 25.10.30-High Security | |
| (14) 25.10.30-Low Security | |
| (15) 25.10.40-Medical Guarding | |
| (16) 25.10.50-Search and Escort | |
| (17) 25.10.60-Housing Unit/Line | |
| (18) 25.10.70-Ancillary | |
| (19) 25.10.80-Perimeter/ingress/Egress | |
| (21) 25.15Transportation | |
| (22) 25.20-Inmate Support | |
| (23) 25.30-County Charges | |
| (24) 25.35-CCFs | |
| (25) 25.36-Female Rehab CCFs | |
| (26) 25.37-OOS Beds | |
| (27) 25.40-Institution Administration | |
| (28) 30.10-Supervision-Case Services-Parole Operations--Adult--Administration | |
| (29) 30.10-Supervision-Case Services-Parole Operations--Adult--Standard Supervision | |
| (30) 30.10-Supervision-Case Services-Parole Operations--Adult--HRSO | |
| (31) 30.10-Supervision-Case Services-Parole Operations--Adult--High Control | |
| (32) 30.10-Supervision-Case Services-Parole Operations--Adult--Any others that make sense. | |
| (33) 30.20.010-Community Based Programs--Treatment Programs | |
| (34) 30.20.090-Community Based Programs--Employment | |
| (35) 30.30-Psychiatric outpatients Services | |
| (36) 30.40-Parole Adult Administration | |
| (37) 35.10-Board of Parole Hearings--Parole Revocation Hearings | |
| (38) 35.30-Narcotics Addicts Evaluation Authority | |
| (39) 35.40-Board of Parole Hearings Administration | |
| (40) 40-Community Partnerships | |
| (41) 45.10-Academic Education-Adult | |
| (42) 45.20--Vocational Education-Adult | |
| (43) 45.25-Library | |
| (44) 45.30-Substance Abuse Program | |
| (45) 45.40-Inmate Activities | |
| (46) 45.50-Education, Vocation and Offender Program Administration | |

CDCR Proposed:

| | |
|---|--|
| 5225-001-0001 | |
| (1) 10-Corrections and Rehabilitation Administration | |
| (2) 15-Corrections Standards Authority | |
| (3) 20-Juvenile Operations | |
| (4) 21-Juvenile Education, Vocations, and Offender Programs | |
| (5) 22-Juvenile Paroles | |
| (6) 23-Juvenile Health Care | |
| (7) 25.10 Security | |
| (8) 25.20 Inmate Support | |
| (9) 25.30 Contracted Facilities | |
| (10) 30.10 Parole Supervision | |
| (11) 30.20 Community Based Programs | |
| (12) 35.10 Board of Parole Hearings Adult | |
| (13) 35.20 Board of Parole Hearings Juvenile | |
| (14) 45.10-Academic Education-Adult | |
| (15) 45.20--Vocational Education-Adult | |
| (16) 45.25-Library | |
| (17) 45.30-Substance Abuse Program | |
| (18) 45.40-Inmate Activities | |

EXAMPLE

CDCR Budget Bill Display Revision

Appropriation by Institution Method

5225-001-0007--For Support of Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Avenal State Prison

Schedule:

- (1) 25.01.001--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Administration
- (2) 25.01.005--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Utilities
- (3) 25.01.010--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Feeding
- (4) 25.01.020--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Clothing
- (5) 25.01.030--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Facility Operations
- (6) 25.01.040 --Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-nmate Employment
- (7) 25.01.050--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Classification Services
- (8) 25.01.060--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Records
- (9) 25.01.070 --Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-nmate Activities
- (10) 25.01.080--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Religion
- (11) 25.01.090--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Security
- (12) 25.01.100--Adult Corrections and Rehabilitations Operations-Reception & Diagnostics
- (13) 45.02.001--Education, Vocation and Offender Programs-Adult-Risk & Needs Assessments
- (14) 45.02.005--Education, Vocation and Offender Programs-Adult-Academic Eduction
- (15) 45.02.010--Education, Vocation and Offender Programs-Adult-Vocational Eduction
- (16) 45.02.020--Education, Vocation and Offender Programs-Adult-OSATS In-Prison Substance Abuse Treatment Pgm
- (17) 45.02.030--Education, Vocation and Offender Programs-Adult-Canteen
- (18) 45.02.040--Education, Vocation and Offender Programs-Adult-Library
- (19) 50.10--Medical Services-Adult
- (20) 50.20--Dental Services-Adult
- (22) 50.30--Mental Health Services-Adult

CDCR Report Card -- Presenting Department Outcomes

Attachment D

Adult Prison Rehabilitation Programs

Budget and Expenditures *(Dollars in thousands)*

| | <u>2006-07</u> | <u>2007-08</u> | <u>2008-09</u> |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Budgeted Expenditures | | | |
| Difference | | | |

Key Performance Measures

Staffing

(As of June 30)

| | <u>2006-07</u> | | <u>2007-08</u> | | <u>2008-09</u> | | <u>CDCR Goal</u> |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| | <u>Approved PY</u> | <u>Vacancy Rate</u> | <u>Approved PY</u> | <u>Vacancy Rate</u> | <u>Approved PY</u> | <u>Vacancy Rate</u> | |
| Classification 1 | | | | | | | |
| Classification 2 | | | | | | | |
| Classification 3 | | | | | | | |

Programs Assessed as Evidence-Based and Implemented with Fidelity

| | <u>2006-07</u> | <u>2007-08</u> | <u>2008-09</u> | <u>CDCR Goal</u> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Total Programs | | | | |
| % Assessed as Being EBP | | | | |
| % Assessed for Fidelity | | | | |
| % Found Adequate or High Fidelity | | | | |

Inmate Education Programs

| | <u>2006-07</u> | <u>2007-08</u> | <u>2008-09</u> | <u>CDCR Goal</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Expenditures | | | | |
| No. I/M Assessed as Needing Program | | | | |
| Percent of I/M Enrolled | | | | |
| Avg. Daily Attendance | | | | |
| Avg. Cost per Participant | | | | |
| Percent Advancing Level | | | | |
| GED/Diplomas Earned | | | | |
| 1-year Recidivism Rate | | | | |

Inmate Vocational Programs

| | <u>2006-07</u> | <u>2007-08</u> | <u>2008-09</u> | <u>CDCR Goal</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Expenditures | | | | |
| No. I/M Assessed as Needing Program | | | | |
| Percent of I/M Enrolled | | | | |
| Avg. Daily Attendance | | | | |
| Avg. Cost per Participant | | | | |
| Completion Rate (success) | | | | |
| Voc. Certifications Earned | | | | |
| % Employed 1 Year Post-Release | | | | |
| 1-year Recidivism Rate | | | | |

Inmate Substance Abuse Programs

| | <u>2006-07</u> | <u>2007-08</u> | <u>2008-09</u> | <u>CDCR Goal</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Expenditures | | | | |
| No. I/M Assessed as Needing Program | | | | |
| Percent of I/M Enrolled | | | | |
| Avg. Daily Attendance | | | | |
| Avg. Cost per Participant | | | | |
| Completion Rate (success) | | | | |
| Percent Attending Aftercare | | | | |
| 1-year Recidivism Rate | | | | |

Other Program Participation Levels

| | <u>2006-07</u> | <u>2007-08</u> | <u>2008-09</u> | <u>CDCR Goal</u> |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| AA/NA | | | | |
| Anger Management | | | | |
| College programs | | | | |
| Family Foundation | | | | |
| Sex Offender Treatment | | | | |