

Analysis of California Prison Programs that Promote Rehabilitation

AP Research

April 28, 2018

Word Count: 4991

### **Abstract**

Minimal research has been conducted on public prison programs in California and whether they are effective in promoting rehabilitation. This issue is crucial, as California has one of the highest recidivism rates in the country, and prison overcrowding has become a major issue. The purpose of this study is to analyze California's main prison programs pertaining to the general population (not including programs focusing on mental health or substance abuse) and assess what these programs are doing to promote rehabilitation, which is directly related to decreasing recidivism rates. A recidivist, for the purpose of this study, is defined as an individual who is incarcerated in a state prison, discharged, and returned to prison within three years. Programs were compared to seven criteria and either passed, failed, or partially passed each standard.

## Introduction

For decades, California has been experiencing a crisis of overcrowding in state prisons. When the prison population peaked at 168,000 inmates (about 200% over capacity) in 2006, residents as well as government officials recognized something had to change (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), 2007).

In 2011, Governor Jerry Brown introduced Realignment, designed to decrease the number of inmates and prevent recidivism. In 2011, a court case was filed due to severe overcrowding and lack of health care for prisoners. The court demanded the total number of inmates in all 33 state prisons be decreased to 137.5% of design capacity by 2013 (CDCR, 2017). This deadline was extended to 2016, and it was confirmed in the report submitted to the court that California had reached 135.7% (Shah, 2017).

Although the general prison population has been steadily decreasing since 2011, recidivism rates have not changed significantly (Bird, Grattet, Nguyen, 2017). According to a 2014 report, inmates released from California state prisons had a recidivism rate of 61.0%, about 4% lower than the rate in 2006 (CDCR, 2014 & 2006). In the official reports of the CDCR, the recidivism rate is determined by dividing the number of inmates that return by the total number of inmates. Currently, prisons have been implementing new programs with the aim to reduce recidivism.

This study aims to assess the prison programs in California to evaluate how effectively each program promotes rehabilitation and what can be changed to provide optimal results, as well as evaluate how the Realignment movement has changed prison programs. California was

chosen because it currently has the highest recidivism rates in the United States as well as extremely overpopulated prisons.

### **Literature Review**

Rehabilitation is directly related to recidivism, as successful rehabilitation of an inmate often results in a permanent reintegration into society, and no recidivism. Usually, an inmate is considered rehabilitated when they are “ready to rejoin society” (Shah, 2017).

### **Types of Programs**

Prison programs often fall under one or more of four general categories: educational, vocational, life skills, and substance abuse (CDCR Expert Panel, 2007). For the purpose of this study, substance abuse programs and classes targeting sex offenders will not be assessed. Although these are important for certain inmates, they typically do not relate to the entire inmate population and therefore will not be included in this study.

Educational programs often involve academic classes designed to aid inmates in getting the necessary education resulting in an easier transition back into society, as well as meet the educational requirements for many occupations. Generally, inmates completing one or more of these programs are much more successful after leaving prison than those who do not. In a study conducted in Ohio, Minnesota, and Maryland, the recidivism rate dropped from 31% to 21% if inmates participated in educational programs (CA Corrections Independent Review Panel, 2006). Although the study mentioned does not focus on California, it shows the potential these programs possess.

Programs involving vocational training are the most common prison programs in California. Inmates in these programs are able to gain experience necessary for obtaining a job

outside of prison. Programs in this category can range from providing actual job experience to teaching inmates skills such as money management, that can aid inmates in obtaining and maintaining a job once released. In the United States, 94% of all prisons, both federal and state, offer vocational programs (MacKenzie, 2006). Work that inmates do in prisons gives them experience, helps maintain the institution, and often supplies the government with needed goods (Wolfgruber, 2010). Although the concepts of this type of program seem very beneficial, many have proven to be unsuccessful. The only current explanation is “*some* programs work for *some* people at *some* locations” (Petersila, 2004).

Programs involving life skills often focus on teaching inmates anger management, decision-making, and other abilities that are helpful in the process of successfully reentering society after prison. Programs involving life skills can vary greatly, as there are countless skills that are considered beneficial. There has been significantly less research on these programs than others; most studies involving the assessment of life skills programs did not use statistical testing, and the two that did were not able to find any significant differences in recidivism rate (Wolfgruber, 2010).

### **Programs Already Assessed by the CDCR**

Although most programs remain unassessed, the CDCR has conducted some evaluations of California’s prison programs in 2007. Five prison programs were evaluated:

- The Family Foundations Program (FFP)
- The Incarcerated Youth Offenders (IYO)
- Reentry Education

- Substance Abuse Program at California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility-Yard F (SAP-SATF)
- The Transitional Case Management Program-Mental Health Services Continuum (TCMP-MHSCP)

The CDCR used a list of 20 criteria (see appendix) to assess these programs (CDCR Expert Panel, 2007). A criterion could either be passed (all of the aspects were met), partially passed (some of the aspects were met), or failed (none of the aspects were met).

The first program the CDCR assessed was the Substance Abuse Program at California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility. This program takes place in a prison designed specifically for offenders sentenced to prison because of substance abuse. Fifteen criteria were met, while three were partially met (CDCR Expert Panel, 2007).

The Family Foundations Program (FFP) centers on family reunification. Mothers with a history of substance abuse and a sentence of 36 months or less can choose this therapeutic community setting as an alternative to prison. FFP passed 12 criteria, partially met 1, and failed the other 7 (CDCR Expert Panel, 2007).

Also evaluated was the Transitional Case Management Program-Mental Health Services Continuum (TCMP-MHSCP). This program consisted of social workers that supplied resources and opportunities necessary for a successful reentry. This program passed 10 criteria and partially met two (CDCR Expert Panel, 2007).

The Incarcerated Youth Offenders (IYO) is a program focusing on promoting rehabilitation for juvenile offenders. This program only passed 7 criteria, while partially meeting 2 and failing the rest (CDCR Expert Panel, 2007).

Another program, Reentry Education, only met 5 criteria and partially passed two (CDCR Expert Panel, 2007). It is a program designed to prepare inmates for a reentry into society by giving them instruction on daily life skills.

Although the CDCR did thoroughly assess these programs, the evaluation shows a large gap in research on the effectiveness of prison programs. Out of the five, three were designed for specific groups of people. The two targeted towards the general inmate population (Reentry Education and TCMP-MHSCP) did not do very well in terms of passing criteria. No programs proved to be completely successful.

All five programs failed two very important criteria. None of the programs changed their curriculum to tailor it to each individual participant, and no programs assessed the risk of a participant. These are both vital to the rehabilitation process, as each individual learns and is motivated differently. If the way something is taught is altered based on an individual's learning style, the individual has a much higher likelihood of obtaining and remembering the information. Assessing the risk of an inmate will help staff determine who is at high risk for returning to prison after release, and who needs more resources and attention.

This is the only official evaluation done by the CDCR, so no other programs have been officially assessed. The CDCR study was conducted in 2007, before the Realignment movement, and the prison system has changed since then. Programs now have a specific focus on rehabilitation, and there are currently very different programs than a decade ago.

This lack of information calls for more research done on this subject, as the programs evaluated were not available to and targeted towards the general prison population.

## Methods

Originally, this study focused on one specific aspect of prison programs promoting rehabilitation: violence risk assessments. The study aimed to compare the use of risk assessments in both California and the Netherlands to assess what the Netherlands was doing that kept one third of their prisons empty. Four surveys were designed, and the necessary paperwork was filled out in order to request the participation of all four survey groups. However, all requests were denied due to confidentiality. No other data was available on this topic, so it was necessary to broaden and generalize the study.

The study shifted to an analysis of prison programs in California, with one of the criteria involving risk assessments. Programs in the Netherlands were not able to be evaluated because no list of programs or information about each program was available. In this study, changes will be suggested to correct ineffective aspects of programs in California, and the most beneficial combination of programs will be determined.

To evaluate prison programs, a meaningful scoring list needed to be developed. The CDCR model used in their Expert Panel on Adult Offender and Recidivism Reduction Programming in 2007 was used as a starting point. While they compared programs to twenty criteria, this study will only focus on the seven main criteria proven to reduce recidivism. The six criteria that had evidence proving their correlation with rehabilitation were chosen, and the seventh criterion was added to determine whether a program was accessible to the majority of public institutions. The list is as follows:



1. Assesses risk and targets high risk- it is essential to target high-risk offenders to give resources to those who are the greatest threat to the public, and to those who are most in need.
2. Assesses criminogenic needs and delivers services accordingly- criminogenic needs are traits of an individual relating directly to the likelihood of the individual to re-offend.
3. Uses cognitive-behavioral or social learning methods- this helps offenders understand the thoughts and emotions influencing specific behaviors.
4. Program dosage varies by level- programs should offer different levels of the curriculum based on the ability or experience of an individual.
5. Continuum with other programs- this includes continuity with families of offenders, the community, and other pro-social support programs.
6. Responsive to learning style, motivation, and culture of offenders- programs pass this criteria if they change curriculum for each individual
7. Available at majority of adult prisons- minimum availability of 20/33 institutions (60%).

These criteria have been proven to promote rehabilitation as well as decrease recidivism in the majority of inmates who partake in programs containing these standards. A study done by D.A. Andrews and his colleagues found assessing and targeting high risk (criterion 1), targeting criminogenic needs (criterion 2), and using styles of treatment matching to inmates' needs and learning styles (criteria 4 and 6) all were important in lowering recidivism rates (Andrews, 1990). Using these methods, according to Andrews, was effective in all settings, and this appropriate treatment has the potential of lowering recidivism rates by 50%. Two different studies conducted by F.S. Pearson (2002) and R.P. Seiter and K.R. Kadela (2003) both found

using cognitive-behavioral styles (criterion 3) can significantly reduce recidivism rates. Criterion 5, continuum with other programs, demonstrates that a different perspective has reviewed the program's curriculum and methods. According to a report from Connecticut assessing factors that influenced recidivism, this builds strong networks that can bridge prison and reentry, which reduces recidivism (Recidivism Reduction Committee, 2012). Lastly, criterion 7 was added to assess whether a program is implemented statewide.

All criteria were weighed equally (no criterion was considered more important than another), because they have all proven to be of equal importance in promoting rehabilitation.

Eight programs were selected for analysis using the official listing of all prison programs on the CDCR website. Programs regarding mental health, juveniles, and substance abuse were not included, which left seven programs to be evaluated. Academic Courses (which includes Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Education Development (GED), and High School Diploma (HSD)), Voluntary Education Program (VEP), Career Technical Education (CTE), Transitions Program (TP), Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Long-Term Offender Program (LTOP), Step Down Program (SDP), and the Arts In Corrections (AIC) programs were all chosen for evaluation.

The general description for each program provided by the CDCR, which included a summary, locations, program length, eligibility, and enrollment, was used to obtain the information needed to compare the program to the seven criteria. A program partially met a criterion when only some of its locations applied this standard, or if it only applied to some of the inmates.

## Findings

Of the eight programs reviewed, none passed all seven criteria. However, as portrayed by Figure 1, some programs passed the vast majority of the criteria.

**Figure 1**

Name	AC	VEP	CTE	TP	CBT	LTOP	SDP	AIC
Type of Program	Education	Education	Vocational	Vocational	Life Skills	Life Skills	All	Other
Assesses risk	✘	✘	✘	✓	✓	○	✓	✘
Assesses criminogenic needs	✘	✘	✘	✘	✓	✓	✘	✘
Uses cognitive-behavioral methods	✘	✘	✘	✘	✓	✓	✘	✘
Dosage varies by level	✓	✓	✓	✘	✓	✓	○	✘
Continuum with other programs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✘	✘	✓	✓
Responsive to individual learning style	✘	✘	✘	✓	✓	✓	✘	○
Available at majority of adult prisons	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✘	✘	✓

✘: Failed      ✓: Passed      ○: Partially Passed

The basic Academic Courses programs in CA state prisons include three main programs: ABE, geared towards inmates with reading skills below the ninth grade level, and GED and HSD, which give inmates the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma. The programs are available in every institution, and works with the Department of Education, fulfilling the requirements for two criteria. The program dosage does vary by level, as there are programs for inmates' reading levels specifically and education levels in general. In ABE, there are three levels: ABE I for reading levels below 3.9, ABE II for levels between 4.0 and 6.9, and ABE III for levels between 7.0 and 8.9. These are determined by the Test of Adult Basic Education assessment, which every inmate has to take before being placed into any of the Academic Courses programs.

However, the Academic Courses programs do not change any aspects of the curriculum based on the individual. High-risk inmates do not get priority, as the results of violence risk assessments (a test that determines the risk of recidivism for an inmate) are not considered. Like a traditional classroom, all students are taught using the same methods, and therefore the program does not deliver services according to each individual's criminogenic needs. In relation to this, the programs are not responsive to inmates' personal learning style and motivation. No cognitive-behavioral or social learning methods are used, because that is not the purpose of these programs. The main goal is to provide inmates with education they can use once they are reintegrated into society.

Therefore, the programs falling under the AC pass three criteria, while failing four. Although many criteria were failed, this program is still able to achieve its goals. It was created to provide inmates with education which they can use as tools to obtain jobs after prison. This program is effective when combined with other programs aimed towards rehabilitation.

The Voluntary Education Program offers inmates the opportunity to continue their education after AC. This is a very open program, and offenders can leave at any time. College degrees are offered, and participants are given academic support, including tutoring and limited access to textbooks. It is available at all institutions, and the program works with 22 California Community Colleges. The program provides different levels based on the level of education each inmate has prior to enrollment in VEP. However, since this program is very hands-off, no specific measures are made to provide any services for individual inmates. Due to this, the four criteria involving this were failed.

Overall, the VEP passed three criteria and failed the other four. Once again, this program is not focused on rehabilitation. It only provides inmates with the tools they need to obtain a higher education.

The Career Technical Education program provides experience in six different career sectors. Twenty different jobs are offered, and inmates get the opportunity to gain employment skills and enter a possible career pathway. CTE is offered at all institutions and partners with a variety of companies that provide work opportunities. The program has two different levels, depending on the amount of skills the inmate wants to acquire. The other four criteria, however, were failed. There are no eligibility requirements, so the inmates are not chosen based on the results of violence risk assessments. Since this program functions like an occupation for inmates, the program does not change based on an individual's needs.

CTE passed three criteria and failed four. The program acts as a job opportunity, and does not aim to rehabilitate the participants.

The Transitions Program is a vocational program targeted towards inmates close to being released from prison. It teaches inmates money management, employment, and financial literacy skills to prepare them for the competitive job market. TP is offered at all institutions and partners with the Division of Adult Parole Operations' Community Transition Program to help inmates acquire jobs after release. This program is responsive to inmates' learning styles, as each inmate is given the tools they need, and they are taught lessons individually, giving the staff an opportunity to assess what each individual needs to attain the necessary information. TP does target high risk, as inmates are placed there through the Classification Committee, which utilizes violence risk assessments. There is only one level of the program, so the program dosage does

not vary. There are no cognitive-behavioral methods used and criminogenic needs are not assessed.

The Transitions Program passed three and failed four criteria. Once again, it is not designed to provide rehabilitation. It aims to aid inmates in the process of finding a job after they are released into society.

Cognitive Behavioral Treatment teaches inmates how to identify and change destructive thoughts influencing bad behavior. It takes a hands-on approach to solving problems that has been found to transform thinking patterns and behaviors. Areas of treatment include substance use disorder treatment, anger management, criminal thinking, and family relationships. CBT only failed one criterion, as it does not work with any programs. The program targets high risk, as it uses the Classification Committee to place inmates. It assesses criminogenic need, adapts the course for each individual's needs, and uses cognitive-behavioral methods, as this is the basis of the entire program.

CBT passed the most criteria out of every program. It passed six and only failed one. The program is focused on rehabilitating inmates by helping inmates change thoughts that negatively affect behaviors.

The Long-Term Offender Program is a voluntary program that provides cognitive behavioral therapy to inmates who are suitable for parole. Individual and group lessons target substance use, criminal thinking, anger management, family relationships, denial management, and victim impact. It is only available at six institutions, and does not work with other programs. LTOP partially passed the first criterion because, although many participants do get placed into the program through the Classification Committee, some join the program voluntarily. Therefore,

not all inmates are assessed using violence risk assessments when entering the program. It does pass criterion two, as an offender has to have an assessed criminogenic need to enter the program. Just like CBT, all other criteria were passed.

The LTOP failed two, partially passed one, and passed the rest. It is very similar to CBT; however, it is more detailed and focuses on more factors causing negative behaviors.

SDP, or the Step Down Program, is a program that gives inmates in a Security Housing Unit (SHU) or a Restricted Custody General Population (RCGP) an opportunity to experience some of the same programs other inmates do. Inmates receive interactive journaling, group facilitation, VEP, elective programming, and pro-social videos. The program targets high risk inmates, as these are often the only ones sent to the SHU or RCGP. It works with other programs, such as the VEP. It partially passed criterion four, as it never had the opportunity to do so. The participants already have a high risk, so there is no need to vary each level. SDP does not assess criminogenic need, use cognitive behavioral therapy, and it is not responsive to learning styles of each inmates, as these classes are general and do not look at each inmate individually. SDP is only available at two institutions.

The Step Down Program only fully passed two, partially passed one, and failed the other four. Although this is a great concept, the program still needs to develop more. It is fairly new, and is only implemented in two prisons.

The Arts in Corrections program is designed to give offenders the opportunity to express themselves and create self-awareness through a variety of art programs. AIC is available at all institutions, and partners with contractors that teach the art classes. It is partially responsive to the learning styles of inmates, since only some programs under the AIC are. It varies by

institution and by contractor. The program does not assess risk, assess criminogenic need, or use cognitive-behavioral treatment. The AIC does not vary by level.

The AIC passed two, partially passed one, and failed four criteria. This cannot be considered a particularly rehabilitative program. However, it does give inmates a creative outlet, and provides participants with an opportunity to learn new skills and create new hobbies.

### **Discussion**

The eight programs chosen for this study had differing levels of success based on the criteria. The number of criteria passed, however, somewhat correlated with the category a program fell under.

Both educational programs failed and passed the same criteria. It can be inferred from this data that most programs offering general education will not focus on rehabilitating inmates.

AC programs are much more interactive than VEP; teachers engage students with interactive lessons which correspond to the College and Career Readiness Standards. In order to provide inmates with more opportunities, the VEP could become much more involved with its participants. Although the AC programs are effective, they do not provide any education higher than a high school diploma. If the VEP provided classes and lessons similar to those of the programs falling under Academic Courses, recidivism rates could potentially drop. Often, it is difficult to get hired with only a GED. Inmates who obtain a Bachelor's Degree in prison will be much more likely to be able to get a job once they are released. A steady job often promotes rehabilitation, so recidivism rates might drop.



The few studies (mentioned earlier) existing on the topic suggest educational programs are the most effective in reducing recidivism; however, this study found it did not contain the majority of aspects that often point towards rehabilitation.

Both vocational programs averaged slightly better than the educational programs, but not by much. Once again, these programs do not focus on rehabilitation; they simply provide inmates with experience and the possible motivation to continue doing the job after release. Although they are not very effective in promoting rehabilitation, they do reach their goal. Both programs prepare inmates on the economic struggles they may face when released from prison. Therefore, no major changes should be made, as both CTE and TP promote rehabilitation in ways other than the standards that the criteria include.

The conclusions drawn in this study regarding vocational programs are similar to those drawn in other studies previously mentioned. Although they do provide inmates with job experience, they do not do much to reduce recidivism.

The two programs falling under life skills did the best out of all eight programs. Both programs used cognitive behavioral techniques to change offenders' mindsets. They used many of the strategies proven to reduce recidivism. The LTOP curriculum does cover more problems (such as denial management and substance abuse), but it is only offered at six institutions. The only suggested changes that can be made is either to provide LTOP at every institution or to expand the CBT curriculum to include more common issues, and to modify the eligibility so more inmates get the opportunity to participate. This has proven to be the most beneficial type of program, so more offenders than just those who were assigned CBT due to test results can benefit from this type of rehabilitation.

Studies regarding life skills have not found anything of significance. However, this study found life skills programs to be the most effective, and should be implemented more.

The SDP, although it does not meet many criteria, has potential. Recommendations for this program would be to both make it available at more institutions and implement either CBT or LTOP as part of the curriculum. High-risk inmates housed at the SHU or RCGP are often the offenders most in need of rehabilitation and cognitive behavioral therapy.

Although the AIC only fully passed two criteria, there are no recommended changes. This program is not meant to rehabilitate inmates directly; it aims to provide entertainment. By keeping inmates happy and inspired, it motivates them to perform better in other programs.

Generally, there are some changes to be made to programs to provide the most beneficial results. However, they are not very drastic and they are achievable. The most optimal results for an inmate will happen if he or she participates in one program per category. If an offender can obtain an education, gain work experience, and go through cognitive-behavioral therapy, there will be a high chance of rehabilitation.

All programs provide some sort of benefit for an inmate; however, some are more effective than others. Assuming inmates can participate in as many as they wish, a timeline of what programs to take and when has been determined. An offender should be advised to take either AC or VEP, depending on the education level, right away. This gives him or her enough time to obtain a diploma of any kind and gain an advantage when having to join the workforce upon release. The inmate can be given the opportunity to join CTE, but this should not be necessary, as this should only be advised if he or she wishes to gain experience in the fields offered. He or she should be highly advised to participate in LTOP or, if it is not offered at the

institution, CBT. This should be the program that is most stressed (and even possibly required), as it has proven to be the most beneficial in promoting rehabilitation. AIC should remain completely optional, as it does not correlate with rehabilitation, but merely gives inmates a chance to form a hobby. Lastly, the inmate should be pushed to engage in TP for last two months before their release. This is very important, and will be very beneficial to the offender.

Although each program can benefit participants in some way, the three most important programs are AC, LTOP, and TP. The combination of the three covers all criteria, and therefore gives inmates the resources and knowledge necessary to fully rehabilitate and be successful once released.

For inmates in maximum security, the SDP is the only program offered, and therefore those inmates should be encouraged to participate in as many aspects of the SDP's curriculum as they can.

Based on these results, the push for more rehabilitation due to Realignment has improved prison programs. Programs such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and the Long-Term Offender Program have been implemented, which provide a specific focus on reducing recidivism. Vocational programs have also shifted in focus, as instead of only providing work experience, some also aim to teach inmates skills such as financial literacy skills. Although the recidivism rate has not significantly decreased, the potential for such a decrease to occur is great. As programs become more available and inmates are able to experience them for a longer amount of time, the efforts put into place to reduce recidivism will successfully rehabilitate more inmates. Since inmates have not been exposed to these relatively new programs for a significant amount

of time, the long-term effects cannot be seen yet. However, as more inmates are exposed to these programs, recidivism rates will decrease, and long-term effects will be evident.

### **Limitations**

Because there was very limited research done on California's prison programs, information had to be taken from the CDCR. Although this mostly ensures an unbiased summary of each program, there is always a chance the CDCR is omitting details. It was not possible to view the programs in person due to confidentiality issues, so the information gathered is not firsthand. There is always the possibility of bias, and the only way to produce truly unbiased results is to observe the programs in person. Due to confidentiality, much of the study's intended research was not conducted. There is very minimal existing data on prison programs, so the programs could not be assessed in more detail.

### **Conclusion**

Since 2007, when the CDCR evaluated programs in institutions across California, prison programs have improved drastically. There is a greater focus on rehabilitation, as Governor Brown's Realignment movement is pushing for less inmates and a lower recidivism rate. Although many more criteria were met, there are still improvements to be made. No program passed all criteria, and inmates must participate in more than one program to obtain everything necessary for a successful return to society.

In educational programs, more opportunities should be given to inmates wanting a college degree. Although the focus should still mainly be on learning to read and obtaining a GED, more support should be given to those who have already graduated high school. Vocational programs could offer more variety in the jobs provided, but they generally do not

need to change much. Programs such as CBT and LTOP could increase availability as well as include more areas of negative thinking. However, they are generally the most beneficial, and already use many techniques that tend to decrease recidivism. The AIC should not be viewed as a program that promotes rehabilitation, but it does provide a creative outlet. Lastly, the SDP can be expanded to include more programs.

Currently, the main problem is that some programs are not available, or that there are limited resources. However, this can be solved over time, as the slow decline in the prison population will cause an increase in funding for expenses other than inmates' basic care. These funds can be used to improve programs and implement them statewide. Governor Brown is still pushing forward with his Realignment movement, and prison populations are slowly dwindling. Ultimately, with the proper resources, recidivism rates can be decreased drastically and the current overpopulation problem will be much closer to resolved than before.

### **Call for Future Research**

It is recommended that more research be conducted on these eight prison programs, including smaller ones targeting specific groups, such as substance abuse programs. Extensive observation of each program in action would be very beneficial in providing a more detailed and thorough analysis. Additionally, a study comparing the recidivism rate of inmates that participated in a program to the rate of those that did not is recommended.

### References

- Bird, M., Grattet, R., Nguyen, V. (2017). Realignment and recidivism in California. *Public Policy Institute of California*.
- California Corrections Independent Review Panel.(2006) Reforming California's Youth and Adult Correctional System.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2007). Expert panel on adult offender and recidivism reduction programming. *CDCR*.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2013). Outcome Evaluation Report. *CDCR*.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2007). Recidivism reduction program inventory. *CDCR*.
- D.A. Andrews et al. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28(3).
- Davila-Centeno, M. (2016). Prison programs to reduce recidivism: What is the ideal structure of an inmate reentry program? *University Honors Theses*, 323.
- James, N. (2015). Offender reentry: Correctional statistics, reintegration into the community, and recidivism. *Congressional Research Service*.
- MacKenzie, D. (2006). What works in corrections: Reducing the criminal activities of offenders and delinquents. *Cambridge University Press*, 90.
- O'Connor, R. (2014). The United States prison system: A comparative analysis. *Graduate Theses and Dissertation, University of South Florida*.

Pearson et al. (2002). The effects of behavioral/cognitive-behavioral programs on recidivism.

*Crime and Delinquency*, 48(3).

Petersila, J. (2004). what works in prisoner reentry? Reviewing and questioning the evidence.

*Federal Probation*, 62.

Pryzbylski, R. (2008). What works: Effective recidivism reduction and risk-focused prevention

programs. *RKC Group, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice*.

Recidivism Reduction Committee. (2012). Evidence-based reentry initiatives devoted to

strengthening positive social relationships. *Connecticut State*.

Shaw, R. (2018). The meaning of rehabilitation and its impact on parole. *Routledge Innovations*

*in Corrections*.

Seiter, R., Kadela, K. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is

promising. *Crime and Delinquency*, 49(3).

Wolfgruber, H. (2010). Reducing recidivism in the state of California: An evaluation of

California's prison and parole programs. *CMC Senior Theses*, 18.

## Appendix

### 20 Criteria Used in CDCR Study:

1. Assesses risk and targets high risk
2. Assesses criminogenic needs and delivers services accordingly
3. Theoretical model clearly articulated
4. Has program manual and/or curriculum
5. Uses cognitive-behavioral or social learning methods
6. Enhances intrinsic motivation
7. Continuum with other programs
8. Program dosage varies by risk level
9. Responsive to learning style, motivation and culture of offenders
10. Uses positive reinforcement
11. Staff has undergraduate degrees
12. Staff has experience working with offenders
13. Staff recruitment and retention strategy
14. New staff training
15. Program director qualifications
16. Program data collected and analyzed
17. Rigor of evaluation studies
18. Best practices and/or expert panel recommends
19. Evaluation study appeared in peer-reviewed publication
20. Extent and consistency of evaluation results