

DRAFT

3/01/07

DOCUMENTATION REPORT

Of the

THE “HEALTHY REENTRY: FROM PRISON TO COMMUNITY” DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Submitted by:

JAMES B. HYMAN

3/02/07

NOTE: Observations, assertions and conclusions put forward in this report are based on interviews with members of the Project Team and other parties as cited herein as well as on participation in team meetings and on materials shared within this project.

DOCUMENTATION REPORT
Of the Planning Effort for
“The Healthy Reentry: From Prison to Community”
Demonstration Project

OVERVIEW

This report was commissioned by the Urban Strategies Council in collaboration with the National Trust for the Development of African-American Men and the Regional Congregations and Neighborhood Organizations. Its intent is to document the process, products and outcomes of a planning effort, launched by the three collaborating organizations, to frame an innovative policy initiative entitled: “Healthy Reentry: From Prison to Community.”

The project was envisioned as a statewide public-private partnership that would develop data, policy and programmatic tools to address the public health and related concerns associated with prisoner reentry in the State of California. Two primary goals were put forward: (1) to assist the state in developing the capacity and infrastructure for effective collaboration with communities and CBOs around the state; and (2) to establish a pilot project that demonstrates the components needed for a comprehensive, effective program of parolee reentry and reintegration into local communities.

At its inception, this project represented a rare, if not unique, convergence of interests among public, private and not-for-profit sectors that could only be described as a “change agent’s dream team.” The project had the attention of and strong personal commitments from: (1) California’s top corrections officials (the Secretary and Under Secretary of CDCR) as project’s eventual policy and program implementers; (2) the CEO of one of the state’s largest philanthropies as the project’s primary funding source; and (3) a team of CEOs from three well-led and highly capable not-for-profits as the project’s architects. It was a policy wonk’s “Trifecta.”

This report however will document how even the most promising of ventures can be overcome by events in ways that produce disappointing results, and ultimately, failure. In the remainder of this report then, we will outline some of the project’s history, explore the project’s outcomes, discuss the developments and dynamics that diminished the project’s potential for impact, and muse a bit about what may lie ahead.

ORIGINS OF THE PROJECT

The history of the California Endowment Planning Grant is a story about collaborative efforts among three sectors operating in partnership to affect change in California’s prisons – government, in the forms of San Quentin Prison and later the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; the not-for-profit sector, in particular the

National Trust for the Development of African American Men (the Trust) , the Regional Congregations and Neighborhood Organizations (RCNO), and the Urban Strategies Council (the Council) in Oakland, CA; and Philanthropy, in the form of the California Endowment.

San Quentin Trust Program as Catalyst

The planning project, which formally began in April 2006, grew out of an 2003 California Endowment (TCE) grant to the Council (on behalf of the Trust) to conduct a “Trust” Program in San Quentin Prison around prisoner health and leadership development. The 2003 project resulted from collaboration between the Trust and Warden to bring the Trust into San Quentin to conduct a demonstration of its leadership development training and its curriculum for personal transformation.

The California Endowment, a \$3.5 billion foundation that resulted from the 1999 for-profit conversion of California health insurance provider Blue Cross/Blue Shield, was interested in supporting the project but asked the Trust to focus its training and curriculum on issues of prisoner health. The California Prison and Community Health Initiative was a first result of this new partnership.

Genesis of the Project Team

Within its first year, the Initiative was already demonstrating promise and both the warden and TCE were seeing evidence of its impact. By then in 2004, TCE was thinking more broadly about its grant-making and programmatic interests in incarcerated men. In particular it was considering how to make its small portfolio of incarceration-related grants more coherent. And there was growing interest in having the Trust connect up with another TCE grantee, RCNO – an umbrella organization for a number of churches in Los Angeles – as a means of having its work in Northern California connect to RCNO’s work that was being supported in Southern California.

Toward that unification, TCE President invited RCNO’s CEO, to accompany him on his first site visit to the San Quentin project. Both were enthused about their on-site experience and the Endowment encouraged the Trust and RCNO to join together in a collaboration that would capture the synergies of the northern and southern California efforts. The result was the current Project Team defined as: the Trust with its in-prison, asset-based, leadership development curriculum; the Council with its Reentry Roundtable experience and data and analytic expertise; and RCNO with its Southern California faith-based, community reentry services and programming. Together the three organizations possess a diverse wealth of experience and expertise that could be expected to align very well with the challenges likely to arise in planning a reentry demonstration.

The Collaboration with the State

Later in 2004, San Quentin’s Warden was appointed to the position of Director of Corrections in CDCR. Because of her avid support for Trust Program, she encouraged the Trust to begin discussions with the state about partnering with CDCR on prisoner reentry. The result was a pivotal meeting in late October 2004 involving her as Director of Corrections, the Secretary of CDCR, the TCE President, and the newly formed Project

Team of the Trust, the Urban Strategies Council and RCNO. They discussed launching a wider demonstration of the Trust curriculum in two institutions – one in the North and one in the South – and combining that with a partnership between the state and selected local communities that would lend more support to the reentry and reintegration of prisoners upon their release. Success with this pilot would support efforts to institute the program statewide.

CDCR was in the midst its own restructuring at that time and the CDCR Secretary felt it lacked the infrastructure to support such a demonstration. TCE responded by offering to support the state in building the necessary infrastructure. The Secretary then turned to the Trust and requested a proposal. In December 2004, a Concept Paper was drafted entitled: *Community-Corrections Partnerships Project: Increasing Public Safety through Community-Corrections Partnerships for Parolee Reintegration*. Its goals and proposed activities and outcomes were as stated in Exhibit A.

On completion of the concept paper a second meeting was held in December 2004 during which the Secretary unveiled a newly drafted plan for restructuring CDCR. The restructuring plan was so compatible with philosophy and work being proposed in Trust's Concept Paper that the conversation shifted from a consideration of the Trust's proposal to forming a partnership with the Trust Project Team to assist CDCR with the restructuring effort and with setting up a new "Partnership" office to work with community relations and reentry issues.

Thus, the collaboration was formed. CDCR agreed to pilot the Trust Demonstration but also to a partnership with the Trust to provide technical assistance and consultation to assist CDCR in its reorganization. To help jump start these efforts TCE pledged to provide a \$100,000 grant to support a planning effort. It was envisioned the planning support would be available within 30 days and that the eventual demonstration would cost approximately \$2 million per year. The entire demonstration budget was to be privately funded. TCE agreed to provide part of that support and to help raised the balance. In addition to the state consultation, the planning grant was to support the Project Team in generating a full proposal for the demonstration. And there was agreement that, if the actual demonstration proved promising, the Department would go to the state legislature for an appropriation for the larger statewide expansion.

So, by the end of 2004, it was understood that the Trust, Urban Strategies Council and RCNO would form a Project Team that would enter a partnership with CDCR for a 1-year planning period, funded by TCE, to assist the department with restructuring and to produce a full blown proposal for a privately funded, two-site demonstration of the Trust's program in the State of California.

PROJECT OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS

A confluence of promising factors: (1) the project's appeal to and positioning among institutions critical to its support; (2) the interest and personal commitments of officials at

the highest levels of those institutions; and (3) the strength and expertise of the Project Team all pointed to a promising collaboration whose results had potential to reshape the state's effort to rehabilitate ex-offenders and enhance local efforts to successfully reintegrate them into their home communities.

By the time of this writing, however, the project had failed to fulfill its promise. Five goals were established for the planning effort as shown below. Exhibit A presents a matrix outlining these goals along with their desired outcomes, and proposed activities and deliverables. Our conclusion in this report is that, though the Project Team (the not-for-profit CEOs) succeeded in producing all of the promised deliverables, it ultimately failed to achieve any of these overarching goals. The primary reason for this failure was the disengagement of CDCR from the effort. Funding delays, political developments, government turnover and partnership dynamics all contributed to this result.

Goals of the Planning Effort

GOAL I: Planning with CDCR for building infrastructure and capacities for community partnerships: CDCR and the Project team will have an improved understanding of the methods by which CDCR and community stakeholders need to work together to improve reentry outcomes.

GOAL II: Reentry data tools: CDCR and the project team will have a beginning set of tools to offer to community groups interested in working with the agency to improve reentry outcomes.

GOAL III: Demonstration program planning: CDCR and the project team will have a concrete plan of action needed to begin implementation of the demonstration project.

GOAL IV: Identify key Latino reentry organizations: CDCR, the project team and TCE will have knowledge of Latino organizations to collaborate with for the demonstration project and for other reentry activities to ensure representation and appropriate cultural competency in addressing reentry issues in the Latino community.

GOAL V: Process Documentation: Produce a report describing project outcomes and factors contributing to the achievement of the outcomes and which helps the project team members improve outcomes.

Central to achieving these goals was the involvement and buy-in of CDCR both as a partner in the effort and as a primary audience for and consumer of its products and outcomes. CDCR's centrality to the project's success resulted from the shift in the project's focus from the original vision of collaborating on a statewide Trust Program Demonstration, to an additional focus on assisting in state restructuring. Ergo, the primary metric for assessing project outcomes became the degree to which the planning effort influenced the prisoner reentry and reintegration thinking and operations within CDCR.

We conclude here, as Exhibit A suggests, that the Project Team was largely successful in pursuing the work and producing the deliverables proposed in the concept paper that guided the effort. It can also be argued that the original vision of a Trust Demonstration has not been foreclosed. But the project failed in its aspirations to influence the

directions and operations of CDCR on matters of ex-offender rehabilitation and/or reentry and reintegration. The following analysis examines factors that contributed to this outcome.

THE ANALYSIS

In hindsight, it would appear that the primary reason for the project's failure is that the Project Team had overreached in setting its project goals by aligning its success too closely with the behavior of CDCR. And while Exhibit A suggests that the Team performed well on most of the activities that were within its span of control, there were too many variables, outside its control, influencing CDCR's directions and behaviors.

Funding Delays

Because of the immediacy of the state's Corrections reform agenda, the Planning Grant project came together quickly – taking less than 60 days, at the conclusion of 2004, to progress from the initial meeting with CDCR to a concept paper and ultimately a \$100,000 proposal to TCE. Funds were expected to become available within 30 days to support an immediate involvement of the project team in helping the state construct its community reentry policies and program agenda.

But beginning in January 2005 (until April 14, 2006), the project went into a hiatus for 16 months waiting for the funds to be awarded. In June 2005, TCE assigned a recently-hired program officer to work with the Project Team's proposal. He was also assigned oversight responsibility for Trust's grant for their work in San Quentin the renewal of which was being considered in the same time frame.

Project team members allege that this staff person was disingenuous in his dealings with the proposal because he had been previously employed by the Council and had been dismissed for poor performance. Interviews with Project Team members produced several allegations of bureaucratic stonewalling and bias that they believed show evidence of his hostility toward the proposal; in particular that he:

- Feigned confusion about the relationship between the San Quentin and Planning Grant efforts as a ruse to decline or defer the grant;
- He insisted that the new proposal be processed through one of the foundation's funding categories rather than as a discretionary item from the President's Office;
- He put the Team through a prolonged process of four or five redrafts and multiple reviews and, at the end of that process decided that a new proposal was still needed because the prior submissions did not fit the foundation's proposal format; and
- He had made disparaging statements about the project both within the foundation and out in the larger community.

The Teams response was to have RCNO take the lead in working with TCE. By October 2005, RCNO was sufficiently concerned to ask the TCE President to intervene and things

begin to move but slowly. The program officer put through a (greatly reduced) grant to the Council for a separate proposal on Reentry Roundtables. And he processed a continuation grant for the work in San Quentin. By December 2005, a full year after the original proposal submission, discussion returns to the planning grant and to a new series of negotiations around how the grant resources should be divided between the foci on Northern vs. Southern California activities. The grant was finally awarded on April 14, 2006 – fully 16 months after the proposal was submitted. Meanwhile the State had moved on with its reorganization.

A Moving Target

The delay would prove costly to the project's ambitions. Plans for restructuring the Department had gone up to the Governor in January 2005 and, through his office, the plans, and the new approach to community partnerships, had been announced publicly with great fanfare. But much of that restructuring effort was dependent on work that was to be assisted and staffed by the Project Team through the planning grant. The delay meant that the partnership with CDCR never materialized and the restructuring effort had to proceed without the Team.

Political Developments Lead to Costly CDCR Turnover

As a separate and initially unrelated matter, the Governor sponsored a Special Election, in January/February 2006, to approve a measure that would require Unions to gain majority consent from their memberships as a requisite for using union dues in political campaigns. This was an attempt to curtail the influence of the state's most powerful union, the CCPOA (California Corrections Peace Officers Association), on the Governor's agenda for reform.

The loss of that election badly damaged the Governor. CCPOA pledged \$10 million to defeat the Governor in the upcoming November election and, as a consequence, caused him to back away from some of the reforms. In the wake of the loss and the subsequent policy shift, the Secretary of CDCR resigned in March 2006. The former Warden and Director of Corrections, who was then Under Secretary, became the CDCR Acting Secretary only to resign herself 6 weeks later.

Members of the Project Team allege that a lack of real progress on a promising approach to the Community Corrections Partnership may have contributed in a small way to the staff turnover. San Quentin's former Warden put it this way:

“From the time you have an idea in state government, it really takes you 18 to 24 months to actually see the sun. Since we were really hoping to get some early wins in this new administration, we were counting on grants – not only this one – but were trying to get some money from the Jett Foundation and some others and none of that came through for us. .. it would have been wonderful if we had had a pilot project .. to show people that we were making an impact on the inmates and their reentry into the fragile communities that they came from. And if we'd had those kind of early successes we wouldn't have been beaten up so badly by the legislature. And when the union came to jump all over us we would have

been able to say, “hey, look, It’s working.” It’s possible that we may have even prevented having turnover at the top.”

By the time the project was funded, in April 2006, the window had closed. The department was in transition. CDCR executives who had fashioned the restructuring effort and who had embraced the partnership with the Project Team were no longer driving the department’s directions. And as a consequence, the Trust team believed it had lost an extraordinary opportunity to reinvent California’s approach to the custody and release of offenders. Indeed, as late as July 2006, the Trust team was uncertain whether the new Secretary had any idea what the Trust team was doing or why.

The Transition to a New and Diminished (Non-) Relationship with CDCR

The out-going secretary appointed the first head of the new Office of Community Corrections Partnerships (OCCP). But by the time the project’s grant was awarded, he had already left and the former Warden, now Acting Secretary would be departing in a matter of weeks. As such, and by default, the new Assistant Director for OCCP and her second in command became the point persons for CDCR’s relationship with the Project Team. And with this transition, the project was implicitly diminished – having declined in stature and visibility from being a priority of the department’s Secretary and Under Secretary to being an inherited responsibility of an assistant director of a small office inside the CDCR bureaucracy.

Still worse, the Office of Community Corrections Partnerships never really engaged with the project. Only two of the monthly meetings scheduled with OCCP ever took place (in May and September 2006). And for the past six months, the Project Team has been unable to get its phone calls returned.

CDCR Charts Its Own Course

By July 2006, CDCR had established a new reentry division labeled the Office of Reentry and Recidivism Reduction in response to the state legislature. Its role is to assert proprietary authority over policy and programming issues related to reentry, prisoner release and reintegration, and recidivism. At this writing, the status of Community Partnerships Office is still unclear but it is expected that it will be incorporated into this new division.

In August 2006, the Governor called a Special Session of the Legislature to address Prison Overcrowding and Recidivism. One result that set the state’s directions for reentry was the Governor’s proposal to build ten, 500-bed, secure facilities in high volume reentry communities to which male inmates would be transferred for reentry programming six months before their scheduled release. A just-released paper by Jeffrey Lin at UC Irvine¹ outlines some recommended directions for this effort. The new reentry division is expected to draw heavily from this report in implementing this program.

¹ Lin, Jeffrey and Susan Turner. February 2007. *Considering Secure Reentry Centers in California*. Center for Evidence-Based Corrections. University of California at Irvine.

As another part of the Governor's program development effort, CDCR created a Task Force in December 2006. The task force has been given the charge to think about implementation (e.g., flesh out the details of the governor's reentry proposals and advise CDCR on how to proceed). This includes: (1) evaluating reentry programs and identifying best practices; (2) making recommendations about the look, feel and operations of the secure facilities; (3) suggesting criteria for determining which inmates should be eligible for "treatment" in these facilities; (4) considering the community and service supports that should be provided; and other related matters. At the time of this writing, it was suggested that the Office of Community Corrections Partnerships that had been a priority in the former CDCR administration has been marginalized by these developments and may itself be waiting for direction from this task force and the new division.

So, while the failure of OCCP to fully engage with the Project Team has been a large concern and disappointment, it is not at all clear to what extent OCCP is driving the state's directions in reentry policy and programming. More important to the project may be pursuing a relationship with the new reentry division and its task force.

The Project Team

As we stated earlier and as Exhibit A attests, in spite of their inability to achieve larger goals, the three CEOs who constituted the Project Team did manage to persevere during the 16-month hiatus and to accomplish much of what they intended by way of pursuing and producing the deliverables promised in their proposal. But even these results were not easily achieved.

Though each of the CEOs maintained a healthy respect for each other's position and capacity, there were several points of tension as follows:

- RCNO felt that, given the tensions with the program officer, assuming the lead role with TCE forced it to use some of its good will with the Endowment to smooth over a problem that it did not own.
- Relatedly, in relinquishing that role, the Council and the Trust, as the original protagonists for the project with CDCR, found themselves in the awkward position of relying on an "unknown" newcomer to their initiative to be the spokesman for the project.
- Moreover, the CEOs of the Council and the Trust share a bond and a trust built on a decades old personal and professional relationship whereas RCNO came to the partnership as a relative unknown.
- The roles of their respective organizations gave the CEOs different perspectives on some outcomes from the project. In particular, the Council and the Trust were focused on the program demonstration as primary whereas RCNO was also deeply invested in the need for policy reform outcomes.
- Lack of mutual understanding of the organizational capacities of each of the partners led to tensions around work products and time tables.
- Resources dedicated to the project proved insufficient to cover Team member costs. Each exceeded the resources available for the work.

These tensions were all at least partially of function of the way the Project Team came together. The partnership was forged by TCE as part of its interest in bringing more coherence to its grant portfolio dealing with corrections issues. It did come together organically – as a result of three organizations deciding to work together on the basis of their histories and a full understanding of each others work, capacities, and potential contributions to a joint effort.

PROSPECTS GOING FORWARD

It is difficult to predict what the future holds for this effort. The intent, in addition to assisting with CDCR’s restructuring was to deliver a two-site – Northern and Southern California – demonstration that featured five program components:

1. ***A data and information system*** that supports assessment, planning, implementation and evaluation decision making at the community level;
2. ***A mechanism for local community engagement in reentry planning and action*** that engages the community and builds the capacities of all stakeholders to effectively participate in assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation decision making;
3. ***A program for personal transformation and pre-release preparation*** that begins well in advance of release and focuses on personal transformation, developing appropriate values and behaviors and preparation for reentry focused on changing parolees from a “liability to an asset” in both perception and reality;
4. ***An intensive focus on the initial post-release period*** and delivering the services and supports identified in release plans; and
5. ***Policy and practice reforms*** at the institutional and community levels to increase the rate of successful reintegration.

While, as we have reported, the project has not succeeded in its efforts to involve or influence CDCR in or by its work, the prospect of proceeding with parts of this demonstration design (subject to its conformance with the directions being identified by the CDCR Task Force and its new reentry division) are not necessarily foreclosed.

There may still be some opportunity to influence CDCR’s directions and mount a demonstration if the Project Team can connect with the Task Force and become a party to its deliberations around best practices that can be brought to bear in operationalizing the Governor’s proposals.

EXHIBIT A

**A SUMMARY OF THE STATUS OF GOALS, OUTCOMES ACTIVITIES AND DELIVERABLES
FOR THE HEALTHY REENTRY PROJECT
2.26.07**

GOAL	OUTCOMES	ACTIVITIES	DELIVERABLES	STATUS	SUMMARY ANALYSIS
I. Planning with CDCR for building infrastructure and capacities for community partnerships	1. CDCR and the Project team will have an improved understanding of the methods by which CDCR and community stakeholders need to work together to improve reentry outcomes.	1. Monthly Meetings with the Staff of Division of Community Partnerships 2. Learning-Articulating to Agency's Related Activities	1. Prepare a set of recommendations to the CDCR's Division of Community Partnerships detailing methods of establishing and maintaining effective community engagement that increases successful reentry and reintegration of parolees back into the community	Planning w/ CDCR's Division of Community Partnerships has not proceeded as expected. 1. Only two face-to-face team meetings w/ CDCR have occurred (in May and Sept of '06) since the beginning of the project. 2. CDCR staff has since become increasingly unresponsive to the team and, over the past several months, have not been returning phone calls. 3. The report of recommendations will document the lack of collaboration w/ CDCR.	Collaboration with CDCR to work with the Office of Community Corrections Partnerships failed. No real constituency in state government for the project's findings/outcomes. 1. TCE Funding delay of 16 months stalls project development and allows windows of opportunity to close. 2. Political Turbulence: Turnover in Top level CDCR staff after Governor loses Special election. New leadership team has no real commitment to the project or the project team. 3. State momentum: funding delays combined with the leadership turnover left the state to begin developing its approach independently from the Project Team.

GOAL	OUTCOMES	ACTIVITIES	DELIVERABLES	STATUS	SUMMARY ANALYSIS
<p>II. Reentry data tools</p>	<p>1. CDCR and the project team will have a beginning set of tools to offer to community groups interested in working with the agency to improve reentry outcomes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Obtain mapping layers and data on parolees returning to Los Angeles County 2. Clean, analyze and prepare maps of parolees returning to Los Angeles County 3. Clean and analyze data on recidivism patterns among parolees in Alameda County 4. Prepare report containing descriptive analysis of Los Angeles Parolees 5. Prepare a report containing analysis of patterns of recidivism among Alameda County parolees 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop report containing descriptive statistical analysis and maps of parolees returning to Los Angeles County 2. Develop report containing analysis of patterns of recidivism among parolees for Alameda County 3. Develop a report outlining basis data tools that community stakeholders need for effective planning and assessment of reentry programs and activities 	<p>Urban Strategies Council succeeded in: accessing and using data to produce reports that can inform community reentry efforts; and creating a set of data tools.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban Strategies Council (the Council) completed the L.A. County Parolees Report including the zip code analysis. 2. Data from CDCR was never “refreshed” beyond June 2005 as necessary for the traditional 3-year recidivism report analysis. So the Council is doing an “in-lieu-of” analysis of career criminality using the data at hand. 3. The Report on Data Tools is in progress. 	<p>The effort to establish data tools has been a success but the potential impact of this data capacity as a statewide resource for improving reentry outcomes is uncertain.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council had succeeded in establishing a good working relationship with CDCR research staff that had facilitated access to data. However CDCR turnover among Executives and Research Staff resulted in diminished access and a lack of updates to the data. 2. The result of the data collaboration has been the production of several quality reports that offer important information that can be very useful to communities and organizations interested in improving reentry outcomes. 3. It is not clear whether or to what extent the community efforts of CDCR will use these reports and data tools as resources for dissemination in their work with communities statewide.

GOAL	OUTCOMES	ACTIVITIES	DELIVERABLES	STATUS	SUMMARY ANALYSIS
<p>III. Demonstration program planning</p>	<p>1. CDCR and the project team will have a concrete plan of action needed to begin implementation of the demonstration project</p>	<p>1. Demonstration Planning Work with CDCR and community stakeholders to conduct specific planning for the demonstration project in Northern and Southern California.</p> <p>2. Reentry Roundtables A reentry roundtable or similar vehicle is called for in the concept paper to support community engagement in reentry planning and action.</p> <p>3. Trust Program Curriculum Adaptation</p>	<p>1. Develop a written plan detailing the Activities needed to implement the demonstration program in Northern and Southern California.</p> <p>2. Prepare a written adaptation of the Trust curriculum suitable for delivery as a part of the demonstration program in a Southern California correctional facility.</p> <p>3. Gain agreement among key stakeholders in Northern and Southern California to support initiation of countywide reentry roundtables</p>	<p>The Trust and the Council have drafted a plan for implementing the demonstration in NorCal.</p> <p>1. NTDAAM has drafted the plan for implementing a “Trust” program.</p> <p>2. RCNO will receive a \$14 million grant from CDCR to begin a demonstration in L.A. County that will include a Trust Program.</p> <p>2. NTDAAM completed the Trust Curriculum revision for San Quentin based on revisions made by the inmates. It is available for use in Southern California.</p> <p>3. The Council has reached Tentative agreement for a countywide reentry roundtable in Alameda County.</p> <p>4. RCNO has separately established a Reentry Health Roundtable in Alameda County.</p> <p>5. RCNO submitted a section on “post-release services.”</p>	<p>No joint planning (w/ CDCR) for specific SoCal or NorCal demonstrations efforts have taken place. CDCR has launched its own directions for issues of community corrections, recidivism and reentry without consultation with the project team.</p> <p>1. CDCR issues \$4 – 5 million RFP for Community Corrections;</p> <p>2. Governor proposes 10 new, secure 500-bed reentry facilities for male prisoners.</p> <p>3. White paper is prepared as part of State plans to create new Office of Reentry and Recidivism Reduction.</p> <p>4. The relationship of this new office and its mission to that of the Office of Community Corrections Partnership, originally advocated by the project team, is unknown.</p> <p>Rather than influencing the state’s approach, the project team will have to adapt its programming to CDCR’s models and frameworks in order to get state support.</p> <p>Prospects for a Trust-like statewide</p>

GOAL	OUTCOMES	ACTIVITIES	DELIVERABLES	STATUS	SUMMARY ANALYSIS
					<p>demonstration stemming from the Project Team's collaboration appear uncertain.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State directions for their reentry and community efforts have not been informed by the work of the project team so that CDCR's RFP is not fashioned on the Trust's model. 2. The pending \$14 million grant to RCNO, one of the team member organizations, may undercut the original demonstration goal if it is construed as the second-site expansion that was sought in the original proposal.
<p>IV. Identify key Latino reentry organizations</p>	<p>CDCR, the project team and TCE will identify Latino organizations to collaborate with in the demonstration project and in other reentry activities to order to ensure representation and cultural competency in addressing reentry issues in the Latino community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct outreach to identify Latino organizations 2. Develop a database for storing and retrieving information on organizations, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A report identifying Latino organizations engaged in reentry work and detailing the nature of their involvement (service delivery, policy advocacy, peer support, etc.) 	<p>RCNO identified 72 Latino organizations in CA with focus on the Bay Area and Los Angeles County and interviewed 31 of them. 23 of 31 organizations surveyed by phone reported being Latino-led.</p>	

GOAL	OUTCOMES	ACTIVITIES	DELIVERABLES	STATUS	SUMMARY ANALYSIS
V. Process Documentation	1. Produce a report describing project outcomes and factors contributing to the achievement of the outcomes and which helps the project team members improve outcomes	1. Attend selected meetings of the project staff 2. Review and summarize background and program documents 3. Interview project team members and selected partners 4. Prepare report	1. A report describing project outcomes and factors contributing to the achievement of the outcomes		