PROCEEDINGS OF THE PROPOSITION 36 IMPLEMENTATION MEETING

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL & DRUG PROGRAMS

NOVEMBER 5, 2001
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PAGE 5 AGENDA

PAGE 7 SACPA PROGRAMS AND PARTICIPANTS: IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

PAGE 9 BUILDING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVES

EMERGING ISSUES:

PAGE 10 CAPACITY BUILDING

PAGE 11 COUNSELOR CERTIFICATION

PAGE 12 CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES

SERVICE DELIVERY CHALLENGES:

PAGE 13 CULTURAL COMPETENCY

PAGE 14 DUAL DIAGNOSIS

PAGE 15 SACPA EVALUATION

PAGE 16 PAROLEE ISSUES

APPENDICES

I UC SAN DIEGO CONFERENCE SURVEY

II MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY

III LIST OF ATTENDEES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 5, 2001, the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) convened the Implementation Meeting regarding Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA). The purpose of the meeting was to provide a forum to support successful implementation of Proposition 36. Three representatives from each California county were invited to attend the meeting to discuss implementation issues and challenges.

ADP Director Kathryn Jett welcomed participants and provided a high-level overview of Proposition 36. Director Jett outlined the objectives for the meeting as:

- Dissemination of information
- Updates on Proposition 36
- Continuation of the building of collaborative relationships
- Discussion of implementation issues and challenges

She said that, "On the eve of the first anniversary of the passage of Proposition 36, it is appropriate that we are here to discuss and share our assessment of progress so far." Director Jett emphasized that Proposition 36 has come a long way in the last twelve months guided by the three primary implementation principles of:

1) local control
2) using this first important year as a baseline
3) collaboration

Dr. Andrea Kopstein, Branch Chief of the U.S. Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) which provided funding and co-sponsored the meeting, discussed "CSAT's Role and Future Initiatives." Dr. Kopstein explained CSAT's mission and activities, and discussed its role in providing technical assistance and federal funds to California. She highlighted the importance to CSAT of Proposition 36 and its successful implementation, and encouraged the audience to visit CSAT's web site for more information about its programs and activities. Dr. Kopstein emphasized the need for collaboration among all the players in the implementation of Proposition 36.

ADP Deputy Director Del Sayles-Owen of the Office of Criminal Justice Collaboration provided the State Report. The status of key items in California's implementation strategy were discussed. Ms. Sayles-Owen talked about the importance of establishing a base to share knowledge by providing forums for information exchange and training. The first such forum, "Proposition 36 - Making It Work," was held in May 2001, in San Diego. Participant responses and evaluations from the 425 conference attendees were excellent. "Making It Work 2002" is planned for March 24-27 2002, in San Diego. Teams of six members from each county will again be invited to participate and will include representatives from law enforcement; criminal justice; the judiciary; probation and parole; Boards of Supervisors; county alcohol and drug programs; local treatment providers; and special populations such

as American Indians. The purpose of the conference will be to identify and define program models based on county reports, evaluation data, and audits.

Ms. Sayles-Owen also reported on the Fifty-eight County Plan Summary that was released by ADP. Highlights included:

- 51 counties require drug testing of SACPA clients using non-SACPA funding sources. Six of the seven counties who did not respond affirmatively to this question are waiting to see what state funds become available.
- 53 counties selected behavioral health professionals to provide assessment and placement services to SACPA-eligible clients.
- 53 counties reported expending funds in FY 2000/01, and 55 of the counties have excess funds they plan to expend in future years.
- The average percentage of funds being budgeted for FY 2001/02 is 92.1percent (range 48.5percent to 100.0percent).
- The average percentage of budgeted funds being spent on services (drug treatment and other services) is 79.1 percent (range 51.5 percent to 100 percent); and the average percentage budgeted for criminal justice activities is 20.9 percent (range: 0 to 48.5 percent).
- 55 counties projected an increase in total capacity of services during FY 2001/02.
- The expected increase in total capacity for medium and large counties is about 40 percent to 43 percent. The expected increase in total capacity is much higher among the 37 small counties. Some of the small counties that have no capacity will grow at exponential rates. With those counties excluded, the expected increase is about 42 percent.

The summary is posted on the ADP web site at www.adp.ca.gov/SACPA/prop36.html

During the update of regulations, potential areas of policy change highlighted included client fees, construction and purchase costs, drug education services, out-of-state treatment facilities, and stakeholder involvement in county planning.

Ms. Sayles-Owen concluded her presentation with an update on the drug testing legislation, Senate Bill 223. It has been signed into law with an appropriation of $8.4 million to be distributed to the counties for drug testing of Proposition 36 clients.

The evaluation of the Proposition 36 program was also described. ADP created an Evaluation Advisory Group to assist the Department and UCLA, the evaluator, in designing and overseeing the annual and long-term evaluation. There are four evaluation goals:

- Conduct independent and rigorous assessment of SACPA
- Link research on SAPCA and similar initiatives (e.g., Arizona)
- Communicate findings to state and national audiences
- Identify implications for criminal justice and treatment policy

The evaluation will focus on four domains: cost benefit; client outcomes – crime and drug use; client outcomes – employment, welfare participation, and family well being; and lessons learned.
The morning agenda continued with sessions of counties divided into six like-size groups: small, medium, and large. The facilitated sessions examined implementation issues at the county level and explored Proposition 36 client profiles. Melody Heaps, President of Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities, presented a consolidated report from these sessions at the end of the day.

The afternoon general session addressed the topic of "Building and Maintaining Effective Collaboratives." Discussion focused on the experiences of Sacramento and San Diego counties in developing, building, and maintaining effective collaboration.

Three breakout sessions followed to discuss emerging issues of Capacity Building, Counselor Certification, and Cross-Jurisdictional Issues. These were followed by workshops on Cultural Competency, Dual Diagnosis, Evaluation Overview, and Parolee Issues. County representatives discussed current practices, issues, concerns, learning experiences, and future strategies.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Director Jett thanked the participants and expressed her pleasure with the collaboration of involved parties at county and state levels. She urged all agencies to continue the spirit of collaboration as the vehicle to implement Proposition 36. She assured the audience of ADP's commitment to provide leadership for successful implementation and to turn every new challenge into an opportunity to improve the process and achieve common goals.

AGENDA

8:30 - 9:00	**REGISTRATION**
9:00 - 9:05	**OPENING**
9:05 - 9:20 ***General Session***	**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS** KATHRYN P. JETT, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS
9:20 - 9:30 ***General Session***	**REMARKS** ANDREA KOPSTEIN, PH.D., M.P.H., CHIEF, PROGRAM EVALUATION BRANCH, CENTER FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT
9:30 - 10:00 ***General Session***	**STATE REPORT** DEL SAYLES-OWEN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE COLLABORATION, ADP
10:00 - 10:15	**BREAK**
10:15 - 11:30 ***Breakout Sessions***	**SACPA PROGRAMS AND PARTICIPANTS: IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES** MODERATOR: MELODY HEAPS, PRESIDENT, TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR SAFE COMMUNITIES **LIKE-SIZED COUNTY BREAKOUT SESSIONS**
11:30 - 1:00	**LUNCH**
1:00 - 2:00 ***General Session***	**BUILDING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVES** MODERATOR: HONORABLE JUDGE STEPHEN MANLEY, CO-CHAIR JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA COURTS PANELISTS: TONI MOORE, ADMINISTRATOR, SACRAMENTO COUNTY ALCOHOL AND DRUG SERVICES THE HONORABLE TALMADGE JONES, SACRAMENTO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT STEVE DEROSS, ASSISTANT PROBATION OFFICER, SACRAMENTO SUSAN BOWER, SAN DIEGO HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY KAREN DERWIN, SPECIAL PROJECTS MANAGER, SAN DIEGO SUPERIOR COURT
2:00 - 3:00 ***Breakout Sessions***	**EMERGING ISSUES:** **CAPACITY BUILDING** MODERATOR: REBECCA LIRA, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION, ADP PANELISTS: CONNIE MORENO-PERAZA, ADMINISTRATOR, STANISLAUS COUNTY ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS TRISH STANIONIS, DIRECTOR, THE EFFORT, SACRAMENTO **COUNSELOR CERTIFICATION** MODERATOR: WILLIAM DEMERS, PRESIDENT, COUNTY ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA PANELISTS: TOM AVEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PROGRESS HOUSE ROBERT CRUTCHER, PRESIDENT, CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE COUNSELORS

WARREN DANIELS, CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE COUNSELORS
DR. DAVE MCCULLOUGH, CALIFORNIA ALCOHOL AND ADDICTION RECOVERY RESOURCES
ANGELA STOCKER, PRESIDENT, CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG EDUCATORS

CROSS JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES
MODERATOR: DAVID DEITCH, PH.D., PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
PANELISTS: HONORABLE JUDGE STEPHEN MANLEY, CO-CHAIR, JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA COURTS
DENNIS HANDIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
MAUREEN BAUMAN, DIRECTOR, ADULT SYSTEM OF CARE, PLACER COUNTY HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ED MCNAIR, CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PRISON TERMS

3:15 - 4:15
Breakout Sessions

SERVICE DELIVERY CHALLENGES
CULTURAL COMPETENCY
MODERATOR: CONNIE MORENO-PERAZA, ADMINISTRATOR, STANISLAUS COUNTY ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS
PANELISTS: FRANK LEWIS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATOR
PHIL SMITH, MODOC COUNTY HEALTH SERVICES
MARTIN MARTINEZ III, NATIVE AMERICAN CONSTITUENT COMMITTEE

DUAL DIAGNOSIS
MODERATOR: PETER BANYS, M.D., CALIFORNIA SOCIETY OF ADDICTION MEDICINE
PANELISTS: MARC BONO, PH.D., CONTRA COSTA COUNTY ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS, PROPOSITION 36 COORDINATOR
MEL VOYLES, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
JIM O'CONNELL, DIRECTOR, SOCIAL MODEL RECOVERY SYSTEMS, INC.

SACPA EVALUATION: AN OVERVIEW
MODERATORS: SUSAN NISENBAUM, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF APPLIED RESEARCH, ADP
LARRY CARR, PH.D., SACPA EVALUATION COORDINATOR, OFFICE OF APPLIED RESEARCH, ADP

PAROLEE ISSUES
MODERATOR: LESTER JOHNSON, PRESIDENT, CALIFORNIA PROBATION PAROLE AND CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION
PANELISTS: HONORABLE JUDGE STEPHEN MANLEY, CO-CHAIR, JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA COURTS
CHRIS GEIGER, CALIFORNIA TREATMENT CONSORTIUM, WALDEN HOUSE
JOE OSSMANN, CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PRISON TERMS
SHARON JACKSON, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

4:15 - 4:30

REPORT OUT FROM IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES BREAKOUT SESSIONS
MELODY HEAPS

4:30 - 5:00

CLOSING REMARKS AND EVALUATION
KATHRYN P. JETT

SACPA PROGRAMS AND PARTICIPANTS: IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

Six concurrent breakout sessions were held. Participants were divided into small, medium, or large county groups, and responded to five questions:

1. What are the three biggest challenges your county has faced with implementing Proposition 36?
2. What have been the differences your program has experienced in expected client profile and client actual profile?
3. What is your anticipated or expected impact on capacity of treatment to accommodate Proposition 36 defendants?
4. What is your experience with ancillary services?
5. What are your technical assistance needs?

Melody M. Heaps, President of Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities, Inc. presented a summary of the input gathered from the like-sized county breakout sessions on implementation issues. Major areas of focus were:

1. CAPACITY

Counties cited a shortage of treatment capacity and continuum of care for clients requiring intensive, inpatient care as important issues. The need for increased residential capacity is critical for most. Small counties reported that their current low Proposition 36-client referral rate does not support capacity building of a full continuum of care. While regional approaches to enhance the range of treatment options and increase capacity may present solutions, smaller counties expressed concern that if regional treatment capacity is developed, it could be vulnerable to domination by larger counties. Homeless clients also present capacity challenges. Engagement, motivation, and retention of staff were viewed as both a capacity and a staffing issue.

2. CLIENT PROFILES

Counties reported serving Proposition 36 clients with more severe addiction and more extensive criminal histories than anticipated during the planning. There is concern that higher need clients will exhaust available funds, resulting in funding and services gaps for clients still needing treatment. Dual diagnosis is a critical issue, as is the lack of access to Mental Health services for dually diagnosed clients.

3. COLLABORATION AND COMMUNICATION

Collaborations and cooperation between stakeholders on the local level are not holding in some areas. It is proving difficult to maintain collaborations that are broad-based. Communication and marketing to stakeholders and communities on effectiveness of program is needed. Counties requested direct access to senior state policy makers.

4. **CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES**
   Effective procedures need to be identified for handling cases that cross jurisdictions. Cross-jurisdictional issues were cited by a majority of counties as a concern.

5. **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDS**
   Counties reinforced the need for technical assistance to strengthen client engagement, motivation, and retention. Access is needed to service and treatment models and Best Practices, as well as to treatment and policy experts. There was a recommendation that a coordinated technical assistance program or services be made available to counties. Models and Best Practices should be utilized including: engagement, motivation, and retention of staff and clients; assessment and treatment matching; pharmacological management; effective intervention and sanctions; and effective collaboration systems.

   Participants requested that technical assistance and support on data collection and financial management requirements associated with Proposition 36 be provided, as well as access to state of the art knowledge and training in the science of addiction and recovery. Local access to experts in treatment and policy is seen as unmet need.

6. **ANCILLARY SERVICES**
   The importance of ancillary services, their role in treatment of Proposition 36 clients, and adequate funding for those services were discussed. Ancillary services are part of good treatment -- but there was agreement that timing is everything.

BUILDING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVES

Moderator: The Honorable Stephen V. Manley, Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara

Panelists: Susan Bower, Proposition 36 Coordinator, County of San Diego Alcohol and Drug Services
Steve DeRoss, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Sacramento County Probation Office
Karen Derwin, Project Manager, Proposition 36 Implementation Planning, San Diego Superior Court
The Honorable Talmadge Jones, Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
Toni Moore, Administrator, Sacramento County Alcohol and Drug Services

Panelists' presentations included:

- Recent data from four large counties. Judge Manley reminded the audience that the data was preliminary and he urged them not to draw conclusions on the emerging data.

- The discussion regarding Sacramento County focused on how they have built and maintained their collaboration through a community approach. The Proposition 36 Steering Committee includes the District Attorney, Probation Office, Superior Court, Parole, Sacramento Alcohol and Drug Services, as well as other stakeholders. The committee meets regularly to discuss impediments to implementation and resolution strategies.

- Toni Moore presented preliminary data showing that, in Sacramento County, a higher percentage of Proposition 36 clients were requiring residential treatment. This is substantially higher than had originally been projected.

- San Diego County provided an overview of their implementation, emphasizing the coordination with the San Diego Superior Court. To ensure an inclusive implementation approach, there were three primary planning and program development tiers established. These are: a policy committee; a steering committee; and implementation development teams consisting of legal, case management, training, and treatment.

- A question and answer period for the audience developed additional ideas about successful strategies for effective collaboratives. Questions centered on how to get courts more engaged with Proposition 36. The panel provided recommendations on developing steering committees involving the principal agencies.

EMERGING ISSUES: CAPACITY BUILDING

Moderator: Rebecca Lira, Deputy Director, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs

Panel: Connie Moreno-Peraza, Administrator, Stanislaus County Alcohol and Drug Programs
Trish Stanionis, Director, The Effort

Panelists' presentations included recommendations to:

- Develop a comprehensive continuum of care for Proposition 36 clients. This continuum should include an array of services that might be needed by clients and their families at different times depending severity of their problem/difficulty (addiction). These could include residential, day treatment, intensive outpatient, outpatient, case management, aftercare, and other services.

- Develop more Sober Living Environments (SLEs) as a strategy to increase service capacity, in particular for those clients who may need residential treatment. Instead of residential treatment, clients could use day treatment and stay in an SLE during the night to remain drug free.

- Develop culturally competent services by language, gender, age, and geographic area as methods to increase access to services. Hire bilingual/bicultural staff who are qualified and trained to provide culturally competent alcohol and drug services. This will help increase service capacity to all clients and their families.

- Involve diverse clients, families and communities in Proposition 36 planning, implementation, and monitoring to ensure buy-in and inclusion. This would be way one to avoid "Not-In-My-Backyard (NIMBY) issues. The inclusive process should be used at all times, not just with Proposition 36. Seek input from these groups via meetings, e-mails, letters, forums, bulletins, and other means. This strategy works well when groups are involved in the process from the beginning to the end.

EMERGING ISSUES: COUNSELOR CERTIFICATION

Moderator: William Demers, President, County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California

Panel: Tom Avey, Progress House
Robert Crutcher, President, California Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors
Warren Daniels, California Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors
Dr. Dave McCullough, California Alcohol and Addiction Recovery Resources
Angela Stocker, President, California Association of Alcohol and Drug Educators

Issues discussed by the panelists were:

- There is the need for adopted statewide standards for counselor skills, competencies, and training. Suggestions included: 1) oversight by ADP; and 2) utilizing the California Coalition of Addiction Certifying/Credentialing Organizations (CCACCO) as the initial oversight group, which then would report to ADP. Minimum requirements are needed for sobriety time before becoming a counselor. There are currently two and four-year counseling institutions which require two years of sobriety before beginning classes.

- In his veto message on SB 537 (Counselor Certification), the Governor directed ADP to develop counselor certification. Licensure is seen as a separate issue from counselor certification, and there was concern expressed that efforts to develop licensure standards would override counselor certification efforts. There is also an issue raised about the use of licensed or certified practitioners such as Marriage and Family Therapists (MFT) or Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) certification for addiction counseling.

- Counselor pay is seen as a critical issue. Counselors should be paid competitive wages. The recommendation was made to work to increase funding in general, but if public funding is not adequate then seek private grant funding to pay counselors.

- There is the need for a distinct and defined career ladder for counselors and for training personnel within current facilities.

- While the variety of certified people working in the field is enriching and adds to the learning possibilities, coordination and cooperation between individuals is critical to success.

- Other professionals in the field, representatives of ethnic groups, and people in different levels of recovery could provide additional diversity.

EMERGING ISSUES: CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES

Moderator: David Deitch, Ph.D., Professor, University of California, San Diego

Panelists: Maureen Bauman, Director, Adult System of Care, Placer County Health and Human Services
Dennis Handis, President, Chief Probation Officers Association of California
Honorable Judge Stephen Manley, Co-Chair, Judicial Council of California Courts
Ed McNair, Chief Deputy Commissioner, California Board of Prison Terms

Issues discussed by the panelists were:

- While treatment is to occur in the county of residence, this may not be addressed in local implementation plans and there is no standard protocol. The lack of a protocol has resulted in a myriad of practical applications. To address the issue, Memoranda of Understanding are in development by some smaller northern counties.

- Probation supervision is a major concern because of the volume of cases. The Chief Probation Officers Association members feel that they have been left out of the mix regarding accessing funds to address probation needs.

- The Chief Probation Officers Association is conducting a survey to identify the capacity of each county to provide courtesy supervision. A legislative fix may be necessary to effect courtesy supervision statewide.

- Focus should be on the Superior Courts obtaining removal of parolee holds to expedite their eligibility determination under Proposition 36. At the parole unit level, out of custody cases need to be identified so that the court can move forward to enjoin Proposition 36-eligible parolees into the system. Whenever possible, in-custody parolee holds should be avoided by early determination of eligibility through coordination with Board of Prison Terms and the California Department of Corrections Parole Division.

- Multiple holds on in-custody parolees and parolees that are Proposition-36 eligible are an issue. The courts and probation need to establish ground rules to address in-custody parolees and probationers on out-of-county holds.

SERVICE DELIVERY CHALLENGES: CULTURAL COMPETENCY

Moderator: Connie Moreno-Peraza, Stanislaus County, Alcohol and Drug Administrator

Panelists: Frank Lewis, Riverside County Alcohol and Drug Programs Administrator
Martin Martinez III, Native American Constituent Committee
Phil Smith, Modoc County Health Services

Panelists discussed:

- Approaches for developing culturally competent services such as consumer involvement, family involvement, mental health involvement, and alternative/complementary involvement.

- Availability of culturally competent services, such as plan resources directory; cultures represented on staff; staff trained in cultural competency; treatment adapted to cultural groups; and availability of culturally competent instruments including screening, intake, and assessment.

- Access to culturally competent services including linguistic capacity, consumer/family education activities, culturally competent environment, transportation, agency-provided mobile-based services, and convenient hours for culturally competent services.

- With respect to tribal government, inclusion in the planning stages of substance abuse treatment programs. There were also suggestions to start a Red Road Program at tribes across the state and to establish a Native American Desk at the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs to provide a state-level contact for tribes.

- There is a need for cultural competency workshops with county Alcohol and Other Drugs staff members, probation, courts, and public defenders.

SERVICE DELIVERY CHALLENGES: DUAL DIAGNOSIS

Moderator: Peter Banys, M.D., California Society of Addiction Medicine, San Francisco

Panelists: Marc Bono, Ph.D., Contra Costa County Alcohol and Drug Programs, Proposition 36 Coordinator
Jim O'Connell, Director of Social Model Recovery Systems, Inc.
Mel Voyles, California Department of Mental Health, Sacramento

Issues discussed by the panelists were:

- Overview of the impact of various abused substances on the brain.
- Discussion of how, once introduced into the system, substances linger and cause reactions from the brain for long periods after the use is discontinued. An example presented was the use of LSD and the associated "flashbacks" that can occur even years after the last use of the substance, or even long after the first and only use of the drug.
- There is mounting evidence that some individuals have a genetic predisposition to substance abuse.
- Among jail detainees with severe mental health disorders, a majority have co-occurring substance abuse disorders.
- Those diagnosed with co-occurring disorders need to receive collaborative substance abuse treatment and mental health treatment.
- A source of information and assistance in this area is the National GAINS Center that gathers information designed to influence the range and scope of mental health and substance abuse services provided to people in the criminal justice system.

SERVICE DELIVERY CHALLENGES: SACPA EVALUATION

Susan Nisenbaum, Deputy Director of the ADP Office of Applied Research and Dr. Larry Carr, SACPA Evaluation Coordinator discussed the evaluation process for Proposition 36. The Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act requires ADP to evaluate the program statewide. The Act specifies annual and long-term (longitudinal) components of a study that will evaluate the "effectiveness and financial impact of the programs that are funded pursuant to the requirements of the act." The evaluation will "include, but not be limited to, a study of the implementation process, a review of lower incarceration, cost reductions in crime, reduced prison and jail construction, reduced welfare costs, the adequacy of funds appropriated, and other impacts or issues ADP can identify."

The evaluation is being conducted by the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Integrated Substance Abuse Programs (ISAP). The first evaluation report will be posted on the SACPA Evaluation web site. Assisting in designing, conducting and disseminating findings from the evaluation process is the Evaluation Advisory Group, a multidisciplinary body of members from the probation, parole, courts, treatment provider organizations, county administrators, other state departments, and public and private research organizations.

In order to maximize resources, focus counties will be used to address certain research questions. This technique will alleviate the burden of all counties collecting all data elements, while still addressing important research issues.

SERVICE DELIVERY CHALLENGES: PAROLEE ISSUES

Moderator: Lester Johnson, California Probation Parole and Correctional Association

Panelists: Chris Geiger, California Treatment Consortium, Walden House
Sharon Jackson, California Department of Corrections
Honorable Judge Stephen Manley, Co-Chair, Judicial Council of California Courts
Joe Ossmann, California Board of Prison Terms

Issues discussed by the panelists were:

- Logistics regarding Parole and the Board of Prison Terms (BPT) and the need for a consistent referral process at the local level, as well as a reporting system for parolees.
- Release of inmates into the Proposition 36 system and the number of parolee referrals.
- Dual referrals and dual supervision for county probation and parole and the conflicts that can arise. Courtesy supervision rather than dual supervision was also discussed.
- Drug testing requirements should be part of the cooperative process between probation and parole.
- Method for referrals to residential treatment for those with dual diagnosis of mental illness and substance abuse.
- There is a problem with BPT releasing parolees prior to the appointment time.
- Review of eligibility and exclusionary criteria.
- Confidentiality issues in regard to CFR 42 and the suggestion that a multi-disciplinary approach could resolve confidentiality issues when developing waivers.