

PART THREE

AMITY OUTCOMES

Outcomes / Drug Use in Prison

- ◆ Warden Ratelle conducted two complete surprise tests of ALL men in the Amity unit, no TC or custody staff were warned: all men locked down in their cells at the same time and not released until all had given a urine specimen
- ◆ In one test, only **one** man of 200 was positive for drugs.
- ◆ In the second test, **none** of the men tested positive.




Outcomes / Institutional Mgmt.

- ◆ “A result of a careful and detailed study of adverse behavior incidents among inmates in the therapeutic community environment contrasted to inmates not in treatment shows, across all types of disciplinary infractions, a lawful and strikingly significant less number in such reports among the ‘**Amity**’ treatment population.”
- ◆ David Deitch, Ph.D, Director of the Addiction Technology Transfer Center at UCSD (1998)

Outcomes / Institutional Mgmt

- ◆ In a six month period, the average number of serious disciplinary write ups in a 200 person housing unit at R.J. Donovan was **53**
- ◆ In the Amity unit there were only **7**
- ◆ This is **87%** lower



Outcomes / Benefits to CDC staff

- ◆ “ There is a similarly positive striking reduction of work injury, sick leave and other personal quality of life/cost impact among custody assigned to the treatment unit { **Amity** } versus officers in all other yards and housing units.”
- ◆ David Deitch, Ph.D, Director of the Addiction Technology Transfer Center at UCSD (1998) *From a six month study conducted by UCSD at the RJ. Donovan Correctional Facility between January 1, 1997 and June 30th, 1997.*)

Comments by the Warden



J.M. Ratelle, Warden
1994 Testimony
to the U.S. Senate,
Judiciary Committee

“The unit that the program {Amity} is in is a safer environment for correctional officers to work in, gives them an opportunity to be more involved, and there are less write-ups on the program participants resulting in cost savings for management.”

“The inmates in the Amity program are some of the most incorrigible inmates in the correctional system. They are “one of the hardest groups of people to work with, with an average of at least eight years of prison time, strong gang affiliations, a long history of substance abuse, and violent backgrounds.”



What does it cost?

- ◆ **Cost of Amity in-prison & aftercare = \$ 12,720**
- ◆ **Cost of Reincarceration:**
 - **@ 5.3 Months (Parole RTC) = \$ 9,483**
 - **@ 20 Months (New Term) = \$ 35,783**
 - **@ 55 Months (2nd Strike Offense) = \$ 98,404**
 - **18 Years (3rd Strike Offense) = \$386,460***
 - ***minimum cost**

Outcomes/Recidivism Reduction

- ◆ Comparisons of Inmates who did **NOT** participate show that **3/4ths** of them were back in prison three years after release.
- ◆ But only about **1/4** of the Amity participants who completed the program were in prison.

From a study conducted by
H. Wexler, Ph.D. 1998
NDRI funded by NIDA



Outcomes / Cost benefits

- ◆ The average social cost of a sample of Amity participants in the year prior to their last incarceration was over **\$93,000**. On a lifetime basis, each of these men had, on average, accounted for social costs in excess of **\$1,500,000**.
- ◆ Most of the Amity participants were 3rd strike candidates, with a mean expected cost to the California Department of Corrections of their next conviction in excess of **\$500,000** each.



Outcomes / Cost benefits

- ◆ The 1997 Legislative Analyst's Report on Prison Population growth determined that if the Amity results could be replicated through an expansion of substance abuse treatment to 10,000 beds over seven years, the state would not have to build an additional 4,700 beds. That scenario would also result in a one time capital outlay savings of **\$210,000,000** with annual savings of **\$80,000,000** a year.
 - » **Report can be found on this web site**


Outcomes/ Confidence to Change

- “One of the most important aspects of the CDC/Amity collaboration was the confidence that it gave the Legislature and the Governor to authorize over \$100 million dollars to build the largest dedicated prison drug treatment program in the world....The Corcoran II Substance Abuse Treatment Facility...and it could have only come about through **Amity's** work. It is clear that **Amity** results are going to help shift the public debate here in California about corrections to a more treatment oriented approach.”
- James Gomez, former Director, California Department of Corrections, 1996

Amity Model adopted by CDC

- ◆ The results of the Amity/RJD program have become the “template” for the expansion of therapeutic community type drug treatment within CDC.
- ◆ 24 months ago there were 400 beds
- ◆ At the end of 1999, there are 5,000, with more on the way
- ◆ Amity’s TC at California State Prison at Los Angeles County, started in 1998, is the first to bring this type of intensive TC to Level IV offenders.

Outcomes / Replication of Model



Making a difference nationally...


- ◆ The Amity outcome data has been cited nationally, and used by the federal government to justify millions of dollars annually to support RSAT (Residential Substance Abuse Treatment) through the U.S. Department of Justice.
- ◆ Amity at R.J. Donovan is used as a model of how an effective TC can be implemented



- ◆ Warden Ratelle welcomes high officials from seven states to a Justice sponsored “TC Implementation” Training that included a full day tour of the Amity TC at R.J. Donovan and Vista. May, 1999

Making a difference for the community...

◆ This.....



◆ Is better than this!



Conclusion

“We are convinced that the **Amity model is successful. It provides a significant benefit to California taxpayers by reducing recidivism and a benefit to all citizens by reducing the level of crime, particularly violent crime, in our communities. Our only question now is how fast can we expand this model while achieving results similar to those achieved by **Amity** at R.J. Donovan.”**

Craig Brown, Director of Finance, Governor Wilson’s Administration, 1998

So, what made it work? (1)

- ◆ Support by the Director of Corrections—and a willingness to wait for results
- ◆ Active support by the Warden, his key staff, and adequate support by correctional staff immediately involved with the program. A “joint venture” approach from the beginning.
- ◆ Central Office staff who played a key liaison role supporting the development of the program both within and outside of the institution.

What made it work? (2)

- ◆ A well-managed and stable correctional facility
- ◆ A program that was experienced in working with criminal offenders in incarcerated settings and committed to a “joint-venture” approach with corrections.
- ◆ A curriculum specifically designed for the inmate population—dealing with “emotional literacy” as well as issues such as family dynamics, violence, racial prejudice, etc.

What made it work? (3)

- ◆ A program director and staff willing and able to work side by side with correctional staff—developing a mutually supportive and respectful working relationships.
- ◆ The incorporation of trained peer mentors to be credible inmate role models, provide 24-7 support and accountability; and neutralize the “yard.”

What made it work? (4)

- ◆ Assignment of a parole agent that worked in an integral manner with corrections, treatment, and other parole agents---and supported the participants in the community after they left the prison.
- ◆ The development of a closely linked residential program for participants operated by the same organization as the in-prison program---providing true continuity.

The Amity Approach (1)

- ◆ A lengthy commitment to working with incarcerated criminal offenders.
- ◆ An organizational commitment to building “models” that have demonstrable (measurable) results---benefits to taxpayers and to participants.
- ◆ Intensive, regular, ongoing immersion training to improve skills and understanding (minimum of one week per year).

The Amity Approach (2)

- ◆ Emphasis on “staff community” and leadership by “demonstration.” eg. “You can’t expect to lead people to a place you have never been and are unwilling to go.”
- ◆ Regular use by staff of TC tools—including encounter groups to improve communication, resolve problems, and develop congruence of expectations.

The Amity Approach (3)

- ◆ Curriculum developed specifically for criminal offenders incarcerated and in the community.
- ◆ An emphasis on self-disclosure, resolving issues both conscious and unconscious, past and present that might lead to relapse and reincarceration.
- ◆ END OF SLIDES