

Impact of the “Rethinking Personal Choice” Program On Inmate Behavior and Facility Operations At Florida State Prison (FSP)

September 2002



Michael W. Moore, Secretary
Richard L. Dugger, Deputy Secretary
Richard J. Nimer, Director of Program, Transition and
Post- Release Services



**Prepared by:
Florida Department of Corrections
Bureau of Research and Data Analysis
2601 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500
(850) 488-1801**



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Highlights of RPC's Impact on Inmate Behavior and Facility Operations	1
Conclusions	1
Recommendations	2
Introduction	3
Background	3
RPC Goal	3
RPC Objectives	3
RPC Design	4
RPC Management Strategies	5
RPC Minimum Criteria for Entry	5
RPC Delivery Strategies	5
RPC Completion	5
Variables Examined and Comparison Groups	6
List and Definitions of Variables Examined	6
Comparison Groups	6
Results and Analysis	6
Based on Program Objectives By Comparison Groups	8
TABLE - Total in CM Status	8
TABLE 1 - Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 1	9
TABLE 2 - Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 2	10
TABLE 3 - Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 3	11
TABLE 4 - Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 4	12
TABLE 5 - Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 5	13
TABLE 6 - Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 6	14
RPC Impact on Movement of Inmates to Reduced Management Levels	15
TABLE 7 - First CM Status Versus Last Status for the Pre-RPC Group	15
TABLE 8 - First CM Status Versus Last Status for the RPC Group	15
Recommendations	16
Program Modifications	16
CM 1 Modifications	16
CM 2 Modifications	16
CM 3 Modifications	16
Program Expansion	16

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to examine the results of the “**Rethinking Personal Choice**” [RPC] Program, a pilot program that began on September 1, 2000 at the Florida State Prison (FSP). The goal of the RPC program is to generate Close Management (CM) releases that function in open population without threatening the security of the institution or abusing the rights and privileges of others.

The report is based on comparing the results for the group of inmates impacted by the RPC program and those of a ‘like control group’ (the cohort of CM inmates at FSP during the year prior to the implementation of the RPC program). Thus, the comparison groups used were the respective cohort of CM inmates at FSP from September 1, 1999 through August 31, 2000 (Pre-RPC Group) versus September 1, 2000 through August 31, 2001 (the first full year of implementation of RPC [RPC Group]).

The results for each group are presented, compared, and analyzed based on program objectives. The report also covers the RPC’s impact on the movement of inmates to reduced management levels. The intent of the RPC program is to move inmates from more restrictive to less restrictive management levels (from CM 1 to CM 2 or CM 3 or Open Population, and from CM 2 to CM 3 or Open Population, and from CM 3 to Open Population).

Highlights of RPC’s Impact on Inmate Behavior and Facility Operations

- Across all CM inmates, the total number released to open population was more than twice as many (182 versus 86) for the RPC Group (the Group Impacted-By-RPC) compared to the Pre-RPC Group.
- For all CM inmates, RPC Group inmates spent on the average about 60 fewer days in CM (247.7) compared to those in the Pre-RPC Group (307.0).
- For all CM inmates, the RPC Group’s ‘Percent Recommitted to CM’ was less than half of Pre-RPC Group’s (24.7% versus 53.5%).
- Across all CM inmates, the RPC Group had a much lower total number of DR’s (1,604) as well as a lower number of DR’s per 1,000 days in CM (8.1) than did inmates in the Pre-RPC Group (which had 2,520 and 11.2 respectively).
- The RPC program has been very effective in having inmates control their anger in group and interpersonal situations. For all CM inmates, RPC Group inmates were only about 20% as likely to get a DR resulting in injury when compared to Pre-RPC Group inmates (13 versus 61).
- RPC Group inmates had no positive drug tests, while Pre-RPC Group inmates had 3 positive drug tests across all CM categories.
- The RPC Group had 137 inmates whose last status was in Open Population, while the Pre-RPC Group had only 40 such inmates.
- The RPC Group had 116 inmates whose last status was a transfer from FSP versus only 65 for the inmates in the Pre-RPC Group.

Conclusions

- The RPC Program Objective # 1 to increase the number of CM inmates released to open population was met to a very high degree.
- The RPC Program Objective # 2 to reduce the average duration of time inmates spend in CM prior to release to open population was met to a high degree.

- The RPC Program Objective # 3 to decrease the number of recommitments to CM status was met to a very high degree.
- The RPC Program Objective # 4 to reduce the number and severity of disciplinary reports of CM 3 inmates while in the RPC program was met to a high degree.
- The RPC Program Objective # 5 to increase the ability of inmates to control their anger and aggressive behaviors in group and interpersonal situations as demonstrated by a reduction of disciplinary reports received for demonstrations of violent behavior was met to a very high degree.
- The RPC Program Objective # 6 to reduce positive drug test rates of CM program participants was met. With so few cases, a definite conclusion in terms of the degree to which this objective was met can not be determined as this time.

Recommendations

Program Modifications:

The RPC program should be modified in order to provide programming to CM 1 and CM 2 inmates. Introducing the inmates to the RPC program at the CM 1 and CM 2 levels will better equip the inmates and the staff at the institution for placement to the CM 3 level and possible transfer to general population.

CM 1 Modifications:

- Each cell should be equipped with a television.
- Program delivery should be through video-based programming, cell-front instruction, and in-cell assignments.
- If the cells aren't equipped with televisions, in-cell material and cell-front instruction should be used to provide programming.

CM 2 Modifications:

- Each cell should be equipped with a television.
- Program delivery should be through video-based programming, cell-front instruction, and in-cell assignments.
- If the cells aren't equipped with televisions, programming should be provided during dayroom activity small-group instruction, in-cell material and cell-front instruction.

CM 3 Modifications:

- There should no longer be three stratified phases of programming.
- The length of the CM 3 programming should be reduced from seven to six months.
- Program delivery should be primarily through classroom instruction and small-group activities.
- Video-based programming, in-cell assignments, and cell-front instruction should also be used to complement program delivery.

Program Expansion:

- The RPC program should be expanded to the other two permanent CM institutions: Santa Rosa CI and Charlotte CI.
- The results of this report indicate that the program is having positive results and can be very beneficial to the institutions and to the department as a whole.

Introduction

Background

The Department of Corrections is committed to addressing the behavior modification needs of inmates who have been placed in Close Management (CM) status. CM refers to the confinement of an inmate apart from the general population, for reasons of security or the order and effective management of the institution, where the inmate through his/her own behavior has demonstrated an inability to live in the general population without abusing the rights and privileges of others.

This status is designed to house inmates who commit acts that threaten the security of the institution, or demonstrate an inability to live in the general population without abusing the rights and privileges of others. There are three CM levels (CM 1, CM 2, and CM 3), with CM 1 being the most restrictive and CM 3 being the least restrictive.

In October 1999, Secretary Michael W. Moore appointed a department-wide work group to examine the existing programming offered to CM inmates and recommend a program approach that provides a specialized incentive program structure for inmates to progress from CM status to an open population environment. A program development team was assigned the responsibility of coordinating the development, implementation and assessment of the pilot initiative.

The selected program design (the “**Rethinking Personal Choice**” [RPC] Program) is based on a cognitive behavioral learning and incentive approach to facilitate the successful reintegration of CM inmates into open population housing in institutions throughout the department.

RPC Goal

Generate CM-releases that function in open population without threatening the security of the institution or abusing the rights and privileges of others.

RPC Objectives

- 1) Increase the number of inmates in CM 3 who are released to open population, as compared to a like control group.
- 2) Reduce the average duration of time inmates spend in CM 3 prior to release to open population as compared to a like control group.
- 3) Decrease the number of recommitments to CM status for a one year period following completion of the RPC program at FSP, as compared to a like control group.
- 4) Reduce the number and severity of disciplinary reports of CM 3 inmates while in the RPC program and within one year of release of CM 3 status, as compared to a like control group.
- 5) Increase the ability of inmates to control their anger and aggressive behaviors in group and interpersonal situations as demonstrated by a reduction of disciplinary reports received for demonstrations of violent behavior.
- 6) Reduce positive drug test rates of CM 3 program participants as compared to a like control group.

RPC Design

The RPC program has been piloted at the Florida State Prison (FSP), beginning on September 1, 2000 with the first RPC class graduating on March 15, 2001. FSP is a close management facility used for the purpose of housing the most dangerous and highest risk inmates in the Florida Department of Corrections. The single most prevalent profile of inmates who have been assigned to FSP is that of an assaulting, violent, and disruptive individual.

CM programming was implemented in other close management facilities concurrently with implementation of the RPC program at FSP. However, the RPC program is unique and has been limited to FSP. The basic structure, purpose, and criteria for placement in CM status has remained the same across facilities.

The RPC pilot program at FSP integrates institutional work-experience, group learning, group recreation, and personal expression through journaling and volunteer visitation as an integral part of the project design. All of these methods are aimed at preparing inmates to successfully return to open population correctional institution settings.

The RPC design utilizes a combination of distance learning methods as well as traditional learning and teaching strategies. The designated wing which houses selected inmates in CM 3 status is retrofitted with a close-circuit television system and video conferencing equipment. Each cell is equipped with a television that is used for program delivery. An on-site institutional implementation team provides coordination of program activities and operations.

The RPC program includes a progressive incentive approach that provides a specialized structure for inmates to transition from CM status to an open population environment based on the consistent demonstration of appropriate behavior.

Cognitive skills training identifies and addresses patterns of thinking and behaving that inhibit an individual's ability to effectively manage emotions, make constructive decisions, and correct mal-adaptive inter-personal skills. In summary, while behavior modification is a good approach to short-term behavioral change, long-term change depends upon modifying thinking (cognition). This cognitive behavioral modification model recognizes that:

- cognitive (thinking) activity effects behavior,
- cognitive activity can be altered, and
- long-term behavioral change depends upon change in one's thought processes.

In addition, cognitive behavioral modification is concerned not only about how an individual perceives his world, but how he/she actively thinks and functions within his/her world.

RPC Management Strategies

The following management strategies were used during the pilot RPC evaluation period:

- No change in rules or procedures for CM 1
- No change in rules or procedures for CM 2
- CM 3 stratified into three phases (A, B, & C)
- CM 3A inmates meet the criteria and are pending placement in CM 3B
- CM 3B designated as first stage of programming to work toward reintegration of CM 3 inmates to open population settings
- CM 3C designated as second and last stage of programming prior to returning a CM 3 inmate to open population

RPC Minimum Criteria for Entry

Minimum criteria for entry are a recommendation by Institutional Classification Committee (ICC) and a determination by Statewide Classification Office (SCO) that the candidate is suitable for active participation in CM 3 program components (B&C) and will be approved for placement in general population upon satisfactory completion of the program.

Inmates sign agreements to participate in the program and abide by program rules prior to placement. Violations of rules or orders can result in removal from the program and regression to any other level of CM. RPC program staff can recommend modification of conditions and privileges in the program as needed.

RPC Delivery Strategies

CM 3B (phase one of programming) consists of 16 weeks of psycho-educational classes. The programming is delivered through video programming, homework assignments, and individualized instruction at the cell. One hundred and twenty consecutive days of appropriate behavior is required in CM 3B prior to movement to CM 3C.

CM 3C (phase two of programming) consists of 12 weeks of programs designed to meet the individual needs of the offender. The programming is delivered through classroom instruction, group activities, video programming, homework assignments, and individualized instruction at the cell.

RPC Completion

RPC participants are required to complete all components of CM 3B & CM 3C and demonstrate behavior which reflects a willingness and ability to live in an open population setting in a satisfactory manner to qualify for program completion. Recommendations for program completion are initiated by program staff, reviewed & approved by the ICC and reviewed and approved by the SCO. The SCO determines which facility the inmate is transferred to for placement in open population.

Variables Examined and Comparison Groups

List and Definition of Variables Examined

In this report on the pilot version of the RPC at FSP, applicable variables of interest have been related to specific Program Objectives to show whether or not (or how well) the RPC met its objectives. Below, where applicable, after each definition of a given variable, the number of the Program Objective (PO) related to that variable is shown in parenthesis. The variables are listed in number order of the PO to which it is related.

Total in CM – Number of inmates spending any time in CM status at FSP in the given time period.

Number Released to Open Population – Number of inmates spending any time in CM at FSP released to the open population at any facility during given time period. **(PO # 1)**

Avg. Days Spent in CM, Per Inmate – Average number of days spent in CM at FSP for inmates during given time period. **(PO # 2)**

Total Days in CM – Total number of days spent in CM at FSP for inmates during the given time period. **(PO # 2)**

Number Recommitted to CM – Number of inmates that were released to the open population at any facility who returned to CM during the given time period. **(PO # 3)**

Percent Recommitted to CM – Percent of inmates released to the open population returned to CM during the given time period. **(PO # 3)**

Total Number of DR's – Total Number of Disciplinary Reports (DR's) for CM inmates at FSP during the given period. **(PO # 4)**

Number of DR's Per 1,000 Days in CM – DR rate per 1,000 man-days in CM during the given time period. **(PO # 4)**

Number of DR's Resulting in Injury – Number of DR's resulting in injury for CM inmates at FSP during the given time period. **(PO # 5)**

Number of Positive Drug Tests – Number of positive drug tests for CM inmates at FSP during the given time period. **(PO # 6)**

Comparison Groups

The pilot version of the RPC Program at FSP began on September 1, 2000. The 'like control group' used in this study was the cohort of CM inmates at FSP during the year prior to the implementation of the RPC program.

Thus, the comparison groups used were the respective cohort of CM inmates at FSP from September 1, 1999 through August 31, 2000 versus September 1, 2000 through August 31, 2001 (the first full year of implementation of RPC). The variables listed above were examined for each comparison group.

In the following section, the variables for each cohort are presented, compared, and analyzed based on program objectives and the RPC's impact on the movement of inmates to reduced management levels. The intent of the RPC program is to move inmates from more restrictive to less restrictive management levels (from CM 1 to CM 2 or CM 3 or Open Population, and from CM 2 to CM 3 or Open Population, and from CM 3 to Open Population).

Results and Analysis

Based on Program Objectives By Comparison Groups

In the discussion that follows, the previous year's cohort will be referred to as the **Pre-RPC Group**, while the cohort for the RPC's first year will be referred to as the **RPC Group (which is the group impacted by the RPC program)**.

NOTE -- Although only CM 3 inmates actively participated in the RPC programming at FSP, all FSP CM inmates are included in this report because the RPC program was designed to potentially impact inmates at all CM levels. The RPC program made the CM 3 status both a 'point of programming', as well as a 'point of achievement' (or a way by which inmates could obtain the primary goal of moving out of CM status). For this reason, the inmates were also categorized for selected CM-groupings based on CM status during the respective year. The categories are **A (CM 3)**, **B (CM 1 or CM 2)**, and **C (CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 [all CM inmates])**.

Total in CM Status Table

VARIABLE – Total	Pre-RPC Group (From 9/1/1999 Through 8/31/2000)	RPC Group (From 9/1/2000 Through 8/31/2001)
(A) Began in CM 3	197	208
(B) Began in CM 1 or CM 2	536	594
(C) Began in CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 (All CM Inmates)	733	802

As shown in Table 1, in the year prior to implementing the RPC program at FSP there were 733 inmates who began in Category C compared to 802 during the first year of the RPC Program. Of the 733 total in a CM status in the Pre-RPC Group, there were 536 that began in Category B and the remaining 197 began in Category C. The 802 in Category C in RPC Group had 594 that began in Category B and the remaining 208 began in Category A.

RPC Objective # 1 -- Increase the number of CM inmates who are released to open population, as compared to a like control group

Table 1 – Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 1

VARIABLE – Number Released to Open Population	Pre-RPC Group (From 9/1/1999 Through 8/31/2000)	RPC Group (From 9/1/2000 Through 8/31/2001)
(A) Began in CM 3	41 (of 197)	75 (of 208)
(B) Began in CM 1 or CM 2	45 (of 536)	107 (of 594)
(C) Began in CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 (All CM Inmates)	86 (of 733)	182 (of 802)

Salient points, in examining the results of the RPC based on Program Objective # 1 are, as follows:

- Across all CM inmates (Category C), the total number released to open population was more than twice as many (182 versus 86) for the RPC Group compared to the Pre-RPC Group.
- Of special note, the results for PO # 1 of the RPC program were quite pronounced (75 released compared to 41) for those who began in CM 3 (Category A). The results were even more impressive for those that began in CM 1 or CM 2 (Category B) with 107 in the RPC Group being released to open population compared to only 45 in the Pre-RPC Group (almost 2.4 times as many).

CONCLUSION – The RPC Program Objective # 1 to increase the number of CM inmates released to open population was met to a very high degree.

RPC Objective # 2 -- Reduce the average duration of time inmates spend in CM prior to release to open population, as compared to a like control group.

Table 2 – Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 2

VARIABLES – Average Days Spent in CM Per Inmate and Total Days Spent in CM per Group	Pre-RPC Group (From 9/1/1999 Through 8/31/2000)	RPC Group (From 9/1/2000 Through 8/31/2001)
(A) In CM 3	Avg. Days = 192.0 Total Days = 37,827	Avg. Days = 251.3 Total Days = 52,278
(B) In CM 1 or CM 2	Avg. Days = 349.2 Total Days = 187,186	Avg. Days = 246.4 Total Days = 146,375
(C) In CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 (All CM Inmates)	Avg. Days = 307.0 Total Days = 225,013	Avg. Days = 247.7 Total Days = 198,653

The salient points in examining the results of the RPC based on Program Objective # 2 are, as follows:

- For all CM inmates (Category C), the success of the RPC program in meeting PO # 2 can be seen in that the RPC Group inmates spent on the average about 60 fewer days in CM (247.7) compared to those in the Pre-RPC Group (307.0). Most of this reduction was due to shorter average stays in CM 1 or CM 2 (Category B) for the RPC Group (246.4 compared to the Pre-RPC Group [349.2]).
- Average days and total days spent in CM status were both actually higher for the RPC Group versus the Pre-RPC Group for Category A (in CM 3). This ‘longer average stay’ for CM 3 inmates was due to the RPC requirement that CM 3 inmates had to stay in CM 3 status for a minimum of the 7-month duration of the RPC program, plus any existing time already spent in CM 3 prior to implementation of RPC. Note - In subsequent years, the average number of days spent in CM3 status should be about the same length as the number of days of the program.

CONCLUSION – The RPC Program Objective # 2 to reduce the average duration of time inmates spend in CM prior to release to open population was met to a high degree.

RPC Objective # 3 - Decrease the number of recommitments to CM status following completion of the RPC program at FSP, as compared to a like control group.

Table 3 – Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 3

VARIABLE – Number and Percent Recommitted to CM	Pre-RPC Group (From 9/1/1999 Through 8/31/2000)	RPC Group (From 9/1/2000 Through 8/31/2001)
(A) Began In CM 3	Number = 5 (of 41 released) Percent = 12.2%	Number = 3 (of 75 released) Percent = 4.0%
(B) Began In CM 1 or CM 2	Number = 41 (of 45 released) Percent = 91.1%	Number = 42 (of 107 released) Percent = 39.3%
(C) Began In CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 (All CM Inmates)	Number = 46 (of 86 released) Percent = 53.5%	Number = 45 (of 182 released) Percent = 24.7%

The key point in examining the results of the RPC based on Program Objective # 3 is, as follows:

- The results of PO # 3 are best reflected in the ‘Percent Recommitted to CM’ (since the actual number recommitted for each group is practically the same for a given category). The success of the RPC in meeting PO # 3 can be seen in looking at Category C and seeing that the RPC Group’s ‘Percent Recommitted to CM’ was less than half of the Pre-RPC Group’s (24.7% versus 53.5%). Although the RPC program met its PO # 3 for inmates that began in CM 3 (Category A), the main effect can be seen in Category B inmates (those that began in CM 1 or CM 2). The percent recommitted in this category for the RPC Group was only 39.3% compared to 91.1% for the Pre-RPC Group.

CONCLUSION – The RPC Program Objective # 3 to decrease the number of recommitments to CM status was met to a very high degree.

RPC Objective # 4 -- Reduce the number and severity of disciplinary reports of CM inmates while in the RPC program, as compared to a like control group.

Table 4 – Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 4

VARIABLE – Total Number of DR’s and Number of DR’s Per 1,000 Days in CM	Pre-RPC Group (From 9/1/1999 Through 8/31/2000)	RPC Group (From 9/1/2000 Through 8/31/2001)
(A) In CM 3	Total Number = 133 Number Per 1,000 Days = 3.5	Total Number = 144 Number Per 1,000 Days = 2.8
(B) In CM 1 or CM 2	Total Number = 2,387 Number Per 1,000 Days = 12.8	Total Number = 1,460 Number Per 1,000 Days = 10.0
(C) In CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 (All CM Inmates)	Total Number = 2,520 Number Per 1,000 Days = 11.2	Total Number = 1,604 Number Per 1,000 Days = 8.1

The salient points in examining the results of the RPC based on Program Objective # 4 are, as follows:

- Again, examining Category C indicates the success the RPC program had in meeting PO # 4. The RPC Group had a much lower total number of DR’s (1,604) as well as a lower number of DR’s per 1,000 days in CM (8.1) than did inmates in the Pre-RPC Group (which had 2,520 and 11.2 respectively).
- Again, a large effect related to PO # 4 could also be found in Category B inmates (in CM 1 or CM 2). The RPC Group had a much lower total number of DR’s (1,460) as well as a lower number of DR’s per 1,000 days in CM (10.0) than did inmates in the Pre-RPC Group (which had 2,387 and 12.8 respectively).
- For Category A, the RPC Group inmates did better than the Pre-RPC Group (2.8 DR’s per 1,000 days in CM compared to 3.5 for the Pre-RPC Group). For Category A, the RPC Group actually had more total DR’s compared to the Pre-RPC Group (144 compared to 133). The higher number of DR’s for the RPC Group’s inmates in CM 3 status was due to more freedom and more scrutiny given as a result of participation in RPC.

CONCLUSION – The RPC Program Objective # 4 to reduce the number and severity of disciplinary reports of CM 3 inmates while in the RPC program was met to a high degree.

RPC Program Objective # 5 -- Increase the ability of inmates to control their anger and aggressive behaviors in group and interpersonal situations as demonstrated by a reduction of disciplinary reports received for demonstrations of violent behavior.

Table 5 – Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 5

VARIABLE – Number of DR’s Resulting in Injury	Pre-RPC Group (From 9/1/1999 Through 8/31/2000)	RPC Group (From 9/1/2000 Through 8/31/2001)
(A) Began in CM 3	2	0
(B) Began In CM 1 or CM 2	59	13
(C) Began In CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 (All CM Inmates)	61	13

The salient points in examining the results of the RPC based on Program Objective # 5 are, as follows:

- Table 5 indicates that the RPC program has been very effective in having inmates control their anger in group and interpersonal situations. As shown for Category C, the RPC Group inmates were only about 20% as likely to get a DR resulting in injury when compared to the Pre-RPC Group inmates (13 versus 61).
- This effect can be somewhat seen for Category A, where the RPC Group inmates had no DR’s of this type while the Pre-RPC Group had 2. But again, the major effect occurred in Category B where there were 46 fewer such DR’s for the RPC Group compared to the Pre-RPC Group (only 13 compared to 59 for the previous year).

CONCLUSION – The RPC Program Objective # 5 to increase the ability of inmates to control their anger and aggressive behaviors in group and interpersonal situations as demonstrated by a reduction of disciplinary reports received for demonstrations of violent behavior was met to a very high degree.

RPC Objective # 6 -- Reduce positive drug test rates of CM program participants compared to a like control group.

Table 6 – Results Related to RPC Program Objective # 6

VARIABLE – Reduce Number of Positive Drug Tests	Pre-RPC Group (From 9/1/1999 Through 8/31/2000)	RPC Group (From 9/1/2000 Through 8/31/2001)
(A) Began in CM 3	2	0
(B) Began In CM 1 or CM 2	1	0
(C) Began In CM 1, CM 2, or CM 3 (All CM Inmates)	3	0

The key point in examining the results of the RPC based on Program Objective # 6 is, as follows:

- For each category, RPC Group inmates had no positive drug tests while the Pre-RPC Group had 3 positive drug tests across all CM inmates (Category C).

CONCLUSION – The RPC Program Objective # 6 to reduce positive drug test rates of CM program participants was met. With so few cases, a definite conclusion in terms of the degree to which this objective was met can not be determined as this time.

RPC Impact on Movement of Inmates to Reduced Management Levels

Another way to analyze the results of the RPC program is to examine its impact on the movement of inmates from their beginning CM status to their last status during the year. Tables 7 and 8 can be used to show the difference in the movement between the Pre-RPC Group and the RPC Group.

**Table 7 - First CM Status Versus Last Status
For the Pre-RPC Group
(FSP Inmates from 9/1/1999 through 8/31/2000)**

First CM Status	Last Status						
	Total	CM 1	CM 2	CM 3	Death Row	Open Population	*TF FSP
Total	733	335	159	133	1	40	65
CM 1	477	300	111	36	1	3	26
CM 2	174	26	38	76	0	5	29
CM 3	82	9	10	21	0	32	10

* TF = Transferred From

**Table 8 - First CM Status Versus Last Status
For the RPC Group
(FSP Inmates from 9/1/2000 through 8/31/2001)**

First CM Status	Last Status							
	Total	CM 1	CM 2	CM 3	Death Row	-MAX MGT	Open Pop	*TF FSP
Total	802	332	79	128	1	9	137	116
CM 1	430	292	39	10	1	7	10	71
CM 2	238	34	31	77	0	1	60	35
CM 3	134	6	9	41	0	1	67	10

- MAX MGT = **Maximum Management:** A temporary status for an inmate, who through a current incident or series of incidences, has been identified as being an extreme security risk to the department and requires an immediate level of control beyond that available in Close Management status or Death Row.

* TF = Transferred From

The salient points in examining the data in Tables 7 and 8 are, as follows:

- The key variables in Tables 7 and 8 are the 'Open Population' and 'Transferred from FSP' columns as found in the Total row.
- The RPC Group had 137 inmates whose last status was in Open Population, while the Pre-RPC Group had only 40 such inmates (a 243% increase).
- The RPC Group had 116 inmates whose last status was a transfer from FSP versus only 65 for the inmates in the Pre-RPC Group (a 78% increase).

Recommendations

Program Modifications:

The RPC program should be modified in order to provide programming to CM 1 and CM 2 inmates. Introducing the inmates to the RPC program at the CM 1 and CM 2 levels will better equip the inmates and the staff at the institution for placement to the CM 3 level and possible transfer to general population.

CM 1 Modifications:

- Each cell should be equipped with a television.
- Program delivery should be through video-based programming, cell-front instruction, and in-cell assignments.
- If the cells aren't equipped with televisions, in-cell material and cell-front instruction should be used to provide programming.

CM 2 Modifications:

- Each cell should be equipped with a television.
- Program delivery should be through video-based programming, cell-front instruction, and in-cell assignments.
- If the cells aren't equipped with televisions, programming should be provided during dayroom activity small-group instruction, in-cell material and cell-front instruction.

CM 3 Modifications:

- There should no longer be three stratified phases of programming.
- The length of the CM 3 programming should be reduced from seven to six months.
- Program delivery should be primary through classroom instruction and small-group activities.
- Video-based programming, in-cell assignments, and cell-front instruction should also be used to complement program delivery.

Program Expansion:

- The RPC program should be expanded to the other two permanent CM institutions: Santa Rosa CI and Charlotte CI.
- The results of this report indicate that the program is having positive results and can be very beneficial to the institutions and to the department as a whole.

**The Florida Department of Corrections
Office of Program, Transition,
& Post-Release Services
and Bureau of Research & Data Analysis
Direct Questions to:
Bernard Cohen, Clarence Rudloff,
or Eric Gaines at (850) 922-8701;
John L. Lewis or Brian Hays at (850) 488-1801**