



# Evaluation of the Integrated Services for Mentally Ill Parolees (ISMIP) Program

April 1, 2017

David Farabee, Ph.D.

Elizabeth Hall, Ph.D.

UCLA Department of Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences  
11075 Santa Monica Bl. Ste. 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

# Table of Contents

I.	<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	2
II.	<b>Preface</b> .....	3
III.	<b>Evaluation of the Integrated Services for Mentally Ill Parolees (ISMIP) Program</b> .....	4
IV.	<b>Introduction</b> .....	4
V.	<b>Program Structure</b> .....	4
VI.	<b>Methodology</b> .....	5
VII.	<b>Results</b> .....	7
VIII.	<b>Discussion</b> .....	13
IX.	<b>Next Steps</b> .....	14
X.	<b>Appendix</b> .....	15

## Executive Summary

---

The goal of the ISMIP program is to provide evidence-based, comprehensive mental health and supportive services, including housing subsidies, to parolees who suffer from mental illness and are at risk of homelessness, in order to successfully reintegrate the parolees into the community, increase public safety, and reduce state costs of recidivism.

To assess the effects of ISMIP on recidivism, we created a concurrent comparison group using parolees in counties where ISMIP services are not currently available. The selection of comparison counties was based on geography, population, and comparable recidivism rates for the CCCMS and EOP populations in 2012, the year ISMIP commenced. Once comparison counties were identified, we used CDCR (SOMS and COMPAS) data to identify matched cases in those counties similar to parolees in the ISMIP samples. While the two groups are similar, caution should be exercised when comparing outcomes, as differences among the two groups (e.g., location, percentage of CCCMS and EOP parolees) exist.

ISMIP and Comparison parolees were released from prison between January 1, 2012 and May 31, 2015 and were tracked for 12 months to determine whether they were arrested, convicted, or returned to prison. Arrests, convictions, and returns were slightly lower for the ISMIP parolees in relation to the Comparison parolees. The percentage re-arrested within 12 months was 50.7% for ISMIP and 51.8% for Comparison parolees. Similarly, ISMIP parolees were reconvicted at a slightly lower rate (14.1%) than Comparison (15.0%) parolees. ISMIP parolees were also less likely than Comparison parolees to be returned to prison within a year (1.5% versus 3.4%, respectively). For arrests and convictions, the percentage differences were not statistically significant, however the percentage difference for returns to prison was statistically significant.

Of parolees arrested for felonies within one year, 31.2% of ISMIP participants were arrested, in contrast to 34.9% of the Comparison group. Of parolees convicted of a felony within one year, 42.9% of ISMIP participants were convicted versus 48.3 % of the Comparison group. Relative to the Comparison parolees, fewer ISMIP parolees were arrested or convicted of felonies although this difference was not statistically significant.

### Arrests, Convictions, and Returns to Prison within 365 Days (N=1187)

	Comparison (N = 593)	ISMIP (N=594)	p value
Arrested (% yes)	51.8	50.7	n.s.
Convicted (% yes)	15.0	14.1	n.s.
Returned to prison (% yes)	3.4	1.5	<.05

# Preface

---

Researchers in the UCLA Department of Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences are operating under an agreement with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) Office of Research, Adult Research Branch to evaluate the Integrated Services for Mentally Ill Parolees (ISMIP) Program.

The purpose of this draft final report is to provide CDCR Executive Staff with evaluation information on the effectiveness of the ISMIP Program in regard to parolee outcomes, including its potential impacts on recidivism and costs.

**Note:** This report was produced under California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Agreement No: 5600005097

# Evaluation of the Integrated Services for Mentally Ill Parolees (ISMIP) Program

## Introduction

---

The goal of the ISMIP program is to provide evidence-based, comprehensive mental health and supportive services, including housing subsidies, to parolees who suffer from mental illness and are at risk of homelessness, in order to successfully reintegrate the parolees into the community, increase public safety, and reduce state costs of recidivism. UCLA has been contracted to evaluate ISMIP programs in the following locations: Los Angeles, San Diego, Kern, Sacramento, Santa Clara, and San Francisco.

## Program Structure

---

DAPO's Integrated Services for Mentally Ill Parolees (ISMIP) program is a comprehensive model that provides varied levels of care, supportive/transitional housing, and an array of mental health rehabilitative services to assist with the development of independent living in the least restrictive environment possible. Parole agents refer parolees to contracted ISMIP providers. Under ISMIP, each parolee-client has a designated mental health personal services coordinator who, as a part of the provider's multidisciplinary treatment team, is responsible for providing needed services.

Penal Code section 2985.3 explains, in part, that the intent of ISMIP to:

Assist in obtaining and maintaining health and housing stability while participating on parole, to enable the parolee to comply with the terms of parole, and to augment mental health treatment provided to parolees.

Services offered to participants in their home or as easily accessible to participants include, but are not limited to: (1) case management services, (2) parole discharge planning, (3) housing location services and if needed, move-in cost assistance, (4) rental subsidies, (5) linkage to vocational, education and employment services, (4) benefit entitlement application appeal assistance, (5) transportation assistance to obtain services and health care needs, and (6) assistance in obtaining appropriate identification.

ISMIP is overseen by the Chief Clinical Program Administrator in the CDCR Division of Adult Parole Operations. Beginning in late 2014, sex offenders were redirected to specialized sex offender

programs.<sup>1</sup> As of January 2015, POC Senior Psychologists and Mental Health Program Supervisors were incorporated into the program to review ISMIP referrals to ensure that the appropriate population is referred to the program. San Diego and Los Angeles share the same parent vendor and therefore use the same program structure and treatment model. Otherwise, each program is unique and follows a different program structure and treatment model. Though all share the same goals under the ISMIP legislation, each program goes about accomplishing those goals in differing ways. For example, each program's intake assessment process is aligned with that of their county mental health department, and therefore differs from each of the other ISMIP programs. In addition, documentation, while extensive in all the programs, differs greatly in organization and emphasis on elements of mental health care. The treatment populations also vary among the programs in number, age, race/ethnicity, and proportion classified as Enhanced Outpatient (EOP) versus Correctional Clinical Case Management System (CCCMS).

Beginning in July 2016, the structure of the ISMIP program was revised by DAPO. The changes made will provide for more uniformity among the providers and better and more uniform indicators of treatment progress for ISMIP participants. This structural change is also designed to promote better accountability among the providers for participants' progress.

## Methodology

---

### Data sources

We collected and analyzed data from the Strategic Offender Management System (SOMS), DOJ arrest databases, and ISMIP programs on treatment and housing. The ISMIP treatment and housing database provided data on treatment entry and exit, whether a participant used a housing subsidy, how many months the subsidy was used and the total amount of the subsidy. The SOMS incarceration data provided release dates, reincarceration dates, county, age at release, ethnicity, gender, CSRA score, and residential instability (housing) score. The DOJ arrest and conviction data included offense category (property crimes, drug crimes, crimes against persons, other crimes, parole violations) and by offense level (felony, misdemeanor, parole violation, unknown).

### Analyses

For the ISMIP outcome analysis, we created a concurrent comparison group using parolees in counties where ISMIP services are not currently available. The selection of comparison counties was based on geography, population, and comparable recidivism rates for the CCCMS and EOP populations in 2012, the year ISMIP commenced. Once suitable comparison counties were

---

<sup>1</sup> Those who were in ISMIP at the time of this programmatic change were able to remain in the ISMIP program until they completed parole, successfully completed the program, or left the program. Los Angeles County did not allow sex offenders in their ISMIP provider's program. In other counties, sex offenders with CCCMS or EOP mental health designations were able to enter the ISMIP programs.

identified, we used CDCR (SOMS and COMPAS) data to identify matched cases in those counties similar to parolees in the ISMIP samples. Both the ISMIP and the comparison participants had to have been identified as EOP or CCCMS while in custody. Matching criteria were: age at release, ethnicity, gender, CSRA score, and residential instability (housing) score. This resulted in 603 participants in each group. We then obtained DOJ data in order to calculate time to re-arrest and conviction and to determine types of arrests and convictions. Some participants (N=19) were missing electronic DOJ data and were eliminated from the analysis.

To calculate arrest within one year and time to first arrest, we used as a starting point the first release date within the target period (released between 1/1/2012 and 5/31/2015) for the comparison group and the date of the first entry into the ISMIP program (between 1/1/2012 and 5/31/2015) for the treatment group and then determined whether the participant was arrested within one year. Each parolee was used in the dataset at the time they first appear, so multiple appearances by an individual were eliminated. Number of arrests within a year and type of arrest were also determined. Conviction within one year, time to first conviction, return to prison within one year, and time to prison return were calculated similarly to the procedure for arrests. We used the first release date within the target period (released between 1/1/2012 and 5/31/2015) for the comparison group and the date of the first entry into the ISMIP program (between 1/1/2012 and 5/31/2015) for the treatment group and then determined whether the participant was convicted or returned to prison within one year.

Statistical analysis (chi-square) was used to determine whether significant differences existed between the groups (ISMIP vs. Comparison) for demographics and re-arrest, conviction, and return to prison within 365 days (% Yes). Independent samples *t*-test was used to test whether there was a significant difference in age between the groups. We also used chi-square to analyze group (ISMIP vs. Comparison) differences in re-arrest and conviction by level of offense (felony, misdemeanor, parole violation, unknown) and by offense category (crimes against persons, property crimes, drug crimes, other crimes, parole violations). We determined days to re-arrest, conviction, and return to prison (ISMIP vs. Comparison) within one year (365 days). Group differences in time to re-arrest, conviction, and return to prison were assessed using Cox proportional hazards models. In each analysis, those not arrested, convicted, or returned were given credit for the full 365 days in the Cox models. Analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4.

## Limitations

Although the Comparison counties used in the matching procedure were pulled from all non-ISMIP California counties, no county is an exact match for another and percentages of EOP and CCCMS parolees returned to custody differed between the ISMIP county and the Comparison county chosen to match it. (See the Appendix for statistics on the ISMIP and Comparison counties.) In addition, with ISMIP being offered primarily in the most populous counties, the Comparison counties were smaller in population and this greatly reduced the sample size available and the

statistical power of our analyses. In addition, Orange County was the match for both San Diego and Los Angeles, based on demographics and return to custody statistics. In order to have enough parolees to match, the CCCMS and EOP groups were combined when the matched sample was drawn. If the Comparison group had a larger percentage of CCCMS or EOP offenders than the ISMIP group, this could have influenced the return rate upward or downward.

## Results

---

In this section, we first describe the background and risk characteristics of the ISMIP and Comparison samples. Next, we provide information on the costs of the programs per participant by county. This is followed by information focusing on ISMIP participants: percentages who are classified as CCCMS versus EOP, and average time spent in ISMIP programs. We then provide results of the outcomes analysis, with regard to arrests, convictions, and returns to prison. Lastly, we provide a further breakdown of arrest outcomes by level of offense, offense category, and time to first arrest, conviction, or return.

### Demographics: Comparison and ISMIP Participants

As shown in Table 1, the ISMIP and Comparison samples are virtually identical, with regard to sex, race/ethnicity, risk, residential instability, and age. There was, however, a significant difference in the percentages of parolees who were registered sex offenders, accounting for 25% of the comparison parolees, versus 18% of the ISMIP parolees. Also, note that the percentages of EOP versus CCCMS parolees may differ between the two samples.

Table 1. Demographics: Comparison and ISMIP Participants (N=1187)

	Comparison (N = 593)	ISMIP (N=594)	p value
Gender (% male)	91.4	91.2	n.s.
Race/Ethnicity (%)			n.s.
African American	50.4	49.2	
Hispanic/Latino	20.1	20.5	
Other	3.9	4.4	
White	25.6	25.9	
CSRA Score (%)			n.s.
1 Low	36.9	36.7	
2 Medium	30.7	31.1	
3 High Drug	2.7	2.5	
4 High Property	6.9	6.7	
5 High Violent	22.8	22.9	
Residential Instability (%)			n.s.
Highly Probable	41.5	41.2	
Probable	5.1	5.2	
Unlikely	37.3	36.9	
(no rating)	16.2	16.7	
Age at release (mean)	39.6	40.0	n.s.
Sex Offender (PC 290 Flag % yes)	25.0	17.7	< .01

Age at release comparison: *t*-test, all other comparisons: chi-square

### Cost Analysis

As shown in Table 2, Santa Clara offers the only program that includes housing within its ISMIP services, thus at a higher per person per day rate of \$73.03. In other counties, housing is not part of the ISMIP program daily rate and is billed separately. Relative costs as provided by the cost data suggest some regional variations across these programs, with Kern County being the lowest at \$32.31 per person per day compared to \$54.80 in San Francisco. These regional differences in costs appear to reflect costs of living associated with each region. Following San Francisco, Los Angeles' daily rate is \$53.33, followed by San Diego at \$47.38, and \$37.74 in Sacramento.

Table 2. Cost Data Breakdown by Program

Program	ISMIP Cost per Person per Day	Monthly Housing Subsidy on Average	Min.	Max.	Number of Clients Receiving Subsidy	Percent of Total Clients Receiving Subsidy	Percent of Total ISMIP County Enrollment
Kern	\$ 32.31	\$1,890.50	\$ 42	\$10,590	245	51.1%	44.8%
Los Angeles	\$ 53.33	\$1,002.45	\$ 54	\$ 3,600	51	10.6%	5.0%
Sacramento	\$ 37.74	\$2,069.17	\$ 21	\$ 9,104	103	21.5%	29.6%
San Diego	\$ 47.38	\$3,212.23	\$113	\$ 9,402	57	11.9%	18.2%
San Francisco	\$ 54.80	\$ 675.50	\$ 1	\$ 1,350	2	0.4%	0.5%
Santa Clara	\$ 73.03	\$4,329.95*	\$550	\$14,912	21	4.4%	7.1%
Total		\$2,093.52	\$ 1	\$14,912	479		

\*not billed to CDCR, included in Santa Clara’s daily rate

Housing utilization appeared to be the highest for Kern County with 245 clients reported having received ISMIP housing subsidies, accounting for more than half of all recorded ISMIP subsidies and 45% of ISMIP clients enrolled in that county. The next was Sacramento with 103 clients, followed by San Diego with 57, Los Angeles with 51, and Santa Clara with 21 clients. The lowest housing subsidy utilization was in San Francisco, with only two clients reported having received ISMIP housing.

### ISMIP Participants: Mental Health Designation by County

Table 3 shows the percentages of ISMIP parolees who are classified as CCCMS versus EOP. Overall, CCCMS accounted for nearly two-thirds of the ISMIP sample. Only in San Diego, did EOP parolees account for the majority of the program participants. The percentages of CCCMS versus EOP participants differed significantly when comparing the counties.

Table 3. ISMIP Participants: Percentage Mental Health Designation by County (N=594)

County	CCCMS (N = 385)	EOP (N=206)	p value
Kern (N=112)	65.2	34.8	<.01
Los Angeles (N=243)	70.0	30.0	
Sacramento (N=100)	71.0	29.0	
San Diego (N=81)	39.5	60.5	
San Francisco (N=28)	57.1	42.9	
Santa Clara (N=30)	86.7	13.3	
Overall	65.3	34.7	

#### ISMIP Participants: Average Time in ISMIP Program by County

On average, participants were enrolled in ISMIP services for 288 (SD=259) days. Average length of participation ranged from 162 (SD=169) days in San Francisco to over a year (395 days; SD = 285) in San Diego. San Diego's greater time in program (Table 4) may be related to their higher percentage of EOP participants who may require lengthier service time to stabilize in the community.

Table 4. ISMIP Participants: Average Time in ISMIP Program by County (N=594)

County	Mean Days in Program	Standard Deviation
Kern (N=112)	175.1	186.3
Los Angeles (N=243)	320.0	255.2
Sacramento (N=100)	302.4	287.7
San Diego (N=81)	394.6	285.0
San Francisco (N=28)	161.8	168.9
Santa Clara (N=30)	236.3	241.3
Overall	288.2	259.4

## Arrests, Convictions, and Returns to Prison within 365 Days

The percentages for the two groups for arrests, convictions and returns are shown in Table 5. In both groups, 608 parolees were rearrested at least once within a year (Comparison N=307, ISMIP N=301). A total of 173 parolees in both groups were convicted within a year (Comparison N=89, ISMIP N=84). Only 29 parolees, total, were returned to prison within a year and a significantly greater number of Comparison parolees than ISMIP participants were returned (Comparison N=20, ISMIP N=9).

Table 5. Arrests, Convictions, and Returns to Prison within 365 Days (N=1187)

	Comparison (N = 593)	ISMIP (N=594)	p value
Arrested (% yes)	51.8	50.7	n.s.
Convicted (% yes)	15.0	14.1	n.s.
Returned to prison (% yes)	3.4	1.5	<.05

## Arrests by Level of Offense

To determine whether ISMIP had an effect on the level of arrest offense, we compared the groups by arrest level (felony, misdemeanor, supervision violation, and unknown). As seen in Table 6, among those arrested, there were no significant differences between the ISMIP and the Comparison group in the percentages of felony, misdemeanor, supervision violation, and unknown level of offense within 365 days.

Table 6. Arrests by Level of Offense (N=608)

	Comparison (N = 307)	ISMIP (N=301)	p value
Felony (% yes)	34.9	31.2	n.s.
Misdemeanor (% yes)	25.1	25.6	
Supervision violation (% yes)	39.1	41.5	
Unknown (% yes)	0.1	1.7	

## Convictions by Level of Offense

As shown in Table 7, among those convicted, there were no significant differences between groups in the percentage of convictions that were for felony or misdemeanor offenses within 365 days. A similar breakdown for prison returns was not possible due to the small numbers.

Table 7. Convictions by Level of Offense (N=173)

	Comparison (N = 89)	ISMIP (N=84)	p value
Felony (% yes)	48.3	42.9	n.s.
Misdemeanor (% yes)	51.7	57.1	

## Arrests by Offense Category

Table 8 shows the distribution of offense categories among those arrested within 365 days in the ISMIP and Comparison groups. Eight arrests in the “unknown” category were deleted from the analysis, resulting in a total count of 600. Consistent with the other analyses, no significant differences were found between groups.

Table 8. Arrests by Offense Category (N=600)

	Comparison (N = 304)	ISMIP (N=296)	p value
Crimes against persons (% yes)	22.0	22.6	n.s.
Property crimes (% yes)	11.8	9.46	
Drug crimes (% yes)	15.5	15.9	
Other crimes (% yes)	11.2	9.8	
Custody violations (% yes)	39.5	42.2	

## Convictions by Offense Category

As shown in Table 9, among those who were reconvicted there were no significant differences between the ISMIP and Comparison paroles in offense categories. The most common offense category was for “crimes against persons,” accounting for approximately one-third of the new convictions. There were too few returns to prison to compare by offense category.

Table 9. Convictions by Offense Category (N=153)

	Comparison (N = 78)	ISMIP (N=75)	p value
Crimes against persons (% yes)	33.3	34.7	n.s.
Property crimes (% yes)	16.7	14.7	
Drug crimes (% yes)	26.9	28.0	
Other crimes (% yes)	23.1	22.7	

### Cox Regressions of Days to First Arrest, Conviction, Return to Prison

Using Cox proportional hazards survival analyses of days to first arrest, first conviction, and return to prison (within 365 days), we found that Group (i.e., ISMIP vs. Comparison) did not predict the number of days to arrest or conviction, but Group did predict days to prison return. The ISMIP group had a significantly greater number of days to return (see Table 10). Time to return to prison was predicted by the model as a whole (likelihood ratio chi-square statistic [df 1] = 4.39,  $p = .04$ ).

Table 10. Cox Regressions of Days to First Arrest, Conviction, Return to Prison

	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Hazard Ratio	95% Confidence Limits	p value
Days to arrest	-0.01	0.08	0.99	0.84 – 1.16	n.s.
Days to conviction	-0.05	0.15	0.95	0.71 – 1.28	n.s.
Days to prison return	-0.81	0.40	0.45	0.20 – 0.98	<.05

## Discussion

The process evaluation of the ISMIP program (submitted in December of 2015)—and the findings summarized in this report—indicate that the ISMIP providers have provided a wide array of services and housing assistance to psychiatrically impaired parolees in their respective counties. In addition, ISMIP parolees were retained in these services for nearly 10 months, which is an admirable length of time to retain this difficult population in community treatment.

With regard to criminal justice outcomes, however, we did not find strong evidence that ISMIP reduced subsequent criminal involvement. The one exception to this was for returns to prison (during the first year following prison release), which occurred at a low rate overall, but were significantly lower among ISMIP participants. Days to prison return followed a similar pattern, the nine ISMIP participants who were returned – remained in the community significantly longer than the 20 Comparison group members.

In addition to not capturing clinical outcomes, the current evaluation was also limited by our reliance on existing data (including program participation data that was provided by the providers themselves), and the lack of a true randomized control group. Although random assignment is always preferable from a scientific point of view, it is often not feasible when dealing with high-risk and high-need populations as the one evaluated here. In order to have enough parolees to match, the CCCMS and EOP groups were combined when the matched sample was drawn. If the Comparison group had a larger percentage of CCCMS participants than the ISMIP group, this could have affected the return rate. That said, our careful matching process did result in a similar comparison group (as shown in Table 1), giving us reasonable confidence in the findings presented here.

## Next Steps

---

Given the scope of this evaluation, we were not able to assess other outcomes, such as psychological functioning, homelessness, or employment. All of these areas may have been impacted through participation in these programs, as they (as opposed to criminal activity) were the direct targets of the enhanced services. Now that the ISMIP programs have more standardized components, these outcomes could be addressed in future evaluations.

## Appendix

ISMIP and Comparison Counties (2012-2013) statistics on EOP and CCCMS releases and returns to custody

ISMIP							Comparison Pool						
County	EOP		CCCMS		County	EOP		CCCMS					
	N of Release	% Ret	N of Release	% Arrest		N of Release	% Ret	N of Release	% Arrest				
<b>Kern</b>	116	7.76	21	74	149	69	<b>Tulare</b>	62	9.68	10	70	68	68
<b>Los Angeles</b>	938	7.78	217	66	904	57	<b>Orange</b>	164	7.32	51	78	204	59
<b>Sacramento</b>	187	2.67	38	68	208	65	<b>Alameda</b>	129	3.10	22	68	138	64
<b>San Diego</b>	265	8.68	121	76	289	66	<b>Orange</b>	164	7.32	51	78	204	59
<b>San Francisco</b>	47	2.13	23	70	58	71	<b>Contra Costa</b>	39	0	10	60	52	75
<b>Santa Clara</b>	103	7.77	9	22	112	46	<b>Sonoma</b>	28	7.14	8	38	30	60