



Administered by OJP

# Prisoner Reentry

**Compiled by  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service  
July 7, 2005**

Additional resources are available on our Web site: <http://www.ncjrs.org>.  
For criminal justice assistance, please e-mail us at: <http://askncjrs.ncjrs.org>

## Office of Justice Programs Sponsored Publications

**Guide for Developing Housing for Ex-Offenders.** CCDO, 5/2004, NCJ 203374.

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ccdo/pdfxt/NCJ203374.pdf>

The Office of Justice Programs organized a focus group to examine the issues related to developing a guide for providing housing to ex-offenders. The population to be served by the guide is a critical question. The decision of who will be served by the housing is based on: housing needs, available housing programs, and key stakeholders. The type of housing to be provided will define plans by deciding if the focus will be on temporary, intermediate, or long-term facilities, or a combination of these.

**Applying Problem Solving Approaches to Issues of Inmate Re-Entry: The Indianapolis Pilot Project, Final Report.** NIJ-Sponsored, 2/2004, NCJ 203923.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/203923.pdf>

This report describes the implementation and evaluation of the Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership (IVRP), which used a problem-solving approach to reduce recidivism among former inmates.

**Reentry Courts Process Evaluation (Phase 1), Final Report.** NIJ-Sponsored, 10/2003, NCJ 202472.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/202472.pdf>

This document presents an evaluation of the Office of Justice Programs' (OJP) Reentry Court Initiative (RCI), which establishes a system of offender accountability and support services throughout the reentry process.

**Offender's Views of Reentry: Implications for Processes, Programs, and Services .** NIJ-Sponsored, 3/2002, NCJ 196490.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196490.pdf>

Part of a series of evaluations by the Reentry Partnership Initiative (RPI), this paper, sponsored by the Office of Justice Programs and the U.S. Department of Justice, focuses on problems faced by offenders who return to communities after a period of incarceration.

**From Prison Safety to Public Safety: Innovations in Offender Reentry .** NIJ-Sponsored, 3/2002, NCJ 196464.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196464.pdf>

This paper is part of a formative evaluation series on the Reentry Partnership Initiatives (RPI) which focus on reducing the recidivism of offenders and includes cooperative efforts between criminal justice, social services, and community groups to implement a reentry process for ex-inmates.

**Emerging Roles and Responsibilities in the Reentry Partnership Initiative: New Ways of Doing Business .** NIJ-Sponsored, 3/2002, NCJ 196441.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196441.pdf>

This is a report on the evaluation of the Reentry Partnership Initiative (RPI) -- a Federal program that includes the formation of a partnership between criminal justice, social service, and community groups to develop and implement a re-entry process for offenders -- conducted to examine how the eight demonstration sites implemented the RPI, with a focus on the organizational development across agencies to construct new offender re-entry processes.

**Engaging the Community in Offender Reentry .** NIJ-Sponsored, 2/2002, NCJ 196492.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196492.pdf>

Highlighting ways to engage the community in offender reentry, this report is a part of a series on reentry initiatives sponsored by the Office of Justice Programs and the U.S. Department of Justice.

**Targeting for Reentry: Matching Needs and Services to Maximize Public Safety** . NIJ-Sponsored, 2/2002, NCJ 196491.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196491.pdf>

Focusing on public safety issues upon offenders' return to communities after incarceration, this paper is a part of a series on reentry initiatives sponsored by the Office of Justice Programs and the U.S. Department of Justice.

**Drugs, Incarceration and Neighborhood Life: The Impact of Reintegrating Offenders into the Community** . NIJ-Sponsored, 2/2001, NCJ 195173.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/195173.pdf>

This qualitative study investigated the aggregate impact of incarceration on the quality of community life in areas with high concentrations of resident incarceration.

**When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences.** NIJ, 11/2000, NCJ 184253.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/184253.pdf>

Changes in sentencing practices, coupled with a decrease in prison rehabilitation programs, have placed new demands on the parole system. This NIJ Sentencing & Corrections Research in Brief examines the state of parole in today's corrections environment—from indeterminate and determinate sentencing policies to investing in prisoner reentry programs. Specifically, the report analyzes the following collateral consequences involved with recycling parolees in and out of families and communities: community cohesion and social disorganization, work and economic well-being, family matters, mental and physical health, political alienation, and housing and homelessness.

**Religiousness and Post-Release Community Adjustment Graduate Research Fellowship - Final Report.** NIJ-Sponsored, 9/2000, NCJ 184508.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/184508.pdf>

This study assessed the effect of inmate religiosity on post-release community adjustment and investigated the circumstances under which these effects were most likely to take place.

**But They All Come Back: Rethinking Prisoner Reentry.** NIJ, 5/2000, NCJ 181413.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/181413.pdf>

Outlines a reentry model and elements needed to make it work. This NIJ Research in Brief discusses the processes and goals of reentry—a nearly universal experience for criminal defendants, not just returning prisoners. Reentry management approaches that reintegrate offenders into the community and prevent recurring antisocial behavior are explored and the need for the judiciary to play a greater role emphasized. Current briefs in this series of eight that distill what has been learned from the Executive Sessions on Sentencing and Corrections also focus on how technological forces are converging with the forces of law and order to create "technocorrections," the drug court approach and its evolution, and the "parallel universe" approach to prison management.

**Reintegration, Supervised Release, and Intensive Aftercare.** OJJDP, 8/1999, NCJ 175715.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/175715.pdf>

The authors distinguish the Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) model from other models and programs that have been implemented and assessed with varying degrees of success and analyze individual IAP initiatives.

**Washington State's Corrections Clearinghouse: A Comprehensive Approach to Offender Employment.** NIJ, 7/1999, NCJ 174441.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/174441.pdf>

Across the country corrections agencies and facilities often develop programs to prepare offenders and ex-offenders for the job market after release. The NIJ Program Focus, *Washington State's Corrections Clearinghouse: A Comprehensive Approach to Offender Employment*,

illustrates the attempts of one such program. Washington's Corrections Clearinghouse (CCH) provides direct brokering, and coordination services to adult and juvenile inmates and ex-offenders to heighten their workplace skills through educational courses and pre- and postrelease job search assistance. This report highlights CCH's activities and their success in ultimately reducing recidivism rates among ex-offenders.

**Reintegrating Juvenile Offenders Into the Community: OJJDP's Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Demonstration Program.** NIJ, 12/1998, FS 000234.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/fs000234.pdf>

Crowded juvenile corrections facilities, high recidivism rates, and escalating correctional incarceration costs were among the primary factors that sparked OJJDP's research on intensive juvenile aftercare. Researchers theorized that if juvenile offenders receive intensive intervention while they are incarcerated during their transition to the community and while they are under community supervision, they would benefit in such areas as family and peer relations, education, jobs, substance abuse, mental health, and recidivism. Working with juvenile justice authorities in four States and a sample group of youthful offenders, the research team is implementing a working model to provide the youths with comprehensive, ongoing services (substance abuse counseling, social services, and mental health counseling) both while they are incarcerated and when they return to their communities.

**Successful Job Placement For Ex-Offenders: The Center for Employment Opportunities.**

NIJ, 3/1998, NCJ 168102.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/168102.pdf>

Describes the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) in New York City, a program that provides transitional services to ex-offenders. Offenders often have difficulty finding permanent, well-paid jobs after release because they lack job-seeking and occupational skills, and because employers are reluctant to hire individuals with criminal records. Unemployment is consistently associated with high recidivism rates. CEO helps ex-offenders transition from incarceration by helping them prepare for, find, and keep jobs.

**Texas' Project RIO (Re-Integration of Offenders).** NIJ, 1998, NCJ 168637.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/168637.pdf>

This Program Focus discusses Texas' Project RIO (Re-Integration of Offenders), one of the most ambitious State government programs devoted to placing parolees in jobs in the Nation. Operating through the Texas Workforce Commission (the State's employment agency), RIO has more than 100 staff members in 62 offices who provide job placement services to nearly 16,000 parolees each year in every county in the State. The program provides job preparation services to inmates while they are still incarcerated in State prisons so that they have a head start in postrelease job hunting. At the same time, RIO's prison presence spreads the word to inmates that the program is waiting to help them find work the day they are released. Project RIO represents the close collaboration of the Texas Workforce Commission, where the program is housed, and the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

## NCJRS Abstracts Database

The following documents are a sample of relevant publications available via the NCJRS Abstracts Database at [http://abstractsdb.ncjrs.org/content/AbstractsDB\\_Search.asp](http://abstractsdb.ncjrs.org/content/AbstractsDB_Search.asp). See the "Obtaining Documents" section at <http://www.ncjrs.org/tutorial/obtain.html> for instructions on how to acquisition publications.

**NCJ Number:** 210156

**Title:** Three Innovative Court-Involved Reentry Programs

**Corporate Author:** National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

**Sponsoring Agency:** Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

**Publication Date:** 2004

**Pages:** 8

**Grant No.:** 2001-JI-BX-K001

**Annotation:** This bulletin profiles juvenile reentry efforts in three jurisdictions in which local juvenile courts and probation departments have taken charge of reentry plans and their implementation.

**Abstract:** Since 1997 Allegheny County (Pittsburgh), PA, has required that all juveniles returning to the county from residential placements receive a minimum of 90 days of aftercare supervision, delivered through existing day treatment reporting programs. The sites are operated directly by the court or by The Academy, a local private day treatment provider regularly used by the court. The West Virginia Division of Juvenile Services Reentry Court Program began as a three-county reentry court pilot project launched in June 2000. Local courts provide oversight of reentry through monthly court hearings to review progress and enforce conditions. The Division of Juvenile Services provides enhanced supervision and case management for returning "high-risk" juveniles. In Marion County (Indianapolis), IN, the Reentry Initiative began operating in the late summer of 2003 and is still in the early stages of implementation. Similar to the reentry courts in West Virginia, it is a State-local planning and supervision partnership, with a juvenile reentry court providing frequent oversight/enforcement hearings. A key role is given to a nonprofit managed care contractor, which provides all case-management services. For all three programs, this bulletin discusses the targeting of aftercare resources, transition planning and preparation, oversight authority upon release, the management during high-risk periods, services and supports, sanctions and rewards, and integration with the community. 12 notes

**NCJ Number:** 209586

**Title:** Report of the Reentry Policy Council: Charting the Safe and Successful Return of Prisoners to the Community, Report Preview

**Corporate Author:** Council of State Governments

**Sponsoring Agency:** US Dept of Labor  
Employment and Training Admin

**Publication Date:** 2004

**Pages:** 22

**Grant No.:** 2003-RE-CX-0002;2002-PR-551;AF131300360

**Annotation:** This preview of the full "Report of the Reentry Policy Council" explains what the report offers to various audiences, introduces some of its principal concepts, and explains how to use the full 600-page report.

**Abstract:** "Reentry" refers to the return of released prison and jail inmates to their communities and the services and assistance they receive from the community to help them develop constructive life patterns. The audience for this report consists of anyone who cares about public safety and people victimized by crime, as well as those responsible for workforce development, health, housing, and family and community vitality. The summary of some of the key concepts addressed by the report's 34 policy statements is presented under the categories of "Get Started," "Address Core Challenges," and "Develop Policies and Programs." In order to "Get Started," the report provides guidance in bringing people together to plan how to improve reentry

experiences for returning ex-offenders, as well as procedures for assessing the status of reentry resources in the jurisdiction. Guidance in how to "Address Core Challenges" focuses on redefining missions, maximizing the value of existing funding, integrating systems, measuring performance, and informing and reassuring the public. In order to "Develop Policies and Programs," the report provides advice on making smart release and community supervision decisions; ensuring support for victims; offering safe places to live; breaking the bonds of addiction; treating physical and mental illnesses; fostering meaningful relationships; and providing training, education, and jobs. The topics of the 34 policy statements are listed.

**NCJ Number:** 209490

**Title:** Step Down Programs: The Missing Link in Successful Inmate Reentry

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:67 Issue:2 Dated:April 2005 Pages:102 to 107

**Author:** Ralph Fretz

**Annotation:** This article describes an effective continuum-of-care model containing a step-down process for offenders before they reenter the community.

**Abstract:** An identified critical component of an effective offender reentry model is a seamless continuum-of-care with information about the offender's progress being transmitted through each stage of reentry. In addition, within the reentry continuum-of-care process, transitional or step-down programming in a secure setting plays a critical role. This article is a description of a continuum-of-care model that includes a step-down process for offenders before they reenter their respective communities. This model is seen as effective in reducing recidivism in a high-risk offender population. The Reentry Continuum-of-Care model contains four phases: institutional phase, step-down phase, community release phase, and aftercare services phase. Research on the continuum-of-care model indicates success in recidivism reduction. Offenders who completed the continuum-of-care reduced their rate of recidivism by more than 30 percent in terms of re-arrest, reconviction, and re-incarceration. Endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 209489

**Title:** Making Inmate Re-Entry Safe and Successful: Using the Report of the Reentry Policy Council

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:67 Issue:2 Dated:April 2005 Pages:98 to 100

**Author:** Katherine Brown

**Annotation:** This article presents findings and recommendations from the Re-Entry Policy Council (RPC) to assist ex-offenders succeed in their communities.

**Abstract:** The Re-Entry Policy Council (RPC) was established in 2001 to develop specific, bipartisan recommendations that would reflect the expertise of a broad spectrum of stakeholders from across the United States to promote safe and successful inmate reentry. The recommendations of the RPC, presented in a report, provide a powerful basis for collaborative efforts in any jurisdiction. The findings of the RPC are divided into three parts: (1) planning a reentry initiative; (2) review of the reentry process; and (3) elements of effective health and social service systems. Several strategies are presented and serve as a step toward building meaningful, collaborative solutions to reduce public spending and ensure the safe and successful return of inmates to the community. These strategies include: (1) engage a policymaker or key official to an inmate reentry initiative; (2) focus interest in reentry on a particular aspect of the problem; (3) determine how to address an obstacle that has impeded an offender's safe transition to the community; (4) assess comprehensiveness of an existing reentry effort; (5) find out what other jurisdictions are doing; (6) learn about relevant research; (7) advocate for change; (8) respond to public pressure generated by a recent tragedy; and (9) educate the media. 1 endnote

**NCJ Number:** 209488

**Title:** Assessing for Success in Offender Reentry

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:67 Issue:2 Dated:April 2005 Pages:94 to 97

**Author:** Kathleen A. Gnall ; Gary Zajac

**Annotation:** This article examines effective approaches in the accurate and objective assessment of offender risk, needs, and responsivity for successful offender reentry by describing recent strategies implemented by the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections.

**Abstract:** Several large evaluations of correctional programs across the United States have found that offender assessment is one of the most poorly implemented principles of effective offender intervention. Correctional programs have relied too much on subjective, clinical assessments of offenders' likelihood of re-offending or risk, and specific risk factors. Corrections programs have neglected one of the most important features of an effective correctional treatment system, standard, objective assessment instruments. Recently, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (DOC) has implemented a rigorous new system for assessing the criminogenic risk and needs of its offenders. Three tools were adopted for all newly committed inmates: the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R); the Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified; and the Hostile Interpretations Questionnaire. To promote effective offender assessment, staff training is essential. Training initiatives under the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections are designed so that all staff who work with inmates will be exposed to the latest research on the causes of criminal behavior, what factors can be targeted for change with the prison environment, how assessment tools can be used, and how best to use this information in delivering treatment. In addition, through training with the Board of Probation and Parole (PBPP), the DOC is attempting to ensure that the sister agencies share a common understanding and language with respect to assessment. 6 Endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 209487

**Title:** Informing Policy and Practice: Prisoner Reentry Research at the Urban Institute

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:67 Issue:2 Dated:April 2005 Pages:90 to 93

**Author:** Elizabeth C. McBride ; Christy Visser ; Nancy La Vigne

**Annotation:** This article describes the Urban Institute's key research projects and publications on prisoner reentry and highlights findings from a project on ongoing research on the dimensions of prisoner reentry and identifying what works in prisoner reentry.

**Abstract:** An ongoing forum, introduced in 2000 by the Urban Institute, brings together accomplished academics, experienced practitioners, community leaders, policymakers, advocates, and former inmates. The intent of this forum is to sharpen the Nation's thinking on prisoner reintegration and criminal justice practice, and foster policy innovations to improve outcomes. This article presents research undertaken by the Urban Institute exploring the policy domains of prisoner reentry, its impact, and programs designed to improve the outcome of prisoners returning to the community. In addition, it discusses the multiyear comprehensive evaluation of the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative, as well as a study on the effectiveness of supervision, in an attempt to improve reentry outcomes of former prisoners. However, the Institute's principal reentry research initiative is *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. It is a multistate, 3-year study documenting the pathways of prisoner reintegration, what factors contribute to a successful or unsuccessful reentry experience, and identifies how these factors can inform policy. The Urban Institute continues to expand its portfolio of reentry policy research. The Institute attempts to fill the gap in knowledge and advance policies and innovations rooted in research. Table, figures, endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 209486

**Title:** Engaging Communities: An Essential Ingredient to Offender Reentry

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:67 Issue:2 Dated:April 2005 Pages:86 to 89

**Author:** Reginald A. Wilkinson

**Annotation:** This article discusses how the community is an important variable in the success of offender reentry, and presents a sampling of effective and successful examples of community engagement in the reentry process.

**Abstract:** The development, maintenance, and influence of community providers in the reentry process of offenders is an acknowledged variable and has become more paramount as releases from confinement continue to increase at record levels. To ensure that formerly incarcerated individuals become productive citizens is not the sole responsibility of correctional agencies; communities must become engaged and empowered to work collaboratively with corrections to provide guidance and direct assistance to released offenders. Research has argued that employability is related to criminal involvement. Attaining sustainable employment and acceptance in the workplace serves as a building block to connecting with the community.

However, this entails attaining educational and work-related skills. In soliciting community organizations to participate in a reentry initiative, correctional agencies must be proactive in their approach. There are multiple pathways to engage communities in reentry, and this article discusses only the surface of the many possibilities currently in operation. The community's role has now become a necessary component and an essential ingredient to the success of offender reentry. Endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 209485

**Title:** Releasing Inmates with Mental Illness and Co-Occurring Disorders Into the Community

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:67 Issue:2 Dated:April 2005 Pages:82 to 85

**Author:** Lance Couturier ; Frederick Maue ; Catherine McVey

**Annotation:** This article examines strategies undertaken by the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (DOC) to address the multiple obstacles facing the reentry of inmates with mental illness and co-occurring disorders.

**Abstract:** According to the U.S. Department of Justice, the number of offenders with mental illness is staggering with estimates of approximately 700,000 adults with mental illness entering United States' jails and approximately 75 percent suffering from co-occurring disorders, such as substance abuse. There are multiple obstacles to reentry into the community for inmates with mental illness and co-occurring disorders. This article discusses the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections' enhancements in the continuity-of-care policies and procedures for inmates with mental illness and co-occurring disorders and the development of programs to assist these inmates with reentry. Specialized community living programs developed by the Pennsylvania DOC are the FIR-St Program, the Coleman Center, and the CROMISA programs. To provide a safe transition and maintain continuity of care for those inmates with mental illness or co-occurring disorders reentering the community, the Pennsylvania DOC and the National Alliance of Mentally Ill established the Forensic Interagency Task Force in 1999 to address local forensic problems. In conclusion, Pennsylvania's strategies to addressing this issue include aftercare planning while the offender is behind the walls and providing a better hand-off from the DOC to the community agencies, developing community corrections centers located near the offender's community, and collaborating with community mental health agencies, advocacy groups, and families. 3 Endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 209484

**Title:** Developing Successful Reentry Programs: Lessons Learned From the "What Works" Research

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:67 Issue:2 Dated:April 2005 Pages:72-74,76 to 77

**Author:** Christopher T. Lowenkamp ; Edward J. Latessa

**Annotation:** This article illustrates the principles and characteristics of effective reentry programs in corrections through research on 38 residential programs in Ohio serving offenders on post-release.

**Abstract:** In reviewing the number of offenders incarcerated or under some form of correctional supervision, it's alarmingly clear that the return of offenders back to the community is ever increasing. Reentry programs have many redeeming qualities and show significant promise. They provide an opportunity to shape an offender's behavior while transitioning back to their community, they offer the ability to proactively deal with violations of post-release supervision and reduce prison populations, and they facilitate a successful reentry. This article presents research on 38 residential programs that serve parolees and offenders on post-release control in Ohio and have the potential to serve as a blueprint in the development or redesign of reentry programs. The article begins by discussing the concept of evidence-based practice (EBP); a decisionmaking process that requires a practitioner to make decisions based on empirical evidence. The practitioner looks at what has been done and what has been effective. This is followed by a discussion on the core principles of effective correctional interventions. These principles and characteristics are identified as important to correctional interventions and are seen to be applicable and important to programs that serve parolees upon reentry. Research also concluded that implementation and other issues captured by measures of program integrity were strongly related to program effectiveness with offenders during the reentry phase. Endnotes, references



**NCJ Number:** 208697

**Title:** Throughcare and Aftercare: Approaches and Promising Practice in Service Delivery for Clients Released From Prison or Leaving Residential Rehabilitation

**Author:** Anne Fox ; Lorraine Khan ; Daniel Briggs ; Nicky Rees-Jones ; Zoe Thompson ; Jan Owens

**Sale:** Great Britain Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate

**URL\*:** <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs05/rdsolr0105.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 2005

**Pages:** 37

**Annotation:** This report presents findings from an evaluation of existing approaches to throughcare and aftercare services for released inmates with drug problems.

**Abstract:** Six aftercare and four residential rehabilitation centers made up the case studies for the evaluation. The study relied on Rapid Assessment and Response (RAR) methodology that allows researchers to gather information rapidly and effectively through multiple methods. The population under study was adults with drug problems who were leaving residential treatment or returning to the community from corrections custody. Formal and informal interviews were conducted with approximately 200 prisoners, clients, and staff members of the 11 rehabilitation and aftercare agencies regarding their approaches to delivering services to released offenders. Additionally, 50 questionnaires were delivered to aftercare agencies across England and Wales and 60 questionnaires were distributed randomly to prisoners in 12 prisons. The main findings regarding the throughcare services indicated the need for timely assessments on offender needs and consistent collaboration in aftercare planning. Potential sources for aftercare service referrals were not well integrated with local service delivery; additional information about local agencies and their functions should be provided to all workers. The main findings regarding aftercare indicated that aftercare case management plans did not always take into account other agencies' interventions. A persistent and non-judgemental approach by staff motivated greater engagement by clients. Other areas of aftercare improvement were identified as greater guidance and training for staff regarding the signs of high-risk situations and characteristics of clients that may indicate a relapse. Finally, there was little empirical evidence concerning the effectiveness of aftercare or throughcare interventions and approaches. A standardized outcome monitoring system that allows for a follow-up of clients should be developed and implemented. Greater in-depth study about case-management practices is warranted. Table, footnotes, endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 208528

**Title:** Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home

**Author:** Nancy G. La Vigne ; Christy Visher ; Jennifer Castro

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/311115\\_chicagoprisoners.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/311115_chicagoprisoners.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 12/2004

**Pages:** 20

**Annotation:** This report presents findings from an Urban Institute prisoner reentry study in Chicago, IL.

**Abstract:** In 2001, the Urban Institute implemented a four-State, longitudinal study of the challenges of prisoner reentry in Maryland, Illinois, Ohio, and Texas. The study in Chicago began with an analysis of pre-existing corrections data in order to glean a picture of the current incarceration and reentry characteristics in Illinois. Following this analysis, a series of interviews was conducted with 400 male prisoners returning to Chicago neighborhoods both before and after their release from prison. Interviews focused on the respondents' prerelease programming, post-release programming and services, and on their attitudes and beliefs toward themselves and others. Interviews were also conducted with prisoners' family members and focus groups were conducted in four Chicago neighborhoods where a high concentration of prisoners return after release from prison. This report presents findings from the interviews and neighborhood focus groups. The analysis indicates that families are an important support system for released prisoners; prisoner interviews underscored the importance of family in reducing recidivism. The four neighborhoods most prisoners in Illinois return to are marked by high levels of social and economic disadvantage and offer little in the way of employment or social support to keep

returning prisoners out of jail. Before release, most respondents expressed desire to change and had positive attitudes about themselves and others. Following release, respondents experienced difficulties finding employment; those who held jobs prior to incarceration were significantly more likely to find post-release employment. Although 3 in 10 respondents reported chronic health problems and 10 percent showed signs of depression, a full 81 percent of respondents did not have health insurance following release. Finally, 22 percent of the respondents were reconvicted within 11 months of release. These data should provide a foundation for policy discussions and recommendations. Table, figures, endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 208480

**Title:** National Portrait of SVORI (Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative)

**Author:** Pamela K. Lattimore ; Susan Brumbaugh ; Christy Visser ; Christine Lindquist ; Laura Winterfield ; Meghan Salas ; Janine Zweig

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**Sponsoring Agency:** National Institute of Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/1000692\\_svorinationalportrait.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/1000692_svorinationalportrait.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 07/2004

**Pages:** 246

**Grant No.:** 2003-RE-CX-K101

**Annotation:** This report provides an overview of the federally funded Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI), summarizes the features of the SVORI program for each of the 69 sites that have received grants, and describes the design of the multi-site evaluation of SVORI currently underway.

**Abstract:** SVORI is a collaborative Federal effort to improve outcomes for adults and juveniles who return to communities from correctional facilities. It focuses on reentry outcomes in terms of avoiding criminal behavior and making satisfactory progress in the areas of employment, education, health, and housing. All grantees are required to establish and support a partnership between institutional and community agencies. SVORI funding supports the creation of a three-phase continuum of services that begins in prison, moves to a structured reentry phase before and during the early months of release, and continues for several years as released inmates assume increasingly productive roles in the community. For each of the 69 sites, this report describes the features of each phase of this 3-phase continuum. The description of the multi-site evaluation notes that its goal is to determine whether the selected programs have achieved the overall goal of SVORI, i.e., increasing public safety by reducing recidivism among the populations served by the programs. In addition, the evaluation will determine the relative costs and benefits of SVORI. Following the completion of a 1-year design and assessment period in April 2004, the evaluation team began work on a 4-year comprehensive impact evaluation that will continue through the end of the evaluation period in 2008. The evaluation includes an implementation assessment of all grantees, an impact evaluation that will focus on a limited number of sites, a cost-benefit analysis, and a dissemination plan. 42 references and appended SVORI grantees and programs and adult admission and release trends by State

**NCJ Number:** 208479

**Title:** Report of the Reentry Policy Council: Charting the Safe and Successful Return of Prisoners to the Community

**Corporate Author:** Council of State Governments

**Sponsoring Agency:** US Dept of Labor; Bureau of Justice Assistance

**URL\*:** [http://www.reentrypolicy.org/documents/rpc\\_report.pdf](http://www.reentrypolicy.org/documents/rpc_report.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 2003

**Pages:** 672

**Grant No.:** 2003-RE-CX-0002;2002-PR-551;AF131300360;282-97-0063

**Annotation:** This report provides recommendations for policies, programs, and legislation that are designed to ease the community reentry process for adult prisoners facing release from jails or prisons in the United States.

**Abstract:** The report provides a comprehensive analysis of essential elements for programs addressing reentry, a review of the current research literature, and examples of programs and

policies that illustrate how other communities have addressed the issue of prisoner reentry. Thirty-five policy recommendations for reentry initiatives are offered in this report for policymakers and practitioners at all levels of government; each policy recommendation is followed by a description of the problem it addresses and research highlights summarizing relevant studies. The recommendations describe the steps that should be followed to implement the recommended policy. Examples illustrate programs, policies, and elements of State statutes that show how other jurisdictions have attempted to implement the policy under consideration. Part 1 of the report focuses on the steps necessary to build a solid foundation from which to develop reentry programming. Chapters in this section discuss how stakeholder commitment and information gathering are important elements for any reentry initiative. Also described in this section are the key issues that form the basis of all reentry efforts, including mission statements, funding, systems integration, performance measurement and evaluation, and public information. Part 2 focuses on the development of reentry policies and programs in a particular jurisdiction. Chapters in this section illustrate the sequence of events that take place from the time a person is admitted to a correctional facility to the time of successful sentence completion in the community. Part 3 describes the essential improvements that must occur within housing, workforce development, substance abuse treatment, mental health services, children and family support, and health care to meet the needs of reentry individuals. Appendixes offer information on the programs used as examples throughout the report and present data about the status of parole by State. Appendixes, bibliography, glossary, index

**NCJ Number:** 208297

**Title:** Offender Reentry: A Returning or Reformed Criminal?

**Journal:** *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* Volume:73 Issue:12 Dated:December 2004 Pages:1 to 10

**Author:** David M. Allender

**Annotation:** This article reviews and discusses past and present American penology and policy decisions and their impact on an offender's return to his community as either a returning criminal or a reformed offender.

**Abstract:** Offender reentry is a pressing issue for American society for many reasons. Governmental resources have been drastically taxed as legislatures have criminalized more and more behaviors. Sentencing reform has created determinate sentencing and mandatory minimum time requirements which has resulted in longer prison stays for offenders. With longer prison stays, many treatment and educational programs have not been able to keep pace with the increased demand. With the longer prison stays and lack of treatment and education programs, 95 percent of all these offenders will be released at some point and will return to their communities. Upon their release, communities are confronted, based on policy decisions made and implemented, by either a returning criminal or a reformed offender. This article discusses the need in new ways of thinking in order to reduce the recidivism rate. Effective partnerships are discussed, such as Project RIO. Project RIO, established in 1985 in the State of Texas forces ex-inmates to conform to societal norms or assists them in making the transition from prison to freedom. After an evaluation in 1992, Project RIO was found to be successful. In addition, during the community reintegration phase, police officers work to lessen the friction that accompanies change for ex-offenders. With its emphasis on problem solving, community policing is changing the face of law enforcement and the reintegration of offenders.

**NCJ Number:** 208073

**Title:** Examining the Role of the Police in Reentry Partnership Initiatives

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:62 to 69

**Author:** James M. Byrne ; Don Hummer

**Annotation:** Following an overview of the development of police-corrections partnerships in the United States, this article discusses the roles of policing during the institutional phase of a reentry program, during the structured reentry phase, and during the community reintegration phase.

**Abstract:** A 1999 nationwide review of the use of police-corrections partnerships in the United States identified five models: enhanced supervision partnerships, fugitive apprehension units, information-sharing partnerships, specialized enforcement partnerships, and interagency

problem-solving partnerships. Partnerships between police and corrections agencies are an emerging strategy adopted by several Federal agencies that fund a wide range of offender reentry initiatives at the Federal, State, and local levels. During the institutional phase of reentry, police should be involved in deciding the types of offenders to include and exclude from a particular reentry program. This provides input from the law enforcement perspective and increases the likelihood of police support for the reentry initiative. Typically, the structured reentry phase focuses on the last few months before release and the first month after release. In several jurisdictions, police officers meet with the offender in prison to explain how local policing has changed since the offender's incarceration and to inform the offender that he/she will be monitored by police after release. Police surveillance and contacts provide a supplement to probation and parole supervision. Regarding the community reintegration phase of reentry, offenders who have difficulty with the initial transition from prison to the community will likely have more intensive police intervention. Issues that should be continually monitored under police involvement in reentry programs are the potential for racial profiling in offender/community targeting decisions, the limits of information-sharing across agencies, and the impact of the expanded police role on both offenders released from prison and jail and the neighborhoods to which they return. 5 notes and 20 references

**NCJ Number:** 208072

**Title:** Targeting for Reentry: Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Across Eight Model Programs

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:53 to 61

**Author:** James M. Byrne Ph.D. ; Faye S. Taxman Ph.D.

**Annotation:** After describing the changing patterns of Federal and State prison admissions and releases, this article examines the target- population criteria used in eight model Reentry Partnership Initiative Programs (RPI's) and then discusses the challenges posed by various offender groups.

**Abstract:** Offenders are now serving a greater proportion of their sentences in prison, and they are returning to the community with the same problems they had when incarcerated. In addition, some offenders return to the community with new mental health, physical health, and criminogenic problems. This article focuses on who should be targeted for reentry programs, and where in the community they should be targeted. This is done by examining the targeting criteria developed in eight model RPI programs identified by the Office of Justice Programs and recently included in a multisite process evaluation. Generally, the reentry programs reviewed include three reentry phases: the institutional phase, the structured reentry phase, and the community reintegration phase; however, there is considerable variation in the design of the programs as well as in the duration of each phase. These differences are related largely to the targeting decisions of program developers at each site. This article highlights the impact of offense, offender, and area-specific targeting decisions on each phase of reentry. The eight reentry programs reviewed are in Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, South Carolina, Vermont, and Washington State. The discussion of the various offender types released from prison daily -- such as sex offenders, drug offenders, repeat offenders, and mentally ill offenders - - emphasizes the need to design each phase of the reentry process to address the reintegration issues associated with specific target populations. This article recommends assessing reentry programs to determine whether they address the needs of the multiple-problem offender. 3 tables and 31 references

**NCJ Number:** 208071

**Title:** Effects of Serious Mental Illness on Offender Reentry

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:45 to 52

**Author:** Arthur J. Lurigio ; Angie Rollins ; John Fallon

**Annotation:** After examining the factors that have led to increasing numbers of the mentally ill being processed by the criminal justice system, this article estimates the prevalence of major psychiatric problems in the parolee population, discusses specialized case management strategies for responding to mentally ill parolees, describes an Illinois program for the reentry of mentally ill parolees, and discusses the challenges of managing mentally ill offenders (MIO's) in the community.

**Abstract:** A change in mental health policy, known as deinstitutionalization, shifted the locus of care for patients with serious mental illness (SMI) from psychiatric hospitals to community mental health centers. The failed transition to community mental health services led to the increased contact of SMI persons with police due to behavioral problems in the community. The most reliable studies of mental illness among State inmates have found that 15 percent have a SMI. Other studies suggest that SMI is common among parolees and increases the risk of parolee recidivism. Specialized reentry strategies are required for SMI parolees. A discharge plan should have information on an inmate's need for community-based mental health treatment, employment, housing, and financial and social support. Court-mandated drug treatment, using the leverage of the court and correctional systems, increases enrollment and participation in interventions and programs while reducing criminal activity. Effective case management techniques can help SMI parolees access multiple services in an overall treatment plan that integrates and coordinates care across various service domains. A team approach should involve formal agreements or memoranda of understanding with mental health agencies that include cross-training among correctional staff and service providers. Illinois' Thresholds' Prison Aftercare Program (PAP) serves people with SMI. PAP is based on the Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) model, which uses multidisciplinary teams with small, shared caseloads and daily staff meetings to discuss individual clients and coordinate a comprehensive range of services. 55 references

**Number:** 208070

**Title:** Emerging Role of Information Technology in Prison Reentry Initiatives

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:40 to 44

**Author:** April Pattavina

**Annotation:** This article describes the goals, objectives, information needs, information technology (IT) support required, and performance measures for a comprehensive, collaborative offender reentry program.

**Abstract:** A comprehensive reentry program spans the management of offenders from sentencing through prison, release, and adjustment in the community after release. Under this model, multiple agencies share the responsibility for the successful integration of offenders back into the community. Participating agencies collaborate with one another and with offenders to develop case management plans, treatment services, and monitoring that facilitates a constructive and law-abiding life for the offender in the community. Information technology and the sharing of information among agencies and organizations is required to support reentry decisionmaking, particularly in monitoring offender progress in prison and in the community. One goal of a reentry program is to prepare offenders for release from prison. Information needs related to this goal pertain to treatment progress and classification. The IT support required for this is a prison-based records management system (RMS) and an incident reporting system. Performance measures include program attendance and completion. Another goal of a reentry program is individual success in the community under treatment services, supervision, and surveillance. Information needs in this effort are program progress and classification, a program inventory, compliance with supervision conditions, and monitoring. The IT support required is a community corrections RMS, computerized phone and other service directories, geographic information system (GIS) software, and electronic tracking devices. A third objective in reentry is community safety. The related information needs are offender profiles and community-based information. The IT support required are local police RMS, biometric systems, criminal history systems, GIS software, and statistical software. 21 references

**NCJ Number:** 208069

**Title:** Instituting a "Reentry" Focus in the Federal Probation System

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:36 to 39

**Author:** Timothy P. Cadigan

**Annotation:** This article describes the design and implementation of the Federal reentry program for offenders as well as the development and execution of an outcome, assessment, and feedback project for the reentry program.

**Abstract:** Current Federal offenders on community supervision are more likely than in the past to

have been in prison, have more serious criminal records, and to have used drugs, thus making them a higher risk to require more services than previous Federal offenders. In an effort to address the needs of this population, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AOUSC) developed a new supervision policy in March 2003. Monograph 109, entitled "The Supervision of Federal Offenders," under its most recent revision, promotes a supervision planning process by a probation officer, his/her supervisor, and a treatment specialist. The plan is based on an accurate assessment of the risks, risk-related needs, and strengths of the individual offender. Following the initial risk assessment with the Risk Prediction Index, the officer continues to reassess the offender's needs throughout the supervision period, particularly needs related to violent behavior, criminal patterns, drug abuse, mental health, physical health, family issues, and third-party risk. The supervision planning process begins no more than 120 days and no fewer than 30 days prior to the offender's release from prison. A new computer software, which is scheduled for release shortly, automates the case planning process, reducing officers' administrative burden in implementing the new planning and supervision policies. The first step in evaluating the implementation of the new reentry program has already been achieved, i.e., the creation of a workgroup that is developing a statement of work to obtain contract assistance in designing the outcome system. 5 notes

**NCJ Number:** 208068

**Title:** Offender and Reentry: Supporting Active Participation in Reintegration

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:31 to 35

**Author:** Faye S. Taxman Ph.D.

**Annotation:** This article proposes the active-participant model as an alternative to the active-recipient model as a design for offender reentry into the community during and after institutionalization.

**Abstract:** The active-participant model for offender reentry involves five steps. First, the offender must be made aware that he/she controls personal destiny. This involves providing options whereby the offender learns to make decisions that are in his/her own best interest. These decisions must be attached to each stage of incarceration in developing the survival and skill-based services that offenders select to ease their transition into society as responsible citizens. Second, during the institutional phase the offender must be assisted in determining reintegration goals and then link institutional programming to transitional planning. Skills of self-diagnosis and self-awareness should be developed to facilitate the management of behaviors in the community. Third, in the prerelease stage, the offender begins planning for his/her transition into the community, including housing and employment. This covers 90 days prior to release. Fourth, in postrelease (from release day to 30 days after release), the offender is assisted in setting goals for adjustment in addressing the particular criminogenic factors that he/she perceives as posing the greatest risk for recidivism. The focus would typically be on issues of housing, family, employment, and leisure activities. The final step is integration, which extends from 30 days after release for up to 2 years. This step consists of maintenance and crisis management, as an offender makes incremental advancements in life adjustments as an active participant in setting and pursuing goals while managing the behavior necessary to reach personal goals. 2 tables and 16 references

**NCJ Number:** 208067

**Title:** Improving Offender Success and Public Safety Through System Reform: The Transition From Prison to Community Initiative

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:25 to 30

**Author:** Dale G. Parent ; Liz Barnett

**Annotation:** This article provides an overview of the development and model of the National Institute of Corrections' Transition From Prison to Community Initiative (TPCI), as well as States' challenges in implementing it in participating sites.

**Abstract:** The TPCI model focuses on the process by which imprisoned offenders should be prepared for transition to the community. The model encompasses the entire process whereby a convicted offender moves through the criminal justice system from sentencing through imprisonment, release from prison, postprison supervision and services, discharge from

supervision, postsupervision aftercare, and the emergence of the ex-offender as a law-abiding citizen. The model also focuses on the various governmental agencies that are engaged with offenders as they move through the criminal justice system, including human services agencies. Another element of the model is the phases of the transition process, i.e., an institutional phase, a reentry phase, and a community phase. The fourth element of the model is the Transition Accountability Plan (TAP), which uses data from assessments that identify offenders' dynamic risks and targets selected groups of offenders for increased access to evidence-based interventions. States face three challenges in implementing the TPCI mode. First, they must initiate, manage, and sustain collaboration among multiple State and local agencies. Second, they must plan, implement, and manage substantial changes in the way they do business in a time of scarce public resources. Third, they must share case-level information that is maintained in various agencies' separate, and sometimes incompatible, management information systems.

**NCJ Number:** 208066

**Title:** Civic Engagement Model of Reentry: Involving Community Through Service and Restorative Justice

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:14 to 24

**Author:** Gordon Bazemore Ph.D. ; Jeanne Stinchcomb Ph.D.

**Annotation:** This article demonstrates the need for a broad-based theoretical and policy-focused effort that will strengthen the role of civic and community commitments in the inmate reentry process.

**Abstract:** Drawing on the findings of the civic-reintegration literature, the authors propose a "civic engagement" intervention model that can be used to develop and test the impact of strategies that focus on strengthening commitments in a variety of citizenship domains related to effective ex-offender reentry. Under such a model, civic-engagement policy and practice would weaken barriers to the development of prosocial identities for those who have been under correctional supervision, alter the community's image of such individuals, and mobilize a community's capacity to provide informal support and assistance for ex-offenders. Two promising practices for implementing the proposed model involve civic community service and restorative justice. Civic community service involves activities that strengthen bonds between ex-offenders and their community in the pursuit of positive goals. Relevant projects would meet community needs, build community capacity, and repair the harm caused to the community by crime. Restorative justice in practice involves a range of activities that focus on repairing the damage to the community caused by crime. Restorative-justice goals of engaging victims, offenders, and the community in nonadversarial responses to crime can include family group conferencing, peacemaking circles, and neighborhood boards. These activities involve offenders, victims, and community members in rehabilitative and constructive endeavors. The implementation of this model, however, is impeded by the many restrictions on ex-offender employment, parental rights, voting rights, and other forms of exclusion and social stigma that make it difficult for released offenders to participate fully in community life. 1 figure and 107 references

**NCJ Number:** 208065

**Title:** Monetary Costs and Benefits of Correctional Treatment Programs: Implications for Offender Reentry

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:9 to 13

**Author:** Brandon C. Welsh

**Annotation:** This article assesses whether there is an economic argument for correctional treatment and explores the implications of this assessment for offender reentry.

**Abstract:** The article first updates previous reviews of cost-benefit analyses of correctional treatment programs (Welsh & Farrington, 2000a, 2000b). These reviews provide some evidence that correctional treatment is economically efficient in reducing reoffending when inmates are released back into the community. This has been determined through cost-benefit analyses that define the scope of the analysis, obtain estimates of program effects, estimate the monetary value of costs and benefits, calculate current value and assess profitability, describe the distribution of costs and benefits, and conduct sensitivity analyses. This article argues that if the monetary benefits of correctional treatment programs outweigh their costs, then efficiency

requires increasing treatment resources for offenders. Further, linking treatment participation to an increased chance for parole could provide another incentive to participate in treatment. One of the studies reviewed in this article found that financial and job placement assistance for released offenders reduced theft offenses, increased ex-offender employment, and reduced reliance on social services such as welfare. These achievements translated into substantial monetary benefits for society. 1 table and 43 references

**NCJ Number:** 208064

**Title:** What Works in Prisoner Reentry?: Reviewing and Questioning the Evidence

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:68 Issue:2 Dated:September 2004 Pages:4 to 8

**Author:** Joan Petersilia

**Annotation:** After summarizing the findings of the published literature on what works in prisoner reentry programs, this article questions the existing evidence on what works and urges a broader conversation about current methods, outcome measures, and practitioner expertise.

**Abstract:** In reviewing the literature on reentry programs, the author defines such programs as "all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law abiding citizens." The literature review distinguishes between Canadian contributions, which tend to identify the principles of effective programs, and the American contribution, which has focused on identifying specific programs that work. A combination of the two types of literature suggest that reentry programs should be based in the community in contrast to institutional settings; should be intensive (at least 6 months long); should focus on high-risk individuals (determined by classification instruments); should use cognitive-behavioral treatment techniques; and should match therapist and program to the specific learning styles and characteristics of individual offenders. The author identifies three problems with these conclusions. First, there have been few rigorous evaluations upon which to base any generalizable knowledge. Second, virtually all of the evaluations have used recidivism as the sole outcome criteria; reintegration, however, encompasses more than remaining arrest-free for a specified time period. Third, results from the academic "what works" literature often do not reflect the experience of correctional practitioners in implementing programs. 18 references

**NCJ Number:** 207661

**Title:** Employment Upon Reentry: Prison-Based Preparedness Leads to Community-Based Success

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:66 Issue:6 Dated:October 2004 Pages:104-107, to 113

**Author:** Jodine Hicks

**Annotation:** This article describes Illinois' model program for preparing inmates to have a successful reentry to the community, which begins from the moment of admission to prison.

**Abstract:** Illinois' Sheridan Correctional Center, a 1,300-bed medium-security facility, was reopened in January 2004 as a national model therapeutic prison and reentry program. The Illinois Department of Corrections partnered with the Safer Foundation and other service-provider staff to craft a unique research-based approach to corrections that offers inmates tools, resources, and structures for practicing new behaviors that will enable them to live drug-free and crime-free lives in the community after release. Based on an assessment of best practices identified over 30 years of research, the Sheridan model provides a broad range of employment-readiness services, including aptitude/interest assessments, individualized career preparedness action plans, job preparedness training, vocational training strategies, job shadowing/competency achievement, employment acquisition and retention tools, and job placement and coaching supports. Based on the first 12 releasees, early outcomes indicate that within the first few weeks of release, 80 percent of the graduates have been placed in full-time employment in significant businesses that provide a living wage. 6 notes

**NCJ Number:** 207655

**Title:** Washington Female Offender Reentry Programs Combine Transitional Services With Residential Parenting

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:66 Issue:6 Dated:October 2004 Pages:82-83, to 87

**Author:** Larry M. Fehr



**Annotation:** This article describes Washington State's transitional services for female offenders re-entering the community after incarceration.

**Abstract:** The State has two work-release programs that exclusively serve women and their children. The women reside with their children in two residential homes, one near downtown Seattle and the other across the State in Spokane. Supervised and guided by trained staff, the women and their children benefit from structured case management based on risk/need assessment, an employment search, counseling, and job placement. All residents must be employed within about 2 weeks of entering the home. Chemical dependency services are provided both outside the home and through 12-step programs inside the home. The Residential Parenting Program accommodates a limited number of children (two to six) at any one time. For those mothers whose children do not reside in the home, a Child Visit Program is offered for mothers who pass a background check and are enrolled in a parenting class. The women first have supervised visits with their children before progressing to unsupervised visits. Program outcomes are measured through satisfaction surveys, successful community releases, and random drug and alcohol testing. 7 notes

**NCJ Number:** 207653

**Title:** Home for Good in Oregon: A Community, Faith and State Reentry Partnership To Increase Restorative Justice

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:66 Issue:6 Dated:October 2004 Pages:72-74,76 to 77

**Author:** Thomas P. O'Connor ; Tim Cayton ; Scott Taylor ; Rick McKenna ; Norm Monroe

**Annotation:** This article describes the development and operations of Oregon's Home for Good program, which involves statewide, broad-based coalitions of community organizations and religious institutions working with criminal justice agencies to reduce recidivism among released offenders returning to the community.

**Abstract:** Religious Services, which is based in the Transitional Services Division of the Oregon Department of Corrections, envisioned and developed the program so as to comply with constitutional mandates regarding the distinct roles of church and state. Religious Services hired Oregon's first full-time reentry chaplain to establish a statewide community and faith-based reentry project whose operations would reflect the State's model of best corrections practices. Four principles underlie the strategy of Home for Good. First, the focus is on developing the community's capacity to assist in the reintegration of offenders. Second, the program identifies and coordinates the distinctive resources of the various religious and community organizations that can assist in offenders' positive adjustment in the community. Third, the program focuses its efforts and resources on those communities that have the highest concentration of returning offenders; and fourth, the strategies and programs used to prevent recidivism have been and continue to be tested to determine their effectiveness. The statewide program is governed by a steering committee of 30-35 members with representation from all regions of the State. 8 notes

**NCJ Number:** 207548

**Title:** Reentry Into the Community After Addiction Treatment Within NJ's Prison and Jails

**Author:** Douglas Ziedonis ; Nancy Violette

**Corporate Author:** New Jersey Institute for Social Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.njisj.org/reports/ziedonis\\_report.html](http://www.njisj.org/reports/ziedonis_report.html)

**Publication Date:** 01/24/2003

**Pages:** 15

**Annotation:** This review of knowledge about the impact of addiction on an inmate's transition from prison to the community describes current approaches for addressing addiction and reentry under New Jersey's criminal justice system, identifies major obstacles to successful reintegration for inmates with substance abuse disorders, and recommends some short-term and long-term strategies for confronting these obstacles.

**Abstract:** Only approximately 8 to 12 percent of New Jersey inmates receive addiction treatment while incarcerated, although current estimates suggest that about 80 percent have substance-use disorders. Inmates do not receive comprehensive substance abuse evaluations; the primary assessment tool is a modified and abbreviated Addiction Severity Index (ASI), which is useful for determining addiction severity but is not a diagnostic instrument that determines the presence or

absence of a substance-use disorder. For addicted parolees there are only 26 intensive parole drug program officers who are specialized in managing addiction-related issues during the reentry process. Most inmates with substance abuse histories are not transitioning to community addiction treatment programs in the community. Untreated addiction disorders compound the typical reentry obstacles of few prospects for employment, limited transportation to jobs and resources, and exposure to the aggressive marketing of drug dealers. These factors can trigger the urge for escape through substance abuse. The 12 recommendations pertain to the creation of a governor's task force on reentry into the community; improved substance abuse assessments of inmates at baseline; the development of individualized reentry plans that include substance abuse relapse prevention and addiction treatment; enhanced case-management services; increased collaboration with drug treatment, mental health, and research communities; and increased funding for substance abuse treatment during and after incarceration. 25 references

**NCJ Number:** 207544

**Title:** North Carolina Department of Corrections Transition/Reentry Work Plan

**Corporate Author:** North Carolina Dept of Correction

**URL\*:** [http://www.doc.state.nc.us/rap/doc\\_transition\\_workplan.pdf](http://www.doc.state.nc.us/rap/doc_transition_workplan.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 06/2003

**Pages:** 45

**Annotation:** This report describes the features, development, and implementation strategy for North Carolina's new (2003) Department of Corrections Transition/Reentry Work Plan for released inmates.

**Abstract:** The ultimate goal of the plan is to ensure that offenders are prepared for a successful reintegration into the community. Under the plan, preparation for the transition from prison back into the community begins with a comprehensive assessment at admission, continues through case management during incarceration, and culminates with coordinated reentry to the community. Electronic information-sharing capability enables the Division of Community Corrections and Division of Prisons staff to coordinate case management and release plans. There is a focus on substance-abuse screening and treatment that includes referral to community services to prevent relapse after release. Other features of the plan are inmate instruction in transition planning, vocational training programs that match relevant work assignments and jobs in the community, apprenticeship opportunities on work release, documentation of inmate work performance in referrals to employers, matching eligible offenders with volunteer mentors upon release, and job-placement services for-ex-inmates. Overall, the plan provides for interagency and public-private sector collaboration to develop and reinforce the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and other competencies that offenders must have to succeed in the community. This report summarizes how the plan was developed and outlines the goals, priorities, and action steps for each stakeholder in implementing the plan. The Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative ("Going Home") is described, as is the Job Preparation for Offenders grant project ("JobStart II"). Appended description of the agency brainstorming exercise

**NCJ Number:** 207539

**Title:** Delaware's Reentry Drug Court: A Practical Approach to Substance Abusing Offenders

**Author:** Richard S. Gebelein

**Sale:** Superior Court of Delaware

**URL\*:** [http://courts.state.de.us/courts/superior%20court/pdf/?reentry\\_france\\_27mar03.pdf](http://courts.state.de.us/courts/superior%20court/pdf/?reentry_france_27mar03.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/28/2003

**Pages:** 13

**Annotation:** This paper examines changes in the judge's role in managing sentences imposed upon substance-abusing offenders in the United States, with a focus on Delaware.

**Abstract:** Recognition that the form and content of a sentence influences whether an offender will reoffend has brought judges into a more active management and modification of the sentences imposed, which may include additional conditions, the imposition of sanctions, or the granting of rewards. In Delaware, legislation was enacted to incorporate community punishments into a complex sentencing structure that consists of five levels of supervision. The sentencing judge must first devise a sentencing plan that includes several supervision levels, and the judge

can retain control over the modification of the custody levels. The judge is the only one with the power to move an offender from level V (incarceration) to level IV (quasi incarceration), or from level IV to level III (intense community supervision). Delaware has also established drug courts, which conduct a nonadversarial process whereby the court mandates treatment, maintains active judicial involvement in monitoring offender performance under the sentence, and modifies the sentence in accordance with offender needs and performance. Delaware has also combined the drug court model with a case management infrastructure in another specialized court, namely, the reentry drug court. Whereas the drug court sets and monitors conditions for eligible drug-abusing offenders sentenced by the court, reentry drug courts set and monitor conditions and programs for released inmates with prior substance-abuse problems who are re-entering the community. Successful completers of the reentry drug court program have been found to be significantly less likely to be arrested for a new felony offense during 18 months after release compared with noncompleters and nonparticipants. 1 figure

**NCJ Number:** 207537

**Title:** Legal Barriers to Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey

**Author:** Nancy Fishman

**Sale:** New Jersey Institute for Social Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.njisj.org/reports/barriers\\_report.html](http://www.njisj.org/reports/barriers_report.html)

**Publication Date:** 04/11/2003

**Pages:** 19

**Annotation:** This paper provides an overview of the legal and regulatory framework in New Jersey that impedes ex-inmates' successful reentry into the community.

**Abstract:** The paper's focus is on barriers to ex-offender employment, but attention is also given to public assistance, education, housing, parental rights, and voting. The major legal regulations that can adversely affect the securing of employment by ex-inmates are jobs that exclude persons with criminal convictions; exclusion of ex-offenders from some occupational licensing by the State; excessive conditions that result in drivers' license suspensions, which affect the ability to reach and perform jobs; the lack of protections against job discrimination based on criminal record; limitations on the expungement of criminal records; and the legal liability of negligent hiring that employers may incur from any damages caused by ex-offender employees. Options are outlined for mitigating the employment barriers for ex-offenders caused by the aforementioned legal barriers. Options are also suggested for reducing the adverse impacts on ex-offenders of identified legal barriers in public assistance, education, housing, parental rights, and voting and jury service. 99 footnotes

**Number:** 207536

**Title:** Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland

**Author:** Nancy G. La Vigne ; Vera Kachnowski ; Jeremy Travis ; Rebecca Naser ; Christy Visher

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410655\\_mdportraitreentry.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410655_mdportraitreentry.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/2003

**Pages:** 77

**Annotation:** This report describes the process of prisoner reentry in the State of Maryland.

**Abstract:** Rising incarceration rates in Maryland and across the Nation, have prompted more attention to the problem of prisoner reentry, which is defined as "the process of leaving prison and returning to society." The current report describes the process of prisoner reentry in Maryland through an exploration of Maryland's policies and practices regarding reentry, the characteristics of released offenders, the geographic distribution of released prisoners, and the social and economic influences within the communities that are home to the highest concentration of released prisoners. Following the introduction, chapter 1 describes the policy context regarding prisoner reentry in Maryland, exploring recent and historical trends in sentencing and corrections practices. Chapter 2 explores how prisoners are released in Maryland and indicates that most prisoners are released through nondiscretionary methods rather than through parole board decisions. Chapter 3 discusses post-release supervision in Maryland, while chapter 4 describes the 2001 release cohort in Maryland, including their demographics, reason for incarceration,

criminal histories, and conditions of release. Chapter 5 examines how the State of Maryland prepares prisoners for reentry, indicating that only 17 percent of inmates were involved in educational or vocational programming at any one time. Chapter 6 offers an account of where Maryland's released prisoners are going upon their release, indicating that the majority of prisoners released from prison return to one jurisdiction in the State: Baltimore City. Chapter 7 specifically explores prisoner release in Baltimore City, including an analysis of the six Baltimore communities most offenders return to upon their release. Finally, chapter 8 presents the key findings of the report and explores additional questions in terms of reentry in the State of Maryland. Future research directions include an examination of the indicators predicting reentry success versus failure. Figures, appendix

**Number:** 207535

**Title:** Briefing Paper: An Overview of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey

**Author:** Nancy Fishman

**Corporate Author:** New Jersey Institute for Social Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.njisi.org/reports/prisoner\\_reentry.html](http://www.njisi.org/reports/prisoner_reentry.html)

**Publication Date:** 07/2002

**Pages:** 9

**Annotation:** This briefing paper presents an overview of prisoner reentry in the State of New Jersey.

**Abstract:** New Jersey, along with the rest of the Nation, has experienced an increase in incarceration rates and the absolute number of individuals in correctional institutions. Once released, these offenders face many barriers and challenges to successful community reentry. In order to address these difficulties, a comprehensive approach is needed that unifies public officials, the criminal justice system, community service providers, and the community. The national picture of prisoner reentry is examined; the majority of released offenders in the United States have not participated in educational, vocational, or pre-release programming at the time of their release, mainly due to a decline in programming availability. Currently in New Jersey, far more people are under community supervision orders than are incarcerated in correctional facilities; however, the number of probation officers has not increased to meet these demands, causing large gaps in supervision. Additionally, funding for drug treatment is sorely deficient, despite considerable funding increases during the past 10 years. Overall, while there is a paucity of current information and analysis concerning prisoner reentry in New Jersey, the existing data suggest New Jersey fits with national trends on offender reentry. Notes

**NCJ Number:** 207534

**Title:** Aftercare as Afterthought: Reentry and the California Youth Authority

**Author:** Michele Byrnes ; Daniel Macallair ; Andrea D. Shorter

**Corporate Author:** Ctr on Juvenile and Criminal Justice

**URL\*:** <http://www.cjci.org/pdf/aftercare.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 08/2002

**Pages:** 59

**Annotation:** This report presents findings and recommendations from an assessment of the status of the California Youth Authority's (CYA's) parolee reintegration.

**Abstract:** The research included a review of relevant literature, interviews, and site visits. To identify model programs in juvenile aftercare, a national search of model transition and aftercare programs for juvenile offenders was conducted. The following barriers to successful reentry have been identified by researchers, parole agents, service providers, researchers, and former wards: lack of educational and housing options; limited skills and education; gang affiliations and attendant racial tensions; institutional identity; substance abuse problems; mental health problems; lack of community supports and role models; and legislative barriers that limit access to education, cash assistance, and public housing. Reentry experts have identified the following minimum "successful" outcomes for reentry: no rearrests since release, no recommitment for a parole violation, and attending school and/or maintaining employment. Based on these goals this report offers recommendations for reforming and improving the CYA's reentry process for juveniles. The eight recommendations include implementing the case-management continuum-of-

care model proven effective in Missouri; creating a pilot program that uses contract arrangement for institutional program services; creating additional community-based treatment and supervision slots for CYA wards; expanding community corrections sanctions, such as community service, restitution, and halfway houses; the creation of educational alternatives; the expansion of gender-specific services; and the replication of model programs. 86-item bibliography and appended parole statistics

**NCJ Number:** 207527

**Title:** Community Reentry of Adolescents from New Jersey's Juvenile Justice System

**Author:** Bruce D. Stout Ph.D

**Sponsoring Agency:** New Jersey Institute for Social Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.njisi.org/reports/stout\\_report.html](http://www.njisi.org/reports/stout_report.html)

**Publication Date:** 06/20/2003

**Pages:** 10

**Annotation:** This paper discusses the role of the New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) in the placement and release of adjudicated youths from secure and residential facilities and the successful reentry of these youths back into their communities under the Division of Parole and Transitional Services and Probation Department.

**Abstract:** Each year, approximately 1,600 adolescents who have been adjudicated delinquent return home or back to their community from a court-ordered out-of-home placement in a secure or residential facility operated by the New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC). All youths released from JJC facilities are released to some form of juvenile justice system supervision and support. For those youth placed under the authority of the JJC's Division of Parole and Transitional Services, as well as the Probation Department, reentry back into their community can be met with many transition challenges. The challenge for parole and probation officers is to guide these adolescents in making these transitions by balancing surveillance with support to maximize a successful return to the community. This paper presents a statistical overview of adolescents committed and received by the JJC, and an identified trend in JJC handling increasing numbers of adolescents on commitment status and decreasing numbers on probation. A statistical overview is also presented on probationers placed in a JJC residential facility and those paroled under the supervision of the JJC's Division of Parole and Transitional Services. Major issues and challenges identified affecting the reentry of these adolescents include: (1) the increasing prevalence of adolescents with psychiatric disorders; (2) the prevalence and incidence of family and community risk factors; and (3) the interrelationship between the JJC and the Department of Youth and Family Services (DYFS).

**NCJ Number:** 207526

**Title:** Partnership with Purpose: Breaking the Ice of Recidivism

**Corporate Author:** Minnesota Dept of Corrections

**URL\*:** <http://www.corr.state.mn.us/publications/pdf/recidivismproceedings.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 12/2002

**Pages:** 45

**Annotation:** This report presents the proceedings of the symposium, Partnership with Purpose: Breaking the Ice of Recidivism, which addressed offender reintegration.

**Abstract:** Record numbers of offenders are being released from prison, some with virtually no plans for the future. Sponsored by the Minnesota Department of Corrections, the symposium, which was held December 13, 2002, brought together a diverse group of participants from State and county agencies, the community, and from various industries such as housing, labor, law enforcement, and faith communities. One of the main goals of the symposium was to discuss Minnesota's Serious and Violent Youthful Offender Initiative, which is a 3-year, federally funded program to promote partnerships for offender reentry. Another goal of the symposium was to expose participants to the challenges offenders face in their communities when they are released from prison. Several speakers gave presentations regarding the need for offender reentry programs and the importance of the Minnesota Serious and Violent Youthful Offender Initiative to the State's long-term economic health. A panel of offenders shared their stories of successful reentry and discussed the problems they faced when they were released. A panel of State

partners in the Initiative shared how their agency is assisting in offender reentry. A community panel consisting of service providers, faith-based organizations, and police discussed options for their participation in the offender reentry Initiative. In addition to the speakers and panels, participants met in breakout groups to discuss challenges, solutions, and to begin an action plan. Appendixes contain the discussion group questions, a list of participants, and the symposium program. Appendixes

**Number:** 207518

**Title:** Reentry Issues for Offenders Living with HIV

**Author:** Riki Jacobs

**Corporate Author:** New Jersey Institute for Social Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.njisi.org/reports/jacobs\\_report.html](http://www.njisi.org/reports/jacobs_report.html)

**Publication Date:** 2003

**Pages:** 8

**Annotation:** This paper discusses HIV/AIDS among offenders and the care, treatment, and education of HIV/AIDS in the New Jersey correctional system and the specific needs of offenders with HIV returning to the community.

**Abstract:** According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, the rate of AIDS has been higher among prison inmates than in the general population since 1991, with New Jersey having the largest number of reported AIDS-related deaths in prison. This data and recent research indicate the importance of HIV prevention and treatment interventions in correctional settings, as well as health care management of HIV/AIDS upon return to the community. This paper begins by discussing current State and county services and programs for HIV/AIDS offenders under the New Jersey Department of Corrections. Recommendations are presented on how New Jersey could improve the reintegration process for those offenders living with HIV and returning to their community. These recommendations include: (1) requiring HIV/AIDS training; (2) HIV testing prior to release and initiating and providing drug therapy; (3) appropriate drug therapy; (4) assessment of the Department of Corrections adherence to the Roe versus Fauver consent decree; (5) providing inmates with copies of medical records prior to release; (6) if no permanent address exists, arrangements should be made with social or health care agencies to receive the inmate's mail; (7) inmates receiving Social Security should be advised to inform Social Security of their incarceration; (8) HIV education for families should be incorporated into institutional programs; (9) additional support and education for family reunification should be provided for women with HIV; (10) the matching of State funds with existing Federal funds; (11) public education supporting access to sterile syringe for HIV prevention; (12) a study to assess the rate of recidivism and how chronic and acute health care conditions contribute to the problem; and (13) a study to determine the prevalence rate of those incarcerated.

**NCJ Number:** 207516

**Title:** From Prison to Home: The Effect of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities: The Skill Sets and Health Care Needs of Released Offenders

**Author:** Gerald G. Gaes Ph.D. ; Newton Kendig M.D.

**Sale:** US Dept of Health and Human Services

**URL\*:** <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/prison2home02/gaes.htm>

**Publication Date:** 01/10/2002

**Pages:** 33

**Annotation:** This paper examines the needs of inmates and programs to address those needs in relation to skill and medical/mental health needs of released offenders, as well as barriers associated with achieving these needs upon release.

**Abstract:** The successful reintegration of offenders released from prison includes having the necessary skill sets and health care. Skill sets imply mastery and competence, emphasizing the interaction of training or teaching in conjunction with the individual's proficiency and achievement or the role of the offender in their successful reintegration. This paper discusses both skill sets and medical/mental health needs of inmates released and the barriers encountered both within the criminal justice system and the community. This paper is divided into six primary sections. The first section reviews the literature on skill sets with the introduction of a classification of these

skills. The classification provides a framework for understanding, assessing, and remediating skill deficiencies. The paper continues with a review of the literature on in-prison programs designed to address the identified deficiencies. Drawing on data from the Federal Bureau of Prisons, as well as a study completed by the National Commission on Correctional Health Care, the third section outlines the health and mental health needs of inmates returning to the community. The fourth section discusses the barriers to addressing inmate skill deficiencies and medical needs from a criminal justice policy perspective, as well as from a community perspective. The fifth section examines the role of the inmate as a parent in the reintegration process. The final section of the paper discusses the "what works" model which focuses on interventions that address primarily the propensity to commit crime. Specifically, a self-help model of behavior or the strength-based reentry philosophy is discussed which emphasizes the individual as an asset to his/her community, as well as the control/service model where the inmate builds his/her skills under the direction and supervision of service provision agents while being monitored by control agents. References

**NCJ Number:** 207502

**Title:** Assertive Community Treatment: A Reentry Model for Seriously Mentally Ill Offenders

**Author:** Katherine A. Brown Ph.D.

**Corporate Author:** Ohio Dept of Rehabilitation and Correction

**URL\*:** <http://www.sconet.state.oh.us/acmic/resources/assertive.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 06/2004

**Annotation:** This article briefly describes the Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) program used as a new approach to transitioning mentally ill-prison inmates back into the community.

**Abstract:** Within the Ohio State prison system, 9.5 percent of the inmate population has a serious mental illness. The Assertive Community Treatment program is a plan for comprehensive community-based mental health treatment. ACT was established for individuals with severe illnesses who have frequent relapses and hospitalizations and/or find it difficult to maintain recovery treatment activities. The ACT program strongly encourages family involvement. Twenty years of research have demonstrated that the ACT model is more effective than traditional intervention in reducing days spent in hospitals and in promoting improved clinical stability, independent living, and client satisfaction. In 2002, grants were awarded by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's (ODRC) Division of Parole and Community Services to the Hamilton and Cuyahoga County Mental Health Boards to establish ACT teams for serious mentally ill offenders being released from prison. To date, a total of 50 offenders have participated in the pilot projects. Formal outcome studies are currently underway with preliminary data indicating a decreased usage of jail, prison, and psychiatric beds. Funding was secured for 2004 for both pilot projects.

**NCJ Number:** 207499

**Title:** Best Practice Approach to Community Reentry from Jails for Inmates with Co-occurring Disorders: The APIC Model

**Author:** Fred Osher M.D. ; Henry J. Steadman Ph.D. ; Heather Barr J.D.

**Corporate Author:** National GAINS Ctr

**URL\*:** <http://www.gainsctr.com/pdfs/apic.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 09/2002

**Pages:** 24

**Annotation:** This paper describes the APIC model for jail transition to the community, designed for jail inmates with co-occurring disorders.

**Abstract:** Jails have a constitutional obligation to provide minimum psychiatric care. Because of the nature of the jail inmate population holding individuals for both detention and short-term imprisonment of less than a year, transition planning is viewed as valuable and essential. Inadequate transition planning compromises public safety, increased incidence of psychiatric symptoms, hospitalization, relapse, suicide, homelessness, and rearrest. The APIC model which entails the critical linkages of the elements of assessment, planning, identification, and coordination provides a model of transition planning that contains core concepts that are equally applicable to jails and communities of all sizes. This paper describes how the model was

implemented with the belief that the basic guidance the model offers can be useful to all United States Jails. The first element assesses the inmate's clinical and social needs and public safety risks with the most important part of the assessment process engaging the inmate in assessing his or her own needs. The second element plans for the treatment and services required to address the inmate's identified needs includes: family, housing, integrated treatment for co-occurring disorders, medication and medical care, food and clothing, transportation, and child care. The third element involves identifying required community and correctional programs responsible for post-release services. The final element is the coordination of the transition plan to ensure implementation and avoid gaps in care. If the elements of the APIC model are implemented in whole or in part, it is seen as likely to improve outcomes for people with co-occurring disorders who are released from jail. References

**NCJ Number:** 207496

**Title:** Leaving Jail: Service Linkage and Community Reentry for Mothers with Co-Occurring Disorders

**Author:** Joan Gillece Ph.D.

**Corporate Author:** National GAINS Ctr

**URL\*:** <http://www.gainsctr.com/pdfs/women/leavingjail.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 09/2002

**Annotation:** This article briefly discusses strategies and programs implemented addressing the needs of justice-involved women (and mothers) with co-occurring disorders and service linkages and reentry into the community.

**Abstract:** Women with co-occurring mental and substance use disorders who come in contact with the criminal justice system often leave children behind. In order to break intergenerational cycles of poverty, despair, behavioral disorders, and criminal justice involvement, it is necessary for programs to be designed to meet the treatment needs of the mother and the psychosocial, emotional, and developmental needs of children. In addition, jail terms are typically brief with women exiting almost as quickly as they entered; returning to society more disconnected and desperate women and mothers. Solutions must involve multi-agency approaches supporting successful reentry to the community. This article discusses various strategies and programs implemented to respond to the need of these women offenders and their children. The article describes the Maryland Community Criminal Justice Treatment Project which provides treatment and aftercare plans for inmates with mental illness, and post-release community follow-up and Maryland's TAMAR program (Trauma, Addiction, Mental Health, and Recovery) which provides a full array of training and clinical services to women with co-occurring substance abuse and psychiatric disorders in jails who are traumatized by a history of physical or sexual abuse. Strategies implemented to address the needs of women in jail with co-occurring disorders include: (1) coordination of local multi-agency response; (2) establish an interagency coordinating council; (3) involvement of consumers and advocates; (4) develop a memorandum of understanding; (5) encourage cross training; (6) develop gender-specific treatment; (7) develop interagency reentry planning; (8) provide case management mentors; and (9) apply for assistance.

**NCJ Number:** 207483

**Title:** Welcome Home? Examining the "Reentry Court" Concept From a Strengths-based Perspective

**Journal:** *Western Criminology Review* Volume:4 Issue:2 Dated:2003 Pages:91 to 107

**Author:** Shadd Maruna ; Thomas P. LeBel

**URL\*:** <http://wcr.sonoma.edu/v4n2/manuscripts/marunalebel.pdf>

**Annotation:** This paper reviews the empirical and theoretical evidence of the value of the "reentry court," which is charged with managing the return of ex-inmates to the community.

**Abstract:** Patterned after drug courts, the reentry court uses its authority to apply graduated sanctions and positive reinforcement while coordinating resources that meet the needs of and support the ex-inmate's reintegration. The concept of the reentry court is under development through pilot sites in nine States, with each site differing significantly from the others in emphases and approaches. This paper distinguishes two basic approaches adopted by the reentry court: the



"risk-based" approach, which emphasizes strict supervision and monitoring of the ex-offender; and the "needs-based" approach, which focuses on providing the services and resources needed by the ex-inmate in order to successfully adjust in the community. These two court strategies are assessed, using the criteria of "therapeutic jurisprudence," which pertains to adherence to psychological principles for sustained positive behavioral change. This paper then proposes a strategy that differs from the aforementioned strategies in focusing not on the ex-inmate's risk or needs, but rather on his/her strengths. This involves developing a case-management approach that identifies and builds upon the ex-inmate's assets in terms of personality characteristics, skills, knowledge, and interests. The paper describes how the reentry court would operate under such a "strengths-based" model. 100 references and 10 notes

**NCJ Number:** 207482

**Title:** Delaware's Reentry Drug Court: A Practical Approach to Substance Abusing Offenders

**Author:** Richard S. Gebelein

**Sale:** Superior Court of Delaware

**URL\*:** [http://courts.state.de.us/courts/superior%20court/pdf/?reentry\\_france\\_27mar03.pdf](http://courts.state.de.us/courts/superior%20court/pdf/?reentry_france_27mar03.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/28/2003

**Pages:** 13

**Annotation:** This paper examines changes in the judge's role in drug courts in Delaware, which involves managing the sentences of substance-abusing offenders.

**Abstract:** The paper first provides a brief history of the evolution of American judges' more active involvement in the management and modification of imposed sentences. Sentence modifications could include additional conditions, sanctions, and rewards following imposition of the initial sentence. The paper then turns to the Delaware experience under this evolution of the judicial role. Delaware law mandates that the sentencing judge devise a sentencing plan that includes several levels of supervision. The judge then retains control over the modification of the custody levels. This has produced more court hearings, both to consider offender violations, modify sentences, and change supervision conditions. Next, the paper discusses the active role judges have played in addressing the prevalence of drug abuse among offenders. The model adopted in Delaware is the reentry drug court, which involves combining the drug court model with a case-management infrastructure that focuses on client-centered services, including screening, assessment, treatment planning, referring clients to substance abuse treatment and other services, monitoring client progress, and facilitating communication between justice and treatment staff. The reentry drug court judge monitors client response under the case-management plan by addressing serious violations with sanctions and rewarding positive behaviors by reducing restrictions. In the 3 years of the court's operation, recidivism has been reduced by just over 10 percent. 1 figure

**NCJ Number:** 207480

**Title:** Prison Reform Through Offender Reentry: A Partnership Between Courts and Corrections

**Author:** Reginald A. Wilkinson ; Gregory A. Bucholtz

**Corporate Author:** Ohio Dept of Rehabilitation and Correction

**URL\*:** <http://www.drc.state.oh.us/web/articles/article93.htm>

**Publication Date:** 10/2003

**Pages:** 12

**Annotation:** Using the Ohio reentry court as a model, this paper discusses how partnerships among courts, corrections, and community enterprises can improve the chances that an offender will undergo positive change and become a responsible participant in community life.

**Abstract:** Outlined in "The Ohio Plan for Productive Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction," Ohio has developed a strategy of coordinated collaboration among courts, corrections, and community partners to promote successful offender reentry into the community after serving a sentence. The strategy has a format of actions for each of six areas believed to influence the outcome of offender reentry: reception, offender assessments, and reentry planning; offender programming that targets criminogenic needs; family involvement; employment readiness and discharge planning; reentry-centered offender supervision; and community justice partnerships. Reentry courts are featured as a new form of jurisprudence that structures the

partnership between courts and corrections in promoting successful offender reintegration. The reentry court oversees prisons' prerelease work in preparing inmates for release; and it coordinates the involvement of community corrections agencies and various community resources that will be involved in helping the ex-offender address reintegration problems. The Ohio model provides a seamless approach to offender rehabilitation whereby all components of the criminal justice system and appropriate community enterprises work with offenders from the beginning of the sentence through readjustment in the community after the sentence is completed. 40 references

**NCJ Number:** 207453

**Title:** Services Integration: Strengthening Offenders and Families, While Promoting Community Health and Safety

**Author:** Shelli Rossman

**Sale:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/prison2home02/rossman.htm>

**Publication Date:** 12/2001

**Pages:** 20

**Annotation:** This article discusses the need for integration of services for offenders reentering the community.

**Abstract:** Single agencies are unlikely to have the human or fiscal resources to fully address the diverse needs of offenders and their families. There is a growing recognition that integration of services across institutional lines may be beneficial not only in addressing the varying needs of offenders and their families who require health and human services, but also in making more efficient use of limited agency resources. The major objectives of services integration include: identifying gaps in service delivery and assigning organizational responsibility for implementing needed services; reducing barriers to obtaining services; and conserving institutional resources by sharing some efforts across systems or by reducing unnecessary duplication of efforts. Historically, corrections systems have focused their efforts only on offenders during the period of their incarceration, ignoring the need for connections to community-based criminal justice entities, as well as health and human service systems. Increasingly though, these systems have exhibited an interest in developing partnerships with other institutional stakeholders, such as State health departments and community-based service providers; however, barriers to coordinated care exist at both the level of individual clients and at institutional/service system and staff levels. In addition, barriers to services integration exist at the local level. These barriers include a changing landscape of service providers, insufficient resources to address the full needs of clients; and an ineffective network of information sharing. The article discusses several promising models that have been developed to overcome services fragmentation. References

**NCJ Number:** 207452

**Title:** Revolving Door: Exploring Public Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry

**Author:** John Immerwahr ; Jean Johnson

**Corporate Author:** Public Agenda

**Sponsoring Agency:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410804\\_revolvingdoor.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410804_revolvingdoor.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/2002

**Pages:** 23

**Annotation:** This paper presents findings from a public-opinion research project offering insight on how Americans in different demographic groups think about prisoner reentry.

**Abstract:** The availability of public opinion research on crime and punishment is considerable. However, public opinion research in the area of prisoner reentry is virtually non-existent. To change this trend, the Urban Institute requested Public Agenda, a nonprofit organization on public opinion research to conduct a public-opinion research study on prisoner reentry. The study consisted of three focus groups, reflecting different population segments in the Philadelphia area: (1) residents of the Philadelphia suburb of Bensalem; (2) residents of Philadelphia's inner city, primarily from West Philadelphia; and (3) affluent Philadelphia residents. The topics focused on during all three sessions included: (1) public awareness of prisoner reentry issues; (2)

perceptions of what happens to prisoners after release; (3) potential public support for programs to aid in transitioning prisoners to society; (4) reactions to barriers to employment, housing, and voting faced by former prisoners; (5) potential concerns and conflicts about reentry programs; and (6) future directions for research. Based on these focus groups, prisoner reentry is an issue that people rarely raise spontaneously. However, the issue of prisoner reentry is one that most seemed to understand readily once it was introduced. Study highlights include: (1) most respondents reacted favorably to helping former prisoners get back on track; (2) there were pronounced differences between the views expressed by suburban respondents and other groups; (3) concern was voiced about fairness to those who had not violated the law; and (4) little support was given for taking money from other social programs and directing to providing better programs for prisoner reentry. Recommendations for future focus groups are presented and discussed.

**NCJ Number:** 207451

**Title:** Religion, Reform, Community: Examining the Idea of Church-based Prisoner Reentry

**Author:** Omar M. McRoberts

**Sponsoring Agency:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410802\\_religion.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410802_religion.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/2002

**Pages:** 10

**Annotation:** This paper examines the use of church-based inmate reentry programs, specifically examining two assumptions underlying strategic thinking about inmate reentry: the understanding of prisons as places where criminals are punished and that reintegration into the community via religious institutions implies an understanding of churches, mosques, and synagogues as community institutions.

**Abstract:** The idea of church-based prisoner reentry programs has something in common with the older moral reform movement with both linking crime and disorder not only with personal weaknesses, but with a presumed breakdown of ordering functions in local community life. This paper discusses prisoner reentry and begins with the fact of the released criminal; it admits that time spent in prison does not conclusively reform him or her. It is understood that prisons are places where criminals are punished. The concern is with those aspects of the community, or the lack thereof, that permit or encourage ex-offenders to continue in their criminal careers. The implication is that churches can form a sacred safety net to catch those who have fallen, or might fall, into trouble with the law. Churches are considered natural and ideal candidates in the transformation of sinner to saint. The assumption is that churches are open communities. They are open to serving nonmembers as well as members, and they are somehow embedded in the social life of the neighborhoods where they happen to congregate.

**NCJ Number:** 207450

**Title:** Prospects for Prisoner Reentry

**Author:** Anne M. Piehl ; Stefan F. LoBuglio ; Richard B. Freeman

**Corporate Author:** Economic Policy Institute

**URL\*:** <http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~apiehl.wiener.ksg/papers/prospects%20for%20prisoner%20reentry.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 08/2003

**Pages:** 42

**Annotation:** This paper discusses the prospects for prisoner reentry by examining the design and execution of a promising prisoner reentry program at a local correctional facility in Boston, MA.

**Abstract:** Over the past several years, prisoner reentry has emerged as an important policy issue on the public agenda. Soaring correctional expenditures are leading State legislators to examine whether reentry programming can slow the proverbial revolving prison door. In 2002, the Federal Government issued \$100 million in grants to States to fund prisoner reentry initiatives over the next 3 years. This paper shows the challenges to implementing a prisoner reentry program by examining in detail the design and execution of the Offender Reentry Program (ORP) at the Suffolk County House of Correction, a local correctional facility in Boston. The analysis found that

implementation challenges still arise even when programs are delivering measurable and statistically significant program effects and are well designed, well funded, and well administered. In addition, the researchers found that the internal capacity of the correctional facility and the external authorizing environment defined by statutes, administrative regulations, policymakers, and other agencies can substantially compromise overall program effectiveness. Specifically, in the case of ORP, the internal and external constraints have led to continued under-enrollment in the ORP, despite the large number of prisoners released from the facility each day who could benefit from the program. Four propositions about prisoner reentry that were learned from the analysis are discussed and include: correctional institutions do not have strong incentives to offer reentry programs; the external environment drives the available options; institutional operations and policies often get in the way of reentry in correctional settings; and while analysts and practitioners agree about the need for reentry programs, there is no clear consensus on reentry treatment models or the rank ordering of inmates to participate in such programs. The challenges to prisoner reentry cover a broad range of political, structural, organizational, and programmatic issues. Appendix, tables, figures, endnotes, and references

**NCJ Number:** 207449

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry: The State of Public Opinion

**Corporate Author:** Eagleton Institute of Politics

**URL\*:** [http://www.njisj.org/reports/eagleton\\_report.html](http://www.njisj.org/reports/eagleton_report.html)

**Publication Date:** 2003

**Pages:** 11

**Annotation:** This article discusses public opinion on criminal justice issues and prisoner reentry.

**Abstract:** In recent years, public opinion on the criminal justice system has been changing, moving away from support for mandatory sentencing and punishment towards alternatives to prison for non-violent offenders. Current research shows that punitive measures for offenders is a minority view among Americans; the majority believe that the criminal justice system needs to be fair, balanced, and effective with a focus on rehabilitation. Recent studies show that support for mandatory sentencing dropped from 55 percent in 1995 to 38 percent in 2001, and that support for treating the underlying causes of crime as opposed to implementing get tough policies increased from 48 percent in 1994 to 65 percent in 2001. There has been little research on issues related specifically to prisoner reentry. Overall, the studies show that the public supports rehabilitation for offenders, but not at the expense of other societal programs that would benefit the entire community. For the general public, the issue of prisoner reentry is not a pressing issue, and most people are not aware of the many barriers faced by prisoners who reenter the community. Future research is needed to specifically examine this issue. References and appendix on select polling results

**NCJ Number:** 207448

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry and the Institutions of Civil Society: Bridges and Barriers to Successful Reintegration

**Author:** Christopher Uggen

**Sale:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410801\\_barriers.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410801_barriers.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/2002

**Pages:** 20

**Annotation:** This paper discusses the civic and political life of criminal offenders, with a particular emphasis on felon disfranchisement.

**Abstract:** While much research on offenders has addressed socioeconomic and family reintegration, the subject of felon reintegration into community life and civic participation has received little attention. To adequately examine this issue, the paper begins with a historical overview of voting restrictions on felons and ex-felons, as well as a discussion of current legal challenges. The analysis found that while many nations currently disfranchise some portion of their correctional populations, the United States is unusual in combining both high rates of criminal punishment and restrictive felon disfranchisement laws, and that correctional populations affected by disfranchisement differ dramatically across the individual States. The analysis also

showed that race and social class play a significant role in disfranchisement, with 13 percent, or more than 1.4 million African-American males disfranchised due to a current or former felony conviction. A review of current legislative efforts shows work at both the State and national levels to correct the problem of felon disfranchisement. The political impact of these restrictive felon disfranchisement laws is that these "lost felon voters" could possibly impact the outcome of close elections at local, State, and national levels. The analysis of barriers to democratic participation next looks at whether the issue matters to felons. Review of recent survey data found that for many felons, the loss of voting rights is part of a larger package of restrictions that confound their efforts to become a "normal citizen." Some studies suggest that facilitating the civic reintegration of offenders will reduce their risk of recidivism. Further research is recommended. References, 4 tables, and 1 figure

**NCJ Number:** 207446

**Title:** Incarceration, Reentry and Social Capital: Social Networks in the Balance

**Author:** Dina Rose ; Todd Clear

**Sponsoring Agency:** US Dept of Health and Human Services

**Sale:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410623\\_socialcapital.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410623_socialcapital.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 01/30/2002

**Annotation:** This article explores the aggregate impact of offender reentry on community levels of social capital and the effect this has on the children living in these areas.

**Abstract:** This article examines the definition of social capital and notes that it is the resource potential or capacity for action produced by personal and organizational networks. Collective efficacy on the other hand, is the process of activating or converting social ties to achieve desired outcomes. In other words, social capital is the potential for action, whereas collective efficacy is the realization of action. The authors draw on the results of their study in two high incarceration neighborhoods in Florida to consider the relationship between reentry and social capital and the relationship between reentry and collective efficacy. They found through thematic content analysis that families and their communities were affected by incarceration and reentry in four main areas: financial, stigma, identity, and relationships, leading to the conclusion that reentry in high incarceration neighborhoods is an important factor in social capital. The research also shows that the way reentry affects the components of social capital translates into effects upon children. For children, the process of adult reentry from prison is an opportunity for reinvigoration of the family unit. Since current research has yet to determine the impact of reentry on collective efficacy, the authors speculate its effect by contemplating how reentry would impact its component parts: shared expectations for informal social control and social cohesion and trust. They review several studies which address these issues. The discussion indicates that reentry has a predominantly negative impact on the quality of life in communities hardest hit by incarceration, especially for children. References and 4 figures

**NCJ Number:** 207445

**Title:** Exploring the Needs and Risks of the Returning Prisoner Population

**Author:** James Austin ; Patricia Hardyman ; John Irwin

**Sponsoring Agency:** US Dept of Health and Human Services

**Sale:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410626\\_returningprisonerpopulation.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410626_returningprisonerpopulation.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 01/30/2002

**Pages:** 23

**Annotation:** This paper is intended to provide a general discussion on the concepts of risk, needs, and stability at both the prisoner and community levels, as well as an examination of the unique situation faced by prisoners with children and the obstacles that must be overcome to maintain any type of parental relationship while incarcerated and after release.

**Abstract:** The paper begins with a discussion of the concepts of risk, needs, and stability from the prisoner's point of view. The authors note that the concern over prisoner risk is grounded in often-cited high recidivism rates associated with prisoners and that this concern has been overstated. Several studies are examined that show data that indicate that such risk is relatively

small expect in impoverished and isolated communities with large concentrations of offenders. The discussion next turns to the concepts of risk, needs, and stability as they relate to the communities to which the offenders will return upon release from prison. The research community needs to recognize that community attributes have at least an equal if not greater impact on prisoner recidivism and public safety in general than the characteristics of the individuals released from prison. Studies which have attempted to measure community risk and its changes over time are examined. This is followed by a discussion of the ramifications of the growing prison population on parents who are imprisoned, especially as they relate to women, whose rates of incarceration are increasing at a faster rate than men. A major issue is the obstacles faced by family members in their attempts to visit incarcerated mothers and fathers. Some of these obstacles include restrictive administrative policies, the often remote location of the prison, and the prison visit experience itself. Finally, the paper examines the plight of long-term offenders with children. A list of legislative reforms and programmatic initiatives that should be considered by State and Federal officials is presented. References and 11 tables

**NCJ Number:** 207444

**Title:** Effect of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities

**Author:** Michelle Waul ; Jeremy Travis ; Amy L. Solomon

**Sponsoring Agency:** US Dept of Health and Human Services

**Sale:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410632\\_hhsconferencebackground.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410632_hhsconferencebackground.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 01/30/2002

**Pages:** 33

**Annotation:** This background paper, which provides the context for the From Prisons to Home conference papers, gives an overview of the issues discussed and includes abstracts of the 10 papers.

**Abstract:** On January 30-31, 2002, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services sponsored the From Prisons to Home Conference held at the National Institutes of Health. The purpose of the conference was to bring together the research, policy, and practice communities to share promising strategies, identify research needs, and inform Federal program and policy development for children and families affected by the incarceration of a parent. This background paper is divided into the following four sections providing different perspectives on the impact of incarceration and reentry: 1) Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Individual Prisoners; 2) Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Children; 3) Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Families; and 4) Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Communities. At least two papers from prominent researchers were commissioned for each perspective. For each section, the paper provides an overview of the issues and an abstract of the papers that were commissioned. It is intended that a final report will be published following the conference that will include discussions from this background paper, the commissioned papers, and the conferences sessions. Endnotes, 7 figures, and 5 tables

**NCJ Number:** 207405

**Title:** Reentry--The Tie That Binds Civil Legal Aid Attorneys and Public Defenders

**Journal:** *Clearinghouse Review Journal of Poverty Law and Policy* Dated:September-October 2003 Pages:328 to 340

**Author:** Cynthia Works

**Corporate Author:** National Legal Aid and Defender Assoc

**URL\*:** <http://www.nlada.org/dms/documents/1066401170.22/cynthia%20works%20article%20from%20clearinghouse%20review.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 09/2003

**Pages:** 13

**Annotation:** This paper identifies and discusses areas where civil legal aid attorneys and public defenders can cooperate to facilitate an offender's successful adjustment (reentry) in the community after release from prison.

**Abstract:** The first section of this report discusses how criminal convictions can create difficulties for ex-offenders when they attempt to establish residence, employment, and responsible

citizenship in the community. Public access to criminal records and the registration of some types of offenders has the potential to stigmatize an offender so as to obstruct his/her search for housing and employment. Advocates who represent ex-offenders can minimize the stigma of a criminal record by filing for expungement or the sealing of records. Barring ex-offenders from Federal financial aid programs and military service constitutes another impediment to educational and employment opportunities. This paper describes various actions that advocates can take to eliminate or mitigate these barriers. Other services, rights, and opportunities that may be denied ex-offenders are public benefits, housing, parental rights, and voting rights. Non-citizen ex-offenders will typically have immigration issues to confront. Collaboration between civil legal aid attorneys and public defenders is essential if ex-offenders are to be helped in navigating through the various obstacles to their reentry. This paper concludes with a discussion of the contexts and resources that can facilitate such collaboration. Attention is given to training and conferences, the establishment of civil legal services units in public defender offices, initiatives of the American Bar Association, reentry courts, and law schools. 61 notes

**NCJ Number:** 207391

**Title:** Value-Based Initiative and Value-Based Reentry Initiative

**Corporate Author:** Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

**URL\*:** <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/mime/open.pdf?item=1026>

**Publication Date:** 09/16/2004

**Pages:** 1

**Annotation:** This report reviews the history and current status of the Value-Based Initiative (VBI) and the Value-Based Reentry Initiative (VBRI) of the U.S. Justice Department's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS).

**Abstract:** The VBI and the VBRI fund projects that partner law enforcement agencies with faith-based organizations and other community groups to assist ex-offenders in adjusting to life in the community after the completion of their sentences (reentry). COPS has invested more than \$6.7 million in these projects throughout the country. The VBI provides the start-up resources to develop a local program and create the infrastructure to implement it. In 2003, COPS expanded its VBI program to include the new VBRI, which involved the selection of five sites to serve as national models that can be replicated in other jurisdictions. As part of the VBRI program, mentors are selected from faith-based and other nonprofit community organizations to serve as liaisons between the offender and various community resources and services. The five recipients of the VBRI grants for fiscal year 2004 are listed.

**NCJ Number:** 206980

**Title:** Front Line: Building Programs that Recognize Families' Role in Reentry

**Author:** Mike Bobbitt ; Marta Nelson

**Sponsoring Agency:** New York Division of Parole

**Sale:** Vera Institute of Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.vera.org/publication\\_pdf/249\\_476.pdf](http://www.vera.org/publication_pdf/249_476.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 09/2004

**Pages:** 8

**Annotation:** In exploring how family involvement in reentry can aid in a more successful transition from prison to the community and provide better recidivism results, this paper examines innovative correctional programs across the country.

**Abstract:** From lessons learned from other fields of study, such as alcohol and drug abuse treatment, there is solidity in the theory that family engagement can produce better outcomes at reentry. For many men and women transitioning back to the community from prison, family members are whom they turn to for assistance and these family members become the "front line" of their reentry. This paper examines the trend towards providing family-focused reentry programming in prison and in the community and highlights ways in which jurisdictions can structure their efforts and address the challenges involved. In providing an examination of such efforts, the paper presents an overview and description of Project Greenlight, a partnership with the New York State Department of Correctional Services (DOCS) and the Division of Parole that includes family-focused services in a prison-based reentry pilot program. Project participants are

adult-males incarcerated for a variety of offenses and are transferred to a prison in New York City 2 months prior to release. It explores ways that family members can support the person coming home. In establishing a family-focused reentry program there are issues that need to be addressed: (1) timing and location--will the intervention be pre-release, post-release, or both and where will it take place; (2) together or separate--will the program sessions with the families and person leaving prison be separate program sessions; (3) the engagement of family reentry program participation; and (4) defining, identifying, and engaging family members. With assistance, families can provide critical material and emotional support during reentry, as well as become powerful partners to government, specifically probation and parole. 18 Endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 206961

**Title:** Transition From Prison to the Community

**Journal:** *Corrections Today Magazine* Volume:66 Issue:5 Dated:August 2004 Pages:16, to 30

**Author:** Kermit Humphries

**Annotation:** This article outlines a National Institute of Corrections model for inmate transition to the community.

**Abstract:** As record numbers of offenders are released back into their communities, reductions in funding have cut offender programs that prepare inmates for this transition. As such, the current correctional system does little to prepare inmates for life outside of prison; most reenter their communities with the same problems they had prior to incarceration. In 2001, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), in partnership with Abt Associates, developed a model for inmate transition to the community. The Transition From Prison to the Community Initiative (TPCI) Model is designed to restructure State's transition practices toward a focus on public safety, victimization reduction, and effective use of correctional resources. In 2002, the TPCI Model was tested in Missouri and Oregon; in 2003, Indiana, Montana, North Dakota, and Rhode Island joined the initiative and in 2004, the District of Columbia, Georgia, and New York were added. Underpinning the TPCI Model is the use of validated risk-assessment tools to identify offenders' criminogenic needs, thus reducing the risk posed to the community by the offender. Under the TPCI Model, transition plans would be developed by offenders soon after being admitted to prison. Each jurisdiction is expected to implement the TPCI Model through multi-agency partnerships; a site coordinator in each jurisdiction maintains contact with State officials and advises them on the initiative's progress. The successful reentry of the Nation's prisoners back into their communities requires a fundamental shift in the mission of correctional agencies, as well as in their priorities, procedures, and staffing and management practices.

**NCJ Number:** 206862

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry, Religion and Research

**Corporate Author:** Caliber Associates

**Sponsoring Agency:** US Dept of Health and Human Services

**URL\*:** [http://www.calib.com/home/work\\_samples/files/kairosissuebriefi.pdf](http://www.calib.com/home/work_samples/files/kairosissuebriefi.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 2004

**Pages:** 7

**Annotation:** This report discusses the role of the faith community in prisoner reentry and successful reintegration and that faith may be a factor in reducing crime problems.

**Abstract:** Today, the exponential increases in incarceration have resulted in more than 2 million prisoners and over a half million ex-prisoners reentering communities each year. These challenges facing corrections planners and policymakers provide an opportunity to examine more extensively about prospective partners in steering prisoner reentry. This report discusses trends in corrections, the role of religion or the church in reentry and existing research. It acknowledges that the faith community is a likely partner in prisoner reentry. Over the past 25 years, there has been a resurgence of religion in corrections resulting in the increase of diverse faith practices entering prison settings and the number of religious services and activities increasing. The historic role of the church combined with its potential for volunteer resources uniquely position the faith community to support the successful reentry or reintegration of returning prisoners to the community. There is also empirical evidence suggesting that religious beliefs reduce crime and recidivism among adult prisoners. The report briefly discusses the evaluation of the Kairos



Horizon program conducted by the Compassion Capital Fund (CCF). The Kairos Horizon program is an outgrowth of the Kairos Prison Ministry and is a faith-based residential rehabilitation program for prisoner and their families. In conclusion, the faith community is seen as a potential partner in prisoner reentry and positioned to provide a variety of services to support the successful reintegration of returning prisoners.

**NCJ Number:** 206652

**Title:** Reentry Court Initiative: Court-Based Strategies for Managing Released Prisoners

**Journal:** *Justice Research and Policy* Volume:6 Issue:1 Dated:Spring 2004 Pages:93 to 118

**Author:** Christine Lindquist ; Jennifer Hardison ; Pamela K. Lattimore

**Sponsoring Agency:** National Institute of Justice

**Grant No.:** 2001-DD-BX-0071

**Annotation:** This article describes nine Reentry Court Initiative (RCI) programs, which were charged with developing strategies to improve the tracking and supervision of offenders upon their release and to provide the service necessary to help offenders reconnect with family and community.

**Abstract:** The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) launched the RCI program in response to the growing need to effectively meet the supervision and services needs of the large numbers of released prisoners returning to their communities. Nine sites were identified as RCI sites and were encouraged to base their strategies for supporting prisoner reentry on the drug court model. This article presents descriptions of these nine pilot RCI sites, including information on program status, target populations, organization, operations, services provided, agencies involved, and barriers encountered. In order to inform the analysis, telephone interviews were conducted with key contacts from each site. Site visits were conducted at three sites and involved semi-structured interviews with stakeholders who included judges, program directors, supervision officers, case managers, and program participants. Diverse approaches were used in establishing the nine sites; the judicial branch maintained programmatic authority in five of the eight operational sites, while administrative law judges or parole boards served as the legal authority in the other three programs. Regular court appearances were a requirement of all RCI programs, although a specialized reentry court docket was not established at all sites. Comprehensive services were offered to program participants at the majority of sites, with case management provided through a case manager or the supervision officer. Barriers commonly experienced across many of the RCI sites included difficulties in securing employment and affordable housing for program participants. The main differences observed across the sites regarded the target population, key agencies involved, and the type of supervision and case management offered to participants. Overall, the RCI pilot sites have underscored the importance of collaborative planning and of leveraging existing resources in local communities. Future research may focus on the relative costs and benefits of programs that serve only a small number of participants. Tables, references

**NCJ Number:** 206149

**Title:** Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice Innovation, Final Report

**Corporate Author:** Massachusetts Governor's Cmssn on Criminal Justice Innovation

**URL\*:** [http://www.mass.gov/agov2/docs/crime\\_commission04\\_final.pdf](http://www.mass.gov/agov2/docs/crime_commission04_final.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 2004

**Pages:** 103

**Annotation:** This report, presented by the Massachusetts Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice Innovation, makes recommendations on key criminal justice innovations in the areas of urban crime control, reentry and post-release supervision, forensic technology, cross-agency information sharing, and criminal justice education and training.

**Abstract:** In 2003, the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice Innovation was created to advise the Governor of Massachusetts on cutting-edge crime fighting techniques that may enhance the safety of the citizenry. The Commission conferred with leaders from the Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies, as well as representatives of human services, community and religious groups, and experts in the field of prisoner reentry, forensic sciences, and information technology. Five subcommittees addressed topics that make up the main

sections of this report: Urban Crime Strategies, Re-Entry and Post-Release Supervision, Forensic Technology, Cross-Agency Information Sharing, and Criminal Justice Education and Training. In each section, the current system in Massachusetts is reviewed; problems, shortfalls, and gaps are identified; best practices are described; and recommendations for improvement are offered. In terms of urban crime, research indicates that small numbers of chronic offenders are responsible for a large percentage of violent crime. Research has established that employing extra police in high crime areas can be an effective strategy to reduce urban crime rates. Recommendations extended for urban crime strategies include statewide community-oriented policing and crime analysis standards and partnerships between criminal justice agencies and human service agencies to intervene with at-risk youth. Reentry and post-release supervision recommendations include the adoption of mandatory post-release supervision, a standardized offender assessment process, and an increase in job training. Recommendations for the use of forensic technology include the creation of a Forensic Sciences Advisory Board and an increase in personnel capacity for forensic analysis. Cross-agency information sharing recommendations involve the establishment of a governance structure to oversee the development and implementation of an integrated criminal justice information system and the creation of uniform criminal justice data privacy guidelines. In the area of criminal justice training and information, recommendations are to conduct a skills assessment, evaluate current training offerings, and establish a minimum entry-level requirement of an associate's degree for all police applicants. A plan is presented for the implementation of the Commission's recommendations that includes the responsible branch of government and the anticipated time to implement the strategy. Table

**NCJ Number:** 205850

**Title:** Prisoners Once Removed: The Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities

**Editor:** Jeremy Travis ; Michelle Waul

**Sale:** Urban Institute Press

**Publication Date:** 2003

**Pages:** 410

**Annotation:** The chapters of this book are expanded papers from a federally sponsored 2002 conference that addressed the impact of incarceration and reentry on individual prisoners, their children and families, and their communities.

**Abstract:** Following an introductory chapter that presents current data on prisoners and their children and families, Part 1 contains three chapters that discuss aspects of the impact of incarceration and reentry on individual prisoners. One chapter examines the psychological impact of imprisonment and how it affects the inmate's functioning after release from prison. Another chapter examines the prison experience from the distinctive perspective of female inmates; and the third chapter provides an overview of recent research on how prison programs improve prisoners' ability to hold jobs, stay sober, and avoid criminal behavior after their release. Part 2 consists of four chapters that examine the impact of incarceration and reentry on inmates' children and families. One chapter examines the effects of mass incarceration on familial relationships through case studies of the experiences of some inmate families in Washington, DC. A second chapter explores the effects of parental incarceration on child development and the many factors that may help or hinder children's ability to cope with the loss of a parent. The third chapter focuses on the potential negative consequences of parental incarceration on the behavior of adolescent children in particular. The fourth chapter provides an overview of family matters during incarceration, including the problems they face and the strategies they use to manage those problems. The chapter concludes by examining the ways in which social policies and administrative practices hinder or support families' efforts to stay connected during incarceration. Part 3 contains three chapters on the impact of parental incarceration on the formal and informal service networks that are designed to support families and children, particularly those networks that serve the poor communities with relatively high percentages of incarcerated and released residents. Using geographical map overlays as a tool, one chapter documents the overlapping needs, services, and resources in Brooklyn (New York) neighborhoods to show how public assistance resources (health and human services) and criminal justice interventions are concentrated in those neighborhoods with relatively high percentages of incarcerated residents.

This suggests the need for coordinated and integrated services in such neighborhoods. Another chapter emphasizes the importance of building social capital in neighborhoods impacted by high percentages of incarcerated and paroled individuals, since families and communities are handicapped and disadvantaged by the disruption of family bonds. The concluding chapter provides advice and instruction on building partnerships to strengthen offenders, families, and communities. Chapter references and notes and a subject index

**NCJ Number:** 205548

**Title:** Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home

**Author:** Christy Visser ; Vera Kachnowski ; Nancy La Vigne ; Jeremy Travis

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/310946\\_baltimoreprisoners.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/310946_baltimoreprisoners.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/2004

**Pages:** 16

**Annotation:** As part of a larger four-State, longitudinal study of prisoner reentry entitled, "Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry," this report focuses on the second phase of a pilot study, which involved a series of interviews with prisoners returning to Baltimore (Maryland), once before and twice after they were released.

**Abstract:** Also, interviews were conducted with family members of some of the returning prisoners. The initial sample consisted of 324 respondents (235 males and 89 females). The median age of respondents was 34. Most of the ex-inmates were optimistic about their lives after release, but also anticipated challenges and obstacles that would require assistance. This suggests that they recognize their need for and are receptive to both prerelease and postrelease programs and services. Families were found to be an important source of housing, emotional support, financial resources, and overall stability for the returning prisoners. Services designed to facilitate such family support are recommended. Returning inmates who were employed after release relied on personal connections to find jobs, and they were also more likely to have participated in work-release jobs while incarcerated. A significant proportion of returning inmates were clustered in a few neighborhoods with high levels of social and economic disadvantage. Younger ex-inmates with drug-abusing family members and friends were more likely to use drugs after release, and those who participated in substance abuse treatment while in prison were less likely to use drugs after release than those who did not. Respondents reported various physical and mental health conditions but did not have health insurance to cover needed services. One-third of the respondents were rearrested within 6 months. They tended to be younger and with more extensive criminal histories; they were also more likely to have been involved in drug abuse prior to going to prison. Given these findings, recommendations are offered for addressing the various inmate needs that apparently are related to maladjustment and recidivism after release. 9 figures, 11 notes, and 7 suggestions for further reading

**NCJ Number:** 205538

**Title:** Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Texas

**Author:** Jamie Watson ; Amy L. Solomon ; Nancy G. La Vigne ; Jeremy Travis

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410972\\_tx\\_reentry.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410972_tx_reentry.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 03/2004

**Pages:** 124

**Annotation:** This description of the process of prisoner reentry in Texas examines the policy context associated with reentry, the characteristics and demographic distribution of the State's released inmates, how they are prepared for their release, the process by which they are released, how they are supervised once released, and the social and economic climates of the neighborhoods to which they return.

**Abstract:** The report consolidates existing data on incarceration and release trends in Texas and presents a new analysis of data on Texas prisoners released in 2001. Declining parole approval rates and legislation that requires inmates to serve greater percentages of their sentences have contributed to an increase in time served by inmates and consequently the size of the prison population. The inmate release patterns reflect inmate admission and population trends; 58,949

inmates were released from Texas prisons and State jails in 2002, nearly 6 times the number of inmates released in 1980. In 2001, most released inmates were male, and nearly half were non-Hispanic Blacks; one-third were non-Hispanic Whites; and 24 percent were Hispanic. The median age at release was 34. Most (39 percent) had been incarcerated for drug offenses. In 2002, most inmates participated in work activities, and a significant proportion participated in work-readiness and education programs. A few participated in vocational or formal substance abuse treatment programs. In 2001, 62 percent of the inmates were released through nondiscretionary means (i.e., mandatory release or expiration of sentence). In 2001, more than half (53 percent) of released inmates were subject to parole supervision after release, and 2 percent were subject to felony probation supervision. Most inmates (84 percent) were subject to postrelease supervision. Ninety-nine percent of inmates released in 2001 returned to Texas communities, with 58 percent returning to 5 of the State's 254 counties. High levels of poverty and crime characterized most of the neighborhoods to which released inmates returned. 58 figures and appended characteristics of ex-prisoners by postrelease supervision and an overview of probation

**NCJ Number:** 205531

**Title:** Dimensions, Pathways, and Consequences of Youth Reentry

**Author:** Daniel P. Mears ; Jeremy Travis

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410927\\_youth\\_reentry.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410927_youth_reentry.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 01/2004

**Pages:** 44

**Annotation:** Synthesizing the observations and lessons learned during a 2-day meeting of the Youth Reentry Roundtable, held in San Francisco on May 28-29, 2003, this report describes youth reentry and its policy relevance to communities nationwide.

**Abstract:** Drawing liberally from the insights and comments of the authors of papers presented at the Roundtable as well as the participants, this report identifies critical facts on youth reentry, including the specific programming and policy challenges that must be addressed.

Recommendations are then offered for next steps in research and practice. One recommendation calls for a reorientation of the juvenile and criminal justice systems to focus on reintegration of young offenders into society. Another recommendation proposes the creation of reentry programs that reflect a youth-development perspective and that address the influences of race/ethnicity and gender on reentry experiences. The report also recommends inclusion of community organizations and institutions as well as family networks in reentry initiatives. Finally, the report recommends the development of a national agenda for public education and research relevant to the challenges posed by youth reentry. The appendices provide a listing of the Roundtable authors and participants, a brief description of each Roundtable paper, and a summary of each of the presentations and ensuing discussions. 41 references

**NCJ Number:** 205469

**Title:** Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Ohio

**Author:** Nancy G. La Vigne ; Gillian L. Thomson ; Christy Visher ; Vera Kachnowski ; Jeremy Travis

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410891\\_ohio\\_reentry.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410891_ohio_reentry.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 11/2003

**Pages:** 86

**Annotation:** This report describes the process of inmate reentry in Ohio by examining the policies that influence reentry, the characteristics of inmates released from Ohio prisons, the efforts to prepare inmates for release, the geographic distribution of released inmates, and the social and economic climates of the communities that house some of the highest concentrations of released inmates in the State.

**Abstract:** Inmates released from Ohio prisons in 2001 were predominantly male and almost evenly divided between Blacks and Whites. Approximately three-fourths were between the ages of 20 and 39, and similar proportions of the released inmates had served time for drug offenses and violent offenses, with 12 percent having served time for a technical violation committed while

on postrelease supervision. Excluding technical violators, almost two-thirds of the release cohort in 2001 served 1 year or less in prison. Less than half (44 percent) had been incarcerated at least once prior to the 2001 release. Of those released in 2001, 17 percent were returned to prison within 1 year. The new Release Preparation Program, which inmates enter 6 months prior to release, includes employment readiness and other workshops designed to ensure that inmates will continue to receive needed services after release into the community; however, this new reentry strategy and the release preparation program have not yet been fully implemented and not all released inmates currently receive the full-range of prerelease and post-release programming. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC) is currently working to develop the following core programming areas for inmates involved in reentry: educational and vocational services, substance abuse programming, mental health services, specialized services for sex offenders, and programs based in the concepts of restorative justice. For each of the specialized programming areas, the ODRC has sought to establish partnerships or contracts with government agencies, halfway houses, and other service providers in the community. Ninety-five percent of inmates released in 2001 returned to communities within the State, with Cuyhoga County having the highest percentage (22 percent) of returns. Of those returning to Cuyhoga County, 79 percent returned to Cleveland (4,237 released inmates). Many of the neighborhoods to which the inmates returned in Cleveland were more economically and socially disadvantaged than the average Cleveland community. This report is the first stage of a comprehensive research project on reentry in Ohio and raises a number of questions that will be answered in later phases of the research. Future research is described in this report. Extensive figures

**NCJ Number:** 205396

**Title:** Navigating the Hidden Obstacles to Ex-Offender Reentry

**Journal:** *Boston College Law Review* Volume:45 Issue:2 Dated:March 2004 Pages:255 to 306

**Author:** Anthony C. Thompson

**Annotation:** This article considers the problems of offender re-entry and explores solutions for successful community reintegration.

**Abstract:** Federal and State correctional institutions have been steadily releasing record numbers of offenders each year back into communities that are unprepared to deal with the economic and social challenges created by this massive reentry movement. Ex-offenders thus find they are without the community support necessary to become active and successful members of society. The author begins by exploring the political trends that led to rising incarceration rates over the course of the past two decades. The resulting massive reentry of ex-offenders back into their communities is examined in terms of its social, legal, and economic impacts on both the offenders and their communities. Recently efforts at easing offender reentry have resulted in the establishment of reentry courts that focus on ex-offender transition, support, and supervision. Following an examination of the efficiency and institutional competence of reentry courts, the author offers two alternatives for the management of offender reentry. The first alternative involves the evolution of public defenders into a less specialized role whereby they could assist ex-offenders in a variety of issues related to reentry. The second alternative involves affording law students with clinical opportunities to explore non-traditional means of representing ex-offenders. Finally, it is argued that a collaborative relationship between lawyers and communities will be necessary to surmount the considerable challenges facing offender reentry. Footnotes

**NCJ Number:** 205269

**Title:** After Prison: Roadblocks to Reentry, A Report on State Legal Barriers Facing People with Criminal Records

**Corporate Author:** Legal Action Ctr

**URL\*:** [http://www.lac.org/lac/upload/lacreport/lac\\_printreport.pdf](http://www.lac.org/lac/upload/lacreport/lac_printreport.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 2004

**Pages:** 26

**Annotation:** This report summarizes the findings of a 2 year study conducted by the Legal Action Center (LAC) of the legal obstacles that people with criminal records face when they attempt to reenter society.

**Abstract:** With more than a half a million people released from State and Federal prisons every year, current State and Federal laws tend to interfere with the rights and obligations of full citizenship in almost every aspect of an individual's life. In essence, these laws are seen as creating roadblocks to the basic necessities of those attempting to rebuild their lives in society. This report presents findings from a 2 year in-depth study, conducted by the Legal Action Center (LAC) of the legal obstacles that people with criminal records face when they attempt to reenter society and become productive, law-abiding citizens. It was found that those individuals with criminal records seeking reentry face an overwhelming array of counterproductive, debilitating, and unreasonable roadblocks. The study was divided into three parts: (1) what is the law; (2) the report card; and (3) the vision for the future. Part 1 presents a comprehensive catalog of each State's legal barriers to employment, housing, benefits, voting, access to criminal records, parenting, and driving. In Part 2, the report card grades each State on whether its laws and policies help or hurt those seeking reentry. Lastly, part 3 outlines how Federal and State policymakers can assist in reintegrating people with criminal records into society and still promote public safety. In summary, these roadblocks block the reintegration of people with criminal records, which in turn compromises everyone's safety and the well-being of communities. There is the need to facilitate the ability of these individuals to live productive and law-abiding lives.

**NCJ Number:** 205127

**Title:** Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey

**Author:** Jeremy Travis ; Sinead Keegan ; Eric Cadora ; Amy Solomon ; Charles Swartz

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410899\\_nj\\_prisoner\\_reentry.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410899_nj_prisoner_reentry.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 11/2003

**Pages:** 78

**Abstract:** The report examines the policy context surrounding prisoner reentry in the State, the characteristics of the State's returning inmates, the geographic distribution of returning prisoners, and the social and economic climates of the communities that are home to the highest concentrations of returning prisoners. The data used were derived from several sources, including the Bureau of Justice Statistics, New Jersey Department of Corrections, New Jersey State Parole Board, New Jersey State Police, Juvenile Justice Commission, and the United States Census Board. The results showed that New Jersey's incarceration and reentry trends are similar to those observed at the national level. Between 1977 and 2002, the prison population more than quadrupled. Prison admissions increased because of the rise in arrests for drug offenses, the increased use of mandatory minimum sentences in New Jersey, and a rising number of individuals returned to prison as a result of parole revocations. The majority of released prisoners were male (91 percent) and Black (62 percent). The median age was 34 years. Over one-third had been serving time for drug offenses. One-third had been diagnosed with a physical or mental health condition. Educational skills were severely limited. A vast majority had a history of drug or alcohol abuse. The average time served for those released for the first time was just under 2 years. In-prison program availability was limited; 17 percent participated in academic programming, and 6 percent participated in vocational programming. A majority, two-thirds, of prisoners released were released to a period of supervision. The number and share of prisoners released without supervision increased over the 1990's. Almost one-third of prisoners released in 2002 came from two counties -- Essex and Camden -- that already face great economic and social disadvantage. 22 figures, 34 maps

**NCJ Number:** 204557

**Title:** Families Left Behind: The Hidden Costs of Incarceration and Reentry

**Author:** Jeremy Travis ; Elizabeth M. Cincotta ; Amy L. Solomon

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/310882\\_families\\_left\\_behind.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/310882_families_left_behind.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 10/2003

**Pages:** 12

**Annotation:** This paper identifies the costs to children and families of the incarceration and reentry of parents and suggests ways in which these harms can be reduced.

**Abstract:** More than half of the 1.4 million adults incarcerated in State and Federal prisons are parents of minor children. Many of these parents have had repeated exposure to the criminal justice system. Losing a parent to prison affects multiple aspects of children's lives to varying degrees. The loss can have a significant impact on the emotional, psychological, developmental, and financial well-being of the child. There has been little research to document the nature and degree of these effects. Research to date suggests that the impact of parental incarceration can have the effects on children of feelings of shame, social stigma, loss of financial support, weakened ties to the parent, changes in family composition, poor school performance, increased delinquency, and increased risk of abuse or neglect. Long-term effects can range from the questioning of parental authority, negative perceptions of police and the legal system, and increased dependency or maturational regression to impaired ability to cope with future stress or trauma, disruption of development, and intergenerational patterns of criminal behavior. Some of these harms can be reduced by structuring ways for inmates to maintain family connections during incarceration through letters and personal visits that help maintain family ties. For a family that has struggled to survive in an inmate's absence, many barriers make it difficult for family members to resume support roles when the inmate returns home. Interventions designed to help both inmates and family members prepare for and adjust to the re-entry can help facilitate positive adjustments for all concerned. Strengthening the family support network for a returning prisoner will improve his/her chances of re-entry success. Community-based organizations are well positioned to help in the re-entry process by providing assistance with housing, substance abuse treatment, health care, employment, child care, counseling, and vocational training. They can also help inmates prior to their release. Such interventions must focus on the particular problems likely to be encountered by the inmate and various family members. 32 notes and 28 suggestions for further reading

**NCJ Number:** 204132

**Title:** Harlem Parole Reentry Court Evaluation: Implementation and Preliminary Impacts

**Author:** Donald J. Farole, Jr. Ph.D.

**Corporate Author:** Ctr for Court Innovation

**Sponsoring Agency:** Bureau of Justice Assistance

**Publication Date:** 10/2003

**Pages:** 89

**Annotation:** This report presents a process and preliminary impact evaluation of the Harlem Parole Reentry Court established in 2001 in New York City.

**Abstract:** The Harlem Parole Reentry Court was established in 2001 in New York City as a pilot demonstration project in East Harlem. It was developed by the New York State Division of Parole, the Center for Court Innovation, and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. The program's purpose is to test the feasibility and effectiveness of a collaborative, community-based approach to managing prisoner reentry, with the goal of reducing recidivism and prison return rates. Key elements of the Reentry Court are: assessment and planning, active oversight, coordination of support services, graduated sanctions and incentives, and neighborhood focus. This report provides a process and preliminary evaluation of the Reentry Court covering the first 20 months of operations (June 2001 through January 2003). It evaluates the project implementation process, accomplishments, and lessons learned for those wishing to replicate the reentry court model. The report is divided into six sections: (1) defines the problems that the Reentry Court is designed to solve; (2) outlines a proposed solution to these problems; (3) the implementation of the Reentry Court model over the Court's first 20 months; (4) examines the first 61 Reentry Court participants in terms of their demographics, criminal history, progress through the program, and key outcomes of interest; and (5) examines the Reentry Court's preliminary impact on recidivism by comparing rates of return 1 year after release from prison among Reentry Court participants. Findings are based on observations of court operations, attendance at planning meetings, review of project records, interviews and discussions with key project staff and participants, analysis of data from the Reentry Court Management Information System and data retrieved from criminal justice system records. A number of lessons are highlighted about managing prisoner reentry into the community: (1) effective joint problem solving requires building the structures and relationships to sustain ongoing collaboration; (2) identifying eligible offenders

as early as possible prior to release from prison is critical in reentry management; and (3) interventions designed to build offender motivation and readiness to change may be critical to offender success. Overall results of the preliminary impact of the Reentry Court show that reconviction rates were not significantly reduced. However, results indicate a significant reduction in convictions on non-drug related offenses. In addition, there was no reduction in overall return to prison after 1 year. Since the study ended, the Harlem Parole Reentry Court has undergone several programmatic changes. In the future, program participants are likely to spend less overall time under the supervision of the Reentry Court. This initial report suggests that there is need for continued study of the Reentry Court model to determine whether it works and what its impacts are across various ex-offender populations and which of its various components is most effective. Exhibits, references, and appendix

**NCJ Number:** 204076

**Title:** Preventing Homelessness Among People Leaving Prison

**Author:** Nino Rodriguez ; Brenner Brown

**Corporate Author:** Vera Institute of Justice

**URL\*:** [http://www.vera.org/publication\\_pdf/209\\_407.pdf](http://www.vera.org/publication_pdf/209_407.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 12/2003

**Pages:** 12

**Annotation:** This paper addresses the issue of homelessness among returning prisoners and describes Project Greenlight's housing assistance program for returning prisoners.

**Abstract:** Three main factors that contribute to the problem of homelessness among people leaving prison: (1) the same social and economic conditions that lead to homelessness among the general population; (2) the barriers erected by their involvement with the criminal justice system; and (3) government agencies and community organizations disengagement with the problem. However, national-level policymakers are beginning to see the connection between homelessness among ex-offenders and recidivism and are beginning to support initiatives that address homelessness among ex-offenders. Local efforts to prevent homelessness generally focus on three principle objectives: (1) to prohibit offenders leaving prison from being homeless; (2) to provide housing as part of aftercare services; and (3) to provide comprehensive transitional services that include housing. Examples are offered of programs in various States that focus on these objectives. For example, the Hawaii Paroling Authority will not release an inmate without an approved place to live. In another example, the Illinois Department of Corrections attempts to find transitional housing and short-term employment for inmates through its Placement Resource Unit. Following this review of eight programs that focus on at least one of the principle objectives listed above, Project Greenlight is described. The original goal of the New York-based Project Greenlight was to address the spectrum of reentry needs of inmates during their last months of incarceration. A group of 348 men participated in the Project Greenlight program offered at the Queensboro Correctional Facility. Participants attended mandatory workshops that focused on job readiness, practical skill development, and cognitive-behavioral tools. Project Greenlight's focus slowly turned to preventing homelessness and its efforts to secure housing for reentry inmates demonstrate how a housing assistance program can rely on existing resources within a community. Without creating or subsidizing new housing, Project Greenlight successfully helped most of the men find housing. The method used by Project Greenlight to match ex-offenders with appropriate housing can be applied in any community, and consists of identifying inmates most at risk of homelessness, conducting housing intake interviews, and referring inmates to appropriate transitional housing. The success of this program suggests that mandatory housing assessment and assistance could greatly reduce homelessness and recidivism among ex-offenders.

Endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 204019

**Title:** Transforming Offender Reentry Into Public Safety: Lessons From OJP's Reentry Partnership Initiative

**Journal:** *Justice Research and Policy* Volume:5 Issue:2 Dated:Fall 2003 Pages:101 to 128

**Author:** Faye S. Taxman ; Douglas Young ; James M. Byrne



**Sponsoring Agency:** National Institute of Justice

**Grant No.:** 2000-IJ-CX-0045

**Annotation:** This article describes the Office of Justice Programs' (OJP) Reentry Partnership Initiative (RPI) concept as developed in eight sites and the issues that are encountered in reframing reentry to focus on community-oriented public safety goals.

**Abstract:** The Reentry Partnership Initiative (RPI) was one of three early efforts by the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice to explore community-based models for offender reintegration. The RPI was designed to connect governmental and community organizations in the design and implementation of both the policies and operations underlying the process of reintegrating offenders into the community. This research, sponsored by the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice describes the RPI concept as developed in eight sites and the issues that are encountered in reframing reentry to focus on community-oriented public safety goals. The article begins with a discussion of the RPI concept and present reentry model that incorporates features identified by the researchers and practitioners as the core components of the RPI approach. RPI's represent a new approach to addressing old problems: offenders transitioning into the community and the failure of conventional community supervision. RPI provides a new strategy to address these problems and their causes. RPI's are a complex mix of correctional service and community efforts aimed at behavior change, not behavioral control. Process evaluation showed that achieving RPI requires a series of developmental steps. The research underscored the complexity of developing systemic, multiagency organizational strategies focused on reentry and reintegration. In a relatively short period of time, these reentry initiatives have made strides in planning a process that can serve to change the landscape of corrections and the communities to which offenders return. Figures, tables, and references

**NCJ Number:** 204018

**Title:** Case-Managed Reentry and Employment: Lessons From the Opportunity to Succeed Program

**Journal:** *Justice Research and Policy* Volume:5 Issue:2 Dated:Fall 2003 Pages:75 to 100

**Author:** Shelli B. Rossman ; Caterina Gouvis Roman

**Sponsoring Agency:** National Institute of Justice

**Grant No.:** 94-IJ-CX-0010

**Annotation:** This article details the findings from a process and impact evaluation of the Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) program designed to reduce substance abuse relapse and criminal recidivism, focusing on the importance of employment and related services for returning prisoners.

**Abstract:** The Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) program was developed by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) and implemented in Tampa, FL, and St. Louis and Kansas City, MO, from 1994 through 1997. OPTS provides comprehensive, community-based aftercare services to substance-abusing felony offenders who had received treatment while incarcerated. Under a cooperative agreement between the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice and CASA, this article presents findings from a process and impact evaluation of the multisite OPTS program. The article focuses on OPTS employment services and employment-related outcomes, with particular attention to issues in service delivery. The main body of the article describes important lessons learned from the process evaluation about delivering employment services to those returning to their communities from prisons and jails. The OPTS evaluation included process and impact components and was designed as a randomized study to compare outcomes related to drug use, recidivism, and employment 1 year after release from prison or jail. The study demonstrates the potential of reentry services to assist those returning to their communities from prisons and jails. OPTS clients were significantly more likely to report at a 1-year follow-up more months employed with full-time jobs. Structural modeling found that case manager interaction as part of the OPTS program was associated with increases in full-time employment which in turn were associated with criminal desistance. The article discusses challenges that may be encountered in providing employment services, as well as suggests avenues that should be considered to enhance reentry success. Figures, tables, and references

**NCJ Number:** 204015

**Title:** Community Meetings as a Tool in Inmate Reentry

**Journal:** *Justice Research and Policy* Volume:5 Issue:2 Dated:Fall 2003 Pages:5 to 32

**Author:** Edmund F. McGarrell ; Natalie Hipple ; Duren Banks

**Sponsoring Agency:** National Institute of Justice

**Grant No.:** 2000-CE-VX-0002

**Annotation:** Using survival analysis, this study attempted to determine whether attending the Marion County (Indianapolis), IN, experimental reentry programming had a significant effect on the risk of rearrest among a sample of recent prison releasees.

**Abstract:** With the steady increase in prison populations, the number of prisoners released will continue to escalate. It is crucial that the Nation devise effective mechanisms for assisting the transition of inmates from prison to community. In the State of Indiana, the Department of Corrections has developed programs to assist in reentry. However, due to a lack of resources it has been difficult to engage in a systematic problem analysis or an evaluation of the effectiveness of their transition efforts. Indianapolis criminal justice officials, neighborhood leaders, and service providers decided to hold group meetings with individuals who had been released from prison within the last 60 days to convey a deterrence message along with social support. This article, supported by the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice describes the problem-solving approach employed by Marion County (Indianapolis) which analyzed inmate reentry and reoffending rates as a way of developing an intervention. It presents the findings from the analyses, describes the pilot project and the intervention, and presents the results of the effectiveness of their transition efforts. The study utilized several methodological approaches. The study began by conducting secondary analysis of Department of Correction fiscal year 2000 release data for Marion County (Indianapolis) which consisted of information on those who were released, those who were recommitted, and those nearing release. Following the initial profile, a more thorough analysis of the patterns of former inmate offending and survival was conducted. The findings from the study are consistent with the limited prior research on former inmate reentry to the community. The analysis indicates that inmates returning to the community are a high-risk group. Both interviews and the statistical analysis suggests that younger former inmates, and those with extensive criminal histories, particularly with more felony arrests, are more likely to reoffend. The evaluation of the pilot project did not yield evidence of impact in terms of reducing future offending. However, the pilot project had a relatively small sample of about 100 inmates in treatment which did not generate a high level of statistical power for detecting differences. The meetings may prove to be a tool that could be used as part of a broader strategy that includes intervention prior to release from prisons and follow-up. Tables and references

**NCJ Number:** 203815

**Title:** Adolescent and Teenage Offenders Confronting the Challenges and Opportunities of Reentry

**Journal:** *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* Volume:2 Issue:1 Dated:January 2004 Pages:72 to 87

**Author:** David M. Altschuler ; Rachel Brash

**Annotation:** This article examines the link between the transitions young offenders face as they develop into adulthood and the transitions they experience when re-entering their communities after incarceration.

**Abstract:** In juvenile corrections, the term "aftercare" is often used to describe the postrelease community corrections period. The term "reintegration" carries a much broader meaning than the terms "aftercare" and "re-entry." "Reintegration" focuses on offenders and their ability to function within society, as well as offenders' effect on their families, victims, the community at large, public safety, and the corrections system itself. It addresses what occurs both while offenders are incarcerated and when they return to their communities. Regardless of the level or type of reintegration, all programs based on a reintegration model do the following: prepare offenders for re-entry into the specific communities to which they will return; establish the necessary arrangements and linkages with the full range of public-sector and private-sector organizations and individuals in the community that can address known risk and protective factors; and ensure the delivery of prescribed services and supervision in the community. The combination of

arrested development typically associated with adolescent offending and the fact that each developmental stage is associated with the mastery of certain tasks and functions not easily achieved in correctional facilities poses a significant impediment for the reintegration of young offenders. The challenge is even greater when an adult corrections system, rather than juvenile corrections, is managing the adolescent offender. Identification of the array of risk and potential protective factors associated with each young offender is the first step toward developing an effective reintegration plan. A number of reintegration programs across the country are attempting to match the level and type of reintegration services provided with the potential for recidivism of each young offender. Effective reintegration programs must address adolescent development in the following areas: family and living arrangements, peer groups, mental and physical health, education, vocational training and employment, substance abuse, and leisure and avocational interests. This article discusses how young offenders' needs might be addressed in each of these areas under a reintegration model. It is imperative that policymakers who are instrumental in forging the policies for institutional and community corrections cooperate in designing and implementing a corrections model for young offenders that addresses developmental needs critical to their positive adjustment in the community upon release. 47 references

**NCJ Number:** 203814

**Title:** Youth Perspectives on the Experience of Reentry

**Journal:** *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* Volume:2 Issue:1 Dated:January 2004 Pages:56 to 71

**Author:** Mercer L. Sullivan

**Annotation:** This article reports on case studies of youth from disadvantaged communities in New York City who were incarcerated and then involved in the re-entry process back into their communities, with attention to contextual factors and developmental issues involved in re-entry.

**Abstract:** The case examples discussed were part of several research projects the author directed. These included three field studies from the 1980's and more recent research in the late 1990's that focused on violence among younger adolescents. Issues discussed in the case studies are differences in degree of prior criminal involvement, education, mental health, crime patterns, continuity and change in social relationships, and the features of the community into which re-entry occurs. The experiences of the youth profiled in this article indicate that there is significant variation among individuals in the process of re-entry following incarceration, with much of the variation linked to the amounts and types of social support available within the re-entry community. The problems encountered by re-entering youth are compounded by issues related to their transition from adolescence to adulthood. They experience the challenges that face all youth in transition to adulthood, namely, moving from dependence on family of origin to independence, from school to work, and from immersion in the adolescent peer group to intimate partnership and parenthood. Thus, in addition to addressing the problems that impede the obtaining of education, employment, and housing, youth must engage in constructive ways of negotiating the changes associated with transitioning from adolescence to adulthood. The case management of each youth must involve an assessment of the particular needs of each youth and the resources available in the community and the youth's social network that can assist in meeting those needs. Aftercare planners should make use of such mechanisms as community advisory groups, established community organizations, and support groups for re-entering youth. To the extent that resources can be coordinated better between their community networks and institutional providers of supervision, education, employment and training, physical and mental health, and other social services, their prospects will improve. 6 notes and 36 references

**NCJ Number:** 203813

**Title:** Empirical Portrait of the Youth Reentry Population

**Journal:** *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* Volume:2 Issue:1 Dated:January 2004 Pages:39 to 55

**Author:** Howard N. Snyder

**Sponsoring Agency:** Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

**Grant No.:** 1999-JN-FX-K002

**Annotation:** This article identifies and discusses some basic conceptual issues involved in

defining the youth re-entry population and uses available data to estimate the magnitude and characteristics of youth who re-enter society from some type of secure confinement; also discussed is the need to provide re-entry services for youth in transition from various other types of out-of-home placements, such as foster care.

**Abstract:** There are no current data on releases from juvenile correctional facilities. The best assessment of the characteristics of committed juveniles in the United States comes from a relatively new national data resource, the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP). From analyses of CJRP data, this article estimates that approximately 88,000 youth were released from juvenile commitment facilities in 1999. It is also possible to use the CJRP data to make a rough estimate of the demographic characteristics of this 1999 release cohort. Of all youth released from commitment facilities in 1999 who had more than a short length of stay in a facility, 88 percent were males; 19 percent were age 14 or younger, and 36 percent were age 17 or older; 39 percent were White non-Hispanic, 39 percent were Black non-Hispanic, and 17 percent were Hispanic; and 38 percent were committed for a violent offense, 33 percent for a property offense, 14 percent for a public-order offense, 11 percent for a drug offense, and 5 percent for a status offense. On the census date in 1999, the average time a committed youth had spent in the reporting facility was nearly 29 weeks, i.e., more than 6 months. The median time in the facility was 17 weeks. In 1987 the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics interviewed a nationally representative sample of juveniles and young adults housed in long-term, State-operated juvenile training schools (the Survey of Youth in Custody 1987). The findings of this survey represent the most recent comprehensive assessment available on the background characteristics of committed youth. The survey indicated that committed youth were likely to come from single-parent homes and to have relatives who had been incarcerated; lagged behind other youth in their levels of educational attainment; used alcohol and other drugs; had a prior adjudication that led to at least probation; and mental health problems that may have contributed to the prevalence and frequency of their offending behavior. Given the many developmental deficits associated with the delinquent behavior of incarcerated youth, it is imperative that funds be provided for research and evidence-based treatment programs designed specifically for youth who are returning to their communities from long-term commitments. 3 notes and 18 references

**NCJ Number:** 203812

**Title:** Reentry of Young Offenders From the Justice System: A Developmental Perspective

**Journal:** *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* Volume:2 Issue:1 Dated:January 2004 Pages:21 to 38

**Author:** Laurence Steinberg ; He Len Chung ; Michelle Little

**Annotation:** This article examines three issues pertinent to the re-entry of young offenders (between the ages of 16 and 24) into the community from juvenile or adult correctional facilities: why they face great challenges in re-entry; why certain individuals achieve positive turning points in early adulthood and others do not; and how programming in the justice system might increase the number of adult success stories.

**Abstract:** Although the authors recognize that punishment and training in a secure correctional facility are important components of the justice system's response to juvenile offending, the widespread failure of punishment and training approaches in the rehabilitation of young offenders is apparent from the statistics on the adult outcomes for individuals who have been embedded in the juvenile justice system. The significant and complex problems faced by young offenders as they make a transition into adulthood suggest that they lack many of the basic psychosocial capacities required for assuming positive adult roles. Punitive and incapacitative measures in themselves do nothing to prepare youth for successful re-entry into the community; thus, youth released from confinement are at high risk for failure in the areas of education, employment, and the establishment of healthy interpersonal relationships. Even if vocational training and skill acquisition accompany incarceration, such programs do not address the psychosocial deficits that impede youth in obtaining and retaining gainful employment. Rehabilitative policies and programs must re-examine the goals and methods of the justice system from the perspective of the psychosocial development of youth, such that case-management strategies identify the specific psychosocial tasks of late adolescence and the contexts that best facilitate constructive development. The features of such contexts include the presence of supportive adults and

opportunities to develop responsible autonomy, acquire important competencies, and establish positive relationships with mature peers. 82 references and appended lists of components of psychosocial maturity and contexts that affect the psychosocial maturity of young offenders

**NCJ Number:** 203811

**Title:** Youth Development and Reentry

**Journal:** *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* Volume:2 Issue:1 Dated:January 2004 Pages:3 to 20

**Author:** Daniel P. Mears ; Jeremy Travis

**Annotation:** This article summarizes the findings and issues discussed at a roundtable of researchers, practitioners, policymakers, and community leaders convened by the Urban Institute to inform national discussions about youth re-entry into the community following institutionalization.

**Abstract:** America currently faces the challenging task of reintegrating approximately 200,000 juveniles and young adults ages 24 and younger who leave secure juvenile correctional facilities or State and Federal prisons to return to their home communities each year, a process this article calls "youth re-entry." After defining "youth re-entry" and the scope of the problem, the authors discuss the implications of a youth-development perspective for understanding and examining youth re-entry. This is followed by an analysis of the experience of youth re-entry, an identification of the challenges to successful reintegration of youth into communities, and descriptions of various strategies for improving youth re-entry so as to address the youths' diverse and distinctive developmental needs. In considering the implications of youth development for re-entry strategies, the article notes that developmental psychology suggests that when youth move toward adulthood, they require assistance in learning how to live independently, find employment and housing, and develop intimate relationships. The roundtable emphasized that the contexts that provide opportunities for constructive youth development vary considerably. These varying contexts include families, peers, schools, work environments, and prisons. The level and characteristics of a youth's development is critical to understanding and improving the re-entry process. One of the most promising re-entry initiatives is the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP). This re-entry model emphasizes prerelease planning and services; structured, short-term transitional programming; and structured, longer term reintegrative activities that balance supervision, treatment, and services. The IAP is based on the concept of "overarching case management" that spans the entire justice system and includes five components: assessment, classification, and selection of high-risk youth; individual case planning that incorporates a family and community perspective; a mix of surveillance and services; a balance of incentives and graduated sanctions coupled with the imposition of realistic, enforceable conditions; and service brokerage with community resources and linkages with social networks. The article concludes with policy and research recommendations. 4 notes and 35 references

**NCJ Number:** 203708

**Title:** Comprehensive Reentry Strategy for Adults in the District of Columbia: Action Plan

**Corporate Author:** Court Service and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA)

**URL\*:** [http://www.csosa.gov/reentry/comp\\_reentry\\_action\\_plan.pdf](http://www.csosa.gov/reentry/comp_reentry_action_plan.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 10/15/2003

**Pages:** 50

**Annotation:** This document discusses reentry services for District of Columbia (DC) offenders.

**Abstract:** This Comprehensive Reentry Strategy is a long-range plan for an effective continuum of reentry services for DC offenders. The Action Plan is the result of a community-based effort. The workgroup action items address important public safety concerns by improving the planning and continuity of services that are necessary for offenders to return from prison and establish productive lives in the community. The workgroups are Pre-Release Planning; Education/Employment; Public Education, Family, and Community Support; Short-term and Long-term Housing; and Legislative and Policy Issues. The Pre-Release Planning Group is to convene a reentry team to complete an individualized reentry plan at the earliest practical moment during incarceration; integrate case management and support services across agencies to assist

offenders in obtaining needed services upon release; and ensure that inmates released from incarceration can access services or resources necessary for survival. The Education/Employment Group will use employment market data and ex-offender skill set data to guide job training and employer outreach. Public Education, Family, and Community Support will encourage the development of support systems for the children and families of incarcerated parents; and emphasize the relationship between public safety and successful reentry through the development of public education campaigns. Short-term and Long-term Housing will encourage individual inmates to begin the application process to place an additional family member's name on a public housing lease at least 90 days prior to release from incarceration; make the process to add a name to public and low-income housing leases more accessible to returning ex-offenders; and encourage reentry teams to include a substance abuse treatment and/or mental health transition plan as part of the pre-release planning process. The Legislative/Policy Issues Group will consider legislation to enhance public safety by addressing the need for an ex-offender housing continuum and the elimination of unnecessary barriers to successful reentry. 28 tables

**NCJ Number:** 203707

**Title:** They're Coming Back: An Action Plan for Successful Reintegration of Offenders that Works for Everyone

**Corporate Author:** Search for Common Ground

**URL\*:** <http://www.fcnetwork.org/reading/philadelphiareentry.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 2002

**Pages:** 32

**Annotation:** This document discusses the barriers to ex-offender employment and the Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) Consensus Group on Reentry & Reintegration of Adjudicated Offenders.

**Abstract:** In Philadelphia, the high rate of recidivism speaks volumes about the reentry experience of men, women, and youth that, after a period of incarceration, find little hope and few resources to help them change their lives for the better. In March 2002, a diverse group of public and private sector organizations, agencies, and individuals met to address this problem. The mission statement includes the development and promotion of pragmatic and concrete measures to enhance the participation in society of men and women leaving the Philadelphia Prison System. The consensus group identified significant barriers to successful reintegration faced by offenders, including poor employment skills, drug addiction, homelessness, lack of positive support systems, and outstanding legal issues. The recommendations of the group covered a wide range of issues, grouped into five general subject areas: Personal Responsibility, Pre-release, Legal, Employment, Education and Training, and Community Integration. The findings and recommendations are reflected in the following five general principles. The Philadelphia criminal justice system must rededicate itself to achieving public safety, offender accountability, and the development of competencies necessary for successful reintegration of offenders into the community. The achievement of better and more coordinated services is crucial for offenders in order for them to successfully reintegrate into their communities. To achieve these goals, the criminal justice system must examine and eliminate legal and administrative barriers that unduly inhibit successful offender reintegration. The criminal justice system must find better ways to coordinate and cooperate. The criminal justice system must engage with members and leaders of the community to assist them in rethinking, and playing a more active role in the reintegration of offenders. 16 endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 203705

**Title:** Can Employers Play a More Positive Role in Prisoner Reentry?

**Author:** Harry J. Holzer ; Steven Raphael ; Michael A. Stoll

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** <http://64.78.63.75/downloads/revised%20holzer.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 03/2002

**Pages:** 17

**Annotation:** This document discusses the willingness of employers to hire ex-offenders based on

survey data.

**Abstract:** Of the many challenges ex-offenders face, those posed by reentry into the labor market may be among the most severe. One of the major causes of these difficulties is the aversion that most employers have toward hiring ex-offenders. The barriers ex-offenders face to employment include low levels of education, substance abuse and mental health issues, racial discrimination, and their own lack of motivation. Data from employer surveys in several large metropolitan areas, administered at various times during the 1990's, show that employers are much more reluctant to hire ex-offenders than any other group of disadvantaged workers. Their willingness to do so is affected by a broad range of job and establishment characteristics, as well as the business cycle. Employer background checks into criminal behavior remain relatively rare; thus employer decisions are often poorly informed and can lead to discrimination against less-educated young Black men more broadly. Fewer than 40 percent of all employers claim that they would definitely or probably hire ex-offenders into their most recently filled non-college job. This stands in sharp contrast to their general willingness to hire other groups of workers that are commonly stigmatized, such as welfare recipients, applicants with a GED instead of high school diploma, or applicants with spotty work histories. Employers seem to fear legal liability where ex-offenders have to deal directly with customers or handle property that belongs to others. A more comprehensive set of treatments to deal with the problems of ex-offenders and to attract employers is needed. These treatments or activities include case management services, education or training activities, prerelease supports and training, transitional work experience, job placement assistance, and post-employment supports. 18 footnotes, 33 references

**NCJ Number:** 203703

**Title:** Halfway House Utilization: The Key to Reentry -- A Cost Savings Report

**Author:** Anne Power Ed.D.

**Corporate Author:** Power & Associates

**URL\*:** <http://www.occaonline.org/pdf/ohiocostsavings.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 02/25/2003

**Pages:** 13

**Annotation:** This study examined the costs and benefits of halfway houses in Ohio compared with incarceration.

**Abstract:** Ohio was selected to participate in a 10-State initiative on re-entry sponsored by The Urban Institute. The research is designed to examine the current re-entry efforts and to assess the future prospects of re-entry. Although the re-entry process in Ohio begins while the offender is still in prison, the re-entry process continues in halfway houses across the State for those released through the Bureau of Community Sanctions. Studies of Ohio halfway house programs have found that time spent in a halfway house enhances public safety, minimizes the financial burden on taxpayers, and achieves long-term reintegration into the community for the majority of halfway house participants. Halfway houses in Ohio are community residential programs that provide supervision and treatment services for offenders released from State prisons, referred by Courts of Common Pleas, or sanctioned because of a violation of supervision conditions. Halfway houses provide such services as drug and alcohol treatment, electronic monitoring, job placement, education programs, and specialized programs for sex offenders and mentally ill offenders. In fiscal year 2002 the Bureau of Community Sanctions contracted for over 1,626 halfway house beds in 26 facilities to house felony offenders. At an average length of stay of 90 days, these 1,626 beds change occupants over 4 times in 1 year, saving 2,373,960 prison days per year. Under Ohio's current budget crisis, the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections' emphasis on re-entry and the proven record of Ohio's halfway houses, the release of targeted offender populations to serve their last months in a halfway house make good fiscal and programmatic sense. This report provides details on cost savings of halfway houses compared to incarceration. 11 notes

**NCJ Number:** 203467

**Title:** Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois

**Author:** Nancy G. La Vigne ; Cynthia A. Mamalian ; Jeremy Travis ; Christy Visher

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**URL\*:** [http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410662\\_ilportraitreentry.pdf](http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410662_ilportraitreentry.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 04/2003

**Pages:** 75

**Annotation:** This report describes the process of prisoner reentry in Illinois and examines the characteristics of reentry prisoners, as well as the social and economic conditions of the communities in which the majority of prisoners enter.

**Abstract:** Information concerning Illinois' reentry policies and programs is consolidated and an analysis of new data on Illinois prisoners who were released in 2001 is offered. Data were derived from the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC), the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, and the Metro Chicago Information Center. Analysis of this data indicates that Illinois' incarceration and reentry trends parallel trends at the national level. Illinois incarceration levels have increased over the past two decades due to three main factors: (1) an increase in the number of violent offenders incarcerated; (2) an increase in the number of drug offenders incarcerated; and (3) a significant increase in parole revocations of released prisoners. The number of prisoners released in Illinois during 2001, 30,068 prisoners, was more than two and half times the number of prisoners released in 1983. The IDOC offers a range of programs to prepare prisoners for community reentry, including education, substance abuse treatment, employment readiness, and mental health treatment. Additionally, since fiscal year 1991, the IDOC has required post-release prisoners under community supervision to participate in a release program called PreStart, which offers education, preparation, and planning for reentry. Community-based programming has also been enhanced in Illinois to help reduce the number of offenders returning to prison. Such programming includes Electronic Detection, Community Correctional Centers, Adult Transition Centers, and Day Reporting Centers. Next, the report examines the characteristics of reentry prisoners: 90 percent are male, 67 percent are Black, 48 percent are under the age of 31, over one-third served time for drug-related offenses, and more than 60 percent served less than 1 year in prison. The majority of released prisoners returned to the Chicago area, with many returning to six of the most economically and socially disadvantaged neighborhoods in the area. Finally, the report analyzed data from 2001, which indicate that most prisoners were released through nondiscretionary means in 2001, such as through mandatory release or expiration of their sentence. The likelihood of recidivism for Illinois offenders is high, with more than 50 percent of inmates having served prior prison sentences. Future research should address the gaps in services for reentry offenders. Figures

**NCJ Number:** 203394

**Title:** Resettlement of Short-Term Prisoners: An Evaluation of Seven Pathfinders

**Author:** Sam Lewis ; Julie Vennard ; Mike Maguire ; Peter Raynor ; Maurice Vanstone ; Steve Raybould ; Andrew Rix

**Sale:** Great Britain Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate

**Publication Date:** 9/2003

**Pages:** 119

**Annotation:** This report presents the results of an evaluation of seven "Pathfinder" resettlement programs for short-sentence prisoners in the United Kingdom.

**Abstract:** The Pathfinders program was developed to assist short-sentence prisoners remain offense free following their release. These short-sentence prisoners, defined as prisoners who are sentenced to less than 12 months and normally released mid-way through their sentences, have among the highest re-offense rates in part because they are not in prison long enough to take advantage of offending behavior programs and pre-release services designed to reduce re-offending. The current evaluation was conducted to assess both the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the programs. A key issue under examination was whether the Pathfinder programs motivated participants to pursue personal change. The evaluation included an early organizational audit of the project design and implementation, an investigation of the resettlement needs of participants, and an assessment of the impact on resettlement problems of participants. Results indicate three main areas of difficulty with the programs that include problems with management, staffing, training; the role of partner prisons in facilitating Pathfinder programs; and deficiencies in resettlement services available to participants. Recommendations on remedying these problems are outlined in the report and include increasing levels of resettlement services to



participants, increasing the level of post-release between Pathfinder staff and participants, and implementing interim measures of effective resettlement work. The evaluation indicates that the most impressive finding of the evaluation process is the level of post-release contact, especially significant and long-term contact, which has been achieved between Pathfinder staff and participants. Finally, recommendations on future resettlement work with short-term prisoners is offered, including increasing access to existing prison services for short-term prisoners and improving partnerships between Employment Services, Benefits Agency, local authorities, and relevant voluntary and private sector agencies. Tables, appendix, references

**NCJ Number:** 202626

**Title:** Aftercare as Afterthought: Reentry and the California Youth Authority

**Author:** Michele Byrnes ; Daniel Macallair M.P.A ; Andrea D. Shorter

**Corporate Author:** Ctr on Juvenile and Criminal Justice

**URL\*:** <http://www.cjcj.org/pdf/aftercare.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 08/2002

**Pages:** 59

**Annotation:** This report examines the importance of reentry and aftercare programs for juveniles and specifically evaluates the current reentry process for youths released from the California Youth Authority (CYA).

**Abstract:** In recent years, policymakers and legislators have increasingly turned their attention to the challenges faced by juveniles released from detention facilities. In California, over 2,000 youth are released each year; and the youths released from the CYA represent the most serious youthful offenders in the State. Upon release, youths face extraordinary challenges that typically overburdened and underfunded correctional agencies are ill-equipped to handle. As such, reform efforts have been underway across the country to improve reentry and aftercare programs for the Nation's youthful offenders. Following a description of the problem and the scope and methodology of the current study, the authors offer data on CYA's population characteristics and their implications. Barriers to the successful reentry to these youth back into their communities are outlined and include a lack of educational options and a lack of housing options. The current state of the CYA reentry and aftercare programs are reviewed, including the educational services, bilingual services, programs dealing with mental health, substance abuse, and sex offenses. The authors offer recommendations concerning case management, the creation of additional community-based treatment and supervision for CYA wards, and the expansion of community corrections sanctions. Five model programs and four promising programs are described. Future research should focus on the particular needs of girls and young women within the CYA. Notes, bibliography, appendix

**NCJ Number:** 202559

**Title:** Nevada Reentry Drug Court Demonstration

**Author:** John S. Goldkamp ; Michael D. White

**Corporate Author:** Crime and Justice Research Institute

**Sponsoring Agency:** National Institute of Justice

**URL\*:** <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/202559.pdf>

**Publication Date:** 01/2003

**Pages:** 91

**Grant No.:** 2000-DC-VX-0031

**Annotation:** This report describes the development and implementation of the Nation's first "re-entry" drug courts (Clark County and Washoe County, NV), which provide for the release to drug courts of prison inmates within 2 years of their expected parole dates.

**Abstract:** The 2-year demonstration project was designed to relieve prison crowding by releasing eligible offenders into the community under the jurisdiction of a drug court for intensive drug treatment under judicial supervision. A total of 150 inmates participated in the program at the 2 sites. This report describes and assesses three specific phases in the development and implementation of the project. Assessment of these phases was conducted through data collection during site visits to both jurisdictions; researchers used a variety of data-collection methods, including in-person and phone interviews of key court, treatment, and corrections

officials, as well as a review of treatment and court files. In Phase I, the pre-implementation period, the researchers found initial problems with funding, overcoming budget concerns, and the securing of funding from the U.S. Department of Justice. In Phase II, the first stages of operation, the research found that each demonstration site developed its programs and devised approaches to identify appropriate target populations and then recruited them through effective screening and enrollment procedures. The drug courts at the two sites adopted different versions of the re-entry court model; however, both courts emphasized a number of features believed to be related to program success, including intensive supervision, the securing and maintenance of appropriate housing, stable employment, and regular participation in an enhanced drug court treatment regimen. The initial screening process failed to produce a sufficient number of acceptable candidates; and when candidates were identified, the process of moving them from prison to the re-entry program took too long. A combination of factors severely limited the implementation of the projects at both sites, resulting in only a small number of eligible candidates being identified, screened, and enrolled in the programs. In Phase III, "finding the rhythm," changes to the original legislation and a change in Department of Corrections leadership enabled both programs to become fully implemented with efficient screening and enrollment mechanisms and impressive interagency cooperation. Despite the different developmental experiences in the two demonstration sites, both programs have succeeded in enrolling participants with similar backgrounds, and both programs have experienced positive early outcomes. Participants in both programs averaged 150 days in treatment, and the vast majority remain active and in good standing in the program. Only one person has been arrested on new charges. The report concludes by offering recommendations in the areas of identifying and enrolling candidates, layering discretion and jurisdiction, incentives and sanctions for managing participant behavior, and the long-term contribution of the demonstration projects. 19 references and appended relevant legislation

**NCJ Number:** 201170

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry: What Works, What Does Not, and What is Promising

**Journal:** *Crime & Delinquency* Volume:49 Issue:3 Dated:July 2003 Pages:360 to 388

**Author:** Richard P. Seiter ; Karen R. Kadela

**Annotation:** This article provides an overview and background of prisoner reentry and examines the current evaluations of reentry programs to determine what works.

**Abstract:** Today, there are many more offenders released from prisons than in the past. There are many factors surrounding the release of prisoners and their reentry to the community. These changes include a modification of sentencing from the use of parole to determinate release with fewer ex-offenders having supervision in the community, increased surveillance as opposed to assistance for those under supervision, less community stability and availability of community social service support, and larger numbers returning to the community. A large number of those released are returned to prison for either committing new crimes or for violating the technical conditions of their parole or release supervision. It is important to identify prisoner reentry programs that work. This article reports on a review of evaluations of prisoner reentry programs. After determining which studies fall within the reentry definition, a criterion had to be developed to determine if they work or not. Summary findings of prisoner reentry studies are presented that were identified within various reentry categories: vocational and work programs, drug rehabilitation, education programs, sex offenders and violent offenders, halfway house programs, and prison prerelease programs. This review identified the positive results of many prisoner reentry programs. Results indicate a positive result for vocational training and/or work release programs, for drug rehabilitation, to some extent for education programs, for halfway house programs, and for prerelease programs. This analysis showed that certain programs can improve prisoner reentry and reduce the revolving-door syndrome. Appendix A-C and references

**NCJ Number:** 200348

**Title:** When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry

**Author:** Joan Petersilia

**Sale:** Oxford University Press, Inc

**Publication Date:** 2003

**Pages:** 278

**Annotation:** This article discusses relevant information pertaining to prisoner reentry into society.

**Abstract:** Prisoner reentry is a complex and multifaceted problem involving some of the central issues in contemporary crime policy: sentencing, prisons, and prison release practices. Recommendations, listed in chapter 1, are to reinvest in prison work, education, and substance abuse programs; re-institute discretionary parole in the 16 States that have abolished it; front-load post-prison services during the first 6 months after release; and establish procedures by which some convicts can put their criminal offending in the past. A profile of returning prisoners is presented in chapter 2, as well as data on the demographic and crime profiles of returning prisoners. Race and gender, literacy and education, physical and mental illness, marital and parenting relationships, and substance abuse are some of the items discussed. The early evolution of parole in the United States and its use in modern sentencing practices are discussed in chapter 3. Chapter 4 focuses on the changing nature of parole supervision and services. Chapter 5 discusses the decline of inmate participation in prison work, treatment, and education programs and ways of preparing inmates for release. In chapter 6, legal and practical barriers to reintegration are detailed, including evidence on how a criminal record affects an offender's right to vote, qualify for public assistance, find work, or retain parental rights. Chapter 7 discusses inmate release and identifies the demographic crime factors that are significant predictors of recidivism. The victim's role in prisoner reentry is described in chapter 8. The legal rights of victims to be notified of a parolee's release and to testify at parole hearings, and the crucial role this plays in enhancing community safety and offender rehabilitation are also discussed. Chapter 9 offers 12 policy suggestions for reforming parole and enhancing prisoner reintegration. Chapter 10 reflects on the political and practical challenges and payoffs of enhancing reentry strategies. Bibliography, index

**NCJ Number:** 198867

**Title:** Successful Reintegration into the Community: One NGRI Acquittee's Story

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:66 Issue:3 Dated:December 2002 Pages:59 to 63

**Author:** Randy Starr

**Annotation:** This author describes his own experience wherein he was found to be not guilty by reason of insanity (NGRI) and his successful reintegration into society.

**Abstract:** This author provides a focus on a microcosm, what happened to one person, himself, rather than on the large numbers of reentering offenders and the systems needed to handle them. A review of the reintegration into the community by conditional release, as was the case for the author, is a challenging procedure. A brief overview of this procedure is provided. The author relates in detail his personal history in which he murdered his mother in a demented rage in 1979 and was incarcerated after being found guilty by reason of insanity. He describes his incarceration and subsequent conditional release. He discusses the insight and coping skills he learned while in the hospital, and how they were reinforced by the outpatient treatment he received. This successful journey through mental health inpatient and outpatient treatment programs and his successful reintegration into society are described in personal detail. In summary, he states that he learned that he could do it, but he couldn't do it alone.

**NCJ Number:** 198866

**Title:** Model for Developing a Reentry Program

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:66 Issue:3 Dated:December 2002 Pages:55 to 58

**Author:** Vincent D. Basile

**Annotation:** This author describes a model program to aid effective reintegration of offenders into society emphasizing collaboration within the segments of the criminal justice system.

**Abstract:** In order to avoid further harm to the community, this author describes how society can aid offenders in their return to its midst by providing for positive change. A brief review of material published on this subject is provided. A paradigm shift is described as being needed, one that accepts the fact that prison or jail seldom if ever has changed behavior. This entails a need to revisit mandatory sentencing, local policies on parole and probation violations, redirect financial resources to a network of more effective community correction centers, and halfway houses, and offer judges a menu of various intermediate sanctions to impose in lieu of incarceration. Focus

areas include building a true criminal justice system, coalition building with non-criminal justice agencies, restorative justice programs, program evaluation, and a model in progress in Massachusetts, a collaborative process between the community correctional and institutional correction staffs plus various public and private agencies in the area to help provide the returning offender with a safety net of needed services. It is this model that the author advocates in his conclusion. A source list of references is included.

**NCJ Number:** 198865

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry and the Role of Parole Officers

**Journal:** *Federal Probation* Volume:66 Issue:3 Dated:December 2002 Pages:50 to 54

**Author:** Richard P. Seiter

**Annotation:** This article describes a study of parole officers in St. Louis, Missouri, to identify aspects perceived as being important to success in prisoner reentry into the community.

**Abstract:** This author provides a brief overview of the past few years of the reentry of prisoners to the community. The four-step research design used in this study is described. Data collection and analysis surveys are identified including survey administration, and description of the sample, with 114 surveys completed and 11 officers interviewed. Programs available for parolee reentry are identified, with 104 responses reported received from officers. These officers identified six important aspects of reentry programs for improving parolees' chances for success. The officer's also reported on the most important aspect of their job in this same respect, with a strong cohesion being received in their responses. Supervisory activities that are believed to improve the chance of success are discussed. In conclusion, parole officers believe that the most effective functions they perform are those that help and assist those under supervision. Thus, the author notes that it may be that casework activities need to be reconsidered as more important than surveillance in policy making for the future. References

**NCJ Number:** 198337

**Title:** Reentry Initiatives: Improving the Monitoring and Managing of Returning Offenders

**Journal:** *Police Chief* Volume:69 Issue:12 Dated:December 2002 Pages:44, 46 to 49

**Author:** Terry Donahue

**Annotation:** This article discusses ways that law enforcement agencies are attempting to help returning offenders break the cycle of crime by becoming contributing members of their communities.

**Abstract:** Focusing on returning offenders, this article addresses the ways in which law enforcement agencies are attempting to help returning offenders break the cycle of crime in order to become contributing members of their communities. After arguing that it is well known that offenders who have served time in Federal, State, or local correctional facilities are at a particularly high risk of committing new crimes upon return to their communities, the author argues that local law enforcement and community corrections officials are considering ways to better manage and monitor former inmates. Contending that few offenders return to their communities with the necessary job skills, education, or prospects for success that will keep them from committing new crimes, this article maintains that the 183,675 offenders released from correctional facilities in 1994 who were sent back to prison within 3 years, were charged with 744,480 new crimes or roughly 4 crimes per offender. Stating that research confirms that most crime is committed by a small group of chronic offenders, the author argues that a number of law enforcement agencies have begun to explore new partnerships with government and private sector organizations in order to find ways to help returning offenders break the cycle of crime by becoming contributing members of their communities. After briefly discussing various reentry initiatives recently implemented in Boston, Richland County, Ohio, and West Virginia, the author argues that reentry initiatives have several benefits including cutting across organizational boundaries, involving the friends, family, mentors, and clergy of offenders in taking part in positive changes for offenders, and utilizing existing Federal and State monies in order to implement reentry programs. Discussing Federal assistance towards reentry initiatives, the author contends that the Office of Justice Programs' Going Home: Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative aims to identify and enhance existing and developing reentry programs that target serious violent offenders among several different offender populations.

**NCJ Number:** 197232

**Title:** Inmate Reentry and Post-Release Supervision: The Case of Massachusetts

**Journal:** *Perspectives* Volume:26 Issue:4 Dated:Fall 2002 Pages:32 to 38

**Author:** Anne Morrison Piehl Ph.D.

**Annotation:** The effects of complex public policies on sentencing and parole and the need for rational, comprehensive public policies that provide for planned release from custody and post-release supervision to protect the community are addressed in this article.

**Abstract:** A review of the history of Massachusetts' experience with the adoption of the popular policy of "truth in sentencing" and its effect on prisoner release is provided here. A discussion of the policy questions around inmate release in Massachusetts is also included, including truth-in-sentencing-reform in 1993. The intent of that policy was to get tough on crime but had the opposite effect and actually increased the number of offenders released into the community without supervision. The practice of parole, pre-release practice of correctional institutions, and conditions of release are topics covered. Also, it is noted that sentencing practices have resulted in inmates being released to probation supervision in overcrowded probation caseloads resulting in increased arrests. Tables are included showing first-time recidivism rates of prisoners released from 15 States in 1994, terms of release from the Massachusetts Department of Corrections in 1999, terms of release by security level of the correctional institution, and type of release from Suffolk County House of Correction in January 2001. Endnotes provide a list of source references. In conclusion, it is noted that an opportunity for improving public safety exists at the point of reentry of prisoners into the community when a modest reduction in recidivism will result in a substantial reduction in criminal victimization and criminal justice expense. However, it is reported that because reforms have not been effective, improvements in policy and practice are needed to begin to achieve high returns.

**NCJ Number:** 195878

**Title:** Challenges of Prisoner Reentry and Parole in California

**Author:** Joan Petersilia

**Corporate Author:** California Policy Research Ctr

**URL\*:** [http://www.seweb.uci.edu/users/joan/images/ca\\_parole\\_and\\_reentry.pdf](http://www.seweb.uci.edu/users/joan/images/ca_parole_and_reentry.pdf)

**Publication Date:** 06/2000

**Pages:** 4

**Annotation:** This paper focuses on varied issues surrounding prisoner release, parole, and prison reentry in California.

**Abstract:** Addressing the changing nature of the California prison system, this paper focuses on various issues of prisoner release, parole, and reentry into prison. Discussing determinant sentencing and the changing nature of parole, the author indicates that release from prison is a now privilege to be earned by prisoners. Focusing on recent tremendous growth in California's prison population, this paper also addresses California's prison building program, State funding to accomplish the program, and the fact this tremendous growth has meant that the number of parole agents has not kept pace with the casework load. Discussing what happens to prisoners once they are released, this author indicates that most parolees return to prison because they are unable to find gainful employment, making the topic of parolee recidivism a key issue for California's policymakers. Highlighting social issues concerning prisoners and parolees, such as employment, neighborhood cohesiveness, and physical and mental health, this paper presents a variety of statistics to illustrate the current demographic make-up of California's prisoners.

**NCJ Number:** 194553

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry: Issues for Practice and Policy

**Journal:** *Criminal Justice* Volume:17 Issue:1 Dated:Spring 2002 Pages:12 to 18

**Author:** Jeremy Travis ; Laurie O. Robinson ; Amy L. Solomon

**Annotation:** This article is an overview of the challenges of prisoner reentry into society after incarceration, including presentation of changing prison and prisoner population conditions and a discussion of the reentry perspective as part of the sentencing, corrections, and parole process.

**Abstract:** The article is a review of the changes over the past 25 years in prisoner reentry processes. Critical changes in incarceration have made prisoner reentry readjustment more

complicated than in the past. Specifically, prisoners today face an increased length of stay, decreased access to vocational and educational programming, and the overrepresentation of certain communities and neighborhoods in both prison and reentry populations. The specialized health and family needs of prisoners suggest that a multi-disciplinary approach utilizing corrections/parole, public health, and children's services resources should be employed in developing current reentry planning. The authors present the "reentry perspective" to the corrections and sentencing process. The four major propositions to the approach are that: prison programming should be designed to better prepare prisoners for reentry; corrections staff should focus on the actual reentry process when working with prisoners; the parole system as a solely criminal justice system should be reexamined and resources should be allocated to evaluate legal barriers to successful prisoner reentry.

**NCJ Number:** 194061

**Title:** Victim's Role in Offender Reentry

**Author:** Anne K. Seymour

**Corporate Author:** American Probation and Parole Assoc

**Sponsoring Agency:** Office for Victims of Crime

**Publication Date:** 2001

**Pages:** 102

**Grant No.:** 96-VF-GX-K001

**Annotation:** This manual presents strategies for involving community members and crime victims in partnerships that facilitate the successful re-entry of ex-inmates into the community, as well as promising practices for re-entry partnerships.

**Abstract:** In the discussion of strategies for involving community members and victims in re-entry partnerships, the manual first defines "community" as "relationships that people build, beginning with one-on-one and emerging into groups of varying sizes that share a common bond and mutual interests." It then advises that in re-entry partnerships, collaboration is required between the following four key communities: victims or those who provide support and services to victims, offenders or advocates for offenders, individuals and agencies that implement venues for justice and community safety, and persons who are affected by an offender's re-entry into their neighborhood. Attention is then given to the role of the community in determining and meeting victims' needs, particularly in the context of offender re-entry. Such a community role includes support, advocacy, liaison services, and the creation of public awareness of victims' needs and rights. Sections of the manual then focus on ensuring victims' rights in the re-entry process in the following key areas: victim notification, victim protection, the defining of victim impact, and victim restitution. Another major section of the manual profiles existing promising practices for re-entry partnerships, including a burglary prevention project; victim advisory councils; considering victims' needs when assessing offenders' risk; programs that pertain to the impact of crime on victims; accountability boards; victim-sensitive parole revocation processes; and restorative community service. 44 notes and appended assistance resources and sample materials

**NCJ Number:** 192225

**Title:** Reentry at the Point of Entry

**Journal:** *Corrections Today* Volume:63 Issue:7 Dated:December 2001 Pages:68 to 75

**Author:** Kit Glover ; Kurt Bumby

**Annotation:** This article discusses the typical youth's processing through the Missouri Division of Youth Services (DYS).

**Abstract:** The goal of the DHS is to successfully transition a youth back home and to the community. The ultimate measure of success for residential or institutional treatment programs is the assurance that youths exiting such facilities maintain positive gains and refrain from re-offending or engaging in problematic behaviors upon return to the community. The importance of developing transitional and aftercare programming lies in additional treatment, education, monitoring, and other support services following release from a residential or institutional treatment program. In Missouri, DHS maintains a commitment to protecting the safety of citizens by providing individualized and comprehensive needs-based services. DHS facilities have evolved from large, statewide training schools that emphasized custodial care into small

regionally based treatment programs designed to serve youths and their families close to home. The services and approaches DYS provides include: a continuum of security and programming ranging from community-based and nonresidential programs to residential programs; comprehensive, standardized needs and risk assessments; an emphasis on individualized needs; community-based partnerships for job placement and alternative education; incorporation of treatment outcome exploration; commitment toward collaboration with local juvenile courts in early intervention and prevention efforts; and a singular case management system. The aftercare consists of an indefinite period of time that youths remain on caseloads but have transitioned into the community. The Intensive Case Supervision Program was developed to maintain consistent and frequent contact with youths in aftercare or community care. Day treatment programs provide an effective transitional service for youths re-entering the community following release from residential care. Treatment and educational services are integral to individual youth development planning, and Missouri continues to refine educational programming. Youth also receive medical, dental, vision and mental health screenings, physical examinations, and qualified reviews of any medications they may have been prescribed. Additional transitional services include sex offender management groups, substance abuse programming, and family therapy services.

**NCJ Number:** 191685

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry in Perspective

**Author:** James P. Lynch ; William J. Sabol

**Sale:** The Urban Institute

**Publication Date:** 2001

**Pages:** 28

**Annotation:** This report examined the present problems of prisoner reentry and compared them to the past.

**Abstract:** Over the years, the number of prisoners released as well as the size of the parole population has increased, while the general population growth rate has declined. Part of the problem is due to insufficient funding for the supervision of parolees. The problem is compounded by the fact that most of the inmates who are currently reentering society are more violent and have failed in previous parole programs. Many have not participated in programs designed specifically to help in the reentry process itself. Furthermore, many of these inmates have served such long sentences that they have few outside ties and, therefore, no one to turn to for help. Changes in the economy and welfare system make matters more difficult. Even though prisoner reentry is not a problem for society at large, many small communities are affected. The author offers the following recommendations: (1) close attention should be given to repeat offenders; (2) more attention should be given to areas that receive a disproportionate number of the reentry population; (3) there should be more focus on the communities and Correctional Institutions themselves; and (4) there needs to be more of an emphasis on correctional policies in general as they clearly affect the prisoners' readiness for reentry. Tables, graphs, and endnotes

**NCJ Number:** 191241

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry: Public Safety and Reintegration Challenges

**Journal:** *Prison Journal* Volume:81 Issue:3 Dated:September 2001 Pages:360 to 375

**Author:** Joan Petersilia

**Annotation:** This article examines the state of parole in today's corrections environment, notably the collateral consequences involved in recycling parolees in and out of families and communities, and suggests policy responses.

**Abstract:** Changes in sentencing practices, coupled with a decrease in prison rehabilitation programs, have placed new demands on the U.S. parole system. Nearly 700,000 parolees are being supervised in their communities. This number of releasees dwarfs any other period in the history of parole; and the needs of parolees are more serious; the public and parole system are less tolerant of failures; and the corrections system has few rehabilitation programs, either in prison or in the community. A number of collateral consequences are likely under such a situation, including increases in child abuse, family violence, the spread of infectious diseases, homelessness, and community disorganization. It is not surprising that most parolees fail to lead law-abiding lives and are rearrested. There have been a number of responses to the problems of

parole. Through their exercise of discretion, parole boards can target more violent and dangerous offenders for longer periods of incarceration. The abolishing of parole may sound tough, but it removes an important "gate-keeping" role of parole boards that can protect communities and victims. Further, parole boards are in a position to demand participation in drug treatment, and research shows that coerced drug treatment is as successful in achieving abstinence as is voluntary participation. Parole boards can also require an adequate plan for a job and residence in the community. Perhaps most important, parole boards can reconsider the tentative release date when more information about the offense and offender has been collected, and the offender's behavior in prison has been observed. Parole guidelines, which are used in many States, can establish uniformity in parole decisions and objectively weigh factors known to be associated with recidivism. Given the increasing human and financial costs associated with prison -- as well as all of the collateral consequences parolees pose to families, children, and communities -- investing in effective re-entry programs may be one of the best investments that can be made. 41 references

**NCJ Number:** 190429

**Title:** From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry

**Author:** Jeremy Travis ; Amy L. Solomon ; Michelle Waul

**Corporate Author:** The Urban Institute

**Publication Date:** 06/2001

**Pages:** 63

**Annotation:** This paper examines the prisoner re-entry (return to the community from prison) process, challenges for prisoner re-entry, and the implications of prisoner re-entry for families and communities.

**Abstract:** The chapter on the re-entry process considers the characteristics of inmates who re-enter the community, how release decisions are made, how prisoners are prepared for release and reintegration, the moment of release, post-release supervision, and parole violations. The chapter on challenges for prisoner re-entry encompass substance abuse treatment, physical and mental health services, employability and workforce participation, and re-entry and housing. This paper argues for a re-examination of the nexus among the jurisprudence of sentencing, the mission of corrections agencies, the availability and quality of services for prisoners and their families, and the social goal of prisoner reintegration. A focus on the moment of release, with its attendant risks and opportunities, suggests that correctional agencies and community groups could create new links to smooth the transition from prison to liberty. A strategy as simple as ensuring that the ex-inmate has proper identification, housing, and a community agency to report to the day after release may avert some failures of the immediate transitional phase. Links to health care providers, drug treatment, transitional work environments, family counseling, and faith institutions are important. Such a strategy suggests moving the re-entry planning process into the prison itself, so that these linkages are developed well before the moment of release. Using the mechanisms of conditional supervision and the tools of graduated sanctions, criminal justice agencies could have an enhanced role in deterring criminal behavior and reducing drug use. This monograph identifies the safety risks posed by returning prisoners as well as a number of interventions that have proven successful in reducing those risks. 236 references

**NCJ Number:** 189677

**Title:** Offender Reentry: A Storm Overdue

**Journal:** *Corrections Management Quarterly* Volume:5 Issue:3 Dated:Summer 2001 Pages:46 to 51

**Author:** Reginald A. Wilkinson

**Annotation:** This article discussed the philosophy and dynamics of an offender's reentry back into the community and provided discussion on the newly initiated Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Ohio Plan.

**Abstract:** Faced with overburdening caseloads, scarcity of institutional and community-based programming and the demand for more fiscal accountability, corrections management found itself with the need to reinvent. In addition, changes in sentencing had led to an increase number of inmates released with no supervision because they completed their definite term. With this



knowledge, it was seen that pre-release preparation or pre-release readiness should begin during the reception and/or diagnostic stage. This would require a change in correctional leadership philosophy. With many corrections concepts steeped in tradition, a change in correctional leadership philosophy would be a challenge. The challenge would be to achieve a more systemic approach ensuring a smooth transition of offender treatment and training from reception through the completion of community supervision. To begin a shift in reentry philosophy toward offender intake, it is necessary that a reentry plan become inculcated into the reception assessment process. In addition, a comprehensive reentry plan must encompass a core set of evidence-based programming that centers on the offender's economic viability on release through education, vocation, or work programs. In reviewing the philosophy of offender reentry, this article discussed the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's newly instituted "Ohio Plan". In 2001, ODRC launched an initiative entitled "The Ohio Plan for Productive Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction" involving the use of an internal planning committee and a larger council of professionals and citizens from the community. The focus involved the examination of several issues important to offender reentry. The plan required that personal reentry plans be developed for each offender being released from institutional supervision. In addition, to get a handle on the number of parole revocations a critical analysis of offenders returned to Ohio's prisons was conducted. These were just the beginning of the ODRC's reentry efforts. Ohio was selected as one of nine States to implement a reentry court program through a partnership between the ODRC and the Richland County Common Pleas Court. The reentry plan requires plenty of continuous improvement processes and dedication. References

**NCJ Number:** 189673

**Title:** Collaboration for Successful Prisoners Reentry: The Role of Parole and the Courts

**Journal:** *Corrections Management Quarterly* Volume:5 Issue:3 Dated:Summer 2001 Pages:11 to 22

**Author:** Peggy B. Burke

**Annotation:** This study examined the revitalization and provision of adequate resources to paroling authorities and parole supervision agencies for successful offender reentry management.

**Abstract:** In the United States, there was a period during which a system of sentencing and corrections had shifted dramatically to a retributive focus. It was a system that relied primarily on the use of incarceration for longer periods of time. Those sentenced under the retributive theme are now completing their periods of incarceration awaiting reentry back to society. This study examined how reentry initiatives need to create new structures replacing those lost during the retributive model. The study focused on significant innovations made by paroling authorities in managing reentry. It was stated that the most promising strategy in assuring successful reentry initiatives was the collaboration across an entire umbrella of criminal justice policy makers and practitioners, including paroling authorities and courts. The reasons for a successful approach to reentry provided a clear goal for sentencing and corrections. First, the size and urgency of the problem were strong. Second, reentry was gaining more visibility with both corrections and the public. Third, the interests of community, victim, and the criminal justice system seemed to converge, and lastly, the term reentry provided a tone to encourage consensus and collaboration. One initiative discussed in response to the reentry crisis was the development of "reentry courts" modeled after drug courts. In addition, paroling authorities were refining their approach to reentry management through their release and violation policy and practices. In doing so, they needed to reach out and collaborate with their partners, the courts, the community supervision agencies, and others providing them the ability to move forward. The key to managing the reentry challenge was seen as collaboration. References

**NCJ Number:** 189201

**Title:** Returning Inmates: Closing the Public Safety Gap

**Journal:** *Corrections Compendium* Volume:26 Issue:6 Dated:June 2001 Pages:1-5, to 10

**Author:** John J. Larivee

**Annotation:** This article examines the issue of inmate reentry into society and the implications for public safety.

**Abstract:** Rising numbers of inmates, coupled with the loss of prerelease training and outside

supervision, foreshadow a breakdown in the continuum of community safety. Ex-inmates face complex challenges when they return home, as do the neighborhoods receiving them. Reentry issues include: (1) employment readiness (7 out of 10 inmates are unable to fill out a job application or read a bus schedule); (2) need for substance abuse treatment, particularly aftercare following in-prison treatment; (3) housing (parole restrictions, public housing statutes, and stringent shelter policies -- designed to enhance public safety -- often limit housing options); (4) public health (a disproportionately large percentage of the U.S. population who have serious infectious diseases are among the incarcerated population; the inmates receive free health care and medicine while incarcerated, but their transition to community based health services is not always seamless). The article concludes that corrections professionals must focus on the eventual release of inmates from the moment of their commitment, place them in settings where they can safely prepare for reentry, and build partnerships with other governmental agencies and communities to enhance the transition from prison to society. References

**NCJ Number:** 188919

**Title:** Health-Related Issues in Prisoner Reentry

**Journal:** *Crime & Delinquency* Volume:47 Issue:3 Dated:July 2001 Pages:390 to 409

**Annotation:** This article reviews health-related issues important to ex-offenders' successful reintegration into the community.

**Abstract:** Correctional inmates and ex-offenders are disproportionately burdened by medical and mental health problems. This article reviews the state of programs and research in five health-related issues important to these inmates' successful transition to the community: discharge planning, community linkages and continuity of care; adherence to treatment regimens; availability of housing; quick access to benefit programs; and the particular needs of dually and triply diagnosed individuals. In general, according to this article, such services are currently inadequate, although there are exemplary programs and promising strategies in some of these realms. Collaborative efforts bringing together correctional systems, public health departments, and community-based organizations and other community providers are especially promising and important. The article recommends additional research to evaluate currently available programs and encourage their replication and enhancement and to broaden collaboration. Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness studies may be particularly important tools for "selling" programs targeting a population that has little or no political constituency and even less public sympathy. Table, references

**NCJ Number:** 188917

**Title:** Returning Captives of the American War on Drugs: Issues of Community and Family Reentry

**Journal:** *Crime & Delinquency* Volume:47 Issue:3 Dated:July 2001 Pages:352 to 367

**Author:** John Hagan ; Juleigh P. Coleman

**Annotation:** This article considers issues of community and family reentry for parents incarcerated for drug-related offenses.

**Abstract:** The 20th century American war on drugs dramatically affected African American inner-city neighborhoods and families, and many within these communities saw more signs of vindictiveness than reconstruction in the aftermath of the conflict. This article considers the dilemma that the erosion of state capital and the formation of negative social capital poses for the return of incarcerated parents into these communities and families. It examines new Federal family welfare legislation as indicative of State disinvestments in these families. The article claims that the challenge to the rights of incarcerated parents when they return to society is part of a larger movement that extends punitive penal policies beyond prison walls. It concludes that, as individuals lose fundamental rights of citizenship, the community itself threatens to become more like a prison, with social workers and parole officers serving like prison guards in their increasing surveillance and monitoring roles. The article suggests directions for research on more constructive policies and procedures regarding the reentry of persons released from prison. References

**NCJ Number:** 188915

**Title:** Prisoner Reentry: Current Trends, Practices, and Issues

**Journal:** *Crime & Delinquency* Volume:47 Issue:3 Dated:July 2001 Pages:314 to 334

**Author:** James Austin

**Annotation:** This article describes current prison admission, release, and community supervision practices and how they vary across States.

**Abstract:** After three decades of passing laws and implementing policies designed to dramatically increase the Nation's prison population and harden the conditions of confinement, policymakers and criminologists are now interested in prisoner release. This article uses national data and a survey of eight States to examine current prison admission, release, and community supervision practices. Most State prison systems are ill equipped to ease the transition of inmates from prison to the community. A significant portion of released inmates pose minimal risk to public safety. The article claims that parole supervision increasingly results in ex-convicts being reincarcerated for noncriminal behavior or misdemeanors. It suggests that, for most inmates, reentry should be altered by either eliminating supervision or greatly shortening the period of supervision. The article also considers two other approaches to releasing inmates. One program would increase the size and funding of the current postrelease system and enhance parole. The second approach would hold offenders, not corrections, responsible for their postrelease behavior and would include a mandatory period of community supervision. Tables, notes, references

**NCJ Number:** 188914

**Title:** Reentry Reconsidered: A New Look at an Old Question

**Journal:** *Crime & Delinquency* Volume:47 Issue:3 Dated:July 2001 Pages:291 to 313

**Author:** Jeremy Travis ; Joan Petersilia

**Annotation:** This article discusses the movement of individuals from prison back into the community.

**Abstract:** Reflecting unprecedented prison expansion, the scale of prisoner reentry has reached new heights. A focus on reentry sheds light on the consequences of America's shifting sentencing policies, the changes in parole supervision, and the concentrated impact of removal and return of prisoners on disadvantaged communities. Prisoners today are not prepared for reintegration and are not connected to community-based social structures. The article examines linkages between prisoner reentry and the related social policy domains of health policy, family and child welfare policy, workforce participation, civic participation, and racial disparities to show the potential for more systematic reintegration policies. The article also discusses the implications of a reentry perspective for developing new strategies for prisoner reintegration. The article concludes that the reentry perspective suggests new ways of thinking about the bases for the concept of parole, a new mandate for corrections, and a new mission at the local level to join public and private capabilities to increase positive outcomes of the reentry process. Figures, table, references

**NCJ Number:** 184143

**Title:** Parole and Prisoner Reentry in the United States

**Journal:** *Perspectives* Volume:24 Issue:3 Dated:Summer 2000 Pages:32 to 46

**Author:** Joan Petersilia Ph.D.

**Annotation:** This first part of a two-part article discusses the sources of parole information, the origins and evolution of parole in the United States, a profile of parolees in the United States, and the re-entry process and parole supervision.

**Abstract:** Section I of this article describes sources of U.S. adult parole data. Most of what is known about U.S. parolee characteristics comes from the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the statistical arm of the U.S. Department of Justice. Since the early 1980's, BJS has reported on the number of persons entering and exiting parole through its National Corrections Reporting Program. Section II discusses the early evolution of parole in the United States, as well as its use in modern sentencing practices. This section reviews the dramatic changes in parole release that resulted from the Nation's skepticism about the ability of prisons to rehabilitate. Section III describes the current parole population. It presents trend data on the growth of the parole population and what is known about parolees' crime, personal backgrounds, and court-ordered conditions. It also presents data on the average size of parole caseloads, offender contact requirements, and annual costs of supervision. Section IV describes the offender's needs as

he/she transitions to the community, as well as the services that are available to meet these needs. This section also outlines the civil disabilities that apply to ex-convicts. Part Two of this article will appear in the Fall 2000 issue of "Perspectives." 1 figure and 4 tables

**NCJ Number:** 182551

**Title:** Jail-Based Treatment and Reentry Drug Courts

**Journal:** *American Jails* Volume:14 Issue:1 Dated:March/April 2000 Pages:9 to 16

**Author:** C. W. Huddleston

**Annotation:** This article explores the need for jail-based treatment from the drug court perspective, and offers a working model for a jail-based treatment program linked to a re-entry court.

**Abstract:** The success that drug courts have enjoyed to date rests on a foundation of collaboration among the legal, treatment, and law enforcement communities. Helping to build effective jail-based treatment programs can broaden and strengthen this foundation. Many drug courts rely on their local jails to incarcerate defendants prior to the start of their drug court program or to house defendants briefly as a sanction. Local jails provide an excellent setting for screening, assessment, delivery of initial treatment services, social detoxification (stabilization), and forging links with community treatment programs. In building a working model for effective jail-based treatment programs with functional linkages to local drug courts, several issues must be considered. Among them are communication between jail and drug court, treatment staffing, program space, experience and training, programming, jail staff assignment, follow-up services, and re-entry into the community. Regarding the latter issue, by acting as a re-entry court, drug courts can provide incentives for participants to complete jail-based treatment, a strong structure for defendants leaving jail, a continuum of treatment services, and a high level of probationer accountability. Appended descriptions of existing drug court and jail-based treatment linkages and 21 references