

March 20, 2007

**House of Representatives
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security**

**Second Chance Act of 2007:
Promoting Prison and Jail Reentry Programs**

**Stefan LoBuglio, Chief
Pre-Release and Reentry Services Division
Montgomery County (Maryland) Department of Correction and Rehabilitation
11651 Nebel Street
Rockville, Maryland 20852
301/240-773-4262**

stefan.lobuglio@montgomerycountymd.gov

Introduction

My name is Stefan LoBuglio and I serve as the Chief of the Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation's Pre-Release and Reentry Services Division in Maryland. I am honored to present testimony to support the introduction and enactment of the Second Chance Act.

From my perspective as both a practitioner and as a researcher in corrections for 15 years, I believe this legislation can catalyze the demonstrated leadership across this county in different disciplines and at all organizational and political levels to incorporate prisoner reentry as part of our nation's correctional systems' policies and practices. Such reforms will directly benefit public safety and community well-being, individual incarcerants and their families, and just as important, the working environment and job functions of the thousands of correctional professionals who run the country's jails and prisons and who supervise probationers and parolees in the community.

The Second Chance Act will provide important seed money to encourage and expand innovative prisoner reentry programs in jurisdictions throughout this country from county and tribal jails to state and federal prisons. Building on the success of the \$100 million federal Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative, the funds from the Second Chance Act will spur partnerships and collaborations across disciplines that will leverage local resources in the areas of health, workforce development, housing, and treatment services. Also significant, the Second Chance Act will continue to build the body of research and identify promising practices in prisoner reentry that will assist local, state, and federal jurisdictions to better assess what models and programs are best adapted for their locations.

By way of background, I currently have the privilege of working with a dedicated staff of correctional professionals and oversee a program that manages nearly 200 sentenced individuals – almost 30% of Montgomery County's total sentenced population – who are living and working in the community and who are within 6-8 months of release from federal, state, and local custody. Prior to Montgomery County, I helped develop reentry programs in a 2,000-bed sentenced facility located in Boston for the Suffolk County Sheriff's Department. In the course of my correctional career, I have made dozens of presentations on different reentry topics at local, state, and national conferences, and more recently have worked with the field's major professional organizations – the American Jail Association and the American Correctional Association -- to advance training and education in this area. I have also been active in a number of innovative reentry projects sponsored by the National Association of Counties and the Council of State Governments.

In terms of research, I have co-authored several articles on reentry on subjects ranging from correctional education, community supervision, recidivism, and implementation challenges. This month, I completed a two-year evaluation of a jail reentry program in Massachusetts, which also serves as my doctoral thesis at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education. Currently, I serve as a member of the External Advisory Committee for the national evaluation of the federal Serious and

Violent Offender Reentry Initiative, which is one of the largest and most comprehensive evaluations of reentry program in recent history. With funding from the U.S Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance, I am also currently participating in a research effort to collect and disseminate information about jail reentry programs and practices -- called the Jail Reentry Roundtable -- which is co-sponsored by the Urban Institute, the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and the Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation.

In this written statement, I provide an overview of prisoner reentry issues with an emphasis on six major points. **First, I believe we have a window of opportunity – perhaps the first in 30 years – to reexamine and change correctional practices and post-release support with the mutually supportive goals of increasing public safety, community well-being, and the lives of the former incarcerated and their families.** Prisoner reentry enjoys wide support from bi-partisan policy makers, practitioners, professional associations, think tanks, faith-based organizations and the inmate-advocacy community, and provides a strategy to mitigate the rising social and economic costs of high rates of incarceration.

Second, we have learned an enormous amount about what programs and services are effective in supporting reentry goals over the past decade. This body of research along with the examples of many promising program models that have emerged in jurisdictions throughout this country can provide direction, support, and technical assistance to spur the development of more programs and to help bring them to scale.

Third, jails and local correctional systems serve as the entry and exit point in the nation's correctional system and must be included in the development of prisoner reentry systems. Not only do jails face the enormous challenge of processing millions of court-involved individuals each year, but they also face unique reentry issues such as managing institutional populations with high proportions of individuals with mental health and serious physical health problems.

Fourth, reentry programs require extensive collaborations and partnerships with government agencies and community organizations to provide the wide range of support and services needed to address the many needs of those under correctional supervision. Correctional facilities are highly complex and challenging institutions to operate, and correctional staff behind the walls and in the community need the expertise and resources of practitioners from many other disciplines to provide targeted and relevant transitional assistance to this population.

Fifth, prisoner reentry reaffirms and refocuses correctional systems on one of their historical goals to correct and rehabilitate. The safest, cleanest, most secure and orderly correctional facilities that I have seen are the same ones that have the most extensive reentry programming. These facilities enjoy a healthy culture that supports mutual respect between staff and incarcerated, and utilize more of the skills and talents of correctional professionals to manage and motivate the institutional population. They are also the facilities that most efficiently manage their bed space and which are best able to

classify appropriate individuals for lower security levels while reserving the use of the higher security levels for those who need this additional level of control and confinement. Prisoner reentry also will lead to more transparent institutions as the magnitude and complexity of the issue transcends corrections alone, and requires the active partnership, collaboration, and in-reach of social service agencies, workforce community, the community and faith-based organizations, law enforcement and other public safety departments.

Sixth, and finally, reentry programs face enormous implementation, coordination, and capacity-building challenges, and it is too soon to expect that many of them will accomplish such long-term goals as significantly reducing recidivism. Instead, we need to ensure that these programs are targeting the right individuals, are addressing real needs of the population that can affect their post-release success, are well-designed with evidenced-based practices, and are implemented with integrity and quality control. Such programs should demonstrate an ability to accomplish intermediate goals in their treatment domains, but an expectation of an immediate reduction in recidivism rates is unrealistic, and may lead us to prematurely conclude these programs are ineffective before they have had a fair chance to demonstrate their long-term benefits.

Prisoner Reentry Background

The growth of the nation's correctional population and the high recidivism rates among those released has triggered a re-examination of correctional policies and programs that aims to assist inmates' transition from incarceration to community life. By mid-year 2005, the nation's correction population had risen to 2.2 million -- up 380% from 1980 -- of which 750,000 were housed in jails and the remainder in state and federal prisons (Harrison & Beck, 2006). Many inmates sentenced to correctional facilities had previously been incarcerated, giving credence to the metaphorical "revolving door" at the prison gate. In June 2002, the United States Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics published one of the largest and best known studies that found that among a representative sample of the nation's prison population released in 1994, 67.5% were rearrested within 3 years, 46.9% were convicted for a new crime and 51.8% were re-incarcerated (Langan & Levin, 2002).

For decades, researchers and policy makers have vigorously debated the effectiveness of prisoner rehabilitation programs to reduce post-release criminality; however, the current national policy discussion on reentry programs has reframed the issue. Instead of being mired in rancorous opinions about inmates' deservedness for programs, the current discussion about prisoner reentry has placed community interests and safety at the forefront of the desired outcomes. It has focused on the daily reality that large numbers of inmates are leaving correctional facilities and returning to communities across the nation, and that better preparing them for release is in everyone's best interests.

As such, this new focus has been notable for attracting bi-partisan support from both sides of the political aisle. Then-President Clinton and his Attorney General Janet Reno launched the reentry dialogue in the late 1990's, and more recently, President Bush has accelerated the discussion by including the issue in his inaugural address in 2004 and by authorizing a \$100 million grant program – called the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative -- that provided funds for reentry programs for every state in the nation. The Second Chance Act will further the development of prisoner reentry programs in more jurisdictions and provide additional opportunities for research and dissemination of promising practices.

These reentry initiatives are touted as serving community interests and safety and draw support from the sheer number of released jail and prison inmates and the growing social and economic costs of corrections. Collectively, correctional budgets at all governmental levels now total more than \$60 billion annually, and have begun to rival expenditures for such public goods as higher education (Hughes, 2006).

Additionally, the hundreds of thousands of state and federal prisoners returning home, and the millions being released from jails, typically return to the same poorly-resourced neighborhoods and bring with them housing, health, and employment problems that further destabilize these areas. An estimated one in three of all African-American males in their mid-to-late twenties is under correctional supervision; the disproportional impact of corrections on this and other groups and regions threatens to solidify a perpetual underclass in this society. Most individuals in prison have poor educational backgrounds and skills (average math and reading scores are 5.0 and 7.8 grade level equivalencies), and their criminal backgrounds handicap them from pursuing certain various careers, licensures, and positions, and from receiving government benefits such as student financial aid (Jeremy Travis, 2000, 2001; Jeremy Travis, Solomon, & Waul, 2001).

Effective Programming: Risk, Needs, Treatment, and Fidelity

For policy makers and correctional practitioners, the new interest in reentry programs has been welcome, but has also left them struggling with the question about which types of programs should be offered, and how these programs should be developed and evaluated. Fortunately, researchers have worked over the past two decades to provide some guidance on effective correctional programs and their designs. This body of work has emerged to counter earlier reports that questioned whether any treatment programming works in corrections to reduce recidivism (D. Lipton, Martinson, & Wilks, 1975; D. S. Lipton, 1995; Robert Martinson, 1974; Robert . Martinson, 1979).

In the late '80's and the '90's, several researchers re-analyzed data from earlier studies and conducted new studies, and came forth with much different conclusions. They found that treatment programming was effective providing that it met certain four principles: first, the programs need to target high risk offenders; second, they need to focus on factors that lead to recidivism; third, they need to incorporate a curriculum that is responsive to this population; and fourth, the programs need to be well-designed,

implemented, and enjoy institutional support (i.e. the programs need to demonstrate “fidelity” to these goals) (Andrews et al., 1990; Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Gaes, Flanagan, Motiuk, & Stewart, 1999; Lowenkamp, Latessa, & Holsinger, 2006; Lyman, 2004; Lyman, Morehouse, & Perkins, 2001). Subsequent meta-analyses have also identified certain treatment programs as more effective than others. For instance, in a policy report in January of 2002, the Washington State Institute for Public Policy found that vocational programs in prison can reduce recidivism by 12.6 percent, basic adult education by 5.1, and cognitive behavioral programming in the community by 31.2, whereas boot camps and behavioral therapy for sex offenders were found to be ineffective (Aos, Miller, & Drake, 2006).

The failure of previous programs to meet the four principles of effective programming -- risk, needs, treatment, and fidelity -- explains why researchers have often failed to find statistically significant and causal connections between treatment programming and reduced recidivism in literally thousands of studies over the past five decades.¹ Gaes et al. explains that education and treatment programs have not been designed or optimized to reduce recidivism:

“The design and delivery of educational programs has commonly violated many of the principles of effective correctional treatment . . . education programs in prison have not been directed to specific criminogenic needs of offenders, have not been part of a multimodal intervention strategy, have not considered responsivity effects, have not been tailored to address the needs of offenders in different risk classifications, and have not been adequately funded to permit the high doses of educational intervention that many offenders require “(Gaes et al., 1999).

Risk

The first principle, “risk,” argues that correctional programs must target offenders who are at high risk of recidivating if they are to demonstrate success at reducing recidivism. By definition, lower-risk offenders do not need such programs, and studies have actually shown that they can fare worse if made to participate. Programs for these offenders can interfere with the structure and support systems that they would be able to create for themselves (Lowenkamp et al., 2006).

Unfortunately, several factors converge in the correctional environment that leads to lower-risk offenders enrolling in programs. Many programs are offered in lower security settings that are off-limits to higher-risk inmates. Others have incorporated eligibility criteria that specifically exclude high risk offenders as part of a strategy to win greater institutional and community support. Also, since programs offer inmates many advantages within the institution -- greater out-of-cell time, reduction in sentence length, nominal pay – and have open and voluntary enrollment policies, they tend to attract the

¹ The literature on “what works” in corrections has greatly expanded in recent years. Professor Edward Latessa from the University of Cincinnati has synthesized this literature into the framework of four principles of effective programming – risk, needs, treatment, and fidelity – which is used in this paper.

most motivated, highly-skilled, and savviest inmates who are less likely to recidivate. Many evaluations that find statistically significant reductions in recidivism between program participants and a control group are actually finding the “self-selection” bias that is comparing low-risk inmates in programs with high-risk inmates in the controls.

Needs

The second principle of effective programming, “needs,” requires that programs specifically target those risks and needs that make certain offenders at higher risk of recidivating. In the field of criminal justice, the most commonly identified criminogenic factors include individual characteristics and traits that are static and immutable: age, family upbringing, prior juvenile and adult criminal history, prior drug use; and others that are dynamic and that can be changed: anti-social/pro-criminal attitudes, belief, and values (sometimes called criminal thinking), impulsive behavior, association with criminal peers, return to high-crime areas; and poor education and vocation skills.

The needs principle states that only programs that explicitly address these dynamic criminogenic factors can reduce recidivism. This obvious point addresses the problem of internal validity that is commonplace in the evaluation literature of correctional treatment programs. Programs that are not designed to reduce recidivism and that lack a direct logical mechanism to address factors that could reduce future criminality are nonetheless often solely evaluated by their success at reducing recidivism. Not surprisingly, the evaluations of these programs find them unsuccessful at demonstrating the effectiveness of this outcome, although the programs may offer other benefits to inmates and to jail administrators that have nothing to do with reduced recidivism rates.

Programming in most correctional facilities was not designed with the specific purpose to reduce recidivism. Instead, many institutions have an eclectic collection of programs that have evolved rather than being the results of deliberative planning. In many cases a community volunteer, organization, or church will have proposed a program or service, and the institution has gladly accepted the opportunity to have inmates engaged in programming that has little cost. Alternatively, cyclical grant programs funded by outside organizations will lead to the development of new programs that did not necessarily address a specific institutional need, but are welcomed nonetheless. From a correctional administrator’s standpoint, these programs serve a valuable function -- to occupy inmates’ time in a constructive fashion making the job of running the facility easier -- but most of these programs were not designed with the goal of reducing recidivism.

Treatment

The third principle for effective programming, “treatment,” relates to the importance of incorporating social learning theory in the curriculum and classroom activities where new skills and behaviors are modeled. It promotes a widely-used therapy used by psychologists in this country called cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) that focuses on action, motivation, goal setting, and “correct” thinking patterns. Unlike psychoanalytic therapy, CBT does not attempt to delve into past issues to identify root

causes of active behavior, but rather is oriented in the present and future. This type of therapeutic style can be infused in treatment programs that focus on specific needs such as substance abuse or anger management.

Fidelity

The fourth principle, “fidelity,” for effective correctional programming, concerns the need to ensure that programs are well-designed, robust, implemented with integrity by qualified and motivated staff, and are supported by the institution. Again, a seemingly obvious point, but many correctional programs do not subscribe to these criteria. Often programs meet infrequently, have no standardized curriculum, are taught by volunteers and staff (and sometimes fellow inmates) who are not schooled in delivering programs effectively, and the programs are poorly supported by the institution.

Implementation Challenges

Recent studies of reentry programs reveal the enormous challenges that correctional practitioners face to develop and implement reentry programs, and to demonstrate their effectiveness particularly on the sole measure of reduced recidivism rates. In an evaluation of a modest jail reentry program in Boston, Piehl, LoBuglio and Freeman generalized the implementation challenges of reentry programs into four points:

- First, they recognized that correctional institutions have few incentives to develop reentry programs given that the benefits of these programs accrue to society as a whole, while the institutions bear the full costs and liabilities of running them. The traditional responsibility of caring for and controlling complex inmate populations proves difficult enough but, unlike recidivism, these goals are within the means of correctional officials to control directly;
- Second, the researchers indicated that the fractious jurisdictional differences in the country’s criminal justice systems make replicating one reentry model difficult, and that the design of reentry programs will be driven by the local stakeholders and community institutions of the facility;
- Third, the case study details just how difficult it is to operate programs in a busy correctional environment, and the critical importance of institutional support for reentry programs;
- And fourth and finally, the authors write that while analysts and practitioners agree on the need to support inmates reentering the community, there is no clear consensus on reentry treatment models or the rank ordering of inmates to participate in such programs in terms of deservedness, greatest need, or potential highest public safety return on investment (Piehl, LoBuglio, & Freeman, 2003).

The research findings to date of the largest and most comprehensive evaluation of reentry programs have also identified implementation issues as a significant problem. Many of the 69 program sites studied as part of the national evaluation of the \$100 million Serious and Violent Offender Initiative (SVORI) were delayed in meeting their planned start-up dates and were under-enrolling participants in their programs. After

thousands of interviews with individuals during their incarceration and post-release, researchers from the two organizations leading the study -- the Urban Institute and the Research Triangle Institute – have found that SVORI program participants did receive slightly more services than non-program participants, but that the level of the services received were generally far below the levels of self-reported needs. There is some encouraging evidence to indicate that the program participants are demonstrating better outcomes on a wide range of program goals, and a recidivism comparison between the treatment and control groups will be completed by next year (Lattimore & Steffey, 2006).

This study and the Boston case study both raise concern that if these start-up issues are not carefully considered and if the expectations of program success are unrealistically too high initially, the enormous implementation challenges may squander this unique opportunity to reassess the three-decade movement of corrections away from rehabilitative ideals and post-release support and supervision. Unfortunately, failure to address implementation challenges could reaffirm the cynical notion that “nothing works” in offender programming, without giving reentry programming a fair chance to prove its effectiveness.

Reentry from Jail

For the past seven years, the policy discussion on offender reentry has focused exclusively on the return of prisoners from state and federal prisons and has largely ignored jails. Several factors may explain this omission. First, comparatively little data exists at the national level on jail populations. While state and federal correctional systems are easy to identify, there were over 3,600 jails in the country when last surveyed in 1999, each of them can be organized and run by different entities including sheriff’s departments, county and municipal departments, Indian tribes, states, penal commissions, and the federal government. They range in size from modest lock-up facilities in rural areas with a handful of cells, to large systems such as those in Los Angeles and New York City that incarcerate more offenders than many state prison systems (19,500 and 14,000 respectively). Nearly half of the nation’s jails have populations under 50, yet the almost 160 jails with average daily populations of more than 2,000 inmates incarcerate 30% of the total number of inmates in the country (Sabol & Beck, 2007).

A second reason that jails have been ignored in the policy discussion on prisoner reentry is that their populations are more varied and complex than prison populations and many policy makers and even some jail practitioners do not understand the relevance of offender reentry for a highly mobile population, most of whom will be released back into the community in a matter of hours. In the criminal justice system, jails serve a variety of functions, from holding individuals pre-trial, holding individuals temporarily (juveniles, mentally ill, military, court witnesses, protective custody), to holding individuals awaiting transfer to a state or federal agencies (often due to overcrowding).

Third, while jails book large numbers of offenders annually, most of these individuals stay for only a few hours or days, and some believe it is not practical or feasible to offer reentry services in this limited time period. The nation’s jails process 12

million bookings of 9 million individuals each year. By comparison, approximately 700,000 individuals are both admitted and discharged from the country's state and federal prisons, and the average inmate spends several years in these facilities. Finally, jail inmates are often viewed as less serious offenders than state and federal inmates, and therefore are viewed as requiring fewer services.

In reality, jails are often the point of entry into the nation's correctional system and incarcerate offenders who are alleged to have committed or who have been convicted of crimes of all types. Jails also incarcerate large numbers of offenders serving relatively short post-conviction sentences for which offender reentry programs are extremely relevant. In many states, offenders sentenced to one year or less serve their sentences in jails rather than in the state prison system.

The sentence threshold between serving time in jails versus serving time in a state prison system actually varies from state to state. In Massachusetts, which has the 30-month sentencing threshold, more sentenced offenders are held in county jails than in state prisons. While the vast majority of the 12 million individuals moving in and out of jails remain only for a few hours or days before community release or institutional transfer, an estimated 20% will spend at least one month in jail, 12% at least two months, and 4% will spend more than 6 months (Gerard, 2005; Sabol & Beck, 2007).

The growing recognition of the importance of including jails in the policy discussion on offender reentry is evidenced by the fact that the government's main statistical gathering entity, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, is due to release the first large-scale survey of jail populations in its history. Also, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, an agency within the U.S. Department of Justice, funded a national conference on jail reentry in June of 2006 that brought together practitioners, policy makers, and academics from across the country. As part of this conference, several papers were commissioned to study effective means of transitioning jail inmates back into their communities.²

Indeed, by including jails in the discussion, policy makers and practitioners have begun to realize that jails possess enormous geographical advantages in delivering reentry services as compared to federal and state prison systems. Most jail releasees are released to a neighborhood in proximity to the jail, whereas state and federal prison inmates are released from correctional institutions hundreds if not thousands of miles from their homes. Some states like Virginia are experimenting with reentry models that transfer state inmates to local jails in order to allow the inmates to develop stronger family and community ties before release. Many state systems and the Federal Bureau of Prison also contract with local jails and community-based facilities to place carefully selected inmates into work release programs just prior to release.

²The conference was organized by the Urban Institute with funding from the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance and was co-sponsored by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation.

Promising Practices

In the last decade, many jurisdictions have developed and refined promising reentry programs. The Report of the Re-entry Policy Council, a 648-page summation of the work of hundreds of stakeholders from around the country organized by the Council of State Governments, lists dozens of noteworthy reentry programs in jurisdictions from across the country. Similarly publications and websites from the American Correctional Association, the Urban Institute, the National Institute of Corrections and other organizations have profiled programs of all types and sizes that target specific populations with specialized services. In this information age, there is no dearth of data on different programmatic reentry models and a Google search on the term “prisoner reentry” yields over 480,000 entries and illustrates the explosion of interest and research in this topic.

In Montgomery County, we continue to develop new programs and ideas daily to improve reentry services both for incarcerated individuals who are confined to our detention centers and to those who are enrolled in our work release program. As mentioned earlier, our Pre-Release and Reentry Services (PRRS) Division supervises nearly 200 sentenced individuals who are living and working in the community and who are within 6-8 months of release from federal, state, and local custody. Our work-release program holds them accountable for their whereabouts at all times, and most importantly directly contributes to public safety and community well-being by ensuring that they are working, paying program fees, child support, and restitution orders, addressing their housing and treatment needs, and developing a support system with family and community institutions that will assist them transition back into their communities.

For thirty years, our program has assisted over 11,000 individuals sentenced at the local, state, and federal level who are returning home to Montgomery County and the Greater Washington area. We conduct extensive screening and assessment to ensure that we enroll individuals who can work, participate in treatment, comply with the rules of the program, and refrain from criminal behavior. Unlike most programs, we have few disqualifiers and operate on the premise that whenever possible – even in the case of lower level sex offenders -- it is in the community’s best interest and the individual’s best interest to have them leave confinement from our program with housing, a job, and family support rather than from a correctional facility, which in the case of state and federal inmates, might be located hundreds of miles from their home.

We look at each case uniquely and carefully balance the benefits and the risks of bringing each individual into our program. The only exceptions are that we will not accept individuals who have a prior history of escape and individuals who have assaulted correctional officers. In our program, we provide intensive and quality services and develop unique reentry plans that combine goals for work, treatment, and family/community support.

At the same time, our programs employs many methods and technologies to ensure that program participants are either at our community correctional facility or at an approved community location whether it be a job site, a treatment program, or the home

of a family member. If they are not and we can not locate them within two hours, we file criminal escape charges, and work directly the police and sheriff's department to apprehend the individual and with the State Attorney's Office to ensure that the individual is prosecuted to the full extent of the law. Once apprehended, we follow the case and attend all of the disposition hearings and I will personally speak at sentencing hearings about the harm that the escape caused our program and public safety.

While we have not measured whether our program reduces recidivism rates, our performance measures speak to many accomplishments. To cite data from 2006:

- 85% successfully completed our program and were released from the pre-release facility instead of from the jail;
- Nearly 90% were released with employment;
- 99% were released with a housing plan that does not include a shelter;
- Nearly all of the residents were referred to community and faith-based organizations and have made follow-up appointments;
- Almost \$400,000 of program fees were collected by clients;
- The average individual released had savings of more than \$600.

The Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation's (MCDCCR) commitment to reentry extends not only to those on our work release program, but also to those individuals in the jail who are pre-trial detainees and who are ineligible for the work-release program and to sentenced individuals who due to institutional misconduct, the nature of their cases, or on-going legal matters cannot be placed in the community program either. In 2006, 9,400 individuals were received and discharged from the Department, and the vast majority of them were detained on a pre-trial status. Of this number, most were released from the detention centers and 550 participated in the work release program, which demonstrates the need for reentry program both in the community and in the jail settings.

To serve the population of individuals in the detention center, the MCDCCR introduced a program called "Reentry for All," in 2005 to better coordinate the extensive array of education, treatment, and workforce programming and services offered within the jail and to develop extensive linkage and in-reach partnerships with community and government agency collaborators. In the longer-term detention facility, the Montgomery County Correctional Facility, over 75% of the institutional population of over 700 individuals is engaged in some form of work or reentry programming that lasts for a minimum of 6 hours a day. These programs include a full service educational program that includes special education instruction, drug treatment and cognitive behavioral therapeutic communities within several living units, mental health therapy in the Crisis Intervention Unit, and a workforce production section. The workforce programs – the Job Shop and the Digital Imaging Shop – offer individuals an opportunity to perform real-world jobs in a work environment that teaches a variety of job readiness and job production skills.

In 2006, the MCDCCR, in collaboration with the Montgomery County Workforce Investment Board, located a full-service One-Stop Career Center in the jail. This career center is staffed by workforce personnel who move between the One-Stop Career locations in the jail and in the community. This allows them to work with individuals in the jail and then to continue to provide direct services post-release at the One-Stop Career Center in Wheaton, Maryland. The One-Stop offers incarcerated individuals carefully controlled internet access to sites with job listings, and offers job readiness and instructional videos, and literature and program guides on a variety of services that can assist them as they reenter the labor market. With technical assistance from the National Institute of Corrections and the US Department of Labor, the program is seeking to extend service hours by tapping volunteers from faith-based organizations.

For selected inmates within 90 days of release and who will be returning to communities in Montgomery County directly, the “Reentry for All” program has also created a Collaborative Case Management Process where more than forty social service providers from community, faith-based organizations, and government agencies review the reentry needs of these individuals and team-up to provide wrap-around services post-release. Meeting twice a month, this group examines the unique reentry challenges that individuals face such as housing, employment, and health service. These issues are discussed at length and a workable and coordinated reentry plan among the partner agencies is developed. Finally, the “Reentry for All” initiative also provides released inmates with a temporary identification card with the County seal: this can assist individuals secure housing, jobs, education opportunities – and in one case -- was even helpful to an individual to allow him to participate in school functions with his children. The 60-day card also serves as a bus pass and a library card, thus addressing very practical transportation and informational needs that individuals have immediately after release.

Montgomery County is but one of dozens of jurisdictions from around the country committed to developing effective Prisoner Reentry programs, and many others offer innovative and exciting models that are worthy of study and emulation. A brief – but by no means complete – survey of such noteworthy models might include:

- The Hampden County Sheriff’s community health care model that successfully integrates the community and institutional health care delivery systems such that incarcerated individuals see the same doctors in the institution that they see in neighborhood health clinics;
- The Allegheny County State Forensic Program that provides mental health services and support for individuals released from the Pennsylvania prison system and those that are detained in the in the county jail in Pittsburgh;
- Statewide efforts in Colorado, Texas, and Virginia that have connected the workforce development system with the correctional system to assist returning individuals secure employment and benefits;
- Parole agents in Iowa case managing individuals before they are released from prisons in Iowa to ensure a greater continuity of support and services;

- Police and Sheriff Departments' efforts to implement monthly public safety and social service panels as part of the Boston Reentry Initiative that seek to target the highest risk returning offenders with an array of services provided by community-based partners, and including a community college and faith-based organizations;
- The efforts to provide discharge planning services in New York City's correctional department with community partners for a system that has an average daily population of 13,000 individuals and that processes over 100,000 per year;
- The array of innovative community correction programs in Minnesota's 31 Community Correction Act Counties that integrate the delivery of adult and juvenile correctional services at the local level including Hennepin's County Sentencing to Service Homes program that trains state prisoners to build homes;
- The correctional and community-based partnership in Davidson County, Tennessee that provides a continuum of jail-based and community-based services including mentors to individuals within seven months of release;
- Family Justice's efforts in New York City, New Jersey, and other jurisdictions to team up with correctional agencies to incorporate family members in the reentry planning processes;
- The job opportunities and training provided by such organizations as CEO in New York City and Pioneer Human Services in Seattle to employ individuals exiting local and state correctional systems into real jobs;
- The integration of work, treatment, and case management services provided by such community-based programs as the Safer Foundation in Illinois, the Talbert House in Cincinnati, Ohio, Community Resources for Justice in Boston, Massachusetts, the 6th Judicial District's Residential community Corrections/Work Release program in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and Volunteer of America's programs in New Jersey and Minnesota.

Again, this is hardly an exhaustive list: there are dozens of other reentry programs at all levels of government involving an array of community and government agency partners, and providing different combinations of services, which are promising and deserving of recognition. The needs of the population of individuals returning from jails and prisons are extensive, and jurisdictions need to employ a variety of combinations of reentry programs and strategies to address them.

Conclusion

Prisoner reentry represents effective corrections and smart public policy. It recognizes the reality that hundreds of thousands of individuals leave state and federal prisons and that upwards of nine million individuals leave jails each year and return to communities and neighborhoods. It better prepares them and their communities for release, and in the long run, will result in reduced crime and recidivism, and other positive social outcomes for former incarcerants such as increased employment, decreased use of shelter beds, improved mental and somatic health care, and increased

parental and civic involvement. Within correctional facilities, prisoner reentry programs can improve safety and order by engaging inmates in productive activities and focusing their attention on equipping themselves for their lives post-release. Such programs contribute to an institutional culture of respect and order and promote better inmate management and control.

The Second Chance Act will spur more jurisdictions to adopt and enlarge prisoner reentry programs, and to continue developing applied research that will guide the development of more effective programs and systems. Passage of this act would continue the important role of federal leadership in encouraging local and state collaborations of government and community stakeholders to responsibly address the challenges of re-integrating large numbers of individuals returning from correctional supervision. Given the magnitude of the costs of corrections in the country, it represents a modest but critical effort that will be leveraged many times over by local sources, and one that potentially can yield an extraordinary high rate of return on investment for our nation's communities.

References

- Andrews, D., Zinger, I., Hoge, R., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. (1990). Does Correctional Treatment Work? A clinically-relevant and psychologically-informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-Based Public Policy Options to Reduce Future Prison Construction, Criminal Justice Costs, and Crime Rates*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing Correctional Rehabilitation: Policy, Practice, and Prospects. In J. Horney (Ed.), *Criminal Justice 2000 - Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System V 3, P , 2000, , ed. -- See)* (Vol. 3, pp. 109-175).
- Gaes, G. G., Flanagan, T. J., Motiuk, L. L., & Stewart, L. (1999). Adult Correctional Treatment. In M. H. Tonry & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Prisons: Crime and Justice: A Review of the Research* (Vol. 26, pp. 361-426). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gerard, V. S. (2005). New Study Proves Jails are an important Component of the Reentry Equation. *On the Line*, 28(2), 2.
- Harrison, P. M., & Beck, A. J. (2006). *Prisoners in 2005* (No. NCJ 215092). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistic, Office of Justice Program, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hughes, K. A. (2006). *Justice Expenditure and Employment in the United States, 2003* (No. NCJ 212260). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994* (No. NCJ 193427). Washington D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Lattimore, P. K., & Steffey, D. (2006). *Intermediate Outcomes: Initial Findings from the SVORI Impact Evaluation*. Washington: RTI International, Urban Institute.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*. New York: Praeger Press.
- Lipton, D. S. (1995). CDATE: Updating "The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment" 25 Years Later. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 22(1-2), 1-20.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Holsinger, A. (2006). The risk principle in action: What we have learned from 13,676 offenders and 97 correctional programs. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(1), 77-93.
- Lyman, M. A. (2004). *Hampden County House of Correction Recidivism Report: Recidivism Rates One and Three Years Post Release*. Ludlow: Hampden County Sheriff's Department.
- Lyman, M. A., Morehouse, D. A., & Perkins, M. A. (2001). *Maximizing Accountability Through Programming: Targeting Criminogenic Factors for Successful Offender Reintegration*. Ludlow: Hampden County Sheriff's Department.

- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.
- Martinson, R. (1979). New findings, new views: A note of caution regarding sentencing reform. *Hofstra Law Review*, 7, 243–258.
- Piehl, A. M., LoBuglio, S. F., & Freeman, R. B. (2003). Prospects for Prisoner Reentry. *EPI Working Paper*, 125, 37.
- Sabol, W. J., & Beck, A. J. (2007). Trends in Crime, Jail Population Growth, and Prisoner Reentry [Powerpoint]. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Travis, J. (2000). But they all come back : rethinking prisoner reentry. *Sentencing & corrections ; no. 7.*, 11.
- Travis, J. (2001). *Prisoner Reentry Seen Through a Community Lens*. Paper presented at the Luncheon Address at the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Training Institute.
- Travis, J., Solomon, A. L., & Waul, M. (2001). *From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.