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Interrelated Goals for Effective and Sustainable Decarceration

1. Substantially reduce the use of incarceration in prisons and jails
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Interrelated Goals for Effective and Sustainable Decarceration

1. Substantially reduce the use of incarceration in prisons and jails

2. Reduce existing social disparities among the incarcerated

3. Maximize public safety and wellbeing
Guiding Concepts for Effective and Sustainable Decarceration

1. Changing the narrative on incarceration and the incarcerated

2. Advancing criminal justice system-wide innovations

3. Implementing transdisciplinary policy and practice interventions

4. Employing evidence-driven strategies
Welcome!

SMART DECARCERATION INITIATIVE
Clusters for Saturday Sessions

• Sharing Data and Resource Allocation
• Incorporating Criminogenic Risks and Needs
• Implementing Evidence Driven Innovations
• Reorienting Responses to Severity of the Crime
• Resetting Norms and Narratives
• Incorporating Multiple and New Perspectives
• Responding to Behavioral and Physical Health Needs
• Improving Reentry
• Reducing Collateral Consequences
• Building Diversionary Systems
• Curtailing Sentencing
• Narrowing the Funnel to Incarceration
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Decarceration means more than getting individuals out of prison. It means healing trauma, restoring civil rights, and ending the suffering this system has imposed on American families and communities.

The U.S. puts more people in prison than any other nation in the world.

Today we have over 2 million behind bars, 10-14 million arrested every year, and 65 million Americans with a criminal record. Not included in these numbers are all of the families, who have committed no crime at all yet suffer greatly from the separation of loved ones.

Our overly punitive system only increases the threat that individuals pose when they are released back into their community. The U.S. now holds more of our citizens in punitive isolation than all the other prisons of the world combined. Even for people who have committed serious and violent crimes, it is time to offer effective rehabilitation based on high quality mental health services.

Of course, with over two million still behind bars, our first priority is to release those prisoners who represent little or no threat to public safety. But releasing people isn’t enough, because the taint of punishment has a debilitating effect on families.
Aging Prisoners: A Vital Population for Decarceration

by M.jahd Farid
GET INVOLVED

Take action with national organizations.

The ACLU believes we can end the War on Drugs, make the sentence fit the crime, incentivize smart practices, eliminate unnecessary incarceration, and invest in better systems.

The Burns Institute works to eliminate racial and ethnic disparity by building a community-centered response to youthful misbehavior that is equitable and restorative.

The Campaign for Youth Justice (CFY) is a national initiative focused entirely on ending the practice of prosecuting, sentencing, and incarcerating youth under the age of 18 in the adult criminal justice system.

Founded in 1966 by attorneys who represented civil rights movements in the South, CCR is a non-
Who Pays?
The True Cost of Incarceration on Families

Smart Decarceration Initiative
September 25, 2015
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Who Pays? The True Cost of Incarceration on Families proves that the costs of locking up millions of people are far deeper than we think. When we lock up individuals we break apart families & communities. This new report reveals the overwhelming debt, severed family bonds, and crushing mental and physical ailments that are some of the hidden consequences of mass incarceration in the United States. The situation is dire. A better approach is possible and required.
Research Partners

☐ BreakOUT! (NOLA)
☐ Center for NuLeadership (NY)
☐ Dignity and Power Now (CA)
☐ Direct Action for Rights & Equality (RI)
☐ DC Jobs with Justice (DC)
☐ Essie Justice Group (CA)
☐ The Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
☐ Families and Friends of Louisiana's Incarcerated Children
☐ Fathers and Families of San Joaquin (CA)
☐ The New Florida Majority (FL)
☐ Forward Together (CA)

☐ Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency
☐ The Ohio Organizing Collaborative
☐ Partnership for Safety and Justice (OR)
☐ Causa Justa/Just Cause (CA)
☐ Prison & Family Justice Project (MI)
☐ Research Action Design
☐ Resource Information Help for the Disadvantaged (VA)
☐ Statewide Poverty Action Network (WA)
☐ Sunflower Community Action (KS)
☐ Workers Center for Racial Justice (IL)
☐ Voice of the Ex-Offender (NOLA)
Who Pays? is a national participatory action research project conducted by 23 partnering organizations, conducting research in 14 states seeking to bring the voices, analysis and vision of individuals and communities directly impacted by mass incarceration to bear on policy decisions.
Key Findings
Incarceration creates many hidden obstacles and barriers for families including:

- Challenges to Meeting Basic Needs
- Challenges to Building Economic Stability
- Challenges to Maintaining Family Relationships
- Challenges to Maintaining Health
MEETING BASIC NEEDS

2 in 3 families had difficulty meeting basic needs as a result of their loved one's conviction and incarceration.

Nearly 1 in 5 survey participants' families were unable to afford housing due to the loss of income resulting from their loved one's incarceration.

70% of these families were caring for children under 18.
Individuals we surveyed nationwide reported spending an average of $13,607.05 on costs related to their loved one’s conviction.

“There’s been times where I’ve gone six months without light because I made an obligation to do what I had to do for my incarcerated children.”

▪ Family member, New Orleans

Families were primarily responsible for the costs (83% of the family members were women)
COURT-RELATED COSTS TO FAMILIES

On average families paid $13,607 in court-related costs. These costs amount to nearly one year’s income for low-income families making less than $15,000 per year.

83% of family members primarily responsible for these costs were women.

1 in 5 families across income levels reported that they had to take out a loan to cover these costs.
Read the report to learn more about:

- Court Fines and Fees
- Child Support
- Loss of Family Income
Challenges to Building Economic Stability

**Reentry Employment**

The biggest barriers to finding stable employment were lack of adequate education and training, and being required to disclose conviction history when applying for a job.

*3 out of 4* survey participants said that finding employment after release was difficult or nearly impossible.
Challenges to Building Economic Stability

EMPLOYMENT

60% of formerly incarcerated people are still unemployed a year after release.

67% of formerly incarcerated individuals associated with our survey were still unemployed or underemployed five years after their release.

Challenges to Building Economic Stability

Who Helped You Find Work?
- Family, 36%
- CBO or nonprofit, 18%
- Faith-based org, 11%
- Other, 6%
- Re-entry support org or program, 5%
- No one (relied on self), 37%

Who Helped You Find Housing?
- Family, 67%
- Re-entry social services, 11%
- CBO or nonprofit, 11%
- Faith-based org, 6%
- Other, 1%
- No one, 21%
**REENTRY HOUSING**

Cost and discrimination were the top barriers to finding housing after release.

79% of survey participants were either ineligible for or denied housing because of their own or a loved one’s conviction history.

58% of survey participants were currently living with family members while only 9% were living in transitional housing.

1 in 10 survey participants reported family members being evicted when loved ones returned.
Read the report to learn more about:

- Access to Education
- Public Benefits
- Housing
Challenges to Maintaining Family Relationships

Phone & Visitation Costs

were the top barrier for families trying to stay in touch during incarceration.

More than 1 in 3 survey participants went into debt to cover phone and visitation costs.

87% of family members responsible for call and visitation costs were women.
20% of individuals surveyed said they went into debt to pay for phone calls

14% of individuals surveyed said they went into debt to pay for visits
Were you able to regularly talk by phone or receive visits with loved ones?

- Yes: 39%
- No: 61%

47%
Challenges to Maintaining Family Relationships

Read the report to learn more about:

- Cost of Maintaining Contact
- Family Separation
- Parents & Children
“I suffered from something similar to post-traumatic stress. I suffered from sensory deprivation. I would spend long hours in 23-hour lock-up, with no human contact, no socialization, no opportunities for education or recreation, for about 14 years. You're damaged, but with a loving supporting family I was able to learn reentry skills.”

--Formerly incarcerated person, Rhode Island
Challenges to Maintaining Health

- Anxiety
- Mental health issues
- PTSD
- Depression
- Incarceration
- Stress
- Physical health
- Time
- Problems
- Mental health
- Jail
Individuals reporting regular contact were less likely to report negative health outcomes they associated with incarceration.
Report Recommendations:

1. Restructure & Reinvest
2. Remove Barriers
3. Restore Opportunities
1. Restructure policies to reduce the number of people in jails and prisons and the sentences they serve.

1. Reinvest money saved from reducing incarceration rates in services that work, such as substance abuse programs and stable housing.

1. Refocus on accountability, safety, and healing the people involved rather than lifelong punishment.
1. Remove barriers to stable housing, employment opportunities, public benefits, education.

1. Remove devastating financial obligations from individuals and families.

1. Remove barriers to family contact: make family visiting accessible, affordable and frequent.
1. Restore opportunities for training and employment.


1. Restore the vote.
Who Pays? Research Participation

- 1,080 Surveys
- 34 focus groups
- 27 employer interviews

Demographics

- California: 35%
- Louisiana: 14%
- Washington: 10%
- Virginia: 9%
- Ohio: 8%
- Florida: 6%
- Illinois: 3%
- Michigan: 5%
- Rhode Island: 5%
- DC: 3%
- New Jersey: 1%
- Kansas: 2%
- Texas: <1%
- New York: <1%
Demographics

Race/Ethnicity of Survey Participants

**FORMERLY INCARCERATED PEOPLE**
- African American or Black: 66%
- Latina/o or Hispanic: 17%
- White: 19%
- Native American: 5%
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 2%
- Other: 1%

**FAMILY MEMBERS**
- African American or Black: 76%
- Latina/o or Hispanic: 15%
- White: 10%
- Native American: 4%
- Other: 2%
Age of Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Formerly Incarcerated People</th>
<th>Family Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender of Survey Participants

Notes:

“Trans*” includes transman and transwoman
“Two-Spirit” includes self-identified Two-Spirit Native American individuals
“GNC” refers to Gender Non-Conforming
Annual Household Income of Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000 (working full-time at or below $7.25/hr)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $25,000 (working full-time $7.25 to $13/hr)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $35,000 (working full-time $13 to $18/hour)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $50,000 (working full-time $19 to $26/hour)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $70,000 (working full-time $27 to $36/hour)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 to $100,000 (working full-time $37 to $52/hour)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100,000 (working full-time $53/hour or more)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crime Survivor Status of Survey Participants

**SURVEY RESPONDENT**
- **YES**: 55%
- **NO**: 45%

**ANOTHER FAMILY MEMBER**
- **YES**: 66%
- **NO**: 34%
Thank you!

Questions? Comments? Feedback?
Criminal Records Post-Decarceration
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Services in the community for justice involved individuals: A methodology to assess gaps in services and quality programming
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REDUCING RECIDIVISM

System calibration is important for justice and fairness goals—reduce sentence lengths, reduce intake to prison/jail, early release, etc.—but they are unlikely to address offending behavior.

The most effective recidivism reduction strategy is to provide evidence-based programming (20-30% down in recidivism).

- addresses the human conditions that affect involvement in criminal behavior
- national estimates are that only 10% can participate in programming on any given day

Most systems do not have the capacity to provide appropriate programming for substance dependence, criminal lifestyles, co-occurring disorders that influence criminal behavior.

Most systems do not know what types of programs will address the needs of individuals in their system.
EVIDENCED BASED PRACTICES LEAD TO BETTER, POSITIVE OUTCOMES

- Education (Psycho-Social)
- Non-Directive Counseling
- Directive Counseling
- Motivational Interviewing
- Moral Reasoning
- Emotional Skills
- 12 Step with Curriculum
- Cognitive Processing
- Cognitive Behavioral (Social Skills, Behavioral Management, etc.)
- Therapeutic Communities
- MAT with Behavioral Therapy
- Intensive Supervision
- Boot Camps
- Case Management
- Incarceration
- TASC
- Diversion to TX, 12 Month Residential
- Tx with Sanctions
- Secondary Education/GED
- Drug Courts
- RNR Supervision
- In-Prison Tx (TC) & Aftercare
- Contingency Management
- MST
ACCELERATING DESISTANCE

- Evidence-based programming (treatment, integrated care) can prevent recidivism by 20-30%:
  - Focuses on improved decision-making
  - Focuses on managing chronic diseases (i.e. substance abuse, mental health, health conditions, etc.)
  - Enhances communities to provide support services
  - Provides habilitation for education and vocational services that were not available earlier in life
  - Improve Quality of Programming

- Jurisdictions struggle with using a solid, research-based method to assess existing programs, to identify capacity needs, and to reallocate services
RNR SIMULATION TOOL

http://www.gmuace.org/tools/
THE RNR SIMULATION TOOL

- Is a research basis to link data on client information (risk and needs) with available programming
- Integrates meta-analytic data with individual level data
- Used to support decisions at the:
  - Individual Level
  - Program Feedback
  - System Building Capability
- Improve the capacity to identify the type of programming for public safety and health needs
  - Population-level impact
SYNTHETIC DATABASE (20,000+ PROFILES) FOR INDIVIDUAL, PROGRAM, & SYSTEM ESTIMATES OF RECIDIVISM REDUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28-35</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28-36</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28-37</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28-38</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28-39</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28-40</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28-35</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28-36</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28-37</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28-38</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28-39</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28-40</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16-27</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Non-Recidivist</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Placements:
- Placement Option 1: Prevalence 74%, Implication 595
- Placement Option 2: Prevalence 70%, Implication 610
- Placement Option 3: Prevalence 72%, Implication 623

Base Recidivism Rate: 60%

Reflect Expected Reductions in Recidivism (from Meta-Analysis)
RESPONDING TO RISK AND NEEDS

PROGRAM GROUP = A

RISK 63%
NEED 87%
RESPONSIVITY 63%
IMPLEMENTATION 82%
DOSAGE 30%
RESTRICTIVENESS 63%
OVERALL SCORE 66%

PROGRAM: How well do the programs adhere to EBPs?

SYSTEM GAPS: How well does my system address risk-needs of offenders?

INDIVIDUAL: What will increase success?
Welcome to the CJ-TRAK Knowledge Translation Tool Suite

Assess An Individual
Assess offenders or estimate the reduction in recidivism by matching individuals to treatment programs.

The RNR Program Tool For Adults
The RNR Program Tool
Assess your current programs based on treatment offered, content, quality, and other factors.

Assess Jurisdiction’s Capacity
Use client population data & current programming to identify programs that meet your population’s needs.

SOARING2
A suite of tools to help learn about the EBP concepts.

View synthesized data from meta analyses and systematic reviews on what works in corrections and health.
Six program groups based on specific target behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RISK Levels</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Stabilizing Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Dependence on Criminogenic Drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Criminal Thinking/Cognitive Restructuring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Self Improvement and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Social/Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Life Skills (e.g. Education, Employment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group F</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Punishment Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programs scoring high on the implementation domain of the RNR Program Tool for Adults in Level A have specific completion criteria requiring participants to successfully complete all program requirements. Treatment and supervision/correctional staff communicate at least monthly about individual's progress, have been evaluated by an external entity, use an evidence-based treatment manual, use coaching model for staff development, assess quality using external audits, and are operated by all clinical staff with advanced degrees (e.g., MA, PhD, LCSW, etc.).

Improvements can be made by:
- revising completion criteria so that it is based on improvement of symptoms or meeting requirements/expectations, rather than attendance or length of program.
- limiting the treatment team to clinical staff only.
- having an external evaluator assess your program for quality and fidelity to the model.
- using a treatment manual developed by an outside entity, such as a proprietary curriculum manual.
- assessing program quality through an external quality assurance audit.
- receiving technical assistance.
CASE STUDY: A CALIFORNIA COUNTY

- **Issues**
  - Corrections reform results in influx of probationers
  - AB-109 offenders differ from general probation population

- **Application of tools**
  - Programs trained and completed the RNR Program Tool
  - Through Program Tool data and stakeholder meetings, identified program-level issues and system-level issues
  - Used the tools for 2 years with substantive changes including
    - Change in type of programming offered
    - Improved program features
    - Implemented system wide changes including
      - universal intake form, training on CBT, building network of providers, stability in funding for providers, etc.
NUMBER OF PROGRAMS INCREASED MORE CLINICAL PROGRAMS

- Self-Improve/Mgmt - C: 4 (2015) vs. 9 (2013)
- Criminal Thinking - B: 4 (2015) vs. 6 (2013)
SERVICE GAPS 2015

- % Recommended by RNR Simulation Tool
- % Currently in Program
RESPONSIVITY GAP IN COGNITIVE RESTRUCTURING

Green Bar = Available Programming for General Population

Red Bar = Need for Programming among General Population
Sequencing of Needs for Comorbid Clients

- Core+MH+Social Skills
- Core+MH
- Core (high)
- Core (med)
RESPONDING TO RISK AND NEEDS: ASSESS AN INDIVIDUAL

Questions to Answer: 17
Minutes to Complete: 5
Program Recommendations: 3

Recommended RNR Program Group, Estimated Success Rate

Risk Level: High
Dosage Level: High

Target Needs:
Housing, Severe Substance Use Disorder, Criminal Thinking/Lifestyle, Antisocial Peers/Family, Education, Family Support, Benefits Assistance

Strengths:
Lack of Mild to Moderate Substance Use Disorder, Lack of mental health issues, Social Supports/Relationships, Employment, Financial, Lack of co-occurring substance use and mental health issues, Access to Food

Estimated Success Rate:
Three Year Rearest
64%

CURRENT: 64%
BEST FIT: 70%
2ND BEST: 68%
3RD BEST: 65%
PRINCIPLES TO ADVANCE DESISTANCE

- Move away from penal culture to **supportive culture**
- Link client to appropriate programs
- Increase capacity to address major factors affecting continued involvement in criminal behavior
- Tailor programming to individual factors
- Improve **PROGRAM QUALITY**
  - Emphasize Integrated programming with Mental Health Needs
  - Emphasize building **Resiliency**, Not Just Managing Risk
- Change from “criminal thinking” to **Productive Activities**
  - Goal attainment focuses attention on positive outcomes
- Build more “counselor-extender” efforts including
  - Technology (ehealth): reminders, plotting progress, feedback
  - Internet based “games” to examine options
- Programming needs to be a priority—increase the capacity, quality of programming, availability
- Expand capacity—transform 10% daily capacity to 50%
- Programming can:
  - build community capacity
  - prevent crime and criminal behavior
- Build resiliency programming

**ACTION STEPS**

[WWW.GMUACE.ORG/TOOLS](WWW.GMUACE.ORG/TOOLS)
Risk Assessment & Decarceration

Minding the Debate; Proceeding with Caution & Care

Washington University in St. Louis, September 2015
Julian Adler (Presenter), Sarah Picard-Fritsche, Michael Rempel, & Jennifer Tallon
“I'm afraid you've had a paradigm shift.”
The Paradigm (in a nutshell)

- Jurisdictions are turning to actuarial risk assessment to systematically revise pretrial release and sentencing practices.

- Decisions based statistical analysis of the defendant’s level of risk – either the risk of failing to appear for court, general reoffending, or violent reoffending.

- Antidote to longstanding and largely unquestioned discretionary habits:
  - money-based pretrial release decisions;
  - overreliance on oftentimes flawed professional judgment;
  - the default use of short-term jail sentences.
Involves the retrospective use of statistics to create evidence-based classifications (e.g., low-, moderate-, and high-risk).

Specific algorithms can vary significantly across risk assessment instruments.
What Determines Risk?
The “Central Eight” Criminogenic Risk/Need Factors

1. History of criminal behavior—STATIC
2. Antisocial personality
3. Antisocial peers/associates
4. Criminal thinking
5. Family or marital problems
6. School or work problems
7. Lack of pro-social leisure/recreational activities
8. Substance abuse
Criminal History

► All of the extant tools include some range of variables concerning a defendant’s criminal history.

► Most predictive variable.
Criminal History (cont.)

- Age of first arrest or conviction (“early onset”)
- Prior juvenile arrests or convictions
- Prior adult arrests or convictions (overall, misdemeanor, felony, or specific types of charges, drug, property, etc.)
- Greater variety of prior offense types
- Prior jail or prison incarcerations
- Open cases (not yet disposed by the time of current arrest)
- Failures-to-appear/warrants issued on prior cases
- Currently on probation or parole
- Prior noncompliance (e.g., probation or parole revocations)
"Once the rollout is complete, the PSA will have been implemented in 29 jurisdictions, including three entire states – Arizona, Kentucky and New Jersey – as well as three of the largest cities in the country – Charlotte, Chicago and Phoenix."

Laura and John Arnold Foundation, Press Release, June 26, 2015
Widely Endorsed, e.g.:

► Pew Center on States (2011): When developed and used correctly, these risk/needs assessment tools can help criminal justice officials appropriately classify offenders and target interventions to reduce recidivism, improve public safety and cut costs.

Actuarial Risk Assessment: Bane or Boon?
The United States inarguably has a mass-incarceration crisis, but it is poor people and minorities who bear its brunt. Punishment profiling will exacerbate these disparities — including racial disparities — because the risk assessments include many race-correlated variables. Profiling sends the toxic message that the state considers certain groups of people dangerous based on their identity. It also confirms the widespread impression that the criminal justice system is rigged against the poor.
If judges or policymakers would be embarrassed to embrace ideas like “we should increase people’s sentences for being poor” openly, then they should not do so covertly by relying on a risk score that is substantially driven by such factors. Doing so merely uses dry, technical language to obscure discrimination that we would otherwise never accept.
In the end, the use of risk instruments focused on prior criminal history is toxic. The consequence is unacceptable: relying on prediction instruments to reduce mass incarceration will surely aggravate what is already an unacceptable racial disproportionality in our prisons.
Toll the Knell?
Many participants stressed the value of risk assessment tools: They center pretrial decisions on threats to public safety and flight risk, whereas the current system, with its focus on a defendant’s ability to pay money bail, does not.
However, a criminal justice reform advocate noted, “We are really concerned that risk assessments may disproportionately benefit white defendants. Considering things like prior arrests can create disparities when people of color tend to live in neighborhoods with more police patrolling them, which leads to more contact with police and more arrests for low-level offenses. But the alternative to a risk assessment is a judge’s gut feeling. That may be worse.”
Another participant concurred, “The use of risk assessments prevents decision makers from falling back on implicit biases that may cause them to assume that individuals of color are more dangerous and more in need of detention.”
Counterpoint: The Risk Principle

Risk Principle: Vary intensity of intervention by risk level.

- **High-Risk**: Provide intensive treatment and supervision.
- **Low-Risk**: Intensive intervention can be harmful: Why?
  - Interferes with offenders’ ties to work or school
  - Increases contact with high-risk peers (if intervention requires interacting with other justice-involved individuals)
  - Can stigmatize offenders with “criminal” label

*But What Exactly IS Risk?* It is an individual’s likelihood of re-offending (any re-offending) in the absence of intervention.
The Risk Principle & Decarceration

Risk Principle → **Assess for risk of re-offense.**

- **Low-Risk:** Off-ramp as soon as possible (e.g., pretrial release).
- **High- or Moderate-Risk:** Provide appropriate intensity of supervision or treatment (e.g., alternative to pretrial detention).
- **High-Risk for Violence:** Potentially candidates for incarceration (e.g., pretrial detention) if unable to supervise safely.
The debate is important and too soon to call.

The more imminent question is how to use risk assessment instruments most effectively and responsibly.

Neither monolithic nor zero-sum – a lot can be done to improve design and implementation.
Safeguarding & Advancing

THREE PRINCIPLES
Maximized **Accuracy** & Transparency

- Jurisdictions are advised to maximize the accuracy of risk assessment, with particular attention paid to the Area Under the Curve (AUC) statistic.

- **AUC**: In intuitive terms, the AUC reflects the extent to which a tool outperforms chance (.500) in accurately predicting who will and will not re-offend.
  - **AUC Range**: .500 to 1.000
  - **General standard**: .500-.600 = poor; .600-.700 = acceptable; .700-.800 = good/very good; .800 plus = excellent (but rare).

- Local Validation is key! Shopping off the rack is contraindicated!
Maximized Accuracy & Transparency

► Eschew secrete recipes and black boxes.

► Risk assessment items, weighting, and scoring algorithms— and past performance in objective validation studies— should be openly disclosed and thoroughly explained to users, including the identification and analysis of any potential proxy variables (variables thought to “stand in” for socioeconomic status).
Judicious Implementation

- Design risk assessment instruments with the utmost care… BUT pay equally careful attention to how they are implemented, including:
  - the need to negotiate risk-based system responses; &
  - the challenges posed by probabilistic models.
Beyond Rank Empiricism: No “Magic Bullet”
Emergent Properties in Systems

“The whole is greater than the sum of its parts.”

-Aristotle
Decarcerative Purpose

► Increase and *broaden* the identification of candidates for alternatives to pretrial detention and incarceration.

► In light of the known criminogenic effects of incarceration and the demonstrated efficacy of rehabilitative intervention, jurisdictions are advised to *maximize* the safe and appropriate use of community-based alternatives.
REMINDER!

Risk Principle → Assess for risk of re-offense.

- **Low-Risk**: Off-ramp as soon as possible (e.g., pretrial release).
- **High- or Moderate-Risk**: Provide appropriate intensity of supervision or treatment (e.g., alternative to pretrial detention).
- **High-Risk for Violence**: Potentially candidates for incarceration (e.g., pretrial detention) if unable to supervise safely.
Decarcerative Purpose: **Action Steps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of Re-Arrest</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Mod-High</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decarcerative Purpose: **Action Steps**

► **The Goal/Challenge:** Create Pioneering Risk-Based Decision-Making Systems:

► Complete three grids for misdemeanors, nonviolent felonies, and violent felonies.

► In each box, enter, e.g., release on recognizance, supervised release, money bail, or remand (default system responses).
Thanks!

Julian Adler, Esq., LCSW
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Md. to count prisoners in home towns

SHIFT IN CENSUS REDISTRICTING

Baltimore stands to gain amid rural area outcry

by Carol Morello

Maryland will become the first state in the country to redraw districts by counting prisoners in their home towns instead of their cells, a change that is expected to help Baltimore avoid losing political power.

Civil rights advocates praised the No Representation Without Population Act signed Tuesday by Gov. Martin O’Malley (D). The National Urban League and the ACLU are among groups that have called for an end to “prison-based gerrymandering,” and similar changes have been considered by at least seven other states.

“The vast majority will be going back to where they came from, and what this will do is...”

Gov. Martin O’Malley is flanked by Senate President Thomas V. Mike Miller Jr., left, and House Speaker Michael Busch at a bill signing. A bill altering the counting of prisoners is among those inked Tuesday.
Md. to count prisoners in home towns

"It doesn’t matter to me. It is just a fair way to count."

Del. Joseline Peña-Melnyk

"It was the right thing to do."

Sen. Catherine Pugh
“I introduced the No Representation Without Population Act to provide better data for redistricting purposes, and I’m now looking forward to using all the data and information generated by this law to directly enlighten future criminal justice policy choices in Maryland.”

Del. Joseline Peña-Melnyk
## BNIA indicator data for CSAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Statistical Area</th>
<th>Employment and Wages</th>
<th>Income &amp; Public Assistance</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Physical Health</th>
<th>Percentage of Residential Properties that are Vacant or Abandoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census population</td>
<td>Percent of Employed Population with Travel Time to Work of 45 Minutes or More</td>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>Percent of Families Receiving TANF</td>
<td>Percent of 9th-12th Grade Students that are Chronically Absent</td>
<td>Percent Population 25 years and over with Less Than a High School Diploma or GED (2008-2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonia/Trankford</td>
<td>43,657</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>39,556</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rosemont</td>
<td>19,529</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>26,893</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Baltimore</td>
<td>17,885</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>28,085</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Baltimore/Guilford/Homeland</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>78,911</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belair-Edison</td>
<td>17,416</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>45,774</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medfield/Hampden/Woodberry/Remington</td>
<td>17,988</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>55,999</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford/Esbridge</td>
<td>16,839</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>53,958</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>16,543</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>56,074</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Charles Village/Barclay</td>
<td>16,391</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28,899</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale/Irvington/S.Hilton</td>
<td>16,217</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>33,178</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Raven</td>
<td>15,311</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>46,722</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>15,020</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>55,751</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen-Pallstaff</td>
<td>14,914</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>37,345</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park</td>
<td>14,896</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>24,098</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Park North &amp; East</td>
<td>14,549</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>55,465</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn/Curtis Re/Howkins Point</td>
<td>14,454</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>33,216</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Park Heights</td>
<td>13,912</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>48,728</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Country/Chevrolese</td>
<td>13,404</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>55,840</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>12,098</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>63,340</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$37,000 is the estimated cost to house one person in a Maryland prison for one year.
7,795 people are in prison from Baltimore City.

Baltimore City’s incarceration rate is 3x that of the state.
Baltimore City’s 55 communities account for $288 million in taxpayer spending on incarceration.
High Incarceration Communities:

- $5 million or more in corrections spending each
- 5,941 people in prison

Higher Incarceration Communities:

- $10 million or more in spending on incarceration each
- 1,874 people in prison

Highest Incarceration Community:

- 458 people in prison
- 3% of the total population is in prison
- 8X the incarceration rate of the state
Invest in Opportunity: Spending the money differently

What could be provided in Baltimore City communities instead of incarceration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost per person</th>
<th>Number that could be served for $37,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Treatment for Adults</td>
<td>$4,494</td>
<td>8 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Training</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>7 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (per month)</td>
<td>$1,252</td>
<td>30 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Course</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>37 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spend less on prisons:

- Reduce sentence length and invest in treatment (New York)
- Reduce revocations (Texas)
- Reform sentencing (California)

No additional spending on incarceration

- Reduce pretrial populations
- Refrain from building a bigger Baltimore City Detention Center

Develop research capacity

- Collect data
- Perform cost-benefit analyses
For More Information:

Justice Policy Institute
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Executive Director
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Minimizing the Maximum: The Case for Reducing Lengths of Stay for All Prisoners

Nazgol Ghandnoosh, Ph.D.

September 25th, 2015
“A just and necessary punishment must never exclude the dimension of hope and the goal of rehabilitation.”
Argument: We must scale back sentences for serious and violent crimes to end mass incarceration.

Since: Excessive sentences produce diminishing returns for public safety while tying up resources for crime prevention, drug treatment, and re-entry.

How? Establish a 20-year limit on prison sentences; depoliticize and professionalize parole; develop meaningful process geriatric release.
The growth in incarceration rates in the United States over the past 40 years is historically unprecedented and internationally unique.
Punitive sentiment has been falling since the late 1990s.
SOLUTIONS:
AMERICAN LEADERS SPEAK OUT ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Edited by
Inmalink Chettiar and Michael Waldman
Decarceration Goal: 50%

powered by #DREAMCORPS

Malta Justice Initiative

11X15
For safer, healthier communities
Projection

Historical and Projected U.S. Federal and State Prison Populations, Based on 2012 Rate of Decline

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prisoners Series.
Ending the Drug War Is Not Enough

State & Federal Prison Population by Offense

Federal (2012)

- Violent: 36.9%
- Drug: 50.6%
- Property: 12.1%
- Public Order: 5.9%
- Other: 5.9%

State (2011)

- Violent: 53%
- Drug: 18.3%
- Property: 10.6%
- Public Order: 16.8%
- Other: 1.4%

The Historic Rise in Life Sentences

- Between 2008 and 2012, the number of “lifers” *increased* by 12% while the US prison population *decreased* by 2%.

- In 2012, one of every nine prisoners were serving a life sentence.
Mass Incarceration’s Limited Contribution to the Crime Drop

The dramatic growth of the prison population has accounted for 0% to 35% of the crime decline since the mid-90s.

Note: Includes murder and nonnegligent manslaughter only.
Why Reducing All Sentences Will Not Harm Public Safety

**Diminishing Returns:**
When incarceration reaches high levels, incremental increases in the prison population make a shrinking contribution to public safety.
Because the propensity to commit crime declines with age, there is little public-safety payoff in incapacitating someone in prison when they have aged out of crime.
“For the general incarceration of aged criminals to be socially efficient, it must have a deterrent effect on younger criminals.... Simply no reliable evidence is available that such an effect is sufficiently large to justify the costs of long prison sentences.”

Steven Durlauf and Daniel Nagin (2011)
The Problem with Long Sentences: Opportunity Costs

EARLY LEARNING ENROLLMENT

The United States ranks 25th in the world in the enrollment of 4-year-olds in early learning.

Source: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Education at a Glance 2013
Proposed Action Plan

How?

- Establish a 20-year limit on prison sentences (Marc Mauer)
- Depoliticize and professionalize parole (Michael Tonry)
- Develop meaningful process geriatric release (Vera Institute of Justice and ACLU)
Criminal Victimization by Race

Homicide Victimization Rates by Race, 1980-2011

“The quality of the solution depends on who is impacted by the problem.”

Vivian D. Nixon

Source: BJS
Racial Differences in Support for Crime Policies

Preferred crime reduction policies, by race, 2001

- More money for education and job training:
  - White: 35%
  - Black: 58%
  - 10% More money for police and prisons
  - 1%

- Both equally:
  - White: 45%
  - Black: 35%
  - 9% Neither
  - 6%
Minimizing the Maximum: The Case for Reducing Lengths of Stay for All Prisoners
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Rethinking Reentry:
Reimagining Community corrections in an age of Mass Supervision
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Two quotes from Baldwin
Social Conditions Matter

• ...the country to which you owe your life and identity, has not in its whole system of reality evolved any place for you.”
Baldwin speaks across generations

You’re having a terrible time...

By the time you are 30, you’ve been through a certain kind of mill...

The millions of details, 24 hours of everyday which spell out to you that you are a worthless human being.
We are people too!

• One of the things the white world does not know, but I think I know, is that black people are just like everybody else.

• We are also mercenaries, dictators, murders, liars. We are human too.

• --James Baldwin, 1965
What organizations that do it well already know

• Social conditions matter
  – The “millions of details” must be accounted for in our interventions

• Former prisoners are humans too
  – “S--- happens,” to quote an esteemed colleague
Today’s presentation

• Sketch the broad contours of the problem
• Discuss some ways an organization distributes its resources to address broader social problems associated with mass supervision
Why Prisoner Reentry?

• Incarceration and Reentry occur across multiple, mostly unaccounted for, sites
• Reentry has transformed the urban landscape
• We must move away from discussions of the prison and imprisonment and direct attention to “mass supervision”
Three takeaways for today

• TAKE AWAY 1:
  – We must rethink the extent of the problem

• TAKE AWAY 2:
  – We must rethink our scope of practice

• TAKE AWAY 3:
  – Effective interventions re-imagine the “target population”
Living in Strange and Marvelous Times

• TAKE AWAY 1:
  • THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM
We live in strange and marvelous times
Prison is now a part of our everyday language, displaying (at times) our morbid humor.

Americans think prison rape is funny because of who gets hurt

Steven W Thrasher

Prison rape is a staple of American comedy because nothing is as hilarious as bad people getting their comeuppance - especially if they are black men.
It provides moments of sobriety and deep introspection.
Policing and Incarceration get the Lion’s Share of Attention
Images from Ground Zero
Policing in the Public Imagination (of some)
The U.S. Prison Population

U.S. State and Federal Prison Population, 1925-2013

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Prisoners Series.

THE SENTENCING PROJECT
The Most “Incarcerated Nation”
Against Mass Incarceration

Obama Decries ‘Mass Incarceration’ in Call for Prisons Overhaul
President says he ordered review of use of solitary confinement in federal prisons

Barack Obama speaks during the NAACP’s annual convention in Philadelphia on Tuesday. PHOTO:
Obama visits Oklahoma federal prison as part of push for fairer criminal justice system
Curious, equally historic, but overlooked phenomenon

• The rise of a supervised society
The Carceral Continuum

Population under carceral control, in millions

- Prison: 2
- Probation and Parole: 5
The Carceral Continuum

Population under carceral control, in millions

Prison
Probation and Parole
Jail
Detention and Lockup Facilities
The Carceral Continuum

Population under carceral control, in millions

- Prison
- Probation and Parole
- Jail
- Detention and Lockup Facilities
- Felony Convictions
The Carceral Continuum

Population under carceral control, in millions

- Prison
- Probation and Parole
- Jail
- Detention and Lockup Facilities
- Felony Convictions
- Criminal Records

Population under carceral control, in millions:
Prison is one (relatively small) piece of a vast carceral network
Community is “where the action is”

Prison vs. The Carceral Continuum
Released prisoners are managed across multiple sites

Population under carceral control, in millions

- Criminal Records
- Felony Convictions
- Detention and Lockup Facilities
- Jail
- Probation and Parole
- Prison

[Bar chart showing the population under carceral control for various categories]
My Research Questions

• What strategies do reentry organizations employ?

• How are these strategies experienced by former prisoners?

• What are the broader implications of these practices and what institutional arrangements foster them?
My Methods

• Two ethnographic projects over the course of 6 years conducted in 2 cities, Chicago and Detroit
  – Over 150 in depth interviews
    • Former prisoners
    • Front line staff
    • Prison and reentry administrators
    • Local politicians
  – Hundreds of hours of participant observations in reentry programs
Findings
The Geography of Reentry

• We must account for the pervasive and cyclical nature of arrest, confinement and release
  – It transforms social life
  – It alters the urban landscape

• But who gets released and where is important to consider
Community is “where the action is”: Where prisoners are released
Community is “where the action is”: Where prisoners are “rehabilitated”
Who get’s released:  
Race, poverty, and the construction of need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chicago Community Area (CCA)</th>
<th>Race (total percent Black and Hispanic-Latino/percent Black in bold)</th>
<th>Percent unemployed (age 16 and older)</th>
<th>Percent below the poverty line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>93.95/85.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Garfield Park</td>
<td>95.03/90.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Lawndale</td>
<td>97.4/91.43</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lawndale</td>
<td>95.64/13.08</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Park</td>
<td>94.34/40.89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>98.43/97.37</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detroit is quite similar.
• Designated “high risk” because of it’s degree of disadvantage. It is a large Midwestern city with a sizable African American population.

• Its residents—82.7 percent of whom are “black”—are 7% of Michigan’s population but 27% of its prisoners.

• Despite its distinction as the largest city to file bankruptcy, its disparities mirror national trends.
Takeaway 2

• Rethinking our Scope of Practice
Rethinking Our Scope of Practice

• The circulation of bodies between the confinement and community is now an enduring social arrangement

• Prisoners are arrested from, returned to and rehabilitated within low income communities (social containment)

• Prisoner reentry organizations are important organizational forms. Their placement and operation must be thought about carefully
What reentry programs can do

• Personal transformation matters!
  – Reentry programs fill skills deficits
  – Reentry programs boost soft skills
  – Some programs offer temporary shelter, food and clothing, stabilizing former prisoners lives in the short term, giving them time to regroup

• But personal transformation and crisis management is not enough

• Remember, the racial geography of reentry services
Where they are reformed
What Reentry programs cannot do

• Reentry programs are not labor market interventions, but are largely address issues of *Human Capital*
  – Emphasis on “employability” rather than employment
  – *CBT* the flavor of the month
  – *Life skills help former prisoners meet day to day needs*
  – *Soft skills training and transitional jobs are not the same as placement in sustainable, full time work*
The Shelter Shuffle

• Rasheeda and Raymond’s story
What programs are ill equipped to do

• Most reentry programs do not have the capacity to address former prisoners housing needs

• Even when stably housed, reentrants face server forms of concentrated disadvantage
  – Place matters!

• Family deeply involved in Reentry but largely unaccounted for in the service landscape
  – Families are the resource of first and last resort
  – Parenting classes don’t go far enough
Reentry Changes Lives: Take “Bad” offenders
Make “good” ex-offenders
But... reentry programs alone do not address structural conditions
Take Away 3

• We must re-imagine the targets of our interventions in order to re-imagine how we intervene
Findings from my research:

- An aging population of returning prisoners
- Long term poverty and abandonment
- Return to “networks of disability”
- Severely strained family ties
- High unemployment for non prisoners (12.8 percent as of December)
- High poverty rates (40%)
- Under insured population
- Limits on continuity of care post release
The “Emmaus Way”

• Acknowledged the limitations of human capital investment
• Understood the need for former prisoners to move beyond subsistence living
• Social capital interventions to connect former prisoners to resource rich social groups
Brokering relationships

• Spot jobs and transitional employment
• Job Developers
• Community partnerships as both “bonding” and “bridging”
  – Running groups
  – Art and creative writing projects
  – Youth interventions
  – Membership in local community groups and governance
• Extending trust
  – Hiring clients as service providers and administrators
Some effects

• Recidivism rates 30 percentage points lower than the state average and 50% lower than rates at the local county jail at 1 year post release.

• Long term relationships formed between former prisoners and community partners

• Many (not most by any means) acquired long term sustainable employment
Potential Solutions: The Emmaus Way

• Labor market interventions (Job developers)
• Supportive housing programming (set asides)
• Rethinking disability (benefits for this group)
• Bringing family into the reentry program
• Taking advantage of the ACA
• Careful media campaign: Centering Mass Supervision
Internalization:

“That’s all I got.”

• When I got here, I was like, ‘F--- this group s---.’

• I’mma go over to the tech center. Get my black a-- up outta here. I don’t know sh-- about no computer man...

• So I had to sit here and do these groups... I need these groups man. That’s all I got to say about that. That’s all I got.

• –Dante, resident
And that’s all I got...
Thank you

R.I.P. “Big Homie”
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