San Francisco
Safe Communities
Reentry Council Summit

"Making Rehabilitation Work: Creating Opportunities for Formerly Incarcerated Individuals."

Wednesday,
September 27, 2006
9 am-5:30 pm

Milton Marks Conference Center
The State Building, Lower Level
455 Golden Gate Ave.
San Francisco

reentry.council@sfgov.org
415-553-9349
www.sfgov.org/pd

Table of Contents

SAFE COMMUNITIES REENTRY COUNCIL SUMMIT
Wednesday, September 27th, 2006, 9:00am – 5:30pm
Milton Marks Conference Center

Making Rehabilitation Work: Creating Opportunities for Formerly Incarcerated Individuals
This summit features practical and relevant information detailing how to improve the coordination and delivery of services for formerly incarcerated individuals. The purpose of this event is to educate our partners, key stakeholders and the general public about the challenges faced by those who are reentering society after a period of incarceration, study the current state of affairs and statistical data concerning reentry and identify new solutions to providing better transitional services to those who need them.

9:00am-9:30am - Registration
(Pre-registration is required – All attendees must be present at 9:30 to be included in the morning session since the summit will be televised.)

9:30am-9:45am – Welcome and Summit Overview by Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi *(confirmed)*

9:45am-10:15am – Keynote Speaker: Honorable Mark Leno *(confirmed)*
Why Providing Effective Reentry Services to Returning Prisoners Benefits the Community
Focus: The need for reentry services and why they make sense from human and public policy perspectives, including an explanation of how a high recidivism rate means more crime and community violence, and how this can be avoided by offering effective reentry services.

10:15am – Welcome by Mayor Gavin Newsom (confirmed)

10:20am-10:35am – Local Re-entry Overview *(Presented by Public Defender Jeff Adachi)*
Powerpoint slideshow presenting reentry challenges, definitions, statistics and emerging trends, including information about probation and parole.

10:35am-12:00pm – Panel One

Defining Reentry and the Need for Reform and Service Implementation in San Francisco and California

Focus: Detailed perspectives on local and state reentry and information about past and present best practices and policies.

Moderator: Jeff Adachi, SF Public Defender

Panelists	**Topic**
Kamala Harris, SF District Attorney	Local re-entry efforts and diversion programs
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff	In-custody re-entry programs; current plans to provide transitional housing and services to former prisoners and parolees
Shirley Poe, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	How parole works; what services are available to parolees
Arturo Faro, Acting Chief of Adult Probation Department	How probation works; what services are available to parolees
Ross Mirkarimi, SF Board of Supervisors	The impact of lack of effective re-entry programs on community and the importance of coordinating delivery of re-entry services to returning former prisoners.
Barry Krisberg, National Council on Crime & Delinquency	Discuss findings re: re-entry efforts by state corrections
Terry Anders, Anders & Anders	Former parolee
Michael Bien, Rosen, Bien, and Galvan, LLP	Prison litigation
Panel Organizers (will develop questions and work w/ panelists):	

Panel Organizers (will develop questions and work w/ panelists):

12:00pm-1:00pm – Lunch in Resource Room

1:00pm-1:15pm – Spoken Word by Angela Wilson and Frank Williams

1:15pm-2:30pm – Panel Two
Programs and Solutions
Focus: Overviews of successful reentry programs and their lessons learned in building collaborative relationships, providing services, identifying funding and institutionalizing their efforts and how that can be applied to our work in San Francisco.
Moderator: Shirley Melnicoe

Potential Speaker	**Topic**
Laura	Needs of parolees upon release
Dr. Emily Wang, Transitions Clinic, Southeast Health Center	Medical and health treatment for parolees
Frank Williams, Senior Ex-Offenders Program	Special challenges affecting seniors
Wayne Garcia, Walden House/ Director of Criminal Justice Programs	Transition housing/substance abuse
Rev. Kinwood Devore, Metropolitan Fresh Start House	Faith-based communities
Jason Bell, Project Rebound	Education
Demarris Evans, Clean Slate Program	Legal
John Baskerville, Swords to Plowshares	Mental health and veterans services
Panel Organizers:	

2:40pm-3:55pm – Panel Three
Building Bridges and Crafting a Plan for San Francisco
Focus: How we can use best practices and existing resources to establish a foundation and leverage additional resources to build an effective continuum of services for individuals returning to our communities.
Moderator: Linda Connelly

Panelists	**Topic**
Del Sayles Owen, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	Collaborating with the Department of Corrections and SB 618
Irma Vargas, West Bay District Administrator Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	How parole can partner with local agencies to better coordinate and deliver services to parolees
Margie Candelaria, MD Consulting	Defining the overall needs of parolees
Yvonne Cooks, *All of Us or None*	Organizing former prisoners for political change; case study of “Ban the Box” for San Francisco.
Deborah Alvarez, Goodwill	Employment development
Rico Remedio, Formerly incarcerated individual	
Herbert Donaldson, Retired Judge	Re-entry Court
Panel Organizers:	

4:00pm-4:20 pm – Closing
Focus: Summary presentation of findings from the Safe Communities Reentry Summit.
4:30pm-5:30pm – Reception/Networking in Resource Room

Supervisor, District **5**
Ross Mirkarimi
Summit Opening

Ross Mirkarimi was elected in 2004 to represent the city's fifth district, which encompasses the Haight-Ashbury, parts of Hayes Valley, Western Addition, Alamo Square and a portion of the Inner Sunset neighborhoods. Mirkarimi co-founded the California chapter of the Green Party.

As a supervisor, Mirkarimi has spearheaded efforts to regulate medical marijuana clubs in San Francisco. He proposed charging license fees for operating the clubs, prohibiting the sale of alcohol in the clubs, and requiring that residents within 300 feet of clubs be notified before a new club opens. On April 20, 2006, the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws honored Mirkarimi with its Rufus King award for outstanding leadership in the reform of marijuana laws. Mirkarimi was also instrumental in the crusade to extend San Francisco's ban on smoking tobacco at bus shelters to the city's public golf courses.

Mirkarimi has also initiated legislation to increase police presence and foot patrols in District 5, which has experienced a rise in gun violence. He has also led efforts in his district to create more services and programs for youth, and has worked with local community leaders to address crime and improve public safety.

Besides co-founding California's Green Party in 1991, Mirkarimi coordinated Ralph Nader's 2000 presidential campaign in California. He had also managed many local campaigns in San Francisco.

In September 2005, Mirkarimi convened the first meeting of the San Francisco Safe Communities Re-entry Council, bringing city and community leaders together to develop a comprehensive plan to coordinate re-entry programs for formerly incarcerated persons. As a member of the budget committee, Mirkarimi advocated for additional funding of re-entry and anti-violence programs.

Mirkarimi was born in Chicago, Illinois and grew up in Rhode Island. He has a Bachelor's degree in political science from St. Louis University, a Master's degree in international economics and affairs from Golden Gate University, and a Master of Science degree in environmental science from the University of San Francisco. He has lived in San Francisco since 1984.

Assembly Member
Mark Leno - Keynote
13th Assembly District

Elected to the Assembly in 2002, Assemblyman Mark Leno represents the 13th District, which encompasses the eastern portion of San Francisco. He is one of the first openly gay men ever elected to the Assembly. He currently chairs the Public Safety Committee, and serves on the Appropriations, Election & Redistricting and Labor Committees. He served as Chair of the LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender) Caucus in 2004. Prior to his election to the Assembly, Leno served on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors from April 1998 to November 2002.

In 2005, Leno authored the first marriage equality bill in United States history to be approved by both houses of a state legislature. Though the historic civil rights measure to protect LGBT couples and their families was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger, Leno plans to continue the fight for marriage equality in the legislature.

Leno's current legislative package includes bills to assist foster youth achieve their academic goals and re-connect with siblings, expand solar power generation, provide LGBT seniors with culturally competent services, regulate private child support collection agencies, allow California farmers to grow industrial hemp, streamline the HIV testing process, encourage stores in low income neighborhoods to offer healthy foods, and reform the initiative process, among others.

Leno has been honored for his public service by many organizations. This year, he was honored by the Stonewall Democratic Club in Los Angeles with their Sheila Kuehl Trail Blazer Award, The Lazarus Project's Lazarus Award for Marriage Equality, The California Young Democrat's Mentor of the Year, Partners Ending Domestic Abuse's Kamala Harris Leadership Award and Temple Beth Chayim Chadashim's 2006 Herman Humanitarian Award.

In 2005, he was honored by the California Attorney's for Criminal Justice with their "Scales of Justice Award" in recognition to his fair and balanced approach in chairing the Assembly Public Safety Committee. He also received the "Lifetime Friend and Champion" award from the Harvey Milk Democratic Club and was chosen by OUT Magazine as one of 2005's "Most Intriguing Gay Men."

In 2004, Leno received the Award of Courage from American Foundation for AIDS Research and he was honored by the Lesbian and Gay Lawyers Association of Los Angeles at their 25th Anniversary Gala for his commitment to marriage equality. In July of 2003, he was awarded the Housing Hero of the Year awarded by the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition. Additionally, Leno was proud to receive honors from the American Heart Association, the California Association of Food Banks and Parents, Families & Friends of Lesbians & Gays.

In 2005, he authored legislation that would reform the parole process and the three strikes law in California, allow for fair competition in the crab fishing industry, provide protection to both women and men experiencing domestic violence, ensure the continuation of San Francisco's mobile methadone maintenance treatment program, promote solar energy installation in homes and provide a funding source for the arts in California.

During his first term, Assemblyman Leno was successful in getting 28 bills passed by the legislature and signed into law, including laws that protect Californians from gender based discrimination in housing and employment, amend the Ellis Act to preserve affordable housing for seniors and the disabled, streamline the administration of rapid HIV tests to at-risk populations, allow rehabilitated drug offenders to access food stamps and allow San Francisco to build large-scale solar systems on public buildings. He also served as chair of the Select Committees on LGBT Families and Childhood Obesity & Related Diabetes.

While on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Leno authored landmark legislation in the areas of affordable housing, universal health care for children, solar energy, late night entertainment, bond oversight, small business services, City CarShare, medical cannabis, equal access to services, and LGBT civil rights.

He has served on the boards of many local and national organizations including the LGBT Community Center Project, Haight Ashbury Community Services, the American Jewish Congress, Mobilization Against AIDS, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. He is the recipient of the 1995 Small Business Owner of the Year Award from the Small Business Network, the 1995 Hormel Community Service Award from the Human Rights Campaign and the James R. Sylla Award from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Outside of his capacity as an elected official, Leno has been a tireless supporter of nonprofit organizations in San Francisco, frequently appearing to show support at events and lending a hand wherever possible. He was a statewide spokesman for the No on Prop 22 Campaign (the Knight Initiative) and was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles in August 2000 and in Boston in August 2004.

Mayor of San Francisco
Gavin Newsom - Welcome

Gavin Newsom was elected the 42nd Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco on December 9, 2003. He was sworn into office on January 8.

Mayor Gavin Newsom has made bold ideas the driving force of his administration. As Mayor, Gavin Newsom uses ideas, innovation and practical solutions to improve the quality of life for all San Franciscans. His administration draws upon San Francisco's greatest asset- the diversity and the talents of its people- to meet any challenges that face the City.

Mayor Newsom is a fourth generation San Franciscan who has dedicated his political career to improving the City. He was elected three times to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and served on the Board from 1997 until 2004.

As a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Newsom focused on the core issues that make a difference for all San Franciscans. He worked with residents from every corner of the city to restore our neighborhood parks. Newsom sponsored legislation implementing Rescue Muni's reform plan and helped put our Municipal Railway on the road to recovery. As a member of the Board of Supervisors, Gavin Newsom was willing to confront San Francisco's greatest challenge, homelessness, and he emerged with the most comprehensive reform of homeless policy in a generation.

Before embarking on his career in public service, Mayor Newsom was a successful small businessman. In 1992 he opened his first local business, the PlumpJack Wine Shop. Over the years he expanded this business and has created more than seven hundred jobs for San Franciscans.

Gavin Newsom was born October 10, 1967 to the Honorable Judge William Newsom and Tessa Newsom. He grew up in the Bay Area and graduated from Santa Clara University in 1989 with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science.

Panelist Bios:

Jeff Adachi

Jeff Adachi is the Public Defender of the City and County of San Francisco. Before being elected as Public Defender in March 2002, Mr. Adachi previously worked as a deputy public defender in San Francisco for 15 years and in private practice for 2 years. From 1998-2001, he served as the Chief Attorney of the office. He has tried over 100 jury trials, including numerous serious felony and homicide cases, and has handled over 3,000 criminal matters throughout his career.

Mr. Adachi graduated from Hastings College of the Law in 1985 and attended undergraduate studies at U.C. Berkeley.

Mr. Adachi serves on the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigents and is a member of the National Board of Trial Advocacy. He has also taught bar review for over 10 years and has published five books in this area. He is the co-author of Chapter 25: Immunity for Testimony, in the California Criminal Law Procedure and Practice book, and a past board member of the California Attorneys for Criminal Justice and the San Francisco Bar Association. He is a past president of the Asian American Bar Association of the Greater Bay Area and the SF Japanese American Citizens League. He has been a certified criminal law specialist since 1991.

Kamala Harris

In December 2003**,** Kamala D. Harris was elected the first woman District Attorney in San Francisco's history and the first African American woman in California to hold the office. The citywide election, against the incumbent, was her first run for public office.

From her first days in office, DA Harris has combated violent crime with intensity and focus. She has substantially increased conviction rates for serious and violent offenses, significantly expanded services to victims of crime and their families and created new prosecution divisions focused on child abuse and public corruption. To combat one of San Francisco's biggest challenges, gun violence, DA Harris created a new gun specialist team and has implemented tough new gun charging policies.

DA Harris' achievements and leadership have earned local and national distinction. The National Urban League honored her as a "Woman of Power" in 2004, and she received the Thurgood Marshall Award from the National Black Prosecutors Association in 2005. California's largest legal newspaper, the *Daily Journal*, has recognized DA Harris as one of the top 100 lawyers in the state. She has been featured on the Oprah Show and in *Newsweek* Magazine as one of "America's 20 Most Powerful Women." She was invited to serve as panelist at the annual "State of the Black Union 2006." Also in 2006, Howard University honored DA Harris for her contributions to the fields of law and public service with a Distinguished Alumni Award. She has been named one of *Ebony* Magazine's "100 Most Influential Black Americans." In July 2006, DA Harris was elected to the National District Attorneys Association's Board of Directors.

Michael Hennessey

A native of Iowa, Michael Hennessey graduated from St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota in 1970 with a BA degree in History. That same year, he continued his education by

entering the University of San Francisco School of Law. After graduating and becoming a member of the state bar, he accepted an assignment as Legal Counsel to then-Sheriff Richard Hongisto.

In 1975, he founded the San Francisco Jail Project, a legal assistance program for indigent prisoners with civil legal problems and provided training for law students and new lawyers while offering technical assistance to the Sheriff's Department. He managed the Jail Project until May 1979, when friends in the Department and civic-minded San Franciscans encouraged him to seek election as Sheriff. He is the only Sheriff in California who is a lawyer. He has served as the Sheriff for over 25 years.

Shirley Poe, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Shirley Poe is the Regional Parole Administrator (A) for the Division of Adult Parole Operations in Region II. She has over 29 years of experience in the field of Criminal Justice. During those 29 years she has worked as an Institutional Probation Officer, a Senior Special State Investigator and for the last 22 years she has worked in various positions with the Division of Adult Parole Operations. Shirley begin her career with the Parole Division as a Parole Agent I and quickly promoted through the ranks holding various supervisory and management positions in the Parole Division. In 1995 she was appointed to the Board of Prison Terms (BPT) as a Deputy Commissioner where she conducted parole revocation and lifer hearings. In 1998 she returned to the Division of Adult Parole Operations as a Parole Administrator. In 2003 Shirley was ask to head the activation and implementation of the New Parole Model as part of California's Parole Reforms. In December 2005 Shirley was appointed to Chief Deputy Regional Parole Administrator in Region II, responsible for Field Operations. In September 2005 she was selected to be the Regional Parole Administrator (A) in Region II and is currently pending appointment. Shirley holds a Bachelors of Science Degree in Criminal Justice from Long Beach State University and a Juris Doctrine Degree from Southwestern University School of Law. Shirley is well known and respected for her collaborative efforts with Community Based Organizations, Law Enforcement and Neighborhood Associations. Her goal is to explore and initiate new and creative techniques in the field of Corrections.

Arturo Faro, Acting Chief of Adult Probation Department

Currently Acting Chief Probation Officer, San Francisco Adult Probation Department since June 2005 to Present. Art has been in the Probation field since 1985. Previously employed with the Corrections Services Agency, Ventura County (Ventura County probation Department) and San Diego Probation Department. Came to San Francisco in 1989 and has been with S.F. Adult Probation Department since that time. Art has worked every facet of the department since coming to San Francisco including handling a case minimum/ medium risk caseload to handling a ISU caseload. He also prepared Pre-Sentence Reports in the Investigations Division and has had supervisory and management positions within the department.

Barry Krisberg, Ph.D., National Council on Crime & Delinquency

Barry has been the President of NCCD for fourteen years. He is known nationally for his research and expertise on juvenile justice issues and is called upon as a resource for professionals and the media. Dr. Krisberg received his master's degree in criminology and a doctorate in sociology, both from the University of Pennsylvania. Prior to joining NCCD, Dr. Krisberg held several

education posts. He was faculty member at the University of California at Berkeley; Dr. Krisberg also was an adjunct professor with the Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs School at the University of Minnesota. He is currently a Visiting Lecturer in Legal Studies at UC Berkeley and holds an adjunct Professorship in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Hawai`i.

Terry Anders, Anders & Anders

In 1989, Terry Anders was facing 140 years in prison for bank robbery in federal court. Miraculously, he was able to obtain a reduced sentence, and not only turned his life around, but has started an employment service helping to train and employ iron workers. In 2003, Terry created Anders & Anders Inc. Job placement/referral provider, and began working with men and women in and out of prison. Terry is a certified CAARR provider.

Michael Bien, Rosen, Bien & Galvan, LLP

Michael W. Bien, a partner at Rosen, Bien & Asaro, LLP, has successfully litigated a series of major civil rights class actions against state and federal correction agencies. These cases have resulted in significant prospective relief regarding unconstitutional conditions of confinement, denial of mental health care, unlawful discrimination against persons with physical and mental disabilities, protect of prisoners from sexual assault, and parole revocation reform. Mr. Bien has also secured damages awards for individuals injured by inadequate prison psychiatric care and sexual assault of female prisoners. He is also well-recognized for accomplishments in developing the law of civil rights attorney's fees. He has briefed and argued several appeals to the Ninth Circuit regarding civil rights attorneys' fees issues, including the effect of the attorney's fees provisions of the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Mr. Bien is a 1980 graduate of Northwestern University School of Law. He was a litigation associate and partner at Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison from 1980-1990. Mr. Bien has consulted, written and lectured on civil rights and attorney's fees issues on numerous occasions. He received an award from the California Attorneys for Criminal Justice "for outstanding contribution to the preservation of prison inmates' rights" in 1994 and from the California Coalition for Mental Health as "Outstanding Mental Health Advocate" in 2003.

Shirley Melnicoe, Executive Director, Northern California Service League

Shirley Melnicoe, the Northern CA Service League's Executive Director since 1986, is a recognized authority on Criminal Justice – as a researcher, consultant, author, social scientist, and non-profit agency director. Her education includes a BA degree in Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, and an MPA, University of Southern California. Ms. Melnicoe was at the National Institute of Justice in Washington, D.C. where she has authored numerous publications, and lectured regularly at the FBI Academy on policy research. She worked on policy issues in corrections with the National Council on Crime & Delinquency before joining NCSL. Under her leadership as Executive Director of NCSL, the following programs were inititated: employment and re-entry programs (Awakening New Futures Life Skills) for ex-offenders, a wide variety of innovative in-jail programs, Cameo House, a transitional housing program for homeless ex-offender women with children, and the Children's Waiting Rooms in the Criminal and Civil Court Houses for the children of people who have business before the courts. She is a past president of the Association for Criminal Justice Research and serves on the boards of the California Association of Re-Entry & Employment Services (CARES), the American Justice Institute (AJI), the San Francisco Partnership for Incarcerated Parents (SF PIP), Positive Directions Equals Change, and Prison MATCH.

Laura

Laura is a former prisoner, who was released in April 2006. She took advantage of the PACT program and enrolled in Project Rebound and Second Chance at City College. She also participated in the Northern California Service League's employment program and at the programs available through the Southeast Health Center. She states "being an ex-felon does not define me because I am a student, a sister, a proud member of the San Francisco community."

Dr. Emily Wang, Transitions Clinic, Southeast Health Center

Dr. Wang is a general medicine fellow at the University of California, San Francisco. She completed her training in internal medicine at UCSF. Her clinical and research interests are how to engage former prisoners into the health care system upon release and how physicians can create systems of care that better support this vulnerable population. She helped co-found Transitions Clinic, which is a post-release clinic for parolees with chronic medical conditions based at Southeast Health Center in the Bayview. In addition to providing primary care, the clinic links former prisoners to community resources, including mental health services, drug addiction, and case management programs. Dr. Wang has worked in the prison systems in California, North Carolina, and in Gaborone, Botswana.

Frank Williams, Senior Ex-Offenders Program

Frank Williams is the director of the Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services new addition -- the Senior Ex-Offender Program, a uniquie an innovative program service (first of its kind in the nation) aimed at providing a wide range of services to assist Senior Citizens in their efforts to re-affiliate within their local communities after incarceration in state, local, or federal penal institutions.

In addition to his ground breaking work with Senior Ex-Offenders, Frank Willimas is a respected community advocate and is also a regular author of articles online for Gibbs Magazine.com on a wide range of social issues of importance to the African American communities and People of Color. Mr. Williams continually volunteers his time and expertise with several significant community service programs and organizations in San Francisco including the City of Hope Mentor and the Fatherhood Project Next Generation.

Mr. Williams hold an AA degree in Liberal Arts from Skyline College and BA (BSW) degree in Social Work from San Francisco State University. He also earned his certificate in Alcohol and Drug Studies from City College of San Mateo in December 1999. He is a Certified Addiction Treatment Counselor and a member of the California Association of Alcohol and Drug Educators. Mr. Williams has a Master's Degree in Humanity and Leadership; and is currently a Ph.D. learner at Capella University majoring in Human Services with emphasis on criminal justice.

Wayne Garcia, Director of Criminal Justice Programs/In Custody Services for Walden House

Wayne Garcia currently supervises 5 prison programs, (2 at S.A.T.F. Corcoran Prison; 1478 beds, 2 at Valley State Prison for Women; 506 beds, 1 program for women at California Rehabilitation Center in Norco, Ca.; 294 beds, 1 seventy-two bed Drug Treatment Furlough facility and Parolee aftercare residential in Los Angeles, and 1 Outpatient co-ed facility in Los Angeles for State Parolees. He is state certified and has spoken in Melbourne, Australia at the World Federation of Therapeutic Communities in 2002 on the "War on Drugs in California". He has also provided numerous cross trainings in various prisons with treatment providers, Office of

Substance Abuse Programs, (OSAP) and Correctional Officers throughout the California prison systems. He is a Walden House graduate and ex-offender with the California Youth Authority and the Department of Corrections. He serves as a motivational speaker to the Criminal Justice community throughout California and inspires ex-convicts that their "History Does Not Have To Be Their Future" and that the Myth is a Lie, because "WE DO CHANGE".....

Rev. Kinwood Devore, Metropolitan Fresh Start House

Kinwood DeVore is the Executive Director of the Metropolitan Fresh Start House, a faith-based 24-hour residential drug rehabilitation treatment facility for men. Although Mr. DeVore has been involved in counseling addicts and their families for the past 30 years, he has also worked as Chaplain for the Alameda County Sheriff's Office at Santa Rita Jail for seven years; five of those years he served as Supervising Chaplain. His position involved managing more than 300 volunteers from many different religious faiths to work together as a team to share a general message with the inmates that might cause them to never again return to custody.

Mr. DeVore grew up in San Francisco where he completed elementary, junior high, and high school before attending City College of San Francisco where he was a track star. He moved to the East Bay where he graduated from the Bay Area School of Religion in 1974, then moved to Southern California, where he worked as the Minister of Evangelism for the Inglewood Church of Christ, then a Pulpit Minister for the West Adams Church of Christ in Los Angeles.

Jason Bell, Director of San Francisco State University's Project Rebound

After graduating high school in 1990, Jason found himself sentenced to 17 years for attempted murder. It did not take long for Jason to realize that the prison system was not designed for people to actually better themselves. He found that there was not much correction in the California Department of Corrections. He took his destiny in his own hands by scraping together the money to pay for college courses that came from outside of California. He negotiated with prison guards and administrators for the materials necessary to earn some college units while still behind bars. He learned how to study amid chaos and violence, prioritizing his time and sticking to a strict study regiment. Jason taught himself to develop his mind while struggling simply to remain sane in a restrictive and punitive institution.

Upon paroling in 2001, after almost 10 years of living in California's prison system, Jason has since gone on to procure his AA degree in 2003 and his Bachelors degree in Sociology from San Francisco State University in 2005. He is an avid prisoner's rights advocate who works as the full time Director of San Francisco State University's Project Rebound. Through Project Rebound he has dedicated his efforts to allowing other former prisoners to follow in his academic footsteps.

Demarris R. Evans, Clean Slate Program

Demarris R. Evans is a Deputy Public Defender with the San Francisco Public Defender's Office. She is the Supervising Attorney of the office's Clean Slate Program, which assists clients with the expungement of criminal convictions, sealing and destroying arrest records, obtaining certificates of rehabilitation, receiving early terminations of probation and reduction of felony convictions to misdemeanors. Prior to overseeing the Clean Slate Program, Demarris handled all aspects of felony cases from arraignment through to jury trial. She has also worked in the juvenile delinquency unit of the office. Prior to working at the San Francisco Public Defender's Office, Demarris worked at the Orange County Public Defender's Office handling felony preliminary hearing matters. Demarris has also worked as a Research Attorney to civil law and motion judges

in Santa Clara County Superior Court. Demarris is currently on the faculty of the University of Phoenix teaching classes in the Criminal Justice Administration Department. Demarris regularly conducts workshops and presentations on issues involving clearing criminal history records which focus on educating community members and staff members of community based organizations and government agencies about the remedies available. She is a former member of the Board of Directors of Women Defenders. She is a graduate of University of California at Berkeley and Santa Clara University's School of Law.

John Baskerville, Swords to Plowshares

John Baskerville is a 12 year employee of Swords to Plowshares. John started his tenure at Swords helping vets secure much needed employment services. He eventually moved into the field of providing mental health and social services, assisting veterans in the important areas of housing stabilization, substance abuse counseling and linkage to both city and county and VA sponsored mental health services. John has been a strong voice within the community advocating for veterans on multiple committees and panels, including acting as Chair of the Subcommittee on Homelessness and Housing for the "Mental Health Services Act, the "Season of sharing Review Committee', and the "Treatment on Demand planning Council" which set priorities for new funding for treatment services. He has spoken about the need for veterans' services both nationally, appearing on "60 Minutes" and locally on radio station KPFA. He recently assumed the position of Director of the Health & Social Services Unit, which acts as the primary gate for most services provided by the organization.

Linda Connelly

Ms. Connelly has thirty-two years experience in the criminal justice field, both in the public and private sector. In 1991 she founded Leaders in Community Alternatives, Inc. (LCA), a private community corrections agency that contracts with the public sector to provide community-based correctional programs. Services have included residential substance abuse treatment, day reporting, electronic monitoring, alcohol testing, case management and consulting services. Ms. Connelly is Treasurer of the International Community Corrections Association (ICCA), member of the San Francisco Safe Communities Re-Entry Council, California Gender Responsive Strategies Commission, American Correctional Association, American Probation and Parole Association, and California Association of Drug Court Professionals. Ms. Connelly is recognized as an expert in community corrections and electronic supervision technology serving on numerous task forces, and speaking at national conferences.

Del Sayles Owen, Director of the Division of Community Partnerships, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (invited)

Ms. Del Sayles-Owen serves as the Director of the Division of Community Partnerships for CDCR. On July 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger appointed Sayles-Owen to the Directorship, where she is responsible for developing partnerships, which are critical to the successful re-entry of offenders into the community. Working with community based and faith-based organizations, as well as local governments and service providers, the Division supports the operation of innovative programming and collaborative relationships designed to promote the shared responsibility for community safety.

Before joining CDCR, she served as Deputy Director for the Office of Criminal Justice Collaboration for the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs from 2001-05. While at the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP), Sayles-Owen led the successful

implementation of Proposition 36, a major voter initiative that provides treatment to drug offenders in lieu of incarceration. She worked closely with treatment advocates, Corrections, law enforcement, local government, and the courts. In that capacity, she was also responsible for implementing and managing drug courts.

Margie Candelaria, MD Consulting/Deb's Place
Margaret Candelaria is a housing specialist for the criminal justice community, trainer and pre-sentencing consultant. She was instrumental in the set up of one of the first Substance Abuse programs for women in Vallley State Prison working closely with the Office of Substance Abuse Programs. Margaret currently has 7 homes that she has started from the ground up for the newly released all with a very high rate of success in reducing recidivism, substance abuse, and the spread of HIV/AIDS with special populations.

Yvonne Cooks, *All of Us or None*
Yvonne Cooks, CCWP Director, has over 20 years of experience working on general issues facing women in prison. She is a former prisoner having served 20 years in the federal prison system. Prior to coming to CCWP, Yvonne was employed by Legal Services for Prisoners with Children (LSPC) in San Francisco. Her responsibilities were wide-ranging as she worked to eradicate systematic discriminatory practices against formerly incarcerated people. She also coordinated the internship program at LSPC. Yvonne holds a Bachelor or Arts Degree in Independent Studies from Columbia College. Yvonne spearheaded efforts inside the prison system to bring awareness of the AIDS crisis to women in prison and was a key organizer for Black Culture Workshops in FCI Dublin for over 15 years. She continues to advocate on behalf of women inside as well as upon their release. Yvonne has published an article on "Islam in Prison" in *the Prison Legal News* and an essay profiling the lives of three women in prison in the book *Schooling the Generations in the Politics of Prison*.

Deborah Alvarez-Rodriguez, President and CEO, Goodwill Industries of San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties
Deborah Alvarez-Rodriguez joined Goodwill Industries as President and CEO in March 2004. Known for her dynamic leadership style, and with 15 years of executive management experience spanning the non-profit, philanthropic, public and private sectors, Ms. Alvarez-Rodriguez has a track record of catalyzing change within organizations and leading them toward greater innovation, accountability and responsiveness. Throughout her career Ms. Alvarez-Rodriguez has consistently aimed to advance disadvantaged individuals and communities by promoting and implementing new policies, services, and business opportunities based on cross-sector collaboration.

Prior to joining Goodwill, Ms. Alvarez-Rodriguez was Vice President of Silicon Valley's Omidyar Foundation, the family foundation created by the founder of E-Bay, where she developed community building, human services and grant making strategies. Previously, as the Director of San Francisco's Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF), she helped build one of the most comprehensive early childhood education and care systems in the nation and launched one of California's most comprehensive working wage and workforce development initiatives for childcare workers.

Before joining DCYF, Ms. Alvarez-Rodriguez specialized in evaluation, strategic planning and health system redesign at the Lewin Group, an internationally recognized health care consulting firm. Previous to that position, she was Founder and CEO of San Francisco's Every Child Can Learn Foundation, Executive Director of Intergovernmental and School-linked Services at the San Francisco Unified School District, and Assistant Director for Budget and Planning for the

San Francisco Department of Public Health. Ms. Alvarez-Rodriguez is a graduate of Harvard-Radcliffe College.

Rico Remedio
Rico Remiedio has successfully re-entered society after serving more than 24 years on a 15 year to life sentence. He was released on parole in July 2005 and immediately entered Walden House. He went to SF City College and is currently participating in an internship program with a non profit agency and is also employed in the construction trade. He shares his experience to help others to not end up as he did.

Herbert Donaldson, Retired Judge

Judge Herbert Donald served as a judge on the Municipal and Superior Court benches from 1983-1999. He still serves as a judge, and most recently presided over the San Francisco Behavioral Health Court, a special court dealing with dual-diagnosed criminal defendants who are admitted to the court; work with the District attorney, the Public Defender, mental health professionals and service agencies in assisting individuals charged with non-violent crimes.

Prior to assuming the bench, Judge Donaldson worked as the chief counsel for the Central City Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation, and as a staff attorney with Southern Pacific Railroad. He has an extensive history of volunteerism, including working with the San Francisco Police Department to review contract proposals, and serving on the boards of the Mental Health Association of San Francisco and Glide Foundation

Judge Donaldson received the California Public Defender's Association's Rose Bird Award (2004), Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom, Lifetime Achievement Award (1995), and the Bar Association of SF Lifetime Achievement award.

Michael O'Yang, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Parole Administrator (A), West Bay District

Mr. O'Yang began his career with the California Department of Corrections in 1986 as a Correctional Officer assigned to San Quentin State Prison. He also worked as a Systems Analyst, prior to transferring to the Parole and Community Services Division in San Francisco, in 1996. Mr. O'Yang worked with the Fugitive Apprehension Team prior to being promoted to Supervisory positions in San Francisco Parole Division. In 2004 he became a Unit Supervisor in the Daly City Parole Unit. While acting as the Parole Administrator for the West Bay District during 2006, Mr. O'Yang was an important contributor to the San Francisco Safe Communities Re-Entry Council.

Performers

Angela Wilson

Angela Wilson is a mother, actress, writer, educator, mentor, and activist who was formerly incarcerated. Presently Angela has a scholarship to American Conservatory Theatre where she studies acting. Angela has been mentored by the acclaimed actress/activist Rhodessa Jones, and since 1999 has traveled with Ms. Jones on the
lecture circuit performing and lecturing at UC Berkeley, Rutgers University and San Francisco State University. In 2002, Angela taught inside the San Francisco County Jail #8 for the Medea Project production of "Can We Get There by Candle Light."

Angela has also toured with the Medea Project to the National Black Theatre Festival in 2003 and 2005 where she performed an original piece and was the stage manager for the New Performance In Black Theater Series. In 2004 she taught and directed Hunters-Point "at-risk" youth for Cultural Odyssey's " Emergency Report: Theater for Inner City Youth" program. In the Spring of 2006 Angela facilitated a domestic violence writing workshop in County Jail #8 led by Ms. Jones in collaboration with Eve Ensler (Vagina Monologues) for VD day in New York City. During June of 2006 Angela performed in New York at Lincoln Center for VD-Until the Violence Stops. Angela's most brilliant and rewarding accomplishment to date, is regaining custody of her fourteen year old son, Jhosea Rodriquez.

San Francisco Safe Communities Re-entry Council
555 Seventh Street, 2nd Floor, SF, CA 94103

San Francisco Reentry Coordinating Council

Who We Are

The San Francisco Reentry Coordinating Council represents a merger of the San Francisco Reentry Council and the San Francisco Safe Communities Re-entry Council (SF SCRC). Both councils were formed independently of one another in 2005. The San Francisco Reentry Council focused its efforts on working with local arrestees and prisoners, while the Safe Communities Reentry Council targeted parolees released from state prison. While the two councils will still be autonomous, both have agreed that it would be advantageous to merge in order to better coordinate programs, maximize resources, avoid duplication and create clarity for clients accessing services. The newly formed Coordinating Council will meet on a semi-annual basis and exchange information among its participating agencies. The Council is comprised of two major workgroups: The Local Reentry Council Workgroup and the Safe Communities Reentry Workgroup. The former is focused on providing services to former county jail prisoners while the latter targets its programs to parolees.

What is Re-Entry?

"Reentry" is generally defined as the process experienced by a prisoner who is re-entering society from a period of incarceration. Reentry programs encompass a wide range of services, including housing, education, employment training and support, mentoring, addiction treatment and mental health services. By providing these services and assisting parolees in leading productive lives, public safety is improved, taxpayer money is more wisely spent and formerly incarcerated individuals are able to support themselves and their children.

Our Mission

The San Francisco Reentry Coordinating Council's mission is "to promote the safe and successful return of formerly incarcerated individuals to our community by developing a comprehensive support system that reduces violence and recidivism and promotes public safety."

Our Objective

The objective of the council is to develop a multi-agency service plan that coordinates the delivery of wrap-around services to formerly incarcerated individuals. These services include:

- Housing (temporary and long-term)
- Life skills and anger management
- Employment development, placement and support
- High school/GED and college
- Technology/vocational training
- Substance abuse
- Mental health
- Medical (wellness, education and screenings, STD/HIV educationa nd testing, dental, vision care, fitness and nutrition)
- Legal (expungement as authorized by law, driver's license and warrant check, civil matters)
- Child support
- Caseworker support
- Mentoring services
- Financial management, credit and back accounts

Our Partners and Participating Members

Each workgroup has its own members, with some members being involved in both workgroups.

Government agencies include:

- The San Francisco Trial Courts & the Administrative Office of the Courts
- The District Attorney
- The Public Defender
- The Adult Probation Department
- The Juvenile Probation Department
- The Sheriff's Department
- The Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (State Parole)
- The Department of Child Support Services
- The Department of Children, Youth & Their Families
- Mayor's Office of Community Development
- Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice
- Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Participating community-based agencies include:

- All of Us or None

- Anders & Anders (employment services)
- Asian American Residential Recovery Services
- Bethel AME Church
- Bayview Hunters Point Foundation
- Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
- Building Trades Council
- Carpenter Union
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
- Chamber of Commerce
- Committee on Jobs
- Cornell Pre-release Program
- Delancey Street
- Friendship House
- Goodwill Industries
- Hope Ministries
- Jelani House, Inc.
- Leaders in Community Alternatives
- Life After Exoneration Program
- Metropolitan Fresh Start House
- National Council on Crime & Delinquency
- New Life Center
- Nordstrom
- Northern Californian Service League
- Positive Direction Equals Change
- Project Rebound (San Francisco State University)
- SF Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership
- SF Labor Council
- Second Chance Program (San Francisco City College)
- Second Chance Tattoo Removal Program
- Senior Ex-Offender Program
- Southeast Health Clinic
- Up From Darkness
- Veteran's Administration (Housing and veterans' services)
- Walden House
- Women's Foundation of California
- Young Community Developers

Current Programs

Members of the Council currently operate the following reentry programs:

Back on Track

Back on Track is an education and employment reentry initiative focusing on young adult persons charged with drug offenses. Designed to increase community safety by reducing recidivism, *Back on Track* couples strict accountability and close supervision with education, employment, health care and other services. *Back on Track* helps young people from committing crimes by leading them to make life-changing choices. Initiated by District Attorney Kamala D. Harris, the Back on Track program is a collaboration with Goodwill Industries, the Department of Child Support Services and a number of partners from the public and private sectors to provide persons ages 18-30 with workforce development and support services. In Back on Track court, Judges John Dearman and Thelton Henderson work with the case management team, supervise participants and review their progress at mandatory appearances every two week. A mix of sanctions and incentives is utilized by the court.

Back on Track has completed its first pilot phase. Of the 49 people who participated in Back on Track during its pilot phase, 92 percent successfully completed the program and at the time of graduation, were holding down a job or going to school. More than 70 percent of the participants were both employed and in-school at the same time. From the pilot phase graduating class, only one person has been charged with a new offense. Since the pilot phase ended, during the first 18 months of full program operation, only 4 participants have been rearrested and terminated from the program. Currently, there are 90 participants in the program and the program hopes to expand to 120 by the end of 2006. Back on Track is currently funded through private foundation grants and in-kind support for the District Attorney's Office and Goodwill Industries.

Five Keys Charter School

In 2004, the San Francisco Sheriff's Department opened the *Five Keys Charter High School*, where incarcerated and formerly incarcerated individuals may pursue high school diplomas and other academic goals. Students are required to pass the California High School Exit Exam before graduating. The school's curriculum offers reading, mathematics, American Literature, writing, biology, earth science, United States History, Government, Economics, Career and Finance, Post-second Education and Career Goals, and health. *Five Keys* also offers computer lab, life skills, health education, substance abuse counseling, violence prevention, youth services and internship programs. The school holds classes at County Jail 7, County Jail 8 and the Sheriff's Post Release Center at 70 Oak Grove Street. It is funded by state charter school funds. The Sheriff's Department also sponsors an annual job fair at its Oak Grove Street site.

The Women's Reentry Center

The Women's Reentry Center, a program of the San Francisco Sheriff's department, will be the first San Francisco government agency to provide direct practical and emotional support services to women coming out of jail or prison. Located at 930 Bryant Street, the Center will help bridge disparities in access to health care, substance

abuse treatment, education and other life sustaining services for women and their children. The Center will be unique as it will bring together the numerous criminal justice agencies, the private sector and local women's groups in addressing the dearth of services that respond to the needs of formerly incarcerated women and their families. Women recently released from jail will be provided the opportunity to learn the trades and job development, recovery services, health services and other life skills to improve self-esteem.

The first phase in the Center's development involves renovation of the building. Thus far, the Center has relied upon donations of time and services and private donations to support the renovation.

Public Defender's Clean Slate Program

The Public Defender's *Clean Slate* program was instituted in 1998 to help persons convicted of a crime clear their criminal records. Many people do not realize that they may move to "expunge" their records upon a showing of rehabilitation. *Clean Slate* provides community education and expungement services to 2,400 people each year, who visit *Clean Slate*'s community-based drop-in centers, located in Visitacion Valley, the Western Addition, Bayview Hunters Point, and at the Public Defender's downtown office at 555 Seventh Street. The Public Defender's other reentry programs include substance abuse placement and assistance to children of incarcerated parents.

Community-based Violence Prevention and Re-Entry Services

The participating organizations provide a number of critical violence prevention and reentry services which include: 1) residential housing; 2) substance abuse treatment; 3) life skills training; 4) high school/GED and college; 5) vocational training and workforce development; 6) prisoner rights advocacy; 7) mental health and medical treatment; 8) legal services; 9) child support; 10) caseworker support; 11) mentoring services.

The San Francisco Safe Communities Reentry Council has conducted a comprehensive inventory of reentry services of its council members and the services they provide.

Comprehensive Guide of Parole Services

The San Francisco Safe Communities Reentry Council also recognized the importance of providing formerly incarcerated individuals with information about existing services. To this end, the Council compiled a list of re-entry services in San Francisco, and has begun collecting both quantitative and qualitative information about the services available to parolees. Parole has agreed to include this information in a guidebook provided to all parolees who are released to live in San Francisco. The

Sheriff's department, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education, also produces a comprehensive employment guide for ex-offenders. These materials are readily available to Council members.

Proposed Programs

The Council Members have designed a number of innovative programs that will fully utilize the resources of the collaborative. Some of these programs will be implemented by the SF Reentry Workgroup and others by the SF Safe Communities Workgroup. These programs include, among others:

Parolee Day-Treatment Center (SF Safe Communities Programs Workgroup)

In San Francisco, there are 1,555 parolees who reside in San Francisco at any given time. On the average, 25 prisoners are released each week. Like other counties, San Francisco's parolees tend to reside in economically hard-hit communities. For example, 564 of the county's 1,555 parolees (one-third) are identified as living in the 94124 zip code (Portrero Hill and Bayview Hunters Point).

Experts have pointed to the lack of rehabilitation programs, drug and alcohol treatment, and other reentry services necessary to maintain a crime-free life as a contributing cause to this revolving door. Most inmates receive $200 and a ride to the nearest bus stop, and are required to attend one parole orientation meeting. Although 97% are subject to supervised parole, most do not receive or obtain re-entry services either before or after their release. Most parolees remain unemployed and under-educated. The current recidivism rate in San Francisco is slightly lower than the statewide average - about 60%.

Although San Francisco has a number of local programs which should, in theory, complement programs offered by state corrections, it is unclear how the local programs are integrated into a parolee's reentry. Other than the programs and services offered at the parole orientation, there is no means by which a parolee can access services, particularly if he or she initially declines services, but later wishes to participate. To this end, the Council believes that providing a more consistent means for parolees who reside in the community to access services.

Presently, connecting parolees with services occurs periodically throughout the year. One of the Council's participating agencies, the Northern California Service League, conducts an annual job fair where parolees receive job readiness skills and even meet with potential employers. The fair is well attended, drawing over 200-300 people citywide. As noted earlier, the Sheriff's Department also conducts a job fair for former prisoners. However, each fair is held only once a year. In addition, parolees often have other needs or problems which prevent or discourage them from seeking work.

The Council therefore recommends that parole centers be established in those communities where the parolees live to help link them with necessary services. The Council also recommends that the centers be located in those communities where the bulk of parolees reside, and that outreach be focused on these communities to maximize the participation of parolees. The Council recognizes that it may be initially difficult to convince parolees to participate, but will enlist the support of its community organizations and leaders to assist in outreach efforts.

Each center will be staffed with caseworkers, a job development specialist and a health worker to support the parolee. Each parolee will be assigned a caseworker, who will serve as a mentor, and will be responsible for helping to link the parolee with necessary services. An evaluation component will be built into the program to measure outcomes, such as employment status , housing and other indicators of success.

The Board of Supervisors has allocated $400,000 to begin work on designing the Parole Day Treatment Center. The San Francisco Sheriff's Department will manage the proposal requests, with representatives from participating departments serving on the selection board.

Increase Funding for Anti-Violence and Reentry Programs (Both workgroups)

San Francisco is fortunate because it has a host of community-based programs which specialize in providing reentry services to formerly incarcerated individuals. However, currently, these programs receive little city funding. This is because until recently, reentry programs have not been the focus of funding initiatives. Most of these programs are privately funded, or receive limited funding from the state or private foundations.

The Sheriff's Department, using funding from the FY 2005-06 anti-violence supplemental approved by the Board of Supervisors, and funds in the current budget year, has issued a $400,000 request for proposals to solicit ideas for programming that will serve formerly incarcerated individuals and provide anti-violence community programming.

Proposals have been reviewed, and programs were be selected and funded to participate. An evaluation component has been built into the request for proposals to ensure accountability and measurable outcomes. The Sheriff has, with the input of the participating organizations, designed a program structure to facilitate collaboration among the partnering agencies. The project is called "The No-Violence Alliance," or NOVA. (Please see Flowchart for a description of the project.)

San Francisco Reentry Court (Safe Communities Programs Workgroup)

According to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), in San Francisco as of May 1, 2006, there are 1,548 active parolees and 430 revoked cases. Some of these individuals are also on probation. Approximately 60% of

those revocations are for non-serious and non-violent violations, known as "technical violations." Most of these individuals are sent back to prison, serving an average of 4-6 months, costing the state between $18,840-$28,260 per inmate. Moreover, many of these individuals have not received needed services to assist in their successful reentry. San Francisco would like to provide an intervention for these violators by providing an alternative program known as the Reentry Court. Targeting this population by providing intensive supervision and coordination of substance abuse treatment, education, employment and other critically needed services, in lieu of a return-to-custody, will significantly impact the numbers of parolees returning to prison, enhance public safety, and result in substantial savings to the state.

A "reentry" court involves the traditional criminal justice agencies, including the Court, the corrections authorities, the prosecutor and defense, in the process of preparing a person for successful release to the community. While the reentry court may take many forms, it usually involves active judicial oversight and supervision through the use of graduated sanctions, positive reinforcement, and coordinated access to services, usually managed by a case worker or reentry counselor.

One example of the reentry court model in San Francisco is the Drug Court. Formed in 1995, the Drug Court now serves over 1,000 individuals annually. Other examples is the Behavioral Health Court, which provides a collaborative, treatment-based support to mentally ill individuals, and Proposition 36, a state-mandated drug treatment program offered to persons addicted to drugs and the Back on Track Court.

These programs, based on best practices, have been successful in reducing recidivism and improving positive outcomes. The re-arrest rate of those who complete Drug Court is 15%, compared to 56% of those who do not graduate from Drug Court. More than 50% of the participants were homeless when they entered the program; by the time of graduation, less than 10% of the graduates were homeless. 90% were unemployed when they entered the program, but by graduation, nearly half had stable sources of income. 10% of graduates were enrolled in school while participating in Drug Court, and more than 10% reunified with their children while still in the program. While statistics for the Behavioral Health Court are still being collected, early reports show a substantial reduction in recidivism.

The San Francisco Safe Communities Reentry Council believes that one population that would benefit from a reentry court are parolees who are returned to custody for a violation of their parole conditions. Many face "technical violations" for failing to report to their parole officer, or for positive drug tests or incurring minor violations of the law. If found in violation of parole after a hearing, these individuals may be returned to custody for up to one year. Many are also probationers and face additional State Prison time if found in violation of their probation.

Under the design of San Francisco's Reentry Court, an inmate facing a parole violation could be referred to the Reentry Court. Participation would be entirely voluntary, and the parolee would have the option of not participating in the program and

returning to face a parole violation at any time. The current design for the court proposes staffing by a judge, court personnel, a bailiff, a prosecutor, defense counsel and a parole/corrections official, and full due process protections would apply, and a wide array of services, including drug, alcohol, methadone treatment, education, employment, health and housing would be available to the parolee.

Several jurisdictions have implemented Reentry Courts, Harlem and Indiana being two successful examples. The San Francisco Safe Communities Reentry Workgroup firmly believes that one strategy to reducing crime and recidivism in our communities is to focus on the parolee population. San Francisco is uniquely situated, since it has an array of quality service providers, and coordinating their services under the auspices of a Reentry Court will provide that missing link for parolees who are facing a return to custody.

The work of the Reentry court will be closely monitored, with individual client assessments at the community level to matching services to parolees' needs and therapeutic counseling focused on changing behavior, while saving money and reducing recidivism. An outcome evaluation will be prepared for each parolee who participates in the reentry court, charting employment, education, health and mental health treatment for 6 months-1year following successful completion of the program

San Francisco Reentry Summit (Planned by Safe Communities Program Workgroup with both groups participating)

A re-entry summit is being planned for September 27, 2006. The summit will be held at the Milton Marks Conference Center at the California State Building from 9:30am - 5:30pm. The reentry summit will draw together hundreds of reentry experts and service providers, along with representatives from government and criminal justice agencies to study best practices and current challenges concerning reentry.

The summit will be televised on SF Gov TV.

Develop Individual Reentry Plans (Adult Probation Department, working with both Programs)

An effective reentry plan is necessary to prepare an incarcerated individual for his or her eventual release into society. It has been recognized that a successful reentry plan accomplishes five things:

1. Prepares the prisoner for reentry;
2. Builds bridges between prisons, jails and communities;
3. Seizes the moment of release;
4. Strengthens concentric circles of support (family, peer group, community organizations, faith based organizations and criminal justice agencies);
5. Promotes successfully reintegration.

Also critical is the timing of the actions that accompany the re-entry plan. It has been acknowledged by most reentry experts that the earlier in time the actions that affect a prisoner's reentry occur, the more likely they will be adopted by the probationer or parolee upon his or her release.

A pilot program would created to allow a probation officer to work jointly with the Reentry Court and other re-entry programs to develop detailed, individualized reentry plans for probationers and parolees. This plan will be prepared prior to the inmate's release and be presented as part of the inmate's pre-sentence report.

The reentry plan should encompass specific objectives in each of the following areas: (1) work opportunities; (2) education; (3) substance abuse and mental health treatment; (4) health care; (5) family ties and parental responsibilities; (6) community support; (7) personal expectations.

Evaluation and Accountability

In designing, planning and implementation stages of these programs, it will be important that data be collected, and factual information relevant to making decisions concerning the operation of these programs be readily available. It will be necessary to collect and maintain statistics and factual information concerning probationers and parolees in San Francisco. The Coordinating Council proposes including funding for this purpose.

It is also important that the Coordinating Council have a reporting mechanism that will allow the council to monitor the progress of each program. This will ensure program accountability and outcome. This level of attention and scrutiny will ultimately assist the council in obtaining additional funds from the state and federal government in the future. The council proposes including funding for this purpose as well.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the San Francisco Reentry Coordinating Council has prepared this plan with the full understanding of the commitment, persistence and hard work it will take to make these programs work, and to produce measurable, real outcomes for those persons who take advantage of these opportunities. We will also be accountable for its outcomes, and be open to constantly critiquing and modifying the program to reach its intended goals. Most importantly, we are fully committed to working together to enhance public safety, reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for reentering ex-offenders, their children and families, and all of the San Francisco communities.

What Works in Prisoner Reentry? Reviewing and Questioning the Evidence

Joan Petersilia
University of California, Irvine

MORE THAN 600,000 individuals will leave state prisons and return home this year. That is 1,600 a day, and a sixfold increase in prisoner releases since 1970. Of course, inmates have always been released from prison, and corrections officials have long struggled with how to facilitate successful transitions. But the current situation is decidedly different. The increase in number of releasees has stretched parole services beyond their limits, and officials worry about what assistance can be provided at release. Research confirms that returning prisoners need more help than in the past, yet resources have diminished. Returning prisoners will have served longer prison sentences than in the past, be more disconnected from family and friends, have a higher prevalence of untreated substance abuse and mental illness, and be less educated and employable than their predecessors. Legal and practical barriers facing ex-offenders have also increased, affecting their employment, housing, and welfare eligibility. Without help, many released inmates quickly return to crime.

State and federal governments are trying to provide help. Recent years have witnessed an explosion of interest in the phenomenon of "prisoner reentry." Between 2001 and 2004, the federal government allocated over $100 million to support the development of new reentry programs in all 50 states. The Council of State Governments, the American Correctional Association, The National Institute of Corrections, The American Probation and Parole Association, and The National Governors Association have each created special task forces to work on the reentry issue—as have most State Departments of Corrections. President Bush even highlighted the prisoner reentry issue in his 2004 State of the Union Address—the first time anyone ever remembers a president including concern for ex-convicts in such a major speech. President Bush spoke sympathetically about the difficulties prisoners face in reintegration, stating that, "America is the land of the second chances, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life." He proposed a four-year $300 million initiative to assist faith-based and community organizations to help returning inmates.

No one doubts that interest in prisoner reentry is high, that money is flowing, and that well-meaning people want to implement programs to assist returning inmates. But the $64,000 question still remains: Which programs should government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and faith-based communities invest in? In short, *what programs work in prisoner reentry?* As states confront massive budget shortfalls, it is critical that we invest in proven programs.

Asking the "what works?" question of correctional programs is not new. In fact, it has become rather a cottage industry. The correctional literature now contains dozens of "what works?" articles and books. The articles summarize research based on metanalysis (the quantitative analyses of the results of prior research studies), cost-benefit analysis, synthetic reviews, literature reviews, expert thinking, and clinical trials. The conclusions are then translated into best practices, evidence-based principles, and programs that 'work,' 'don't work,' or 'are promising.' This literature is scattered in criminology, sociology, and psychology publications—although most of it exists in agency and government reports.

How can a correctional administrator make sense of it all? The analysis is frequently difficult to sort out, even for this author, who is a seasoned corrections researcher. But the question "what works in reentry programs?" is too important and timely to leave unaddressed. The author reviewed this literature to condense its most important findings for correctional practitioners. The first section summarizes findings of the published literature as they pertain to reentry programs. The second section questions the existing evidence and urges a broader conversation about current methods, outcome measures, and privileging practitioner expertise.

What Constitutes a Prisoner Reentry Program?

To answer, "what works in reentry programs?" we must first *define* a reentry program. Here lies the first difficulty: what exactly should qualify as a prison reentry program?

Travis and Visher (2005) of the Urban Institute define prisoner reentry as the inevitable consequence of incarceration. They write, "With the exception of those who die of natural consequences or are executed, everyone placed in confinement is eventually released. Reentry is not an option." In their view, reentry is not a legal status nor a program but a *process*. They write: "Certainly, the pathways of reentry can be influenced by such factors as the prisoner's participation in drug treatment, literacy classes, religious organizations, or prison industries, but reentry is not a result of program participation." In other words, "every aspect of correctional

operations and programs conceivably (and in some ways, accurately) affects the prospects of offender reentry."

Petersilia (2003) agrees and writes that isoner reentry "simply defined, includes all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law abiding citizens." Petersilia says it includes "how they spent their time during confinement, the process by which they are released, and how they are supervised after release." Reggie Wilkinson, Director of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections, believes, "Reentry is a philosophy, not a program." He writes that prisoner reentry begins at the point of admittance to a prison (or even sentencing) and extends beyond release. Successful reentry can only be accomplished "through associations with community partners, families, justice professionals and victims of crime. Programs will cover offender assessments and reentry planning; offender programming; family involvement, employment readiness and discharge planning; offender supervision; and community justice partnerships." (www.drc.state.oh.us/web/offenderreentry.htm, accessed 4/30/2004).

According to these experts, *everything* about the prison and post-prison experience is loosely related to reentry, and reentry really isn't a program at all. That may be an accurate conceptualization, but then how can we measure it? How can we statistically evaluate a "process," "a philosophy," or "all activities" from sentencing to freedom? If *everyone* goes through it, and it includes *all* of corrections, how do we isolate reentry? If we can't operationally define and isolate reentry programs as distinct from the entire correctional system, then how can we possibly evaluate their effectiveness?

Seiter and Kadela (2003) in their recent article "What Works In Prisoner Reentry" faced the same definitional dilemmas but solved the problem by adopting a much narrower definition. They defined reentry programs as those that: 1) specifically focus on the transition from prison to community, or 2) initiate treatment in a prison setting and link with a community program to provide continuity of care. Within this broad definition, they include only programs that have an outcome evaluation. Their definition too is arguably correct, and allows us to access the program evaluation literature in a way that the broader definitions do not. But the Seiter/Kadela definition is quite narrow and eliminates programs that have not been formally evaluated, do not specifically focus on the transition process, and begin in the community.

So, the first problem in trying to answer "what works?" is a serious definitional one. The Travis/Petersilia/Wilkinson definitions are too conceptual and all-encompassing to be of much use in identifying a relevant program evaluation literature. The narrower Seiter and Kadela definition makes the program evaluation task manageable, but fails to capture the range and diversity of programs thought to assist prisoner reentry.

Assessing Whether a Reentry Program Works: Principles vs. Program Outcomes

The second problem in trying to make sense of the "what works" corrections literature is that there are really two literatures, using distinct disciplinary traditions and methodologies. These differences have evolved over the last two decades due to disciplinary training (mainly psychology versus criminology), and the methods each discipline has adopted.

Ever since Martinson (1974) published his now celebrated review of the effectiveness of correctional treatment, concluding that, "With few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitation efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism," scholars from various disciplines have continued to dispute Martinson's pessimistic conclusion, amassing data on the potency of offender rehabilitation programs.

The Canadian Contribution: Identifying Principles of Effective Programs

The first successful challenges of Martinson came from Canadians Paul Gendreau and Robert Ross (1979). These clinically-oriented psychologists tended to focus not on programs per se but on the individual within the program. Unlike Martinson, they believed it was not sufficient to just sum across studies and file them into "works" or "not works" and then tally the final score (what Martinson et al. did), but rather to look into the "black box" of treatment programs and identify the principles that distinguish between effective and ineffective programs. In their view, it was not enough to say that a job program worked. Rather it was necessary to ask: What does it mean to say that an employment program was offered? What exactly was accomplished under the name of "employment"?

Using a variety of techniques, including narrative reviews, meta-analytic reviews, individual studies, and insights from their clinical experience, they developed a list of principles of effective intervention, and found evidence that programs adhering to these principles significantly reduced recidivism. Gendreau and Ross also presented evidence that the effectiveness of treatment programs can vary substantially to the extent that the offender's individual differences (such as age, prior record, and intellectual development) are measured and taken into account in the delivery of services. They—now joined by others—later published their meta-analysis of the treatment literature, and confirmed their evidence-based principles of risk, need, and responsivity. Moreover, Andrews et al.'s meta-analysis (1998) showed that when these principles were followed and when appropriate interventions were delivered, there was a 30 percent reduction in recidivism. (For an excellent review see Cullen and Gendreau 2000.) These principles included:

- Treatment services should be behavioral in nature, interventions should employ the cognitive behavioral and social learning techniques of modeling, role playing, reinforcement, extinction, resource provision, verbal suggestions, and cognitive restructuring;
- Reinforcements in the program should be largely positive not negative;
- Services should be intensive, lasting 3 to 12 months (depending on need) and occupying 40 to 70 percent of the offender's time during the course of the program;
- Treatment interventions should be used primarily with higher-risk offenders, targeting their criminogenic needs (dynamic risk factors for change). Less hardened or lower risk offenders do not require intervention and may be made more criminogenic by intrusive interventions;
- The most effective strategy for discerning offender risk level is to rely not on clinical judgments but on actuarial-based assessments instruments, such as the Level of Supervision Inventory;
- Conducing intervention in the community as opposed to an institutional setting will increase treatment effectiveness;
- In terms of staffing, there is a need to match styles and modes of treatment service to the learning styles of the offender (specific responsivity). Depending on the offender's character-

> istics (e.g., intelligence, levels of anxiety) he or she may have different learning styles and thus respond more readily to some techniques than others.

Andrews and Bonta (1998) also found that across numerous studies, one type of intervention was the most reliable in achieving high reductions in recidivism: cognitive-behavioral programs. As Cullen and Gendreau (2000) summarize this approach:

> There are several different forms of programs known as cognitive-behavioral... essentially they all attempt to accomplish two aims: first they try to cognitively restructure the distorted or erroneous cognition of an individual; second they try and assist the person to learn new adaptive cognitive skills. In light of offender deficits, effective cognitive behavioral programs attempt to assist offenders: 1) define the problems that led them into conflict with authorities, 2) select goals, 3) generate new alternative pro-social solutions, and 4) implement these solutions.

The Canadians also reported that control-oriented programs—those seeking to deter offenders through surveillance and threats of punishment—were ineffective. Because these control-oriented programs do not target for change the known predictors of recidivism, and do not conform to theories of cognitive behavioral treatment, they will not reduce recidivism.

The Canadians' theory of rehabilitation has been influential, particularly in Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom. However, while the terms cognitive restructuring, risk responsivity, and so forth are familiar to American corrections, they don't seem to heavily influence most prison reentry programs today.

The U.S. Contribution: Identifying Programs that Work

The "what works" movement is also alive and well within the U.S., but it evolves from a sociological rather than a psychological perspective and uses different methods. Instead of focusing on the individual offender, treatment provider, and program characteristics ("inside the black box"), U.S. scholars have primarily assessed correctional programs using recidivism outcome studies (e.g., the black box itself). The question for U.S. criminologists has been: Did participants in X program have a lower level of recidivism after participating in the program? This phrasing of the "what works" question reflects our current anti-psychological approach to rehabilitation in the U.S., which often switches criterion variables from the psychological to the social. Our programs focus on the community and those things that surround the offender (e.g., jobs, housing, education) and are less inclined to treat the individual per se (except for sex offenders, where the offender is more viewed as sick). The "what works" literature in the U.S. tends to be program- rather than principles-based.

The largest and most influential U.S. "what works" study was conducted by a team of scholars at the University of Maryland and funded by the U.S. Justice Department. The report, "Crime Prevention: What Works, What Doesn't, and What's Promising," began by collecting crime prevention evaluations in seven institutional settings (e.g., schools, families, labor markets, criminal justice). (Sherman et al. 1997) Once all the individual evaluations had been assembled, each was rated on a "scientific methods score" of 1 through 5, with 5 being the strongest scientific evidence (i.e., large samples with random assignment). The scores generally reflect the level of confidence one can place in the evaluation's conclusions about cause and effect. This methodology—identifying evaluations, scoring them as to methodology, and summarizing the results of rigorous program evaluations—is known as a synthetic review.

Doris MacKenzie, a well-respected researcher, completed the synthetic review for the corrections system. Her results were published in the original Maryland report, and later expanded (in MacKenzie and Hickman 1998). Dr. MacKenzie and her colleagues identified 184 correctional evaluations conducted between 1978 and 1998 that employed a methodology that could be rated at a level of 3 or higher (meaning that the study employed some kind of control or comparison group). She identified the following programs as working to reduce offender recidivism: 1) In-Prison Therapeutic Communities With Follow-Up Community Treatment, 2) Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, 3) Non-Prison Based Sex Offender Treatment Programs, 4) Vocational Education Programs, 5) Multi-Component Correctional Industry Programs, and 6) Community Employment Programs. She also identified as "promising" (meaning there were one or two evaluations showing effectiveness): 1) Prison-Based Sex Offender Treatment, 2) Adult Basic Education, and 3) Transitional Programs Providing Individualized Employment Preparation and Services for High-Risk Offenders. She too found that increased monitoring in the community (e.g., intensive probation, electronic monitoring) did not alone reduce recidivism. Thus, if we accept the Travis/Petersilia/Wilkinson encompassing definition of prisoner reentry, this is the body of "what works" literature we must draw upon.

Seiter and Kadela (2003) applied the exact same methodology in their search for evaluations of prison reentry programs, defining reentry programs as previously discussed and searching published and unpublished literature between 1975 and 2001. They found just 28 program evaluations that fit their reentry definition, and only 19 of those program evaluations contained any control or comparison group (e.g., met level 3 criteria). Of these 19 evaluations, fully 10 were drug treatment program evaluations. This means that during a 25-year period, when hundreds of work release, halfway houses, job training, education programs, prerelease classes, and so forth, were implemented in the U.S., the literature contains only 9 credible evaluations! This is a disgrace.

Seiter and Kadela identified the following reentry programs as effective, as measured by reduced recidivism among participants: 1) Vocational training and work release programs, 2) halfway houses, and 3) some drug treatment programs (intensive plus aftercare). They also found that education programs increased education achievement scores, but did not decrease recidivism, and that pre-release programs have some evidence of effectiveness, although the evaluation literature is weak.

In sum, if we combined the Canadians' theory of rehabilitation with the U.S. program evaluation data on "what works," we would design prison reentry programs that took place mostly in the community (as opposed to institutional settings), were intensive (at least six months long), focused on high-risk individuals (with risk level determined by classification instruments rather than clinical judgments), used cognitive-behavioral treatment techniques, and matched therapist and program to the specific learning styles and characteristics of individual offenders. As the individual changed his or her thinking patterns, he or she would be provided with vocational training and other job-enhancing opportunities. Positive reinforcers would outweigh negative reinforcers in all program components. Every program begun in a jail or prison would have an intensive and man-

datory aftercare component. And, if we were able to accomplish all of this, we would likely reduce recidivism by at most 30 percent. (Andrews et al. 1990) But even with this rather moderate level of recidivism reduction, the cost/benefit calculation would favor the rehabilitation program, and the program would pay for itself in terms of future criminal justice and corrections costs avoided. (Aos et al. 2001).

But Do These Research Results Have Face Validity? Questioning the "Evidence"

The author could end this article here, but is uncomfortable doing so. She sees three problems with using the above evidence to answer the important question, "what works in reentry?" The first is that are so few rigorous evaluations upon which to base any generalizable knowledge. Seiter and Kadela were able to identify just 19 reentry program evaluations that contained a comparison group. Only two of these evaluations were randomized experiments. Without this methodology, virtually every finding of program impact is open to criticism. If we assume that each state operated a minimum of 10 reentry programs, using Seiter and Kadela's definition, each year during this 26-year period, then there were close to 10,000 programs nationwide that were implemented during this time period. The 10 per year estimate is actually low, if one considers the program data reported each year by Camp and Camp in *The Corrections Yearbook*. Yet, just 19 evaluations (less than 1 percent of the total) were published from this experience and the majority of those use weak methodology and pertain to drug programs. Using this "body" of research to conclude *anything* about which reentry programs "work" or "don't work" seems misguided.

Second, virtually all of these evaluations use recidivism as the sole outcome criteria. Programs that reduce the level of criminal behavior among program participants are said to work. Recidivism is an important, perhaps the most important, measure of correctional impact, but it is insufficient as a sole measure of the effectiveness of reentry programs. After all, the ultimate goal of reentry programs is reintegration, which clearly includes more than remaining arrest-free for a specified time period. The author has urged the expansion of outcome criteria for evaluating corrections programs previously (Petersilia 1993), and the argument seems even more germane to reentry programs.

If we wish to truly measure reintegration, we need to build into our evaluations measures of attachment to a variety of social institutions. Research shows that these factors are related to long-term criminal desistance. For example, evaluations should measure whether clients are working, whether that work is full or part time, and whether the income derived is supporting families. We should measure whether programs increase client sobriety and attendance at treatment programs. We should track whether programs help convicts become involved in community activities, in a church, or in ex-convict support groups or victim sensitivity sessions. There are many outcomes that reentry programs strive to improve upon, and these are virtually never measured in traditional recidivism-only outcome evaluations. Jeremy Travis (2003) makes this point powerfully when he writes of the far-reaching impacts of drug courts. He notes that one of the positive impacts of an offender's participation in a drug court is that the children born to drug court participants are much less likely to be born addicted to drugs. Drug courts reduce participants' drug use, and result in healthy children being born to sober mothers. When we use recidivism as the sole criterion for judging whether reentry programs "work" or "don't work," we often miss the more powerful impacts of program participation.

Third, the author's experience suggests that the results from the academic "what works" literature does not feel right to correctional practitioners. The results don't have much face validity. Of course, research has to go beyond face validity. We shouldn't implement specific programs because practitioners *believe* they are effective. This would be too vague and subjective. There has to be a corresponding body of scientific evidence proving that they are effective. But at the same time, the scientific or statistical results should make common sense, be persuasive, and have the appearance of truth and reality. In other words, they should be playing well in Peoria. This doesn't seem to be the case with the "what works" literature in reentry programming.

The author has been involved with nearly a dozen recent efforts to design and implement reentry programs. Federal, state, and county governments, as well as private industry, religious organizations, and research institutions have initiated these efforts. In each instance, the initiative usually begins by forming a task force comprised of corrections professionals, academics, and state agencies. Some task forces also include ex-convicts, victims, and business and religious leaders. The task force then identifies programs that are thought to improve offender transition from prison to the community. In my experience, none of these task forces have chosen to implement reentry programs that derived primarily from the published "what works" literature as summarized above. This is not to say that these task forces have ignored the literature entirely, but rather that in the end, the programs funded and implemented do not derive primarily from this literature. To me, this suggests the "what works" literature does not ring true to their experience nor identify the kinds of programs these experts believe work.

Let's take a couple of recent examples. The Department of Justice funded the Reentry Partnership Initiatives (RPI) in eight sites. Byrne et al. (2002), the evaluators of RPI, write that the implemented reentry programs share a common vision about what it takes to achieve effective reentry, and the core of that vision is community *collaboration*, not any individual program. Byrne et al. write that the RPI sites each believe that "we must act as a system to improve public safety. That requires key criminal justice actors (police, courts, corrections, community) to redefine their role and responsibilities, focusing not on what individual agencies should be doing, but on what the partnership should be doing to improve public safety. RPI programs will involve shared decision-making by police, institutional corrections, community corrections, and public/private service providers."

An identical theme was identified in the National Institute of Corrections' (NIC) *Transition from Prison to Community Initiative* (TPCI). Dale Parent (2004) of Abt Associates, the evaluator, convened a task force of 35 experts to identify a best-practices reentry model. He writes that the model identified represents "a sea-change for participating jurisdictions." It requires "corrections, releasing agencies, supervision, and human service agencies to form strategic and tactical partnerships to integrate and coordinate basic policies." And finally, if one examines the recent Urban Institute publication *Outside the Walls: A National Snapshot of Community-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs*, which identifies 100 reentry programs that experts have nominated as successful, there is virtually no overlap between those programs and

the programs identified as "working" in the scientific literature summarized above. (Solomon et al. 2004)

The author certainly doesn't mean to imply that the "what works" movement in corrections has been unimportant. In fact, she believes exactly the opposite. It has enabled us to rebut the "nothing works" doctrine that was so popular in the 1980s and 1990s. It is now accepted that something works in rehabilitation programming. It has also prompted all of us to focus on program accountability, resource allocation, and outcome measurement. It was our failure to do this in the 1970s that permitted a weak study like Martinson's to have the dramatic impact it did. But at the same time, we must be cautious not to apply scientifically rigorous methods to an exceedingly weak program evaluation literature. Michael Maltz (1984) notes this problem in his book *Recidivism*. He writes, "Engineers measure it with a micrometer, mark it with a piece of chalk, and cut it with an axe. Criminologists measure it with a series of ambiguous questions, mark it with a bunch of inconsistent coders, and cut it to within three decimal places." Maltz is talking about the imprecision in the different disciplines. Engineers have a great deal of precision with the initial measurement. Criminologists have focused very little on what goes on inside corrections programs or how well key recidivism outcomes are measured. Instead they have become increasingly precise at statistical measurement and modeling, without questioning the "black box" itself. Ironically, it is perhaps this push toward methodological sophistication in academia that is widening the divide between what scholars and practitioners believe "works" in corrections and offender reentry.

Conclusion

Interest in prisoner reentry has brought a new-found enthusiasm for rehabilitation programming. Correctional practitioners are working hard to identify and implement programs that reduce reoffending after prison. At the same time, academics are trying to amass a body of literature that will guide practitioners' choice of programs. Yet, when one looks closely at the two enterprises, there is little evidence that research is driving policy, or that policy is driving research. Despite good intentions, each of these fields is moving on rather independent tracks and the gulfs between them are still wide.

We must work hard to correct this, since crime policy is a fickle business and today's interest in reentry will likely be replaced in a few years by another corrections hot topic. The author envisions a system where, start to finish, practitioners and researchers work side-by-side to create corrections programs that are both substantively and administratively effective. In short, we must join the same team. Have you ever noticed a flock of geese flying in their traditional "V" formation? A study by two engineers showed that each bird, by flapping its wings, creates uplift for the bird that follows. Together, the whole flock gains something like 70 percent greater flying range than if they were journeying alone. It is the same in any organization. When we combine our efforts, our talents, and our creativity, we're far more productive than when we all go in different directions.

We should use this window of opportunity wisely to produce scientifically credible evaluations of reentry programs that practitioners believe work. With this data in hand, we will be able to challenge decision makers to think more substantively and less ideologically about crime. More important, we will have identified truly effective reentry programs and, over time, prisoner reentry should cease to be one of our most profound social challenges simply because more inmates will be going home and staying there.

References

Aos, Steve, Polly Phipps, Robert Barnoski, and Roxanne Lieb (2001). The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime. Seattle: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Andrews, D. and J. Bonta (1998). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati, Ohio, Anderson Publishing.

Andrews, D., I. Zinger, et al. (1990). "Does Correctional Treatment Work? A Clinically Relevant and Psychologically Informed Meta-Analysis." *Criminology* 28(3): 369–404.

Byrne, J. M., F. Taxman, et al. (2002). *Emerging Roles and Responsibilities in the Reentry Partnership Initiative: New Ways of Doing Business*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Cullen, F. and P. Gendreau (2000). Assessing Correctional Rehabilitation: Policy, Practice, and Prospects. *Criminal Justice 2000*. J. Horney. Washington, DC, National Institute of Justice. 3: 109–175.

Gendreau, P. and R. Ross (1979). "Effective Correctional Treatment: Bibliotherapy for Cynics." *Crime & Delinquency* 25: 463–489.

MacKenzie, D. L. and L. J. Hickman (1998). What Works in Corrections? An Examination of the Effectiveness of the Type of Rehabilitation Programs Offered by Washington State Department of Corrections. College Park, Maryland.

Maltz, M. D. (1984). *Recidivism*. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc.

Martinson, R. (1974). "What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform." *Public Interest* 35 (Spring): 22–35.

Parent, D. G. (2004). *Transition from Prison to Community Initiative*. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates.

Petersilia, J. (1993). Measuring the Performance of Community Corrections. *Performance Measures for the Criminal Justice System*. J. DiIulio. Washington, DC, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Petersilia, J. (2003). *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Seiter, R. and K. Kadela (2003). "Prisoner Reentry: What Works, What Doesn't, and What's Promising." *Crime and Delinquency* 49.

Sherman, L., D. Gottfredson, et al. (1997). *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Solomon, A., M. Waul, et al. (2004). *Outside the Walls: A National Snapshot of Community-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Travis, J. (2003). In Thinking About "What Works," What Works Best? Washington, DC.: The Urban Institute.

Travis, J., A. Solomon, et al. (2001). *From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Travis, J. and C. Visher (forthcoming, 2005). Prisoner Reentry and Public Safety: Introduction. *Prisoner Reentry and Public Safety*. J. Travis and C. Visher. Cambridge University Press.

Washington State Institute for Public Policy

110 Fifth Avenue Southeast, Suite 214 • PO Box 40999 • Olympia, WA 98504-0999 • (360) 586-2677 • www.wsipp.wa.gov

January 2006

EVIDENCE-BASED ADULT CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS: WHAT WORKS AND WHAT DOES NOT‡

In recent years, public policy decision-makers throughout the United States have expressed interest in adopting "evidence-based" criminal justice programs. Similar to the pursuit of evidence-based medicine, the goal is to improve the criminal justice system by implementing programs and policies that have been shown to work. Just as important, research findings can be used to eliminate programs that have failed to produce desired outcomes. Whether for medicine, criminal justice, or other areas, the watchwords of the evidence-based approach to public policy include: outcome-based performance, rigorous evaluation, and a positive return on taxpayer investment.

This report to the Washington State Legislature summarizes our latest review of evidence-based adult corrections programs. We previously published a review on this topic in 2001.[1] In this study, we update and significantly extend our earlier effort.

The overall goal of this research is to provide Washington State policymakers with a comprehensive assessment of adult corrections programs and policies that have a proven ability to affect crime rates.

We are publishing our findings in two installments. In this preliminary report, we provide a systematic review of the evidence on what works (and what does not) to reduce crime. In a subsequent final report, to be published in October 2006, we will extend this analysis to include a benefit-cost estimate for each option.

Summary

This study provides a comprehensive review of evidence-based programs for adult offenders. We asked a simple question: What works, if anything, to lower the criminal recidivism rates of adult offenders? To provide an answer, we systematically reviewed the evidence from 291 rigorous evaluations conducted throughout the United States and other English-speaking countries during the last 35 years.

We find that some types of adult corrections programs have a demonstrated ability to reduce crime, but other types do not. The implication is clear: Washington's adult corrections system will be more successful in reducing recidivism rates if policy focuses on proven evidence-based approaches.

Washington's Offender Accountability Act

This research was undertaken as part of our evaluation of Washington's Offender Accountability Act (OAA). Passed in 1999, the OAA affects how the state provides community supervision to adult felony offenders. In broad terms, the OAA directs the Washington State Department of Corrections to do two things:

1) Classify felony offenders according to their risk for future offending as well as the amount of harm they have caused society in the past; and
2) Deploy more staff and rehabilitative resources to higher-classified offenders and—because budgets are limited—spend correspondingly fewer dollars on lower-classified offenders.

‡Suggested citation: Steve Aos, Marna Miller, and Elizabeth Drake. (2006). *Evidence-Based Adult Corrections Programs: What Works and What Does Not.* Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

[1] S. Aos, P. Phipps, R. Barnoski, and R. Lieb (2001) *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime*, Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

When the Legislature enacted the OAA, it defined a straight-forward goal for the Act: to "reduce the risk of reoffending by offenders in the community."[2] To determine whether the OAA results in lower recidivism rates, the Legislature also directed the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Institute) to evaluate the impact of the Act.[3]

Whether the OAA is able to affect crime rates will depend, in part, on the policy and programming choices made to implement the Act. As we show in this report, there are some adult corrections programs that have a demonstrated ability to reduce crime, but there are other types of programs that fail to affect crime rates. Given these mixed results, it is reasonable to conclude that the OAA (or any other adult corrections policy initiative) will be successful in reducing crime only if it encourages the implementation of effective approaches and discourages the use of ineffective programs. The purpose of this report is to assist policymakers in sorting through the many evidence-based choices.

The Evidence-Based Review: The Basic Question

The goal of the present study is to answer a simple question: Are there any adult corrections programs that work? Additionally, in order to estimate costs and benefits, we seek to estimate the magnitude of the crime reduction effect of each option.

To answer these fundamental questions, we conducted a comprehensive statistical review of all program evaluations conducted over the last 40 years in the United States and other English-speaking countries. As we describe, we found 291 evaluations of individual adult corrections programs with sufficiently rigorous research to be included in our analysis. These evaluations were of many types of programs—drug courts, boot camps, sex offender treatment programs, and correctional industries employment programs, to name a few.

It is important to note that only a few of these 291 evaluations were of Washington State adult corrections programs; rather, almost all of the evaluations in our review were of programs conducted in other locations. A primary purpose of our study is to take advantage of all these rigorous evaluations and, thereby, learn whether there are conclusions that can allow policymakers in Washington to improve this state's adult criminal justice system.

Research Methods

The research approach we employ in this report is called a "systematic" review of the evidence. In a systematic review, the results of *all* rigorous evaluation studies are analyzed to determine if, on average, it can be stated scientifically that a program achieves an outcome. A systematic review can be contrasted with a so-called "narrative" review of the literature where a writer selectively cites studies to tell a story about a topic, such as crime prevention. Both types of reviews have their place, but systematic reviews are generally regarded as more rigorous and, because they assess all available studies and employ statistical hypotheses tests, they have less potential for drawing biased or inaccurate conclusions. Systematic reviews are being used with increased frequency in medicine, education, criminal justice, and many other policy areas.[4]

For this report, the outcome of legislative interest is crime reduction. In particular, since the programs we consider in this review are intended for adult offenders already in the criminal justice system, the specific outcome of interest is reduction in recidivism rates. Therefore, the research question is straightforward: *What works, if anything, to lower the recidivism rates of adult offenders?*

As we describe in the Appendix, we only include rigorous evaluation studies in our review. To be included, an evaluation must have a non-treatment comparison group that is well matched to the treatment group.

---

[2] RCW 9.94A.010.

[3] The Institute's first five publications on the Offender Accountability Act are available for downloading at the Institute's website: www.wsipp.wa.gov. The final OAA report is due in 2010.

[4] An international effort aimed at organizing systematic reviews is the Campbell Collaborative—a non-profit organization that supports systematic reviews in the social, behavioral, and educational arenas. See: http://www.campbellcollaboration.org.

Researchers have developed a set of statistical tools to facilitate systematic reviews of the evidence. The set of procedures is called "meta-analysis," and we employ that methodology in this study.[5] In the Technical Appendix to this report (beginning on page 9) we list the specific coding rules and statistical formulas we use to conduct the analysis—technical readers can find a full description of our methods and detailed results.

Findings

The findings from our systematic review of the adult corrections evaluation literature are summarized on Exhibit 1.[6] We show the expected percentage change in recidivism rates for many types of evaluated adult corrections programs. A zero percent change means that, based on our review, a program does not achieve a statistically significant change in recidivism rates compared with treatment as usual.

We found a number of adult corrections programs that have a demonstrated ability to achieve reductions in recidivism rates. We also found other approaches that do not reduce recidivism. Thus, the first basic lesson from our evidence-based review is that some adult corrections programs work and some do not. A direct implication from these mixed findings is that a corrections policy that reduces recidivism will be one that focuses resources on effective evidence-based programming and avoids ineffective approaches.

As an example of the information on Exhibit 1, we analyzed the findings

Exhibit 1

Adult Corrections: What Works?

Estimated Percentage Change in Recidivism Rates
(and the number of studies on which the estimate is based)

Example of how to read the table: an analysis of 56 adult drug court evaluations indicates that drug courts achieve, on average, a statistically significant 10.7 percent reduction in the recidivism rates of program participants compared with a treatment-as-usual group.

Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders		
Adult drug courts	-10.7%	(56)
In-prison "therapeutic communities" with community aftercare	-6.9%	(6)
In-prison "therapeutic communities" without community aftercare	-5.3%	(7)
Cognitive-behavioral drug treatment in prison	-6.8%	(8)
Drug treatment in the community	-12.4%	(5)
Drug treatment in jail	-6.0%	(9)
Programs for Offenders With Co-Occurring Disorders		
Jail diversion (pre- and post-booking programs)	0.0%	(11)
Programs for the General Offender Population		
General and specific cognitive-behavioral treatment programs	-8.2%	(25)
Programs for Domestic Violence Offenders		
Education/cognitive-behavioral treatment	0.0%	(9)
Programs for Sex Offenders		
Psychotherapy for sex offenders	0.0%	(3)
Cognitive-behavioral treatment in prison	-14.9%	(5)
Cognitive-behavioral treatment in the community	-31.2%	(6)
Behavioral therapy for sex offenders	0.0%	(2)
Intermediate Sanctions		
Intensive supervision: surveillance-oriented programs	0.0%	(24)
Intensive supervision: treatment-oriented programs	-21.9%	(10)
Adult boot camps	0.0%	(22)
Electronic monitoring	0.0%	(12)
Restorative justice programs for lower-risk adult offenders	0.0%	(6)
Work and Education Programs for the General Offender Population		
Correctional industries programs in prison	-7.8%	(4)
Basic adult education programs in prison	-5.1%	(7)
Employment training and job assistance in the community	-4.8%	(16)
Vocational education in prison	-12.6%	(3)
Program Areas in Need of Additional Research & Development		
(The following types of programs require additional research before it can be concluded that they do or do not reduce adult recidivism rates)		
Case management in the community for drug offenders	0.0%	(12)
"Therapeutic community" programs for mentally ill offenders	-27.4%	(2)
Faith-based programs	0.0%	(5)
Domestic violence courts	0.0%	(2)
Intensive supervision of sex offenders in the community	0.0%	(4)
Mixed treatment of sex offenders in the community	0.0%	(2)
Medical treatment of sex offenders	0.0%	(1)
COSA (Faith-based supervision of sex offenders)	-31.6%	(1)
Regular parole supervision vs. no parole supervision	0.0%	(1)
Day fines (compared to standard probation)	0.0%	(1)
Work release programs	-5.6%	(4)

[5] We follow the meta-analytic methods described in M. W. Lipsey and D. Wilson (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

[6] Technical meta-analytical results are presented in Exhibit 2.

from 25 well-researched cognitive-behavioral treatment programs for general adult offenders. We found that, on average, these programs can be expected to reduce recidivism rates by 8.2 percent. That is, without a cognitive-behavioral program we expect that about 49 percent of these offenders will recidivate with a new felony conviction after an eight-year follow-up. With a cognitive-behavioral treatment program, we expect the recidivism probability to drop four points to 45 percent—an 8.2 percent reduction in recidivism rates.

It is important to note that even relatively small reductions in recidivism rates can be quite cost-beneficial. For example, a 5 percent reduction in the reconviction rates of high risk offenders can generate significant benefits for taxpayers and crime victims. Moreover, a program that has no statistically significant effect on recidivism rates can be cost-beneficial if the cost of the program is less than the cost of the alternative. Jail diversion programs are examples of this; even if research demonstrates that diversion programs have no effect on recidivism, the programs may still be economically attractive if they cost less than avoided jail costs. In the final version of this report, to be delivered to the Legislature in October 2006, we will present full benefit-cost estimates for each of the programs shown in Exhibit 1.[7]

Findings by Type of Program

We organized our review of the adult corrections evidence base into eight categories of correctional programming (as shown in Exhibit 1). A brief discussion of our findings for each of these categories follows.

Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders. We analyzed 92 rigorous evaluations of drug treatment programs. These programs are for drug-involved adult offenders in a variety of prison and community settings. We found that, on average, drug treatment leads to a statistically significant reduction in criminal recidivism rates. We examined adult drug courts, in-prison therapeutic communities, and other types of drug treatment including cognitive-behavioral approaches.

Adult Drug Courts. Specialized courts for drug-involved offenders have proliferated throughout the United States, and there are several adult drug courts in Washington. We found 56 evaluations with sufficient rigor to be included in our statistical review. We conclude that drug courts achieve, on average, a statistically significant 10.7 percent reduction in the recidivism rates of program participants relative to treatment-as-usual comparison groups.

In-Prison Therapeutic Communities. Programs for drug offenders in a prison or jail setting are typically called "therapeutic communities" when they contain separate residential units for the offenders and when they follow group-run principles of organizing and operating the drug-free unit. Some evaluations of the effectiveness of in-prison therapeutic community programs have also included community-based aftercare for offenders once they leave incarceration. Based on our review of the evaluation literature, we found that the average therapeutic community reduces recidivism by 5.3 percent. The community aftercare component, however, produces only a modest additional boost to program effectiveness—to a 6.9 percent reduction. Thus, most of the recidivism reduction effect appears to stem from the prison-based therapeutic community experience for these offenders.

Other Types of Drug Treatment. As shown in Exhibit 1, we also studied the effects of three other types of drug treatment modalities: prison-based drug treatment that employs a cognitive-behavioral approach, general drug treatment approaches in the community, and general drug treatment programs in local jails. We found that each of these approaches achieve, on average, a statistically significant reduction in recidivism.

Jail Diversion Programs for Offenders With Mental Illness and Co-Occurring Disorders. There is young but growing research literature testing the effectiveness of jail diversion programs for mentally ill adults and for offenders with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders. Some of these are pre-booking programs implemented by the police, and some are post-booking programs implemented by court personnel, such as mental health courts. We found 11 evaluations with sufficient research rigor to be included in our review. Eight of these programs were part of a recent federally-funded

[7] An overview of what will be included in the October 2006 report can be found at www.wsipp.wa.gov/ Steve Aos (2006). *Options to Stabilize Prison Populations in Washington State. Interim Report.* Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy

effort (Broner et al., 2004). On average, these approaches have not demonstrated a statistically significant reduction in the recidivism rates of program participants. This null finding does not mean the programs are not valuable; since they are typically designed to divert offenders from costly sentences in local jails, they may save more money than the programs cost. As mentioned earlier, we will review the economics of all programs in the present study in our October 2006 final report.

Treatment Programs for the General Offender Population.

Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment. We found 25 rigorous evaluations of programs for the general offender population that employ cognitive-behavioral treatment. This type of group therapy addresses the irrational thoughts and beliefs that lead to anti-social behavior. The programs are designed to help offenders correct their thinking and provide opportunities to model and practice problem-solving and pro-social skills. On average, we found these programs significantly reduce recidivism by 8.2 percent. We identified three well-defined programs that provide manuals and staff training regimens: *Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R), Moral Reconation Therapy (MRT)*, and *Thinking for a Change (T4C)*. Effects of *R&R* and *MRT* are significant and similar to each other and to the other cognitive-behavioral treatment programs in our review. Only a single evaluation of *T4C* is currently available. Since, on average, all of these programs produce similar results, we recommend the state choose any of the three well-defined programs for implementation in Washington.

Programs for Domestic-Violence Offenders

Education/Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment. Treatment programs for domestic violence offenders most frequently involve an educational component focusing on the historical oppression of women and cognitive-behavioral treatment emphasizing alternatives to violence. Treatment is commonly mandated by the court. Based on our review of nine rigorous evaluations, domestic violence treatment programs have yet, on average, to demonstrate reductions in recidivism.

Programs for Sex Offenders.[8] We found 18 well-designed evaluations of treatment programs for sex offenders. Some of these programs are located in a prison setting and some are in the community. Sex offenders sentenced to prison are typically convicted of more serious crimes than those sentenced to probation. We found that cognitive-behavioral treatments are, on average, effective at reducing recidivism, but other types of sex offender treatment fail to demonstrate significant effects on further criminal behavior.

Psychotherapy/Counseling for Sex Offenders.[9] These programs involve insight-oriented individual or group therapy or counseling. We found only three rigorous studies of this approach to treatment. The results indicate that this approach does not reduce recidivism in sex offenders.

Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Sex Offenders in Prison. Sex offenders sentenced to prison are typically convicted of more serious crimes than those sentenced to probation. We examined five rigorous studies of these specialized cognitive-behavioral programs that may also include behavioral reconditioning to discourage deviant arousal, and modules addressing relapse prevention. Among the five programs in this category was a randomized trial[10] with an eight-year follow-up showing small but non-significant effects on recidivism. On average across all five studies, however, we found that cognitive-behavioral therapy for sex offenders in prison significantly reduces recidivism by 14.9 percent.

Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Sex Offenders on Probation. Offenders sentenced to probation have usually been convicted of less serious crimes than sex offenders sentenced to prison. Cognitive-behavioral programs for sex offenders on probation are similar to the programs in prisons, and may also incorporate behavioral reconditioning and relapse prevention. We found

[8] The categories of sex offender treatment listed here are based on those outlined in two recent reviews of sex offender treatment literature: R. K. Hanson, A. Gordon, A. J. Harris, J. K. Marques, W. Murphy, V. L. Quinsey, and M. C. Seto (2002). First report of the collaborative outcome data project on the effectiveness of psychological treatment for sex offenders, *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14(2): 169-194; F. Losel, and M. Schmucker (2005). The effectiveness of treatment for sexual offenders: A comprehensive meta-analysis, *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1: 117-146

[9] Psychotherapy and counseling are not currently used as stand-alone treatment for sex offenders (Hanson, et al., 2002).

[10] J. K. Marques, M. Wiederanders, D. M. Day, C. Nelson, and A. van Ommeren (2005). Effects of a relapse prevention program on sexual recidivism: Final results from California's Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project (SOTEP). *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 17(1): 79-107

six rigorous studies and conclude that cognitive-behavioral therapy for sex offenders on probation significantly reduces recidivism. As a group, these programs demonstrated the largest effects observed in our analysis.

Behavioral Treatment of Sex Offenders. Behavioral treatments focus on reducing deviant arousal (using biofeedback or other conditioning) and increasing skills necessary for social interaction with age appropriate individuals. The two rigorous studies of programs using only behavioral treatment failed to show reductions in recidivism.

Intermediate Sanctions. In the 1980s and 1990s a number of sanctioning and sentencing alternatives were proposed and evaluated. Interest in developing additional alternatives continues. We found studies that center on five types of these "intermediate" sanctions.

Intensive Supervision With and Without a Focus on Treatment. We found 24 evaluations of intensive community supervision programs where the focus was on offender monitoring and surveillance. These programs are usually implemented by lowering the caseload size of the community supervision officer. This approach to offender management has not, on average, produced statistically significant reductions in recidivism rates. On the other hand, intensive supervision programs where the focus is on providing treatment services for the offenders have produced significant reductions; we found 10 well-researched evaluations of treatment-oriented intensive supervision programs that on average produced considerable recidivism reductions. The lesson from this research is that it is the treatment—not the intensive monitoring—that results in recidivism reduction.

Adult Boot Camps. Boot camps are intensive regimens of training, drilling, and some treatment. We found 24 rigorous evaluations of adult boot camps and, on average, they do not produce a statistically significant reduction in re-offense rates. As with our comment on jail diversion programs, however, it is possible that boot camps are economically attractive if they cost less to run than the alternative. Our October 2006 report will analyze the economics of adult boot camps.

Electronic Monitoring. Supervision of offenders in the community that is aided with electronic monitoring devices has been the focus of some rigorous evaluation efforts. We found 12 control-group studies; on average they indicate that electronic monitoring does not reduce recidivism.

Restorative Justice for Lower-Risk Adult Offenders. Restorative justice approaches have been tried for both juvenile and adult offenders. Offenders placed in restorative justice programs are often, but not always, lower risk compared with offenders processed through the usual court procedures. Restorative justice typically involves a form of victim-offender mediation, family group conferences, or restitution. We found six rigorous evaluations of these programs for adult offenders. On average, they did not result in lower recidivism rates. Our October 2006 report will also report on restorative justice programs for juvenile offenders. Unlike our findings for the restorative justice programs for adult offenders, our preliminary findings indicate that restorative justice programs do achieve significant reductions in recidivism rates of lower-risk juvenile offenders.

Work and Education Programs for General Offenders. We found 30 rigorous evaluations of programs that attempt to augment the educational, vocational, and job skills of adult offenders. Some of these programs are for offenders in prison and some are in community settings. On average, we found that employment- and education-related programs lead to modest but statistically significant reductions in criminal recidivism rates. We examined the following five categories of these programs.

In-prison Correctional Industries Program. Most states run in-prison correctional industries programs, yet only a few have been evaluated rigorously. We located only four outcome evaluations of correctional industries programs. On average, these programs produce a statistically significant reduction in recidivism rates. Our updated economic analysis of this finding will be presented in October 2006.

Basic Adult Education Programs in Prison. We found seven rigorous evaluations of programs that teach remedial educational skills to adult offenders when they are in prison. On average, these programs reduce the recidivism rates of program participants.

Employment Training and Job Assistance Programs in the Community. We analyzed the results of 16 rigorous evaluations of community-based employment training, job search, and job assistance programs for adult offenders. These programs produce a modest but statistically significant reduction in recidivism.

Vocational Education Programs in Prison. We found only three quality studies of vocational training programs for offenders while they are in prison. On average, the programs appear to reduce recidivism, but additional tests of this tentative finding is necessary.

Programs Requiring Further Study. In our review of the adult corrections literature, we were unable to draw conclusions about recidivism reduction for a number of programs. In Exhibit 1, we list these inconclusive findings at the bottom of the table. For each of these approaches, further research is required before even tentative conclusions can be drawn.[11]

Case Management in the Community for Drug Offenders. These types of programs typically involve an outside third-party agency that provides case coordination services and drug testing. The goal is to provide the coordination of other existing monitoring and treatment services for offenders in the community. We found 12 rigorous tests of this approach. Our statistical tests reveal that while, on average, these programs have no significant effect on recidivism, some case management programs do have an effect and some do not. This inconclusive result means that additional research is required on this class of programming in order to identify the aspects of case management that are effective or ineffective. In other words, additional research may indicate that some forms of case management reduce recidivism.[12]

"Therapeutic Community" Programs for Mentally Ill Offenders. A relatively new approach to providing treatment to mentally-ill offenders follows a modified version of the therapeutic community approach to drug offenders described earlier. This approach appears to show promise in reducing recidivism rates. However, this is based on only two rigorous studies, and they involved small samples of offenders. Thus, this is an approach that requires additional research.

Faith-Based Programs. These Christian-based programs provide religious ministry, including bible study, to offenders in prison and/or when offenders re-enter the community. The faith-based offender programs that have been evaluated to date do not significantly reduce recidivism.[13] Rigorous evaluations of faith-based programs are still relatively rare—we found only five thorough evaluations—and future studies may provide evidence of better outcomes.

Domestic Violence Courts. These specialized courts are designed to provide effective coordinated response to domestic violence. Domestic violence courts commonly bring together criminal justice and social service agencies and may mandate treatment for offenders. The two courts included here differed—one was exclusively for felony cases and the other for misdemeanors. In the misdemeanor court, recidivism was lowered, while the felony court observed increased recidivism. Thus, this is an area that requires additional research.

Intensive Supervision of Sex Offenders in the Community. The programs included in the analysis were all developed in Illinois and varied by county. All involve a specialized probation caseload, frequent face-to-face meetings with offenders, and home visits and inspections. Supervision programs may also include treatment. The recidivism results in the four counties vary widely, suggesting that some of the programs may be effective while others are not. Additional research is needed to identify these characteristics.

Mixed Treatment of Sex Offenders. Two rigorous studies evaluated community sex offender treatments employed across geographic areas (Washington State and British Columbia). In each case, the individual treatment programs varied widely. On average, these mixtures of treatments significantly reduced recidivism; however, while the treatments in Washington were significant and large, those in British Columbia were very small and non-significant. Controlling for the variation, the overall effect was zero.

---

[11] Technical Note. As we explain in the technical appendix, we employ "fixed effects" and "random effects" modeling to derive meta-analytic estimates of program effectiveness. Sometimes, a collection of evaluations of similar programs has significant recidivism when judged with fixed effects modeling, but the same set of programs has insignificant findings when a random effects model is used. This situation provides an indication that additional meta-analytic research is needed to identify the factors that produced the heterogeneity in the outcomes. Several of the programs listed here fall into this category For more information, see the technical appendices.

[12] As a technical note, Exhibit 2 shows that case management services produce a marginally significant (p=.114) effect on recidivism in a fixed effects model but the model indicates significant (p= 000) heterogeneity. The random effects model indicates non significance (p=.48). Thus, a multivariate meta-analysis of this literature may isolate the factors that were associated with successful approaches among the 12 studies

[13] Similar findings were recently published in a review of faith-based prison programs: J. Burnside, N. Loucks, J. R. Addler, and G. Rose (2005). *My brother's keeper: Faith-based units in prison.* Cullompton, Devon, U.K.: Willan Publishing, p. 314.

The Los Angeles Times

http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-felon12oct12,1,2068369.story

A Call to Let Felons Start Fresh

San Francisco supervisors urge deletion of the question about prior felonies from public job applications.

By Lee Romney
Times Staff Writer

October 12, 2005

SAN FRANCISCO — Elected leaders here Tuesday took a step unusual for politicians: They sided with felons.

With no debate, supervisors unanimously urged the city and county to delete the question about prior convictions from public employment applications.

The resolution is not binding. And it does not prevent employers from conducting criminal background checks or asking about prior felonies during job interviews.

"It's very important, because it gives you an opportunity to sell yourself to the employer," Robert Bowden, 42, an ex-convict who has been out of prison for seven years, said after the vote. "It gives you another option other than going back to what you did.... If they want us to be productive members of society, they've got to let us back into society."

In introducing the measure two weeks ago, Supervisor Tom Ammiano stressed that it would broaden the city's pool of qualified applicants while reinvesting in ex-convicts who are working to rehabilitate themselves.

The resolution prompted more than 160 letters from members of a San Francisco political action committee concerned that potential changes would hamstring city hiring managers and inappropriately allow certain classes of felons into sensitive positions.

Others nationwide watched with interest: With the vote, San Francisco became the first municipality in the state — and possibly the country — to grapple with what advocates say is employment discrimination against a swelling population of ex-prisoners.

Increasing security concerns since the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks have led to a sharp rise in criminal background checks by employers: Eighty percent conducted them in 2003, up from 51% in 1996, according to the Society for Human Resource Management. The trend has further weeded former offenders from the workplace and prompted some employers to fire otherwise stable workers who lied about criminal pasts, advocates say.

"If they can get their foot in the door so that at least they can be considered ... I think that's extremely important," said former Clinton administration pardon attorney Margaret Colgate Love, who recently completed a study for the Washington, D.C.-based Sentencing Project of state laws

that affect felons after their release.

The vote by the supervisors came the same day that San Francisco Dist. Atty. Kamala Harris unveiled a "reentry" program to provide job training, education and other guidance to ex-offenders in an attempt to reduce steep recidivism rates among California parolees.

Dozens of ex-felons packed the supervisors' chambers late last month to support the employment application measure. Activists hope the San Francisco resolution will become a blueprint for others across the state. One spoke of fruitlessly seeking rental housing when his only identification was a prison ID.

Linda Walker, 47, a Contra Costa County employee who works securing child support payments, talked of suffering eternally for crimes she had long ago done the time for. Although the former heroin addict with a petty theft conviction managed to find a sympathetic manager and land a good job, she said she feared having to reveal her felon status each time she sought advancement.

"There have been many times I didn't apply for a position because of that box," she told supervisors when the measure was introduced. "There are so many of us who do not seek housing, jobs, loans and the opportunity to advance because we don't want to answer that question — because we've already paid."

Driving the measure is a Bay Area-based group of ex-convicts called All of Us or None. Leader Dorsey Nunn has urged public officials to view the application checkbox issue as one hurdle in a broader civil rights movement for the formerly incarcerated.

The scene was more subdued Tuesday as two members of the group showed up to watch their measure succeed. Bowden, convicted of drug dealing, now works security for St. Anthony's Foundation. He believes he secured the job only because the application did not inquire about his felony status and he could explain his past in person. He never received a call back after checking the felon box on 40 other applications, he said.

The debate comes as the public policy problem of a vast felon underclass is capturing attention nationwide. There are an estimated 12 million people in the U.S. with felony convictions — about 8% of the working-age population, and more than 600,000 offenders are being released from prisons yearly, said Devah Pager, a Princeton University sociologist who researches employment discrimination against felons.

Pager hired groups of African American and white young men with identical resumes and experience to pose as job applicants. Some were told to say they had a drug felony. Her study found that checking the felony box on applications reduced the white applicants' chance of an interview by 50% and the black applicants' by two-thirds.