



REENTRY COUNCILS FOR EX-OFFENDERS

A Report on Ten States and Best Practices:

Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Florida,
New York, Michigan, Virginia and Oregon

August 2013

Introduction:

Across the United States, decades of effort to “get tough on crime” through strict sentencing laws, prison conditions, and parole rules have produced the highest incarceration rates in United States history. The high rate of prison releases strains law enforcement, social service, health, and housing resources at the community level, and creates serious problems for ex-offenders seeking to reintegrate into society.

In 2001, the Council of State Governments, a leading organization of elected state officials, launched a national Ex-Offender Reentry Policy Council. The Council sought to develop bipartisan consensus on policies and principles that would enable state and local government officials to meet the re-integration needs of ex-offenders while ensuring public safety. Since that time, reentry councils have been established in cities and local communities across the country.

Offenders returning to communities across Texas, citizens with criminal backgrounds and family members of offenders meet numerous barriers to successful reentry and reintegration. Affordable housing, employment, transportation, health care and basic needs are only a few of the challenges they face. Accessing community resources and services that assist in meeting the needs of this special population is critical to promoting public safety through reduced recidivism. Much is happening across the United States regarding reducing the number of incarcerated individuals, as well as developing programs and policies concerning ex-offender reentry.

The mission of the Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable (A/TCRRT) is to be a community-based council that encourages systemic change by educating, facilitating and promoting public safety through effective reentry and reintegration of incarcerated and formerly incarcerated persons. A/TCRRT partnered with the University of Texas, School of Social Work, to conduct a comprehensive review of reentry councils in other communities focusing on the successes and challenges of those councils. The goal of this document is to lay the foundation for the development of an Austin/Travis County Report Card in FY2014 to determine the effectiveness of Travis County’s efforts for the reintegration of ex-offenders being released from state prisons or the Travis County jail.

Acknowledgments to Travis County Criminal Justice Planning Department for providing funding for this A/TCRRT report. A special thank you to the following University of Texas, School of Social Work, graduate researchers: Sean Berkley, Ciera Culpepper, Teralyn Hobbs, Victoria Terranova, and Alycia Welch, and sincere appreciation to Dr. Sandra Eames, Chair of the A/TCRRT.

The Role of Reentry Councils:

This report is intended to provide an overview of research conducted on reentry councils in various states across the country. The best practices of reentry councils serving people returning to the community from incarceration has resulted in a reduction of offender re-arrest, thus increasing public safety. This reduction in offending furthermore reduces the financial burden overcrowded prisons and jails place on the community.

State legislators across the country are burdened with the economic strain of mass incarceration. Experts agree that the high recidivism rates plaguing the majority of states around the country add potentially unnecessary costs to an already expensive criminal justice system. Findings from a national trend to reduce recidivism rates show that a greater investment in community support services for offenders reentering the community save taxpayer money and increase public safety.

In 2011, the Council on State Governments Justice Center and the Urban Institute developed a “tool kit” identifying that, upon release from incarceration, people need access to the following resources: housing, employment, education, identification documentation, substance abuse, health, mental health, transportation, fiduciary, family reunification, and therapy. People returning to the community from incarceration frequently face multiple barriers when attempting to access these service areas. Reentry councils should target these areas comprehensively to break barriers, ensure equitable access, and ultimately reduce recidivism and increase public safety.

In FY2013, the Evidence-Based Practices Committee of the Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable identified the following seven (7) states for our investigation of common practices of reentry councils across the country: Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Florida, and New York. Reentry councils within these seven states were compared to current reentry efforts in Texas. Michigan, Virginia and Oregon were added to this state list after researching best practices for reentry councils. This small sample of ten (10) states provides an accurate reflection of common and best practices for reentry councils as of August 2013.

There are several key points to highlight from the state-by-state comparison and best practice research:

- Three (3) different structures of reentry initiatives were identified within the states:
 1. coordinated, statewide initiatives,
 2. states with regionalized reentry councils that are in the beginning states of coordinating statewide initiatives, and
 3. county-level councils that largely focus on local and state level policy initiatives. Existing research illustrates a correlation between the structure the council fits into within their state and the role the council plays in aiding ex-offenders successfully reintegrating into their community.
- Illinois, Michigan and Virginia implemented statewide initiatives to coordinate reentry services. These councils maintain a diverse group of service sectors including, but not limited to, health, mental health, child and family services, local business coalitions, parole and probation officers, corrections department administrators, and formerly incarcerated individuals who have made a successful transition into the community. These states have documented models that outline their planning phases allowing for program replication. These models include best practices for reentry councils within statewide initiatives that support individuals returning to the community from incarceration.
- Ohio and Florida were found to have regionalized reentry initiatives that utilize councils to support people who are exiting prison and jail. However, services between regions are not coordinated, so implementation varies between localities within these states. There have been initial attempts to create a coordinated, statewide initiative, and these states are making progress toward that goal.
- Reentry councils in Texas and New York focus primarily on policy initiatives at the state and local levels that remove the barriers which prevent people exiting prison and jail from making a successful transition into the community. Reentry councils within this county-level structure coordinate with one another on implementing state-level legislation to help formerly incarcerated individuals access a job, housing and other community services needed to help them in their transition.
- Reentry councils are relatively new and were initiated within the last decade. There are limited data driven practices that exhibit a direct cause and effect relationship with a reduction in recidivism. However, experts seem to agree that statewide initiatives as seen in Illinois, Michigan and Virginia are working to reduce recidivism and save taxpayer dollars by reducing the cost of prison and jail operations in those states. These states have

well-documented, replicable models for other states interested in implementing similar initiatives. In 2009, Texas established a statewide Texas Department of Criminal Justice Reentry Task Force via state legislation. The Task Force is composed of criminal justice, health and human services, education and regulatory agencies, judicial and special interest groups that provide technical assistance and advice on strategies for improving local and state reentry activities. The Task Force meets quarterly.

- The ten (10) states in this report have identified the following areas as most important for successful return to the community: employment, housing, health, mental health, identifying documents, family reunification, financial management, substance abuse, education, and transportation.

The accompanying report attachment, Appendix I, organizes the ten states reviewed by the structure of reentry initiatives outlined above. It shows which states coordinate representatives from each target area of needs in an effort to assist in the provision of services and which states focus largely on policy initiatives to support the successful transition of people exiting prison and jail.

Reentry Initiative Structures:

As stated above, research on best practices for reentry councils revealed that they function within one of three (3) structures within their state: state supported reentry initiatives, regional/county supported reentry initiatives, and states without councils. Each of the three (3) structures is outlined below.

State Supported Reentry Initiative:

- Initiative is a product of a need identified by a state executive
- Reentry councils are defined in communities with highest need
- Advisory role to steering committee or task force is appointed by state executive
- Facilitates collaboration among service agencies
- Participates in the collaboration between defined councils
- State examples: Michigan, Illinois, Virginia, Wisconsin

Regional/County Supported Reentry Initiative:

- Initiative is a product of a regional and/or county identified need
- Reentry councils are responsible for decision making, facilitating collaboration between service agencies, service implementation and/or policy changes
- The mission of the council is defined by the council itself or by the host organization
- Some states are in the process of developing a state supported initiative
- Used by both rural regions and urban counties
- State example: Texas

States Without Established Councils:

- Programming provided without guidance, coordination or collaboration between service agencies
- State examples: Florida, Minnesota, Indiana

Reentry Council:

The following list identifies best practices for reentry councils and is based on the research conducted for this report. Additional research is suggested. The attached list of references provides a foundation for future research:

1. Reentry councils should operate within a state-supported initiative
 - State level reentry council, steering committee or task force appointed by state executive
 - Initiative led by state's unique assets and needs
 - Identify high need areas within the state
 - Appoint local reentry councils in high need areas and have collaboration between councils (reflect local governance structure)
 - Collaboration between state and local councils
2. Reentry councils should simultaneously:
 - Advocate for policy referendums
 - Provide access to direct services that support a successful return to the community
3. Reentry council membership should represent a diversity of service areas:
 - All identified areas of reentry need
 - Includes DOC administration personnel
 - Includes parole and probation representatives
 - Includes the business community
4. DOC and community supervision representatives should be among the membership but should not drive implementation.
5. Reentry council should identify its own mission based on unique needs of locality.
6. Collaboration is critical for successful reentry council efforts.

Recommendations for Texas and the A/TCRRT:

The following list identifies recommendations for the A/TCRRT based on the best practices listed above. The five (5) established local reentry councils in Texas should develop a structure for a state-supported reentry initiative. The five (5) Texas reentry councils are located in Austin, Dallas, Ft. Worth, Houston, and San Antonio.

Reentry councils should identify needed areas of research for planning and implementation such as:

- Mapping existing community resources in high impact areas to pinpoint gaps in service
- Follow state supported initiatives in Michigan, Illinois and Virginia for comparison
- Locate sustained funding
- Implementation of local programs

STATE OF VIRGINIA

Virginia Community Reentry Initiative (VCRI), local reentry and community collaboration councils, is a community-based reentry approach that integrates human services and public safety. VCRI continues to be an important component of the state's comprehensive approach to reentry.

VCRI is based on four (4) primary principles:

1. pre-release planning
2. interagency coordination
3. integrated service delivery
4. a system of family and community support

Communities that voluntarily adopt the VCRI model establish reentry councils. In FY2012, there were 34 reentry councils in Virginia serving 105 localities. These supportive reentry efforts helped build a statewide system of collaboration at the community level.

Key functions and characteristics of the VCRI councils are listed below:

- Local reentry councils bring together community service providers, public safety agencies, businesses, nonprofits, and the faith community to address local reentry issues, assets, and barriers.
- Social service agencies partner with the Virginia Department of Corrections (DOC), nonprofits, and other reentry stakeholders to convene and operate the local reentry councils.
- Directors of local social services departments, community organizations, and/or public safety offices volunteer to serve as council conveners.
- Local reentry councils are comprised of representatives of public and private agencies, law enforcement, correctional agencies, the courts, local businesses, community based services.
- Providers, victims of crime, former offenders, families of offenders, and faith-based institutions, which join the councils on a voluntary basis.
- Professional personnel from the DOC, including wardens, chief probation officers, and their staff, continue to be active participants in the councils but are not the primary decision makers regarding the reentry process.
- Reentry council agencies work together to engage the community in reentry related issues. They secure locality buy-in, identify community assets and service gaps, identify reentry resources and coordinate service delivery to promote public safety.
- No new or additional resources have been provided for coordinating and operating the reentry councils. Lack of funding ultimately limits the services that can be provided. Funding limitation results in local social service departments using only existing resources. Disparity in reentry council resources leads to localities having unequal resources and time amongst different areas.

VCRI's reintegration approach includes reentry mentoring. Volunteer mentors work with previously incarcerated persons and their families for 12 months. Mentors serve as concerned adults who help former offenders develop positive connections with the community. Volunteer mentors recruited from the community are able to have an initial meeting with the incarcerated mentee three (3) months prior to his or her release. The mentor continues that formal relationship for nine (9) months following release.

- In addition to coordinating reentry service delivery at the community level, reentry councils across the state address policy and practice issues. Councils work with local and state decision

makers to develop strategies to reduce the barriers of successful reentry.

- The most common reentry barriers identified by councils include housing, employment, transportation, timely access to mental health and substance abuse programs, fiscal debt, and financial obligations of those returning to the community.

As a result of these efforts, the VCRI has had a significant impact on reentry service delivery in the State of Virginia.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

Illinois is in the early planning and implementation phases of a statewide initiative. In 2007, Illinois assembled the Community Safety and Reentry Commission (CSRC), a team of committed individuals charged with the task of creating an effective, seamless reentry system that extends beyond the prison gates and into the community.

Currently, there is no integrated system of reentry in Illinois. Although many programs serve the formerly incarcerated, they often lack sufficient funding, they are not coordinated in any meaningful way, and their ongoing sustainability is at constant risk. The state must, therefore, foster partnerships among various government agencies and the community and faith-based organizations by creating legislation that supports reentry, eliminating or modifying legislation that imposes barriers to reentry, and by reinvesting funds currently used to incarcerate individuals into reentry programs and support at the community level.

The Illinois model is informed by two (2) successful programs already operating at the state level:

- Sheridan National Model Drug Prison and Reentry Program aims to be the largest state prison and comprehensive reentry program in the nation dedicated to inmates with substance abuse issues. The program focuses its efforts both in prison as well as supervision post-release. Among graduates of the Sheridan Program within its first two (2) years, recidivism rates were nearly 40 % lower than comparison groups.
- Operation Spotlight Parole Reform Initiative is a long-term plan to dramatically increase the number of parole agents, improve case management, tighten parole supervision to emphasize risk reduction and expand community-based resources that help reduce crime. The Operation Spotlight Initiative has already helped to reduce new crimes among all of the state's parolees to the lowest levels in state history.

The Sheridan Program and Operation Spotlight Initiative underscored the importance of systemic change rather than simply focusing occasionally on individual programs with no overall guiding plan. Systemic change would introduce a set of seamless, comprehensive reforms, creating a system that would ultimately be able to better sustain and deliver programs as they were funded.

In part, because of these and other initiatives, the state's overall three (3) year recidivism rate has declined to 51%.

CSRC Recommendations:

CSRC studied model programs from across the United States and made recommendations for tailoring them to Illinois. The recommendations are below.

Expand the Community Support and Advisory Council's (CSAC's) Pilot Project:

The CSAC model, which is currently funded through the Sheridan Program, builds community-based networks of stakeholders.

- Community members visit inmates from their neighborhoods to help rebuild health, family, and community connections.
- CSAC offers a place for parolees to seek help and guidance once they return home and provides ongoing recommendations to DOC on improving the ability of communities to safely and effectively sustain the reentry of offenders.
- CSAC was established in some high impact communities to build partnerships between the professional service providers, prison staff, parole agents, and faith, family, and community members.
- Formerly incarcerated individuals are hired as outreach workers and leaders in the community, which has helped develop an extensive infrastructure of more than 100 community-based service providers so far.
- Case management is coordinated through the two (2) pilot Community Support and Advisory Councils (CSACs.)

The Need for Comprehensive Change:

Illinois quickly realized that, given the enormity of the challenge, the existing system of supports was no longer efficient or cost effective. In the past, although several programs were available for inmates, no real system was in place to move them through goals and personal development.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

The Michigan Prisoner Reentry Initiative (MPRI) model aligns three (3) major national paradigms on how to develop and fully implement a comprehensive model of inmate transition planning:

- Uses a three-phase reentry approach of the Department of Justice's Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative;
- Further delineates the transition process by adding the seven (7) decision points of the National Institute of Correction's (NIC) Transition from Prison Community Initiative (TPC) model; and
- Incorporates into their approach the policy statements and recommendations from the Report of the Reentry Policy Council coordinated by the Council of State Governments.

Funding benefits obtained in developing the MPRI model:

- Grants from the National Governors Association
- Two (2) million dollar grant from the JEHT* Foundation
- Technical assistance from National Institute of Corrections (NIC), which provided substantial resources for consultation, research and training
- Grants from local foundations such as the Hudson Webber Foundation in Detroit, Michigan
- Neighborhood level parolee mapping was conducted by the Urban Institute and Wayne State University

*The Justice, Equality, Human Dignity and Tolerance (JEHT) Foundation closed in January 2009.

Reentry Councils For Ex-Offenders: A Report on Ten States and Best Practices, August 2013

Early Success:

- A time study conducted by the DOC five (5) years after its implementation indicates inmates engaged in the MPRI are returning to prison 6% less often.

Implementation:

- The model started out in eight (8) community pilot sites in 2005.
- Seven (7) additional sites were incorporated in 2007 using findings from the first round of pilot sites.
- 85% of returning inmates reside in one of these fifteen territory jurisdictions.
- The remainder of the state joined the effort in 2008, fully integrating a statewide reentry model.

Local governance structure:

- Provide as much statewide consistency as possible in the implementation of the MPRI model while protecting local control by the MPRI steering team and other stakeholders.
- Provide protection from legal liability to local stakeholders involved in the MPRI process through their involvement in formal and established administrative structures.
- Ensure key decisions about the design, implementation and oversight of the local MPRI comprehensive plans are part of a formal, clear and open process that involves community leaders, representatives from the DOC, local elected and appointed officials, and citizens who support the crime-fighting goals of the MPRI: and
- Provide an effective forum to conduct public education about the MPRI.

Local Reentry Advisory Council:

This group advises, informs and supports the implementation process along the same lines as the statewide MPRI Advisory Council:

- Build community support for local implementation of the MPRI model by educating the community on how the initiative will create safer neighborhoods and better citizens.
- Each advisory council is comprised of as many as 150 members.

Steering Team:

Members of the steering team develop, oversee, and monitor the local implementation process and coordinate local community involvement in the overall statewide MPRI process. The steering team is led by four co-chairs:

- The warden of a local prison from where the inmates will be released
- A parole supervision representative from the local DOC Field Operations Administration Office.
- Two (2) community representatives drawn from the large number of local faith-based, human service and planning organizations that are critical to the local reentry effort.
- Members of each steering team represent the service modalities that must be included in successful reentry planning.
- MPRI has a mandate for multi-agency collaboration and participation.

Transition Team:

The transition team supports offenders in the transition planning process and guides the offender from the institution back into the community through a case management approach.

- Led by the Field Operations Administration parole representative, who also serves as one of the co-chairs of the steering team.
- Team comprised of key local service providers, drawn from the membership of the steering teams.
- Major responsibilities include essential local input to develop and implement the transition accountability plans for the reentry, community supervision and discharge phases of the MPRI model.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

The Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan's (MCORP) primary goals to reduce recidivism are to:

- Increase case management collaboration between caseworkers in prison and supervision agents in the community
- Reduce caseloads
 1. For caseworkers, from standard client caseload of 80-90 to a caseload of 35-40
 2. For supervision agents, from standard caseload of 75-80 to a caseload of 35-40
- Establish a steering committee
- Creating a Reentry Services Unit at the DOC
- Establishing advisory groups at the county level, comprised of local leaders and service providers
- Foster interagency collaborations, including
 1. DOC and Department of Human Services (fund a child support liaison)
 2. DOC and Department of Public Safety (to create state identification documents)
 3. DOC and Department of Employment and Economic Development (offender employment workshops)
 4. DOC and Public Defender's Office (create a law school clinic for ex-offenders)
 5. DOC and community organizations (listening sessions)
- Increasing access to the following services:
 1. Employment
 2. Housing
 3. Educational and vocational programming
 4. Chemical dependency treatment
 5. Income support
 6. Community support (mentoring, restorative justice circles and faith-based support)

MCORP Results on Recidivism:

- Scope of pilot program: 269 offenders; 175 were enrolled in MCORP and 94 comprised the control group:
 - Lowered risk of re-arrest for a new offense by 37%.
 - Lowered risk of reconviction for a new crime by 43%.
 - Lowered risk of re-incarceration for a new felony offense by 57%.

MCORP Offenders were:

- 91% more likely to have found employment within six (6) months.
- 80% less likely to be homeless.
- 17 times more likely to report having any social support.
- Four (4) times more likely to participate in mentoring, restorative justice circles, and faith-based support.
- Three (3) times more likely to participate in educational programming.

STATE OF WISCONSIN

- The Council on Offender Reentry was created by the Wisconsin Legislature; effective in 2010
- Organized in Madison, the state capital at the DOC.
- Responsibilities include: making policy recommendations, working to improve agency coordination and communication, and supporting the implementation of the Reentry Business Plan Workgroup

Reentry Business Plan Workgroup:

- Initial five (5) year plan was adopted in 2008.
- A revised plan for the next five (5) years was adopted in 2011
- Evaluated periodically by the Reentry Executive Team
- Monitored quarterly by the Reentry Business Plan Workgroup

Characteristics of Wisconsin Reentry Initiatives:

- Implementation of Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Solutions (COMPAS) a risk and needs assessment and unified case planning system.
- COMPAS used for offenders from first day in prison until end of post-release supervision.
- Risk assessment is statistically based and automated.
- Goal is to end silo approach in favor of coordinated and unified case management.
- Focus is on evidence based practices (EBP) and on abandoning that which doesn't work.
 1. Creation of an evidence based program manager position.
 2. From 2010–2011, over 70% of Wisconsin Division of Community Corrections field personnel received training on EBP and COMPAS.
 3. Emphasis on fitting interventions to criminogenic need.

- **The Unified Corrections Coalition:**

1. Brings together personnel from DOC, county and state courts, and Northpointe, the COMPAS vendor.
2. Purpose is to implement COMPAS with unified case plans and to integrate EBPs.

- **Program Evaluation: the Corrections Program Checklist (CPC):**

Wisconsin DOC contracted with the University of Cincinnati located in Cincinnati, Ohio to administer the CPC. The CPC is used to evaluate program integrity, capacity, and content.

STATE OF FLORIDA

Florida's reentry efforts have been discussed on the state level, but there are no council-coordinated efforts to implement seamless reentry services for people returning to communities from incarceration. Legislation was passed that required the Florida DOC to provide up to six (6) months of case management for inmates prior to their release back into the community; however, this Florida DOC-driven program is not recommended as a best practice. Along with this legislation were efforts at the county level, which included a number of programs and initiatives but these initiatives programs were operated in a coordinated effort.

Targeted Florida Reentry Communities Include:

- Duval County and Jacksonville
- Miami-Dade County and Miami
- Palm Beach County and Palm Beach
- Hillsborough County
- Lee County
- Pinellas County

Target Reentry Need Areas for Florida:

- Identification documents
- Housing and transitional housing
- Employment and job readiness
- Case management
- Mental health and intervention pre-release
- Transportation
- Policy

Currently, there is no hard data on the effects of the current initiatives in these six (6) counties. Florida publishes state re-arrest rates. However, these numbers do not reflect a direct correlation between reentry programs and a reduction in re-arrest rates. Several of Florida's reentry experts in each county indicate that because the programs are so young, the state does not have any evaluation data.

STATE OF INDIANA

Indiana's reentry efforts are driven by the state's DOC. Along with Florida, Indiana is part of the original TPC model that was led by the NIC in 2001.

The state of Indiana has an employment hiring policy similar to the City of Austin and Travis County, Texas which bans the felony box on application forms. Additionally, Indiana has implemented policy to ensure ex-offenders records can be expunged if they don't reoffend for a certain period of time. Employers can no longer ask if individuals have been convicted of a felony, but they can ask if they have been convicted of a felony that has not been expunged.

Targeted Reentry Communities:

- Marion County and Indianapolis
- Allen County and Fort Wayne

Reentry Needs in Indiana:

- Housing
- Employment and job readiness
- Education
- Policy
- Case management and pre-release intervention

Data and Results:

The Public Advocates in Community Reentry (PACE) program in Marion County offers an array of services to ex-offenders returning to the community. In 2012, 635 PACE clients obtained and maintained full-time employment. PACE is not a transitional housing facility but it provides wraparound services to clients that include: care coordinated case management, free HIV/AIDS testing and counseling, medical and housing referrals, job preparation workshops, drug, alcohol and mental health needs, Indiana Access to Recovery (INATR), emergency and basic needs, independent job search center, mentoring, transportation assistance for employment and advocacy.

PACE's collaboration with INATR has yielded these client results in 2012:

1. Served 178 clients through the INATR program
2. Achieved a 96.67% follow-up rate (clients complying to plans set by INATR specialists)
3. 49.33% of clients enrolled were successfully discharged from the program with positive completions
4. Increase of 14.61% of clients with stable housing
5. Increase of 23.04% of clients who were employed
6. Decrease of 12.36% of clients indicating use of alcohol
7. Decrease of 14.05% of clients indicating use of drugs
8. Decrease of 1.68% of clients rearrested within 30 days of their appointment

Allen County/Fort Wayne:

The federally funded Weed and Seed Program* in Fort Wayne focused on one (1) quadrant of the city but has already yielded significant results. The specific services offered to ex-offenders include:

- Immediate processing and housing of returning offenders.
- Individual assessments that evaluate the offender's risk to the community and the offender's strengths and weaknesses in education, employment and housing needs, mental health and other health care needs, substance abuse, criminal history, community and familial support networks.
- A corresponding reentry plan that addresses each of the assessed issues.
- Electronic monitoring.

*The United States Department of Justice defunded all Weed and Seed programs at the end of fiscal year 2011.

Offender management and oversight by community corrections, parole, and local law enforcement personnel provide:

- Provision of support services in a secure setting.
- Regular judicial review by the reentry court judge of returning offenders' compliance with their official reentry plans.

The support services, or seeding functions, involve providing transitional programs, remedial education, employment readiness and job development services, mental health and other health care services, substance abuse treatment, housing, and help in developing support systems that may involve family and faith-based and other neighborhood organizations.

Some of these services are provided by the existing human service systems in the community; most are provided at the Community Corrections Center, particularly following initial release

Indiana Data:

The City of Fort Wayne has seen a significant reduction in recidivism:

- The percentage of individuals who participated in the program for more than two (2) years and were rearrested within one (1) year of release was reduced from 45% to 22.5%.
- A cost avoidance evaluation showed the financial benefit of the program. The evaluation estimated a savings to the community of nearly two (2) million dollars when comparing the number of crimes committed by participants in the program to the crimes the participants would have been expected to commit had they not been in the program. In addition, the target neighborhood experienced a 13.5% reduction in crime.

REFERENCES

Agerton, M. (personal communication, June 20, 2013)

Bolotin, F. "Gcirp completes its three-year mission." *Cuyahoga County Reentry Review*. Retrieved from http://reentry.cuyahogacounty.us/pdf_reentry/en-US/Newsletters/Sept2012.pdf

Consensus Building Institute, Retrieved online July 2013 from: <http://www.cbuilding.org/publication/case/facilitating-work-exoffender-reentry-policy-council>

"County reentry task force." (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.oasas.ny.gov/cj/TPCI/CRTF.cfm>

Council on State Governments. "Reentry Fact Sheet" *Reentry Policy Council* (2005).

Crews, M. D. "Florida Department of Corrections: Community Corrections." (2010) Retrieved from <http://www.dc.state.fl.us/pub/annual/0910/ar-cc-reentry.html>

Hansford, D. (personal communication, June 26, 2013).

Harding, D.J., Wyse, J., Dobson, C., Morenoff, J. (2011). "Making ends meet after prison: How former prisoners use employment, social support, public benefits, and crime to meet their basic material needs." *National Poverty Center Working Paper Series*. No. 11-25. Retrieved from: http://www.npc.umich.edu/publications/working_papers/

"Ideas for an Open Society," *Open Society Institute* (November 2003).

Inside Out: A Plan to Reduce Recidivism and Improve Public Safety (2007). Report from the Community Safety and Reentry Commission. State of Illinois.

Indiana Department of Corrections. "Road to Reentry: Reentry Resources." (2013) Retrieved from <http://www.in.gov/idoc/reentry/2715.htm#Family>

La Vigne, N., et al., "A Portrait of Prisoner ReEntry in Illinois" *The Urban Institute* (2003)

Nichols, J. (personal communication, June 27, 2013)

Public Advocates in Community Reentry. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.paceindy.org/> on June 15, 2013.

Schranz, D. "Coordinating Community Development: The Heart of the Michigan Prisoner ReEntry Initiative" *Corrections Today* (2007).

"Status Report on Offender Transitional and Reentry Services" (2012). Office of the Secretary of Public Safety. Commonwealth of Virginia.

“The Ohio ex-offender reentry coalition.” (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.reentrycoalition.ohio.gov/default.html>

The United States Conference of Mayors. “Status of ex-offender reentry efforts: A 79-city survey. *City Policy Associates*. (2009).

Travis, J. “But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry.” *Urban Institute* (2005): ISBN 0-87766-750-0.

SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL RESEARCH MATERIALS

Freeman R. (2003) Can We Close the Revolving Door?: Recidivism vs. Employment of Previously incarcerated persons in the U.S. *Urban Institute*.

Holzer H, Raphael S, Stoll M. (2003) Employment Barriers Facing Previously incarcerated persons. *Urban Institute*.

Inciardi J, Martin S, Butzin C, Hooper R, Harrison L. (1997) An effective model of prison-based treatment for drug-involved offenders. *J Drug Issues* 1997, 27(2):261-278.

Knight K, Simpson D, Hiller M. (1999) In-prison therapeutic communities in Texas: 3 year reincarceration outcomes. *The Prison Journal* 1999, 79(3):337-351.

Petersilia, J. (2004) What Works in Prisoner Reentry? Reviewing and Questioning the Evidence. *Federal Probation* 68: 4-8.

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. (2000) Extra Help Takes Parolees Only So Far. Retrieved from: <http://www.rwjf.org/portfolios/resources/grantsreport.jsp?filename=020660s.htm&jajd=131&gsa=1>

Rossman S, Sridharan S, Buck J. (1998) The Impact of the Opportunity to Succeed Program on Employment Success. *National Institute of Justice Journal*

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

Solomon A, Johnson K, Travis T, McBride E. (2004) From Prison to Work: The Employment Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry. A Report of the Reentry Roundtable. *Urban Institute*.

Urban Institute. (2004) Family Support is Key to Staying Out of Prison, Say Previously incarcerated persons in Chicago. www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=900762

Western, Bruce. “Reentry: Reversing Mass Imprisonment.” *Boston Review*, July/August 2008. www.bostonreview.net/BR33.4/western.php.

For More Information, contact: Jeri Houchins, Administrative Director 512-873-4959 jeri jeanw@gmail.com

APPENDIX

I

State Structure	IDENTIFIED POPULATION NEEDS															NON-DIRECT SERVICE						
	Housing	Employment	Education	Public Safety	Health/Bhealth	Faith, fam, comm	Substance A	ID docts	Resource Fairs	Continuum of Care	Case Management	Flat-Discharge Ex-Offender Services	intervention prior to release	Debt/financial obligations	Transportation	Portal of Entry	Ex-offender guided	Policies	Neighborhood Initiatives	DOC Led	Resource List	
STATE SUPPORTED REENTRY INITIATIVES	<u>MICHIGAN COUNCILS</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grand Rapids	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Washtenaw County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	<u>ILLINOIS COUNCILS</u>	-																				
	Cook County/Chicago	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Collar County Region	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	St. Clair/Madison	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Winnebago County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Champaign/Vermillion	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Macon County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Peoria County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Sangamon County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Rock Island County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	Jefferson County	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x				
	<u>VIRGINIA (34 councils)</u>																					
Richmond	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x		x	x					

<u>WISCONSIN</u>															
Wisconsin, State level	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x			x	x
Green Lake County/Markesan	x	x	x		x	x	x	x						x	
Bayfield County/Washburn Counties															

REGIONAL REENTRY INITIATIVES	<u>NEW YORK COUNCILS</u>														
	Albany County/Albany	x	x	x		x	x	x			x			x	
	Erie County/ Buffalo													x	x
	Onondaga County/Syracuse													x	x

REGIONAL REENTRY INITIATIVES	<u>OHIO COUNCILS</u>														
	Franklin County/Columbus													x	x
	Cuyahoga County/Cleveland		x	x		x	x		x		x			x	x
	Hamilton County/Cincinnati													x	x

REGIONAL REENTRY INITIATIVES	<u>TEXAS COUNCILS</u>														
	Bexar													x	x
	Tarrant													x	x
	Travis												recommendations made	x	x
	Dallas													x	x
	Houston													x	x

x (Restore Rundberg)

