

COACHING PACKET

A Framework for Offender Reentry

One in a series of Coaching Packets designed
to assist jurisdictions in the implementation
of effective practices that will support
successful offender outcomes

Author: Gary Kempker, Center for Effective Public Policy
Editors: Susan Gibel, Center for Effective Public Policy
and Rachelle Giguere, Center for Effective Public Policy

2010



Coaching Packet Series 1: Creating a Blueprint for an Effective Offender Reentry System

- A Framework for Offender Reentry
- Establishing a Rational Planning Process
- Engaging in Collaborative Partnerships to Support Reentry

Coaching Packet Series 2: Delivering Evidence-Based Services

- Implementing Evidence-Based Practices
- Effective Case Management
- Shaping Offender Behavior
- Engaging Offenders' Families in Reentry
- Building Offenders' Community Assets through Mentoring
- Reentry Considerations for Women Offenders

Coaching Packet Series 3: Ensuring Meaningful Outcomes

- Measuring the Impact of Reentry Efforts
- Continuous Quality Improvement



This project was supported by grant number 2008-RE-CX-K001, awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Coaching Packet Series.....	1
FY 2007 Prisoner Reentry Initiative (PRI) Grantees	2
Acknowledgments.....	3
Introduction to A Framework for Offender Reentry Coaching Packet	4
The Contents of this Packet	4
The Intended Audience for this Packet.....	4
How to Use this Packet	4
How to Seek Additional Information	6
Section I: A Framework for Offender Reentry	7
Introduction	7
Leadership and Organizational Change	10
Collaboration	13
A Rational Planning Process.....	15
Effective Offender Management	18
Conclusion.....	23
Section II: A Framework for Offender Reentry Coaching Packet Checklist.....	24
Section III: Action Planning Worksheet.....	25
Section IV: References and Additional Resources	26

Introduction to the Coaching Packet Series

The Center for Effective Public Policy (the Center) and its partners, The Urban Institute and The Carey Group, were selected by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance to serve as the training and technical assistance providers to the Fiscal Year 2007 Prisoner Reentry Initiative grantees (hereafter “PRI grantees”). The project team served in this capacity from April 2008 to June 2010.

The Center is a nonprofit criminal justice consulting organization based in Silver Spring, Maryland. Since the early 1980s, the Center has provided training and technical assistance to the criminal justice field on a wide array of topics, including transition and reentry, and has administered a number of national projects of this kind. The Urban Institute was established as a private, nonprofit corporation in Washington, D.C. in 1968 and is a leader in prisoner reentry research, focusing on making best practice information accessible to practitioners and policymakers. The Carey Group is a justice consulting firm with extensive practitioner experience in evidence-based practices, strategic planning, community and restorative justice and corrections.

As a part of its technical assistance delivery to the PRI grantees, the Center developed a series of tools to assist grantees in specific areas of their reentry work. The final products of this work include eleven Coaching Packets in three series. These Coaching Packets offer practical value beyond the jurisdictions involved in this initiative and are available to criminal justice professionals and their partners interested in enhancing their strategies for reducing recidivism and improving offender outcomes.

Each Coaching Packet provides an overview of a specific topic as it relates to successful offender reentry, and offers tools and resources for those interested in exploring the topic in greater depth.

- *Series 1* provides a blueprint for an effective offender reentry system. This series provides a conceptual framework for addressing prisoner reentry at the policy level; outlines a strategic planning process to support implementation efforts; and explores the establishment of successful collaborative partnerships at the policy and case management levels.
- *Series 2* addresses key issues related to the delivery of evidence-based services to offenders. This series summarizes the key literature with regard to implementing evidence-based practices; explores advances in approaches to case management; addresses the important role of staff in changing offender behavior; and summarizes research and practice as it relates to working with women offenders, engaging families, and mentoring.
- *Series 3* provides guidance and tools to ensure that reentry efforts achieve their intended outcomes. This series describes methods to assess the effectiveness of reentry efforts and offers strategies for achieving continuous quality improvement.

FY 2007 Prisoner Reentry Initiative (PRI) Grantees

The Prisoner Reentry Initiative (PRI) – intended to support the development and implementation of institutional and community corrections-based reentry programs to help returning offenders find employment and provide other critical services – is a collaborative effort of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance and the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). Grants were awarded to state and local corrections agencies by DOJ to provide pre-release and transition services to offenders and were “matched” by DOL grants to faith- and community-based organizations (FBCOs) to provide post-release services, focusing on employment assistance and mentoring.

Thirty-five states received grants in three cycles of the Initiative during Fiscal Years 2006, 2007, and 2008.¹ Of these, 23 FY 2007 PRI grantees received assistance under this project. FY 2007 grants were awarded in the fall of 2007 and implemented from 2008 to 2010; however, some grantees will not complete their activities until 2011. The FY 2007 grantees provided technical assistance under this project included:

- ✓ ALASKA, Native Justice Center
- ✓ ARIZONA, Criminal Justice Commission/ Yuma County Sheriff’s Office
- ✓ CALIFORNIA, Department of Community Services and Development
- ✓ COLORADO, Division of Criminal Justice Services/City of Denver
- ✓ DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Government
- ✓ FLORIDA, Department of Corrections
- ✓ HAWAII, Department of Public Safety
- ✓ INDIANA, Department of Corrections
- ✓ IOWA, Department of Corrections
- ✓ KANSAS, Department of Corrections
- ✓ MAINE, Department of Corrections
- ✓ MICHIGAN, Department of Corrections
- ✓ MINNESOTA, Department of Corrections
- ✓ NEVADA, Department of Corrections
- ✓ NEW JERSEY, Department of Corrections
- ✓ NORTH CAROLINA, Department of Corrections
- ✓ OHIO, Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
- ✓ PENNSYLVANIA, Department of Corrections
- ✓ RHODE ISLAND, Department of Corrections
- ✓ TENNESSEE, Department of Corrections
- ✓ VIRGINIA, Department of Criminal Justice Services
- ✓ WISCONSIN, Department of Corrections
- ✓ WYOMING, Department of Corrections

¹ The PRI program will end when the FY 2008 grantees complete their activities.

Acknowledgments

Becki Ney, Principal, Center for Effective Public Policy, served as the PRI Training and Technical Assistance Program Project Director. Ms. Ney conceptualized and oversaw the development of the Coaching Packet series.

Madeline M. Carter, Principal, and Rachelle Giguere, Program Associate, Center for Effective Public Policy, served as the key editors for the Coaching Packet series. Ms. Giguere also provided extensive research support to the development of the series.

Introduction to A Framework for Offender Reentry Coaching Packet

The Contents of this Packet

This Coaching Packet provides:

- An introduction to a framework that serves as a blueprint for efforts to implement successful reentry processes;
- A review of the framework's four components: leadership and organizational change, rational planning, collaboration, and effective offender management strategies;
- References to other Coaching Packets that provide additional information on the individual components of the framework;
- A tool to help determine your jurisdiction's broad strengths and gaps in your offender reentry strategies;
- An aid to developing plans to address identified gap areas and prioritize targets of change; and
- References to additional resources on this topic.

The Intended Audience for this Packet

This Coaching Packet was originally developed to assist grant teams that were established to manage local PRI initiatives. The teams were composed of representatives from institutional and community corrections and faith-based or community organizations involved in the delivery of pre- and post-release services to offenders transitioning from prison to the community. The content of these Coaching Packets has much broader application, however; the information and tools contained within this Coaching Packet can also be used by teams of criminal justice professionals and their partners to assess the status of their efforts in implementing evidence-based practices and effective reentry services to offenders.

This Coaching Packet is intended specifically for policy level and mid level management teams who have the authority to make policy decisions for their agencies. However, it may also be useful for mid-level managers who have the authority and responsibility to influence those above and below them, or to assume responsibility for policy changes themselves.

How to Use this Packet

SECTION I: READ THE OVERVIEW OF A FRAMEWORK FOR OFFENDER REENTRY.

This section of the Coaching Packet provides an overview of a framework that offers an effective structure and lays out a blueprint for implementing successful offender reentry policies and practices. Review its content, and if the information it contains is applicable to your work and addresses an area in which you feel you need to focus your efforts, use the tool in Section II to assess your jurisdiction's strengths and gaps with regard to implementing such an approach.

SECTION II: COMPLETE THE FRAMEWORK FOR OFFENDER REENTRY COACHING PACKET CHECKLIST.

As a team, complete the Framework for Offender Reentry Coaching Packet Checklist. Based upon the information you read in Section I, consider who may need to be involved so that you are able to answer the questions thoroughly. Complete the checklist as a group and discuss your responses along the way.

- Rate each item listed in the checklist (yes, no, not clear).
- For items where your response is “not clear,” make note of the additional information the team needs to collect in order to be able to rate this item.
- Add additional items that may relate to your jurisdiction’s implementation of the framework that are not already included on the checklist.
- Develop a consensus-based response for each item on the checklist.
- Once the checklist is completed, consider your jurisdiction's strengths in implementing such an approach. Make note of these.
- Next, consider your most significant gaps. Make note of these as well.

SECTION III: DEVELOP AN ACTION PLAN.

If, after completing the checklist in Section II, your team determines that further work on this topic is necessary or would be helpful, follow the steps below to identify your goals, objectives, and action items, and any additional assistance or expertise needed.

Working as a team, review your findings from the Framework for Offender Reentry Coaching Packet Checklist. Specifically:

1. Determine whether, based upon what you have read and discussed, you desire to advance your jurisdiction’s work with regard to implementing this framework.
2. If you determine you have a desire to improve in this area, write a goal statement that reflects where you want to be with regard to improving your current efforts. Your goal might be to “Establish a common vision for offender reentry among our partners,” “Educate the policy team on evidence-based practices,” “Create a work plan for data collection,” or another goal. Using the Action Planning Worksheet in Section III, note the desired goal.
3. Identify your three most significant strengths in this area and discuss how you might build on those to overcome some of your gaps.
4. Identify your three most significant gaps. For each gap, write an objective. Your objectives might be, “To conduct a team retreat to discuss joint goals and objectives for reentry,” or “To conduct a gaps analysis to determine where our practices diverge from evidence-based principles,” or something else. Note your three objectives on the Action Planning Worksheet.
5. Add the following on the Action Planning Worksheet for each objective:
 - a. The specific sequential steps that must be taken to meet the objective.
 - b. The individual who will assume lead responsibility for this action item.
 - c. The completion date for this action item.
6. Discuss whether additional assistance or outside expertise is needed to successfully achieve any of your action items. For instance, explore whether additional literature, guidance from

another practitioner over the telephone, examples of work products from other jurisdictions, or on-site technical assistance would be helpful options.

- a. For each action item, identify those for which assistance/expertise is needed.
- b. Identify the type of assistance/expertise needed.
- c. Prioritize each of these need areas. If assistance/expertise will be limited, for which action items is assistance most needed?
- d. Begin exploring ways to secure the needed assistance/expertise.

How to Seek Additional Information

To download copies of the Coaching Packets, please visit the Center's website at <http://www.cepp.com/coaching.htm>. To obtain further information on the use or content of this or any of the Coaching Packets, or on the 2007 PRI Training and Technical Assistance Program, please contact:

Becki Ney
Principal
Center for Effective Public Policy
32 East Montgomery Avenue
Hatboro, PA 19040
Phone: (215) 956-2335
Fax: (215) 956-2337
Email: bney@cepp.com

Section I: A Framework for Offender Reentry

Introduction

The growth in the number of offenders incarcerated and under community supervision, as well as the failure rate for offenders released from prison, has placed a tremendous burden on the criminal justice system. Approximately 700,000 offenders are released annually and more than half will return to prison within three years.² Many will be rearrested within the first six months after release. In the United States, the cost of incarceration has grown from \$9 billion to more than \$60 billion annually over the last twenty years,³ a figure that does not include the added cost to the courts, prosecutor and public defender offices, or probation and parole. This ever growing burden on federal and state budgets has resulted in increased interest in the complex challenges of successful offender reentry, encouraging many jurisdictions to reexamine their current policies and practices in the light of escalating costs, limited resources, and particularly, emerging research on methods to reduce recidivism.

PUBLIC OPINION ON OFFENDER REENTRY

Even as correctional agencies are expressing a renewed interest in offender reentry strategies, recent surveys indicate that the public sentiment toward dealing with offenders is changing, creating new opportunities to explore methods of encouraging offender success. As with other areas of government responsibility, the public has expressed a desire for the criminal justice system to be “smarter” and use the knowledge about “what works” and “what doesn’t work” in changing offender behavior to inform public policy. A 2006 national opinion survey indicates that the public supports (by an almost 8:1 margin) rehabilitative services for offenders, as opposed to a punishment only approach to offender management.⁴ Providing these services both during incarceration and following release is favored. A survey conducted in 2009 found that a majority of respondents (61%) agreed that criminal justice professionals should base their decisionmaking on research.⁵

BARRIERS TO OFFENDER SUCCESS

Research has made clear that punishment-driven approaches alone are not effective in reducing recidivism or preventing future crime.⁶ To encourage successful offender reentry and prevent future crime, corrections professionals must address the reasons why offenders become involved in the criminal justice system. Without effective intervention, offenders will leave incarceration facing those same challenges and without the tools necessary to overcome them. Common obstacles to offenders’ success include:

- ✓ **Education Barriers.** More than one-third of offenders in prison have not earned a high school diploma or GED and 4 out of 5 have not received any postsecondary education.⁷

² Hughes & Wilson, 2005; Langan & Levin, 2002.

³ Hughes, 2006.

⁴ Krisberg & Marchionna, 2006.

⁵ NIC, 2010.

⁶ Andrews, 2007; Aos, Miller, & Drake, 2006; Aos, Phipps, Barnoski, & Lieb, 2001; Gendreau, Goggin, & Cullen, 1999; Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews, 2001; Hughes, Wilson, & Beck, 2001; Langan & Levin, 2002; Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau, 2002.

⁷ Brazzell et al., 2009.

While most prisons offer educational classes (e.g., Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education), only a portion of inmates receive these services. In fact, between 2000 and 2005, the number of prisons offering these services decreased.⁸

- ✓ **Employment Barriers.** Furthermore, the lack of job skills, the deterioration of skills while incarcerated (1/3 of offenders receive vocational training while they are incarcerated⁹), intermittent work histories, and the stigma of being in prison make finding legitimate and well-paying employment in the community difficult.¹⁰
- ✓ **Substance Abuse and Addiction.** Fifty-three percent (53%) of male state prisoners and 60% of female state prisoners meet the DSM-IV drug dependence or abuse criteria.¹¹ This is four times the rate of addiction experienced by the general population.¹² Yet only about one in every ten offenders participates in substance abuse programming prior to release.¹³
- ✓ **Mental Health Concerns.** Mental health problems affect the majority of both male (55%) and female (73%) adults in prison.¹⁴ Women offenders often suffer from depression, anxiety disorders (e.g., PTSD), and eating disorders, while substance abuse and antisocial personality disorders are more prevalent among men.¹⁵
- ✓ **Homelessness.** For offenders who may have been homeless prior to incarceration and struggle to find sustainable, affordable housing after release,¹⁶ fewer than ten percent will have the opportunity to live in a halfway house or other community release center.¹⁷
- ✓ **Caring for Children.** For the majority of offenders (55%) who have dependent children,¹⁸ reentry brings an increased responsibility for the physical, emotional, and financial wellbeing of others.
- ✓ **Other Survival Concerns.** For offenders who are released from prison without the necessary identification (e.g., birth certificate, state issued identification) and transportation options (e.g., personal vehicle, a residence near public bus routes), obtaining appropriate housing, employment, and services can be quite challenging if not impossible.¹⁹

IMPROVING PUBLIC SAFETY THROUGH SUCCESSFUL OFFENDER REENTRY

Despite the challenges facing corrections, never have the conditions for change in correctional practice been as promising as they are today. Correctional agencies and their partners are embracing additional responsibilities and new approaches in order to improve public safety. At the same time, corrections officials are taking advantage of increased access to information on

⁸ Brazzell et al., 2009.

⁹ Harlow, 2003.

¹⁰ Visher, Debus, & Yahner, 2008.

¹¹ Mumola & Karberg, 2006.

¹² NIJ, 2003.

¹³ Hammett, 2000; Mumola, 1999; NIDA, 2006.

¹⁴ James & Glaze, 2006.

¹⁵ Bloom, Owen, & Covington, 2003; Kassebaum, 1999; WHO, 2010.

¹⁶ Gouvis Roman & Travis, 2004.

¹⁷ Petersillia, 2003.

¹⁸ Travis, McBride & Solomon, 2003.

¹⁹ Visher, LaVigne, & Travis, 2004.

risk reduction to make decisions about institutional management, reentry approaches, and post-release interventions, abandoning anecdotal information and historic approaches to crime for solutions based upon research evidence.

Armed with this knowledge, corrections officials and their partners are turning their focus to improving public safety by increasing the success of offenders returning to the community. The changes are complex and often require a realignment of policy and practice around an organizational and operational philosophy that promotes the success of offenders and makes strategic use of scarce resources.

To accomplish such large scale change, a structure is needed to guide their information gathering, decisionmaking, and implementation processes. Such a structure should address all of the key ingredients for successful change, and provide a blueprint for the necessary components of an effective reentry process. The framework presented here is intended to provide guidance in this pursuit.²⁰

A FRAMEWORK FOR OFFENDER REENTRY

As jurisdictions across the nation have worked to improve the outcomes of offenders released into the community, key elements have been identified as essential components to the most successful efforts. These components include:

- ✓ Leadership and Organizational Change
- ✓ Collaboration
- ✓ A Rational Planning Process
- ✓ Effective Offender Management Practices

Success is more likely when jurisdictions address key issues in a strategic way. The four elements of the reentry framework represent a holistic approach to the development of a strategic reentry effort.



²⁰ The framework and concepts presented in this document can be found in more detail in *Increasing Public Safety Through Successful Offender Reentry: Evidence-Based and Emerging Practices in Corrections* available at http://www.cepp.com/documents/CEPP%20SVORI_final.pdf.

Leadership and Organizational Change

To achieve significant change in offender reentry, agencies and collaborative policy teams working toward this goal require strong leadership. The leaders of such efforts must agree that the successful reentry of offenders into the community is a primary goal. Also, they must be willing to examine every aspect of the current system (i.e., initial assessment and case management upon entrance into the corrections system, the transition of offenders from institutions to the community, and post-release supervision and management practices) to determine whether current policies and practices reflect the philosophy of offender success. Achieving such large scale change is not an easy or quick process; longstanding routines, priorities, and relationships may need to be reconsidered and revised to support the new philosophy and vision. Leaders must be able to work collaboratively with others in order to develop and implement an action plan for change. Perhaps most importantly, leaders must have a vision for a new approach to their work, and the necessary qualities to inspire enthusiasm and commitment from others to align with and work toward that vision.

ADOPTING A VISION FOR OFFENDER REENTRY

One of the necessary attributes of a successful leader is the ability to envision – and communicate – a vision for the future of the organization. Successful leaders are able to chart a course for moving the organization from the present to the desired future, one in which offenders are productive members of the community. Without an appreciation of the intended destination, even well-intentioned efforts can become fragmented or disconnected.

QUALITIES OF EFFECTIVE LEADERS

It is important to note that effective collaborative leaders are sometimes, but not always, those who occupy the positions of authority within an agency or community. Regardless of their position, it is the skills that leaders offer that make a difference in the success of their teams. Although the information in this Coaching Packet is intended for policy level and mid-management staff, it is important that policy teams recognize and take advantage of others in their agencies and organizations who demonstrate leadership qualities, as they can be important to organizational change efforts in their ability to influence their colleagues.

In addition to communicating a vision for successful reentry, leaders of collaborative teams should:²¹

- ✓ Be clear about their goals and committed to achieving them.
- ✓ Give their team members permission to excel, be creative, and push the envelope.
- ✓ Motivate their team members by providing direction, not criticism.

²¹ Adapted from Carter, 2006.

What is the emerging “vision” for offender reentry?

There is growing consensus among many state and local agencies that their vision is to collaboratively develop strategies that will promote a greater likelihood of offender success following release.

This vision translates into a reduction of recidivism and enhanced public safety as a result of fewer crimes, fewer victims, and more offenders living productive lives in the community.

- ✓ Understand the importance of collaboration and the need to bring diverse stakeholders to the table.
- ✓ Possess skills such as a willingness to take risks, listen well, and seek new information.
- ✓ Possess qualities such as a passion for reentry, optimism, and a desire to put the team's interests ahead of their own.
- ✓ Be able to manage the team process (e.g., establish a work process, facilitate meetings, develop goals and objectives to reach the team's vision).
- ✓ Exhibit excellent interpersonal skills (e.g., the ability to build consensus among team members, manage conflict, build trust, read other's needs).
- ✓ Offer political skills such as being able to negotiate relationships and garner support from outside the team.

Leadership alone, however, will not guarantee success. A thoughtful and strategic approach to organizational change is also necessary.

“Leaders must promote overall objectives so that the direction of the [effort] can be fully understood and appreciated, yet they must also involve others in determining the most appropriate and effective means for reaching particular goals.”

-CEPP, 2007.

A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

In addition to strong leadership, a strategic approach to organizational change is necessary to overcome possible resistance and foster commitment. Leaders may consider the following strategies when preparing their teams, partners, and others within the jurisdiction to adopt a vision for public safety through successful offender reentry:²²

- ✓ ***Recognize that change does not happen overnight.*** In many jurisdictions, corrections professionals and their partners have seen leadership establish and then change priorities with regard to organizational goals depending on the events of the moment. It is not unusual for these individuals to become resistant to change and develop their own values, norms, and beliefs. For these reasons, change can be slow; leaders must recognize that turning the tide will take consistent and continuous effort over a substantial period of time.
- ✓ ***Recognize your system's culture.*** Leaders should work to understand the current cultural environment by listening to others and collecting information (e.g., through the use of surveys, focus groups, or meetings). By gathering information on the behaviors, norms, and attitudes of the present system, leadership can understand the “starting place” for change and build from there.
- ✓ ***Examine your current policies and practices.*** Leaders and their collaborative teams should review existing policies and practices, and consider what messages these convey to both the professionals and offenders in the system. That is, do policies support offender reentry as a critical concern, or do they encourage activities and behavior that create barriers to offender success?

²² Adapted from CEPP, 2007, Chapter 2: Preparing for Organizational Change.

- ✓ **Review the research and share it with others.** Leaders and their teams must become familiar with the empirical research on offender reentry, as well as relevant data from their own jurisdictions (e.g., reentry barriers, recidivism rates) to ensure that they develop goals and plans that are both grounded in “what works” and what is appropriate for their jurisdiction. Equally important is to create opportunities to share this information with others so that they can be included as part of the discussion on identifying targets for improvement and how best to accomplish these.
- ✓ **Promote your new vision.** For others to buy into a new (or revised) vision, they must receive consistent messages about the desired future, why it is important, and the role that they will play in it. Leaders and teams working to achieve successful outcomes with offenders must communicate this path to all those who influence or are effected by it. This can be accomplished through a variety of means including internal and external publications, presentations, and public speaking opportunities.

Tips for Leaders:

Reducing Resistance and Mobilizing Others to Undertake the Change Process

- Communicate information about the change in an accurate and timely manner to avoid resistance.
- Clarify what the impact of the changes will be for each individual/agency involved.
- Ask for feedback and for participation in the plan for change.
- Investigate the reasons (e.g., loss of power, uncertainty of the future, need for new skills) for resistance before deciding on a strategy to address it.
- Identify and engage “informal leaders” – professionals at all levels of authority whom others respect or view as credible – to carry the message of reentry to others.
- Model the behaviors you wish to see in others.
- Target your persuasive efforts on those individuals who are “in the middle” or are on the fence of embracing change. Those who easily embrace change are unlikely to be resistant, and those that are very resistant are unlikely to be persuaded.
- Offer incentives and positive reinforcement to professionals who align with the desired change.

Adapted from: CEPP, 2007, Chapter 3: Preparing Staff for Organizational Change.

Collaboration

Since many of the complex barriers offenders face are beyond the expertise (and resources) of most individual corrections agencies – including housing issues, employment barriers, educational needs, mental health problems, financial instability, social stigma, and family reunification – it is clear that a well-planned and collaborative response from a diverse set of agencies and individuals is necessary if successful offender reentry is to be achieved.

It is important to remember, however, that collaboration doesn't "just happen." Bringing various individuals together – sometimes with competing interests – to develop common goals and clear responsibilities for the offender reentry process can be difficult and time consuming. In return, however, teams will find that their collaborative efforts to address the challenges of reentry will benefit from the diverse experiences, different perspectives, and greater resources their team members bring to the table.

Collaboration is defined as:

Working together to achieve a common goal that is difficult or impossible to reach without the assistance of another.

BRINGING TOGETHER THE STAKEHOLDERS IN REENTRY

In considering the multiple needs of returning offenders, there is the potential for a collaborative effort in virtually every jurisdiction. Collaborative teams working to achieve successful offender reentry should include individuals, agencies, and organizations that:

- ✓ Have a vested interest in community safety.
- ✓ Are directly or indirectly involved in offender management.
- ✓ Work with – or advocate for – victims.
- ✓ Can provide mentoring or positive social supports.
- ✓ Offer educational or vocational services.
- ✓ Can provide for appropriate and affordable housing.
- ✓ Deliver healthcare services.
- ✓ Provide mental health and counseling services.
- ✓ Have the ability to facilitate access to employment.
- ✓ Can provide support and assistance to children and families of returning offenders.

COLLABORATION AT THE POLICY LEVEL

At the policy level, the individuals serving on a collaborative team often will be representing their own agencies and may come to the table with different missions and visions that, at least initially, may not compliment each other. It is very important that everyone involved contributes to the development of a shared vision that all team members can support and work toward. To be successful, team members must find a way to reconcile the goals and missions

of the agencies they represent with a shared, systemwide vision for offender reentry. Determining common values and desired outcomes can be a method to facilitate the development of a shared vision. Most team members can agree that offender success leads to greater public safety and reduced crime, fewer victims, and an improvement in the quality of life in a community.

Policy level collaborative teams should include those with the authority to make policy and resource allocation decisions for their agency or organization. Policy teams operate most effectively when there are equal levels of authority among those at the table. Common undertakings for policy level teams focused on offender reentry issues are to:²³

- ✓ Examine critically the offender reentry process in the jurisdiction, including the policies, procedures, and practices of the various agencies that have a role in reentry;
- ✓ Identify specific needs and challenges related to current reentry efforts;
- ✓ Develop a strategic plan to address the needs and challenges that are surfaced; and
- ✓ Establish strategies to monitor over time the impact of the changes that were implemented, and to continue to make adjustments as necessary in order to maximize the likelihood of positive offender outcomes and increases in public safety.

Many jurisdictions have successfully implemented collaborative efforts at the policy level using a tiered system of collaboration.

- ✓ **Tier I.** A Tier I policy team is a decisionmaking body authorized to review and set policy for the state on reentry issues. Such a policy team is often established by the Governor, and includes state cabinet level executives (also appointed by the Governor) representing housing, labor, health, welfare, education, and economic development, among others. Community and faith-based leaders often are invited to participate as well.
- ✓ **Tier II.** The Tier II team (made up of policy level staff from multiple agencies or organizations) is charged with implementing the decisions of the Tier I policy team. The Tier II team first studies the decisions of the Tier I team (to determine the best methods for implementing those decisions) and then is responsible for providing oversight to the implementation of those policy decisions.

Together these policy teams create an infrastructure for the collaboration by developing policies, removing organizational barriers that inhibit collaboration, and making decisions that compliment the larger reentry effort.

CASE-LEVEL COLLABORATION ACROSS THE PHASES OF REENTRY

Collaboration at the case management level is also instrumental in achieving offender success. In practice, a seamless approach at the case management level requires collaboration across all phases of the reentry process.²⁴

²³ For more information regarding these steps and the critical work activities associated with each, please see the Coaching Packet on Establishing a Rational Planning Process. In addition, see CEPP, 2007 and Burke, 2008.

²⁴ For more information about collaborating at the case-level, see the Coaching Packet on Engaging in Collaborative Partnerships to Support Reentry.

- ✓ ***Institutional Phase:*** During this phase the collaborative case management team (including institutional case managers, treatment providers, correctional staff and others) gather key information (e.g., data and information critical to risk/needs assessment) and develop a strategy for preparing offenders for release. Such a strategy might address those interventions that will be delivered while offenders are in custody and those that will be planned for post-release.
- ✓ ***Transition Phase:*** Approximately 6-12 months prior to offenders' anticipated release, the collaborative case management team reorganizes to include individuals who work both in the institution and those based in the community to prepare offenders for release. During this period, concrete plans are developed including housing arrangements, employment, enrollment in community-based programs and services, among others.
- ✓ ***Community Phase:*** Following release, the collaborative case management team once again is reconstituted to include those individuals involved in providing accountability and support services to offenders in the community. Those involved may include parole and probation officers, community-based treatment providers, community support networks, and others.

Steps to Successful Case-Level Collaboration

1. Share information about cases (and, if new to working together, one another).
2. Establish ground rules for working together.
3. Clarify team members' individual and collective roles and responsibilities.
4. Discuss expectations of one another.
5. Identify the strengths and assets of each team member.
6. Agree upon outcomes for cases overall and for individuals specifically.
7. Develop a strategy for monitoring these outcomes.

For more information see the Coaching Packet: Engaging in Collaborative Partnerships to Support Reentry.

Collaborative teams working to improve the transition of offenders from institutions to the community should consider both the multiple policymakers and stakeholders involved with the offender at the case level. Professionals at both levels have an enormous impact on the way the present system operates and have a role to play in improving offender reentry through the collaborative policymaking and case management processes.

A Rational Planning Process

Given the significant increase in the number of offenders incarcerated and enhanced pressure from the public to achieve results with the resources available, the identification and utilization of a deliberate strategy with demonstrated results is essential to the success of the criminal justice system. Even with good intentions, it is not uncommon for jurisdictions to falter in the change process. Jurisdictions may, with the best of intentions:

- ✓ Act in a reactionary manner, or make large scale changes in response to a single or isolated situation.

- ✓ Succumb to various external pressures, resulting in changes that are inconsistent with the desired goals.
- ✓ Implement new or popular trends that may not be tested or consistent with evidence-based practices.
- ✓ Implement solutions before the actual problem is clearly identified, based solely on the suspicion that a particular problem, need, or gap exists.

Many of these approaches may, in fact, produce change. However, the problem then becomes that the change is unanticipated (i.e., individuals may not be ready for change and try to undermine it) or may not produce the desired results. Reasonable, effective, and lasting change is more likely to occur when a team understands and agrees upon:

- ✓ Precisely where it wants to be and what it wants to achieve.
- ✓ Where it is currently with respect to the vision that has been identified.
- ✓ Who should be at the table – the stakeholders who will bring the skills, expertise, and resources necessary to effectively plan for change.
- ✓ Existing strengths in the jurisdiction or system that can be the foundation for future efforts.
- ✓ A clear identification of the barriers and needs that must be addressed in order to achieve success.
- ✓ The most critical priorities (among what may be a long list of action items requiring attention).
- ✓ The strategies that will be most effective for the team to explore.

Teams working toward successful offender reentry need a system or method to determine where they are currently and how this compares to their desired future. By objectively identifying the gaps, problems, and opportunities available, jurisdictions can move constructively in their desired direction. This process is called rational planning.²⁵

THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EVIDENCE-BASED

A key element in the rational planning process is for a team to develop an understanding of and the ability to apply evidence-based practices (EBP). Teams are less likely to succumb to external

Steps in a Rational Planning Process

1. Articulate a vision and mission.
2. Establish a team to undertake the process.
3. Understand the research on evidence-based practice.
4. Collect information on present circumstances.
5. Determine the strengths and gaps in current efforts.
6. Develop and prioritize goals.
7. Develop specific objectives for each goal.
8. Implement the strategic plan.
9. Monitor the impact of the strategic plan.
10. Maintain momentum.

For more information see the Coaching Packet: Establishing a Rational Planning Process.

²⁵ For more information regarding the material covered in this section, see the Coaching Packet on Establishing a Rational Planning Process.

pressures or jump quickly to solutions when they have taken the time to educate themselves fully in this regard. Thorough knowledge will assist the team to determine what information should be gathered, how the information should be interpreted, and what action should emerge based on the resulting findings. In order to make sound decisions regarding changes to current systems, the team must not only understand how current policies and practices may or may not adhere to EBP, but also how to craft new intervention strategies based on the research. Taking the time to ensure the team is educated about current research findings is a necessary, preliminary step in the rational planning process.

GATHERING INFORMATION

The success of the rational planning process rests heavily on the decisions made by the team about the information they will gather. Information should drive decisionmaking; therefore, it is important that the team consider carefully what information they need and how that information will be collected and analyzed. Comprehensive data on the offender population, the construction of a system "map" that will demonstrate the process of a case from intake through discharge from supervision, and similar information will assist the team in conducting a gaps analysis and lead to the eventual setting of priorities.

Sample Questions for Identifying Barriers to and Gaining Input on an Effective Offender Reentry Strategy

The following questions may be used in interviews, focus groups, or surveys to identify barriers to implementing change and to gain feedback from others on the change process.

- How would you explain the effort/team's vision/mission regarding offender reentry?
- Do you think that everyone (e.g., team members, administrators, managers, staff, policymakers, partners, the public) understands and agrees with the vision/mission? If not, why not? What else do they see the mission to be?
- What is your perception of how others view this effort/team?
- What resources and expertise do you bring to this effort/team? Have they been utilized? If not, why not?
- What are three of your greatest satisfactions with the effort/team's work to date? What are three of your greatest frustrations?
- What suggestions do you have to make the process more effective, rewarding, or inspiring?
- What are the most urgent or important concerns/challenges facing the effort/team over the next two years?
- What recommendations do you have about the effort/team's future direction and priorities? What obstacles do you anticipate? What resources will be necessary to implement these recommendations?

Adapted from: Carol Flaherty-Zonis Associates, 2007, p. 181.

SETTING PRIORITIES

It is likely that a team will develop a very long list of gaps, barriers, and needs as they compare their current practice to their desired future of implementing an evidence-based reentry strategy. Therefore, it is important that teams work through a process of identifying, and then prioritizing, the most important goals for immediate action. Teams have limited capacity in terms of the number of complicated issues that they can take on at any given time. Prioritizing their efforts will ensure that the issues most critical to success are addressed first, while making note of other issues for future action.

MEASURING PROGRESS

Effective planning is an essential ingredient of offender reentry work; however, planning on the front end will not, by itself, ensure success. Throughout the implementation process, it is important that teams collect data in order to measure the impact of their efforts. The team must determine whether the correct steps have been taken to implement the strategic plan and whether the plan has achieved the reentry outcomes the team desired.²⁶ Monitoring outcomes allows for critical interim corrections to avoid derailment of the team's efforts due to a lack of performance or unintended consequences. This is accomplished by developing process and outcome measures that will help ensure that the work is progressing as intended and that desired outcomes are achieved.

Effective Offender Management

The final component of the framework is an evidence-based approach to offender management. Improving the outcomes of returning offenders requires that the jurisdiction adopt evidence-based principles and practices. By using research to guide and shape offender interventions it is possible to identify the approaches and programs that produce desired outcomes. Equally important, research makes it possible to identify the methods and programs that do not work in order to reposition resources to achieve greater efficiency. This section offers an overview of some offender management strategies for achieving successful reentry outcomes based on the empirical research.²⁷

ASSESSMENT

Research indicates that maximizing reentry outcomes requires early and ongoing assessments throughout the phases of reentry to identify offenders' levels of risk to reoffend and criminogenic needs.²⁸ By identifying the offenders who are medium to high risk, corrections professionals and their partners can target limited resources in a manner that will maximize results.

Assessments also help in determining those risk factors in individual offenders that must be addressed to reduce the likelihood of future criminal behavior. These are called criminogenic

²⁶ For more information on performance measurement, see the Coaching Packet on Measuring the Impact of Reentry Efforts.

²⁷ This section includes information adapted from Section 6: Key Strategies in Effective Offender Management in CEPP, 2007.

²⁸ For a list of the Coaching Packets that address the topic of assessment, see Exhibit 2.

needs, which are indicated by the research to be specifically linked to recidivism, the most salient of which include:²⁹

- ✓ History of antisocial behavior
- ✓ Antisocial personality pattern
- ✓ Antisocial attitudes, cognition
- ✓ Antisocial associates, peers
- ✓ Family and/or marital stressors
- ✓ Lack of employment stability, achievement/educational achievement
- ✓ Lack of prosocial leisure activities
- ✓ Substance abuse

Recent research suggests that women's criminogenic needs may look different from men's.

For more information see the Coaching Packet: Reentry Considerations for Women Offenders.

Research also suggests that it is possible to have a greater impact on changing offender behavior when the individual characteristics that impact how offenders respond to interventions are identified. These responsivity factors – which include a wide variety of traits like gender, mental health issues, culture, level of motivation, and functioning level – should be identified as part of the assessment process and considered when determining how best to tailor interventions to achieve maximum benefit.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Research has demonstrated that punishment and sanction-driven approaches like incarceration do not reduce recidivism when used in isolation;³⁰ however, there are correctional programs and services that have been found to be successful in reducing the likelihood that offenders will commit future crimes. A number of these programs are listed in Exhibit 1. Research indicates that effective programs and services share some common elements, such as:³¹

- ✓ Targeting multiple criminogenic needs in favor of non-criminogenic needs.
- ✓ Intervening with a duration and intensity appropriate to risk level (i.e., high risk offenders should receive higher dosages of interventions over longer periods of time).
- ✓ Responding to offenders in ways appropriate to their unique traits (i.e., responsivity).
- ✓ Implementing programming with integrity (i.e., based on sound theory such as cognitive-behavioral or social learning theories, ensuring services are delivered by staff who possess the appropriate traits and skills, etc.).

It is important that collaborative teams interested in improving offender reentry outcomes consider the extent to which the interventions available in their jurisdiction are consistent with the principles of effective interventions.³²

²⁹ These criminogenic needs are based on predominantly male samples (see Andrews, 2007; Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2006) and may look different for women. For more information on women offenders, see the Coaching Packet on Reentry Considerations for Women Offenders.

³⁰ Gendreau & Goggin, 1996; Gendreau, Goggin, & Cullen, 1999; Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews, 2001; Lipsey & Cullen, 2007; Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau, 2002.

³¹ For a list of the Coaching Packets that address the topic of programs and services, see Exhibit 2.

³² For more information on implementing efforts that achieve the outcomes we desire, see the Coaching Packet on Continuous Quality Improvement.

Exhibit 1:
Adult Programs that Reduce Recidivism

- Vocational education in prison
- Intensive supervision: treatment-oriented programs
- General education in prison
- Cognitive-behavioral therapy in prison or the community
- Drug treatment in the community
- Correctional industries in prison
- Drug treatment in prison
- Adult drug courts
- Employment/job training in the community
- Sex offender treatment in prison with aftercare

Adult Programs that Do Not Reduce Recidivism

- Electronic monitoring to offset jail time
- Intensive supervision: surveillance only (no treatment)
- Adult boot camps
- Domestic violence education
- Jail diversion for mentally ill offenders
- Life skills education

Source: Aos, Miller, & Drake, 2006.

EFFECTIVE INTERACTIONS WITH OFFENDERS

As illustrated in Exhibit 1, intensive supervision that focuses exclusively on surveillance does not reduce recidivism but intensive supervision that is treatment focused does have a positive impact. This finding – that surveillance and sanctioning on their own do not reduce recidivism – when considered with the research available on what does work, has lead corrections professionals and their partners in jurisdictions across the country to consider new approaches to working with offenders. Two of these evidence-based approaches include “success-driven supervision”³³ and interacting with offenders in ways that promote positive behavior.³⁴ Both approaches place a responsibility on corrections professionals and their partners to take an active role in ensuring that offenders will be successful following their release into the community.

Success-driven supervision requires that community supervision officers combine monitoring and accountability activities with casework activities as part of a “balanced approach” to working with offenders. Officers continue to provide direction, structure, and limitations (i.e., placing external controls on offenders as appropriate for public safety), while engaging

³³ See CEPP, 2007.

³⁴ For a list of all the Coaching Packets that cover the topics of success-driven supervision and effectively interacting with offenders, see Exhibit 2.

offenders in the change process (i.e., assisting offenders in developing their own internal controls for their behavior) and assisting them in meeting their criminogenic and transition needs (i.e., linking them to appropriate programs, services, and resources). A critical part of this approach includes responding to infractions and violations in consistent, timely, and proportional ways.³⁵

Corrections professionals and their partners who are successful understand that every interaction with an offender is an opportunity to positively influence their behavior.

For more information, see the Coaching Packet on Shaping Offender Behavior.

While success-driven supervision focuses specifically on the role of corrections and supervision officers in successful offender reentry, many of the basic skills needed to conduct this approach are consistent with the research on how to deliver effective interventions with offenders. These skills can, and should, be used by any professional providing direct services to offenders so that all interactions with offenders are treated as opportunities to change their behavior. Research indicates that professionals with the following qualities and skills achieve better outcomes with offenders:³⁶

- ✓ Adhering to the principles of risk, need, and responsivity.
- ✓ Developing relationships or building rapport with offenders (and their families as appropriate) to promote behavior change (i.e., being open, genuine, flexible, non-blaming).
- ✓ Applying motivational techniques to combat resistance and encourage engagement in making positive attitude and behavior changes.
- ✓ Role modeling prosocial attitudes and behaviors.
- ✓ Advocating for and brokering programs and services based on criminogenic needs.
- ✓ Providing incentives and reinforcers for prosocial behavior (ideally using four positive reinforcers for every negative to achieve maximum impact).
- ✓ Employing an effective use of authority with offenders (i.e., using a firm but fair approach, making rules clear, offering choices with consequences).
- ✓ Capitalizing on all contacts with offenders to ensure that goals are being met.
- ✓ Teaching concrete problem-solving skills.
- ✓ Encouraging offenders to practice the prosocial skills they have learned.
- ✓ Responding to violations consistently, in a timely fashion, and with proportionality to the behavior, in order to allow offenders – where public safety concerns are not present – the opportunity to correct their behaviors and complete supervision successfully.

³⁵ For more information, see Chapter 4: Success-Driven Supervision of CEPP, 2007.

³⁶ See the Coaching Packet: Shaping Offender Behavior for more information on these concepts.

OFFENDER CASE MANAGEMENT

To ensure that offenders are managed effectively by the various agencies involved in their transition from prison to the community, jurisdictions across the country are developing and implementing a shared plan of action for each offender, a case management approach that spans the three phases of reentry.³⁷ Case management can be defined as the strategic use of resources at the case level to enhance the likelihood of success following institutional release and discharge from supervision and decrease the likelihood of offender recidivism. To be effective, case management approaches should:

- ✓ Begin with and be based upon an empirical assessment of risk and criminogenic needs.
- ✓ Be comprehensive, including addressing factors that interfere with offenders' abilities to address their criminogenic needs (i.e., stability factors).
- ✓ Start at sentencing (or before) and continue seamlessly until offenders are discharged from supervision.
- ✓ Be dynamic to accommodate changes in risk level, needs, and other conditions (e.g., changes in family life, job status, and ability to comply with supervision conditions).
- ✓ Include a team of individuals – including the offender – in the day-to-day management of the offender.
- ✓ Incorporate the targeting of interventions that are evidence-based.
- ✓ Include the use of engagement techniques (e.g., Motivational Interviewing).
- ✓ Be supported by automation.

Steps to Effective Case Management

1. Assess risk, needs, and responsivity.
2. Determine offender' strengths, triggers, and stability factors.
3. Engage offenders; seek their active involvement.
4. Align strategies with criminogenic needs.
5. Match interventions with risk levels.
6. Balance control and treatment goals.
7. Establish a therapeutic alliance.
8. Have offenders practice their skills.
9. Use rewards, punishers, and incentives appropriately.
10. Make all contacts count.
11. Monitor dosage, intensity, and duration.
12. Involve others – a team of providers, families, and offenders themselves.

For more information see the Coaching Packet: Effective Case Management.

These activities should bridge the institutional, transition, and community phases of reentry to ensure that each offender has a single, individualized, dynamic case plan. When a case management team works collaboratively and armed with a shared plan of action, they are well positioned to successfully impact recidivism.

³⁷ For a list of all the Coaching Packets that cover case management, see Exhibit 2.

Conclusion

The framework presented in this document is intended to assist corrections professionals and their partners in creating a structure for their efforts to implement an offender reentry process that will reduce recidivism, enhance public safety, and allow for better allocation of limited resources. This Coaching Packet reviews only the essentials of this organizing framework; there are a number of resources available for professionals interested in learning more, including the ten other Coaching Packets available in this series. For a summary of key topics covered, see Exhibit 2. For more information on offender reentry (including related topics), see the Section IV: References and Additional Resources.

Exhibit 2: Topics Covered by Other Coaching Packets												
Coaching Packet	Assessment	Case Management	Programs/ Services	Success-Driven Supervision	Staff-Offender Interactions	Enhancing Motivation	Prosocial Supports	Collaboration/ Team Approach	A Vision for Reentry	Planning	Measuring Reentry Efforts	Quality Assurance
Effective Case Management	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Implementing Evidence-Based Practices	x		x		x	x	x				x	x
Shaping Offender Behavior	x		x	x	x	x	x					
Engaging Offenders' Families in Reentry	x	x	x	x	x	x	x					
Building Offenders' Community Assets Through Mentoring			x		x	x	x					
Reentry Considerations for Women Offenders	x	x	x	x	x	x	x					
Engaging in Collaborative Partnerships to Support Reentry		x						x	x	x	x	
Establishing A Rational Planning Process								x	x	x		
Measuring the Impact of Reentry Efforts									x	x	x	
Continuous Quality Improvement	x	x	x		x					x	x	x

Section II: A Framework for Offender Reentry Coaching Packet Checklist³⁸

A Framework for Offender Reentry	YES	NO	NOT CLEAR	NOTES
1. Are collaborative teams for offender reentry established at the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy level? • Case level? 				
2. Does the team have a shared vision for reentry?				
3. Are the appropriate stakeholders involved in reentry efforts?				
4. Is there a shared commitment to work towards the vision and goals of reentry?				
5. Is there an effective leader(s) in place to guide your efforts?				
6. Does the leader of the effort: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide clear direction (e.g., is clear regarding vision/goals)? • Motivate others? • Work in a collaborative manner? 				
7. Are all stakeholders knowledgeable about evidence-based practices in reentry?				
8. Has the jurisdiction's strengths and gaps been identified in regards to fulfilling its vision for offender reentry?				
9. Have strategies for reducing gaps/barriers been identified?				
10. Has the jurisdiction prioritized the most significant needs/gaps?				
11. Does the jurisdiction have a strategic plan for achieving its prioritized goals that is shared by all stakeholders?				
12. Has the jurisdiction developed outcome and process measures to monitor the impact of the strategic plan?				
13. Do case level collaborative efforts occur at the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional phase? • Transition phase? • Community phase? 				
14. Are offender assessments conducted to identify level of risk, criminogenic needs, and responsivity factors?				
15. Do the results of these assessments drive case management planning?				
16. Do the results of these assessments regarding risk level dictate the duration and intensity of interventions (i.e., programs/services)?				
17. Do the results of these assessments regarding criminogenic needs inform the types of programs/services received by offenders?				
18. Are the programs and services available in the jurisdiction demonstrated to be effective (i.e., are they proven to reduce recidivism)?				

³⁸ Readers are encouraged to utilize the checklists in the other Coaching Packets in this series for a more comprehensive assessment in these areas: collaboration, rational planning, and effective offender management practices.

Section III: Action Planning Worksheet

GOAL:			
Objective 1:			
Tasks	Lead Person	Completion Date	Assistance/Expertise Needed
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
Objective 2:			
Tasks	Lead Person	Completion Date	Assistance/Expertise Needed
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
Objective 3:			
Tasks	Lead Person	Completion Date	Assistance/Expertise Needed
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

Section IV: References and Additional Resources

References

- Andrews, D.A. (2007). Principles of effective correctional programs. In L.L. Motiuk & R.C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on Effective Correctional Programming*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J.S. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52(1): 7-27.
- Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-Based Public Policy Options to Reduce Future Prison Construction, Criminal Justice Costs, and Crime Rates*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Aos, S., Phipps, P., Barnoski, R., & Lieb, R. (2001). *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Bloom, B., Owen, B. & Covington, S. (2003). *Gender-Responsive Strategies: Research, Practice, and Guiding Principles for Women Offenders*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Available at: <http://www.nicic.org/pubs/2003/018017.pdf>.
- Brazzell, D., Crayton, A., Mukamal, D., Solomon, A., & Lindahl, N. (2009). *From the Classroom to the Community: Exploring the Role of Education during Incarceration and Reentry*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Available at: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411963_classroom_community.pdf
- Burke, P. (2008). *TPC Handbook: Implementing the NIC Transition from Prison to Community Model*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.
- Carol Flaherty-Zonis Associates (2007). *Building Culture Strategically: A Team Approach for Corrections*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.
- Carter, M. (2006). *The Importance of Collaborative Leadership in Achieving Effective Criminal Justice Outcomes*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy.
- Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP) (2007). *Increasing Public Safety Through Successful Offender Reentry: Evidence-Based and Emerging Practices in Corrections*. Silver Spring, MD: Author. Available at: http://www.cepp.com/documents/CEPP%20SVORI_final.pdf
- Gendreau, P. & Goggin, C. (1996). Principles of effective correctional programming. *Forum on Corrections Research*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Cullen, F. (1999). *The Effects of Prison Sentences on Recidivism*. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General of Canada.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F. T., & Andrews, D. (2001). The effects of community sanctions and incarceration on recidivism. In L. L. Motiuk & R. C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming: Volume 1*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Gouvis Roman, C. & Travis, J. (2004). *Taking Stock: Housing, Homelessness, and Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Available at: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411096_taking_stock.pdf

Hammett, T. M. (2000). *Health-Related Issues in Prisoner Reentry to the Community*. Paper presented at the Reentry Roundtable on Public Health Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and Correctional Populations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Hughes, K. A. (2006). *Justice Expenditure and Employment in the United States, 2003*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at: <http://www.unlv.edu/centers/crimestats/pdf/jeeus03.pdf>

Hughes, T., & Wilson, D. (2005). *Reentry Trends in the United States* (Web site). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/reentry/reentry.htm>

Hughes, T., Wilson, D., & Beck, A. (2001). *Trends in State Parole, 1990–2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

James, D. & Glaze, L. (2006). *Special Report: Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at: <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/mhppji.pdf>.

Kassebaum, P. (1999). *Substance Abuse Treatment for Women Offenders: Guide to Promising Practices*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. Available at: <http://www.treatment.org/TAPS/Tap23.pdf>.

Krisberg, B. & Marchionna, S. (2006). *Attitudes of U.S. Voters Toward Prisoner Rehabilitation and Reentry Policies*. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. (2002). *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Lipsey, M.W. & Cullen, F.T. (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3: 297-320.

Mumola, C. J. (1999). *Substance Abuse and Treatment, State and Federal Prisoners, 1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Mumola, C.J. & Karberg, J.C. (2006). *Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

National Institute of Corrections (NIC) (2010). *A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Available at: <http://www.cepp.com/documents/EBDM%20Framework.pdf>

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) (2003). *2000 Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring: Annual Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Available at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/193013.pdf>

National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) (2006). *Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations: A Research-Based Guide*. Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health. Available at: http://www.drugabuse.gov/PDF/PODAT_CJ/PODAT_CJ.pdf

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

Smith, P., Goggin, C., & Gendreau, P. (2002). *The Effects of Prison Sentences and Intermediate Sanctions on Recidivism: General Effects and Individual Differences*. Available at: http://ww2.ps-sp.gc.ca/publications/corrections/200201_Gendreau_e.pdf

Travis, J., McBride, E.C., & Solomon, A. (2003). *Families Left Behind: The Hidden Costs of Incarceration and Reentry*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Visher, C., Debus, S., & Yahner, J. (2008). *Employment after Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Releasees in Three States*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute. Available at: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411778_employment_after_prison.pdf

Visher, C., LaVigne, N.G., & Travis, J. (2004). *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prison Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

World Health Organization (2010). *Gender and Women's Mental Health* (web site). Available at: http://www.who.int/mental_health/prevention/genderwomen/en/.

Additional Resources

Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, J. (1998). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Joplin, L., Keiser, G., Wasson, B., & Woodward, W. (2004). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

Burke, P. (2004). *Parole Violations Revisited: A Handbook on Strengthening Parole Practices for Public Safety and Successful Offender Transition*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy.

Carter, M. (2005a). *The Emergence of Collaboration as the Preferred Approach in Criminal Justice*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy.

Carter, M. (2005b). *Collaboration: A Training Curriculum to Enhance the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Teams*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy.

Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A Meta-Analysis of Adult Offender Recidivism: What Works? *Criminology*, 34: 575-607.

National Institute of Corrections & Crime and Justice Institute (2004). *Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: Leading Organizational Change and Development*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, Community Corrections Division, & Boston, MA: Crime and Justice Institute.

Re-entry Policy Council (2005). *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council: Charting the Safe and Successful Return of Prisoners to the Community*. New York, NY: Council of State Governments.

Travis, J. (2005). *But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Travis J. & Lawrence S. (2002). *Beyond the Prison Gates: The State of Parole in America*. Washington DC: the Urban Institute.

Zogby International (2006). *Americans Abandon "Punishment Only" Attitudes in Effort to Reduce Crime*, April, 19, 2006. Available at:
<http://www.zogby.com/news/readnews.dbm?id=1101>