

SUCCESSFUL REENTRY: A COMMUNITY-LEVEL ANALYSIS

*The Harvard University Institute of Politics
Criminal Justice Policy Group*

December 2019

Policy Program Co-Chairs

Ryan Zhang

Swathi Srinivasan

Criminal Justice Policy Group Co-Chairs

Amisha Kambath

Venus Nnadi

Authors

Adiah Price-Tucker

Amy Zhou

Andrew Charroux

Choetsow Tenzin

Emma Robertson

Hoda Abdalla

Jeffrey Gu

Jordan Barton

Maria Keselj

Owen Bernstein

Paul Alexis

Sethu Odayappan

Tabitha Escalante



ABOUT THE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS POLICY PROGRAM

The Institute of Politics is a nonprofit organization located in the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. It is a living memorial to President John F. Kennedy, and its mission is to unite and engage students, particularly undergraduates, with academics, politicians, activists, and policymakers on a nonpartisan basis and to stimulate and nurture their interest in public service and leadership. The Institute strives to promote greater understanding and cooperation between the academic world and the world of politics and public affairs. Led by a Director, Senior Advisory Board, Student Advisory Committee, and staff, the Institute provides wide-ranging opportunities for both Harvard students and the general public. This report is the result of a semester-long intensive effort by a team of undergraduates. The Institute of Politics does not endorse specific policy positions; accordingly, all views expressed in this publication should be understood to be solely those of the authors.

2019 by the Institute of Politics. All rights reserved.

Institute of Politics
Harvard University
79 John F. Kennedy Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Tel: (617) 495-1360
Fax: (617) 496-4344
Web: www.iop.harvard.edu
Email: ioppolicy@gmail.com

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Recommendations	4
Background	7
Dynamic Risk Factors for Reentry	8
<i>Health</i>	8
<i>Employment</i>	9
<i>Housing</i>	11
<i>Skill Development</i>	12
<i>Mentorship</i>	15
<i>Social Networks</i>	16
<i>Organization Type</i>	19
Tailored Interventions	22
<i>Race</i>	22
<i>Gender</i>	24
<i>Age</i>	28
<i>Type of Crime</i>	30
<i>Type of Community</i>	32
<i>Income Level</i>	33
Institutional Interventions	34
Key City Spotlights	35
<i>Tulsa and Oklahoma City, OK</i>	35
<i>Chicago, IL</i>	38
<i>Waco, TX</i>	39
Final Discussion	40
Works Cited	41

I. Executive Summary

The following report details how various factors significantly affect successful reentry, how existing community-based organizations tailor interventions to address those factors, and provides recommendations for the best practices community-based reentry programs can follow.

As shown below, interventions must address health, employment, housing, skill development, mentorship, and social networks, as these factors have the most significant impact on reentry success. This report then goes on to analyze how the magnitude of the success of the above interventions are mediated by factors such as race, gender, age, type of crime, type of community, and income level. The presence of these factors requires reentry programs to tailor their services in order to address the unique needs of the populations they serve. Examples of community-based organizations that successfully address all of these risk factors are provided. The next section compares the strengths and weaknesses of both community and governmental reentry programs, discussing areas in which each type of organization is more effective, and suggesting ways in which they can partner with each other to maximize success. The paper ends with highlights of four American cities with large reentering populations – Tulsa and Oklahoma City, OK; Chicago, IL; and Waco, TX – that employ successful combinations of both community and governmental reentry programs in order to reduce recidivism rates in their communities.

Using information on what issues community-based reentry programs should prioritize and how they can best address these issues, this report provides recommendations best reentry practices for community organizations. The tailored interventions section lists important considerations to keep in mind when implementing the general recommendations as listed below:

Given the fact that research and practice typically move on separate tracks, this report urges reentry programs to take time to evaluate their services and incorporate takeaways from existing reentry research into their practices in order to maximize reentry success and reduce recidivism rates.

II. Recommendations

Our research showed that several dynamic risk factors – namely health, employment, housing, skill development, mentorship, social networks, and organization type – significantly affect the success of reentry. Thus, community-based organizations aiming to facilitate successful reentry and reduce recidivism rates should place special emphasis on addressing these risk factors.

I. HEALTH

Community-based organizations should prioritize providing reentering citizens with quality health care that properly addresses any mental health, physical health, and substance abuse conditions. Although community-based organizations typically have limitations to providing formal healthcare services, many have successfully addressed health needs through support groups and counseling services.¹ Community-based organizations should work with correctional institutions and the state government in this area especially because governments typically have access to data on the health needs of incarcerated individuals.²

In particular, female reentering citizens often have greater health-related needs than the general reentering population.³ Thus, organizations should specifically target services to women, especially in the form of trauma and counseling services, as practiced by STRIVE in Waco, TX.⁴

II. EMPLOYMENT

We find that community-based programs that provide training and placement services to returning citizens using a holistic approach in which they focus on both training and job placement are the most effective in ensuring returning citizens' successful reentry into society. Given the importance of long-term employment on recidivism rates, community reentry programs must emphasize placement into high quality jobs with upward potential. Ways to do so include through educational, particularly vocational and GED-based, and entrepreneurship programs.⁵

Additionally, though reentry programs may offer job training and placement programs, the success of these services depends largely on the job opportunities available in the neighborhoods into which their clients are reentering, which makes reentry particularly difficult for people of color.⁶ One way to navigate this issue is for community organizations to partner with prisons to better advise incarcerated individuals on which neighborhoods to return to.

III. HOUSING

Although state programs predominantly account for housing services, there are a few community-based organizations that offer transitional housing, with the end goal of eventually

¹ See section on Waco, TX under Key City Spotlights.

² See section on Institutional Interventions.

³ See section on Gender under Tailored Interventions.

⁴ See section on Waco, TX under Key City Spotlights

⁵ See section on Employment under Dynamic Risk Factors.

⁶ See section on Race under Tailored Interventions.

securing an independent living situation. Many successful programs also provided housing in combination with other services, such as employment services, health services, socio-emotional development, and more.⁷ It is important for such programs to have a specialized focus on communities with the highest risk of homelessness, namely women, Black and Hispanic individuals, and the elderly.⁸ Additionally, since many reentering women fill the responsibility of caring for children who also need shelter, housing for reentering women must be more than just transitional shelters, in terms of safety, security, and affordability.

IV. SKILL DEVELOPMENT

Education

Community-based organizations should provide a variety of educational programs, such as employment training programs, college enrollment assistance and referrals, GED preparation and testing referrals, and vocational training (on site and referrals). Educational programs must be tailored to the unique education needs of different age demographics. For example, youth tend to prefer GED programs are often better served through case management and tailored educational programs based on the specifics of each juvenile's school records.⁹

Interpersonal Skills

Programs that specifically develop interpersonal skills (such as anger management, time management, goal setting and parenting) and target antisocial peer relationships are most important for successful reentry, as these factors, if neglected, have the highest indication for post-release failure.¹⁰ In addition, cognitive behavioral programs that target the attitudes and perspectives individuals may have for criminal lifestyles have proven to be quite effective in reducing recidivism.¹¹

V. MENTORSHIP

Community-based organizations that offer reentry services should also prioritize mentorship programs. Matching reentering citizens with mentors who share similar backgrounds has also been shown to significantly reduce recidivism rates. Accordingly, same gender mentor-mentee pairings, and even same-gender group mentoring sessions, have been shown to be more effective than mixed-gender mentoring.¹² Pairing mentors based on similar racial/ethnic identities is also important, particularly for African American males.¹³

Additionally, youth and adults generally have different priorities upon reentry, as adults usually need more support with vocational training and job attainment and retainment whereas

⁷ See section on Housing under Dynamic Risk Factors.

⁸ See sections on Race, Gender and Age under Tailored Interventions.

⁹ See section on Age under Tailored Interventions.

¹⁰ See section on Skill Development under Dynamic Risk Factors.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² See section on Gender under Tailored Interventions.

¹³ See section on Race under Tailored Interventions.

youth tend to benefit more assistance with family problems, and mental health treatment, and thus organizations should modify the environment and purpose of the mentoring for optimal utility to the mentee based on their age.¹⁴

VI. SOCIAL NETWORKS

Community-based organizations should specifically and strategically emphasize the role of family connection and cohesiveness as organizations which combine services such as transitional living assistance with long-term family support have proven to be successful.¹⁵ It is particularly important to promote familial support among young reentering individuals, as family is generally more central to their social interactions and responsibilities. Moreover, given women's predominant role as primary caretaker of children, both before and after incarceration, reentry programs should specifically address such needs through services that support building stronger familial ties and provide them with therapy, mentorship, life skills training, domestic violence education, and safe homes.¹⁶

While strong family ties have been shown to ease reentry, as reentering individuals often rely on family support upon release, income level can affect the ability for strong family connections to be formed and maintained between families and their incarcerated members.¹⁷ Therefore, programs that subsidize or cover travel and communication costs would greatly aid incarcerated individuals in maintaining close relationships with their families.

A. INSTITUTIONAL INTERVENTION

Given that government programs and community-based organizations often have different priorities in their reentry services, the two should work together, complementing each other's strengths and weaknesses in order to help facilitate successful reentry.¹⁸ For example, while government organizations are also ideal for collecting data that can guide community organizations in their work, as well as referring recently released individuals to community reentry programs, community-based programs are better able to tailor their interventions to the specific subset of reentering individuals they serve.

The rest of this paper provides further analysis and evidence to support these recommendations and examples of community organizations that put these principles into practice.

¹⁴ See section on Age under Tailored Interventions.

¹⁵ See section on Social Networks under Dynamic Risk Factors.

¹⁶ See section on Gender under Tailored Interventions.

¹⁷ See section on Income Level under Tailored Interventions.

¹⁸ See section on Institutional Interventions.

III. Background

Reentry is not an under-studied issue, but it has seldom received significant attention from policy-makers. However, recent legislation such as the Second Chance Act has brought the issue once more into the forefront of policy debate. While the vast majority of reentry literature to date focuses on state or national level policies that create barriers to reentry, otherwise known as collateral consequences, there is limited analysis of what reentry looks like on a community level. While understanding state and national penalties and policies that explicitly affect reentry is undeniably important, research on neighborhood effects and social ecology demonstrate the importance of one's community on outcomes.

Sociologists William Julius Wilson, Robert Sampson and Hanna Katz revisit Wilson and Sampson's 1995 chapter "Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality" in a 2018 article to review the empirical evidence of their racial invariance thesis, which argues that while the causes of crime are largely the same for both white and Black Americans, the structural disadvantages that induce crime are disproportionately concentrated in Black neighborhoods.¹⁹ The authors reference a systematic meta-analysis conducted in 2005 by Travis Pratt and Frances Cullen that confirmed the hypothesis that community-level structural disadvantage is a major predictor of crime, and found that link to be robust even after controlling for factors such as joblessness, low education, skill, poverty, and female-headed households.²⁰

Informed by the significant literature on the effects of neighborhoods on crime, scholars have recently turned to studying reentry on a micro level. Particularly, there has been a spotlight on the spatial concentration of reentry for formerly incarcerated persons. The Boston Reentry Study, directed by Bruce Western, Anthony Braga and Rhiana Kohl, is a longitudinal study following 135 men and women released from Massachusetts state prison and entering neighborhoods in the Boston area. Harvard sociologist Jessica Simes examined disparities in the individuals' neighborhood attainment after prison and found that 40 percent of respondents returned to one of two neighborhoods in Boston,²¹ illustrating the trend of mass incarceration's incredibly concentrated impact on communities across the country.

Given the spatial concentration of reentry and the importance of social ecology, it is critical to investigate how communities that bear the brunt of mass incarceration respond to the unique needs of the formerly incarcerated.

¹⁹ Wilson, William Julius, Robert Sampson, and Hanna Katz. "Reassessing 'Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality': Enduring and New Challenges in 21st Century America." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research* 15, no. 1 (2018): 13–34.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Simes, Jessica. "Neighborhood Attainment after Prison." *Harvard Department of Sociology*, Working Paper (March 2016).

III. Dynamic Risk Factors

This section will cover a variety of factors that affect successful reentry and explain why they are significant aspects to focus on. The risk factors covered in this section include: Health, Employment, Housing, Skill Development, Mentorship, Social Networks, and Organization Type. This section also includes examples of community-based organizations that put these principles into practice and provide a model for addressing these risk factors.

A. Health

The overall health of reentering citizens is a critical factor to their success with the reentry process, as adverse health conditions are highly prevalent among prison populations. A study performed by the Bureau of Justice Statistics from 2007-2009 reported that roughly 60% of people in state prisons and two-thirds of people in jail met the criteria for “drug dependence or abuse.”²² As a 2011 RAND Corporation study of prison populations in California concludes, prison populations also have elevated rates of physical and mental health conditions.²³

Furthermore, outside research has already proven that the health conditions of reentering individuals does affect reentry success. A 2008 Urban Institute study revealed that respondents with physical health conditions had the fewest distinct challenges, those with mental health conditions reported the most overall challenges, and those with substance abuse problems were likely to relapse and recidivate.²⁴ Additionally, a 2019 study in the *Journal of Criminology* illustrated that it is not just that one’s health state correlates directly with the likelihood of crime and recidivism, but that one’s health state affects other factors that are directly linked to crime/recidivism (such as employment, finances, and family connections).²⁵ Because of this, services focusing on improving people’s employability are only marginally helpful because chronic health issues serve as significant obstacles in achieving steady employment.^{26 27}

B. Employment

Employment is an essential factor in facilitating successful reentry of formerly incarcerated people. The positive benefits of employment after release include lower rates of

²² “Reentry Essentials: Prioritizing Treatment for Substance Addictions.” CSG Justice Center. The Council of State Governments, December 12, 2018. <https://csgjusticecenter.org/nrrc/posts/reentry-essentials-prioritizing-treatment-for-substance-addictions/>.

²³ RAND. “Understanding the Public Health Implications of Prisoner Reentry in California.” PDF file. 2008. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2011/RAND_MG1165.pdf

²⁴ Mallik-Kane, Kamala. Visher A., Christy. “Health and Prisoner Reentry: How Physical, Mental, and Substance Abuse Conditions Shape the Process of Reintegration” PDF file. February 2008. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/31491/411617-Health-and-Prisoner-Reentry.PDF>

²⁵ Link, NW, Ward, JT, Stansfield, R. Consequences of mental and physical health for reentry and recidivism: Toward a health-based model of desistance. *Criminology*. 2019; 57: 544– 573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12213>

²⁶ Visher, C. A., Debus-Sherrill, S., & Yahner, J. (2011). Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of former prisoners. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(5), 698–718.

²⁷ Western, B. (2018). *Homeward: Life in the year after prison*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

recidivism, greater levels of economic stability, as well as identity building opportunities for formerly incarcerated people.²⁸ However, formerly incarcerated people face many obstacles in securing a job. As of 2008, the unemployment rate of formerly incarcerated people was 27 percent, significantly greater than the national unemployment rate of 5.8 percent that year.²⁹ Formerly incarcerated people are also significantly less likely to receive favorable responses or callbacks for interviews from potential employers.³⁰ Ultimately, formerly incarcerated people are frequently prevented from securing employment despite the positive impact employment has in facilitating successful reentry.

Community-based programs that provide training and placement services to returning citizens have had mixed success. These programs are structured in a variety of ways, including varying focuses on training and job placement. For example, Exodus Transitional Community is an organization that serves the East Harlem community through educational employment-oriented training and holistic support. The organization manages over five thousand cases a year and has a recidivism rate of only 4%. Their educational programs include soft skills training, GED classes, and one-on-one mentorship. After completing these programs, 78% of the participants were able to secure a living wage employment.³¹

While employment does contribute to lower recidivism rates, the type of employment, including the longevity and wage, plays a big factor in determining successful reentry. In fact, simply having a short term job post-release has no impact on the rate of recidivism. The impact of employment on recidivism can only be found when returning citizens hold jobs for longer than six months.³² Criminologists Sampson and Laub attribute this effect of employment longevity to the fact that formerly incarcerated people are able to develop relationships with their coworkers and employers.³³ Given the importance of long term employment, community reentry programs must emphasize high quality jobs with upward potential. The main factor in determining whether or not returning citizens are able to secure these jobs is education level. Returning citizens of the same education level have similar recidivism rates and these similarities hold true across different races and genders. As seen with the Exodus Transitional Community, these services can be given in parallel with other services that address returning citizens' holistic needs. However, most studies show that no community-based employment program can have the

²⁸ Berg, Mark and Huebner, Beth. 2011. Reentry and the Ties that Bind: An Examination of Social Ties, Employment, and Recidivism. Justice Quarterly.

²⁹ Couloute, Lucius and Kopf, Daniel. "Out of Prison & Out of Work: Unemployment among formerly incarcerated people." Prison Policy Initiative. July, 2018. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/outofwork.html>.

³⁰ Decker, Scott et al. "Criminal Stigma, Race, Gender, and Employment: An Expanded Assessment of the Consequences of Imprisonment for Employment." National Institute of Justice. January, 2014. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/244756.pdf>

³¹ "Exodus Transitional Community." Exodus Transitional Community. Accessed November 25, 2019. <https://www.etcny.org/>.

³² Ramakers, Anke, Paul Nieuwebeerta, Johan Van Wilsem, and Anja Dirkzwager. "Not Just Any Job Will Do: A Study on Employment Characteristics and Recidivism Risks After Release." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 61, no. 16 (2016): 1795–1818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x16636141>.

³³ Sampson R. J., Laub J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609-627.

same impact as natural market forces.³⁴ The biggest indicator of a returning citizen's ability to secure a job is the state of the economy in the community that they return to.

Community level programs designed to teach entrepreneurial skills to currently and formerly incarcerated individuals have also been effectively applied to support reentry. Entrepreneurship programs prepare people for reentry by improving their confidence and teaching skills necessary for economic self-sufficiency. These programs provide short term lessons for successful reentry as well as long-term skills for sustained success. The Prison Entrepreneurship Program (PEP) in Texas was founded in 2004 and teaches skills such as business plans and taxes as well as soft skills such as meeting etiquette and resumes. PEP also provides reentry housing and weekly classes after release.³⁵ The program has had 1,300 graduates of which 100% were employed 90 days after release. Program graduates have also started 112 businesses and the program has been 380 percent more effective at reducing recidivism than similar programs.³⁶ Similarly, the Mercy Corps Northwest's Lifelong Information For Entrepreneurship in Oregon is a 32-week course that covers business planning, re-entry goal setting, public speaking, time management, finance management as well as soft skills such as problem solving and healthy living. The 197 participants have been found to be 40 percent less likely to recidivate. Defy Ventures in New York and California provides online and in person instruction with hundreds of modules and tutorials. The program provides character development training and teaches business planning and financial management over five months. Additionally, for those interested, Defy Ventures offers a nine-month business management and creation course. The program has served 475 people. Participants have created over 100 businesses and 95 percent of participants secure stable wages within seven months. Furthermore, program participants have a 3% recidivism rate. Rising Tide Capital in New Jersey is a 12 week business academy. The program has served 1,385 formerly incarcerated individuals and many have started or joined businesses. Each of these programs follows a similar model of educating currently and formerly incarcerated people in business creation and financial management. These skills are applicable and relevant and also promote a more positive mindset that supports successful re-entry. The success of these programs suggests that community level entrepreneurship programs can have tangible positive results.³⁷

C. Housing

Securing a place to stay is a key part of successful reentry for formerly incarcerated people. Having a stable home is a fundamental part of reentering society, providing a place from which to orient oneself while beginning to search for employment, reestablish social networks,

³⁴ Yang, Crystal S. "Local Labor Markets and Criminal Recidivism." *Journal of Public Economics* 147 (2017): 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.12.003>.

³⁵ Klein, Joyce and Mohan, Lavanya. "Prison to Proprietor: Entrepreneurship as a Re-Entry Strategy." FIELD at the Aspen Institute. September, 2016. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/prison-proprietor-entrepreneurship-re-entry-strategy/>.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

and get treatment.³⁸ Sleeping on the street may also increase the likelihood of rearrest for violation of laws that criminalize homelessness.³⁹ A study of Solid Start, a program for male formerly incarcerated people, found that housing “not only facilitated feelings of stability and independence, it also influenced cognitive shifts in commitment to change and hope for the future.”⁴⁰ Overall, stable housing provides a strong basis of support for individuals reentering their communities following incarceration.

However, there are numerous barriers to finding stable housing for reentering citizens. These range from policies restricting Temporary Assistance for Needy Families benefits for people with a prior criminal record to a scarcity of affordable housing on the housing market.⁴¹ Residing with family or friends can also be difficult for many upon reentry, whether due to restrictive parole conditions or deterioration of these relationships due to time spent in prison.⁴² Others do not have any place that they could potentially return to. Greenberg and Rosenheck (2008) found that 15.3% of individuals in jail were homeless at some point in the year leading up to their incarceration.⁴³ Furthermore, Roman and Travis (2006) detail a host of issues in matching reentering citizens to housing services, including lack of coordination between correctional facilities and local housing providers as well as lack of coordination between housing programs and other reentry services.⁴⁴ These problems can be magnified by an inability to secure employment or other stable source of income upon reentry, making it that much more difficult to make regular rent payments.⁴⁵ Together, these obstacles have contributed to high rates of homelessness and housing instability among formerly incarcerated individuals. One study found that in 2008, 2% of formerly incarcerated individuals were homeless, a rate ten times higher than the rate of homelessness among the general population.⁴⁶ Additionally, homelessness is strongly correlated with incarceration and recidivism as aspects of homelessness have become criminalized.⁴⁷ Even though these offenses are usually minor, failure to pay fines or

³⁸ Lutze, Faith E., Jeffrey W. Rosky, and Zachary K. Hamilton. "Homelessness and reentry: A multisite outcome evaluation of Washington State's reentry housing program for high risk offenders." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 41, no. 4 (2014): 473.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Pleggenkuhle, Breanne, Beth M. Huebner, and Kimberly R. Kras. "Solid start: supportive housing, social support, and reentry transitions." *Journal of Crime and Justice* 39, no. 3 (2016): 380-397.

⁴¹ Roman, Caterina Gouvis. "Taking stock: Housing, homelessness, and prisoner reentry." (2004); Morani, Nicole M., Nora Wikoff, Donald M. Linhorst, and Sheila Bratton. *The Prison Journal* 91, no. 3 (2011): 361.

⁴² Roman, Caterina Gouvis. "Taking stock: Housing, homelessness, and prisoner reentry." 11. (2004)

⁴³ Greenberg, Greg A., and Robert A. Rosenheck. "Jail incarceration, homelessness, and mental health: A national study." *Psychiatric services* 59, no. 2 (2008): 170-177.

⁴⁴ Roman, Caterina Gouvis, and Jeremy Travis. "Where will I sleep tomorrow? Housing, homelessness, and the returning prisoner." *Housing Policy Debate* 17, no. 2 (2006): 389-418.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 405.

⁴⁶ Couloute, Lucius. "Nowhere to Go: Homelessness among formerly incarcerated people." Northampton, MA: Prison Policy Initiative (2018).

⁴⁷ Stephen Metraux, Caterina G. Roman, Richard S. Cho, "Incarceration and Homelessness", *2007 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*, March 1, 2007, <https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/p9.pdf>.

be present for court appearances (out of inability or due to other reasons) can lead to incarceration.⁴⁸

With that being said, one faith-based organization located in Chicago, IL is working to combat homelessness among reentering citizens. Since its founding in 1994, the Grace House residential program (under St. Leonard’s Ministries) has provided “interim housing, emotional and spiritual support, and professional counseling to women who are exiting the Illinois prison system.”⁴⁹ Located on the Near West Side of Chicago, eighteen formerly incarcerated people are housed in a building that includes a library, computer-lab, and other amenities.⁵⁰ According to Grace House, only 5% of the women who complete their program recidivate, compared to the statewide statistic of 35%.⁵¹ In addition to Grace House, the Center for Women in Transition provides wraparound services for women recently released from prison or jail in the St. Louis community.⁵² These services include mentoring and advocacy, case management, basic necessities, and transitional housing.⁵³ The Center operates two apartment-style housing arrangements. Baker House houses 12 women who are a part of the Center’s mentoring and advocacy program and Schirmer House houses 32 women who are fulfilling a state-mandated supervision requirement.⁵⁴ In 2018, only 6.3% of the 126 women the Center served recidivated, which is much lower than the national average of 23.3% for women within the first six months of release.⁵⁵ Some common themes among these community-based organizations appear to be housing that is transitional—aimed toward eventually securing an independent living situation—and housing that is combined with other services, including employment services, health services, socio-emotional learning, and more.

D. Skill Development

I. Education

Education is now more popularly recognized as a means to reduce recidivism. The Bureau of Justice Statistics indicates that incarcerated persons have considerably fewer years of education than the public. Approximately 19 percent of the public has not completed high school compared with 40 percent of people in state prison, 27 percent of people in local jails, and 31 percent of people on probation.⁵⁶ This evidence demonstrates the strong correlation between education and incarceration. Moreover, one study from 2001, which provides the strongest

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ “Grace House,” *St. Leonard’s Ministries*, accessed October 27, 2019, <http://slministries.org/gh/>.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² “Transitional Housing,” *Center for Women in Transition*, accessed October 27, 2019, <http://www.cwitstl.org/store/c1/Home>.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Caroline Wolf Harlow, “Special Report: Education and Correctional Populations,” *Special Report: Education and Correctional Populations* (Bureau of Justice Statistics, April 15, 2003), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf>.

evidence to date that education reduces recidivism, reports that education improves the likelihood of employment after release.⁵⁷

Given that education is an important factor for successful reentry, many community-based organizations around the country focus on supporting education for the formerly incarcerated people they serve. For example, an organization in Mississippi named Parole2Project is focused on assisting released non-violent offenders in starting a new life and getting employed.⁵⁸ One way they do this through their academic service. This community service organization provides employment training programs, college enrollment assistance and referrals, GED preparation and testing referral, and vocational training (on site and referrals). The Post Prison Education Program, located in Washington state, focuses on helping formerly incarcerated people find educational opportunities post-release.⁵⁹ This community organization provides individuals with two years of post secondary education, along with a fund of \$6,700 to help individuals resettle in their communities. Additionally, other forms of educational programming seen in community organizations are GED classes and tutoring. In Little Rock, Arkansas, the OurHouse Organization focuses on reducing recidivism through offering this as an educational opportunity.⁶⁰

II. Interpersonal Skills

Beyond education in the academic sense, people have become increasingly aware of the importance of developing interpersonal skills prior to and during reentry. These interpersonal skills include anger management, time management, goal setting, and parenting. In particular, the factors with the highest indication for post-release failure were identification or close relationship with criminal peers, attitudes supportive of a criminal lifestyle, and lack of education or employment skills.⁶¹

Interpersonal skill training can take place at both the institutional and community levels. At the institutional level, the training is provided in the incarceration facility, and at the community level, these programs are often referred to as “transitional services.” However, since interpersonal skill training requires particularly close relationships between reentering individuals and other members of society, interpersonal training is a factor that is often handled more effectively at the community level. Interpersonal skills training programs often include cognitive behavioral programs, anger management programs, motivation programs, and communication and relationship skills. Cognitive behavioral programs target the attitudes and

⁵⁷ Linda Smith, “Education Reduces Crime: Three State Recidivism Study Executive Summary,” ed. Stephen J. Steurer, *Education Reduces Crime: Three State Recidivism Study Executive Summary*, 2003, <https://www.mtctrains.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Education-Reduced-Crime-Three-State-Recidivism-Study.pdf>.

⁵⁸ “SERVICES,” Paroled2Pride (Paroled2Pride, 2017), <https://www.paroled2pride.org/services>.

⁵⁹ Post-Prison Education Program (Seattle, Post Prison Education Program).

⁶⁰ “Reentry”, Reentry (Little Rock, Our House).

⁶¹ Gerald G. Gaes and Newton Kendig, “FROM PRISON TO HOME: THE EFFECT OF INCARCERATION AND REENTRY ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES,” January 10, 2002. <https://aspe.hhs.gov/basic-report/skill-sets-and-health-care-needs-released-offenders>

perspectives individuals may have for criminal lifestyles and have proven to be quite effective. In one meta analysis by Pearson, Lipton, Cleland & Yee (2002), it was found that cognitive behavioral therapy reduced recidivism by as much as 30% over other methods.⁶² Moreover, one study found that CBT in particular was more effective on higher risk individuals.⁶³

Another comprehensive training program, America Works, found that the comprehensive social skills training helped people who were incarcerated for non-violent crimes the most.⁶⁴ In particular, America Works uses one to two-week long intense, tough love sessions to teach individuals skills needed in the workplace. The program places special emphasis on interpersonal skills, such as communication, time management and anger management. It then uses its connections with employers to place individuals into jobs. In another set of programs, the Rhode Island Department of Corrections programs, women received interpersonal training. However, they did not see significant decreases in recidivism. The reason behind this was that the women were particularly vulnerable to unstable home situations, poor social support and abusive partners that would derail progress. Moreover, one-third of women in the program were released with no job, income or formal job training. Hence, the Rhode Island Department of Corrections recommended transitional living assistance safe from abusive partners, with opportunities to develop and practice skills.⁶⁵

Thus, we can see that for interpersonal skills training, community level programs might be more effective as they would allow for better post-incarceration contact for reentering individuals. There are countless community programs that have observed great effects with their programs. In particular, for individuals with children, parenting training was shown to have great effects on their success rate upon reentry. For example, an Oregon-based program found that graduates of the program had a 48% lower rate of one-year recidivism than non-graduates.

E. Mentorship

Participation in mentorship by reentering citizens is increasingly being viewed as a reliable strategy to improve social and cultural ties, assist in the connection to resources, and reduce recidivism. Furthermore, peer mentorship programs serve as “a key means of ensuring continuity of support for those released from prison, making mainstream services go further and providing employment opportunities for those displaying an aptitude for such roles.”⁶⁶ Time

⁶²Megan Marie Gosse, “THE EFFICACY OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL THERAPY FOR REENTRY: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SERIOUS VIOLENT OFFENDER REENTRY INITIATIVE DATA,” 2013, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3bb4/a5997d15bc5457aa7d1ae00b14f67b373345.pdf>

⁶³ Nana A. Landenberger and Mark W. Lipsey, “The Positive Effects of Cognitive–Behavioral Programs for Offenders: A Meta-Analysis of Factors Associated with Effective Treatment,” *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1, no. 4 (2005): 451–76, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-005-3541-7>.

⁶⁴ Aaron Yelowitz and Christopher Bollinger, “Prison-To-Work.” *Prison to Work* (Manhattan Institute, February 14, 2019), <https://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/prison-work-5876.html#.VRNX82fwutg>

⁶⁵ “Reentry Programs for Women Inmates.” National Institute of Justice, July 1, 2005. <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/reentry-programs-women-inmates>.

⁶⁶ Fletcher, Del Roy, and Elaine Batty. "Offender peer interventions: What do we know." *Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield* (2012).

spent in the criminal justice system often exacerbates criminal behavior by eroding critical social, educational and vocational support.⁶⁷ Due to weakened social ties, those affected by the criminal justice system benefit greatly from mentorship programs that provide guidance and support as citizens reenter society. Denney, Tewksbury, and Jones look into this extensively by examining the needs of people released from prison, and their work revealed that “among the most frequently expressed desired forms of social support were a mentor to guide them to make everyday decisions, peers with whom to share struggles, and a support system to hold them accountable for their lifestyle and behavior.”⁶⁸ Mentorship has been shown to increase job obtainment/security and recidivism rates, in examples such as the Ready4Work program based in the north-east USA. Ready4Work found that those who were mentored were 35% less likely to recidivate after one year, twice as likely to find a job, more likely to stay in the program for an average of 3.1 months extra, than those who were not mentored.⁶⁹ By addressing the social transition out of custody, supporting the vocational and educational pursuits of a reentering citizen, enhancing the success of other reentry services, and overall reducing recidivism, mentorship is a vital aspect of reentry services.

There are further specific examples showing the success of mentorship. In New York, the program Arches was created in 2012 to connect high-risk youth ages 16 to 24 with mentors from community-based organizations who share similar backgrounds. Through individual mentoring, group mentoring, and journaling practices, the program reduced one-year felony reconviction by 69 percent and reduced two-year felony reconviction over 50 percent.⁷⁰ A Minnesota male prison program called InnerChange connects people in prison with volunteer mentors from local faith organizations during the individual’s last 18 months of incarceration and for the 12 months post release. Those who continued to meet with their mentors saw significant improvements in a variety of reentry success measures compared to the control group, including a 44 percent decrease in recidivism for rearrests, a 52 percent decrease in reconviction, a 95 percent decrease in new offense reincarceration, and a 62 percent decrease in technical violations.⁷¹

Mentorship is a feature of re-entry which should be prioritized but is often overlooked by reentry organizations, particularly on the state and national level. However, there are a large number of community organizations that provide extensive mentoring, and the support of these organizations significantly helps formerly incarcerated people succeed when reentering.

⁶⁷ “Evidence-Based Reentry Initiatives Devoted To Strengthening Positive Social Relationships: A Report of the Recidivism Reduction Committee of the Connecticut Sentencing Commission” (September 2012)

⁶⁸ Denney, Andrew S., Richard Tewksbury, and Richard S. Jones. "Beyond basic needs: Social support and structure for successful offender reentry." *Journal of Quantitative Criminal Justice & Criminology* (2014).

⁶⁹ Fletcher, Renata Cobbs, and Jerry Sherk. "Mentoring Former Prisoners: A Guide for Reentry Programs." *Public/Private Ventures* (2009).

⁷⁰ Lynch, Mathew, Nan Marie Astone, Juan Collazos, Micaela Lipman, and Sino Esthappan. "Arches Transformative Mentoring Program." (2018).

⁷¹ McDaniel, Kimber. "Recidivism Prevention Through Prosocial Support: A Systematic Review of Empirical Research." (2014).

F. Social Networks

Generally, for formerly incarcerated persons, a wide ranging social support network will lead to a greater feeling of acceptance and an increased likelihood of being a productive member of society. One of the most critical aspects of a social support network include a returning individual's family. Having a family to depend on after a prison sentence ensures financial and home security. This is especially important because formerly incarcerated people are almost 10 times more likely to be homeless than the general public.⁷² Not having a place to live creates a revolving door of struggle and uncertainty that is accentuated for a reentering citizen.

On the opposite side of this spectrum, one may choose to disassociate with a given social support network because of the potential negative influences and consequences of that given group. Through social bonds, formerly incarcerated people begin to see themselves as less of a member of a criminal outgroup. Additional complications arise for parents who received public assistance prior to incarceration due to many states' restrictions on access to public housing for individuals with a criminal record. These parents are one and a half times more likely to have their children placed in foster care than parents who did not receive public assistance prior to their arrest. Receipt of public assistance may be associated with a weak family support network and an inability to find adequate relative care.⁷³ This may present additional burdens for reunification.

I. Family Outcomes in Terms of Expectations and the Availability of Support

An increasingly important area of research into reentry success is the role that family relationships play in creating successful reentry support, and thus the role such relationships can play in reducing recidivism. From research that indicates parent-child relationships undergo significant stress in incarceration scenarios, potentially creating stresses which may push children into the criminal justice system, to research which indicates that a lack of communication and associated support from family members can create multiple barriers to successful reentry upon release, especially in finding housing and employment, there is sufficient evidence to claim that reentry outcomes are heavily dependent on familial support.^{74 75}

A major consideration community groups must take into account in their application of family-based support is the role of expectations in shaping outcomes post-release. These expectations are most directly addressed by the existing literature as the extent and cohesion of formerly incarcerated persons' family/social groups. According to Christy A. Visher and Shannon M. E. Courtney at the Urban Institute Justice Policy Center in Washington, DC, a notable finding in this expectation framework was the distinction between pre-release

⁷² Lucius Couloute, *Nowhere to Go: Homelessness among formerly incarcerated people* (Massachusetts, Prison Policy Initiative, 2018).

⁷³ Travis Jeremy, *Families Left Behind: The Hidden Costs of Incarceration and Reentry* (Urban Institute, 2005).

⁷⁴ See: Hirsch, Amy E., Sharon M. Dietrich, Rue Landau, Peter D. Schneider, Irv Ackelsberg, Judith Bernstein-Baker, and Joseph Hohenstein. "Every Door Closed Barriers Facing Parents With Criminal Records." *Every Door Closed Barriers Facing Parents With Criminal Records*. Philadelphia, PA: Community Legal Services, Inc., 2002.

⁷⁵ See: Naser, Rebecca L., and Christy A. Visher. "Family Members' Experiences with Incarceration and Reentry." *Western Criminology Review* 7, no. 2 (2006): 20–31. http://www.antoniocasella.eu/nume/naser_reentry_2006.pdf.

expectations in family support to post-release realities, especially for men.⁷⁶ Visher & Shannon's research indicated that men, "had high expectations for the quality of family relationships and family support they would receive after release, [but] they did not fully recognize the importance of family until they had been in the community a few months." This was primarily a factor connected to the underestimation of financial and employment security post-release, causing people post-release to cling closer to family networks for reentry assistance. However, Visher & Shannon also note that this reliance on family relationships is not necessarily problematic in the short term: for the cohort of men studied, 63% cited family support as a major factor against recommitting and 43% noted that maintaining relationships with their children was a major reason to avoid recidivism. This is especially relevant as not all men studied had children, suggesting a higher reliance rate for those in the cohort that did. However, the major unifying suggestion presented in Visher & Shannon is the difficulty of reconciling differences in pre-and-post release conceptions of family support, suggesting the necessary interventionist role of community action in both stages of the process in creating successful family relationships. This suggestion is especially important for women studied in the literature due to the prevalence of domestic violence in vulnerable post-release situations, which may necessitate further support to help transition from such abusive environments.⁷⁷

A major consideration to further account is the relationship between family support and financial limitations, primarily as the ability to support family members post-release and how this influences the quality of familial relationships.⁷⁸ As Fontaine, et al., notes, family support outcomes may become diminished due to lack of resources families are capable to provide to returning family members post-release. For instance, Fontaine, et al., notes: "while family members [report] that the number of activities performed together increases significantly over time ... the number of hardships reported by family members also increases."⁷⁹ This finding demonstrates a gap between positive relationships in families and external factors, especially of an economic nature, that can affect family support. This mainly appears to be that, as economic struggles enhance in a family network, the quality and range of support decreases. This further suggests the necessary intersectional approach that community groups must take in addressing financial hardship and familial support as fundamentally linked exercises.

However, a consensus within the literature (especially that of Visher & Courtney and Fontaine, et al.) is the importance of the "closeness" of family relationships in shaping positive

⁷⁶ Visher, Christy A., and Shannon M. E. Courtney. "One Year Out Experiences of Prisoners Returning to Cleveland." *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*, April 2007, 3–8. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/43021/311445-One-Year-Out-Experiences-of-Prisoners-Returning-to-Cleveland.PDF>.

⁷⁷ See: Cross, Courtney. "Reentering Survivors: Invisible at the Intersection of the Criminal Legal System and the Domestic Violence Movement." *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice* 31, no. 1 (2016). <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/a95c/662dea05b85d61e2661542125a414dfb88a0.pdf>.

⁷⁸ Fontaine, Jocelyn, Douglas Gilchrist-Scott, Megan Denver, and Shelli B. Rossman. "Families and Reentry: Unpacking How Social Support Matters." *Safer Return Demonstration Project, The Urban Institute*, June 2012. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/24921/1001630-Families-and-Reentry-Unpacking-How-Social-Support-Matters.PDF>.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

outcomes. As Visser & Courtney note the value of family ties in the resistance to recommit, Fontaine, et al., qualifies this finding by explaining that more than just family ties, the level of closeness among those ties was the significant factor in reentry success. Closeness here is certainly a subjective factor, but community groups can have a significant role in shaping family cohesion nevertheless. As relational ties can vary in intensity and positive intent, extending services that seek to enhance people's expectations post-release and seek to enhance family support can be critical. Research still demonstrates that the two major dimensions to seek to enhance these outcomes are in increasing relational cohesion, be it by therapy, reentry resource support, and in assisting financial stability for families preparing for a post-release situation.

II. Examples Within Community Organizations

Significant examples of success in the strategies aforementioned include community organizations which combine transitional living assistance with long-term family support. A key example is the STRIVE Program in Waco, Texas, which combines educational and employment-based support for women as they prepare to leave the criminal justice program. Not only does STRIVE provide peer mentoring and counseling and employment support, but also emphasizes the role of occupational stability in creating positive family outcomes.⁸⁰ Jolie McCullough at *The Texas Tribune* notes the case of Candice Diaz, a mother in the program, whose continued successful mentorship has not only endowed her with professional skills but also has strengthened her relationship with her children, as they state noting a positive "difference" in her since her participation in the program.⁸¹ Programs like STRIVE address the major structural positions posed in this section, especially the intersectionality of financial stability and family cohesion; the case of Diaz is one of many in the STRIVE program which have both helped uniquely disadvantaged women in the criminal justice system prepare for successful reentry and subsequently strengthen their familial relationships, which, as this section notes, poses successful reentry factors.

However, programs that exclusively focus on strengthening familial ties are also uniquely of interest. An organization of interest would certainly be The Family Connection Center based out of New Hampshire Department of Corrections. This program exclusively focuses on keeping families and their incarcerated members in contact, through services such as recording books/stories for children at home, requiring parenting classes for incarcerated individuals, and offering parent support groups.⁸² Such group interactions strengthen both the relationship between families and associated emotional importance of family for incarcerated individuals, previously mentioned to aid in curtailing chances of recidivism post-release. The Family Connection Center acknowledges specifically the role of parental neglect through incarceration

⁸⁰ McCullough, Jolie. "New Texas Prison Program Aims to Help Women Leave the System with Jobs Waiting for Them." *The Texas Tribune*, September 25, 2019. <https://www.texastribune.org/2019/09/25/texas-prison-program-help-women-reenter-society-jobs-waiting-them/>.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² New Hampshire Department of Corrections. "The Family Connections Center." The Family Connections Center. New Hampshire Department of Corrections, April 2015. <https://www.nh.gov/nhdoc/fcc/>.

as a high-risk factor for a child’s future incarceration.⁸³ Thus, a significant role is to be played by organizations that specifically and strategically emphasize the role of family connection and cohesiveness, even outside the intersectional frameworks posited above.

G. Organization Type

Among the work exploring various factors that affect the ability of formerly incarcerated people to find successful reentry, researchers have begun to focus on how the types of organizations these reentering citizens engage with affect their reentry and recidivism rates. While we currently lack sufficient research to support a formula for creating a sustainable reentry program that will significantly impact recidivism rates nationally, we are able to draw from research highlighting specific programs and their individual impacts.⁸⁴ The characteristics of these organizations that have proven to have a demonstrable impact on reentry and recidivism are whether it is community- or state-based, as well as the size of the particular organization.⁸⁵

I. Community vs. State

In dissecting what makes a reentry program successful, it is important to understand the two main types of reentry. While one form involves the supervision of government liaisons through parole and probation programs, the other primary form focuses on an individual voluntarily accepting or seeking admission to community- or government-based programs that can provide them with support services that will ease the return to their communities.⁸⁶ Despite the lack of consensus on how exactly reentry programs should be structured, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that community-based organizations often emphasize elements that lead to successful reentry that government-based organizations tend to miss.⁸⁷

Beginning with the influence of government-based organizations stationed in jails and prisons, research has proven that it is often beneficial for correctional staff and facility programs to strive to help individuals acquire a positive view of community in order to help them address and overcome any present issues with mental health or substance abuse.⁸⁸ Men and women face constant struggles with reentry because, as Jesse Jannetta—a senior policy fellow at The Urban Institute—argues, their time in jail often leaves them “undereducated, [with] few employable skills, and frequently suffer[ing] from addiction and other physical or mental health concerns.”⁸⁹ Many of the criticisms of government-based organizations center on the fact that most of these programs focus on work and employability alone. Although these programs are successful to the extent that beneficiaries are able to secure jobs, these programs often fail to target the

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Mosteller, Jeremiah. “Why Reentry Programs Are Important.” Charles Koch Institute. Accessed October 30, 2019.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Mosteller (n 1).

⁸⁷ Thomson, Sakala, King, and Harvell. “Investing Justice Resources to Address Community Needs.” Urban Institute. Urban Institute, February 2018.

⁸⁸ Mosteller (n 1).

⁸⁹ Crayton, Ressler, Mukamal, Jannetta, and Warwick. “Partnering with Jails to Improve Reentry.” Urban Institute, August 2010.

intersection of issues present at unemployment for formerly incarcerated citizens, nor do they focus on success in that particular job. On an even larger scale, these government-based programs tend to fail the communities they set out to help because they are rooted in states that consistently invest financial capital into incarcerating people while never focusing on the root of the crimes that plague the neighborhoods they often target.

These issues often fall into the sphere of community-based programs, which emphasize larger issues of access to social services like healthcare, housing, and economic development.⁹⁰ Given the fact that many of these needs and access problems are not addressed during the duration of an incarcerated citizen's sentence, some programs choose to partner with jails to dismantle these issues from their root.⁹¹ Conversely, research has shown the success of investing justice resources to address the needs of individual communities. In a study conducted by Chelsea Thomson, Leah Sakala, Ryan King, and Samantha Harvell, all of the Urban Institute, the role of community organizers in reducing crime rates was discussed further. After looking at data from the Work and Gain Education and Employment Skills (WAAGES) community-based reentry program in Colorado, it was noted that their initiative boasted a 2.5% recidivism rate for program members returning to prison for new crimes. The study drew a clear connection between these rates and the community- and citizen-focused strategies, emphasizing the necessity of a clear focus on economic development, treatment and counseling, as well as reinvesting in healthier neighborhoods.⁹²

Researchers at the Council of State Governments Justice Center agree, citing the successes of Second Chance Act Grantees as support for these community-specific strategies. These grants provide federal assistance to government and non-profit agencies on their mission to provide employment assistance, housing, addiction treatment, mentoring, or any other type of support that would reduce recidivism. Their study on successful reentry strategies centers on the impact of incarceration on individuals from vulnerable communities, emphasizing the necessity of focus on access issues, but also on specific characteristics of their chosen populations. In the explanation of tailored approaches for specific populations, the study finds that reentry interventions have more success when accounting for characteristics such as age or geographic location of individuals.⁹³ Because government-based organizations tend to focus on a more holistic assessment of issues for the general population of incarcerated citizens, community-based organizations take on the range of issues facing more specific subgroups, such as youth, women, and tribal communities.

II. Organization Size

Beyond research surrounding the types of organizations formerly incarcerated people may engage with on their path to reentry, scholars have also focused on how the size of

⁹⁰Thomson, Sakala, King, and Harvell. "Investing Justice Resources to Address Community Needs." Investing Justice Resources to Address Community Needs. Urban Institute, February 2018.

⁹¹Crayton (n 6).

⁹²Thomson (n 7).

⁹³"Reentry Matters: Strategies and Successes of Second Chance Act Grantees." CSG Justice Center. CSG Justice Center, November 2018.

individual organizations affect their success in facilitating successful reentry. Because of a lack of literature on the effectiveness of different types of reentry programs, it remains difficult to discern whether program size is instrumental in success. In an analysis of reentry and recidivism conducted by Nathan James, an analyst in crime policy for the Congressional Research Service, it was concluded that the way a program is implemented is just as imperative to its overall success as the model it was based on. While there are numerous factors that could result in the failed implementation of a successful program, a pattern of success for intensive individual-focused programs was noted.⁹⁴

Additionally, in the case of treatment programs, cognitive-behavioral treatment is best implemented through the matching of particular therapists to individuals by way of addressing the specific learning characteristics of program participants.⁹⁵ While there is no specific recommended program size, we can infer that these programs function best with smaller group sizes to accommodate for the lack of resources available to most reentry programs and community-based organizations. James Lynch and William Sabol concur, adding that “the size of the returning prisoner and parole populations has increased, but that funding for supervision has not kept pace.”⁹⁶ We can conclude that programs that allow for a larger allocation of funds and mentorship/therapeutic resources for formerly incarcerated individuals would be conducive to greater success simply because of a greater availability of resources.

IV. Tailored Interventions

Although each of the above risk factors affect reentry, the magnitude of their individual effects are mediated by certain other factors that warrant tailored interventions. The factors discussed in this section include: Race, Gender, Age, Type of Crime, Type of Community, and Income Level. This section will highlight how those factors uniquely interact with established risk factors for reentry, and provide examples of organizations that successfully address those specific needs.

A. Race

Race plays a major role in the reentry experiences and chances of recidivism for formerly incarcerated people. One of the main causes of this is the fact that the predominantly low-income, Black, latinx or mixed race neighborhoods that recently released individuals return to often are not conducive to successful reentry.⁹⁷ This is expanded upon by Robert J. Sampson in *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*, who finds that the correlation between concentrated disadvantage and incarceration rates is zero in white

⁹⁴ James, Nathan. “Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reintegration into the Community, and Recidivism.” Congressional Research Service, January 12, 2015. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL34287.pdf>.

⁹⁵ James, Nathan. “Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reintegration into the Community, and Recidivism.” Congressional Research Service. Congressional Research Service, January 12, 2015.

⁹⁶ Lynch, James, and William Sabol. “Prisoner Reentry in Perspective.” Urban Institute, September 2001.

⁹⁷ Robert J. Sampson, *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

neighborhoods, but 0.6 in predominantly Black, latinx or mixed race neighborhoods.⁹⁸ Sampson and Wilson (2018) also study the variation in crime rates across Black and white communities and find similar levels of variation based on ecological contexts for both Black and white communities, implying that race is simply a marker for susceptibility to the concentrated disadvantages in neighborhoods that most induce crime.⁹⁹ It is the spatial concentration of disadvantage itself that largely explains why race is such a strong mediator of successful reentry.

I. Housing

One risk factor in which race acts as a strong mediator is housing. According to a study on the connection between homelessness and incarceration from the Prison Policy Initiative, the rate of unsheltered homelessness is higher for Black than white or Hispanic men.¹⁰⁰ In addition, the same study also suggests that women of color face homelessness at higher rates than white women, with black women experiencing sheltered homelessness rates nearly four times the rate of white men and double the rate of Black men.¹⁰¹ In addition to outright homelessness, housing insecurity is also a problem as many formerly incarcerated people live in marginal housing (rooming house, hotel, or motel). Again, people of color are particularly at risk, with Hispanics being the most likely to live in marginal housing.¹⁰² With this being said, it is clear that housing programs need to specifically and purposefully target these underserved groups, as too many people (of color, in particular) are falling through the cracks. This means that more general solutions to the housing crisis, like the decriminalization of homelessness and the expansion of social services for the homeless, need to explicitly take race into account because experiences vary widely by race.

II. Mentorship

Like most interventions, mentorship cannot be structured universally without attention to intersectionality as people of color often have different experiences than their white counterparts. This is especially the case when it comes to African American men and, more specifically, boys. Black male mentors are extremely important for the development of a positive racial identity, as they serve to counterbalance the negative messaging that these boys have received about themselves.¹⁰³ This is further supported by research that shows that “when minority youth have developed a healthy ethnic identity, they are more likely to achieve more positive academic,

⁹⁸ Ibid, 103.

⁹⁹ Wilson, William Julius, Robert Sampson, and Hanna Katz. “Reassessing ‘Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality’: Enduring and New Challenges in 21st Century America.” *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research* 15, no. 1 (2018): 13–34.

¹⁰⁰ Lucius Couloute, "Nowhere To Go: Homelessness Among Formerly Incarcerated People," *Prison Policy Initiative*, August 2018, <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/housing.html>.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ G. Roger Jarjoura, “Effective Strategies for Mentoring African American Boys,” *American Institute for Research*, January 2013,

<https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Effective%20Strategies%20for%20Mentoring%20African%20American%20Boys.pdf>.

psychological, and social outcomes.”¹⁰⁴ Therefore, a goal of mentorship should be to foster this sense of ethnic identity, which can be most effectively achieved with the presence of a role model.¹⁰⁵

III. Employment

Employment is seen as an important intervention in reducing recidivism; however, race is often a mediator in employment post-incarceration. For incarcerated black men, hourly wages are 10 percent lower after prison than before.¹⁰⁶ Similarly, black men with a prison record have the most difficulty moving through the hiring process - their odds of receiving a callback for an interview or job offer are 125 percent lower than for formerly incarcerated white males.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, black women were 37 percent less likely to receive a positive response from potential employers than white women. This same study showed that recently released white female incarcerated persons have odds that are 11 percent greater than the odds for black women who have not been incarcerated for employment.¹⁰⁸ These statistics show the impact that race has on employment, which is particularly concerning given the importance employment has in reducing rates of recidivism.

IV. Education

Education is another heavily supported means to reduce recidivism in communities. However, factors like race have influenced the impact this intervention can make. In different educational opportunities, formerly incarcerated white males were more likely to identify college courses as being beneficial. Secondary education was also seen to promote higher levels of self esteem, and individuals were more likely to continue their education post-release and not likely to face barriers to employment. In contrast, although black males in this study reported that college education was important for self-confidence and critical thinking, they did not find it helpful in employability. Black males reported that their employment and educational opportunities were most likely reduced by the institutionalized racism in the communities they reentered. Therefore, black males reported higher value in vocational training that provided work skills that made them readily employable post-release.¹⁰⁹

B. Gender

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Loury, Glenn C., Pamela S. Karlan, Loïc J. D. Wacquant, and Tommie Shelby. 2008. *Race, Incarceration, and American Values*. Boston Review Book. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press. <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=235130&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

¹⁰⁷ Decker, Scott H., Natalie Ortiz, Cassia Spohn, and Eric Hedberg. “Criminal Stigma, Race, and Ethnicity: The Consequences of Imprisonment for Employment.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 43, no. 2 (2015): 108–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2015.02.002>.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Case, Patricia, and David Fasensfest. "Expectations for Opportunities Following Prison Education: A Discussion of Race and Gender." *Journal of Correctional Education* 55, no. 1 (2004): 24-39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23292123>.

Gender has a significant impact on an individual's experiences with reentry. The needs of men differ greatly from their female counterparts and young women often face unique risk factors that affect their individual needs. Upon gaining an understanding of how exactly these critical differences affect reentry, community organizations will be able to provide tailored services to address the barriers that gender differences provide to reentry.

I. Health and Family Ties

With regard to health-related needs of reentering persons, clear gender differences appear both in the type of issues that are most prevalent and in the type of treatment that is most effective. In particular, mental health needs vary significantly by gender. For one, returning women are more likely (one quarter of females compared to one tenth of males) to have co-occurring substance abuse and mental health issues. Additionally, they report higher rates of anxiety and depression in the year following incarceration. The Justice Policy Center at the Urban Institute notes that women are often "doubly-disadvantaged" as they generally experience poorer outcomes overall when reentering regardless of their health status.¹¹⁰ Lastly, women also use mental health services at a higher rate than men, perhaps indicating their willingness to engage in treatment.¹¹¹ Community centers should keep all of these factors in mind when supporting reentering females and consider offering programs geared toward women which address all these needs, especially if there is an increased likelihood they will take advantage of such programs.

Furthermore, females are more vulnerable to the stigmatization of incarceration and the negative consequences of trauma. Not only do women report higher rates of trauma compared to men, they also exhibited higher rates of personal feelings of shame, which can bleed into their ability to cope with reintegration.¹¹² This is especially important as a study by the *Journal of Correctional Education* revealed that self-esteem was the largest barrier to employment faced by women post-release.¹¹³ Additionally, women under correctional supervision are more likely to report having experienced physical and sexual abuse as children and adults than their male counterparts.¹¹⁴ Furthermore, domestic violence remains a key problem for women coming out of incarceration, and contact with the criminal justice system creates many obstacles for women in accessing domestic violence shelters and support.¹¹⁵ Correspondingly, it appears women would especially benefit from programs providing therapy, mentorships, life skills training,

¹¹⁰ Urban Institute. Health and Prisoner Reentry: How Physical, Mental, and Substance Abuse Conditions Shape the Process of Reintegration;2008 SRI R9280-29, 2008.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Case, Patricia, and David Fasenfest. "Expectations for Opportunities Following Prison Education: A Discussion of Race and Gender." *Journal of Correctional Education*, 2004, 24-39.

¹¹⁴ 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. Retrieved from: <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/mhppji.pdf>

¹¹⁵ Cross, Courtney. "Reentering Survivors: Invisible at the Intersection of the Criminal Legal System and the Domestic Violence Movement." *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice* 31, no. 1 (2016): 60-120.

domestic violence education, and even safe homes to help women handle their feelings of stigmatization, trauma, and potentially dangerous home situations.

Lastly, another study revealed that prior to their incarceration, women are more likely to have served as the primary caretakers of children.¹¹⁶ They also hope to continue being their children's primary caretaker upon release.¹¹⁷ During reintegration, more women than men report that a constant source of stress they have is the fear of losing legal custody of their children.¹¹⁸ More community centers should develop programs that are relational and promote healthy connections to children, family, significant others and the community in order to improve their chances of maintaining a steady family life coming out of incarceration and protect their parental statuses.

II. Housing

In addition to the issues present at the intersection of gender and health, experiences with housing during reentry also differ greatly based on gender. Although housing security for all is important to allow reentering individuals to establish a sense of place within the community, a specialized focus on reentering women is necessary because they are at a higher risk of homelessness than their male counterparts, often due to structural inequalities that make them extremely vulnerable to housing insecurity and force them to depend on others for support. Housing for women during reentry must also be more than just transitional shelters—it needs to be safe, secure, and affordable—as many women fill the responsibility of caring for children who also need shelter because single men are often excluded from public welfare and affordable housing initiatives.¹¹⁹ This issue is a widespread reality, as nearly 65% of women in state prisons alone are mothers, and approximately 2/3 of those women lived with their children prior to becoming incarcerated. According to a study conducted by the Center for Law and Social Policy, many women cite their children as being a top priority for them after release.¹²⁰ Additionally, over 96% of the reentering parents wanted assistance with their relationships with the other parent of their children, suggesting that a strong familial bond is vital to the successful reintegration of these formerly incarcerated citizens, which can be facilitated by simpler access to secure housing.¹²¹

III. Organization Type

¹¹⁶ Mumola, C.J. (2000). *Incarcerated Parents and their Children*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from: <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=981>

¹¹⁷ Hairston, C.F. (2002). *Prisoners and Families: Parenting Issues During Incarceration*. Urban Institute. Retrieved from: <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/410628-Prisoners-and-FamiliesParenting-Issues-During-Incarceration.PDF>

¹¹⁸ Raeder, M. (2013). *Pregnancy- and Child-Related Legal and Policy Issues Concerning Justice-Involved Women*. National Institute of Corrections. Retrieved from: <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/027701.pdf>

¹¹⁹ Lutze, Faith, and Jenny Lau. "Centering Women's Reentry With Safe, Secure, and Affordable Housing." In *Female Offenders and Reentry: Pathways and Barriers to Returning to Society*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2018.

¹²⁰ "Every Door Closed: Barriers Facing Parents with Criminal Records." CLASP, January 4, 2018.

¹²¹ Ibid.

The framework of the organization that a reentering person engages with also plays a large role in the success of that individual's reentry journey. Kelley Blanchette, an expert in forensic psychology with a specialty in female correctional services, emphasizes this idea in her studies on the reintegration of formerly incarcerated females. In her analysis of where reintegration efforts and services are successful, she explains the necessity of programs separate from those geared toward male reentering citizens is essential, and can most easily be instituted in community-based organizations.¹²² She describes three "gendered" pathways to women's incarceration that should be addressed in reentry services. Among these pathways include a focus on childhood victimization as a factor in mental illness, substance abuse, dysfunctional intimate relationships that enable adult victimization, and reduced self-efficacy. Given the strong emphasis on mental and physical health, as well as other connected risk factors that require holistic attention, it is necessary for women to engage with organizations that are able to provide services attentive to their specific needs. Most government-based organizations tend to be lacking in this area, guiding their rehabilitation programs with gender-neutral principles. Community organizations differ in their ability to emphasize an incorporation of these principles and female-centered strategies to find approaches that will produce the most effective and successful reentry programs for reentering females.¹²³

IV. Mentorship

Research conducted by Public/Private Ventures, a nonpartisan social research and policy organization focusing on the effectiveness of policies and initiatives in vulnerable communities, suggests that successful mentorship relationships can attribute their demonstrated success to a focus on background experiences and demographics in constructing mentor relationships.¹²⁴ Their findings emphasize the necessity for mentorship pairs to share a common experience, as mutual understanding allows pairs to communicate more honestly. More specifically, the research calls for one-on-one matches to be between pairs of the same gender, arguing that even group sessions work best when they are limited to the same gender. This is true not only because of the ability to create the previously mentioned honest environment, but to also lower the possibility of inappropriate relationships occurring.¹²⁵

These same gender pairings are also beneficial to the mentee because of differential mentorship dynamics based on gender.¹²⁶ According to research conducted by the Women's Prison Association (WPA), mentoring relationships should be approached differently when it comes to mentoring men vs. mentoring women.¹²⁷ While men are problem-focused and goal-oriented, women seek mentoring relationships where they "feel safe and can form interpersonal relationships that serve as a basis for support." It is further noted that women's relationships tend

¹²²Blanchette, Kelley. "Reintegration of Female Offenders: Perspectives on What Works." *Corrections Today* 71, no. 6 (December 2009).

¹²³Ibid.

¹²⁴"Mentoring Former Prisoners: A Guide for Reentry Programs." Public/Private Ventures, 2009.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶Ibid.

¹²⁷ "Mentoring Women in Reentry: A WPA Practice Brief." Institute on Women & Criminal Justice, 2008.

to be built on “intimacy, empathy and self-disclosure,” while men more often maintain their relationships through activities.¹²⁸ *Gender Responsive Strategies* (Bloom, Owen and Covington) concur, positing that women’s largest motivation is to build connections with others.¹²⁹ In addition to this, the WPA discusses the assistance that mentors should be equipped to provide for women, focusing specifically on issues of domestic violence and trauma. It should also be taken into account that childcare is often a greater issue for women, as they need to obtain it in order to develop a more consistent and dedicated mentorship relationship. These types of practices have proven to be successful in programs like WomenCare, which tries to recruit mentors from various demographics and with different experiences that will allow for pairings that are more suited to each others’ experiences. The success of this program is highlighted by the fact that the recidivism rates of its participants dropped to less than 7% in two years after the mentoring relationship was active.¹³⁰

With the influence of these various risk factors, it is not only important that community-based organizations implement the described interventions to counter said factors, but also that they are structured to offer support tailored to the needs of reentering citizens. Addressing the critical differences facing individuals of different gender identities will have a clearly positive impact on their reentry process.

C. Age

This section describes the ways in which the age of formerly incarcerated individuals affects the reentry process and the effectiveness of various interventions. It begins by explaining the impact of age on a wide range of outcomes relevant to reentry, such as housing, education, mentorship, and health. It then discusses existing literature on tailoring reentry services to fit the specific needs of different age groups. We find that greater steps need to be taken toward rendering mentorship and housing programs more accessible to older populations, while familial supports and educational measures such as GED programs must be better tailored to the needs of youth.

Firstly, youth and adults generally have different priorities upon reentry. We see programs for adult mentorship such as Ready4Work overwhelmingly focus on vocational training and job attainment and retainment.¹³¹ Youth programs, though having a significant focus on jobs, tend to provide more variety in services, such as GED programs, assistance with family problems, and mental illness support. Mentorship for older individuals has the added complication of time constraints due to reentering adults having greater work obligations and more dependents compared to reentering youth.¹³² This leads to adults not meeting with their mentors as regularly as youths.¹³³ Therefore, the logistics of meeting with mentors are a more significant consideration

¹²⁸ Ibid (n 10).

¹²⁹ Ibid (n 8).

¹³⁰ Ibid (n 10).

¹³¹ Fletcher, Renata Cobbs, and Jerry Sherk. "Mentoring Former Prisoners: A Guide for Reentry Programs." *Public/Private Ventures* (2009).

¹³² Ibid., p. 7.

¹³³ Ibid.

among older individuals, as is the use of mentoring time. Making mentorship accessible in terms of transportation and time flexibility are important amendments to these unique barriers faced by older mentees. Another important consideration is the attitude surrounding the mentorship process: Ready4Work found that adult mentees were more sensitive to hierarchical and condescending attitudes and environments. When done properly, mentorship involves establishing a trusting and openly communicative relationship between a mentor and mentee, something that is especially important among older mentees. One way this can be done is through peer mentorship, which has been shown to be effective among youth and adults through participant feedback and comparative recidivism rates.¹³⁴ We therefore see that as older reentering citizens generally have more time, family, and financial burdens, mentorship is difficult to logistically pursue and must be tailored to the specific, largely vocational and financial needs of their life. In addition, we see that peer mentorships are particularly effective in combating the issue of perceived hierarchy, which is particularly harmful to older mentees.

Moreover, the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, and At-Risk created a Mentoring Toolkit outlining evidence-based strategies for mentoring youth affected by the criminal justice system. The toolkit first emphasizes that mentorship programs for youth have greater efficacy when implemented for a long period (over one year) as a result of many youth having a history of negative relationships with adults in the past. By increasing the duration of the mentorship, youth have more time to establish the necessary trust to receive the benefits of a positive relationship.¹³⁵ The toolkit also highlights the trend for youth mentorship programs to be more effective when mentors and mentees are of the same gender and race. Studies analyzing the Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP) reveal that when mentors were paired with mentees of different races and genders, there was significantly less improvement in reducing substance use, gang involvement, and violence of all kinds.¹³⁶

Age additionally plays a significant role in housing outcomes for reentering citizens. One study conducted by the Prison Policy Initiative found that among formerly incarcerated people, older populations were at the highest risk for homelessness upon reentry, with 865 out of every 10,000 formerly incarcerated individuals ages 45 and older facing insecurity, as opposed to 570 out of every 10,000 formerly incarcerated individuals of all ages.¹³⁷ Housing instability, while still a significant issue, is less of a problem for younger populations, as individuals under 24 face

¹³⁴ Schumer, Jean. "MENTORING FOR YOUTH AND YOUNG ADULTS DURING REENTRY FROM CONFINEMENT." (2016).

¹³⁵ Bazron, B. J., L. Brock, N. Read, and A. Segal. "The mentoring tool-kit: Resources for developing programs for incarcerated youth (Unabridged version)." *Washington, DC: National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent and At-Risk, US Department of Education* (2006).

¹³⁶ Novotney, Laurence C., Elizabeth Mertinko, James Lange, and Tara Kelley Baker. "Juvenile Mentoring Program: A Progress Review. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*." (2000).

¹³⁷ Couloute, Lucius. "Nowhere to Go: Homelessness among formerly incarcerated people." 12. *Northampton, MA: Prison Policy Initiative* (2018).

housing insecurity at about 30% of the rate for individuals ages 45 and older.¹³⁸ However, this is not necessarily an indicator that reentry programs are better at meeting the housing needs of younger people. Another report from 2007 notes that although older reentering citizens face higher rates of housing instability, they also face lower reincarceration rates, suggesting that younger people are simply getting rearrested rather than being matched with better housing reentry services.¹³⁹ This is not an irresolvable problem. Williams et al found that risk of homelessness among older non-veteran and veteran reentering citizens is roughly the same, but only veteran reentering citizens are set up with homelessness prevention planning prior to release due to assistance from the Department of Veterans Affairs.¹⁴⁰ Older non-veterans reentering society do not get the same degree of support, and thus more efforts must be made to target housing interventions toward older populations as a whole, not just older veterans.

De Wese-Mitchell describes the correlation between young age, lack of education, and incarceration, detailing that many incarcerated individuals are young high school dropouts, and notes the struggles of finding a job during reentry due to insufficient education and skills as well as lack of support in attaining a better education post-incarceration.¹⁴¹ A report from 2009 by the Urban Institute stresses the importance of tailoring educational programs to younger populations, who might be returning to school instead of seeking to earn a GED, and have likely had recent bad encounters with the education system.¹⁴² The authors suggest case management and tailoring educational programs based on the specifics of each juvenile's school records.¹⁴³

The age of a reentering individual can also be an indicator of their familial situation, and their social environment. The Sociogenic Model of Crime finds that informal social interactions have important effects on recidivism.¹⁴⁴ These social interactions are provided more by family and school to youth, whereas adults find these interactions more in their place of employment. Research by the Vera Institute of Justice shows that the nature of these interactions have significant effects on recidivism and relapse, with the rate of illicit drug use falling from 80% to 42% when families are provided with support.¹⁴⁵ Moreover, when 65% of women in state prison are mothers, and when mothers with dependent children tend to be younger, there are unique challenges young women face regarding familial obligations. It is therefore important to promote familial support

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Metraux, Stephen, Caterina G. Roman, and Richard S. Cho. "Incarceration and homelessness." 6. In *National Symposium on Homelessness Research*. US Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, DC, 2007.

¹⁴⁰ Williams, Brie A., James McGuire, Rebecca G. Lindsay, Jacques Baillargeon, Irena Stijacic Cenzer, Sei J. Lee, and Margot Kushel. "Coming home: health status and homelessness risk of older pre-release prisoners." 1042. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 25, no. 10 (2010): 1038-1044.

¹⁴¹ De Wese-Mitchell, Taralyn. "An exploratory case study of reducing recidivism through a prison reentry education program." 19. PhD diss., Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, 2014.

¹⁴² Ibid, p. 26.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ La Vigne, N. G., C. Visher, and J. Castro. "Chicago prisoners' experiences returning home." (2004); Visher et al. 2004; Nelson, Marta, Perry Deess, and Charlotte Allen. "VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE." THE FIRST MONTH OUT: POST-INCARCERATION EXPERIENCES IN NEW YORK CITY (1999).

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

particularly among young reentering individuals, as family is generally a more significant aspect of their social interactions and responsibilities, compared to older reentering individuals.

D. Type of Crime

Reentering citizens have varying experiences with the reentry process based on the type of crime committed. Certain policies, such as the One Strike and You're Out initiative in public housing which allows public housing authorities to evict residents for engaging in illegal drug use on or off public housing property, disproportionately affects reentering individuals who have committed drug-related offenses.¹⁴⁶

In addition, several reentry programs only offer services to individuals previously convicted for nonviolent and nonsexual crimes.¹⁴⁷ A study by James Byrne and Faye Taxman examined eight Reentry Partnership Initiative Programs which the authors determined to be representative of a larger 68 program sample. Of these programs, the authors found that four restricted former sex offenders from participation, and one of these also restricted individuals formerly incarcerated for a violent offense.¹⁴⁸ Therefore, formerly incarcerated people who have “serious” offenses on their record are typically shut out of reentry services. In order to foster a more inclusive effort to reduce recidivism, opportunities for reentry assistance must be open to reentering individuals who do not fit into the minor, non-violent drug offenses category.

Exclusion from reentry services for individuals who have committed violent crimes or sex offenses makes reentry more difficult for these people. One study found that individuals formerly incarcerated for sex offenses who do not receive some form of treatment have twice the recidivism rate as those who do receive treatment.¹⁴⁹ Additionally, specific reentry programs should be created for individuals who have committed multiple offenses and substance abuse offenses. The Byrne and Taxman report explains that most prisons do not have systems in place to identify risk factors for individuals who have committed multiple offenses. This results in reentry programs being unprepared to support these individuals. Other research also differentiates between individuals who are dependent on drugs and those who use drugs recreationally. A study by Marcia Chaiken and Bruce Johnson suggests that treatment is more necessary for individuals for which drug-alcohol dependency is directly linked to other criminal

¹⁴⁶ “Meeting the Challenge.” U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Photocopy/183952NCJRS.pdf>

¹⁴⁷ Weissmann, Elena. “When Coming Home Means Being Shut Out: Expanding Reentry to All Types of Offenses.” When Coming Home Means Being Shut Out. Legal Action Center, January 27, 2017. <https://lac.org/when-coming-home-means-being-shut-out-expanding-reentry-to-all-types-of-offenses/>.

¹⁴⁸ Byrne, James and Taxman, Faye. “Targeting for Reentry: Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Across Eight Model Programs.” *Federal Probation* 68 (2004): 53-6.

¹⁴⁹ Margaret, Alexander. “Sexual Offender Treatment Efficacy Revisited.” *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 11 (1999): 101-116.

behavior. They also report that treatment is not as vital for those who use drugs or alcohol recreationally as this usage does not directly affect other criminal behavior.¹⁵⁰

A federal reentry program, the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI), was an initiative to fund reentry programs that served individuals who had committed serious and violent offenses. These programs generally offered services such as diagnostic and risk assessments, individual reentry plans, transition teams, community resources, and supervision. Assessment of SVORI shows that participating individuals had better access to resources than non-participating individuals. However, the results also show that the SVORI funded programs had no effect on criminal behavior, recidivism, housing, or substance abuse.¹⁵¹

E. Type of Community

The negative impact of the neighborhood one lives in after reentry is larger for those entering economically depressed areas where the job market is fully saturated or essentially nonexistent.¹⁵² This negative impact is worsened when considering one's race. Due to redlining and segregation, black returning citizens generally face harsher conditions and therefore experience higher rates of recidivism.¹⁵³

The types of community that people return to become increasingly important as reentering citizens tend to be very concentrated in the same neighborhoods. Even those that express wishes to leave these communities often return because of family ties and lack of housing elsewhere. Recent studies by Piketty and Sampson have found increasing income inequality contributing to not only greater concentrations of wealth but also greater concentrations of poverty.¹⁵⁴ When upward mobility and employment are important factors in reducing recidivism, such concentrations of poverty may prevent successful reentry. However, while poverty has remained concentrated, the location of such concentration has been shifting. Poverty in particular has been growing significantly in suburban areas at double the rate of urban centers as public housing in urban areas was demolished.¹⁵⁵ In a study by David Kirk focusing on those reentering in the Chicago area, he found that the percentage of people who returned to Chicago in a given year declined from 59% to 32% from 1998 to 2013 while the surrounding

¹⁵⁰ Chaiken, Marcia, Johnson, Bruce. National Institute of Justice, & Abt Associates. (1988). *Characteristics of different types of drug-involved offenders*. U.S. Dept. of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Office of Communication and Research Utilization.

¹⁵¹ United States Office of Justice Programs. *Program Profile: Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI)*. June 16, 2011. <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=167>.

¹⁵² Crystal S. Yang, *LOCAL LABOR MARKETS AND CRIMINAL RECIDIVISM*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016).

¹⁵³ Susan Klinker Lockwood, John M Nally, Taiping Ho, and Katie Knutson, "Racial Disparities and Similarities in Post-Release Recidivism and Employment Among Ex-Prisoners with a Different Level of Education," *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry* 2, no. 1 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.15845/jper.v2i1.703>.

¹⁵⁴ Robert J. Sampson, 2012, *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

¹⁵⁵ Elizabeth Kneebone, 2016, *Suburban Poverty Is Missing from the Conversation about America's Future*, (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution).

suburbs of Cook County saw a percent increase in returning individuals, in line with the findings of the suburbanization of poverty. Notably, Kirk found that while the spread of reentering citizens was more even when looking at the greater Chicago area as a whole, the reentering citizens actually experienced greater concentration and segregation in the city limits.

Furthermore, neighborhoods with increasing poverty also saw increases in returning people.¹⁵⁶

Significantly, studies have shown that suburbs are not prepared to handle the increase in returning citizens. According to a study by Scott Allard, most reentry programs are concentrated in urban centers as these have been where reentry has previously been concentrated.¹⁵⁷ As reentry shifts to the suburbs, social programs still have to catch up. The effect is even more strongly seen in rural areas, and individuals reentering in these areas are forced often either to seek services in urban areas or go without them.¹⁵⁸ Thus, community organizations are particularly important in suburban and rural areas to fill the gaps that currently exist.

The greatest predictor of a successful reentry is the sustainability of employment. However, some communities are simply unable to provide low-skilled, high-wage labor for returning citizens. One successful strategy to resolve these challenges has been to develop partnerships between community organizations and jails.¹⁵⁹ When organizations develop relationships with returning citizens before they decide their place to live, these organizations can better advise them on the benefits and consequences of various neighborhoods. Harvard economist Raj Chetty conducted a study to test the effect of additional knowledge about neighborhoods on people's decisions on where they should live. He found that the individuals who were given advice and information about locations chose neighborhoods that had significantly greater economic opportunities and lower crime rates.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, aiding returning citizens with their housing decision will have a large impact on their reentry success.

F. Income Level

Although social networks are an important risk factor that impacts all people, differences in income level affect the ability for strong family connections to be cultivated and maintained. Prior to incarceration, there are a number of formerly incarcerated individuals who received public assistance. While in prison they become one and a half times more likely to have their

¹⁵⁶ Kirk. "Where the Other 1 Percent Live: An Examination of Changes in the Spatial Concentration of the Formerly Incarcerated." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 5, no. 1 (February 2019): 255–74. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2019.5.1.11>.

¹⁵⁷ Scott W. Allard 2017, *Places in Need: The Changing Geography of Poverty*, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation).

¹⁵⁸ Eric J. Wodahl, "The Challenges of Prisoner Reentry from a Rural Perspective," *Western Criminology Review* 7, no. 2 (2006): 32–47.

¹⁵⁹ Anna Crayton, Liz Ressler, Debbie A Mukamal, Jesse Janneta, and Kevin Warwick, *Partnering with Jails to Improve Reentry* (Washington D.C, Urban Institute, 2010).

¹⁶⁰ Raj Chetty, Nathaniel Hendren, and Lawrence Katz, *The Effects of Exposure to Better Neighborhoods on Children: New Evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment*, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w21156>.

children placed in foster care than parents who were not on assistance.¹⁶¹ Another difficulty for low-income families are costs such as gas, tolls, renting a car, facility rules, and communication as barriers to contacting their loved ones.¹⁶² The clear way to tailor this issue is to provide financial support for these families. In 2011, after a previous 38 years of operation, New York ended its free bussing program to upstate correctional facilities.¹⁶³ A program like this could significantly help thousands of families who find the costs insurmountable.

Research also indicates there is a generally causal relationship between employment opportunity, and thus wage stability, and recidivism. Given that employment stability remains the key indicator of stable income level post-release, external market conditions are critical in the flux between employment opportunity and thus income stability.¹⁶⁴

V. Institutional Interventions

While both government and community organizations lower recidivism rates, they each have their strengths and weaknesses. Due to our legislative structure, the state and the federal government have the ability to create the most impactful change that affects the greatest number of people. Since legislative change is so impactful and can only be influenced on the governmental level, government officials should focus their energy on policy and allocating funds and outsource some of their reentry work to community organizations. When state and local governments re-classify and decriminalize certain offenses, they reduce costs associated with incarceration, which allows for these savings to be reinvested into community-based treatment.¹⁶⁵ Communities are better able to tailor their interventions to the specific subset of individuals reentering.¹⁶⁶ In addition, they generally tend to be more cost-effective and led by individuals who themselves have gone through the criminal justice and reentry process.¹⁶⁷ These programs do not need to follow the strict bureaucratic structures that a government organization would be required to follow.

In addition to this, the Urban Institute has supported the use of community-based organizations in reducing recidivism rates, arguing that a comprehensive approach gives organizations the ability to address problems facing every individual community and provide

¹⁶¹ Travis, Jeremy, McBride, Elizabeth, and Solomon, Amy. *FAMILIES LEFT BEHIND: THE HIDDEN COSTS OF INCARCERATION AND REENTRY*. Urban Institute. 2005.

¹⁶² Olumhense, Ese. “‘I Have to Hold My Family Together’: The Hidden Costs of Prison Visits”. Truthout. 2017.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Yang, Crystal S. *LOCAL LABOR MARKETS AND CRIMINAL RECIDIVISM*, pg. 5.

¹⁶⁵ “Reducing Recidivism: States Deliver Results (2014).” CSG Justice Center, June 12, 2014. <https://csgjusticecenter.org/nrrc/publications/reducing-recidivism-states-deliver-results/>.

¹⁶⁶ Robinson, Lena, and Mark Hake. “The Role of Community Development in Supporting People in Reentry from Prison.” Community Development Investment Review. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, n.d. <https://www.frbsf.org/community-development/files/role-of-community-development-supporting-people-in-reentry-from-prison.pdf>.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

adequate services where reentering citizens live.¹⁶⁸ Conversely, the Urban Institute acknowledges the value in government organizations, accounting for the fact that comprehensive approaches may spread resources so thin that there can be no measurable impact in any specific area. They also noted that greater utilization of halfway houses or transitional living facilities for reentering individuals would result in a more positive impact on reentering individuals' recidivism rates.¹⁶⁹ Given that governments on local and state levels can provide support and funding to specific community programs, their research calls for greater communication and collaboration between community based and government based organizations.

Both levels of organization, government and community, cannot exist without one another. Rather, efficiency and outcomes would be improved if there was increased collaboration between them. In particular, community organizations can often provide the aftercare that government programs are not always capable of providing. In areas of lower population density and geographic areas such as rural and suburban areas, community organizations are more capable of providing specialized and detailed care over the entire area. Governmental organizations have the ability to collect data that would help community organizations better understand the people they serve.¹⁷⁰ In addition, governmental organizations have more power to communicate with prisons and jails. This communication allows them to intervene before people leave jail and identify at-risk individuals who they can refer to community organizations. They are also more capable of addressing issues that are inherently under the government's jurisdiction, such as helping individuals keep their legal documents up to date or providing education in conjunction with the wider education system. In fact, a UN report recommends following the Nelson Mandela rule which means that individuals should be integrated into the larger education system so that it is easier to transfer them from one system to another.¹⁷¹ On the other hand, vocational skills training needs to be well suited to the community's labor market, and thus may be better handled by community organizations.

The two programs must communicate and build off the strengths of one another. While governmental organizations should focus on funding, policy writing, data collection, and referrals, community organizations should focus on tailored interventions and personal support. Collaboration between the two types of organizations are also key to preparing the community to accept the returning individuals.

¹⁶⁸ Visher, Christy, and Jill Farrell. "Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry." *Urban Institute*, September 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e720022011-001>.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ "Reducing Recidivism." Deloitte Insights. Accessed November 18, 2019. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/public-sector/reducing-recidivism-ecosystem-approach-for-successful-reentry.html>.

¹⁷¹ *Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Reintegration of Offenders*. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2018.

VI. Key City Spotlights

This section highlights five cities in America to demonstrate how areas with large reentering populations serve those communities using a varying combination of community and government organizations. The five cities this section looks at are Tulsa and Oklahoma City, OK; Chicago, IL; and Waco, TX.

A. Tulsa and Oklahoma City, OK

We can see the examples of the efficacy of community organizations towards reentry success in the cities of Tulsa and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Oklahoma has one of the highest incarceration rates in the United States.¹⁷² The state also has the second highest indigenous population in the country, with Oklahoma City having the fourth largest indigenous population in the country.¹⁷³ Tailored interventions are beneficial to indigenous peoples as a group with unique needs and circumstances both culturally and legally, and these interventions are more easily carried out by community organizations where specialized services can more readily be provided, and where personal services relating to culture, social ties, and mentorship can more effectively be administered. As a state with relatively low population density, community organizations are also particularly effective regarding their ability to provide services in a manner less centralized than state-wide or federal organizations.¹⁷⁴

Such an example of efficacy is exactly the case of Tulsa. The Community Service Council (CSC) of Tulsa notes the particular risks associated with areas with high reentry demand. Demands for housing, employment assistance and education have created unique threats to public safety and have increased homelessness. The case of such debilitating demand is apparent in Tulsa, where nearly 1,500 formerly incarcerated citizens were released back into the community in 2013 alone. Moreover, 75% of these returning citizens are diagnosed with substance abuse disorders and 24% have a history of mental illness, documented from Oklahoma state prisons.¹⁷⁵

However, in Tulsa, community groups offer a comprehensive model of reentry services that offer high-impact results, significantly curtailing local recidivism while offering a lens to investigate community efforts with high reentry demand. Through the CSC, such services are distributed from the “Tulsa Reentry One-Stop” which assists in career-reentry services (especially in “high-demand occupations”) and support services aimed at reintegration.¹⁷⁶ The CSC’s One Stop program notes that, in 2015, 77% of citizens that successfully completed their

¹⁷² Bronson, Jennifer, E. Ann Carson, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), US Dept of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and United States of America. "Prisoners in 2017." *Age* 500 (2019): 400.

¹⁷³ U.S. Census Bureau. Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics, 2010. Prepared by American Fact Finder. (accessed Nov 24 15:35:00 EDT 2019).

¹⁷⁴ “List of States by Population Density,” n.d. <https://state.1keydata.com/state-population-density.php>.

¹⁷⁵ Community Service Council. “Tulsa Reentry One-Stop.” CSC Tulsa, 2015. <https://csctulsa.org/tulsa-reentry-one-stop/>.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

reintegration program were still working the following quarter post-exit. The CSC also continued to provide educational training in multiple high-demand occupations: “CNC Machining, Welding, Core Construction, Forklift, Certified Production Technician, Food Service Management, and Hospitality.”¹⁷⁷ Such career-based interventions, as illuminated previously in this paper, are critical in securing financial independence, a major determinant of reentry success.

The One Stop’s recognition of mental and substance illnesses is also a critical intervention category, primarily as targeting employment-based discrimination based on such illnesses provides a platform for successful training and employment-based skills. As aforementioned, most returning citizens to Tulsa have extensive histories with substance abuse, mental illness, or both. Recognizing the relevant challenges such factors bring is arguably evidenced in the CSC’s reentry success.

The Citizen Potawatomi Nation in the Oklahoma City region works on a small and personalized level with reentering indigenous people. This is done in the context of the larger Oklahoma Inter-Tribal Reentry Alliance, with various tribes across the state participating in the Alliance and using it as a resource to promote reentry initiatives in their individual communities.¹⁷⁸ The Citizen Potawatomi Nation’s reentry program has had only one person return to prison following completion of the program, out of 300 people participating over the past 5 years.¹⁷⁹ While providing many services for those in the program, such as buying clothing, paying for utilities, assisting in the search for housing, providing GED and vocational training, and helping with transportation, the coordinator of the program cites the talking circles done by the group as one of the most beneficial aspects. The circles are discussions by participants which often address sobriety concerns, culture, and family and social life. This level of intimacy is not seen in larger reentry organizations, and it is coordinated effectively by the Citizen Potawatomi nation to address the concerns of reentering citizens in a prompt and personal manner. Furthermore, the shared cultural experience of the program’s participants and organizers add meaning to the steps of reentry, and addresses many underlying issues on the path to rehabilitation. The unique effectiveness of this can be seen in anecdotes from participants who did not find reentry programs built for a more general group effective, but who have found success in the programs run by and for indigenous peoples.

Oklahoma also presents the valuable gains that can be made in reentry services by combining local, faith-based, or community organizations with state correctional support. In Oklahoma, *The Oklahoma Partnership for Successful Reentry* (OPSR) works to combine broad reentry services with state resources and planning. This is evidenced by the OPSR’s Healing Communities initiative, which encourages returning citizens to engage in community service and

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Tribal Access to Justice Innovation. “Muscogee Creek Reintegration Program,” n.d. <http://www.tribaljustice.org/places/corrections-reentry/muscogee-creek-reintegration-program/>.

¹⁷⁹ Eaton, Kristi. “Self-Sufficiency at Forefront of Tribal-Reentry Program.” *NonDoc* (blog), February 1, 2018. <https://nondoc.com/2018/02/01/tribal-reentry-program-culture/>.

provides need-based assistance.¹⁸⁰ OPSR is the “selected partner of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections (ODOC)”¹⁸¹ in implementing the Healing Communities initiative, which is assisting in co-sponsoring the initiative through supporting local churches, especially in the Tulsa and Oklahoma City areas, providing resources to assist where necessary. Such assistance has allowed OPSR to grow, and it now supports 12 local chapters with government assistance.¹⁸²

The case of OPSR demonstrates the potential gains, both in organization and growth, that community groups can make in engaging with state or local governments. Not only do such co-sponsorships help alleviate financial barriers to services, such as in the case of OPSR’s expansion with state correctional assistance, but they also help to solidify the mission of reentry. Combining the essential missions of state correctional reentry with community groups’ more localized initiatives allows for more broad-based support and individual assistance, and it also demonstrates state correctional departments’ recognition and commitment to successful reentry. As the Oklahoma Department of Corrections partnered with OPSR, local initiatives were given increasing assistance, community expansion was made possible, and the state committed tangibly to citizen reentry. Such a case is replicable and significant in all other localities.

B. Chicago, IL

Chicago is a key example of a city with a stark layout of spatially concentrated disadvantage, a manifestation of which is the concentration of returning citizens. For example, in neighborhoods such as Lawndale and the South Side, incarceration rates reach 13%.¹⁸³ However, in areas like Chicago, where decades of unequal distribution of resources and unjust policies have contributed to widespread wealth inequality and concentrated poverty and disadvantage in communities of color, community-based programs fill in the gaps where the government falls short.¹⁸⁴ Specific programs recognize historic disinvestment in communities such as North and South Lawndale, in which people returning from prison are inevitably met with limited housing, sparse job opportunities, and minimal state services to address issues such as substance abuse or mental health.¹⁸⁵

For example, Safer Foundation in Chicago aims to secure employment for returning individuals through providing dedicated, wrap-around support services and programs.¹⁸⁶ Aspects of their programs such as the Youth Empowerment Program, which helps youth obtain their High School Equivalent Diploma, and their Financial Opportunity Center, which provides one-

¹⁸⁰ Oklahoma Partnership for Successful Reentry Inc. “Initiatives,” n.d. <http://okreentry.org/opsr-initiatives.html>.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Chetty, Raj, John Friedman, Nathaniel Hendren, Maggie Jones, and Sonya Porter. “The Opportunity Atlas: Mapping the Childhood Roots of Social Mobility.” *Opportunity Insights*, October 2018.

¹⁸⁴ “Racial Wealth Divide in Chicago”, *Racial Wealth Divide Initiative*. https://prosperitynow.org/files/resources/Racial_Wealth_Divide_in_Chicago_OptimizedforScreenReaders.pdf

¹⁸⁵ Lori Lightfoot, “A Plan to Help Returning Citizens Succeed in Chicago” https://lightfootforchicago.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/LL_ReturningCitizens_policy.pdf

¹⁸⁶ “Safer Foundation.” Accessed November 16, 2019. <https://saferfoundation.org/>.

on-one financial literacy and strategy lessons from Financial Coach and Income Support Specialist, foster a forward-looking transition back into their communities.¹⁸⁷ Safer Foundation has shown to reduce recidivism to 17.5% for clients who have maintained employment for a 30-day period, compared to a state average over 40%.¹⁸⁸

Another strong example of a community based organization addressing specific community needs is Bethel New Life (BNL) in Chicago. In 2002, BNL began the “Welcome Home” campaign to support the reentry of individuals who were formerly incarcerated through addressing the specific barriers within their community, such as stigma in the workforce and lack of experience. For example, along with their traditional services that help individuals find housing and employment, BNL “implement[ed] a network of support, conduct[ed] sermons that address reentry to raise awareness, and [held] community discussions on reentry.”¹⁸⁹ Although there is no clear evidence as to the direct effectiveness of this initiative, this program demonstrates the ability of community organizations to interact in alternative ways with their community and target specific issues.

C. Waco, TX

Waco, Texas is a city that sits in central Texas in McLennan county with a citywide incarcerated population of 786 out of 245,671 residents as of 2015, although certain neighborhoods in the northeast and southeast portions of the central Waco have incarceration rates of about 9.7%.¹⁹⁰ ¹⁹¹ Out of those 786, 107 returned to prison, leading to the recidivism rate of approximately 13.61%. There are several reentry programs serving the Waco area, most of which are community-based.¹⁹² For example, Associated Family Counseling is a reentry initiative that provides counseling services to formerly incarcerated individuals, including those with sex offense and juvenile records. Another example is The House Where Jesus Shines, a faith-based prisoner reentry program for reentering men. The program offers residency to reentering citizens as they make efforts to reintegrate into society, putting an emphasis on prosocial behaviors such as cooperative living and respectfulness and providing communal

¹⁸⁷ “Reshaping Reentry: Safer Foundation Annual Report 2018” *Safer Foundation*.
<https://saferfoundation.org/Portals/1/Files/Annual%20Report%202018.pdf?ver=2019-06-20-191739-613×tamp=1561058299261>

¹⁸⁸ Social Enterprise Alliance. “Safer Foundation.” Accessed November 16, 2019.
<https://socialenterprise.us/organization/safer-foundation-2/>.

¹⁸⁹ Amy L. Solomon, Michelle Waul, Asheley Van Ness, Jeremy Travis, “Outside the Walls: A National Snapshot of Community-based Prisoner Reentry Programs,” Reentry National Media Outreach Campaign, January 27, 2004, http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410911_OTWResourceGuide.pdf

¹⁹⁰ Pinney, Leah. *Adult Criminal Justice Data Sheet*. PDF file. 2015.
https://www.texascjc.org/system/files/publications/Adult%20McLennan%20County%20Data%20Sheet%202016_0.pdf

¹⁹¹ Chetty, Raj, John Friedman, Nathaniel Hendren, Maggie Jones, and Sonya Porter. “The Opportunity Atlas: Mapping the Childhood Roots of Social Mobility.” *Opportunity Insights*, October 2018.

¹⁹² Surprenant, Erica. *A New Start*. PDF file. 2010.
https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/rid/RID_Article_A_New_Start.pdf.

activities, meals, and Bible studies.¹⁹³ The program additionally offers a recovery support group specifically targeted toward people with substance abuse issues but also open to anyone struggling with “life controlling issues.”¹⁹⁴

More recently, the Strength Through Restoration, Independence, Vision and Empowerment (STRIVE) program was established in Waco to specifically target women with a high risk of recidivating.¹⁹⁵ The program focuses primarily on job skills and healing from emotional trauma. At STRIVE, women are taught office, interview and customer skills, and usually secure jobs upon leaving prison.¹⁹⁶ As for healing, the program sets aside at least 3 hours a day for “teach[ing] coping strategies, self love, and the difference between healthy and unhealthy relationships,” noting that oftentimes it is past traumas and an inability to unpack them that leads people into vicious cycles.¹⁹⁷ Although at the moment, the program only works with 31 reentering women, the directors are seeking to improve their services and eventually expand.¹⁹⁸ The success of these programs highlights the necessity of attending to the specific needs of reentering citizens in the communities they enter upon release.

VII. Final Discussion

This report provides recommendations on which interventions community-based reentry organizations should prioritize, details on how these interventions can be best implemented in order to address specific needs, and examples of organizations that successfully put these guidelines into practice.

More recently, the importance of evidence-based practice in guiding reentry has become more and more acknowledged. However, research and practice have generally been moving on separate tracks; numerous studies surrounding best practices for reentry exist, yet very few reentry programs are actually evaluating the efficacy of the services they offer and applying the research that exists. Thus, we urge more collaboration between researchers, policymakers, and practitioners in order to develop reentry interventions and implementation plans that would be most effective for facilitating successful reentry and reducing recidivism.

Still, our recommendations are limited; they do not address the failure of prisons to achieve their stated aim of rehabilitating individuals during their sentences. This report also does not address the plethora of deep-rooted systemic issues within many communities that serve as facilitators of crime, making incarceration, and subsequently reincarceration, nearly inevitable for certain subgroups of people. Outside of modifying the practices of community-based reentry

¹⁹³ House Where Jesus Shines. Accessed November 18, 2019. <http://housewherejesusshines.org/>.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ McCullough, Jolie. “New Texas Prison Program Aims to Help Women Leave the System with Jobs Waiting for Them.” The Texas Tribune. The Texas Tribune, September 25, 2019.

<https://www.texastribune.org/2019/09/25/texas-prison-program-help-women-reenter-society-jobs-waiting-them/>.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

programs, there must be significant change within our communities and our justice system in order to address the root causes of crime.

Works Cited

- Allard, Scott W. 2017. *Places in Need: The Changing Geography of Poverty*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- “Baltimore Ex-Offender Reentry Program.” *The Work First Foundation*, August 2019.
<https://www.theworkfirstfoundation.org/baltimore-exoffender-program>.
- Bazron, B. J., L. Brock, N. Read, and A. Segal. "The mentoring tool-kit: Resources for developing programs for incarcerated youth (Unabridged version)." Washington, DC: National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent and At-Risk, US Department of Education (2006).
- Berg, Mark and Huebner, Beth. 2011. *Reentry and the Ties that Bind: An Examination of Social Ties, Employment, and Recidivism*. Justice Quarterly.
- Blanchette, Kelley. “Reintegration of Female Offenders: Perspectives on What Works.” *Corrections Today* 71, no. 6 (December 2009).
- Brazzell, Diana, Anna Crayton, Debbie A. Mukamal, Amy L. Solomon, and Nicole Lindahl. "From the Classroom to the Community: Exploring the Role of Education during Incarceration and Reentry." Urban Institute (NJ1) (2009).
- Bronson, Jennifer, E. Ann Carson, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), US Dept of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and United States of America. "Prisoners in 2017." *Age 500* (2019): 400.
- Byrne, James and Taxman, Faye. “Targeting for Reentry: Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Across Eight Model Programs.” *Federal Probation* 68 (2004): 53-6.
- Case, Patricia, and David Fasenfest. "Expectations for Opportunities Following Prison Education: A Discussion of Race and Gender." *Journal of Correctional Education* 55, no. 1 (2004): 24-39.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23292123>.
- Chaiken, Marcia, Johnson, Bruce. National Institute of Justice, & Abt Associates. (1988). *Characteristics of different types of drug-involved offenders*. U.S. Dept. of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Office of Communication and Research Utilization.
- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, and Lawrence Katz. “The Effects of Exposure to Better Neighborhoods on Children: New Evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment,” 2015.
<https://doi.org/10.3386/w21156>.
- Chetty, Raj, John Friedman, Nathaniel Hendren, Maggie Jones, and Sonya Porter. “The Opportunity Atlas: Mapping the Childhood Roots of Social Mobility.” *Opportunity Insights*, October 2018.
https://opportunityinsights.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/atlas_paper.pdf.
- Coley, Richard J., and Paul E. Barton . “Locked Up and Locked Out: An Educational Perspective on the U.S. Prison Population.” *Locked Up and Locked Out: An Educational Perspective on the U.S. Prison Population*. Educational Testing Service, 2006.
<https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PIC-LOCKEDUP.pdf>.
- Community Service Council. “Tulsa Reentry One-Stop.” CSC Tulsa, 2015.
<https://csctulsa.org/tulsa-reentry-one-stop/>.
- Couloute, Lucius and Kopf, Daniel. “Out of Prison & Out of Work: Unemployment among formerly incarcerated people.” Prison Policy Initiative. July, 2018.
<https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/outofwork.html>.
- Couloute, Lucius. "Nowhere to Go: Homelessness among formerly incarcerated people." Northampton, MA: Prison Policy Initiative (2018).
- Crayton, Anna, Liz Ressler, Debbie A Mukamal, Jesse Janneta, and Kevin Warwick. *Partnering with Jails to Improve Reentry*. Washington D.C: Urban Institute, 2010.
- Cross, Courtney. "Reentering Survivors: Invisible at the Intersection of the Criminal Legal System and

- the Domestic Violence Movement." *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice* 31, no. 1 (2016): 60-120.
- Davis, Lois, Robert Bozick, Jennifer Steele, Jessica Saunders, and Jeremy Miles. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-Analysis of Programs That Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults," 2013. <https://doi.org/10.7249/rr266>.
- Decker, Scott et al. "Criminal Stigma, Race, Gender, and Employment: An Expanded Assessment of the Consequences of Imprisonment for Employment." National Institute of Justice. January, 2014. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/244756.pdf>.
- Denney, Andrew S., Richard Tewksbury, and Richard S. Jones. "Beyond basic needs: Social support and structure for successful offender reentry." *Journal of Quantitative Criminal Justice & Criminology* (2014).
- De Wese-Mitchell, Taralyn. "An exploratory case study of reducing recidivism through a prison reentry education program." PhD diss., Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, 2014.
- Eaton, Kristi. "Self-Sufficiency at Forefront of Tribal-Reentry Program." *NonDoc* (blog), February 1, 2018. <https://nondoc.com/2018/02/01/tribal-reentry-program-culture/>.
- "Every Door Closed: Barriers Facing Parents with Criminal Records." CLASP, January 4, 2018. "Evidence-Based Reentry Initiatives Devoted To Strengthening Positive Social Relationships: A Report of the Recidivism Reduction Committee of the Connecticut Sentencing Commission" (September 2012).
- "Exodus Transitional Community." Exodus Transitional Community. Accessed November 25, 2019. <https://www.etcny.org/>.
- Fenton, Nancy. "Helping Ex-Offenders Stay out of Prison." *The Baltimore Sun*, March 30, 2015. <https://www.baltimoresun.com/opinion/op-ed/bs-ed-reentry-programs-20150330-story.html>.
- Fernandes-Alcantara, Adrienne L. "Vulnerable Youth: Federal mentoring programs and issues." (2015).
- Fletcher, Del Roy, and Elaine Batty. "Offender peer interventions: What do we know." *Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield* (2012).
- Fletcher, Renata Cobbs, and Jerry Sherk. "Mentoring Former Prisoners: A Guide for Reentry Programs." *Public/Private Ventures* (2009).
- Gaes, Gerald G, and Newton Kendig. *FROM PRISON TO HOME: THE EFFECT OF INCARCERATION AND REENTRY ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES*. January 10, 2002. <https://aspe.hhs.gov/basic-report/skill-sets-and-health-care-needs-released-offenders>.
- Gosse, Megan Marie. "THE EFFICACY OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL THERAPY FOR REENTRY: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SERIOUS VIOLENT OFFENDER REENTRY INITIATIVE DATA," 2013. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3bb4/a5997d15bc5457aa7d1ae00b14f67b373345.pdf>.
- Greenberg, Greg A., and Robert A. Rosenheck. "Jail incarceration, homelessness, and mental health: A national study." *Psychiatric services* 59, no. 2 (2008): 170-177.
- Hairston, C.F. (2002). *Prisoners and Families: Parenting Issues During Incarceration*. Urban Institute. <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/410628-Prisoners-and-FamiliesParenting-Issues-During-Incarceration.PDF>.
- Harlow, Caroline Wolf. "Special Report: Education and Correctional Populations." *Special Report: Education and Correctional Populations*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, April 15, 2003. <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf>.
- House Where Jesus Shines. Accessed November 18, 2019. <http://housewherejesushines.org/>. *Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Reintegration of Offenders*.

- Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2018.
- 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. Retrieved from: <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/mhppji.pdf>.
- James, Nathan. "Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reintegration into the Community, and Recidivism." Congressional Research Service. Congressional Research Service, January 12, 2015.
- Jarjoura, G. Roger. "Effective Strategies for Mentoring African American Boys." *American Institute for Research*. January 2013. <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Effective%20Strategies%20for%20Mentoring%20African%20American%20Boys.pdf>.
- Kirk. "Where the Other 1 Percent Live: An Examination of Changes in the Spatial Concentration of the Formerly Incarcerated." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 5, no. 1 (February 2019): 255–74. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2019.5.1.11>.
- Klein, Joyce and Mohan, Lavanya. "Prison to Proprietor: Entrepreneurship as a Re-Entry Strategy." FIELD at the Aspen Institute. September, 2016. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/prison-proprietor-entrepreneurship-re-entry-strategy/>.
- Kneebone, Elizabeth. 2016. Suburban Poverty Is Missing from the Conversation about America's Future. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- La Vigne, N. G., C. Visher, and J. Castro. "Chicago prisoners' experiences returning home." (2004).
- Landenberger, Nana A., and Mark W. Lipsey. "The Positive Effects of Cognitive–Behavioral Programs for Offenders: A Meta-Analysis of Factors Associated with Effective Treatment." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1, no. 4 (2005): 451–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-005-3541-7>.
- Link, NW, Ward, JT, Stansfield, R. Consequences of mental and physical health for reentry and recidivism: Toward a health-based model of desistance. *Criminology*. 2019; 57: 544– 573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12213>.
- "List of States by Population Density," n.d. <https://state.1keydata.com/state-population-density.php>.
- Lockwood, Susan Klinker and Nally, John M. "Racial Disparities and Similarities in Post-Release Recidivism and Employment Among Ex-prisoners with a Different Level of Education." *Journal of Prison Education & Reentry* 2, no. 1 (2015): 27-28. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1148844.pdf>.
- Loury, Glenn C., Pamela S. Karlan, Loïc J. D. Wacquant, and Tommie Shelby. 2008. *Race, Incarceration, and American Values*. Boston Review Book. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press. <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=235130&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Lutze, Faith E., Jeffrey W. Rosky, and Zachary K. Hamilton. "Homelessness and reentry: A multisite outcome evaluation of Washington State's reentry housing program for high risk offenders." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 41, no. 4 (2014): 471-491.
- Lutze, Faith, and Jenny Lau. "Centering Women's Reentry With Safe, Secure, and Affordable Housing." In *Female Offenders and Reentry: Pathways and Barriers to Returning to Society*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2018.
- Lynch, James, and William Sabol. "Prisoner Reentry in Perspective." Urban Institute, September 2001.
- Lynch, Mathew, Nan Marie Astone, Juan Collazos, Micaela Lipman, and Sino Esthappan. "Arches Transformative Mentoring Program." (2018).

- “Meeting the Challenge.” U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Photocopy/183952NCJRS.pdf>
- Margaret, Alexander. “Sexual Offender Treatment Efficacy Revisited.” *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 11 (1999): 101-116.
- “Mentoring Former Prisoners: A Guide for Reentry Programs.” Public/Private Ventures, 2009.
- “Mentoring Women in Reentry: A WPA Practice Brief.” Institute on Women & Criminal Justice, 2008.
 Metraux, Stephen, Caterina G. Roman, and Richard S. Cho. "Incarceration and homelessness." In National Symposium on Homelessness Research. US Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, DC, 2007.
- McCullough, Jolie. “New Texas Prison Program Aims to Help Women Leave the System with Jobs Waiting for Them.” *The Texas Tribune*. The Texas Tribune, September 25, 2019.
<https://www.texastribune.org/2019/09/25/texas-prison-program-help-women-reenter-society-jobs-waiting-them/>.
- McDaniel, Kimber. "Recidivism Prevention Through Prosocial Support: A Systematic Review of Empirical Research." (2014).
- Morani, Nicole M., Nora Wikoff, Donald M. Linhorst, and Sheila Bratton. "A description of the self-identified needs, service expenditures, and social outcomes of participants of a prisoner-reentry program." *The Prison Journal* 91, no. 3 (2011): 347-365.
- Mosteller, Jeremiah. “Why Reentry Programs Are Important.” Charles Koch Institute.
<https://www.charleskochinstitute.org/issue-areas/criminal-justice-policing-reform/reentry-programs/>.
- Mumola, C.J. (2000). *Incarcerated Parents and their Children*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from:
<http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=981>.
- Nelson, Marta, Perry Deess, and Charlotte Allen. "VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE." *THE FIRST MONTH OUT: POST-INCARCERATION EXPERIENCES IN NEW YORK CITY* (1999).
- Novotney, Laurence C., Elizabeth Mertinko, James Lange, and Tara Kelley Baker. "Juvenile Mentoring Program: A Progress Review. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*." (2000).
- Oklahoma Partnership for Successful Reentry Inc. “Initiatives,” n.d.
<http://okreentry.org/opsr-initiatives.html>.
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When prisoners come home*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pinney, Leah. *Adult Criminal Justice Data Sheet*. PDF file. 2015.
https://www.texascjc.org/system/files/publications/Adult%20McLennan%20County%20Data%20Sheet%202016_0.pdf
- Pleggenkuhle, Breanne, Beth M. Huebner, and Kimberly R. Kras. "Solid start: supportive housing, social support, and reentry transitions." *Journal of Crime and Justice* 39, no. 3 (2016): 380-397.
- Post-Prison Education Program*. Seattle: Post Prison Education Program. *Reentry*. Little Rock: Our House. <https://ourhouseshelter.org/reentry/>
- Raeder, M. (2013). *Pregnancy- and Child-Related Legal and Policy Issues Concerning Justice-Involved Women*. National Institute of Corrections. Retrieved from:
<https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/027701.pdf>.
- Ramakers, Anke, Paul Nieuwbeerta, Johan Van Wilsem, and Anja Dirkzwager. “Not Just Any Job Will Do: A Study on Employment Characteristics and Recidivism Risks After Release.” *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 61, no. 16 (2016): 1795–1818.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x16636141>.

- “Reducing Recidivism.” Deloitte Insights. Accessed November 18, 2019.
<https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/public-sector/reducing-recidivism-ecosystem-approach-for-successful-reentry.html>.
- “Reducing Recidivism: States Deliver Results (2014).” CSG Justice Center, June 12, 2014.
<https://csgjusticecenter.org/nrrc/publications/reducing-recidivism-states-deliver-results/>.
- “Reentry Matters: Strategies and Successes of Second Chance Act Grantees.” CSG Justice Center. CSG Justice Center, November 2018.
- “Reentry Programs for Women Inmates.” National Institute of Justice, July 1, 2005.
<https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/reentry-programs-women-inmates>.
- Robinson, Lena, and Mark Hake. “The Role of Community Development in Supporting People in Reentry from Prison.” Community Development Investment Review. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, n.d. <https://www.frbsf.org/community-development/files/role-of-community-development-supporting-people-in-reentry-from-prison.pdf>.
- Roman, Caterina Gouvis. "Taking stock: Housing, homelessness, and prisoner reentry." (2004).
- Roman, Caterina Gouvis, and Jeremy Travis. "Where will I sleep tomorrow? Housing, homelessness, and the returning prisoner." *Housing Policy Debate* 17, no. 2 (2006): 389-418.
- Sampson, Robert J. 2012. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sampson R. J., Laub J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609-627.
- Schumer, Jean. "MENTORING FOR YOUTH AND YOUNG ADULTS DURING REENTRY FROM CONFINEMENT." (2016).
- “SERVICES.” Paroled2Pride. Paroled2Pride, 2017. <https://www.paroled2pride.org/services>.
- Silver, E. (2006). Understanding the relationship between mental disorder and violence: The need for a criminological perspective. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30, 685–706.
- Simes, Jessica. “Neighborhood Attainment after Prison.” *Harvard Department of Sociology*, Working Paper (March 2016).
- Smith, Linda G. “Education Reduces Crime: Three State Recidivism Study Executive Summary.” Edited by Stephen J. Steurer. *Education Reduces Crime: Three State Recidivism Study Executive Summary*, 2003. <https://www.mtctrains.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Education-Reduced-Crime-Three-State-Recidivism-Study.pdf>.
- Surprenant, Erica. *A New Start*. PDF file. 2010.
https://www.tdcj.texas.gov/documents/rid/RID_Article_A_New_Start.pdf.
- Thomson, Sakala, King, and Harvell. “Investing Justice Resources to Address Community Needs.” Tribal Access to Justice Innovation. “Muscogee Creek Reintegration Program,” n.d.
<http://www.tribaljustice.org/places/corrections-reentry/muscogee-creek-reintegration-program/>.
- Urban Institute. Health and Prisoner Reentry: How Physical, Mental, and Substance Abuse Conditions Shape the Process of Reintegration;2008 SRI R9280-29, 2008.
- Urban Institute. Urban Institute, February 2018.
https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/96341/investing_justice_resources_to_address_community_needs.pdf.
- U.S. Census Bureau. Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics, 2010. Prepared by American Fact Finder.
- United States Office of Justice Programs. *Program Profile: Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI)*. June 16, 2011. <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=167>.
- Visher, Christy, and Jill Farrell. “Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry.” *Urban Institute*,

- September 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e720022011-001>.
- Visher, C. A., Debus-Sherrill, S., & Yahner, J. (2011). Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of former prisoners. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(5), 698–718.
- Visher, Christy, Nancy LaVigne, and Jeremy Travis. “Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry.” 7. Washington DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, January 2004.
- Weissmann, Elena. “When Coming Home Means Being Shut Out: Expanding Reentry to All Types of Offenses.” When Coming Home Means Being Shut Out. Legal Action Center, January 27, 2017. <https://lac.org/when-coming-home-means-being-shut-out-expanding-reentry-to-all-types-of-offenses/>.
- Western, B. (2018). *Homeward: Life in the year after prison*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Williams, Brie A., James McGuire, Rebecca G. Lindsay, Jacques Baillargeon, Irena Stijacic Cenzer, Sei J. Lee, and Margot Kushel. "Coming home: health status and homelessness risk of older pre-release prisoners." *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 25, no. 10 (2010): 1038-1044.
- Wilson, William Julius, Robert Sampson, and Hanna Katz. “Reassessing ‘Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality’: Enduring and New Challenges in 21st Century America.” *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research* 15, no. 1 (2018): 13–34.
- Wodahl, Eric J. “The Challenges of Prisoner Reentry from a Rural Perspective.” *Western Criminology Review* 7, no. 2 (2006): 32–47.
- Yang, Crystal S. “Local Labor Markets and Criminal Recidivism.” *Journal of Public Economics* 147 (2017): 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.12.003>.
- Yelowitz, Aaron, and Christopher Bollinger. “Prison-To-Work.” Manhattan Institute, February 14, 2019. <https://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/prison-work-5876.html#.VRNX82fwutg>.