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This Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland is part of a larger Urban Institute initiative on prisoner reentry in Maryland and three other sites across the country. With support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Open Society Institute, the Abell Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, and the State of Maryland’s Governor’s Office on Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP), the Urban Institute has launched a pilot project in Maryland to develop a deeper understanding of the reentry experiences of returning prisoners, their families, and their communities. This pilot study in Maryland, which provides the groundwork for a multistate study entitled Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry, involves interviews with prisoners before and after their release from prison; interviews with released prisoners’ family members; focus groups with residents in communities to which many prisoners return; analysis of extant data on local indicators of community well-being; and interviews with community stakeholders. State laws and policies will also be reviewed to provide the overall political and policy context.

The results of this research on prisoner reentry in Maryland will be published in 2003. This Maryland research, in turn, will provide the basis for a full-scale longitudinal study of prisoner reentry that the Urban Institute plans to carry out in Illinois, Ohio, and Texas.
Executive Summary

This report describes the process of prisoner reentry by examining the policy context surrounding Maryland reentry, the characteristics of Maryland’s returning inmates, the geographic distribution of returning prisoners, and the social and economic climates of the communities that are home to the highest concentrations of returning prisoners. This report does not attempt to evaluate a specific reentry program, nor does it empirically assess Maryland’s reentry policies and practices. Rather, the report consolidates existing data on incarceration and release trends and presents a new analysis of data on Maryland prisoners released in 2001. The data used for this report were derived from several sources, including the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Policy, the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, and census data compiled by the Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance (BNIA). Highlights from the report are presented below.

Historical Incarceration and Release Trends. Maryland’s incarceration and reentry trends are similar to those observed at the national level. Between 1980 and 2001, Maryland’s prison population more than tripled, from 7,731 to 23,752 prisoners. The per capita rate of imprisonment in Maryland more than doubled over the same period, rising from 183 to 422 prisoners per 100,000 residents. The growth in Maryland’s prison population is attributable to increased admissions rather than to longer lengths of stay in prison. Key factors influencing increased admissions include rising crime rates and arrests, more admissions of drug offenders, and more parole violators returning to prison. Maryland’s release patterns reflect these rising admissions and population trends: 9,448 prisoners were released from Maryland prisons in 2001, nearly double the number released in 1980 (5,436).

How Maryland Prisoners Are Released. In 2001, nearly three-quarters of Maryland prisoners were released through nondiscretionary means (i.e., mandatory release or expiration of sentence). About one-fifth of prisoners were released by parole board decision, a discretionary approach. The number of prisoners released by parole board decision has decreased over the past decade.

Profile of Prisoners Released in 2001. The majority of released prisoners were male (91 percent) and black (76 percent). Three-quarters were between 20 and 40 years old at release; the median age at release was 34. One-third had been serving time for drug offenses. About half of the prisoners released in 2001 had served two years or less in prison; the largest share (37 percent) served between 40 and 60 percent of their sentences. Seventy percent had been in prison at least once before, and 22 percent had been parole violators at some point in their criminal careers.

Reentry Defined

For the purposes of this report, “reentry” is defined as the process of leaving the adult state prison system and returning to society. The concept of reentry is applicable to a variety of contexts in which individuals transition from incarceration to freedom, including release from jails, federal institutions, and juvenile facilities. We have limited our scope to those sentenced to serve time in state prison in order to focus on individuals who have been convicted of the most serious offenses, who have been removed from communities for longer periods of time, who would be eligible for state prison programming while incarcerated, and who are managed by state correctional and parole systems.
**How Prisoners are Prepared for Release.** In 2001, about 17 percent of inmates were involved in educational or vocational programs offered by the Maryland Division of Correction (MD DOC) at any given time (roughly 40 percent over the course of the year), half had work assignments (e.g., sanitation, food service) within the correctional institutions, and an additional 7 percent participated in a work-release program. Nearly one-third of all Maryland state prisoners (31 percent) were classified as idle, which denotes a lack of participation in programming or work. In addition to traditional programming, comprehensive reentry efforts, such as the Reentry Partnership Initiative (REP), currently serve a very small fraction of returning prisoners. REP served 125 of the 4,411 who returned to Baltimore City in 2001, or 3 percent. The state plans to use a portion of its recently awarded Going Home funds to expand the REP program to serve 500 prisoners returning to the City of Baltimore each year.

**Life on the Outside: Parole Supervision.** In 2001, 89 percent of released prisoners were subject to some period of parole supervision after release. The number of people on parole in Maryland has more than doubled, from 6,436 in 1980 to 14,143 in 2000. Over the past decade, the number of parole violators, especially technical violators, also has increased. In 2002, 58 percent of parole revocations were for technical violations, while 42 percent were for new crimes.

**Geographic Distribution of Released Prisoners.** The vast majority (97 percent) of Maryland prisoners released in 2001 returned to Maryland; of those, 59 percent returned to Baltimore City (4,411 released prisoners). Within Baltimore City, releasees are even more concentrated in just a few communities, including Southwest Baltimore, Greater Rosemont, and Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park. Some of these communities received more than 200 released prisoners in 2001, more than the number that returned to some entire counties in Maryland. These communities also are characterized by high levels of poverty and crime.
Introduction

This report examines the prisoner reentry phenomenon in the State of Maryland. Prisoner reentry—the process of leaving prison and returning to society—has become a pressing issue both in Maryland and nationwide, and with good reason. Rising incarceration rates over the past quarter century have resulted in more and more inmates being released from prison each year. Nationwide, an estimated 630,000 inmates were released from state and federal prisons in 2001, a fourfold increase over the past two decades. Thus, released prisoners, their families, and the communities to which they return must cope with the challenges of reentry on a much greater scale than ever before.

And the challenges of reentry are many. More prisoners nationwide are returning home having spent longer terms behind bars, exacerbating the already significant challenges of finding employment and reconnecting with family. Prisoners today are typically less prepared for reintegration, less connected to community-based social structures, and more likely to have health or substance abuse problems than in the past. In addition to these personal circumstances, limited availability of jobs, housing, and social services in a community may affect the returning prisoner’s ability to successfully reintegrate.

These challenges affect more than returning prisoners and their families; they can also have serious public safety implications for the communities to which prisoners return. Reentry concerns are most pressing in major metropolitan areas across the country, to which about two-thirds of the prisoners released in 1996 returned—up from 50 percent in 1984. Within central cities, released prisoners are often even more concentrated in a few neighborhoods. These high concentrations of returning prisoners generate great costs to those communities, including potential increases in costs associated with crime and public safety, greater public health risks, and high rates of unemployment and homelessness. Thus, developing a thorough understanding of the characteristics of returning prisoners and the challenges they face is an important first step in shaping public policy toward improving the safety and welfare of all citizens.

In many ways, the dimensions and challenges of prisoner reentry observed on the national level are mirrored in the State of Maryland. In 2001, 9,448 people were released from Maryland prisons—nearly twice the number released two decades ago (5,436 in 1980). During 2001, 97 percent of all men and women released from Maryland prisons returned to communities in Maryland. Of those prisoners who returned to Maryland, well over half (59 percent) returned to one jurisdiction in the state, Baltimore City, and the flow of prisoners was further concentrated in a small number of communities within Baltimore City. Thirty percent of the 4,411 released prisoners who returned to Baltimore City returned to just 6 of 55 communities: Southwest Baltimore,
Greater Rosemont, Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park, Greenmount East, Clifton-Berea, and Southern Park Heights. These high-concentration community areas in Baltimore, which already face great social and economic disadvantages, may experience reentry costs to a magnified degree. In addition, while these numbers represent individuals released from Maryland prisons after serving sentences of one year or more, it is important to note that approximately 5,000 additional inmates are released to Baltimore City each year after having served jail time (typically less than a year). The sizable number of jail releasees makes the impact of reentry on Baltimore even greater. (For more information, see sidebar About the Data.)

Government leaders, corrections officials, local organizations, and service providers are keenly aware of the reentry challenges in Maryland, and they have begun to use both research and programmatic knowledge to address them. In July 2002, the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services was awarded $2,000,000 over three years from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, as part of the federal government’s Going Home program, which supports reentry initiatives nationwide. This recent grant provides the opportunity for Maryland to continue and expand upon current reentry initiatives in the state. Specifically, a share of the funds will be used to expand a collaborative reentry partnership formed in May 1999 among the Enterprise Foundation, the Maryland Division of Correction (MD DOC), and many partner organizations. This collaboration, entitled the Maryland Re-Entry Partnership Initiative, was established to create a network of transitional services for prisoners returning to Baltimore City. The partnership combines the efforts of state corrections agencies, local law enforcement, and community-based organizations to reduce recidivism and crime and improve the quality of life in Baltimore City.

Other organizations and agencies in Maryland have made reentry an important item on their agendas, including the Abell Foundation, the Baltimore Office of the Open Society Institute (OSI), and the City of Baltimore. In addition to being one of the funders of the Maryland Re-Entry Partnership Initiative, the Abell Foundation also funds a number of employment and substance abuse programs that serve returning prisoners, among others. OSI has made prisoner reentry one of the two main priorities of its criminal justice program by giving grants to nonprofit organizations, service providers, advocates, and government entities that focus on reforming policies and practices aimed at improving services to prisoners as they return to the community. OSI also convenes representatives from Baltimore area organizations for roundtable discussions on reentry issues and hosts a speakers’ series on reentry. In addition, as a result of a proposal submitted by OSI in collaboration

9 See footnote 117 for more information on these communities.

with the Baltimore City Mayor’s Office of Economic Development and representatives from government agencies, nonprofit organizations, foundations, and employers, Baltimore City was chosen in April 2002 to be one of 10 cities nationwide to participate in the National League of Cities’ (NLC’s) Transitional Jobs Project. This initiative provides technical assistance to help cities develop a transitional employment program for hard-to-employ individuals. In Baltimore City, the NLC resources will be used to create a Transitional Jobs Project that will help ex-offenders find permanent jobs with adequate living wages.11

These collaborative efforts in Maryland are positive steps toward improving reentry outcomes in Baltimore City, the most critical reentry location in the state. The premise of these programs is that a well-designed reentry system can enhance public safety, reduce returns to prison, control corrections expenditures, and help prisoners achieve successful long-term reintegration, potentially resulting in positive outcomes not only for returning prisoners but for their families and communities as well.

This report is designed to contribute to the efforts currently under way in Maryland to enhance public safety and improve the prospects for successful prisoner reintegration in the state. It is important to note that this report does not attempt to evaluate a specific reentry program, nor does it empirically assess Maryland’s reentry policies and practices. Rather, the process and characteristics of prisoner reentry in Maryland are described by answering several questions that frame the organization of the report:

- **What is the policy context surrounding prisoner reentry in Maryland?** How do state sentencing and postrelease supervision practices affect the Maryland reentry picture?
- **What are the characteristics of Maryland’s returning inmates?**
- **How are Maryland prisoners prepared for reentry?**
- **What are the Maryland communities with the greatest concentrations of returning inmates?** What are the economic and social climates of those communities?

The report begins by describing the reentry process at the state level, followed by a description of the characteristics of inmates released from Maryland prisons in 2001.12 We next turn our attention to an analysis of reentry in Baltimore City, where the largest number and percentage of Maryland releasees return. The characteristics of Baltimore and the unique challenges
the city faces with regard to the reintegration of prisoners are described and discussed. The report concludes with a spatial analysis of select neighborhoods in Baltimore to which a large percentage of prisoners return. It is our hope that this report will provide a useful, factual foundation for the individuals and organizations working to improve reentry outcomes for prisoners, their families and communities, and the general public in Maryland.
The data used for this report were derived from several sources. Longitudinal data describing the policy context of incarceration and reentry trends in Maryland, for example, were derived from a mix of federal statistics, such as the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and statistics compiled by various agencies within the State of Maryland, such as the Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Policy and the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. Community-level data used to develop the maps of reentry and related demographic and socioeconomic status (SES) data by Baltimore neighborhood were derived from census data compiled by the Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance (BNIA). BNIA also provided the files that enabled us to aggregate and map data according to the 55 Baltimore community areas.

The available data from each of these sources spanned different time periods—some had data for only a few years, while others had data for two decades or longer. Rather than truncating longitudinal data so that graphs and statistics from all sources cover a common time span, we chose to include all years for which we were able to obtain data points. As a result, readers will not always be able to make year-to-year comparisons across graphs. Much of our consecutive longitudinal data stops at calendar year 1998 or 1999. In some cases, we were able to obtain a single data point for a more recent year. In these instances, because of the gaps between data points, readers may see statistics presented in the text that are not included in the figures.

Data on the population of inmates released from Maryland prisons in calendar year 2001 were obtained from the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, and represent only those released inmates who received sentences of one year or more to ensure that these data represent those individuals who were sentenced to serve time in the state prison system. The reason for this distinction is that, as a result of acts of the 1991 General Assembly, the State of Maryland agreed to take over operation of the Baltimore City detention center complex, providing services and administering programs associated with processing, detaining, and managing Baltimore Region arrestees [An. Code 1957, art. 41, § 4–1403; 1999, ch. 54, § 2.]. We acknowledge in this report that the number of people being released from Maryland prisons is in fact much higher due to this jail population. However, jail inmates are housed for relatively short periods of time, are not eligible for most prison programming, and are not subject to postrelease supervision. Thus, the challenges of jail reentry are substantively different than those of prisoner reentry and are not addressed in this report.
CHAPTER 1

What is the Policy Context Surrounding Prisoner Reentry in Maryland?

Figure 1. Maryland prison population and admissions, 1980–2001

In order to understand the reentry phenomenon in Maryland, it is first necessary to examine recent trends in sentencing and corrections practices in the state. This section provides an overview of recent sentencing and incarceration history in the state and describes the factors contributing to the growth in Maryland’s inmate population, as well as changes in release policies and postrelease supervision practices. This policy context will help frame the reentry issue and will provide background for the discussion of the needs and challenges of returning inmates that follows later in this report.

PRISON POPULATION ON THE RISE

The Maryland prison population has grown tremendously over the past two decades, reflecting the rise in prison populations nationwide. Between 1980 and 2001, the Maryland prison population more than tripled, increasing from 7,731 to 23,752 people. (See figure 1.) Over these two decades, the per capita rate of imprisonment in Maryland rose from 183 to 422 per 100,000 residents in the state. In 2001, Maryland had the highest per capita rate of imprisonment in the nation. The Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (MD DPSCS) responded to this growth by building five new correctional facilities with 8,826 new beds between 1990 and 2000. The Maryland prison system now consists of 26 correctional facilities.

As the incarceration rate has increased in Maryland, so too has state spending on corrections. Maryland’s per capita spending on corrections rose from $105 (inflation-adjusted 1999 dollars) during FY1990 to $172 per capita during FY1999. Maryland’s per capita corrections expenditures during FY1999 were higher than the national average of $162 per capita and represented the highest per capita corrections expenditures in the nation. MD DOC operating expenditures have also increased over the past two decades. In 2000, MD DOC expenditures totaled well over $500 million, compared with $179 million in 1984 (inflation-adjusted 2000 dollars).

EXPLAINING MARYLAND INCARCERATION TRENDS

This section describes how Maryland’s crime rates and revocation practices have contributed to increased admissions over time, driving the growth in Maryland’s prison population. Longer stays in prison often drive prison growth as well, but this trend is not observed in Maryland. In fact, Maryland
inmates today are serving shorter prison terms than in the past as a result of more inmates serving time for offenses that carry shorter sentences, as well as MD DOC’s use of “diminution credits,” which we discuss below. While shorter prison terms alone would result in a smaller prison population, the volume of those admitted with shorter sentences has increased so dramatically that the net result has been an increase in the prison population over time.

Rising Crime Rates

Increases in crime rates across the United States in the latter part of the 20th century heightened concerns about public safety and coincided with a shift in the political landscape. This ideological shift toward a more conservative approach to criminal behavior resulted in more stringent policing practices and more punitive sentencing policies. As shown in figures 2 and 3, Maryland experienced a rise in rates of property crimes from the mid 1980s through the mid 1990s, with violent and drug crime rates also rising steadily. Rising crime rates prompted initiatives to more vigorously arrest and punish offenders and resulted in increased admissions to Maryland prisons.22 While these crime rates declined in the latter half of the 1990s, “tough on crime” policing and sentencing policies remained in practice.

Of particular note is the use of incarceration in response to rising rates of drug crimes (possession and sales; see figure 3). As part of the “War on Drugs,” which introduced a more punitive approach to drug offenses in Maryland and nationwide, drug offenders have represented an increasingly larger share of new commitments to Maryland prisons over the past two decades. In 2001, persons convicted of drug offenses represented the largest share of new commitments to Maryland prisons (43 percent), nearly four times the share of new commitments that they represented in 1983. (See figure 4.)23 Nationwide, the incarceration rate for drug offenders in state prisons increased more sharply than for any other offense category between 1980 and 1996, representing about 33 percent of the growth in the incarceration rate in state prisons during that period.24

Increases in Parole Violations and Revocations

The number of parole violators returned to Maryland prisons also has been increasing, rising sevenfold from 1980 to 1998, reflecting an increase from 7 percent to almost one-third of all admissions to Maryland prisons during that same period. (See figures 5 and 6.)25 This increase resembles national parole revocation trends. Parole revocations can be due to new crimes or technical violations of parole conditions. In Maryland, technical violations for parolees typically involve absconding from supervision, failure to report to the parole officer as directed, or positive urinalysis tests for illegal drugs.26 Normally, a warrant is issued and a revocation hearing is held before a parolee is returned to prison on a technical
Figure 2. Number of property crimes in Maryland per 100,000 residents, 1975–2000
Source: FBI Uniform Crime Reports.

Figure 3. Number of violent and drug crimes in Maryland per 100,000 residents, 1975–2000
Source: Uniform Crime Reporting Program, Central Records Division, Maryland State Police.

Figure 4. Drug offenders as percentage of new commitments to Maryland prisons, 1983–2001
violation. In the case of new crimes that result in new terms of confinement, the parolee typically serves the revocation time concurrently with the new sentence.  

Over the past decade, the number of revocations for technical violations in Maryland has increased, while the number of revocations for new crimes has remained relatively stable. (See figure 7.) As a result, technical violations now account for a greater share of all parole revocations in Maryland than they did a decade ago. In 2002, technical violations represented 58 percent of revocations in Maryland, while 42 percent were for new crimes. (See figure 8.)

**Reductions in Sentence Length and Time Served**

Prison population growth is often affected by increases in the average length of stay, which can be driven by longer sentences meted out by the courts as well as by higher percentages of time served. Longer sentences and more time served, in turn, can be affected by changes in sentencing policies such as federal truth-in-sentencing (TIS) statutes that many states, but not Maryland, have implemented over the past two decades.  

Recent changes in Maryland’s sentencing policies, however, do not appear to have resulted in longer lengths of stay, though they may have affected the number of admissions to Maryland prisons. (See sidebar Changes in Maryland Sentencing Policy.) In fact, longitudinal data on Maryland prisoners indicate that sentence lengths and time served have both decreased in recent years. Thus, the growth in Maryland’s prison population cannot be attributed to longer lengths of stay by its inmates.

With regard to sentence length, Maryland mirrors national trends, with average sentence lengths declining between 1981 and 2001. Over the past two decades, the share of Maryland prisoners given shorter sentences (one to three years) increased from 39 percent to 44 percent. At the same time, the share of prisoners given longer sentences (8 to 10 years, and more than 10 years) decreased from 11 to 7 percent and from 17 to 13 percent, respectively. (See figure 9.) And while limited longitudinal data exist on time served by Maryland inmates, we do know that for violent offenders, the mean time served dropped from 63 months to 65 months. (See figure 10.)

Several factors explain the shorter sentence lengths and shorter time served by Maryland prisoners. In terms of average sentence lengths, Maryland’s prison population has increasingly been comprised of inmates incarcerated for offenses that carry relatively short sentence lengths, namely drug offenders and parole violators. The average sentence length for drug offenders who were released from Maryland prisons in 2001 was 54 months (about 4.5 years), compared with 72 months (6 years) for the entire release cohort. (See figure 10.) Parole violators who are revoked for technical violations in Maryland (58 percent of parole violators in FY 2002) typically return to prison for two- to three-year sentences but often

---

27 Maryland Division of Correction; Maryland Parole Commission website: http://www.dpscs.state.md.us/mpcc.
29 The length of a prisoner’s sentence, which is the term of imprisonment meted out by the court, does not necessarily correspond to the actual time served in prison (i.e., prisoners usually serve less time than their court-ordered sentence lengths).
30 At the national level, the average prison sentence has decreased. From 1990 to 1999, the mean sentence length dropped from 69 months to 65 months. Source: Hughes et al. 2001. Trends in State Parole, 1990–2000.
31 Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Corrections, Annual Reports. Fiscal Years 1981 to 2001.
33 In 1990, the average time served for prisoners released from state prison was 22 months; by 1999, it had increased to 29 months. Source: Hughes et al. 2001. Trends in State Parole, 1990–2000.
34 As measured by the mean.
35 2001 Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Correction data.
Figure 5. Number of parole violators returned to Maryland prisons, 1980–1998

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Prisoner Statistics data series (NPS–1).

Figure 6. Parole violators as percentage of total Maryland prison admissions, 1980–1998


Figure 7. Number of technical and new crime revocations, 1992–2002

Source: Maryland Division of Parole and Probation.

Figure 8. Percentage of parole revocations for technical violations vs. new crimes, 1992–2002

Source: Urban Institute analysis of Maryland Division of Parole and Probation data.
serve a smaller share of that time. In terms of lengths of stay, the Maryland Division of Correction has increasingly employed diminution credits to control crowding. These credits, which reduce an inmate’s maximum release date, are also used to encourage participation in programs. In recent years, MD DOC has been offering more good time credits—as much as 20 days for every 30 days served.

### SUMMARY

In summary, increased admissions of offenders carrying shorter terms and more opportunities to reduce time served through diminution credits have resulted in more prisoners cycling through Maryland’s prison system on shorter sentences. Shorter sentence lengths and reductions in time served on their own would result in a smaller prison population; however, the volume of prisoners admitted has increased so dramatically that the net result has been growth in Maryland’s prison population over the past two decades.

The volume of inmates serving shorter terms not only explains the growth in Maryland prisons but also significantly changes the profile of the reentry population in Maryland. For instance, many of these inmates served such short terms that they were ineligible for prison programming that might have prepared them for their release and were able to bypass the parole process as well.

Related to the issue of sentence length is that of the mechanisms by which inmates are released. We now turn to a discussion of the use of parole, mandatory release, and the expiration of sentences in Maryland.

[Figure 9. Percentage of Maryland prison population, by sentence length, 1981 and 2001]

*Source: Urban Institute analysis of MD DPSCS, Division of Correction annual reports, FY 1981 and 2001.*
Changes in Maryland Sentencing Policy

The past two decades have seen four major changes in Maryland’s sentencing policies. First, in response to perceptions of unwarranted sentencing disparity, the Maryland judiciary introduced voluntary sentencing guidelines in 1983. Maryland’s voluntary sentencing guidelines—recommended sentencing policies not mandated by law—prescribe sentence ranges based on both the seriousness of the offense and the criminal history of the offender. Judges are expected to document their reasoning. A 1996 nationwide assessment of structured sentencing conducted by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) found that under guidelines, repeat offenders and persons convicted of violent and drug crimes are much more likely to be imprisoned and to serve longer prison terms than before guidelines were implemented. Guidelines may have affected increased admissions in Maryland, but they do not appear to have resulted in the longer prison terms observed in guideline states across the nation.

In addition, Maryland has enacted mandatory minimum sentences for certain offenses. Currently, six types of offenses require a mandatory minimum sentence in Maryland: (1) violent crimes involving the use of a firearm in relation to drug trafficking; (2) drug dealing as a subsequent offense; (4) violent crimes as a subsequent offense; (5) certain felony drug offenses; and (6) first degree murder. Maryland also enacted legislation in 1994 patterned after the “three-strikes-and-you’re-out” model, requiring mandatory life in prison with no parole eligibility on the fourth strike after separate prison terms have been served for the first three. Finally, in 1994, Maryland began requiring prisoners convicted of violent crimes to serve at least 50 percent of their terms before becoming eligible for discretionary parole release.

a. In the late 1970s and 1980s, the indeterminate sentencing model that had dominated American sentencing policy for most of the mid-1900s came into question. Sentencing reforms were established to limit the discretion of judges and other corrections officials in sentencing matters, and to combat rising crime rates with tougher sentencing standards. See Tonry, M. 1996. *Sentencing Matters.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.


c. “Structured sentencing” is defined to include voluntary/advisory sentencing guidelines, determinate sentencing, presumptive sentencing guidelines, and mandatory sentencing. See Bureau of Justice Assistance. 1996. *National Assessment of Structured Sentencing,* (NCJ 153853).


f. Offenses that count as strikes include murder; rape; robbery; first- or second-degree sexual offense; arson; burglary; kidnapping; manslaughter; use of a firearm in a felony; and assault with attempt to murder, rape, rob, or commit sexual offense. Maryland later added carjacking and armed carjacking to the list of offenses in the “strike zone.” (See Clark, J., J. Austin, and D.A. Henry. 1997. “Three Strikes and You’re Out”: A Review of State Legislation. *National Institute of Justice Research in Brief.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.)
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Figure 10. Mean sentence lengths of released Maryland prisoners, by offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.

*The offense category of Criminal Procedure includes Probation Violations, Parole Violations, Escape, Contempt of Court, Perjury, Criminal Procedure Other, and Attempt to Flee Police. Over two-thirds (68 percent) of the inmates released in 2001 who were included in the criminal procedure category were probation violators. Per email communication with Bob Gibson of the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Office of Research and Statistics, October 17, 2002.
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Figure 11. Maryland prison population and admissions and release cohorts, 1980–1998

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics National Prisoner Statistics data series (NPS–1).
As shown in figure 11, the growth in Maryland’s prison population over the past two decades has been mirrored by the number of releases from Maryland prisons. In 2001, 9,448 people were released from Maryland state prisons—nearly double the number who were released two decades ago (5,436 in 1980).39 Prisoners in Maryland (and nationwide) can be released through either a discretionary or a nondiscretionary process. With nondiscretionary (mandatory) release, the release date is determined by statute rather than by a panel or board. With discretionary release, the prisoner’s release from prison to supervision is decided by a parole board or other authority.

In 2001, most prisoners released in Maryland were released through nondiscretionary means (e.g., mandatory release, expiration of sentence, or continuation of mandatory release; see descriptions below). In total, nearly three-quarters (71 percent) of the released prisoners in 2001 were released without the intervention of a parole board or other authority, which has important implications for this discussion of prisoner reentry. These inmates did not have to appear before the parole board to be reviewed or to present a postrelease home or employment plan.

Mandatory releasees accounted for 58 percent of Maryland prisoners released in 2001. These prisoners served part of their sentence in prison, less any good time credits,40 and were released to the community to complete the remainder of their terms under parole supervision. Eight percent of Maryland prisoners released in 2001 were released due to the expiration of their sentences. These prisoners completed the entire term of their sentences and were released to the community without being under the supervision of a community corrections agency (parole). Five percent of prisoners released during 2001 were continued on mandatory release (CNT/mandatory release). These prisoners had been released earlier for the same sentence and then returned to prison on a parole violation. When these prisoners were re-released in 2001, they continued to fulfill the conditions of their original mandatory release.

The remainder of the Maryland prisoners released in 2001 were released through discretionary means (e.g., parole, court, and continuation of parole). For about one-fifth (22 percent) of Maryland prisoners released in 2001, their release was decided following review by the Maryland Parole Commission. A small percentage (3 percent) of prisoners released in 2001 were released as a result of a decision by a court, such as deciding to suspend the balance of a prisoner’s sentence. Finally, some prisoners released during 2001 (4 percent) were continued on parole release (CNT/parole). These prisoners had been released by parole decision for the same sentence and then returned to prison on a parole violation. When these prisoners were re-released in 2001, they continued to fulfill the conditions of their original parole release. These data are shown in figure 12.
Parole Release in Maryland

Nationwide, a move away from indeterminate sentencing and a push for truth-in-sentencing over the past few decades have prompted many states to eliminate or reduce the role of parole boards in the release process. In Maryland, the Maryland Parole Commission (MPC)—the main paroling authority in the state—still plays a role in the release process, though the share of prisoners released by MPC decision has decreased over the past decade. (See figures 13 and 14.) Following a sharp rise in the percentage of all prison releases attributable to parole board decisions in the late 1980s (from 29 percent to 42 percent), the share of prisoners released by parole board decision declined significantly during the 1990s, dropping from 42 percent of all releases to slightly more than 20 percent. These statistics reflect national trends: The percentage of state inmates released from prison as a result of a parole board decision dropped from 39 percent of all releases in 1990 to 24 percent in 1999.

There are several reasons for the reduction in the share of parole board releases over time, including legislation introduced in 1994 that requires prisoners convicted of violent crimes to serve at least 50 percent of their terms before becoming eligible for discretionary parole release. According to some observers, this statute, coupled with a more conservative MPC, has resulted in fewer longer-term prisoners being released via parole.

In addition, as mentioned above, a large number of Maryland prisoners are serving shorter sentences. (See figure 9.) Most Maryland prisoners who have been sentenced to more than six months become eligible for parole after they have served one-fourth of their term. These short-term sentences result in many prisoners reaching their maximum release date (less pretrial jail and diminution credits) before they can be scheduled and heard by the parole board. Inmates who are still incarcerated after having served enough of their sentences to be eligible for parole release often opt to waive the parole hearing process in lieu of serving out their sentences so that they are not subject to parole supervision upon release.

Finally, there has been an increased use of diminution credits, which can reduce an inmate’s maximum release date as much as 20 days for every 30 days served. With more opportunities to reduce sentence lengths in this manner, the parole board has become less instrumental in the release process, because inmates are less likely either to seek a parole hearing or to still be incarcerated by the time they are eligible for parole.
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b. Parole in Maryland has gone through many organizational arrangements over time, but since 1976 the Maryland Parole Commission (MPC) has been composed of eight members appointed for six-year terms by the secretary of public safety and correctional services with approval from the governor and the state senate. While the MPC has paroling authority over the bulk of prisoners serving Maryland sentences, the Board of Review of the Patuxent Institution supervises the several hundred prisoners in that program. In addition, the governor is responsible for making parole decisions about prisoners who are serving life sentences. (Maryland Parole Commission website: http://www.dpcs.md.gov/mpc/, accessed March 2002.)


d. The Maryland Parole Commission (MPC) bases its definition of “violent crimes” on Article 27, Section 643b of the Annotated Code of Maryland. Crimes the MPC defines as “violent” include abduction, arson, assault first degree, burglary, carjacking, child abuse, escape, housebreaking, kidnapping, maiming and mayhem, manslaughter (except involuntary manslaughter), murder, rape, robbery, sexual offense first and second degrees, use of a handgun, and assaults with intent to commit certain crimes. There are exceptions to this list, depending on when the offense was committed. See Maryland Parole Commission. Annual Report Fiscal Year 98. Available at http://www.dpcs.md.gov/mpc/pcn/pcn/fy98.pdf (accessed April 2002).


f. Per conversation with James Austin, August 15, 2002, Washington, D.C.

g. Maryland Parole Commission website.

h. Per conversation with James Austin, August 15, 2002, Washington, D.C.

i. Ibid.

j. Four types of diminution credits may be awarded: good conduct credit, industrial credit, education credit, and special project credit.

k. Maryland Division of Correction.
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Figure 12. Percentage of Maryland prison releases, by release method, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.

Figure 13. Percentage of Maryland prisoners released by Parole Commission decision, 1987–1999


Figure 14. Number of Maryland prisoners released by Parole Commission decision, 1987–1999

What Happens After Maryland Prisoners Are Released?

Figure 15. Maryland parole population, 1980–1998

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics Annual Parole Data Survey data series (CJ–7).
The majority of prisoners released in Maryland in 2001 (89 percent) were released conditionally, meaning they were subject to some kind of community supervision after release. In essence, prisoners who are released conditionally serve the last portion of their sentences while back in the community. Prisoners released by parole decision and mandatory releasees both are supervised in the community for some period of time. Indeed, mandatory releasees are subject to the same rules, regulations, and community supervision conditions as parole releasees. The remaining 11 percent of Maryland prisoners were released unconditionally, meaning they were not subject to any postrelease supervision. These prisoners, who were released because of the expiration of their sentences or by a court decision, were under no legal obligation to abide by conditions of release such as having a job, participating in drug or alcohol treatment, or having prearranged housing plans.

All conditional releasees are supervised by the Maryland Division of Parole and Probation (MDPP), a separate organization from the Maryland Parole Commission. With more and more inmates being released from Maryland prisons over the past two decades, the number of people under parole supervision in the community has increased. (See figure 15.) At year-end 2000, 14,143 people were on parole in Maryland, compared with 6,436 people in 1980.

Released prisoners under parole are supervised by parole agents located in offices across the state. Maryland parolees are subject to a number of general conditions, including reporting to parole agents at specified times, working regularly, and obtaining permission to leave the state. (See figure 16.) Some parolees are subject to additional conditions, such as paying restitution. Violating these conditions can result in a return to prison. In recent years, MDPP has been more likely to initiate formal revocation procedures for violations, in part due to increased supervision and more frequent urinalysis testing. The Maryland Parole Commission, in turn, has been more likely to revoke supervision.

Experiments in PostRelease Supervision

In response to the increase in parole violators returning to prison, Maryland has launched several efforts in recent years to improve the outcomes of parolees, with a particular focus on Baltimore City. These include redesigning the way the MDPP operates through the Proactive Community Supervision model, as well as implementing new community supervision programs aimed at reducing crime and recidivism, such as Break the Cycle and the HotSpots Initiative.
**Proactive Community Supervision.** Maryland has been planning an aggressive strategy to revamp its parole system with the goal of improving public safety and prisoner reintegration. Parole officers currently have many responsibilities and very high caseloads, leaving little time to work intensively with individuals in the community. Each agent handles about 103 cases—which includes both high-risk and low-risk offenders. Parole agent performance is currently measured by how many contacts he or she has with an ex-prisoner rather than by ex-prisoner performance outcomes, such as staying substance abuse-free and avoiding violations. The new Proactive Community Supervision (PCS) model will gauge agent performance based upon parolee performance and will redistribute caseloads so that high-risk offenders receive appropriate amounts of time and attention from agents. Parole agents will work with 50 to 55 high-risk, high-need cases or with about 200 low-risk, low-need cases. In addition to changing the way cases are assigned, more staff will be hired and improved technology, such as laptops, mobile phones, and body armor, will be made available to more agents.

As the name suggests, this new system envisions a proactive role for agents—working with and in the communities where their assigned parolees live. Under the old system, parole agents spent most of their time in their offices, and parolees reported to them. Under PCS, agents are assigned to supervise parolees in a specific area. They will become familiar with the neighborhoods and work with parolees in the community. In addition, community agencies will help parolees with job placement, education, and training. While plans for the PCS system are under way, it is unclear when it will be completely implemented or how it will be funded.

**Break the Cycle.** As mentioned above, increasing numbers of parole violators returning to prison have played a significant role in rising Maryland prison admission rates over the past two decades. Recognizing that offending (and reoffending) is often linked to substance abuse, the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services launched Break the Cycle (BTC) in 1999. BTC was designed to achieve three main goals: (1) reducing crime, with a focus on crimes committed to support drug addictions or other drug-related crime; (2) reducing the number of parole violators by helping to facilitate greater compliance with parole conditions, thereby reducing prison admissions for new crimes and technical violations; and (3) reducing court caseloads. The program has been implemented in seven jurisdictions in Maryland: Baltimore City and Baltimore, Charles, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George’s, and Washington counties. BTC uses a combination of drug testing, substance abuse treatment, and a system of sanctions and rewards to reduce substance use among parolees. All released inmates who are in specialized substance abuse programs or who have been ordered by the court or the Parole Commission to undergo drug testing or substance abuse treatment are eligible to
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participate in BTC. The Division of Parole and Probation is responsible for administering drug testing and delivering appropriate sanctions.

An early evaluation of BTC found that, in 2001, the positive drug test rate dropped from 25 percent to 15 percent of participants between the 1st and the 16th drug test. Positive results have also been achieved in terms of recidivism rates. In 2000, 21 percent of BTC participants were rearrested within the first 180 days of their supervision, compared with 29 percent of a comparison group of released Baltimore City inmates who did not participate in the program. Despite these promising findings, it is too early to say whether the program has been effective in reducing the number of technical parole violators returning to prison and in adequately addressing the drug treatment needs of this population. The Urban Institute is currently conducting an impact evaluation of BTC that will compare rearrest rates in BTC jurisdictions to those in probation/parole offices not implementing BTC, controlling for differences among the sites and clients.

**HotSpots Initiative.** MDPP is also a partner in a community-based crime-fighting effort initiated by the Governor’s Office on Crime Control and Prevention. The program provides funding to 62 high-crime, at-risk communities in Maryland, called HotSpots. As one might expect, many of these communities are also home to high concentrations of returning prisoners. As part of the HotSpots strategy, adults and juveniles on probation and parole in HotSpots communities are subject to intensive supervision by joint teams of police officers, parole and probation, juvenile justice, and federal probation officers.
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Figure 17. Percentage of Maryland prison releases, by race, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.

Figure 18. Percentage of Maryland prison releases, by age, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
In order to understand the reentry picture in Maryland, it is important to examine the characteristics of the population being released from Maryland prisons each year. This section describes the 2001 release cohort, including basic demographics, reasons for incarceration, criminal histories, time served, and conditions of release.

DEMOGRAPHICS

In 2001, 9,448 men and women were released from Maryland state prisons. The composition of this release cohort reflects the composition of the Maryland prison population. The majority were male (91 percent) and black (76 percent). Nearly three-quarters (73 percent) of these released prisoners were between the ages of 20 and 40 at the time of their release, with the average age at release being 34 years old. These data are shown in figures 17 and 18.

CONVICTION OFFENSE

As described in the first section of this report, an increase in convictions for drug offenses has contributed to rising incarceration rates in Maryland. In 2001, a third (32 percent) of all released Maryland prisoners had been serving time for drug offenses, including possession and sale. Other common conviction offenses of released prisoners include assault, larceny, and robbery. (See figure 19.)

TIME SERVED

About half of the Maryland prisoners released in 2001 served two years or less in prison, with an average time served of 23.8 months. (See figure 20.) The largest share (37 percent) of Maryland prisoners released in 2001 served between 40 and 60 percent of their sentences in prison. (See figure 21.)

CRIMINAL HISTORY AND THE REVOLVING DOOR

Cycling in and out of prison is common among released prisoners, whether they are returned to prison while under parole supervision or not. A recent study by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, which tracked close to 300,000 prisoners who were released from prisons in 15 states in 1994, found that within three years of their release, nearly 52 percent were back in prison for new

51 Refers to prisoners who were sentenced to a year or more.
52 As measured by the median.
53 Refers to prisoners who were sentenced to one year or more. Based on Urban Institute analysis of 2001 Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Correction data.
54 Although all the men and women included in our analysis had been sentenced to a year or more, many may have earned good time credits and been released earlier. In addition, we calculated time served and percentage of sentence served based on when they actually entered prison rather than when their sentence began (i.e., they may have served pre-trial custody time before admission to prison).
prison sentences or technical violations of the conditions of their release. The criminal histories of the Maryland prisoners released in 2001 demonstrate similar patterns of recidivism. For instance, nearly 22 percent of these prisoners had violated their parole at some point during their criminal careers. Perhaps more striking, more than two-thirds (70 percent) of the prisoners released in 2001 had been in prison at least once before their most recent term, with some having served four or more previous prison terms. (See figure 22.) In addition, by the time these data were compiled in spring 2002, more than 15 percent of the men and women released in 2001 had already returned to prison.

**MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH PROBLEMS**

Prisoners nationwide suffer from a range of mental and physical health problems. In 1997, nearly one-third (31 percent) of state prisoners reported having a learning or speech disability, a hearing or vision problem, or a mental or physical condition. A specific area of heightened concern is HIV/AIDS in prison populations. Nationally, in 1999, 2.3 percent of state prisoners were HIV positive, and the overall rate of confirmed AIDS cases among the nation’s prison population was five times the rate in the U.S. general population (0.60 percent versus 0.12 percent). In Maryland, 3.5 percent of inmates are HIV positive.

While we were unable to obtain detailed statistics on the health of Maryland inmates, it stands to reason that the state’s soon-to-be-released prisoners have rates of physical and mental health conditions similar to those of inmates across the country. The MD DOC does prepare medical discharge plans for some inmates, but these plans are primarily prepared for those who are HIV positive, have serious chronic mental or physical health problems, or are medically paroled. In FY2002, discharge plans were prepared for 476 soon-to-be-released prisoners. Thus, mental and physical health issues present yet another reentry challenge for a considerable portion of Maryland’s released inmates—one that could significantly affect the ease of transition to life on the outside.

**LIFE ON THE OUTSIDE**

The above description of Maryland’s 2001 releasee cohort has implications for these prisoners’ prospects for reintegration. The typical released inmate served two years in prison and may have had limited opportunities for program participation to improve job skills and address substance abuse problems. Most released inmates had been in prison at least once before, and more than one-fifth had served prison time for a parole violation at some point in their criminal careers. This cycling in and out of prison creates spotty employment histories at best, and
Figure 19. Percentage of Maryland prison releases, by primary conviction offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.

Figure 20. Percentage of Maryland prison releases, by time served, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.

Figure 21. Percentage of Maryland prison releases, by percentage of sentence served, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.

Figure 22. Percentage of Maryland prison releases, by number of prior prison terms, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
often none at all. And, given national statistics, it is likely that the typical released inmate in Maryland has a history of substance abuse.\footnote{Seventy-four percent of state prisoners who expect to be released in the next 12 months report a history of drug and/or alcohol use. See Beck, A. 2000. State and Federal Prisoners Returning to the Community: Findings from the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Paper presented at the First Re-entry Courts Initiative Cluster Meeting, Washington, D.C. April 13, 2000. Available at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sfprc.pdf. (Accessed May 2002.)} Substance abuse problems can compound the above-mentioned reentry challenges, leading to relapse, recidivism, and ultimately re-incarceration. Mental and physical health problems make for additional burdens to the released prisoner, who may have difficulty obtaining medications and treatment that were available while he or she was in prison.

In addition to these personal characteristics, ex-prisoners are often hindered by laws and policies that may impede successful reintegration. For example, civic participation for former prisoners is limited and often never fully regained after release. In Maryland, people in prison, on parole, or on probation are denied voting rights.\footnote{Legal Action Center. 2002. Fifty-State Survey of Collateral Consequences Faced by Individuals with Criminal Records.} Even after successful completion of postrelease supervision, violent ex-felons with two or more felony convictions are permanently banned from voting. Recent legislation that takes effect in 2003 restores voting rights to nonviolent ex-felons with two or more felony convictions three years after sentence completion. A recent study indicates that 40,900 ex-felons in Maryland will remain disenfranchised when the new law takes effect.\footnote{Uggen. C., and J. Manza, with M. Thompson and S. Wakefield. 2002. Impact of Recent Legal Changes in Felon Voting Rights in Five States. Presentation at the National Symposium on Felony Disenfranchisement, Washington, D.C., Sept. 30, 2002.} The effects of disenfranchisement are felt most strongly in communities, such as those discussed in the next section, that are home to large numbers of returning prisoners.

Being an ex-prisoner in Maryland carries other collateral consequences for some released prisoners. For instance, in order to receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)\footnote{In Maryland, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits and food stamps, persons convicted of drug-related felonies must submit to drug testing and treatment for two years following their release from prison or from the end of their parole or probation term (whichever is later). Individuals who were convicted of drug-related offenses after July 1, 2000, are ineligible for any cash assistance or food stamps until one year after the conviction date. Sanctions follow from positive drug test results or failure to comply with treatment requirements.} benefits and food stamps, persons convicted of drug-related felonies must submit to drug testing and treatment for two years following their release from prison or from the end of their parole or probation term (whichever is later). Individuals who were convicted of drug-related offenses after July 1, 2000, are ineligible for any cash assistance or food stamps until one year after the conviction date. Sanctions follow from positive drug test results or failure to comply with treatment requirements.\footnote{Criminal history records also affect ex-prisoners’ abilities to find jobs and housing. In Maryland, a range of organizations are permitted to obtain criminal history information, including employment agencies, membership associations, and landlords. The Baltimore Public Housing Authority, for example, considers criminal history as part of its admission criteria and bars individuals who have been convicted of drug-related and violent crimes.} Criminal history records also affect ex-prisoners’ abilities to find jobs and housing. In Maryland, a range of organizations are permitted to obtain criminal history information, including employment agencies, membership associations, and landlords. The Baltimore Public Housing Authority, for example, considers criminal history as part of its admission criteria and bars individuals who have been convicted of drug-related and violent crimes.\footnote{In summary, the characteristics of Maryland’s released inmates suggest that successful reintegration is an uphill battle. Criminal and substance abuse histories put returning prisoners at a disadvantage both socially and economically, and state and local laws and policies may hinder, rather than help, the reentry process. Given the reentry challenges discussed above, it is useful to examine the types of assistance and preparation provided to inmates prior to their release.}

In summary, the characteristics of Maryland’s released inmates suggest that successful reintegration is an uphill battle. Criminal and substance abuse histories put returning prisoners at a disadvantage both socially and economically, and state and local laws and policies may hinder, rather than help, the reentry process. Given the reentry challenges discussed above, it is useful to examine the types of assistance and preparation provided to inmates prior to their release.
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Figure 23. Nationwide program participation rates of prisoners to be released in the next 12 months, 1991 and 1997

Prison programming has historically played an important role in American corrections, guided by the belief that providing educational and vocational training to prisoners can help them become productive, law-abiding citizens upon their return to the community. Whether prison programming does, in fact, contribute to positive postrelease outcomes (e.g., reduced recidivism) has been the subject of much research and dispute. In the 1970s, many studies suggested that prison programming did not work. By contrast, more recent research and meta-analyses have found favorable results, with treatment groups across programs consistently achieving at least a modest reduction in recidivism versus comparison groups.

While the effectiveness of prison programming is still up for debate, we do know that prisoners nationwide are less likely to have participated in prison programs than they were in the past. The number of soon-to-be-released prisoners who reported participating in vocational programs dropped from 31 percent in 1991 to 27 percent in 1997. The number reporting participation in educational programs dropped from 43 percent to 35 percent in that same period. In addition, the number of state prisoners who reported receiving formal substance abuse treatment while in prison dropped from 25 percent in 1991 to 10 percent in 1997. (See figure 23.) With regard to prerelease programming, in both 1991 and 1997, only about 13 percent of soon-to-be-released prisoners reported participating in such programs.

MARYLAND PRISON PROGRAMMING

While no historical data exist on prison program participation in Maryland, we do know that in 2001, about 17 percent of inmates were involved in educational or vocational programs at any given time. Over the course of the year, roughly 40 percent of inmates participated in educational or vocational programs. Approximately half of all Maryland inmates had work assignments (e.g., sanitation, food service) within the correctional institutions. An additional 7 percent of prisoners participated in a work-release program, which allows selected prisoners to work in the community during the day and return to their correction institution at the end of the workday. However, nearly one-third of all Maryland state prisoners (31 percent) were classified as idle, which denotes a lack of participation in programming or work. The institutions do not have enough job and program assignments for everyone, so these inmates must wait for slots to become available.

Education and Employment Readiness Programs

Finding and maintaining a legitimate job after release could help with reintegration and reduce recidivism. Most released prisoners, however, expe-


rience difficulties finding jobs. They often enter prison with poor educational backgrounds and little work experience. The average reading level of Maryland inmates is between the sixth and eighth grade level; less than half hold high school degrees or GEDs; and most did not have jobs when they were arrested. During the time they spend in prison, inmates may lose work skills, forfeit the opportunity to gain work experience, and sever interpersonal connections that could provide information about jobs. After release, the stigma of their ex-prisoner status makes the job search even more difficult. A recent survey of 3,000 employers in four major metropolitan areas revealed that two-thirds of the employers would not knowingly hire an ex-prisoner.

MD DOC has several programs aimed at educating prisoners, improving job skills, and providing employment experience. A recent study found the recidivism rates of inmates who participated in Maryland’s educational programs to be lower than those of inmates who did not participate. One of the programs the MD DOC operates is a mandatory education program in compliance with Maryland state law that requires prisoners who do not possess a high school degree or GED and who have a minimum of 18 months to serve when received by the DOC to attend school while incarcerated. This program, which is conducted in accordance with the Education Coordinating Council for Correctional Institutions, requires eligible prisoners to participate in school at least 12 hours per week in maintaining institutions or 5 hours per week in prerelease system facilities for a minimum of 120 calendar days. Prisoners who meet the eligibility requirements for this program are assigned by their case manager to the appropriate class and are required to participate. If they refuse to participate or are removed from the program because of disciplinary or other problems, the consequences are severe. They lose all diminution credits accrued up to that point and are not allowed to participate in any other programs and, therefore, cannot earn any diminution credits until certain conditions, as outlined by the case manager, are met.

Unfortunately, because of teacher shortages, there is not enough room for all eligible prisoners to participate, and many are released without having taken part in the mandatory program. Between 1990 and 2000, Maryland’s prison population grew 54 percent while the number of correctional educators only increased by 4 percent. In 2001, more than 1,500 prisoners were on waiting lists to participate in educational or vocational programming. Seventeen percent of the inmate population (4,132 prisoners) participated in the correctional education program in some way during that year. Nineteen hundred ten participated in mandatory education, 966 prisoners earned a GED, 1,625 prisoners completed basic literacy/life skills certificates, 500 prisoners participated in postsecondary education programs, and approximately 600 prisoners served as inmate tutors to their peers.

The correctional education program also coordinates 38 vocational programs designed to improve job skills. These programs cover 17 skill areas, including auto body repair; automotive power services; building maintenance; business

73 Refers to inmates scheduled to be released in the next 12 months. Source: Lynch and Sabol. 2001. “Prisoner Reentry in Perspective.”
74 Ibid.
76 Lynch and Sabol. 2001. “Prisoner Reentry in Perspective.”
77 These prisoners are closely supervised by correctional personnel while in the community. The prisoners use their earnings to reimburse the MD DOC for room, board, and transportation as well as to make child support payments and pay victim restitution fees. Source: Maryland Division of Correction.
78 Maryland Division of Correction.
82 The Maryland Correctional Education Program is administered by certified staff of the Maryland Department of Education.
83 Maryland correctional institutions other than prerelease facilities.
84 Prisoners do not lose their diminution credits if they were unable to participate because they remained on a waiting list.
data processing; commercial roofing; computer repair; drafting; electrical wiring; furniture upholstery; graphic arts; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; masonry; plumbing; residential construction; sheet metal fabrication; vocational trades internship; and warehousing/distribution. It is important to note, however, that vocational programs are not distributed equally among MD DOC institutions, making them unavailable to many inmates who may be interested in participating in them. About 1,000 inmates, or 4 percent of the total inmate population, are trained in vocational programs each year.87

Substance Abuse Treatment Programs

The link between substance abuse and criminal activity is well documented. In a 1997 national survey, more than half of state prisoners reported that they were under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time they committed the offense that led to their imprisonment.88 In another recent national study, 74 percent of state prisoners who expected to be released within the next 12 months reported a history of drug and/or alcohol abuse.89 Substance abuse problems that are not treated both during incarceration and after release from prison can pose a severe impediment to successful reintegration. Not only do they increase the chance of reoffending, they may also hinder the returning prisoner’s ability to complete job requirements and reestablish relations with family.

MD DOC operates several programs that address substance abuse problems. One of these programs, a residential substance abuse treatment (RSAT) program for prisoners who are identified as having a history of substance abuse problems, provides prisoners with six months of residential treatment at the Central Laundry Facility or the Maryland Correctional Institution for Women. After their release, participants are referred for further treatment at community-based outpatient centers. In 2001, 610 men and 34 women, or 3 percent of Maryland prisoners, were admitted to the program.90

Another substance abuse program offered by the MD DOC is the Women’s Intensive Treatment (WIT) program. While much substance abuse treatment within prison systems focuses on inmates who will be released in the near future, WIT provides female prisoners who are serving longer sentences and are not yet close to their release date with intensive drug and alcohol treatment. The inmates who participate in WIT are typically 36 months or longer from release. The treatment, which is specifically designed to address the unique needs of female prisoners, may last up to nine months. In addition to drug and alcohol treatment, other components of WIT include self-esteem and relationship issues, domestic violence, and parenting assistance. In 2001, 73 women, or 6 percent of female inmates, were admitted to the WIT program.91
In addition, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA) groups are administered by addiction specialists at major facilities and most prerelease and minimum security facilities. Many of the prerelease and minimum security facilities also have AA and NA groups that are run by inmates. MD DOC does not maintain data on the total number of AA and NA programs available systemwide.

**Physical and Mental Health Treatment**

As mentioned earlier in this report, prisoners experience higher rates of mental illness and infectious disease than the general population. MD DOC does not maintain comprehensive data on the physical health care needs of and range of services available to all inmates under their supervision. We do know, however, that while in prison, Maryland inmates have access to preventive, standard, and emergency mental health services. Of Maryland’s 26 facilities, 12 screen prisoners for mental illness at intake, 14 conduct psychiatric assessments, 13 provide 24-hour mental health care, 18 provide therapy and counseling, 18 distribute psychotropic medications, 22 report helping released prisoners obtain services, and 2 do not provide any services. With regard to usage rates, a small but significant proportion of the Maryland prison population takes advantage of mental health services. As of midyear 2000, 15 percent of Maryland prisoners were receiving therapy or counseling, 12 percent were receiving psychotropic medications, and just over 1 percent of prisoners had received 24-hour mental health care.

While prisoners may receive treatment for their mental or physical conditions while incarcerated, the chances that treatment will continue after release are often slim. Furthermore, accessing and paying for necessary prescription or over-the-counter drugs present another challenge for many released prisoners.

**Correctional Options Programs**

In addition to the programs described above, MD DOC also runs Correctional Options Programs (COPs) that are specifically intended to serve low-risk offenders, many of whom (but not all) are at the prerelease security level. COP programs address many different prisoner needs, such as substance abuse treatment, relationship and parenting skill building, and other rehabilitative areas. Many of the COP programs are included in a special category of mandatory programming called mandatory remediation programs. Prisoners who are deemed eligible for participation in these programs, either through case management or assessment, are required to participate.

One version of the COP programs is the Herman L. Toulson Correctional Boot Camp, which 4 women and 229 men completed in 2000. This program offers selected offenders a reduced period of incarceration—usually three to six...
months—during which they must adhere to a program of strict discipline, physical exercise, and work, as well as other rehabilitative programming.\footnote{Ibid.}

Another COP program called the Home Detention Unit (HDU), places prisoners in the community. Through this program, prisoners live in an approved private residence and maintain a job. Participants are subject to intense monitoring through both electronic means and supervision by correctional officers and must continually meet certain requirements of the program. All participants are required to hold gainful employment. Other requirements may include substance abuse treatment or educational programs. Almost 850 prisoners are placed in the home detention program annually.\footnote{Ibid.}

A third COP program, targeted to prisoners in need of specific programs or services in order to successfully reintegrate in the community upon their release, is the Correctional Options Program: Regimented Offender Treatment Center (COP: ROTC). This program serves a wide range of nonviolent offenders, from those who live in traditional incarceration facilities to those under noninstitutional, community-based supervision. The program consists of a series of graduated sanctions and services, including substance abuse treatment, intensive supervision, urinalysis, life skills training, education, and job readiness and placement. In 2001, 707 men and 140 women were admitted to the COP: ROTC program.\footnote{Ibid.}

A study of the Maryland COP initiatives by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) found that the prison beds saved by diverting offenders to community-based sanctions result in savings of more than $32 million in construction and debt service costs and $9 million in annual operating expenditures (based on average annual COP participation of 1,593). NCCD also found that COP participants were less likely to return to prison for new convictions one year after their release compared with non-COP participants, though they were more likely to return to prison for technical violations.\footnote{Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. 1997. Recidivism Status Report on the Correctional Options Program. Available at http://www.ns1dpscs.state.md.us/pnp/cop/coprep.htm. (Accessed August 2002.)}

**Comprehensive Prerelease Programming Initiatives**

The Maryland Re-Entry Partnership Initiative (REP) is a demonstration project designed to improve reentry transitions for prisoners returning to a small number of communities in the City of Baltimore. REP services in the correctional facilities include substance abuse treatment, family counseling, and cognitive/behavioral skills development. After release, community case managers and advocates provide assistance in accessing housing, medical care, substance abuse treatment, and education and employment services. Parole and probation agents and police officers provide community supervision and work in tandem with the case management team.
While this program is promising, it currently serves a very small fraction of the prisoners who return to Baltimore City (125 of the 4,411 who returned there in 2001, or 3 percent). The state plans to use a portion of its recently awarded Going Home funds to expand the REP program to serve 500 prisoners returning to the City of Baltimore each year. These new federal funds will allow the program to expand somewhat—though still reaching a small share of released prisoners—but more funding will be needed to continue and expand this effort.

In fall 2001, MD DOC launched another reentry program, the Partnerships for Re-Entry Programming (PREP). To date, this initiative has been implemented in only seven MD DOC facilities to a small percentage of soon-to-be-released inmates, and currently the program is on hold because of budget constraints. PREP is intended to provide about 150 hours of release preparation and skill development focusing on the areas of employment readiness, community contacts, cognitive skills training, and helping prisoners understand the impact of their crimes on their victims. A community case manager would meet with a soon-to-be-released inmate approximately 75 days before release to create a detailed release plan. Approximately one month before release, the case manager would convene the inmate, the parole officer, and representatives from other agencies with which the released prisoner will have contact, to review the release plan and further prepare the inmate for release. On the day of release, the inmate would be picked up and taken to preidentified housing arrangements.

In addition to the goals of helping prepare soon-to-be-released prisoners with the basics of successful community reintegration—such as obtaining personal identification, identifying and accessing services, and finding a job—MD DOC expects PREP to have a long-term, significant impact on the transition from prison to the community for Maryland inmates statewide. Additional goals include increasing MD DOC prerelease and transition services over a three-year period, standardizing prisoner programming from intake through release, tracking participants for 12 months, and ultimately reducing recidivism rates by 10 percent.

Finally, MD DOC has published a handbook entitled Moving On: A Community Transition Handbook, to help soon-to-be-released prisoners reintegrate. The handbook was prepared by Project YES, an employment readiness program, and is distributed by employment readiness mentors at Project YES, transition coordinators who work with soon-to-be-released inmates, and through some of the Maryland correctional education libraries. The handbook lists community service providers that released prisoners can contact about substance abuse treatment, employment, health care, financial assistance, legal assistance, credit information, and education. There is no uniform distribution plan for the handbook, however, so not all MD DOC prisoners receive a copy upon release. Aside from REP and PREP, MD DOC has no comprehensive plan in place to provide prerelease planning and referrals to community resources for reentering prisoners.
In summary, the Maryland Division of Correction has a broad array of educational, treatment, and life skills classes, at least some of which, according to research, should help prepare inmates for reentry. Of particular note is the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment program, which begins in prison and continues in the community; this type of continuity-of-care model has been found to be associated with reduced recidivism. In addition, the fact that MD DOC already has developed two comprehensive reentry programs suggests that Maryland is ahead of many other states in understanding the importance of reentry preparation and doing something about it. However, REP is only in the pilot phase, reaching a very small number of inmates, and PREP is currently not in operation. Furthermore, fiscal constraints preclude MD DOC from offering traditional in-prison programs to all inmates who are eligible and interested in participating. Indeed, many program participation rates are extremely low, suggesting that any positive impact from these programs would not occur on a large scale.


104 Gaes et al. 1999. *Adult Correctional Treatment.*
CHAPTER 6

Where Are Released Prisoners Going?

Figure 24. Geographic distribution of returning prisoners, by county, 2001
Source: Maryland Division of Correction.

Figure 25. Percentage of released prisoners returning to Maryland counties, 2001
Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
During 2001, 97 percent of all men and women released from Maryland prisons returned to communities in Maryland. One percent returned to Washington, D.C., and the remaining 2 percent returned to 28 other states, including Virginia, Delaware, and New York. Of the men and women released from Maryland prisons who returned to Maryland, well over half—59 percent—returned to Baltimore City. The next largest share of released prisoners (10 percent) returned to Baltimore County, which surrounds Baltimore City. About 6 percent of released prisoners returned to Prince George's County, which borders Northeast Washington, D.C., and about 3 percent returned to Anne Arundel County, which borders Baltimore City to the south and is home to the state capital, Annapolis. Wicomico and Worcester counties each received 3 percent of returning prisoners; Harford, Charles, and Montgomery counties each received about 2 percent. The remaining 15 counties in Maryland received 1 percent or less of returning prisoners. These data are shown in figures 24 and 25.

The community context of prisoner reentry can have an important influence on postrelease success or failure. It stands to reason that ex-prisoners returning to communities with high unemployment rates, limited affordable housing options, and few services are more likely to relapse and recidivate. This section presents findings from a geographic analysis of returning inmates by county and examines this reentry distribution in relation to the socioeconomic characteristics of the counties with the highest percentages of released prisoners in 2001, as well as the characteristics of the prisoners who returned to those counties. We will give special attention to Baltimore City, which received the largest number of released prisoners in 2001, in the next chapter.

105 2001 Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Correction data. Statistics on where released Maryland prisoners returned are based on cases for which address information was available (n=8,516). Of the 8,516 cases for which we had address data, 8,222 had addresses in Maryland. Of these 8,222 cases, 7,447 had viable addresses identified by our mapping software. Using the mapping software, we were able to identify the counties in which each of these 7,447 cases was located, allowing us to examine the data for these cases on a county-by-county level. Nearly all the court release cases in our data set did not include address information; court releases are excluded from the remainder of the analyses in this report.

106 See appendix A for the number of returns to each county in Maryland in 2001.

107 Defined as those counties that received 3 percent or more of the released prisoners who returned to Maryland.
With more than 750,000 residents, Baltimore County (see figure 26) is one of the largest counties in the state—in terms of both population and geography. About 74 percent of its residents are white, 20 percent are black, 3 percent are Asian, and 3 percent are other races. Approximately 6.5 percent of the population are living below the poverty level, compared with the state average of 8.5 percent. Baltimore County’s unemployment rate (4.4 percent) is just above the statewide average of 4.1 percent. Its median household income of $50,667 is just below the statewide median household income of $52,868. Female-headed households account for nearly 13 percent of all households in the county—just below the statewide average of 14.1 percent.108

Quick Facts on Reentry in Baltimore County

- In 2001, 755 released prisoners returned to Baltimore County—one per 1,000 residents.
- The majority of the prisoners who returned to Baltimore County in 2001 were male (91 percent)—the same percentage as across the state.
- About 56 percent of returning prisoners were black, 43 percent were white, and 1 percent were of unknown racial background. While this distribution differs from the racial distribution of returning prisoners across Maryland (see figure 17), it is more similar to the racial distribution of Baltimore County residents.
- As with returning prisoners across Maryland, the largest share (24 percent) of released prisoners returning to Baltimore County had been convicted for drug offenses, though this represents a smaller proportion than the statewide share of returning drug offenders (33 percent). Other common conviction offenses among those returning to Baltimore County in 2001 were assault, larceny, robbery, and burglary. (See figure 27.)109
- The majority (95 percent) were released to some period of parole supervision. Most (63 percent) were mandatory releases, 24 percent were parole board releases, 5 percent were released due to the expiration of their sentences, and 4 percent each were released and continued on parole or continued on mandatory supervision.
- About 63 percent of released prisoners returning to Baltimore County in 2001 had been in prison at least once before. This is less than the 70 percent of prisoners statewide with prior incarcerations. By spring 2002, about 15 percent of them had returned to prison after their release in 2001.
Figure 26. Baltimore County

Figure 27. Percentage of released prisoners returning to Baltimore County, by conviction offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
PRISONER REENTRY IN Prince George’s County

Prince George’s County (see figure 28) is the second most populous county in the state, with more than 800,000 residents. The median household income in Prince George’s County of $55,256 is about $2,500 above the statewide median household income of $52,868. Nearly 8 percent (7.7) of Prince George’s County residents live below the poverty line, just under the statewide average of 8.5 percent. Prince George’s County’s unemployment rate is equal to the statewide average of 4.1 percent. In terms of racial distribution, nearly two-thirds of its residents are black and 27 percent are white. Females head 19.6 percent of the households in Prince George’s County. This is higher than the statewide average of 14.1 percent.

Quick Facts on Reentry in Prince George’s County

- In 2001, 458 released prisoners returned to Prince George’s County—0.6 per 1,000 residents.
- The majority of the released prisoners who returned to Prince George’s County in 2001 were black (88 percent) and male (94 percent).
- As seen across the state, the largest share (24 percent) of released prisoners returning to Prince George’s County had been convicted of drug offenses—though this is less than the 33 percent of returning drug offenders across the state. Robbery, assault, burglary, and larceny are the next most common conviction offenses of those released in 2001. (See figure 29.)
- Nearly 94 percent of Prince George’s County’s returning prisoners were released to some period of parole supervision. About 63 percent were mandatory releases, 22 percent parole board releases, 6 percent each expiration of sentence and continued on parole, and 3 percent continued on mandatory supervision.
- About 60 percent of the released prisoners in Prince George’s County had been in prison at least once before; by spring 2002, 7 percent of them had returned to prison after their release in 2001. Again, these represent lower percentages of people returning to prison than across the state (70 percent with prior incarcerations, 15 percent returned to prison after release in 2001).
Figure 28. Prince George’s County

Figure 29. Percentage of released prisoners returning to Prince George’s County, by conviction offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
PRISONER REENTRY IN Washington County

Washington County (see figure 30) is home to 131,923 residents, making it one of the smaller counties in the state in terms of population. The majority (90 percent) of its residents are white, 8 percent are black, 1 percent are Asian, and 1 percent are other races. Approximately 9.5 percent of its residents live below the poverty level—higher than the state average of 8.5 percent—and its median household income of $40,617 is about $12,000 below the statewide median household income of $52,868. The unemployment rate in Washington County is equal to the state average of 4.1 percent. About 11 percent of the households in Washington County are female-headed, compared with 14.1 percent across the state.

Quick Facts on Reentry in Washington County

- In 2001, 242 released prisoners returned to Washington County—1.8 per 1,000 residents.
- The majority of these releasees were male (91 percent).
- Just over half were white (51 percent), and just under half were black (48 percent)—a much different distribution than that of released prisoners across Maryland, though more representative of the overall population of Washington County.
- Nearly half (46 percent) of those returning to Washington County had been convicted of a drug offense. This is a much higher share of drug offenders than is seen across the state (33 percent). Other common offenses include assault, larceny, robbery, and burglary. (See figure 31.)
- The vast majority of those returning to Washington County were released to some period of parole supervision (95 percent). A little more than half (58 percent) were mandatory releases, 27 percent parole board releasees, 6 percent continued on parole, 5 percent released due to the expiration of their sentences, and 4 percent continued on mandatory supervision.
- Two-thirds (65 percent) had been in prison at least once before. By spring 2002, about 18 percent had returned to prison after their release in 2001.
Figure 30. Washington County

Figure 31. Percentage of released prisoners returning to Washington County, by conviction offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
Anne Arundel County (see figure 32) has 489,656 residents, most of whom are white (81 percent), followed by black (14 percent). The median household income in the county is $61,768—about $9,000 more than the statewide median household income of $52,868. Five percent of Anne Arundel residents live below the poverty line—below the statewide average of 8.5 percent. The unemployment rate in Anne Arundel County (3.2 percent) is less than the statewide average of 4.1 percent. Female-headed households account for 11.1 percent of all households, compared with 14.1 percent across the state.

**Quick Facts on Reentry in Anne Arundel County**

- In 2001, 219 released prisoners returned to Anne Arundel County—0.4 per 1,000 residents.

- The majority of the returning prisoners were male (92 percent).

- As in Baltimore and Washington counties, the racial distribution of returning prisoners was much different from the statewide average, with whites making up a much greater share of the returning prisoners than they do statewide (47 percent versus 21 percent statewide). Blacks account for 51 percent of the released prisoners who returned to Anne Arundel County in 2001.

- The most common conviction offense among those returning to Anne Arundel County was assault, followed by drug offenses, robbery, larceny and burglary. (See figure 33.) Anne Arundel is the only county in Maryland in which an offense other than drugs represents the most common conviction among the released prisoners.

- About 5 percent of those who returned to Anne Arundel County were released unconditionally; the remaining 95 percent were released to some period of parole supervision. Sixty-three percent of released prisoners were mandatory releasees, 24 percent were released by parole, 5 percent released due to the expiration of their sentence, 5 percent continued on parole, and 4 percent continued on mandatory supervision.

- About 68 percent of those returning to Anne Arundel County had been in prison at least once before. By spring 2002, about 11 percent had returned to prison after their release in 2001.
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Figure 32. Anne Arundel County

Figure 33. Percentage of released prisoners returning to Anne Arundel County, by conviction offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
PRISONER REENTRY IN Wicomico County

Wicomico (see figure 34) is one of the smaller and more economically disadvantaged counties in the state. About 12.8 percent of its 84,644 residents live below the poverty line (compared with 8.5 percent statewide), and its median household income ($39,035) is approximately $14,000 below the statewide median of $52,868. Wicomico County’s unemployment rate (5.4 percent) is higher than the statewide average of 4.1 percent. The majority of its residents are white (73 percent), followed by black (23 percent) and Asian (2 percent). About 14.1 percent of the households in the county are female-headed, mirroring the statewide average of 14.1 percent.

Quick Facts on Reentry in Wicomico County

- In 2001, 219 released prisoners returned to Wicomico County. Because of the relatively small population in the county, the prisoners who returned there represent a greater per capita share of the population than in the other counties discussed so far—2.6 per 1,000 residents.
- Most (95 percent) of the released prisoners who returned to Wicomico County were male.
- The racial composition of those who returned to Wicomico County closely matches the statewide distribution: Blacks accounted for 78 percent of the releases, and whites accounted for 21 percent.
- As in most counties, the largest share of ex-prisoners returning to Wicomico County were convicted of drug offenses. The next most common offenses were assault, larceny, and burglary. (See figure 35.)
- The vast majority of those returning to Wicomico County were released to some period of parole supervision (95 percent). A greater share of the released prisoners who returned to Wicomico were released by the parole board (38 percent) than across the state (22 percent). A little more than half (51 percent) were mandatory releasees, 6 percent were released due to the expiration of their sentence, and 3 percent each were continued on parole or continued on mandatory supervision.
- Seventy-one percent of the released prisoners who returned to Wicomico County had been in prison at least once before; by spring 2002, 12 percent had returned to prison after their release in 2001.
Figure 34. Wicomico County

Figure 35. Percentage of released prisoners returning to Wicomico County, by conviction offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
CHAPTER 7

Prisoner Reentry in Baltimore City

Figure 36. Percentage of released prisoners returning to Baltimore City, by conviction offense, 2001

Source: Urban Institute analysis of 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data.
n 2001, the majority of Maryland prisoners (59 percent) returned to the City of Baltimore. Not only does Baltimore City have the most returns in absolute numbers (4,411 men and women in 2001), but it also represents the highest per capita returns in the state, at 6.8 released prisoners for every 1,000 residents. In addition, Baltimore is an extremely small geographic area compared with the counties profiled in the previous section of this report. For example, with just 81 square miles, Baltimore City is less than one-seventh the size of surrounding Baltimore County. Thus, the city is home to the most densely concentrated geographic distribution of returning prisoners in the state.

Baltimore City is not likely to be an easy place for returning prisoners to surmount the challenges of reentry, especially with regard to finding employment and supporting oneself financially. The 651,154 residents of Baltimore City face many economic and social disadvantages compared with other areas in Maryland. The median household income in Baltimore City is $30,078—well below the statewide median household income of $52,868—and is the second-lowest median income in the state, when compared by county. The unemployment level in Baltimore City (7.9 percent) is nearly double the statewide average of 4.1 percent, and almost a quarter (22.9 percent) of Baltimore’s residents lives below the poverty line. This is much higher than the statewide average of 8.5 percent and is the highest level of poverty in the state, by county. In addition, female-headed households account for 25 percent of the households in Baltimore City—much higher than the statewide average of 14.1 percent.

OVERVIEW OF RELEASED PRISONERS WHO RETURNED TO BALTIMORE CITY

The majority of the released prisoners returning to Baltimore were male (90 percent) and black (89 percent). Nine percent were white, and 2 percent were of other races. This reflects a different racial distribution than that of all released prisoners returning to Maryland (78 percent black, 21 percent white, 1 percent other). By way of comparison, the majority of Baltimore’s residents are black (64 percent), whites comprise 32 percent of the residents, and other racial groups make up the remaining 4 percent of the residents. Three-quarters of the released prisoners returning to Baltimore were between 20 and 40 at the time of their release, with the median age being 33.

DRUG OFFENDERS AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

As in other Maryland counties, drug offenses top the list of conviction offenses for the 2001 Baltimore City release cohort. (See figure 36.) Thirty-eight percent were convicted of drug offenses—a slightly higher percentage than the statewide average of 32 percent. Abuse of alcohol and illicit drugs is highly problematic in Baltimore. A recent survey conducted by the Center for Sub-


stance Abuse Research (CESAR) for the Maryland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA) estimated that 58,316 Baltimore residents are in need of treatment for alcohol and/or drug abuse—approximately 9 percent of the city’s population.112

Heroin use is especially problematic in Baltimore. Nearly three-quarters (72.6 percent) of the Baltimore City residents who were treated for substance abuse in FY 2001 reported heroin use.113 Heroin use may be even more prevalent among Baltimore City residents involved in the criminal justice system. A recent multicity study by the National Institute of Justice’s Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) Program found that in 2001, arrestees in Baltimore City had the highest opiate-positive rate of all U.S. cities studied (38 percent of male arrestees and 49 percent of female arrestees). The study also found that the majority (70 percent of males and 86 percent of females) of the Baltimore City opiate-positive arrestees also tested positive for cocaine.114

As mentioned earlier in this report, the link between criminal activity and substance abuse is strong. Whether or not they were serving time for a drug offense, many soon-to-be-released prisoners reported a history of drug and/or alcohol abuse.115 In addition to managing the challenges of returning to the community, released prisoners who return to Baltimore City also face the pressures of a thriving drug scene.

PAROLE IN BALTIMORE CITY

In 2001, 92 percent of the released prisoners who returned to Baltimore City were released conditionally—that is, they were subject to some period of community supervision by the Maryland Department of Parole and Probation. MDPP has many offices in Baltimore City, including specialized offices for ex-prisoners with unique needs, such as sex offenders and those suffering from mental health problems. In addition, MDPP operates three offices specifically for released prisoners who live in HotSpots communities.

Almost all released prisoners who return to Baltimore spend some time under supervision, and the likelihood of their violating the conditions of their parole is high. Of the inmates released in 2001 who returned to Baltimore City, 23 percent had violated their parole at some point during their criminal careers. Three-quarters (74 percent) of 2001 releasees who returned to Baltimore had been in prison at least once before. By the time the 2001 release cohort data were compiled in spring 2002, 20 percent had returned to prison after their release in 2001.

PRISONER REENTRY WITHIN BALTIMORE COMMUNITIES

Prisoner reentry affects not only the inmates who are returning home but also the communities to which they are returning. Conversely, the character-


The return of released prisoners to these high-concentration communities is only part of the story. Another important factor is the high rates of people from these communities who are sent to prison. Such high concentrations of residents cycling into and out of prison may disrupt social networks and social relationships in communities. Some researchers suggest that communities with weakened social networks have less success promoting informal social control among residents, which may result in increased neighborhood crime, though little is known about this phenomenon.\footnote{Part 1 crimes include murder, aggravated assault, rape, robbery, larceny, burglary, stolen auto, and arson.}

What we do know is that, in addition to being home to large numbers of returning prisoners, these high-concentration areas are among the Baltimore communities most affected by poverty and crime. In 2000, the percentages of residents in these communities who received TANF were among the highest in the city. (See figure 38.) These communities also have some of the highest shares of female-headed households in Baltimore (see figure 39) and some of the highest levels of Part 1 violent crimes\footnote{For this and subsequent ranking tables, the communities are listed from highest to lowest numbers of returning inmates.} in Baltimore (see figure 40).

We describe the six communities in Baltimore that received the highest number of returning prisoners in 2001 below. Figure 41 lists the 6 communities, among the 55 Baltimore City communities, that received the highest number of returning prisoners in 2001 and ranks each community on the basis of key demographic data.\footnote{For this and subsequent ranking tables, the communities are listed from highest to lowest numbers of returning inmates.} A lower rank indicates a higher percentage or frequency. As figures 42, 43, and 44 show, these communities are almost always higher than the city average for each of these demographics. It is interesting to note, however, that three of the six communities have crime rates that are lower than the citywide average.
Figure 37. Distribution of released prisoners who returned to Baltimore City, by Baltimore Neighborhood Indicator Area, 2001

Source: Maryland Division of Correction.

Figure 38. Percentage of population receiving TANF, by Baltimore Neighborhood Indicator Area, 2000

Source: Maryland Department of Human Resources.
Figure 39. Percentage of female-headed households per 1,000 residents, by Baltimore Neighborhood Indicator Area, 2000

Source: 2000 Census.

Figure 40. Number of Part 1 crimes per 1,000 residents, by Baltimore Neighborhood Indicator Area, 2001

Source: Maryland Division of Correction.
Table 41. Rank of six high-concentration communities among 55 Baltimore communities, by demographic, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community area</th>
<th>Average percentage of households receiving TANF</th>
<th>Percentage of female-headed households with no husband</th>
<th>Number of Part 1 crimes per 1,000 residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Baltimore</td>
<td>7th of 55</td>
<td>13th of 55</td>
<td>17th of 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rosemont</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandtown-Winchester / Harlem Park</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenmount East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton-Berea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Park Heights</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of BNIA data.

Figure 42. Comparison of six high concentration communities to Baltimore City average: Percent of households with TANF recipients, 2000

Source: Urban Institute analysis of BNIA data.

Figure 43. Comparison of six high concentration communities to Baltimore City average: Percent of households with female head of household, 2000

Source: Urban Institute analysis of BNIA data.

Figure 44. Comparison of six high concentration communities to Baltimore City average: Number of Part 1 crimes per 1,000 residents

Source: Urban Institute analysis of BNIA data.
We now turn to individual profiles of these six Baltimore communities.

**Southwest Baltimore.** In 2001, 277 prisoners returned to the Southwest Baltimore community, which has a total population of 20,965 (13.2 prisoners per 1,000 residents; see figure 45). The Southwest Baltimore community includes the following neighborhoods: Booth Boyd, Carrollton Ridge, Franklin Square, Mill Hill, Mount Clare, Penrose, Shipley Hill, Union Square, Western, and Pratt-Monroe.\(^{121}\) The population in this community is 73 percent black, 24 percent white, and 3 percent other races. Female-headed households account for 35 percent of the households in this community. An average of 20 percent of the households in this community are TANF recipients. In 2000, there were 2,658 reported Part 1 crimes in this community (127 per 1,000 residents).\(^{122}\)

**Greater Rosemont.** In 2001, 265 released prisoners returned to the Greater Rosemont community, which has a total population of 21,877 (12.1 prisoners per 1,000 residents; see figure 45). The Greater Rosemont community includes the following neighborhoods: Greenlawn, Ash-Co-East/Coppin Heights, Easterwood, Evergreen Lawn, Fairmont, Franklin Road, Midtown-Edmonson, Mount Holly, Rosemont, Walbrook, Mosher, and Winchester. The population in this community is 98 percent black, 1 percent white, and 1 percent other races. Female-headed households account for 37 percent of the households in this community. An average of 14 percent of the households in this community are TANF recipients. In 2000, there were 1,897 reported Part 1 crimes in this community (86 per 1,000 residents).\(^{123}\)

**Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park.** In 2001, 250 prisoners returned to the Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park community, which has a total population of 17,495 (14.3 prisoners per 1,000 residents; see figure 45). The Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park community includes the following neighborhoods: Bridgeview/Greenlawn, Easterwood, Harlem Park, Midtown-Edmonson, and Sandtown-Winchester. The population in this community is 98 percent black, 1 percent white, and 1 percent other races. Female-headed households account for 39 percent of the households in this community. An average of 19 percent of the households in this community are TANF recipients. In 2000, there were 2,036 reported Part 1 crimes in this community (116 per 1,000 residents).\(^{124}\)

**Greenmount East.** In 2001, 185 prisoners returned to the Greenmount East community, which has a total population of 11,561 (16 prisoners per 1,000 residents; see figure 46). The Greenmount East community includes the following neighborhoods: Broadway East, Gay Street, Greenmount West, Johnston Square, and Oliver. The population in this community is 97 percent black, 2 percent white, and 1 percent other races. Female-headed households account
Figure 45. Distribution of returning prisoners in Southwest Baltimore, Greater Rosemont, and Sandtown-Winchester/Harlem Park communities, 2001
Source: Maryland Division of Correction.

Figure 46. Distribution of returning prisoners in Greenmount and Clifton-Berea communities, 2001
Source: Maryland Division of Correction.
Figure 47. Distribution of returning prisoners in Southern Park Heights community, 2001

Source: Maryland Division of Correction

Figure 48. Location of social services for ex-prisoners in Baltimore City

Source: Maryland Division of Correction
for 37 percent of the households in this community. An average of 22 percent of the households in this community are TANF recipients. In 2000, there were 1,588 reported Part 1 crimes in this community (137 per 1,000 residents).125

**Clifton-Berea.** In 2001, 159 prisoners returned to the Clifton-Berea community, which has a total population of 12,496 (12.7 prisoners per 1,000 residents; see figure 46). The Clifton-Berea community includes the following neighborhoods: Berea, Collington Square, Biddle Street, Broadway East, Clifton Park, Darley Park, East Baltimore Midway, Middle East, and South Clifton Park. The population in this community is 98 percent black, 1 percent white, and 1 percent other races. Female-headed households account for 41 percent of the households in this community. An average of 19 percent of the households in this community are TANF recipients. In 2000, there were 1,063 reported Part 1 crimes in this community (85 per 1,000 residents).126

**Southern Park Heights.** In 2001, 174 prisoners returned to the Southern Park Heights community, which has a total population of 15,761 (11 prisoners per 1,000 residents; see figure 47). The Southern Park Heights community includes the following neighborhoods: Central Park Heights, Cylburn, Greenspring, Park Heights, Park Circle, Parklane, Towanda-Grantley, and Lucille Park. The population in this community is 97 percent black, 1 percent white, and 2 percent other races. Female-headed households account for 40 percent of the households in this community. An average of 20 percent of the households in this community are TANF recipients. In 2000, there were 1,138 reported Part 1 crimes in this community (72 per 1,000 residents).127

**SERVICES FOR RETURNING PRISONERS IN BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITIES**

The profiles of these six communities suggest that these are some of the most disadvantaged areas in the city, with the fewest economic and human capital resources. Perhaps it is not surprising that these communities are home to more returning prisoners, but these profiles raise important policy questions with regard to the ability of these communities both to insulate against the potential negative impact of large numbers of returning prisoners and to provide resources to these ex-prisoners. As shown in figure 48, many of the organizations that provide services to former prisoners—employment, housing, legal assistance, physical or mental health care, substance abuse treatment, or some combination of these support services—are located in and around the communities that are home to the highest concentrations of returning prisoners.128 However, a significant number of services also are located in central
Baltimore, which is some distance from these high concentration areas. It is unclear whether prisoners returning to Baltimore are aware of the social services in the city, the extent to which they already use them, and whether they have the means to make use of them. For example, transportation issues and costs of services may be barriers to taking advantage of programs and assistance that might smooth the reintegration process. In addition, it is unknown whether these service organizations can meet the demand of such high numbers of returning prisoners.
Summary

This report highlights the many challenges and opportunities prisoner reentry poses for the State of Maryland and for the individuals released from Maryland's prisons. As the size of the Maryland prison population has increased over the past two decades, so too has the number of inmates being released from prison. Thus, more and more returning prisoners are faced with the many challenges of reentry, including finding jobs, housing, and substance abuse treatment; reuniting with family; and reintegrating into the community. Given the increasing numbers of returning prisoners and the fact that they are returning to a small number of communities in the state, the impact of reentry on communities is a particularly pressing problem. Clearly, prisoner reentry is an important policy issue and one that has significant implications for public safety and quality of life across the state and particularly in the City of Baltimore. This summary section highlights the key findings in this report, raises additional questions with regard to reentry in Maryland, and describes future research efforts that will help to answer those questions.

HIGHLIGHTS

Over the past quarter century, the growth in prison populations nationwide has translated into more and more people being released from prison and reentering society. The State of Maryland has experienced similar incarceration and release trends and thus faces the reentry challenges that accompany such growth. Between 1980 and 2001, Maryland's prison population more than tripled. This growth is attributable to more people, specifically drug offenders and parole violators, cycling through prison on shorter sentences. In 2001, persons convicted of drug offenses represented the largest share of new commitments to Maryland prisons (43 percent), nearly four times the share of new commitments they represented in 1983. Between 1980 and 1999, the number of parole violators returned to Maryland prisons rose sevenfold, reflecting an increase from 7 percent to almost one-third of all admissions to Maryland prisons during that same period. In 2002, 58 percent of parole revocations were for technical violations, while 42 percent were for new crimes.

The number of people released from Maryland prisons reflects these rising admissions and population trends: 9,448 prisoners were released from Maryland prisons in 2001, nearly double the number released in 1980. The majority of these released prisoners were male (91 percent) and black (76 percent). Three-quarters were between 20 and 40 years old at the time of their release, with a median age of 34. One-third had been serving time for drug offenses; assault, larceny, and robbery were the next most common conviction
offenses. About half of the prisoners released in 2001 had served two years or less in prison; the largest share (37 percent) served between 40 and 60 percent of their sentences.

The percentage of prisoners released by parole board decision in Maryland has decreased over the past two decades, with 22 percent of prisoners being released by this method in 2001 compared with 42 percent in 1990. In 2001, nearly three-quarters of Maryland prisoners were released through nondiscretionary means, such as mandatory release or expiration of sentence. That is, these inmates did not appear before a parole board or other authority to be reviewed or to present a postrelease home or employment plan. While the number of prisoners being released by parole board decision has decreased, the number subject to postrelease parole supervision has increased—from 6,436 in 1980 to 14,143 in 2000. In 2001, 89 percent of Maryland’s released prisoners were subject to some period of parole supervision in the community.

Returning prisoners in Maryland have many needs as they begin the process of reintegration, and the likelihood of recidivating is high. More than two-thirds of released inmates in Maryland had served prior terms in prison, and one-fifth had violated their parole at some point in their criminal careers. These extensive criminal histories do not bode well for maintaining crime-free lifestyles; they can also create barriers to employment, housing, and eligibility for food stamps and other forms of welfare, and can limit opportunities for civic participation. The Baltimore Public Housing Authority, for example, considers criminal history as part of its admission criteria and bars individuals who have been convicted of drug-related and violent crimes.

The largest share (59 percent) of released inmates who returned to Maryland returned to Baltimore City, an area that faces great economic and social disadvantage compared with the rest of the state. The median household income in Baltimore City is the second lowest in the state, the unemployment rate is nearly double the statewide average, and almost a quarter of Baltimore's residents live below the poverty line—the highest poverty level in Maryland. Within Baltimore City, releasees are further concentrated in a handful of communities—Southwest Baltimore, Greater Rosemont, Sandtown-Winchester/ Harlem Park, Greenmount, Clifton-Berea, and Southern Park Heights. Some of these high-concentration communities, most of which are also characterized by high levels of poverty and crime, received more than 200 released prisoners in 2001—more than the number that returned to some entire counties in Maryland. Some services for ex-prisoners are located in close proximity to the neighborhoods with high rates of releasees, but other services are located in central Baltimore, which is some distance from these high-concentration areas. In all cases, it is unclear whether prisoners returning to Baltimore are aware of these social services and have the means (e.g., transportation, funds) to make use of them.
Released prisoners who return to Baltimore City—38 percent of whom were convicted of drug offenses (possession and sales)—also face the pressures of a prominent drug scene. Abuse of alcohol and illicit drugs, notably heroin and cocaine, is highly problematic in Baltimore. Approximately 9 percent of the city’s population is deemed to be in need of treatment for a substance abuse problem. Baltimore City residents involved in the criminal justice system display particularly high rates of heroin use compared with other cities. A recent study found that in 2001, arrestees in Baltimore City had the highest opiate-positive rate of all U.S. cities studied (38 percent of male arrestees and 49 percent of female arrestees).

This report also illustrates the fact that Maryland’s rising prison population has placed a strain on already limited programming resources. Substance abuse, vocational training, and educational programs are available to a small fraction of Maryland inmates. The fact that inmates are serving shorter terms than previous cohorts means they may have fewer opportunities to take advantage of in-prison programming that might help them on the outside. In addition to traditional programming, comprehensive reentry efforts currently serve only a small share of returning prisoners. For example, the Maryland Re-Entry Partnership Initiative (REP), which is designed to improve reentry transitions for prisoners returning to select communities in Baltimore City, served 125 out of the 4,411 released prisoners who returned to Baltimore City in 2001 (3 percent). The state plans to use a portion of its recently awarded Going Home funds to expand the REP program to serve 500 prisoners each year; but as with all programming, sustained funding will be needed to continue and expand this effort.

**UNANSWERED QUESTIONS**

This report represents the first stage of our research on reentry in Maryland and raises a number of questions that will be answered in later phases of the research. While we know much from our analysis of a cohort of released inmates in Maryland, there is much more to be learned. Such additional knowledge can provide valuable guidance to practitioners and policymakers as they prepare to expand reentry efforts in the state.

We know, for example, that the majority of prisoners released in Maryland return to Baltimore City and that returning prisoners are concentrated in a few communities. An examination of demographic data for these areas indicates that they are economically disadvantaged compared with the city average. What we do not know from this research is how these community characteristics might affect individual postrelease outcomes. For example, are
released prisoners returning to high-crime areas more likely to recidivate than those returning to areas in which the crime rate is closer to the city average?

We also know that a history of substance abuse is common among prisoners and that prisoners returning to Baltimore City return to a city that is rife with substance abuse problems, especially heroin and cocaine use. What this current research does not tell us is the extent to which prisoners returning to Baltimore are drawn back into a pattern of drug use and whether they seek and receive treatment for these problems. While substance abuse treatment programs exist in Baltimore, it is unclear whether returning prisoners are aware of them, whether cost or transportation issues limit their ability to access these services, and whether providers have targeted services to prisoners at the moment of their release from prison, when they are likely to be in the greatest need of assistance.

Very little is known about the family circumstances of released prisoners, or about the role that family and other peer and interpersonal relationships play in either facilitating or preventing recidivism. This information would be useful in developing the content of family reunification programs both behind bars and on the outside. It could also help guide counseling efforts aimed at encouraging ex-prisoners to establish or renew relationships with prosocial, rather than antisocial, peers.

In addition, we do not know much about the different types of reentry challenges that different populations might face. For example, youthful ex-prisoners are likely to have different issues and challenges than their older counterparts. Similarly, employment issues are probably different for those who have served long prison terms than for those who served shorter terms. And reentry challenges experienced by women, who often have different and more pressing family issues, are likely to be different from those of men. Identifying the different needs of subpopulations of returning prisoners will help aid in effective program design, avoiding the “one-size-fits-all” model in favor of one that targets individuals’ needs.

**FUTURE RESEARCH**

This report is the first product of a larger study, *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*, which is examining prisoner reentry in four states. Many of the unanswered questions described above, and others, will be explored through other components of the Returning Home Maryland pilot, including interviews with inmates returning to Baltimore both before and after their release, and interviews with inmates’ family members after inmates are released. These interviews are critical to understanding the individual, family, and community circumstances affecting reentry.
Such interviews, combined with analyses of official records, will help to identify needs of returning inmates that are not currently being met, such as housing, employment, and health care. The longitudinal aspect of this study will help practitioners prioritize programs by focusing on some of these needs before others. For example, we may learn that enrolling in an outpatient substance abuse program within the first 30 days after release is more important than finding a job for certain types of ex-prisoners. We may discover that some returning prisoners find a job too early, before they have become accustomed to life on the outside, making it difficult to keep the job while managing other pressures of reentry. Such findings can help case managers prepare inmates for release and support them after release.

Interviews with family members may help identify factors that have bearing on the returning inmate’s ability to stay drug- and crime-free. For example, we may find that family support in drug rehabilitation is an important predictor of staying off drugs after release from prison, suggesting the expansion of drug treatment programs that include family member involvement. These family interviews also will enable us to explore the role that expectations—on the part of both the inmate and the family member—may have on the inmate’s reintegration experience.

Returning Home also explores the role of community setting and organizations on prisoner reentry through an assessment of local community resources, assets, and risks; analyses of community administrative and census data; interviews with community stakeholders; and focus groups with community residents. Interviews with community stakeholders are intended to shed light on gaps in local resources available to returning prisoners, particularly in the areas of heaviest concentrations of returning inmates. Neighborhood focus groups can inform grassroots efforts to support returning inmates (e.g., helping them find housing and jobs, and offering child care services). And, by linking individual data on released inmates to data on neighborhood indicators, we can begin to explore the influence that community characteristics may have on postrelease success or failure.

It is clear that the challenges of reentry in Maryland are great, but so are the opportunities. The fact that the federal government has awarded the State of Maryland $2 million over three years, a portion of which will support a reentry program that is well under way, holds great promise for the reentry prospects of future cohorts of released prisoners. As Maryland expands its reentry efforts, the Urban Institute is preparing to release reports and policy papers and to convene a forum of practitioners and policymakers to discuss the results of the Returning Home study. We hope that this report and the Returning Home research that follows can help shape decisions about the best ways to serve the state’s citizens, communities, and returning prisoners.
Returning Home’s two primary research questions are: **What is the experience of those being released from prison and returning home?** and **What factors influence a released prisoner’s propensity to reoffend?** The first research question is primarily descriptive and qualitative in nature. We plan to document and describe the individual reentry trajectory—from prison release, to early entry, to reconnection, to full integration in society—exploring critical stages of integration and the role of individual life events, family support, community context, and state sentencing and release policies in this trajectory. The second research question is predictive in nature, and is supported by ancillary questions, including:

- How do individual characteristics (e.g., demographics, family and criminal history, psychological attributes, life events, health and substance abuse status, and attitudes and beliefs) affect post-release criminal behavior?
- How does family support (emotional and financial) affect post-release criminal behavior?
- How do in-prison experiences (both formal and informal) affect post-release criminal behavior?
- How does an individual’s post-release supervision status and conditions of release (if any) affect post-release criminal behavior?
- How do peer relationships affect post-release criminal behavior?
- How do community factors (e.g., economic viability, housing availability, social service delivery, crime rates, social capital) affect post-release criminal behavior?

We also plan to explore intermediate outcomes that represent positive post-prison adjustment and can, in turn, affect recidivism. Examples include acquiring and maintaining a job, obtaining and paying for housing, and remaining substance abuse-free.
## Appendix A. Number and Rate of Prisoners Returning to Maryland Counties, 2001, and Demographic Information by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Returns</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>County Population</th>
<th>Returns / 1,000 Residents</th>
<th>Square Mileage</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Returns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Returns / 1,000 Residents</td>
<td>Square Mileage</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male : Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black : White : Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>651,154</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64% : 32% : 4%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>754,292</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>686 : 69</td>
<td>20 : 74 : 6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>801,515</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>429 : 29</td>
<td>63 : 27 : 10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>131,923</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>221 : 21</td>
<td>8 : 90 : 2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>489,656</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>202 : 17</td>
<td>14 : 81 : 5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84,644</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>208 : 11</td>
<td>23 : 73 : 4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>218,590</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>143 : 14</td>
<td>9 : 87 : 4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120,546</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>131 : 5</td>
<td>26 : 69 : 5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>873,341</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>108 : 4</td>
<td>15 : 65 : 20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30,674</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>69 : 7</td>
<td>28 : 69 : 3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195,277</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>65 : 7</td>
<td>6 : 89 : 5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>247,842</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>63 : 4</td>
<td>14 : 74 : 12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150,897</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>60 : 5</td>
<td>2 : 96 : 2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46,543</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>54 : 3</td>
<td>17 : 81 : 2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74,930</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>50 : 5</td>
<td>5 : 93 : 2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85,951</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>49 : 5</td>
<td>4 : 93 : 3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,772</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>46 : 7</td>
<td>15 : 82 : 3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24,747</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>49 : 3</td>
<td>41 : 56 : 3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33,812</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>35 : 17</td>
<td>15 : 82 : 3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary's</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86,211</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>36 : 2</td>
<td>14 : 82 : 4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,197</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>29 : 2</td>
<td>14 : 80 : 6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74,563</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>27 : 3</td>
<td>13 : 84 : 3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,563</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>27 : 3</td>
<td>9 : 89 : 2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,846</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5 : 1</td>
<td>0 : 99 : 1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MD TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,447</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,296,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,785 : 662</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,774 : 28% : 64% : 8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2001 MD DPSCS, Division of Correction data; Census 2000; Bureau of Labor Statistics 2001 unemployment averages.