JAIL REENTRY ROUNDTABLE INITIATIVE

Reentry Roundtable Meeting
The Urban Institute
Washington, D.C.
June 27–28, 2006

research for safer communities

URBAN INSTITUTE
Justice Policy Center

URBAN INSTITUTE
Justice Policy Center

2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037
www.urban.org

Acknowledgments

Contents

1.   Introduction and Meeting Overview

Over the past five years, there has been substantial momentum around the issue of prisoner reentry. It is now well known that some 650,000 prisoners return from state and federal prisons each year, facing a myriad of challenges and high recidivism rates. At the same time, little attention has been paid to the issue of reentry from local jails, despite the fact that jails process more than 12 million admissions and releases each year.

With support from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Urban Institute, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and the Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation have partnered to convene a Reentry Roundtable on the topic of reentry from jails. Over the past six years, the Urban Institute has held eight Reentry Roundtables, each focusing on a different aspect of prisoner reentry with the aim of advancing knowledge and creating policy opportunities to improve outcomes. This ninth Reentry Roundtable focused attention—for the first time at the national level—on those 12 million individuals released from local jails each year. The two-day meeting, held June 27–28, 2006 at the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C., brought together leading jail administrators, researchers, corrections and law enforcement professionals, county and community leaders, service providers, and former inmates to discuss the unique dimensions, challenges, and opportunities of jail reentry (see participant list on the following page).

Informing the Roundtable discussion were a set of papers that focus on the following jail reentry issues: inmate challenges, short-term interventions, community supervision, evidence-based reentry practices in the jail setting, reentry from jails for females, the economics of jail reentry, jail to community linkages, and reentry from rural jails. A summary of the Roundtable presentations and discussion follows.

> **All papers, presentations, and materials developed for the Jail Reentry Roundtable Initiative are available on the Roundtable website:**
>
> http://www.urban.org/projects/reentry-roundtable/roundtable9.cfm

Jay Ashe	Hampden County Sheriff's Department
Chris Baird	National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Allen Beck	Bureau of Justice Statistics
Melissa Cahill	Collin County Community Supervision and Corrections
Gary Christensen	Dutchess County Sheriff's Office
Reverend Warren Dolphus	National Alliance of Faith and Justice
Judge Robert Francis	Dallas County Criminal District Court
Nicholas Freudenberg	Hunter College/City University of New York
Joanne Fuller	Multnomah County Department of Community Justice
Susan Galbraith	Our Place DC
Richard Goemann	National Legal Aid and Defender Association
Gregory Hamilton	Travis County Sheriff's Office
Frank Hecht	Tohono O'odham Nation Police Department
Gary Hinzman	Iowa's First Judicial District Department of Correctional Services
Susan Smith Howley	National Center for Victims of Crime
Robert Johnson	Anoka County District Attorney
Stefan LoBuglio	Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation
Martha Lyman	Hampden County Correctional Center
Paul Mulloy	Davidson County Sheriff's Office
Lisa Naito	Multnomah County Commissioner
Marta Nelson	Center for Employment Opportunities
Dorsey Nunn	All of Us or None
Fred Osher	Center for Behavioral Health, Justice, and Public Policy
John Roman	The Urban Institute
Ramon Rustin	Allegheny County Jail
Timothy Ryan	Orange County Corrections Department
Harriett Spencer	Philadelphia Mayor's Office for the Reentry of Ex-Offenders
Mindy Tarlow	Center for Employment Opportunities
Faye Taxman	Virginia Commonwealth University, Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs
Anthony Thompson *	New York University School of Law
Arthur Wallenstein	Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation
Rhon Wright	Norfolk Police Department

* Roundtable Facilitator

2.   What Do We Know about Jails at the National Level?

Presenter: Allen Beck, Bureau of Justice Statistics

Abstract: This presentation offered an overview of the most recent data from Bureau of Justice Statistics surveys of jails and jail inmates.

Key Points from the Presentation

Characteristics of jails
- Jails serve a variety of functions. They are points of entry into the correctional system, but also points of release and return.
- Jails process about 12 million admissions and releases every year, a number 16 times the average daily population. The 12 million admissions and releases represent 9 million unique individuals.
- People entering jail have short lengths of stay. Nearly 90 percent stay less than one month, 13 percent longer than two months, and only 4 percent stay in jail longer than six months.
- Small jails turn over at a much greater rate than larger jails. Small jails with an average daily population (ADP) of less than 50 turn over about 34 times a year. The average length of stay at small jails is 10–11 days compared to larger jails with an ADP of over 1,000 where the average length of stay is 27–28 days.

Characteristics of the jail population
- An increasing percentage of the jail population is female and aging; a decreasing percentage is black. In 2005, 13 percent of the jail population was female, up from 9 percent in 1990. In 2002, 38 percent of the jail population was over the age of 34, up from 23 percent in 1989. Thirty-nine percent of the jail population was black in 2005, down from 43 percent in 1990.
- An increasing number of people under community supervision are returning to jail. On any given day, nearly half of the people in jail are there as a consequence of failure on community supervision. Put another way, 46 percent of all jail inmates were on probation or parole at the time of their arrest.
- The offense composition of jail inmates is evenly distributed across four major offense types: a quarter are in for violent offenses, a quarter for property offenses, a quarter for drug offenses, and a quarter for public order offenses.
- Sixty-two percent of jail inmates are unconvicted, up from 51 percent in 1990.
- The jail population experiences high rates of substance abuse and dependence and few are or have ever been treated under correctional supervision. Nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of those on probation or parole at the time of arrest met the criteria for substance abuse or dependence. In 2002, only about half (47 percent) of the substance dependent or abusing jail population in need of drug treatment had participated in any drug treatment programs while under correctional supervision. Most of this treatment was received while on community supervision as opposed to while in jail.

- In addition to substance abuse and dependence, the jail population experiences high rates of mental illness (16 percent), homelessness (14 percent), physical and sexual abuse (nearly half of women and 13 percent of men), histories of unemployment (29 percent unemployed and 18 percent only occasionally employed), and family members involved in the justice system (nearly half have a family member who has ever been incarcerated).

Jail population growth

- The jail population has increased by about 4 percent annually since 1995 from a little over 500,000 to nearly 750,000 in 2005. This growth is linked to
    - Use of detention space for other criminal justice authorities
    - Rising number of pretrial detainees (accounts for more than two-thirds of growth)
    - Growth in number of felons sentenced to jail
    - Growth in number of community supervision violators
    - Time expected to be served by sentenced inmates unchanged (an average of nine months)

Roundtable Discussion Points

- The numbers highlight both why we should be discussing jail reentry and also why it is distinctly challenging.
- There are about 3,500 jails in the country, but very few are involved in reentry efforts. We need to determine what the incentives and disincentives are for implementing reentry initiatives. With the population becoming more complex (aging, mental illness, gender issues), there are not a lot of incentives for agencies to get into the reentry business. The increasing number of people who are coming to jail as a result of their failure on probation/parole present a huge risk for jail administrators.
- It is important to define what reentry efforts should accomplish and toward whom they should be geared to increase the likelihood of success. Developing and implementing reentry initiatives require buy in from the larger community. To get everyone on board, we must increase chances of success by targeting the jail population most able and willing to benefit from reentry efforts. It is too challenging to attempt to target all 9 million unique admissions/releases.
- There has been an increase in the categories of behavior that are criminalized, blurring the distinction between jail inmates and probationers. The jail population has the potential to explode because of this blurred distinction.
- Reentry looks different in different jurisdictions.

3.   Inmate Challenges

Presenter: Nicholas Freudenberg, Hunter College/City University of New York

Abstract: This paper laid out the social and health needs of people leaving jail, described some of the services now available in jail, and identified opportunities for intervention to improve the well-being of people returning from jail as well as their families and communities. The presentation elaborated on these issues and outlined six themes to focus on as we begin to tackle the issue of jail reentry. While there are several complex problems to address, there is reason to be optimistic about the possibility of developing solutions. There are many examples of promising programs, increased recognition of the problems, and a diverse group of stakeholders committed to working on this jail reentry issue.

Key Points from the Paper and Presentation

Social and health needs
- The jail population is characterized by high levels of substance use and receives very little treatment while in jail. In 2002, 82 percent of jail inmates reported ever having used illicit drugs, and over two-thirds (68.7 percent) reported having used drugs regularly at some point. In 1996, of the jail inmates identified as being drug involved, only 14 percent received any kind of treatment since admission to jail. Typically, the jails that offer any kind of substance abuse treatment primarily offer self-help groups, education groups and detoxification services. Few systems offer the range of services deemed most effective in reducing drug use.
- There is a strong correlation between homelessness and incarceration. Homeless people are at a higher risk for incarceration than the housed, and in turn, incarceration can result in loss of housing. A New York City survey found that over 30 percent of people entering homeless shelters are persons recently released from state and city correctional facilities. A study of inmates in the San Francisco Jail found that 16 percent of incarcerations involved a person who was homeless.
- While employment can contribute to positive outcomes by providing income for basic needs and a daily structure that reduces temptation to engage in criminal activity or pressure to earn money illegally, very few jail inmates receive vocational training, a jail-based job, or help finding a job after release. In 1996, the latest year for which data are available, fewer than 5 percent of those under jail supervision participated in vocational programs. In 2004, less than 1 percent of those under jail supervision participated in community-based work programs, down 22 percent from 1995. Further, inmates returning from jail must compete with other low-skilled, low-income people for low-wage jobs.
- There is a significant presence of mental health problems among the jail population, and jail systems are often ill equipped to address these problems appropriately or efficiently. According to a 1998 Bureau of Justice Statistics survey of the mental health status of jail inmates, 15.6 percent of male inmates and 22.7 percent of female inmates were identified as mentally ill. As a result of

the deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill, the jail systems in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York have become the three largest providers of mental health care in the nation.

- People in jail have higher rates of chronic and infectious diseases than the general population. While jails could provide an opportunity for chronic disease management, many believe the complexity of this task is more than a jail can handle. The rates of HIV infection in the nation's jails is 10 to 20 times higher than the estimated prevalence in the general population.
- Restrictions on public benefits placed on many returning jail inmates can eliminate a safety net for people with no job, limited education and skills, or with a health problem, disability, or addiction.
- Jail inmates report high rates of injuries and violence in their lives.

Interventions to improve jail reentry outcomes

- Jail reentry interventions differ by population served; service needs addressed; intervention setting, strategies, and characteristics; and intervention outcomes. Interventions can seek to bring about change at different levels (e.g., in individuals, families, communities, institutions, jurisdictions, or at the national level).
- Interventions can take place along various points in the criminal justice system continuum: early intervention (prior to arrest), alternatives to incarceration, jail-based programs, discharge planning/transitional programs, and longer-term community-based programs.
- Because the problems of people leaving jail are often intertwined and must be tackled simultaneously, it is difficult to prioritize which problems to focus on. In developing solutions, it is important to consider the problem from different perspectives (client, case manager, service provider, county or municipality, etc.).
- It is also important to study the political and administrative processes by which reentry programs are planned and implemented, and identify factors that contribute to successful outcomes.

Six themes to shape our approach to jail reentry and future research

- *What are some of the important similarities and differences between jails and prisons?* We need to develop a research agenda to study jails as distinct institutions, and identify jail characteristics associated with successful reentry outcomes. How much of what is known about prisoner reentry is relevant to jail reentry? It is important to understand where we can work together with prisoner reentry efforts and where we should work separately.
- *What are the outcomes of interest, and how broadly do we define the problem?* It is important that we develop consistent definitions and typologies of reentry interventions that enable systemic consideration of results. Should the primary outcome be recidivism or should we include broader measures like health, family ties, etc.? Framing outcomes broadly engages new constituencies but also creates more complex responsibilities for all involved. For example, the need for chronic disease management among the jail population requires jail administrators to assume a role for which they are probably not trained and are likely to resist. It is

important to recognize the diverse constituencies involved with this population in order to determine when common ground can be reached and when consensus may not be feasible. One area that jail administrators and mental health treatment providers agree on is the detriment of housing people with mental illness in jail.

- *How do we find a balance between changing individuals and changing systems?* Should the focus of jail reentry efforts be on changing the individual or changing the system? Traditionally, there has been too much emphasis on changing individual behavior and not enough emphasis on systems change. The focus has been on perfecting the service package without much consideration of the policies in place that effect opportunities.
- *How do we best develop system-wide cost-effectiveness?* In thinking about how jail reentry efforts can create cost savings to society, future victims of crime, and jails themselves, we ought to consider the potential savings in other arenas as a result of these efforts. Addressing health needs while in jail and during the transition can prevent hospitalizations and reduce the need for expensive emergency room visits. Efforts to keep families together during involvement with the justice system can ease the financial burden imposed by the foster care system.
- *How do we best prepare the workforce to focus on people coming out of jail in need of employment?* What are the roles of jails, universities, and elected officials in expanding the workforce and creating employment opportunities?
- *What is the balance between incremental reforms and transformative reforms?* Transformative reforms involve large-scale systems change that address the question of what it would take for all jail inmates to leave jail less likely to return. Focusing on transformative reforms is necessary to maintain engagement and ongoing investment in improving outcomes and reducing incarceration rates for populations inappropriately placed in jail. Transformative reforms require further research that will include new stakeholders in the discussion to make jail reentry a priority.

Roundtable Discussion Points

Attitudes and priorities of jail administrators

- The role of jail staff in the reentry discussion is very important. Traditionally, jail staff do not consider it part of their role to prepare inmates for release, but rather to guard them while they are in custody and provide a safe and secure environment. The jail must begin to recognize that reentry work can be beneficial to its own success.
- Correctional officers in jail must be trained in a treatment-oriented approach.
- It is often hard for sheriffs and jail administrators to focus attention on reentry preparation because the demands of running correctional facilities and dealing with the myriad of care, custody and control issues consumes most of their time. Reentry is often viewed as desirable but not as critical as core services.

Community involvement

- For there to be a seamless transition from jail to the community, all involved must recognize that the jail is part of the community. Jail administrators must actively reach out to community and faith-based groups, local agencies, and service providers to confirm their standing in the community. This takes courage on the part of jail administrators.
- The faith-based community is an underused local resource. There are several opportunities for religious leaders to reach out to the faith community and engage them in the issue.

Collaboration and systems integration

- The various criminal justice agencies (e.g., jail, probation, parole, the juvenile system, police) often act as competing fiefdoms instead of working together to coordinate resources and roles and share information about the same population. For example, other justice system agencies can use jails effectively as a short-term intervention for people on probation to enable program or treatment completion or serve as a graduated sanction. Communities need a local political figure to champion system integration and create a continuous system.
- The public risks that people pose and the problems they face upon release cannot be the jails' responsibility alone. Individuals often enter jail with a history of involvement in the social service and criminal justice system.
- Jails should have a place within the larger system to act as a resource to change and improve people's lives and address the range of issues they are confronted with.
- Information sharing and linked data systems across agencies can enable an examination of the type of people involved in both the social service and criminal justice systems that are costing the most to serve.
- Upon release, inmates often lack basic needs that can have immediate effects on their success outside of jail, such as appropriate clothing, identification cards, bus or subway fare, social security cards and birth certificates, and directories of community resources. Some suggest that before we focus on building large-scale agency collaborations, jails should work to address these basic humanitarian needs that can offer technical solutions to many reentry barriers.
- Jails must develop relationships and agreements with their departments of motor vehicles and other local agencies to issue valid identification cards and passes that are accepted for multiple uses (e.g., state ID, library card, bus pass, etc.).

Funding and support for jail reentry

- For sheriffs, judges, and other elected officials, it is difficult to sell the message of jail reentry to certain communities accustomed to the traditional law enforcement role of jails. Elected officials must "repackage" the message of reentry as public safety, "victim reduction," or family-strengthening initiatives. Some believe cherry picking rather than targeting all in need of reentry services is necessary because increasing success rates is the only way to maintain funding for certain programs or initiatives.

- We must capitalize on the role of community support in creating funding priorities. Clear, evidence-based messages communicated to the public and elected officials can encourage support for investing resources in reentry. Elected officials often lag behind rapidly changing public opinion. There is a growing recognition that jails are integrated into the lives of the community, and there may be an increased willingness by communities to address complex jail reentry issues.
- Collaboration across systems is necessary to leverage community resources for jail reentry efforts.

Addressing the needs of the returning jail population
- The top priority for inmates leaving jail may not always coincide with their most pressing needs, and practitioners often disagree on what the top priorities should be. For example, some individuals with substance use problems may not perceive their drug use to be an impediment to their success, but instead may be most concerned with finding work and stable housing. Therefore, for some people in need of substance abuse treatment, finding a job may take priority over getting treatment, regardless of what will ultimately lead to better outcomes for that individual. Some believe that stable housing is the first priority before certain individuals will be able to concentrate on treatment and finding and maintaining employment. There needs to be better collaboration between treatment and employment providers in the community to determine the most appropriate priorities for each individual.
- Finding a job for people coming out of jail may be more challenging than finding a job for people returning from prison. Jail inmates often have more severe treatment needs that make finding and maintaining a job difficult.
- It is a mistake to think that educating people about the community resources available to them after release is sufficient to enable service receipt. Access to these resources is extremely limited. We must determine the range of services needed and the cost of these services.

4.   Public Attitudes Toward Rehabilitation and Reentry: The NCCD-Zogby Poll

Presenter: Chris Baird, National Council on Crime and Delinquency

Abstract: This presentation summarized the results of the recent NCCD-Zogby poll on public perceptions on reentry. The poll is based on 1,039 interviews conducted beginning in February of 2006. The poll finds that 74 percent of people are somewhat or very concerned with crime in their communities and 79 percent are somewhat concerned or fearful of prisoners returning home to their communities. However, most believe that lack of skills and certain resources (e.g., medical care and public housing), rather than inherent criminality, are barriers to successful reintegration. A full 70 percent are in favor of implementing services both in prison and after prison.

Key Points from the Presentation

The NCCD-Zogby Poll

- How concerned are you about crime in your community?
    - 74 percent either somewhat or very concerned with crime.
- How do you feel about the large numbers of prisoners returning home to their communities?
    - 22 percent fearful, 57 percent somewhat concerned, and 21 percent not concerned.
- Do you think that people who have served their time in prison for nonviolent offenses are as likely (51 percent), more likely (31 percent), or less likely (14 percent) than they were before imprisonment to commit future crimes?
- What would you prefer the state implement: services in prison (11 percent), services after prison (6 percent), services in prison and after prison (70 percent), or punishment (11 percent)?
- What are the major factors contributing to the high rate of returns to prison: life skills (66 percent), prison experience (58 percent), other obstacles (57 percent), inherent criminality (21 percent)?
- What barriers have a 'very important' impact on the successful reintegration of people into society: job training (82 percent), medical services (48 percent), public housing (44 percent), student loans (44 percent), right to vote (28 percent)?
- What services are very important to a person's successful reintegration: job training (81 percent), drug treatment (80 percent), mental health services (70 percent), family support (62 percent), mentoring (60 percent), housing (53 percent)?
- When do you think planning for an incarcerated person's reentry into society should begin: at sentencing (44 percent), one year prior to release (27 percent), not in favor of reentry planning (7 percent)?
- How supportive are you of the Second Chance Act?
    - 78 percent support or strongly support this bill

Roundtable Discussion Points

- Gaining public support depends on how the problem is defined and how questions are asked. For example, people need to be asked, "are services going to work?" not "do people deserve services"? If the public understand the issues, they are more likely to make reentry efforts a priority.
- Public support is essential for prioritizing the budget to focus on programming, services, and aftercare, which are more expensive in the short-term. The public must understand how the cost will benefit them. The message must sell a reentry investment as less victimization and more public safety.

5.   Short-Term Interventions

Presenter: Fred Osher, Council of State Governments

Abstract: Considering the majority of jail inmates are released within a short time, this presentation discussed the possibilities and opportunities for short-term interventions and transition planning. Transition planning is emphasized as a process involving several diverse players in jail and in the community. Experience with the Assess, Plan, Identify, and Coordinate (APIC) model, a "best practice" transition planning model developed for those with mental illness, is applied as a guide to transition planning for the general inmate population.

Key Points from the Presentation

Three themes to consider
- Jails present a public health opportunity considering the myriad psychological and medical problems facing many jail inmates. The screening and assessment process at intake provides an opportunity to identify, perhaps for the first time, inmates' health problems and the public health risks they pose.
- Dedicated collaboration is a necessary component for a successful intervention. A collaborative must include a broad set of stakeholders who can articulate measurable goals, outline the needs of offenders, and determine responsibility for initiating and monitoring a transition plan for each jail inmate.
- Transition planning can and should focus on each of the 9 million individuals admitted to jail each year.

APIC model
- *Assess*: Using standardized instruments, quickly and comprehensively collect information on an inmate's social and clinical needs and public safety risks. Because length of stay is often uncertain at intake, the goal is to collect as much relevant information as possible in a short amount of time. When possible, update information on inmates and reassess their needs prior to release.
- *Plan*: At both the system and individual level, plan for the treatment and services required to address the identified needs. Know the problems and resources unique to your own community to appropriately and efficiently match needs with resources. Incorporate the inmate's perspective in the transition plan to make it more real for him or her.
- *Identify*: Identify the community and correctional programs responsible for providing postrelease services. Ask the questions: who, what, when, where, how? Provide those in jail 48 hours or less with a resource card that includes pertinent information, such as how to get a social security card, locations of various service providers, shelters, etc.
- *Coordinate*: Coordinate the transition plan to ensure implementation occurs and gaps in the community are filled. At the systems level, an oversight group must be responsible for coordinating the multidisciplinary action of all agencies involved.

Case management is a critical ingredient to successful transition plans, but because of limited resources, it may have to be prioritized for those most in need.

A short-term intervention strategy must answer the following questions:
- What are the incentives to invest in the community planning process, and who should be the leader to pull all stakeholders together?
- Is it appropriate to do reentry planning for all inmates and detainees?
- What jail staff are required to develop and implement transition plans, and how are they trained and paid?
- Who are the community-based staff that will match the jail staff?

Roundtable Discussion Points

System accountability
- The cooperation and dedication of multiple staff are needed to make transition plans work. The reentry checklist cannot be one person's responsibility. The booking officer, nurse responsible for triage, release officer, etc., should all be responsible for a piece of the checklist. The system needs a formal loop mechanism where probation/parole, service providers, and jail staff are all checking back with each other.
- Those involved in the transition planning process must consider the unique local issues of their specific community or jurisdiction.
- There ought to be a targeted and distinct effort toward individuals coming in and out of jail over and over again. An expansive model of care with wraparound services is necessary to stop the revolving door for certain jail populations.
- The sooner the police are involved in the reentry process, the better. Police need incentives to become involved in reentry efforts at both the back and front ends. Police can play a role in collecting social and criminal history data on people entering and coming out of jail to inform the transition process. Police departments must be educated on the benefits of their involvement.
- Focus on using the term "transition" because it indicates a sender (the jail) and a receiver (the community), rather than "reentry," which signifies a dumping of individuals from one place to another, suggesting they might return.

Legislation and policy
- There is a need for model local legislation that addresses these issues of systems integration and policy barriers. Federal, state, and local legislators must be involved in the discussion.
- Local political leaders, especially mayors and county commissioners, must take the leadership role in harnessing diverse local resources toward reentry efforts. Local leadership must expect and demand more from jail administrators in order to orient the culture toward reentry preparation.
- Marketing the reentry message is key to political support that will continue throughout changes in political leadership.

6. The Role of Community Supervision in Addressing Reentry from Jails

Presenter: Faye Taxman, Virginia Commonwealth University

Abstract: This presentation assessed whether the current state of community supervision can assist people cycling in and out of jail with the challenges they face in the community and foster positive outcomes. The presentation outlined a behavioral management model of community supervision and engagement in the context of the jail population.

Key Points from the Presentation

Community supervision as a useful intervention

- Community supervision is undervalued as a form of intervention in the criminal justice system. New efforts are being developed to refocus supervision toward addressing the criminogenic needs that enable those under supervision to concentrate on changing the behavior that leads to criminal activity and reducing their risk of recidivism. Community supervision can be redesigned to engage offenders, change behavior, and sustain behavior change. Community supervision must change from contact driven (e.g., face-to-face appointments that "monitor") to performance driven (e.g., engagement in supervision plan and involvement in appropriate services).
- The Pro-Active Community Supervision Model is an example of a promising intervention. This model includes three major tenets: (1) Procedural justice—address the issue of legal cynicism and demonstrate a fair process; (2) Responsivity—involve the offender in the process; and (3) Behavioral management—use positive reinforcement and social learning models to shape behavior.

Evidence-based behavioral management strategies

- *Engagement:* in order to take ownership of their behavior, people under community supervision must understand the rules of their supervision, such as the criteria for being successful, the rewards for meeting expectations, and the behavior that will result in revocation. The supervision officer must work with the supervisees to develop a supervision plan that outlines incremental steps for behavior change.
- *Early Change:* community supervision must assist people in addressing their dynamic criminogenic factors and help motivate them to commit to a change process.
- *Sustained Change:* to sustain change, community supervision must transfer external controls from government institutions to informal social controls (e.g., parents, peers, employers, etc.).

- *Deportment and Reinforcers:* the change process and its importance must be reinforced swiftly through recognizing and rewarding positive gains and addressing negative behavior.

Key components of a behavioral management model of community supervision
- Standardized risk and needs assessment tools should be used to identify criminogenic needs that affect involvement in criminal conduct, such as anti-social peers and networks, a dysfunctional family, substance abuse, and low self-control.
- People under community supervision should be matched to services that address their criminogenic needs. High risk people should be targeted first. Services should employ cognitive behavioral, cognitive processing, and contingency management approaches to facilitate change.
- A system of rewards and sanctions should be used to reinforce behavior change, with a priority on reinforcing positive behaviors. This system must be equally applied to all people under supervision of a particular office or officer in accordance with procedural justice.
- Community supervision officers should focus on building a trusting relationship with people on their caseload to achieve procedural justice.

Goals for implementing a behavioral management model of community supervision
- *Retraining and redefining the role of supervision officers*: use of motivational interviewing techniques, positive reinforcements, and a social learning environment to develop a case plan that the offender will participate in.
- *Offender engagement*: develop a clear behavioral contract that engages individuals and allows them to take ownership of their behavior. Focus on moderate to high risk offenders.
- *Organization*: reshape probation and parole agencies to incorporate a learning environment, shared vision, and staff development and engagement.

Stepping back: additional issues
- Can we change the "tone" of the criminal justice system?
- Do we even need community supervision at all? Are we committed to it as a short-term intervention? Are we interested in short-term incarceration instead?
- Can offenders become functioning members of society considering the collateral consequences in place?

Roundtable Discussion Points

Systemic reorganization
- We should rephrase the question "do we need community supervision?" to "*who* needs community supervision?" It is difficult to imagine producing any meaningful results with such high caseloads and limited resources. If people present a low risk to reoffend, why spend scarce local resources on them?

- If there is no community supervision, then who is responsible for connecting people to resources in the community? The system must rely on community groups, such as the faith community, to reach out and take responsibility of people leaving jail.
- There must be a jail-based connection made between inmates and the officers who will be supervising them in the community. These connections between the jail and probation rarely continue when people are released, as jails and probation often do not communicate when people leave jail. Ideally, probation officers would devote part of their time in jail, and jail staff would devote part of their time in the community. This relationship is critical to help probation understand why people may fail on supervision.
- The expansion of probation alone has outpaced that of parole, jail, and prison expansion without adequate resources to follow. We do not consider the systemic effect of the burden on probation.
- There is too much focus on people who fail in the criminal justice system. We need to learn more from success stories, and use them to inform our practices and determine the role of community supervision. Community supervision needs to adopt a balanced approach to rewarding successes and positive behavior and enforcing conditions. Probation and parole officers are not evaluated by the number of people on their caseload who successfully complete their sentence, or get a job, or follow through with treatment, etc.

Staff culture

- Engaging community supervision officers in restructuring the organization of community supervision can be challenging because we are asking them to take on a different role than they signed up for. They often lack the tools and skills to assume many of the proposed responsibilities of a reformed system.
- The day-to-day interactions that community supervision officers have with the people they supervise can have a huge impact on offender behavior, and officers often do not realize this. When dealing with individuals on their caseload, officers forget what motivates people to change because they regard offenders as "others." Further, when officers are able to recognize the impact they have through ongoing training, their job satisfaction increases.

7.   What Do We Mean by Recidivism?

Presenters: Martha Lyman, Hampden County Sheriff's Department
Stefan LoBuglio, Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation

Abstract: This presentation discussed the importance of collecting recidivism data and the challenges of doing so, emphasizing the need to define recidivism clearly and uniformly in order to improve operations and achieve better results. The presentation highlighted Hampden County's practice of collecting data and using it to inform their programming and planning processes.

Key Points from the Presentation

Why aren't jails measuring recidivism?
- Jail administrators are always being asked about their recidivism rates, but jail systems rarely collect data for several reasons: measuring recidivism is extremely complicated, most jails do not have the capacity to track recidivism and other important measures, and jail systems are often concerned with how this data might be used to reflect their work.
- There is no standard for how recidivism should be measured because it is not clearly or uniformly defined. For example, returning to jail for issues that do not involve new offenses (e.g., technical violations) may or may not be defined as recidivism but is nonetheless important data to collect.
- Collecting jail data is challenging because the jail population turns over so rapidly and for a variety of reasons, any of which may or may not be considered recidivism.
- Recidivism is a poor indicator of success, but it can be helpful to measure population flow and identify risk factors of re-offending, which in turn informs programming and release planning practices.

Measuring recidivism in Hampden County
- Hampden County has been tracking and studying recidivism since 1998, and it is now part of the Sheriff's Department's routine operation. Hampden County chose to focus their data collection resources on sentenced inmates who were returning to the street because they occupy more bed space and are required to be involved in programming and release planning.
- Hampden County uses its recidivism data as a diagnostic tool to inform the direction of their resources and staff and to create a useful inmate profile of needs and past successes and failures to hand off to postrelease supervisors and community providers. Hampden County is currently involved in a study looking at people succeeding in the community.

Roundtable Discussion Points

- The need for consistent national data is especially important and challenging to collect in local corrections. We need more information that can inform where we devote our resources and what systems can be held accountable. The lack of an operational definition of recidivism and few consistent measures is very limiting and prevents the development of standard models that can be replicated. Can the models used in Hampden County be replicated elsewhere? If we do not develop standard models, we will continue to debate the problem of jail reentry ten years from now.
- The data collection process must be informed by people who have positive experiences in the community after release, not just those that recidivate. In addition to defining and collecting data on recidivism, we must define and study success. Definitions of success ought to be expanded to include public health outcomes, family connectedness, and other qualitative measures. Interviewing people who have been successful after release about what has fostered their success can produce very valuable information for the field.
- Considering there is no national consensus on recidivism measures, we must be careful about how we use recidivism data. Sometimes the recidivism rates associated with certain programs may not be convincing enough to maintain funding, and their survival depends on other influential leaders convinced by anecdotal success stories and an overall impression that the program produces positive outcomes.

8. Evidence-Based Reentry Practices in Jail Setting

Presenter: Gary Christensen, Dutchess County Sheriff's Office
               (Paper coauthored with Elyse Clawson, Crime and Justice Institute)

Abstract: This presentation provided an overview of the need for evidence-based practices in corrections in order to reduce recidivism and improve offender outcomes. The Dutchess County Jail Transition Program was highlighted as an example of a jail system incorporating evidence-based principles. In addition, the paper offered several examples of how evidence-based principles are and can be employed in various jail and community supervision settings.

Key Points from the Paper and Presentation

Evidence-based principles for effective interventions in corrections
- Assess actuarial risks and needs.
- Enhance intrinsic motivation.
- Target interventions based on risk; need; responsivity (individual characteristics); dosage of services, structure and supervision; and treatment.
- Provide evidence-based programming that emphasizes cognitive behavioral treatment methods to enhance skills.
- Increase positive reinforcement.
- Engage ongoing support in the immediate environment (family, spouses, etc.).
- Routinely measure relevant processes and practices relating to behavior change and staff performance.
- Provide measurement feedback to monitor an individual's progress and change as well an organization's service delivery.

Evidence-based practice in a jail setting
- Jails are an integral component of the larger correctional system and must be included in the correctional treatment strategies that are validated through scientific outcome evaluation to reduce recidivism.
- Regardless of setting, the evidence shows that assessment, intervention, and support are necessary components of any correctional strategy meant to reduce recidivism. There is disagreement within the justice system on the purpose of a criminal sanction and the value of alternatives to incarceration. Risk management strategies should not be a choice between risk control and risk reduction. There is need for both sanctions and interventions.
- Before we can incorporate evidence-based practices (EBPs) in a jail setting, we must understand how EBPs might differ in jails, community corrections, and prisons, and how they may be similar. We must also explore how differences across jurisdictions might affect EBPs.

Recommendations for developing a successful transition program

- Establish jails as proactive social learning environments where outcomes are evaluated and system processes are changed to improve outcomes.
- Educate correctional staff and sell the concept of evidence-based practice. Correctional officers must understand their role beyond the jail and be engaged in transition efforts. While it is important to bring clinical staff into the jail to work with inmates, correctional staff can also be invaluable in service delivery and follow-up to connect inmates to services and prosocial forces in the community. The role of correctional staff in follow-up is especially important for those inmates not released to any form of community supervision.
- Open the jail and engage community-based stakeholders in collaborative and inclusive efforts. Encourage system professionals to meet clients in jail prior to their release. If community-based providers develop relationships with inmates before they are released, they will be more likely to offer services and access to resources in the community after release. Community corrections officers can benefit from early and regular interaction with jail transition staff through sharing of information obtained while inmates are incarcerated.
- Serve as a resource to educate the public and other systems about the jail's role.
- Use actuarial assessment tools that measure dynamic criminogenic risks, as these are essential for inmate classification, case planning, and development of needs-driven transition plans.
- Measure outcomes regularly (daily, weekly, long-term) and follow inmates upon release.
- Plan for the transition of all inmates upon release.
- Correctional leadership is key.

Evidence-based practice in Dutchess County

- The Dutchess County Jail has incorporated EBPs in its daily operations through the Jail Transition Program. The Dutchess County Jail Transition Program (DCJTP) seeks to enhance public safety through the management of criminogenic risk factors while also considering treatment and service interventions. The Dutchess County jail has developed a social learning environment in which jail staff are trained in a social work approach to risk management. DCJTP tracks people returning to jail and regularly measures other outcomes as well. More details about Dutchess County reentry tools and practices are available in the paper referenced above.

Roundtable Discussion Points

Implementing EBPs in a jail setting

- Accurate risk assessments are critical to learn more about what specifically works for certain individuals and must be used to guide jail and community-based programming and case plans. Because many jail inmates may not be incarcerated long enough to administer a full risk and needs assessment, it is helpful to know what the key risk factors are. For example, criminal thinking and interaction with

criminal associates are two very high risk factors. Lack of stability, such as homelessness, is also an important need that drives the risk factor. The LSI-R is a thorough instrument and more appropriate for those individuals serving longer jail terms, but we can use abbreviated versions of the LSI-R for brief stays. However, there is also an illusion that risk assessment tools are objective, and we must be cautious about what we can determine from them.

- Jail-based programs that incorporate elements of EBPs, like social learning and cognitive restructuring, usually need more time to be effective than the average length of stay allows, and therefore, the work begun in these programs must continue in the community. One solution is to streamline jail-based programs into one core program that coincides with the average length of stay for most inmates and link them to providers willing to receive them in the community.

- The mission and culture of jails must change to incorporate EBPs. Correctional leadership is necessary to change the jail culture. Support for programs and initiatives must come from the top (e.g., sheriffs, chiefs of police, corrections directors, jail administrators, etc.).

- If jail reentry efforts are to be effective, they must involve collaboration as well as cooperation. Collaboration is not effective unless members of the collaborative are also cooperative. Jail administrators must be creative in selling the message of reentry to enlist cooperation from diverse groups.

Cultural sensitivity

- Risk assessment tools and programs must be culturally sensitive and work to address the overrepresentation in the justice system of people of color. We cannot continue to build more jails, but instead must stop filling our jails by changing the lives of current inmates to prevent return and future victimization. One recommendation to the legislator, made by the Vera Institute's Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons, is to require a correctional environmental impact report for every law passed.

- It is very difficult and takes a lot of courage to work on changing the correctional environment. Correctional leadership must challenge staff assumptions about gender and race and the value of programming.

9. Reentry From Jails for Females

Presenter: Susan Galbraith, Our Place DC

Abstract: This presentation built on Susan McCampbell's paper for the National Institute of Corrections, The Gender-Responsive Strategies Project: Jail Applications. *It also outlined six principles that jail administrators should review to determine whether their practices are gender-responsive.*

Key Points from the Paper and Presentation

The need for gender-responsive strategies

- As the number of women involved with the justice system continues to grow, it has become clear that the differences between women and men warrant an approach to reentry programming and treatment that reflects these differences in order to produce positive outcomes. Recent research focusing on gender differences in the justice system has produced a significant body of knowledge on gender-specific approaches to treatment and programming that can help correctional administrators more effectively manage the women in their custody.
- Women in jail have high rates of physical and sexual abuse in their past, and this is often correlated with substance abuse. Women in jail consume health and mental health services at higher rates than men in jail. Women also face unique reproductive health needs and are often mothers of young children.
- Jails rarely distinguish between men and women inmates when considering management, operations, and training, and as a result, jail staff often do not work effectively with women inmates.
- There are four theories guiding gender-responsive strategies: pathways perspective (understanding how women enter the criminal justice system), relational theory and female development, trauma theory, and addiction theory.

Six guiding principles for jail administrators in managing, supervising, and treating women inmates

- Do you acknowledge that gender makes a difference?
- Have you created an environment based on safety, respect, and dignity?
- Have you developed policies, practices, and programs that are rational and promote healthy relationships with family, children, spouses, significant others, and the community? How is this relational model taken into consideration when implementing EBPs?
- Do you address substance abuse, trauma, and mental health issues through gender and culturally relevant services?
- Do you provide women with opportunities to improve their socioeconomic condition?
- Have you established a system with comprehensive and collaborative services?

Roundtable Discussion Points

Unique needs and risks of female inmates

- When discussing gender issues in jail, there are four major factors to consider: the effect of interactions with jail staff, the extent to which programming is geared toward women, gender-specific aftercare and community supervision, and policies in place that focus on women's specific needs.
- Women in the jail system often have longer histories of criminal activity, trauma, and substance use upon entry than do men. Women bring to jail a whole set of health problems that are often more expensive to treat than the problems facing men in jail. Collaboration among agencies can make it cheaper to address the treatment and social support needs unique to women.
- Harm reduction approaches that set realistic goals are especially relevant for women. They are more likely to have long-term effects than short-term cost-reduction approaches that do not consider gender issues (e.g., substance abuse and pregnancy, dependent and antisocial relationships with men).
- Some argue that we need to treat women and men differently for similar offenses because men are often closely related to the cause of the woman's criminal activity, and there is a greater collateral impact of a woman's incarceration and unmet needs. Women have a more extensive effect on families and a prosocial impact on men.
- We cannot forget that men have gender too, as fathers, sons, partners, etc., and these roles have a profound impact on reentry outcomes as well. The principles for a gender-responsive correctional system outlined in the presentation may apply to men as well.

Implementing gender-responsive approaches in jail

- Incentives must exist to change the culture and approach of the system, and it will cost money. We need to equip correctional staff with the tools and training to create a gender-responsive environment incorporating EBPs. Since correctional staff often imitate the warden or captain, correctional leaders must emphasize the importance of this training and set an example. The Virginia Department of Corrections is training staff in certain areas (e.g., motivational interviewing, working with women), and as an incentive, they will enhance the salaries of staff that receive certification.
- Strategy for moving the reentry issues forward: start from the top—either a judge, elected official, or other local leader must identify other local allies and recruit representative community groups (like the faith community and advocacy groups) to push the message to constituents and bring them on board to help persuade other political leaders.

Engaging diverse resources

- Collaboration is also critical in serving women in the justice system because various agencies specialize in certain areas, and one agency may not be able to address the specific needs of women as effectively on its own. For example, the Center for Employment Opportunities in New York City is partnering with the

Women's Prison Association to better serve the employment needs of this population.

- We should consider the contributions that local businesses can make in housing and training the jail population, especially women. It may be easier to engage businesses in dealing with female rather than male inmates. With the right incentives, local hotels could provide short-term housing as well as job training in the hotel industry for recently released women whose only option may be to return to the home of the man who got them in trouble in the first place.

10.   The Economics of Jail Reentry

Presenter: John Roman, Justice Policy Center, Urban Institute
              (Paper coauthored with Aaron Chalfin, Justice Policy Center, Urban
              Institute)

Abstract: This presentation was framed as a "think piece" on the costs and benefits of providing reentry services to jail inmates. The presenters first estimated average spending on jail-based reentry in the few communities actively implementing these programs. They then estimated how much crime would have to be prevented for the reentry investment to break even. The presentation concluded that very modest reductions in offending are necessary to offset the costs of jail-based reentry. It also found that most of the benefit accrues to the public and not to government agencies.

Key Points from the Presentation

Study Goals and Design
- The goal of this study is to estimate the economic impact of providing jail-based reentry services to jail inmates. The paper attempts to estimate the costs of providing reentry services (e.g., life skills, substance abuse treatment, employment and education services, healthcare) and the costs of new crime (costs both to the justice system in processing offenders and to new victims) to determine the expected crime that would have to be prevented in order to make investment in jail reentry cost-neutral.
- The study used a standard cost-benefit analysis to determine (a) the likely effects of providing reentry programming to jail inmates, and (b) the conditions under which reentry programming is most cost-beneficial. Most of the study's data on the costs of providing a suite of reentry services come from the Hampden County Sheriff's Department and the Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation.

Study findings
- Under a variety of conditions, jail-based reentry would only have to reduce recidivism by less than 2 percent to offset the additional cost of jail-based programming
- Most of the benefit of jail reentry programming accrues to the public through reduced victimizations, rather than to jail systems whose populations increase despite declining crime rates.

Challenges to gaining support for investment in jail reentry
- It is extremely challenging to analyze the costs and benefits of jail reentry on a national level for several reasons. First, very little data are being collected on jails to determine the costs of providing a suite of reentry services (life skills, substance abuse, education, employment, health care, etc.). Second, because there are so many jail systems and they vary considerably, it would be hard to collect

data that is consistent across systems. However, analysis from a few local systems that are implementing full reentry services and collecting relatively extensive data is a good starting point to inform the issue.

- Because most of the benefit of jail reentry programming accrues to the public from reduced victimizations and not to jails from reduced costs, demonstrating the value to policymakers primarily interested in getting every invested dollar back may be hard. Tangible gains by the jail system cannot be estimated. Resources must be saved before they are spent. Incentives need to be in place to award various system agencies for how well inmates fare when released (across many dimensions, such as housing, health, and employment).

Roundtable Discussion Points

Strategies to encourage investment in jail reentry

- To convince policymakers of the potential savings to the system and the public associated with jail reentry, we must consider the costs to other systems also burdened by this population, such as mental health providers and shelters. We must look at the frequent fliers and short-stayers, who often churn from homelessness to jail.
- Fiscal crises can provide an ideal opportunity to reinvest money in new initiatives because decisions must be made quickly to save money before it is spent. During a fiscal crisis in New York City, the corrections department proposed buying a prison barge to use as a new jail. The Office of Management and Budget determined that millions could be saved through diversion and alternatives to jail through New York's existing office of correctional alternatives, and the money was instead spent on after-school programs.
- We must consider the circumstances of each jail system in creating policy. Lofty goals of reentry may not be possible immediately. Encourage some jail systems to start with small stuff like identification documents and bus passes. Many jails are considerably overcrowded and can focus on little else but limiting violence and managing their population. Under such conditions, how can we create a socially responsible model for correctional officers?
- How do we address the pretrial population, considering they often make up a majority of the jail population? On the one hand, the pretrial population faces the same challenges as the sentenced population; but is jail the most appropriate place for them?

11.   Jail/Community Linkages

Presenters: Marta Nelson, Center for Employment Opportunities
Mindy Tarlow, Center for Employment Opportunities

Abstract: This presentation explored the value both to government agencies and private community-based organizations in forming partnerships to invest resources in the community to successfully address the reentry needs of the jail population. It also discussed the challenges involved for both government and community-based agencies in collaborating. The Center for Employment Opportunities' (CEO) Jail to Work Program was highlighted as an example of one such collaboration.

Key Points from the Presentation

The value of collaboration

- Collaborating to establish linkages from the jail to the community is important for both government agencies and community-based service providers as a means to improving outcomes. Certain groups of people, like those with severe service needs and those who churn in and out of jail, cost the government a lot of money. Investment in jail programming is not always effective or efficient if the investment is not linked to the community side, especially considering the short lengths of stay of most jail inmates. In New York City, the DOC commissioner was forced to cut spending, and he decided to take money out of jail programming and invest it in community-based organizations who can provide discharge planning and ongoing follow-up after release.
- Community service providers can also find value in this investment. Many community providers work with clients who overlap with the jail population (e.g., low-income clients and clients suffering from mental illness). Whatever the category of service, the jail population has a client in need. The quick turnover of the jail population allows community providers to continue serving their clients while they are in jail.
- The Center for Employment Opportunities' Jail to Work Program is a public/private collaboration of several partners and supported by multiple funding sources. The partnership has created an advantageous situation in which community organizations can come in and out of jail without long waits or administrative setbacks to work with their clients.

Challenges to collaboration

- Funding—It is important to broaden the view of who has a stake in and should fund a collaboration like this. Funding does not always have to start in the criminal justice system. Often community groups come with their own funding and need clients.
- Cultural differences—Community-based organizations and correctional staff often come from different places with different agendas and must work to understand each other's points of view and experiences. Service providers must

be sensitive to the fact that correctional staff are working with inmates in a different setting, under different circumstances. Reframing interaction with inmates and focusing on what service providers and correctional staff are jointly working on with inmates is important.

- Differences in jail and prison populations—In addition to the vast difference in length of stay, jail and prison inmates often have different motivations and challenges. Service providers accustomed to working with a more long-term prison population will have to adjust their service delivery model and develop realistic expectations to account for these differences.

Roundtable Discussion Points

Sharing the responsibility of reentry

- Reentry work cannot be the responsibility of community groups alone. We have to think about what the government is responsible for. While recognizing the necessity of community involvement in addressing the needs and risks of people who come out of jail is important, the jail setting provides an appropriate place to start treatment readiness and harm-reduction programs.
- Police, probation, parole, and other justice system agencies must be on board as well and take responsibility to help bridge the gap between jail and community-based service delivery. Engaging police can be especially difficult because they often have a "nail 'em and jail 'em" attitude. The jail must reach out to police and solicit cooperation.
- Jail systems often have reservations about allowing community organizations into the jail because they breach security and can cause problems for jail operations. Jails take a while to welcome community groups and recognize them as a benefit to their operations and management. Community organizations have especially difficult times working with local jails and often wait for hours before they are allowed in.
- Engaging jail inmates in reentry and keeping them engaged is often hard since they are usually in jail for short periods and may see little incentive. But once they are engaged, there is good opportunity to have an impact. Community supervision and other alternatives to incarceration (e.g., day reporting centers) must play a role in maintaining engagement. Jails and service providers must make a pitch to inmates, and then they can choose.
- There are jails with excellent treatment models and linkages to the community for continuing treatment, but a person shouldn't have to be sent to jail to receive treatment.

12.   Reentry from Rural Jails

Presenter: Frank Hecht, Tohono O'odham Nation Police Department

Abstract: This presentation highlighted statistics of rural jails and discussed the challenges unique to these jails. The most critical challenges are limited funding, lack of local resources, and staffing.

Key Points from the Presentation

Overview of rural jails
- Rural jails make up a majority of the jails around the country. For the most part, reentry programs do not exist in rural jails.
- The funding and local resources are generally most limited for jails in rural areas. The rural criminal justice system often lacks referral resources.
- Staffing is a huge problem, and inmates are often poorly supervised.
- Indian country jails make up a significant portion of rural jails, and it is important to include them in the discussion.

Leveraging limited resources in a rural system
- Community partnerships involving multiple and diverse agencies are especially important in rural areas as a means to leverage resources.
- Regionalization provides another opportunity to maximize resources and funding. We should promote regional resource centers.

Reentry programs in rural jail systems
- The program design of rural jail reentry programs must be based on local resources and funding opportunities, local community issues and values, jail crowding challenges, criminal justice system priorities, and characteristics of those involved in the local justice system. For example, in many Indian country jail systems, programming resources are spent on sweat lodges and native craft or vocational classes (e.g., basket weaving, talking circles) in response to community values.
- Community and justice system partnerships are critical elements in the design of a rural jail reentry program. The community must be included in the design and planning process of a program to encourage buy in and support. Local organizations and groups support what they help create. Collaboration is worthless without cooperation.
- Types of rural reentry programs include day reporting centers, work release, and pretrial release programs where services such as job development, education, substance abuse, life skills and family preservation can be offered. Central components to any reentry program are public safety, accountability, and close supervision or monitoring.

Indian country jails

- As we begin to call national attention to the topic of jail reentry, we must remember to include Indian country, or "tribal" jails in our language.
- Indian country jails are some of the most rural and most resource-drained in the country.
- A representative of the Native American voice, such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, ought to be invited to help frame the discussion on rural jails.

Roundtable Discussion Points

Regionalization

- There is not enough focus on intergovernmental solutions; at the state level, we must strategize the design of a comprehensive reentry approach that involves the cooperation of counties. Multicounty regionalization can be a solution to providing competent care to inmates in rural America. An example of successful regionalization is in Virginia, where regional jails have allowed the sheriff's department to focus resources on other functions, such as road patrol.

What works in rural jail reentry

- Community corrections and restorative justice may be more successful in rural counties because everyone knows who is coming back to the community, and they are generally more receptive.
- Reentry should be seen as a reform movement and thought process that incorporates many local players rather than a single program.

13. Final Comments and Next Steps

At the close of the Roundtable meeting, participants were asked to answer one of the following two questions:
(1) What advice would you give for building national public policy on jail reentry?
(2) What are you committed to doing on the topic at the local level?

Suggestions for building national jail reentry policy

- We need to define appropriate outcomes, recidivism being only one.
- We can identify best practices, but so few jails are actually incorporating them. We must develop a strategy to engage all jails in reentry work.
- At the national level, justice system agencies must be involved and recognize their role in the community at the local level. Jails cannot operate in an isolated system. Reentry must be considered a global issue that affects all communities.
- Systems change requires tying money to outcomes. We must define the outcomes we want to achieve and persuade others to care about them as well.
- We should not think of reentry as a "program." Instead, we must approach it as a system improvement process involving many different participants, partners, and outcomes that can be combined to solve complex problems.
- The victim's voice should be included in reentry collaborations, especially considering the level of past victimization present in the jail population. It is also important that victims be brought to the table as part of the movement because they have a role in sentencing and ought to be encouraged to think about sentencing options, consequences, and possible outcomes.
- Police, especially the arresting officer, play a major role in contributing to positive outcomes. They have key background information on arrestees that, if shared, can inform the jail intake process. The conduct of the arresting officer is also important, as it can influence offender behavior and officer reactions.
- The jail setting may not be the most appropriate place to focus reentry work. We must think about what should be "of" the jail and what should be "in" the jail. Addressing important logistical issues that are very important for successful reentry (e.g., identification documents, public benefits) are best located in the jail, whereas strategies for long-term successes (treatment, housing, education, employment, etc.) are better located in the community where systems can be held accountable.

Commitment from participants

- Many participants stated that they were energized by the Roundtable and hope to bring this energy back to their staff, their communities, and their local public officials to continue the conversation.
- The director of a community supervision agency is starting to survey all people on community supervision, asking them what has contributed to their success and what supervision could have done differently.
- One participant stated they would push the idea of a government identification card (like Montgomery County's) for all inmates in the New York City Department of Corrections.

- A sheriff was enthusiastic about changing the mindset of people in his county and state. To begin this process, he will organize a local roundtable modeled on this Jail Reentry Roundtable.
- A county commissioner said she would work with NACO to put together a brief pamphlet for county commissioners on what they should ask and require of their jail administrators.

Next Steps

Over the next nine months, the Urban Institute, John Jay College, and Montgomery County team will:

1. Focus on two special topics: reentry from rural and small jails and the role of community supervision in jail reentry. This supplement to the national report on jail reentry is made possible by additional funding from the Bureau of Justice Assistance.
2. Complete the scan of innovative jail reentry practices around the country.
3. Produce a national report on jail reentry that draws on the Roundtable's commissioned papers and presentations, the Roundtable discussion, and the scan of jail reentry practice.
4. Develop a reentry training curriculum geared toward jail and community corrections staff.

> **The Jail Reentry Roundtable website will be updated with these additional resources as they become available**
>
> http://www.urban.org/projects/reentry-roundtable/roundtable9.cfm