



Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry:

Research Findings from the Urban Institute's Prisoner Reentry Portfolio

Justice Policy Center Reentry Researchers:

Demelza Baer, Avinash Bhati, Lisa Brooks,
Jennifer Castro, Nancy La Vigne, Kamala Mallik-
Kane, Rebecca Naser, Jenny Osborne, Caterina
Roman, John Roman, Shelli Rossman, Amy
Solomon, Christy Visher, Laura Winterfield



Introduction

The four-fold increase in incarceration rates in America over the past 25 years has had far-reaching consequences. In 2003 alone, more than 656,000 state and federal prisoners returned to communities across the country,¹ affecting public safety, public health, economic and community well-being, and family networks. The impact of prisoner reentry is further compounded by the returning jail population with its unique set of challenges and opportunities.

Research in the last decade has begun to measure the effect of reentry on returning prisoners, their families, and communities. Two-thirds of released prisoners are rearrested within three years of release.² One and a half million children have a parent in prison.³ Four million citizens have lost their right to vote.⁴ Men and women enter U.S. prisons with limited marketable work experience, low levels of educational or vocational skills, and many health-related issues, ranging from mental health needs to substance abuse histories and high rates of communicable diseases. When they leave prison, these challenges remain and affect neighborhoods, families, and society at large. With limited assistance in their reintegration, former prisoners pose public safety risks to communities, and about half will return to prison for new crimes or parole violations within three years of release.⁵ This cycle of removal and return of large numbers of adults, mostly men, is increasingly concentrated in communities often already deprived of resources and ill equipped to meet the challenges this population presents.⁶

In 2000, the Justice Policy Center at the Urban Institute launched an ongoing investment in prisoner reentry research to better understand the pathways of successful reintegration, the social and fiscal costs of current policies, and the impacts of incarceration and reentry on individuals, families, and communities. Over the past six years, the Urban Institute's reentry research portfolio has informed a broad set of policy and practice discussions about the challenges facing former prisoners. The Institute's research includes a range of studies, from rigorous program evaluations to strategic planning partnerships with state and local jurisdictions. More specifically, the Institute's reentry portfolio includes the following:

- **Primary Research.** The Urban Institute's cornerstone study is *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*, a multistate, longitudinal study that documents the pathways of prisoner reintegration, examines what factors contribute to a successful or unsuccessful reentry experience, and identifies how those factors can inform policy. The *Returning Home* study has been implemented in four states, including a pilot study in Maryland and full studies in Illinois, Ohio, and Texas. The goal in each state is to collect information on individuals' life circumstances immediately prior to, during, and up to one year after their release. *Returning Home* documents the challenges of reentry along five dimensions: individual, family, peer, community, and state.
- **Program Evaluations.** A large part of the Urban Institute reentry research portfolio includes evaluations of reentry programs and initiatives. For example, with funding from the National Institute of Justice and in partnership with the Research Triangle Institute (RTI), the Urban Institute is conducting a multiyear comprehensive evaluation of the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative, a collaborative federal effort to improve reentry outcomes along criminal justice, employment, education, health, and housing dimensions. Urban Institute researchers are also engaged in individual evaluations of faith-based and other targeted reentry programs.

- **Reentry Roundtables.** The Reentry Roundtable is an ongoing forum that brings together prominent academics, practitioners, community leaders, policymakers, advocates, and former prisoners to explore the policy impact of various components of reentry such as housing, health care, public safety, and civic participation. The goal of the roundtables is to develop new thinking on the issue of prisoner reentry and to foster policy innovations that will improve outcomes for individuals, families, and communities.
- **Policy Reports.** An important component of the Urban Institute’s reentry research portfolio also includes policy reports that synthesize existing research. One example is a study using data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics to examine the state of parole in America. The study examined three major dimensions of the parole function: the extent to which parole boards make release decisions, the population under parole supervision, and the issue of parole revocation (the decision to send a parolee back to prison).
- **Strategic Partnerships.** The Urban Institute has engaged in several strategic partnerships with national organizations, including the National Governors Association, the Council of State Governments, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, as well as state and local organizations. For example, the Urban Institute is one of 10 partner agencies of the Re-Entry Policy Council, established in 2001 by the Council of State Governments to assist state government officials face the growing numbers of people leaving prison and jail and returning to the community. The *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council*, coauthored by the Council of State Governments and the 10 project partners, provides extensive recommendations for the safe and successful return of prisoners to the community, reflecting the common ground reached by the Policy Council during a series of meetings.
- **Scans of Practice.** The Urban Institute has produced several scans of practice that identify and highlight prisoner reentry programs in the field. For example, as part of Outreach Extensions’ Reentry National Media Outreach Campaign, the Urban Institute conducted a national scan of notable or innovative reentry programs that address the needs and risks facing returning prisoners, their families, and communities.⁷

This document provides an overview of some of the key dimensions of prisoner reentry and highlights the Urban Institute’s original research across these topics. In addition, it points to recent and relevant reports published by the Urban Institute that provide more in-depth research and related findings.

¹ Paige Harrison and Allen Beck, *Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2004*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin NCJ 208801 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2005).

² Patrick A. Langan and David Levin, *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ 193427 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2002).

³ Christopher J. Mumola, *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ 182335 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2000).

⁴ Jamie Fellner and Marc Mauer, “Losing the Right to Vote: The Impact of Felony Disenfranchisement Laws in the United States,” The Sentencing Project, Washington, DC, 1998.

⁵ Langan and Levin, *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994*.

⁶ Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Nancy G. La Vigne and Cynthia A. Mamalian, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Nancy G. La Vigne and Gillian L. Thompson, *A Portrait of Reentry in Ohio* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

⁷ Outside the Walls: A National Snapshot of Community-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs

Employment and Reentry

Finding and maintaining a job is a critical dimension of successful prisoner reentry. Research has shown that employment is associated with lower rates of reoffending, and higher wages are associated with lower rates of criminal activity.¹ However, former prisoners face tremendous challenges in finding and maintaining legitimate job opportunities, including low levels of education, limited work experience, and limited vocational skills.² This is further compounded by the incarceration period, during which they forfeit the opportunity to gain marketable work experience and sever professional connections and social contacts that could lead to legal employment upon release.³ In addition, the general reluctance of employers to hire former prisoners serves as a barrier to job placement.⁴

The Urban Institute has explored the nexus between employment and prisoner reentry through a Reentry Roundtable, the *Returning Home* study, and an impact evaluation of the Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) program. During the May 2003 Reentry Roundtable, national experts examined policies, practices, problems, and incentives involved in connecting returning prisoners to legitimate, marketable employment. In addition, *Returning Home* explores issues related to employment by documenting the prerelease expectations and postrelease work experiences of prisoners in Illinois, Maryland, Texas, and Ohio. Finally, a process and impact evaluation of the multisite OPTS program illuminated the importance of employment and related services for returning prisoners.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Employment and Reentry

- **While prisoners believe that having a job is an important factor in staying out of prison, few have a job lined up after release.** The vast majority of *Returning Home* respondents felt that having a job would help them stay out of prison; however, on average, only about one in five reported that they had a job lined up immediately after release.⁵
- **Despite the need for employment assistance, few prisoners receive employment-related training in prison.** Several studies have shown that the vast majority of prisoners cite assistance finding employment as one of their greatest needs after release.⁶ However, only about one-third of Illinois and Maryland *Returning Home* respondents reported participating in an employment readiness program while in prison, and far fewer reported participating in a job-training program in prison (one-quarter of Maryland respondents and only 9 percent of Illinois respondents).⁷ One-quarter of prisoners in Virginia (2002) participated in vocational programs while in prison,⁸ as did 6 percent in New Jersey (2001) and 1 percent in Georgia (2002).⁹
- **Participation in work release jobs in prison may have a positive impact on the likelihood of finding full-time employment after release.** Respondents in the Maryland and Illinois *Returning Home* sample who held a work release job in prison were more likely to be fully employed and had worked more weeks after prison.¹⁰
- **Case-managed reentry services may increase the likelihood of finding and maintaining employment after release from prison.** The Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) evaluation found that participants who interacted with their case manager were more likely to report full-time employment and maintain employment for a longer time than those receiving no case management.¹¹

- **Prisoners who *do* find work after release do not necessarily have full-time or consistent employment.** When interviewed four to eight months after release, 44 percent of Illinois *Returning Home* respondents reported having worked for at least one week since their release.¹² However, less than a third (30 percent) of respondents were employed at the time of the interview, and just 24 percent of all respondents were employed full-time (40 or more hours per week).¹³ At their first postrelease interview, 56 percent of Maryland respondents were either unemployed or were working fewer than 40 hours a week.¹⁴
- **Transportation is a significant barrier to employment.** In the OPTS evaluation, more than a third of the respondents reported having difficulty obtaining a car for work or emergencies and nearly a quarter reported various difficulties accessing public transportation. Former prisoners in a focus group in Rhode Island also cited transportation challenges as a barrier to employment as well as access to services.¹⁵
- **Finding and maintaining employment may reduce recidivism.** The OPTS evaluation found that an increase in levels of employment was a predictor of reductions in drug dealing, violent crime, and property crime. *Returning Home* findings show that Illinois respondents who were unemployed were more likely to be reincarcerated after release.¹⁶

¹ Jared Bernstein and Ellen Houston, *Crime and Work: What We Can Learn from the Low-wage Labor Market* (Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 2000); Bruce Western and Becky Petit, "Incarceration and Racial Inequality in Men's Employment," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54, no.3 (2000): 3–16.

² Caroline Harlow, *Education and Correctional Populations*, NCJ 195670 (Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003).

³ Bruce Western, Jeffrey Kling, and David Weiman, "The Labor Market Consequences of Incarceration," *Crime and Delinquency* 47 (2001): 410–27.

⁴ Harry Holzer, Stephen Raphael, and Michael Stoll, "Will Employers Hire Former Offenders? Employer Preferences, Background Checks, and Their Determinants," in *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*, edited by Bruce Western, Mary Patillo, and David Weiman (New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 2004).

⁵ Christy Visher, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Christy Visher, Nancy La Vigne, and Jill Farrell, *Illinois Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Nancy G. La Vigne, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro, *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Christy Visher, Demelza Baer, and Rebecca Naser, *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, forthcoming).

⁶ John Roman, Michael Kane, Emily Turner, and Beverly Frazier, *Instituting Lasting Reforms for Prisoner Reentry in Philadelphia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Nancy G. La Vigne and Samuel J. Wolf, with Jesse Jannetta, *Voices of Experience: Focus Group Findings on Prisoner Reentry in the State of Rhode Island* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne and Sarah Lawrence, *Process Evaluation of the Pennsylvania Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR) Program* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2002); Visher et al., *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)*; La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; La Vigne and Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*.

⁷ Christy Visher, Vera Kachnowski, Nancy La Vigne and Jeremy Travis, *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

⁸ Sinead Keegan and Amy L. Solomon, *Prisoner Reentry in Virginia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

⁹ Jeremy Travis, Sinead Keegan, Eric Cadora, with Amy Solomon and Charles Swartz, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Nancy G. La Vigne and Cynthia Mamalian, *Prisoner Reentry in Georgia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹⁰ Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

¹¹ Shelli B. Rossman and Caterina G. Roman, "Case-Managed Reentry and Employment: Lessons from the Opportunity to Succeed Program" *Justice Research and Policy* 5, no. 2 (2003): 75–100.

¹² La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

¹⁵ Rossman and Roman, "Case-Managed Reentry and Employment"; La Vigne et al., *Voices of Experience*.

¹⁶ Rossman and Roman, "Case-Managed Reentry and Employment."

Health and Reentry

The prevalence of severe mental disorders and chronic and infectious diseases among the prison population is far greater than among the general population.¹ Even when individuals have received adequate physical and mental health services while in prison, they often face limited access and insufficient linkages to community-based health care upon release.² Service providers have identified the lack of available resources for services and the competition for funding as significant problems in delivering services to former prisoners, especially those with the most serious health needs.³ In addition, incarceration disqualifies inmates from Medicaid eligibility. Restoring eligibility can take several months, interrupting access to prescription drugs and putting individuals at high risk of relapse.

The *Returning Home* study at the Urban Institute has illuminated many health-related challenges associated with reentry, including a special focus on returning prisoners with serious mental and physical illness in Cincinnati, Ohio, as well as a study on the health care Chicago prisoners receive during prison and the health challenges they face after release. The Urban Institute also convened a Reentry Roundtable on the public health dimensions of prisoner reentry to generate a discussion among experts about the health needs and risks of returning prisoners and their families. In addition, researchers at the Urban Institute explored evidenced-based housing programs that serve persons with mental illness who have had contact with the criminal justice system and identified various programs serving this population across the country.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Health and Reentry

- **A substantial number of prisoners have been diagnosed with a physical or mental health condition.** *Returning Home* findings show that between nearly 30 and 40 percent of respondents reported having a chronic physical or mental health condition, with the most commonly reported conditions including depression, asthma, and high blood pressure.⁴ In New Jersey, about a third of prisoners released in 2002 had been diagnosed with at least one chronic and/or communicable physical or mental health condition.⁵
- **More prisoners report being diagnosed with a medical condition than report receiving medication or treatment for the condition while incarcerated.** While 30 percent of Illinois *Returning Home* respondents reported having a physical or mental health condition, only 12 percent reported having taken medication on a regular basis while in prison.⁶ In a small study of prisoners in Ohio, over half reported being diagnosed with depression, but only 38 percent of the sample reported receiving treatment or taking prescription medication for depression.⁷ Similarly, 27 percent reported having asthma, yet less than 14 percent reported receiving treatment for asthma.⁸
- **Many corrections agencies lack discharge planning and preparation for addressing health care needs upon release, making continuity of care difficult.** Less than 10 percent of prisoners in the Illinois *Returning Home* study reported receiving referrals to health care or mental health care services in the community.⁹ In fact, respondents who reported having *fair* or *poor* health were no more or less likely to receive referrals to health care in the community than those reporting to be in good general health.¹⁰ In addition, only 20 percent of respondents in the small study of Ohio prisoners reported programming or assistance to prepare them to address their health care needs upon release.¹¹

- **Securing health care is a major concern for many released prisoners.** At least three-quarters of *Returning Home* respondents acknowledged they would need help getting health care after release.¹²
- **The vast majority of returning prisoners do not have any form of medical insurance.** *Returning Home* findings show that four to eight months after release, only 10 to 20 percent of respondents in Maryland and Illinois had private insurance.¹³ Sixteen months after release, the percentage of Illinois respondents who had private insurance dropped from almost 20 to 15 percent.¹⁴ In Maryland, only 5 percent of *Returning Home* respondents reported being recipients of Medicaid or Medicare, a disability pension, or Veteran’s Administration health insurance.¹⁵

¹ National Commission on Correctional Health Care, *The Health Status of Soon-to-Be-Released Inmates: A Report to Congress*, Vol. 1 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 2002).

² Theodore M. Hammett, Sheryl Roberts, and Sofia Kennedy, “Health-Related Issues in Prisoner Reentry to the Community,” *Crime and Delinquency* 47, no. 3 (2001): 390–409.

³ Christy A. Visher, Rebecca L. Naser, Demelza Baer, and Jesse Jannetta, *In Need of Help: Experiences of Seriously Ill Prisoners Returning to Cincinnati* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

⁴ Kamala Mallik-Kane, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Health and Prisoner Reentry* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Christy Visher, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Christy Visher, Demelza Baer, and Rebecca Naser, *Ohio Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, forthcoming).

⁵ Jeremy Travis, Sinead Keegan, Eric Cadora, with Amy Solomon and Charles Swartz, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

⁶ Mallik-Kane, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief*.

⁷ Visher et al., *In Need of Help*.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Mallik-Kane, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief*.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Visher et al., *In Need of Help*.

¹² Mallik-Kane, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief*; Visher et al., *Returning Home*; La Vigne and Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Ohio Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home*.

¹³ Christy Visher, Vera Kachnowski, Nancy La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Baltimore Prisoners’ Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Mallik-Kane, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief*.

¹⁴ Mallik-Kane, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief*.

¹⁵ Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners’ Experiences Returning Home*.

Housing and Reentry

Securing housing is perhaps the most immediate challenge facing prisoners upon their release. While many returning prisoners have plans to stay with family, those who do not confront limited housing options. The process of obtaining housing is often complicated by a host of factors: the scarcity of affordable and available housing, legal barriers and regulations, prejudices that restrict tenancy for this population, and strict eligibility requirements for federally subsidized housing. Research has found that released prisoners who do not have stable housing arrangements are more likely to return to prison,¹ suggesting that the obstacles to securing both temporary and permanent housing warrant the attention of policymakers, practitioners, and researchers.

In an effort to understand the dimensions of the housing challenge and how it relates to the reentry process, the *Returning Home* study has examined the housing arrangements of recently released prisoners, as well as the relationship between these arrangements and the successes and challenges of the reentry process. In addition, the Urban Institute has researched housing programs for returning prisoners and the ways in which housing and criminal justice agencies can effectively work together to address the housing needs of this population.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Housing and Reentry

- **The majority of prisoners believe that having a stable place to live is important to successful reentry. Those with no housing arrangements believe that they will need help finding a place to live after release.** In their prerelease interview, three-quarters of both the Illinois and Maryland *Returning Home* respondents stated that having a place to live would be an important factor in staying out of prison. Of those who did not have housing arrangements lined up in prison, over 70 percent reported that they would need *some help* or *a lot of help* finding a place to live.²
- **The majority of returning prisoners live with family members and/or intimate partners upon release.** Three months after release, 88 percent of the *Returning Home* respondents in Illinois and nearly 60 percent of those in Maryland were living with a family member and/or intimate partner.³ Between 63 and 78 percent of respondents in Ohio and Texas anticipated living with a family member upon release.⁴
- **Many former prisoners return home to living arrangements that are only temporary.** Overall, one-third of Illinois *Returning Home* respondents returned home to temporary living arrangements.⁵ About one in five reported living at more than one address after being in the community for one to three months, and by six to eight months after release, 31 percent had lived at more than one address.⁶ Furthermore, more than half of Illinois respondents believed they would not be staying in their current neighborhood for long.⁷ The Maryland *Returning Home* respondents reported similar expectations of relocating six months after release, with over half expecting to leave their current location within weeks or months.⁸
- **Housing options for returning prisoners who do not stay with family members or friends are extremely limited.** Potential housing options for former prisoners include community-based correctional housing facilities; transitional housing; federally subsidized and administered housing; homeless assistance supportive housing, service-enhanced housing, and special needs housing supported through HUD; and the private market.⁹

However, most of these options are extremely limited and often unavailable to formerly incarcerated people.¹⁰ A Rhode Island focus group of service providers and former prisoners overwhelmingly agreed that the shortage of affordable and available housing is an enormous problem for returning prisoners.¹¹

- **Practitioners and researchers agree that there are few evidence-based reentry housing programs that target returning prisoners with mental illness.** Thousands of persons with mental illness exit prisons and jails each year, and research has found that adequate housing for this population can enhance their ability to become self-sufficient and avoid future justice system contact. However, few programs provide housing for releasees with mental health problems, and there is no body of compelling evidence regarding the most effective components of such housing programs.¹²

¹ Stephen Metraux and Dennis P. Culhane, “Homeless Shelter Use and Reincarceration Following Prison Release: Assessing the Risk,” *Criminology and Public Policy* 3 (2004): 201–22.

² Christy Visher, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Nancy G. La Vigne, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro, *Chicago Prisoners’ Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Christy Visher, Demelza Baer, and Rebecca Naser, *Ohio Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

³ Visher et al., *Returning Home*; La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners’ Experiences Returning Home*.

⁴ La Vigne and Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Ohio Prisoners’ Reflections on Returning Home*.

⁵ Christy Visher and Jill Farrell, *Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Visher et al., *Returning Home*.

⁹ Caterina G. Roman and Jeremy Travis, *Taking Stock: Housing, Homelessness, and Prisoner Reentry* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Nancy G. La Vigne and Samuel J. Wolf, with Jesse Jannetta, *Voices of Experience: Focus Group Findings on Prisoner Reentry in the State of Rhode Island* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹² Caterina G. Roman, Elizabeth C. McBride, and Jenny Osborne, *Principles and Practice in Housing for Persons with Mental Illness Who Have Had Contact with the Justice System*.

Substance Use and Reentry

Substance use among former prisoners presents significant challenges to the reentry process. Studies have shown that while 83 percent of state prisoners have a history of drug use, only a small fraction receive treatment while incarcerated and after release. For example, while three-fourths of state prisoners have had some type of involvement with alcohol or drug use in the time leading up to their offense, only 15 percent of this group receives treatment in prison.¹ Furthermore, for those who have access to and take advantage of treatment programs in prison, few continue to receive appropriate treatment once they return to the community.² At the same time, prison-based drug treatment has been shown to reduce drug use and criminal activity, especially when coupled with aftercare treatment in the community.³

The Urban Institute has studied the challenges that substance use presents to the reentry process from the perspectives and experiences of both prisoners and practitioners. *Returning Home* documents the prevalence of drug use and treatment participation among prisoners through their preprison substance use histories, their expectations before release, and their engagement in substance use after release. Other studies synthesize the literature on drug treatment and the challenges of integrating treatment services into the criminal justice system.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Substance Use and Reentry

- **A majority of prisoners have extensive substance use histories.** Similar to national statistics, most *Returning Home* respondents reported some drug use (between 66 and 80 percent) or alcohol use or intoxication (between 48 and 60 percent) prior to prison.⁴ Specifically, *Returning Home* findings show that in the six months before entering prison, 41 percent of Maryland respondents reported daily heroin use, and 57 percent of Texas respondents reported daily cocaine use (compared with less than 5 percent who reported daily heroin use).⁵
- **Prisoners identify drug use as the primary cause of many of their past and current problems.** The Maryland *Returning Home* study found that nearly two-thirds of drug users reported arrests associated with their drug use, and about one-third reported missing school and/or losing their job as a result of drug use.⁶ In Illinois, 60 percent of respondents cited substance use as the cause of one or more family, relationship, employment, legal, or financial problem.⁷ Almost one-third of Ohio respondents reported experiencing problems in their relationships due to drug use.⁸
- **Despite high levels of drug use, relatively few prisoners receive drug treatment while incarcerated.** Of all *Returning Home* respondents, between 21 and 27 percent reported participating in specific drug or alcohol treatment programs.⁹ In Illinois, only 42 percent of *Returning Home* respondents who reported drug use prior to prison also reported receiving drug treatment in prison.¹⁰ In 2002, New Jersey implemented a Substance Use Disorder Continuum of Treatment plan that included prison-based therapeutic communities; however, despite the fact that 81 percent of New Jersey inmates suffer from some type of drug or alcohol abuse problem, program capacity was limited to 6 percent of the 2002 state prison population.¹¹ Similarly, in Texas, substance abuse program capacity can only serve 5 percent of the potential population in need.¹²

- **Consensus in the field holds that individualized in-prison treatment in concert with community-based aftercare can reduce substance use and dependency.** Corrections and treatment researchers and practitioners agree that in-prison treatment is much more likely to effectively sustain a decline in substance use if it is tailored to an individual's need and level of risk, integrated across all stages of the justice system, and linked to drug treatment aftercare in the community.¹³
- **Those with substance use histories and those who engage in substance use after release are at a high risk to recidivate.** *Returning Home* respondents who were rearrested after release had more extensive criminal and substance use histories and were more likely to have used drugs before prison as well as after release.¹⁴

¹ Christopher J. Mumola, *Substance Abuse and Treatment, State and Federal Prisoners, 1997*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ 172871 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1999).

² Laura Winterfield and Jennifer Castro, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Treatment Matching* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

³ Gerald G. Gaes, Timothy J. Flanagan, Laurence L. Motiuk, and Lynn Stewart, "Adult Correctional Treatment," in *Prisons*, edited by Michael Tonry and Joan Petersilia (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Lana D. Harrison, "The Challenge of Reintegrating Drug Offenders in the Community," paper presented at the Urban Institute Reentry Roundtable, Washington, DC, October 2000.

⁴ Christy Visher, Vera Kachnowski, Nancy G. La Vigne and Jeremy Travis, *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro, *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Christy Visher, Demelza Baer, and Rebecca Naser, *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, forthcoming).

⁵ Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; La Vigne and Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*.

⁶ Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

⁷ La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

⁸ Visher et al., *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*.

⁹ Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; La Vigne and Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*.

¹⁰ Winterfield and Castro, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Treatment Matching*.

¹¹ Jeremy Travis, Sinead Keegan, Eric Cadora, with Amy Solomon and Charles Swartz, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

¹² Jamie Watson, Amy L. Solomon, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, with Meagan Funches and Barbara Parthasarathy, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Texas* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹³ Daniel P. Mears, Laura Winterfield, John Hunsaker, Gretchen E. Moore, and Ruth White, *Drug Treatment in the Criminal Justice System: The Current State of Knowledge* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Gretchen E. Moore and Daniel P. Mears, *Voices from the Field: Practitioners Identify Key Issues in Corrections-Based Drug Treatment* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Gretchen E. Moore and Daniel P. Mears, *A Meeting of the Minds: Researchers and Practitioners Discuss Key Issues in Corrections-Based Drug Treatment* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

¹⁴ La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

Families and Reentry

The impact of incarceration and reentry on children and families is significant, and in many respects difficult to measure. More than half of U.S. prisoners (55 percent of state male inmates and 65 percent of state female inmates) are parents of minor children.¹ By the end of 2002, 2 percent of all minor children in America, and 7 percent of children of color, had a parent in prison.² Including parents who are in jail, on probation and on parole, this number increases to 10 percent of all minor children. When a parent is sent to prison, the family structure, financial responsibilities, emotional support systems, and living arrangements are all potentially affected. Incarceration, as a result, can drastically disrupt spousal relationships, parent-child relationships, and family networks.³ Restoring these relationships, reunifying with the family, and undertaking these roles and responsibilities upon return also pose a unique set of challenges.

In recent years, research has found that strengthening the family network and maintaining supportive family contact can improve outcomes for both family members and prisoners.⁴ In fact, maintaining family connections through letters, phone calls and personal visits has shown to reduce recidivism rates.⁵ Yet, given the challenges of maintaining this contact—including visiting regulations, transportation costs to distant corrections facilities, other financial barriers, and emotional strains—more than half of incarcerated parents report never having received a personal visit from their children.⁶ However, many social service providers and corrections departments across the country are working to overcome and address these barriers.

The Urban Institute has explored the impact of incarceration and reentry on families and children through several projects. The *Returning Home* study examines reentry from the lens of family members of prisoners by interviewing them after their family member's release. The Urban Institute has also convened a Reentry Roundtable, sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services and informed by commissioned papers by leading academics. Finally, Urban Institute researchers have provided an overview of the costs of incarceration and reentry on children and family structures by synthesizing extant work on the topic from a variety of disciplines.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Families and Reentry

- **Most prisoners believe that family support is an important factor in helping them stay out of prison.** Prior to release, over half of Illinois and Maryland *Returning Home* respondents reported that family support would be an important factor in helping them avoid returning to prison.⁷ After release, nearly three-quarters of Illinois and Maryland respondents felt that family support had been an important factor in avoiding prison.⁸ In a focus group, participants in Pennsylvania's Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR) Program cited family reunification as a major need in their reentry process.⁹ Prisoners in a Rhode Island focus group reported heavy reliance on their families for both emotional and financial support following their release.¹⁰
- **Strong family support before prison may reduce the likelihood of recidivism.** Respondents in the Illinois *Returning Home* study who reported more positive family relationships were less likely to be reconvicted, while those with negative family relationships were more likely to be reconvicted or reincarcerated.¹¹ Further, respondents in the Maryland *Returning Home* study with closer family relationships and strong family support were less likely to have used drugs since their release.¹²

- **While most prisoners have some regular contact with family members during their prison term, relatively few ever receive visits.** The vast majority of respondents in the Illinois *Returning Home* study reported having had at least some telephone or mail contact with family members and intimate partners.¹³ However, only 13 percent of respondents had in-person contact with family members or children, and 29 percent had visits from partners.¹⁴
- **One of the greatest challenges to maintaining contact with incarcerated family members is the distant location of the prison.** Three-quarters of family members identified by respondents in the Illinois *Returning Home* sample reported that it was a challenge to stay in touch with their incarcerated family members because the prison was located too far away.¹⁵ For the two-thirds who did not visit their family members in prison, the median estimated travel time to the prison was four hours longer than those who visited, a possible indicator of why they did not visit.¹⁶
- **Close family relationships may improve employment outcomes for returning prisoners.** Respondents in the Maryland *Returning Home* study who had closer family and intimate partner relationships and stronger family support were more likely to be employed after release.¹⁷ In Illinois, respondents who had an intimate partner after release reported having been employed for more weeks on average (30 percent more) than those without a partner.¹⁸

¹ Paige M. Harrison and Allen J. Beck, *Prisoners in 2001*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin NCJ 195189 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2002).

² Christopher J. Mumola, *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ 182335 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2000).

³ Jeremy Travis, Elizabeth M. Cincotta, and Amy L. Solomon, *Families Left Behind: The Hidden Costs of Incarceration and Reentry* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

⁴ Eileen Sullivan, Milton Mino, Katherine Nelson, and Jill Pope, *Families as a Resource in Recovery from Drug Abuse: An Evaluation of La Bodega de la Familia* (New York: Vera Institute of Justice, 2002).

⁵ Creasie F. Hairston, "Family Ties During Imprisonment: Do They Influence Future Criminal Activity?" *Federal Probation* (1998): 48–52.

⁶ Mumola, *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*.

⁷ Christy Visher, Vera Kachnowski, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro, *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

⁸ La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; Christy Visher, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

⁹ Nancy G. La Vigne and Sarah Lawrence, *Process Evaluation of the Pennsylvania Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR) Program* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2002).

¹⁰ Nancy G. La Vigne and Samuel J. Wolf, with Jesse Jannetta, *Voices of Experience: Focus Group Findings on Prisoner Reentry in the State of Rhode Island* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹¹ La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

¹² Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

¹³ Nancy G. La Vigne, Rebecca L. Naser, Lisa R. Brooks, and Jennifer Castro, "Examining the Effect of Incarceration and In-Prison Family Contact on Prisoners' Family Relationships," *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 21, no. 4 (2005): 1–22.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Rebecca L. Naser and Christy A. Visher, "Family Members' Experiences with Incarceration and Reentry" (forthcoming).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Visher et al., *Returning Home*.

¹⁸ La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

Communities and Reentry

Released prisoners are returning in relatively high concentrations to a small number of communities in America's urban centers,¹ thereby having a profound—and disproportionate—impact on community life, family networks, and social capital in these neighborhoods. Social and economic disadvantage often characterize these communities, compounding the challenges and burdens that this population brings to bear when they return home.² Research also suggests that high rates of incarceration and reentry of community residents through the revolving door of the criminal justice system may further destabilize these communities.³

The Urban Institute has mapped concentrations of prisoner reentry in several states and communities across the country. As a provider of research and technical assistance to the National Governors Association Reentry Policy Academy as well as through the *Returning Home* study, the Urban Institute has mapped the reentry to communities in Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Idaho, Georgia, Virginia, Maryland, Illinois, Ohio, and Texas. The Urban Institute also established the Reentry Mapping Network, a partnership among 12 community-based organizations to create community change through the mapping and analysis of neighborhood-level data related to reentry and community well-being. To examine both the impact of reentry on communities and the role of communities in a prisoner's reintegration process, the *Returning Home* study involves interviews with returning prisoners, focus groups with members of communities that are home to large concentrations of returning prisoners, and interviews with stakeholders involved in reentry activities at the community and city levels. The Urban Institute has also convened a Reentry Roundtable exploring the role of community institutions, such as faith-based organizations and local businesses, in prisoner reentry.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Communities and Reentry

- **A relatively large number of prisoners return to a small number of cities in each state.** For example, Chicago and Baltimore received more than half of prisoners returning to Illinois and Maryland, respectively, in 2001.⁴ Houston received a quarter of all prisoners returning to Texas.⁵ In 2002, 2 of New Jersey's 21 counties accounted for nearly a third of returning prisoners.⁶ In 2002, more than one-third (37 percent) of adult prisoners returned to 2 of Massachusetts's 14 counties.⁷ Five of Idaho's 44 counties accounted for 73 percent of returning prisoners.⁸
- **Returning prisoners are often clustered in a few neighborhoods within those cities.** In 2001, 8 percent of Chicago communities (6 of 77) accounted for 34 percent of all prisoners returning to Chicago.⁹ Thirty-six percent of respondents in the Maryland *Returning Home* study returned to 11 percent of Baltimore communities (6 of 55).¹⁰ In 2002, almost half of adult prisoners returning to Suffolk County, Massachusetts, returned to just 10 percent of Boston's 630 block groups.¹¹ In Virginia, about half of all prisoners returning to Richmond in 2002 returned to 15 percent of the city's 163 block groups.¹² In 2003, 7 percent of the Zip Codes (8 of 115) in Wayne County, Michigan, all of which are located in the city of Detroit, accounted for 41 percent of all prisoners released to parole in Michigan.¹³
- **High levels of social and economic disadvantage often characterize the communities to which prisoners return.** The Chicago, Baltimore, Cleveland, and Houston communities that are home to the greatest concentrations of released prisoners have above-average rates of unemployment, female-headed households, and families living below the federal poverty

level.¹⁴ In Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, the cities to which the greatest percent of prisoners return have poverty rates more than twice that of the state as a whole and are characterized by higher than average levels of unemployment and female-headed households.¹⁵

- **Prisoners do not necessarily return to the communities from which they came.** About half of *Returning Home* respondents who returned to Chicago and Baltimore did not return to the neighborhood in which they lived prior to incarceration.¹⁶ These respondents reported that the principal reasons for relocation were either to avoid problems in their old neighborhood or because their families had moved.¹⁷
- **Former prisoners who relocate after they are released tend to move to neighborhoods similar to the ones they left.** Illinois *Returning Home* findings show that prisoners who move at least once in the two years after their release move to neighborhoods with similar socioeconomic characteristics as the ones they left.¹⁸
- **Prisoners returning to neighborhoods perceived to be unsafe and lacking in social capital are at greater risk of recidivism.** Illinois *Returning Home* respondents who viewed their communities as safe and good places to live were much less likely to return to prison and more likely to be employed than those who reported their communities were unsafe or characterized by low social capital.¹⁹ In addition, those who felt that drug selling was a problem in their neighborhood were more likely to have engaged in substance use after release than those living in neighborhoods where drug selling was not perceived to be a problem.²⁰

¹ James P. Lynch and William J. Sabol, *Prisoner Reentry in Perspective* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2001).

² Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003);

Nancy G. La Vigne and Cynthia A. Mamalian, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003);

Nancy G. La Vigne and Gillian L. Thompson, *A Portrait of Reentry in Ohio* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

³ Todd R. Clear, Dina R. Rose, and J. Ryder, "Incarceration and the Community: The Problem of Removing and Returning Offenders," *Crime and Delinquency* 47, no. 3 (2001): 335–51.

⁴ La Vigne and Kachnowski, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland*; La Vigne and Mamalian, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois*.

⁵ Jamie Watson, Amy L. Solomon, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis with Meagan Funches and Barbara Parthasarathy, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Texas* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

⁶ Jeremy Travis, Sinead Keegan, Eric Cadora, with Amy Solomon and Charles Swartz, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

⁷ Lisa E. Brooks, Amy L. Solomon, Sinead Keegan, Rhiana Khol, and Lori Lahue, *Prisoner Reentry in Massachusetts* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

⁸ Nancy G. La Vigne, Cynthia A. Mamalian, Gillian Thompson, and Jamie Watson, *Prisoner Reentry in Idaho* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

⁹ La Vigne and Mamalian, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois*.

¹⁰ Christy Visser, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

¹¹ Brooks et al., *Prisoner Reentry in Massachusetts*.

¹² Sinead Keegan and Amy L. Solomon, *Prisoner Reentry in Virginia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹³ Amy L. Solomon and Gillian L. Thompson with Sinead Keegan, *Prisoner Reentry in Michigan* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹⁴ La Vigne and Mamalian, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois*; La Vigne and Kachnowski, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland*; La Vigne and Thompson, *A Portrait of Reentry in Ohio*; Watson et al., *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Texas*.

¹⁵ Keegan and Solomon, *Prisoner Reentry in Virginia*; Travis et al., *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey*; Brooks et al., *Prisoner Reentry in Massachusetts*.

¹⁶ Visser and Farrell, *Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry*; Christy Visser, Vera Kachnowski, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Nancy G. La Vigne and Barbara Parthasarathy, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Prisoner Reentry and Residential Mobility* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

¹⁹ Christy Visser and Jill Farrell, *Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

²⁰ *Ibid.*

Public Safety and Reentry

Given the significant rates at which former prisoners recidivate, prisoner reentry presents a tremendous public safety dilemma. The Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates that within three years of release, more than two-thirds of prisoners are rearrested for a new crime—most within the first year out of prison. Forty-seven percent of all releasees are reconvicted for a new crime and more than half are reincarcerated for a new crime or parole violation.¹ Released prisoners make a substantial contribution to new crime; one study estimates that recent prison releasees account for about one-fifth of all adult arrests made by police.² This statistic likely understates the proportion of new crime for which former inmates are responsible because it includes neither those reentering from jails nor former prisoners who have been in the community for more than three years.

In 2004, the Urban Institute convened a Reentry Roundtable to explore the links between prisoner reentry and community policing in the context of enhancing public safety. As part of that project, researchers conducted a scan of police reentry partnerships to identify innovative reentry strategies underway across the country. The *Returning Home* study also examines the relationship between recidivism and other factors, such as criminal and employment histories, substance use, and family relationships. In addition, researchers at the Urban Institute edited a collected volume on the topic that looks broadly at public safety and other dimensions of prisoner reentry.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Public Safety and Reentry

- **Most returning prisoners have extensive criminal histories.** Most *Returning Home* respondents (between 80 and 87 percent) had at least one prior conviction, and at least two-thirds had previously served time in prison.³ In Massachusetts, all but 1 percent of prisoners released from the Department of Correction in 2002 had been previously incarcerated in a Massachusetts state or county facility.⁴ Between 1996 and 2003, almost 80 percent of the individuals who were admitted and released to the Philadelphia Prison System had been previously incarcerated there.⁵
- **A substantial number of released prisoners are reconvicted or rearrested for new crimes, many within the first year after release.** Illinois *Returning Home* findings show that one-fifth (22 percent) of released prisoners were reconvicted for a new crime within 11 months of release, and nearly one-third (31 percent) were returned to prison on a new sentence or parole revocation within 13 months of release.⁶ Maryland *Returning Home* findings show that within 6 months of release, roughly one-third (32 percent) had been rearrested for at least one new crime, 10 percent had been reconvicted for a new crime, and 16 percent had been reconfined to prison or jail for a new crime conviction or technical violation.⁷
- **Those with substance use histories and who engage in substance use after release are at a high risk to recidivate.** *Returning Home* respondents who were rearrested after release had more extensive criminal and substance use histories and were more likely to have used drugs before prison as well as after release.⁸
- **High crime areas are not always the same areas as those to which the highest numbers of prisoners are returning.** Many neighborhoods that receive high concentrations of

returning prisoners have more moderate crime rates than the regional average. In Baltimore, for example, three of the six communities that received the highest number of returning prisoners in 2001 had Part I crime rates⁹ lower than the citywide average.¹⁰ In Cleveland, three of the five communities that received the highest number of returning prisoners in 2001 had Part I crime rates lower than the citywide average.¹¹ Most of the areas in Virginia to which the largest numbers of prisoners return experience over a third fewer crimes per 1,000 residents than the areas with the highest concentrations of crime.¹² Still, some communities with high rates of returning prisoners also have high crime rates. In Chicago, all but one of the six neighborhoods that receive the highest concentrations of returning prisoners have crime rates higher than the citywide average.¹³

¹ Patrick A. Langan and David Levin, *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ 193427 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2002).

² Richard Rosenfeld, Joel Wallman, and Robert J. Fornango, "The Contribution of Ex-Prisoners to Crime Rates," in *Prisoner Reentry and Public Safety in America*, edited by Jeremy Travis and Christy Visher (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

³ Christy Visher, Vera Kachnowski, Nancy G. La Vigne and Jeremy Travis, *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro, *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Christy Visher, Demelza Baer, and Rebecca Naser, *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

⁴ Lisa E. Brooks, Amy L. Solomon, Sinead Keegan, Rhiana Khol, and Lori Lahue, *Prisoner Reentry in Massachusetts* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

⁵ John Roman, Michael Kane, Emily Turner, and Beverly Frazier, *Instituting Lasting Reforms for Prisoner Reentry in Philadelphia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

⁶ La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

⁷ Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

⁸ La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

⁹ The Federal Bureau of Investigation defines Part I offenses as murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

¹⁰ Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

¹¹ Nancy G. La Vigne and Gillian L. Thompson, *A Portrait of Reentry in Ohio* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

¹² Sinead Keegan and Amy L. Solomon, *Prisoner Reentry in Virginia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

¹³ Nancy G. La Vigne and Cynthia A. Mamalian, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois*, (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

Community Supervision and Reentry

Nationwide, the vast majority (about 80 percent) of released prisoners are subject to a period of supervision in the community. There are now 765,000 released prisoners on parole, up from 220,000 in 1980.¹ Resources have not kept pace with this increase. Most supervision officers are responsible for 70 parolees, about twice the volume experts recommend.² Large numbers of parolees return to prison for new crimes or technical violations of their parole and account for 35 percent of new prison admissions nationally. While trends in community supervision are measured on a national level, there is extensive variation in release decisions and supervision practices across states.³

Using the data from the landmark Bureau of Justice Statistics recidivism study, Urban Institute researchers compared prisoners released to parole supervision with those released without supervision in order to assess whether postrelease supervision affects arrest outcomes. The *Returning Home* study also examines community supervision via the expectations and experiences of prisoners who have been released to community supervision. In addition, Urban Institute staff used Bureau of Justice Statistics data to examine various aspects of parole in all U.S. states.

Recent Findings from the Urban Institute on Community Supervision and Reentry

- **Nationally, parole violation rates have increased substantially over the past 25 years, and in many states, violators account for a significant number and share of state prison admissions.** The number of people returned to state prison for a parole violation increased sevenfold in the last two decades, from 27,000 in 1980 to 203,000 in 2000.⁴ Further, parole violators, who accounted for 17 percent of state prison admissions in 1980, accounted for over one-third of all admissions in 2000.⁵ In 2002, more than 40 percent of prison admissions in Virginia and Georgia were the result of probation or parole violations.⁶
- **A significant share of prisoners is serving time in prison or state jail for parole or probation violations.** *Returning Home* findings show that about 4 in 10 respondents in Texas and Ohio had been serving their current term in prison or state jail because of a parole or probation violation.⁷ Of prisoners released in New Jersey in 2002, 39 percent were incarcerated for a violation of parole.⁸
- **Many prisoners believe that it will be easy to avoid a parole violation after release.** The majority of *Returning Home* respondents (between 77 and 81 percent) believed it would be easy to avoid a parole violation.⁹ Nearly 60 percent of prisoners surveyed in the Philadelphia Prison System believed it would be *very easy* or *pretty easy* to avoid a parole or probation violation upon release.¹⁰
- **Individuals released to supervision generally have high expectations and respect for their parole or probation officers (POs); however, their expectations are not always realistic.** Prior to release, the vast majority of *Returning Home* respondents (between 82 and 87 percent) expected their PO to be helpful with their transition to the community.¹¹ And after release, while nearly all *Returning Home* respondents in Illinois and Maryland believed that their PO acted professionally and treated them with respect, only half reported that their PO had actually been helpful in their transition from prison.¹²

- **Parole supervision appears to have little effect on the rearrest rates of released prisoners in some large states.** A study of 14 states indicates that mandatory parolees, the largest share of released prisoners, fare no better on supervision than similar prisoners released without supervision in terms of rearrest outcomes. Parolees released by a parole board were less likely to be rearrested; yet when taking into account personal characteristics and criminal histories, this difference narrows to about 4 percentage points. Despite this general finding, females, individuals with fewer prior arrests, public order offenders, and those in prison for technical violations were less likely to be rearrested if supervised after release.¹³

¹ Lauren E. Glaze and Seri Palla, *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2004*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin NCJ 210676 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2005).

² Joan Petersilia, *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Jeremy Travis and Sarah Lawrence, *Beyond the Prison Gates: The State of Parole in America* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2002).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Sinead Keegan and Amy L. Solomon, *Prisoner Reentry in Virginia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); Nancy G. La Vigne and Cynthia A. Mamalian, *Prisoner Reentry in Georgia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004).

⁷ Nancy G. La Vigne and Vera Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005); Christy Visher, Demelza Baer, and Rebecca Naser, *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

⁸ Jeremy Travis, Sinead Keegan, and Eric Cadora with Amy Solomon and Charles Swartz, *A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003).

⁹ Christy Visher, Nancy G. La Vigne, and Jeremy Travis, *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003); Nancy La Vigne, Christy Visher, and Jennifer Castro, *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004); La Vigne and Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*.

¹⁰ John Roman, Michael Kane, Emily Turner, and Beverly Frazier, *Instituting Lasting Reforms for Prisoner Reentry in Philadelphia* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

¹¹ Visher et al., *Returning Home*; La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*; La Vigne and Kachnowski, *Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*; Visher et al., *Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home*.

¹² Visher et al., *Returning Home*; La Vigne et al., *Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*.

¹³ Amy L. Solomon, Vera Kachnowski, and Avinash Bhati, *Does Parole Work?: Analyzing the Impact of Postprison Supervision on Rearrest Outcomes* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2005).

Strategic Partnerships and Collaboration

The Urban Institute has partnered with municipalities, state and federal agencies, community-based organizations, and other groups to work toward developing innovative strategies to address the challenges of prisoner reentry. The Urban Institute's chief role in these endeavors is to develop an empirical base from which to frame the problem-solving efforts of these strategic partnerships. This section briefly highlights the key partnerships and collaborative efforts in which the Urban Institute has been engaged.

Reentry Mapping Network

Launched with the support of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Reentry Mapping Network (RMN) is a partnership among community-based organizations and the Urban Institute, designed to create community change through the mapping and analysis of neighborhood-level data related to reentry and community well-being. Following the successful model of the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership, RMN partners use mapping to pinpoint neighborhoods that experience high concentrations of returning prisoners and to examine community capacity to address the challenges that prisoner reentry presents. These findings are used to inform and develop targeted responses to address reentry-related problems. They help corrections officials, community organizations, and service providers develop a better understanding of the dynamics and correlates of prisoner reentry at the local level; engage local stakeholders and practitioners in developing strategies to address reentry-related challenges; and facilitate greater coordination and collaboration among state and local agencies and organizations around this work. For more information on RMN publications, resources, and partners, visit the Justice Policy Center's Prisoner Reentry web site at <http://www.urban.org/Pressroom/prisonerreentry.cfm>.

National Governors Association Reentry Policy Academy

The National Governors Association launched the Prisoner Reentry State Policy Academy in the summer of 2003. The goal of the Policy Academy is to help state governors and other state policymakers develop and implement prisoner reentry strategies to reduce costly recidivism rates. The Urban Institute provides research and technical assistance to inform the Academy's efforts and activities in the seven participating states: Rhode Island, Georgia, Idaho, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, and Virginia. In each of these states, Urban Institute researchers documented incarceration and release trends, characteristics of returning prisoners, release and supervision policies and practices, and the geographic distribution of released prisoners. These reports are presented in state portraits on reentry for each of the seven states and are available online at the Justice Policy Center (<http://jpc.urban.org>) and the National Governors Association (<http://www.nga.org/center/reentry>).

Council of State Governments Re-Entry Policy Council

The Urban Institute is one of 10 partners of the Re-Entry Policy Council (RPC), established in 2001 by the Council of State Governments (CSG) to assist state government officials with the growing number of people leaving prison and jail and returning to the community. The RPC is made up of key leaders and experts at the local, state, and national level, including criminal justice officials and practitioners; state legislators; workforce development, housing, health, mental health, and substance abuse officials; and service providers. The *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council*, authored by CSG and the 10 project partners, provides recommendations for the

safe and successful return of prisoners to the community, reflecting the common ground the Policy Council reached during a series of meetings. More information on the Reentry Policy Council and access to the full report is available at <http://www.reentrypolicy.org>.

New Jersey Reentry Roundtable

The New Jersey Institute for Social Justice and the New Jersey Public Policy Research Institute partnered with the Urban Institute to convene a Reentry Roundtable in October 2003. The Roundtable, followed by a series of topic-based meetings, examined the phenomenon of prisoner reentry in New Jersey and resulted in a strategic set of recommendations. The full report of the New Jersey Reentry Roundtable is available at http://www.njisj.org/reports/cominghome_report.html.

Philadelphia Reentry Roundtable

To compliment their analysis of the Philadelphia Prison System population, the Urban Institute helped to develop a community-level roundtable on reentry. Using the same model developed by the Urban Institute at the national level, the Philadelphia Roundtable sought to gather policymakers, researchers, service providers, community members, and other key stakeholders to assess and develop a strategic response to the challenge of prisoner reentry in one Philadelphia neighborhood, Frankford. Unlike other Reentry Roundtables that sought broad policy objectives, the Frankford–Philadelphia Roundtable was intended to facilitate the development of interventions that resolve practical and logistical problems within a targeted community.

Winston-Salem State University Center for Community Safety

The Urban Institute has partnered with the Center for Community Safety to provide strategic assistance in addressing the reentry challenges in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The Urban Institute first collaborated with the Center for Community Safety on three efforts to gain an understanding of the reentry issues in the Winston-Salem community: focus groups with former prisoners, asset maps of resources in the community, and a meeting of community members on the topic of prisoner reentry. The Center for Community Safety and the Urban Institute are currently working together on reentry efforts in federal Weed and Seed sites, and the Center has become a recent partner in the Urban Institute's Reentry Mapping Network. More information on the Center for Community Safety is available at <http://www.wssu.edu/WSSU/About/Partnerships/Center+for+Community+Safety>.

The Reentry Roundtable Series

The Reentry Roundtable series is an ongoing forum that brings together accomplished academics, experienced practitioners, community leaders, policymakers, advocates, and former prisoners to push the envelope of research and practice. Since its inception in 2000, the Urban Institute has convened eight meetings of the Roundtable. To date, topics have covered prisoner reentry as it relates to employment, public health, youth development, public safety, housing and homelessness, and institutions of civil society, such as businesses and the faith community. The goal of the Roundtable series is to sharpen the nation's thinking on the issues of prisoner reintegration and to foster policy innovations that will improve outcomes for individuals, families, and communities. More information is available on the Justice Policy Center's Prisoner Reentry web site at <http://www.urban.org/Pressroom/prisonerreentry.cfm>.

Select Prisoner Reentry Publications as of January 2006

PRIMARY RESEARCH

- A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland* (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410655>
- A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Illinois* (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410662>
- A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Texas* (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410972>
- A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Ohio* (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410891>
- Baltimore Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (2004)
- Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=310946>
- Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311225>
- Chicago Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home* (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311115>
- Does Parole Work?: Analyzing the Impact of Post-prison Supervision on Rearrest Outcomes* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311156>
- Examining the Effect of Incarceration and In-Prison Family Contact on Prisoners' Family Relationships* (2005) Published in the November issue of the *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*
- Family Members' Experiences with Incarceration and Reentry* (forthcoming)
- Illinois Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=310846>
- In Need of Help: Experiences of Seriously Ill Prisoners Returning to Cincinnati* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311155>
- Instituting Lasting Reforms for Prisoner Reentry in Philadelphia* (2005)
- Matching Drug Treatment to Those in Need: An Analysis of Correctional Service Delivery in Illinois and Ohio* (forthcoming)
- Ohio Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311272>
- Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Health and Prisoner Reentry* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311214>
- Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Employment and Prisoner Reentry* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311215>
- Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Prisoner Reentry and Residential Mobility* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311213>
- Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief: Treatment Matching* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311216>
- Returning Home: Preliminary Findings From a Pilot Study of Soon-to-Be Released Prisoners in Maryland* (2003) Published in the Fall 2003 issue of *Justice, Research and Policy*
- Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore)* (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410974>
- Texas Prisoners' Reflections on Returning Home* (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311247>
- The Housing Landscape for Returning Prisoners in the District of Columbia* (forthcoming)

EVALUATIONS

- Case-Managed Reentry and Employment: Lessons From the Opportunity to Succeed Program* (2003) Published in the Fall 2003 issue of *Justice Research and Policy*
- Evaluation of Breaking the Cycle* (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410659>
- Impact of the Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) Aftercare Program for Substance-Abusers* (1999) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=409052>
- Process Evaluation of the Pennsylvania Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR) Program* (2002) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311023>
- National Portrait of SVORI: Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative* (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=1000692>

REENTRY ROUNDTABLES

Inaugural Reentry Roundtable, October 2000

From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry (publication)

<http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410098>

Commissioned papers for the Roundtable

Published in *Crime and Delinquency* (July 2001, Vol. 47)

- *Prisoner Reentry: Current Trends, Practices, and Issues* (James Austin)
- *Returning Captives of the American War on Drugs: Issues of Community and Family Reentry* (John Hagan and Juleigh Petty)
- *Coercive Mobility and the Community: The Impact of Removing and Returning Offenders* (Todd Clear, Dina Rose, and Judith A. Ryder)
- *The Challenge of Reintegrating Drug Offenders in the Community* (Lana Harrison)
- *Health-Related Issues in Prisoner Reentry to the Community* (Theodore Hammett)
- *Issues Incarcerated Women Face When They Return to Their Communities* (Beth Ritchie)
- *The Labor Market Consequences of 'Mass' Incarceration* (Jeffrey Kling, Bruce Western, and David Weiman)

Prisoner Reentry and the Institutions of Civil Society, March 2002

Commissioned papers for the Roundtable

- *Barriers to Democratic Participation* (Christopher Uggen) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410801>
- *Can Employers Play a More Positive Role in Prisoner Reentry?* (Harry Holzer, Michael A. Stoll, and Steven Raphael) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410803>
- *Religion, Reform, Community: Examining the Idea of Church-based Prisoner Reentry* (Omar McRoberts) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410802>
- *The Revolving Door: Exploring Public Attitudes toward Prisoner Reentry* (John Immerwahr and Jean Johnson) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410804>

The Public Health Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry, December 2002

The Public Health Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry: Addressing the Health Needs and Risks of Returning Prisoners and their Families (meeting summary) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410920>

Commissioned papers for the roundtable

Published in *Journal of Correctional Health Care* (Fall 2003, Vol. 10)

- *Prisoner Health Services: An Overview* (B. Jaye Anno)
- *Community Health Services for Returning Jail and Prison Inmates* (Nicholas Fruedenburg)
- *Linkages Between In-Prison and Community-Based Health Services* (Cheryl Roberts, Sofia Kennedy, and Theodore Hammett)
- *Insiders as Outsiders: Race, Gender & Cultural Considerations Affecting Health Outcomes Among Prisoners After Release to the Community* (Raymond Patterson and Robert Greifinger)
- *The Dynamics of Social Capital of Prisoners and Community Reentry: Ties that Bind?* (Nancy Wolff and Jeffrey Draine)
- *What is Known About the Cost-Effectiveness of Health Services for Returning Prisoners?* (Embry Howell)

The Employment Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry, May 2003

From Prison to Work: The Employment Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry (publication)

<http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411097>

Commissioned papers for the roundtable

- *Can Inmates Become an Integral Part of the U.S. Workforce?* (Rob Atkinson and Rostad A. Knut) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410854>
- *Can We Close the Revolving Door?* (Richard Freeman) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410857>
- *Crime, Work and Reentry* (Anne Piehl) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410856>
- *Employment Barriers Facing Ex-Offenders* (Harry Holzer, Steven Raphael and Michael Stoll) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410855>
- *Reentry and Prison Work Programs* (Shawn Bushway) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410853>

The Youth Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry, May 2003

The Youth Dimensions of Prisoner Reentry: Youth Development and the Impact of Incarceration and Reentry (publication) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410927>

Commissioned papers for the roundtable

Published in a special issue of *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* (January 2004, vol. 2, no. 1)

- *Youth Development and Reentry* (Daniel P. Mears and Jeremy Travis)
- *Reentry of Young Offenders from the Justice System: A Developmental Perspective* (Laurence Steinberg, He Len Chung, and Michelle Little)
- *An Empirical Portrait of the Youth Reentry Population* (Howard N. Snyder)
- *Youth Perspectives on the Experience of Reentry* (Mercer Sullivan)
- *Adolescent and Teenage Offenders Confronting the Challenges and Opportunities of Reentry* (David M. Altschuler and Rachel Brash)
- *Interventions and Services Offered to Former Juvenile Offenders Re-entering Their Communities: An Analysis of Program Effectiveness* (Margaret B. Spencer and Cheryl Jones-Walker)

Prisoner Reentry and Housing, October 2003

Taking Stock: Housing, Homelessness, and Prisoner Reentry (publication) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411096>

Prisoner Reentry and Community Policing, May 2004

Prisoner Reentry and Community Policing: Strategies for Enhancing Public Safety (publication) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411061>

Prisoner Reentry and Community Policing: Strategies for Enhancing Public Safety (meeting summary) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411107>

Commissioned papers for the Roundtable

Published together in a single report (<http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=900743>)

- *Brick Walls Facing Reentering Offenders* (Faye Taxman)
- *The Roles of the Police in the Offender Reentry Process* (Edmund F. McGarrell, Carol Rapp Zimmerman, Natalie K. Hipple, Nicholas Corsaro, and Heather Perez)
- *Promoting Public Safety: A Problem-Oriented Approach to Prisoner Reentry* (Walter Dickey and Cecilia M.Klinge)
- *Turning “Weeds” into “Seeds”* (Alan Mobley)
- *The Revolving Door: Exploring Public Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry* (Jean Johnson and John Immerwahr)

POLICY REPORTS AND BOOKS

A Meeting of the Minds: Researchers and Practitioners Discuss Key Issues in Corrections-Based Drug Treatment (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410619>

Beyond the Prison Gates: The State of Parole in America (2002) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=310583>

But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (2005) (Book) Available to order online at <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=211157>

California's Parole Experiment (report released in the *California Journal*, August 2002) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=1000251>

Crime Policy Report: Prisoner Reentry in Perspective (2001) http://www.urban.org/pdfs/410213_reentry.pdf

Drug Treatment in the Criminal Justice System: The Current State of Knowledge (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410618>

Families Left Behind: The Hidden Costs of Incarceration and Reentry (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=310882>

Improving the Link Between Research and Drug Treatment in Correctional Settings: A Summary of Reports from the Strong Science for Strong Practice Project (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410620>

Principles and Practice in Housing for Persons with Mental Illness who have had Contact with the Justice System (2005)

Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America (2005) (Book)

Prisoner Reentry in Perspective (2001) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410213>

Prisoners Once Removed: The Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities (2004) (Book) Available to order online at <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=210900>

The Practice and Promise of Prison Programming (2002) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410493>

Voices from the Field: Practitioners Identify Key Issues in Corrections-Based Drug Treatment (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410617>

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

National Governor's Association Reentry Policy Academy

A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in New Jersey (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410899>

Prisoner Reentry in Georgia (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411170>

Prisoner Reentry in Idaho (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411171>

Prisoner Reentry in Massachusetts (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411167>

Prisoner Reentry in Michigan (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411172>

Prisoner Reentry in Virginia (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411174>

Voices of Experiences: Focus Group Findings on Prisoner Reentry From the State of Rhode Island (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411173>

Reentry Mapping Network

Mapping Prisoner Reentry: An Action Research Partnership (2005) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411250>

SCANS OF PRACTICE

Outside the Walls: a National Snapshot of Community-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs (2004) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410911>

Principles and Practice in Housing for Persons with Mental Illness Who Have Had Contact with the Justice System (2005)

Prisoner Reentry and Community Policing: Strategies for Enhancing Public Safety (forthcoming)

Taking Stock: Housing, Homelessness, and Prisoner Reentry (2003) <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411096>



URBAN INSTITUTE
Justice Policy Center

2100 M STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

(202) 833-7200

www.urban.org

UI's **Justice Policy Center (JPC)** carries out nonpartisan research to inform the national dialogue on crime, justice, and community safety. JPC researchers collaborate with practitioners, public officials, and community groups to make the Center's research useful not only to decisionmakers and agencies in the justice system but also to the neighborhoods and communities harmed by crime and disorder.

Visit our web site to browse, download, or purchase copies of many Justice Policy Center reports: <http://jpc.urban.org>