The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia

Report by:

Katalin Kraszlan - Churchill Fellow - 2009

To Study the Development, Provision and Evaluation of Re-entry Services for Prisoners – USA, Israel.

“America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life.”

George W Bush – 2004 State of Union Address

I understand that the Churchill Trust may publish this report, either in hard copy or on the internet or both, and consent to such publication.

I indemnify the Churchill Trust against any loss, costs or damages it may suffer arising out of any claim or proceedings made against the Trust in respect of or arising out of the publication of any Report submitted to the Trust and which the Trust places on a website for access over the internet.

I also warrant that my Final Report is original and does not infringe the copyright of any person, or contain anything which is, or the incorporation of which into the Final Report is actionable for defamation, a breach of any privacy law or obligation, breach of confidence, contempt of court, passing-off or contravention of any other private right or of any law.

Signed: Katalin Kraszlan  Date: 17-05-2010
Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my thanks to the members of the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust who agreed that this was an important topic and provided me with a remarkable opportunity to see how we can change lives.

My thanks also go to my colleagues at the Department of Corrective Services, in particular Christine Ginbey and Graeme Doyle – I don’t think that I can ever live up to the references that you provided.

To all the people in the jurisdictions that I visited all of you made me feel welcome and provided me with so much information. I will always be grateful that you were all willing to share not only your successes, but also your difficulties and disasters. From all of you I have learnt how to make an overseas guest feel truly welcome.

Lastly I would like to thank my husband Joe, whose 96 hour trip to the USA through snowstorms, cancelled flights, delayed flights and lost luggage will always be appreciated and remembered.
# Table of Contents

List of Tables iv  
List of Figures iv  
Executive Summary v  
Report Summary vi  
Introduction and Program 1  
  Program 6  
What is a successful Re-entry program 7  
Getting Started 9  
  Encouraging Collaboration among Key Stakeholders 9  
  Developing a Knowledge Base 10  
Addressing Core Challenges 13  
  Incorporating Re-Entry into the Organisations' Mission and Work Plans 13  
  Funding a Re-entry Initiative 14  
  Promoting Systems Integration and Coordination 16  
  Measuring Outcomes and Evaluation the Impact of a Re-entry Initiative 17  
  Educating the public about the Re-entry population 18  
Review of the Re-Entry Process: From admission to the institution to return to the community 20  
  Admission to the facility 20  
  Prison and Jail Based Programming 24  
Managing the Transition Period 30  
  Planning Continuity of Care 30  
  Housing 33  
  Creation of Employment Opportunities 34  
  Victims, Families and Communities 36  
  Identification and Benefits 37  
Conclusion 39  
A Re-Entry Plan for Western Australia 41  
Recommendations 44  
Appendix A – MPRI funding application 46  
Appendix B – Kansas Department of Corrections and Private industry 51
List of Tables

Table 1 – How to plan a Re-entry initiative 7

List of Figures

Figure 1 - USA Sentencing process 21
Figure 2 - Michigan, Re-entry flow chart 23
Figure 3 - Washtenaw County Michigan Services 33
Figure 4 - A Re-entry Model for West Australia 43
Executive Summary

Katalin Kraszlan
Program Manager
Remote and Regional Prisons
Department of Corrections (WA)
Level 4 141 St Georges Terrace
PERTH WA 6000
Kati.kraszlan@correctiveservices.wa.gov.au
+61 8 9264 1497

To Study the Development, Provision and Evaluation of Re-entry Services for Prisoners – USA, Israel

Highlights

• Michigan Prisoner Re-entry Initiative – Washtenaw County and Wayne County
• Kansas Prisoner Re-entry – Lansing Correctional Facility
• Israel Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority – Halfway houses

Key Points

• High level government and agency support is required for re-entry to be adopted as a statewide integrated program. In the USA this started with the issue being raised in the 2004 State of the Union Address and was subsequently endorsed with the 2008 Second Chance Act.
• Jurisdictions that devolved service delivery to the local level were achieving the most success.
• Prisoner employment was seen as key to success. All of the jurisdictions paid particular attention to preparing the prisoner for employment outside of the prison system.
• The separation of re-entry and parole staff was working effectively in all of the jurisdictions and this separation provided returning prisoners with a greater degree of support and services.
• Israel had a well developed system of half way houses/hostels for long term high need released prisoners.
• Those jurisdictions that had strong interagency and interdivisional support for re-entry were the most successful. It was clear that the myriad of problems experienced by prisoners on release from custody were beyond the remit or the capacity of correctional agencies to manage.

Implementation and Dissemination

• Presented key finding at Department of Corrections, Joint Development Day
• Copy of report presented to Minister for Corrective Services in Western Australia
• Discussions with key service personnel
• Preparation of paper for publication on positive re-entry initiatives
Report Summary

• Over the last decade Western Jurisdictions have been faced with increasing prison populations. In an effort to reduce the numbers there has been a greater focus on the delivery of effective and coordinated re-entry programs.

• In the USA the Second Chance Act 2007 provided the opportunity for jurisdictions across the country to invest in re-entry. The Second Chance Act reflected the view that supporting prisoner re-entry services improved public safety, improved the lives of offenders and was a more efficient use of government spending than imprisonment.

• In Israel the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority (PRA) provides services to criminal prisoners on release. The authority was founded in 1984 and is mandated by law to provide services to all criminal prisoners, male or female, Jewish or Arab. The authority provides services to:
  o Prisoners
  o Families and Partners
  o Children of Prisoners

• There are a number of ways in which a re-entry program can be developed and implemented and realistically each jurisdiction should implement the program best suited to their needs. The Re-entry Policy Council developed a series of steps which outline what should be considered when developing such a program. These steps include:
  o Getting started
  o Addressing core challenges
  o Admission to the facility
  o Prison and Jail programming
  o Managing the release decision
  o Managing the key transition period
  o Community supervision
  o Engaging other social service agencies

• High level government and agency support is required for re-entry to be adopted as a statewide integrated program. In the USA this started with the issue being raised in the 2004 State of the Union Address and was subsequently endorsed with the 2008 Second Chance Act.

• In the USA, States and Local Counties rely on the considerable support and expertise provided by Federal and National agencies. By providing; research, literature reviews, contacts in the tertiary sector, grant acquisition and acquittal support they allowed the service providers to focus on service delivery.

• Jurisdictions that devolved service delivery to the local level were achieving the most success. By providing local agencies with the capacity to develop the services required for their specific populations, these jurisdictions were able to target resources effectively.

• Most of the jurisdictions operated with little permanent funding for re-entry. Money was sourced from federal grants, foundations and other state grants. Michigan has increased its state funding by demonstrating that their programs were impacting on the recidivism rates. Israel was developing cost benefit models in an attempt to increase their funding. Most jurisdictions had reallocated funding rather than acquired new funding.
• None of the jurisdictions visited had implemented comprehensive, rigorous and well-funded evaluation programs. This was likely to impact on their ability to demonstrate success in future funding applications.

• In the USA there had been a move towards integrated risk assessment processes; these were used at admission to a correctional facility and also at key points during the sentence including release.

• The Michigan Re-entry process was the most developed, it defined responsibilities and outcomes for each stage of the sentence. This enabled each part of the agency to work effectively and reduced duplication of services.

• Prisoner employment was seen as key to success, the Kansas Corrections Private Industry program was a good example of an employment program. This program had developed strong partnerships with a number of private providers, prisoners employed in these industries gained valuable work skills and experience. The key to its success was that prisoners were employed in meaningful jobs, provided with the opportunity to progress in the industry and were paid meaningful wages.

• The benefits to Kansas corrections was that by having high quality training given to prisoners at no cost, fine payments and criminal compensation was paid the prisons had fewer disciplinary problems, reduced recidivism, meaningful jobs and also the rent and utilities were paid for by the private industry.

• The Prison Build Program in Michigan was an example of an industry that benefited both prisoners and the community. The Prison Build Program was a partnership between the Department of Corrections and Habitat for Humanity to build houses for low income earners and other disadvantaged groups.

• All of the jurisdictions paid particular attention to preparing the prisoner for employment outside of the prison system. The key issues covered included:
  - Writing a job application;
  - Interviewing skills;
  - Telling an employer you have a felony conviction; and
  - Telling an employer how you have addressed your offending behaviour.

• It was evident that the separation of re-entry and parole staff was working effectively in all of the jurisdictions and this separation provided the returning prisoners with a greater degree of support and services. When staff were not responsible for the statutory requirements associated with parole and probation they were able to concentrate on the welfare needs of the offender.

• All of the jurisdictions attempted to work with the prisoner in the three months before their release and for up to 12 months after their release. Where possible they initiated contact with the prisoner much earlier than three months.

• Housing was seen as a critical factor in preventing re-offending; each jurisdiction provided some form of transitional housing. Israel had a well developed system of half way houses/hostels. These hostels provided intensive support to long term or high need prisoners for up to nine months after release.
• Each jurisdiction provided some form of employment assistance on release, this involved either 90 days of transitional employment or some form of support and training to find employment. Georgia has implemented the Take 5 Program, in this program the Department encouraged large corporations to employ 5 released prisoners, and 500 prisoners had been employed through this program.

• Israel and Kansas had a commitment to working with the families of released prisoners. This involved working directly with their children to provide support and mentoring and also working with the prisoner to re-develop connections with their families.

• All of the jurisdictions visited had programs in place to ensure that prisoners had valid identification before release, this was seen as more important and more complex in the USA than in Israel.

• Re-entry in the USA is a new process and it was apparent in each of the jurisdictions that they are slowly adjusting to these changes in policy and service delivery. However what was clear was that in each jurisdiction they had embraced the changes and worked to ensure that they were embedded across all agencies, both government and non-government.

• Those jurisdictions that had strong interagency and interdivisional support for re-entry were the most successful. It was clear that the myriad of problems experienced by prisoners on release from custody were beyond the remit or the capacity of correctional agencies to manage. When agencies worked closely together and were committed to the same philosophy they conserved financial and human resources and achieved more sustainable outcomes.
**Introduction and Program**

Over the last decade most western jurisdictions have been faced with ever expanding prison populations. In 2008 The Pew Centre\(^1\) reported that in the United States (US/USA) the prison population was over 2.3 million, with more than one in 100 adults in jail or prison. In 2009\(^2\) the Centre estimated that if you include all forms of correctional supervision, 1 in 31 individuals in the US are under some form of Criminal justice Supervision. In the United Kingdom (UK), between 1995 and 2009, the prison population in England and Wales grew by 32,500 or 66%\(^3\). In Australia between 1994 and 2004 the male prison population grew by 40%, whilst the female prison population doubled. Since 1994 the Australian prison population has grown from 22,499 in 2004 to 28,638 in 2009, an increase of 27%. Between December 2008 and December 2009 the Australian prison population grew 3%, whilst in Western Australia the population grew by 17%\(^4\).

This rapid and unsustainable growth in the prison population is not solely related to increases in crime rates. In 2009 the US Deputy Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics stated that “the growth [in the incarceration rate] wasn’t really about increase[ed] crime but how we chose to respond to crime\(^5\)” This is supported in the UK by Bottomley who stated that “prison populations are determined intentionally or otherwise by policy choices\(^6\).” The steep increase in the number of people in prison is driven, according to most experts, by changes in public policy regarding releasing prisoners and breaching paroled prisoners and a corresponding tougher stance on sentencing.

In the UK the rapid increase in the prison population is primarily due to two factors, an increase in the number of prisoners sentenced (78% of the increase) and an increase in the number of parole violations (16%). The increase in the number of prisoners sentenced was primarily due to the trend for tougher sentencing\(^7\). This trend results in an increase in the number of individuals sentenced and an increase in the length of time individuals serve in custody. The increase in parole violations was primarily due to the changes in the Criminal Justice Act which resulted in more paroled offenders being recalled and those that were recalled spending longer in custody. Messinger and Berecoheca refer to this as a ‘sentence on the instalment plan’. In their opinion return to prison has become not a rarity but the most common experience for prisoners\(^8\).

A similar picture arises in the USA where a wave of policy choices resulted in sending more offenders to prison and the introduction of sentencing enhancements which kept them there longer\(^9\). There has also been an increase in the use of imprisonment to punish parole violators. The Urban Institute in a study on the New Jersey prison system found that there had been an increase from 1,192 parole

\(^1\) The Pew Center on the States, One in 100: Behind Bars in America (February, 2008)
\(^2\) The Pew Center on the States, One in 31: The Long reach of American Corrections (March 2009).
\(^4\) Australian Bureau of Statistics, Prisoners in Australia (Canberra, 2009).
\(^6\) http://webb.senate.gov/newsroom/pressreleases/2007-10-04-01.cfm
\(^8\) Ministry of Justice, 3
violators in 1980 to 6,822 in 1998, by 1998 returning parolees accounted for 41% of all prison admissions in New Jersey\textsuperscript{10}. The United States Bureau of Justice reports that 42% of all parolees in the USA will return to jail.

The difficulty is that after announcing policies which are tough on crime and the implementation of law and order political agendas it is often difficult for governments to change the political rhetoric. Governments can become locked into a cycle that provides few opportunities for the discussion of alternative sanctions. This process then forces governments to continuously build larger prisons and expend more money on corrective services budgets. In the US in 1987 the total corrections budget was $10.6 billion, this rose to a staggering $44 billion in 2007, even when adjusted for inflation this was a 127% increase\textsuperscript{11}.

The initial response to the increasing pressure placed by correctional costs was to attempt to cap operating costs by implementing ‘no frills’ prison regimes. Jurisdictions focused on defining their mission as operating safe, secure and importantly, low cost prisons. Programs and services were increasingly cut back and policies such as ‘double or triple bunking’, long lock downs and ‘tent prisons’ were implemented. The key outcomes of these policies were leaner and more cost effective prison services, but not necessarily safer communities; these policies did not impact positively on the rates of recidivism upon release.

The unsustainable rise in prison expenditure, the failure of punitive sanctions and the constitutional issue of overcrowding has resulted in a number of jurisdictions examining the use of alternative sanctions. There has been a growing realisation that utilising a range of sanctions can protect communities, punish offenders and conserve tax dollars without the need to change the prevailing political agenda. In Kansas there is a sentencing commission which has a statutory obligation to submit plans to manage overcrowding and is required to investigate the impact of legislation on the prison population and to always consider alternate sentencing policies.

### Is prison overcrowding unconstitutional

Prisoners in the US have filed suit against state jurisdictions citing the provisions of the Eighth Amendment. This part of the Bill of Rights prohibits the Federal Government from imposing excessive bail, excessive fines or cruel and unusual punishment. In a number of cases the US Supreme Court has through the Fourteenth Amendment (due process guarantees) ruled that the Cruel and Unusual Punishment Clause does apply to the states. The Court has allowed criminal offenders to use the Cruel and Unusual Punishment Clause to challenge the conditions and treatments they have experienced when they are confined in custody.

In Wilson v Seiter, 501 U.S. 294 (1991), the Court ruled that the subjective intent of prison officials must be examined when determining if the prisoners has faced Cruel and Unusual Punishment. This standard made it more difficult for prisoners to claim that the conditions of their confinement are cruel and unusual, even when the conditions are objectively abominable. Previous to this case the Court historically viewed that an objective assessment of the conditions was sufficient. In Rhodes V Chapman, 452 U.S. 337 (1981) the District Court concluded that the practice of double bunking, as used in Ohio, constituted cruel and unusual punishment. The Supreme Court, although not supporting the findings of the District Court, when reviewing the findings stated that “conditions in a prison must be examined in light of contemporary standards of decency” and did not need to examine intent. Although the Supreme Court in Rhodes V Chapman did not rule that prison overcrowding is unconstitutional. They did however note that overcrowding can lead to other conditions which may violate the eighth amendment, in particular; the deprivation of “the minimal civilised measure of life necessities” and the “serious deprivation of basic human needs”.

\textsuperscript{10} Jeremy Travis and Sarah Lawrence, Beyond the Prison Gates: The State of Parole in America . (The Urban Institute, 2002).

\textsuperscript{11} The Pew Center, 2008.
In order to achieve reductions in the number of people imprisoned there is a need to reduce the level of recidivism without changing sentencing policy. Recidivism is difficult to measure, however most western jurisdictions report a high return to prison rate. In Australia in 2009, 38.2% of all prisoners returned to prison on a new sanction within 2 years, this figure is 37.1% for prisoners in Western Australia. It is substantially higher for Indigenous Australians. In 2008, 73% of Indigenous prisoners, compared to 49% of non-Indigenous prisoners, had a history of prior adult imprisonment. The 1994 US recidivism study estimated that within 3 years, 51.8% of prisoners released were back in prison either because of a new crime for which they received another prison sentence, or because of a technical violation of their parole. The UK and Canada have reported similar rates to those reported for the US and Australia.

Internationally researchers and practitioners have realised that impacting on the level of recidivism can improve community safety, reduce the prison population and provide significant cost savings. There has been considerable interest in this area and Borzycki reported that prisoners on release, regardless of jurisdiction face similar problems.

At the point of release the prisoner faces specific challenges these include; lack of stable accommodation, no immediate employment, acquiring specific Identification, inability to obtain social welfare benefits and a lack of financial and social support. If the offender has been in prison for an extended period of time they will also have to manage significant changes in day to day life, prisoners on release in Western Australia have indicated problems in utilising electronic banking systems, the internet and email, changes in the design and speed of transportation and for some changes in the size of their neighborhoods. The pace of change in modern day life is not mirrored within the prison system, and prisoners can leave prison with little or no experience in those things taken for granted outside. Overall Prisoners do not necessarily leave prison equipped for a life of freedom. These structural and systemic difficulties confronting prisoners on release has been defined as ‘gatefever’. Given these factors it is not surprising that prisoners on release have high rates of mortality, substance abuse, mental and physical health problems, homelessness, unemployment, debt and family breakdown and thus they frequently return to an offending lifestyle.

Re-entry as a service philosophy is a direct result of the recognition that impacting on the recidivism rates of returning prisoners can influence correction costs without reducing community safety. Community safety benefits from preventing future crime and these crime reduction benefits in conjunction with lower costs of imprisonment results in significant cost savings to government.

---

15 Maria Borzycki, Interventions for Prisoners Returning to the Community. Australian Institute of Criminology. (Canberra, 2005).
18 Social Exclusion Unit, Reducing re-offending by Ex-Prisoners. Social Exclusion Unit, London, 2002)
Re-entry is not a new concept, Borczycki\textsuperscript{19} reports that the UK Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders in 1963 highlighted the need to provide effective aftercare for prisoners. This report identified three key issues which are still relevant almost 50 years later:

- A humanitarian concern for all ex-prisoners.
- An acknowledgement that supervision at the close of a sentence may effect recidivism.
- Recognition that specialist systems of aftercare are needed for various classes of offenders.

In July 2002 the UK Social Exclusion Unit published the report Reducing Reoffending by Ex-prisoners. This report highlighted the factors which led to reoffending on release and the need for services to support ex-prisoners, particularly

- The identification of the specific issues related to reoffending and the individual preparation of offenders for release.
- Making the necessary links with agencies in the community.
- Ensuring the effective delivery of required supervision and services.

In 2002 the then Attorney General for Western Australia Jim McGinty visited a number of jurisdictions to look at programs which focused on prisoner re-entry into the community\textsuperscript{20}. The outcomes of this trip were a number of recommendations for the introduction of effective re-entry programs for prisoners following release. Following this, the then Department of Justice in Western Australia implemented the re-entry program which was designed to “reduce re-offending through the provision of inclusive coordinated and integrated services to offenders and their families, increase victim, offender and others’ participation in the justice process and establish effective partnerships with both government and non-government agencies”\textsuperscript{21}. This program has continued to operate in various guises since 2003.

In Israel the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority (PRA) provides services to criminal prisoners on release. The authority was founded in 1984 and mandated by law to provide services to all criminal prisoners, male or female, Jewish or Arab. The authority provides services to;

- Prisoners.
- Families and Partners.
- Children of Prisoners.

The authority is focused on strengthening the family bonds and thus supporting rehabilitation and reintegration back into the community. The PRA states that everyone has a right to a new beginning and that there is no person who can not be rehabilitated. The PRA works not only with the prisoner and their families but also with the community to increase their awareness and involvement in prisoner rehabilitation.

\textsuperscript{19} Borczycki, 2005, p9
\textsuperscript{20} Jim McGinty MLA, Reducing Reoffending - focusing on re-entry to the community, (WA Government, 2002)
In the last few years the US has embraced re-entry as a chance to reduce the ever expanding correctional budgets. President G.W. Bush in the 2004 State of the Union Address stated that;

“In the past, we’ve worked together to bring mentors to children of prisoners, and provide treatment for the addicted, and help for the homeless. Tonight I ask you to consider another group of Americans in need of help. This year, some 600,000 inmates will be released from prison back into society. We know from long experience that if they can’t find work, or a home, or help, they are much more likely to commit crime and return to prison. So tonight, I propose a four-year, $300 million prisoner re-entry initiative to expand job training and placement services, to provide transitional housing, and to help newly released prisoners get mentoring, including from faith-based groups. America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life.”

Following this the Second Chance Act of 2008 was introduced by Senators Joseph Biden (D-DE), Sam Brownback (R-KS), Patrick Leahy (D-VT), and Arlen Specter (R-PA). The Second Chance Act reflected the view that supporting prisoner re-entry services improved public safety, improved the lives of offenders and was a more efficient use of government spending than imprisonment.

The Second Chance Act provides a number of grants to state and local governments in order to:

- Promote the safe and successful reintegration of offenders into the community upon their release.
- Provide employment services, substance abuse treatment, housing, family programming, mentoring, victim services, and methods to improve release and revocation.
- Provide mentoring services to adult and juvenile offenders.
- Implement family-based treatment programs for incarcerated parents who have minor children.
- Provide guidance to the Bureau of Prisons for enhanced re-entry planning procedures.
- Provide information on health, employment, personal finance, release requirements and community resources.

The following funding has been allocated under this program. In the 2009 Fiscal Year $25 million was appropriated for Second Chance Act programs, including $15 million for state and local re-entry demonstration projects and $10 million for grants to nonprofit organizations for mentoring and other transitional services.

In the 2010 Fiscal year $114 million was appropriated for prisoner re-entry programs in the Department of Justice, $14 million for re-entry initiatives in the Federal Bureau of Prisons and $100 million for Second Chance Act grant programs. These were broken down into the following allowances:

- $37 million for re-entry demonstration projects.
- $15 million for mentoring grants to nonprofit organizations.
- $10 million for re-entry courts.
- $7.5 million for family-based, substance abuse treatment.
• $2.5 million for grants to evaluate and improve education in prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities.
• $5 million for technology careers training demonstration grants.
• $13 million for re-entry substance abuse and criminal justice collaboration.
• $10 million for re-entry research.
• The appropriations bill also provides $108,493,000 for re-entry programs in the Department of Labor.

The decision to visit the USA and Israel was based on the greater similarities that existed between Western Australia and these jurisdictions than other jurisdictions and the apparent success of their programs in a time of fiscal constraint. In the USA the agenda included visiting the Michigan Prisoner Re Entry Initiative, The Kansas Offender Re-entry Program, the Atlanta re-entry program, the National Institute of Corrections, the Urban Institute and the Centre for Effective Public Policy in Washington DC, the New York Department of Corrections and the Re-entry Policy Council and the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority in Israel.

This report will focus on how the information obtained during these visits can be incorporated into a cohesive re-entry program. The report will outline the key components required for such a program providing examples from the jurisdictions observed.

Program

19 January – 25 January – Michigan Prisoner Reentry Initiative
26 January – 1 February – Kansas Re-entry Initiative
2 February – 5 February – Georgia Department of Corrections
6 February – 11 February – Washington DC – Federal Correctional agencies22
12 February – 18 February – New York Department of Corrections, Re-entry Policy Council
26 February – 5 March – Israel Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority

22 Due to the worst snowstorm in 100 years, all but one meeting in Washington were cancelled as all federal agencies and transport was closed. Information on the roles of the national bodies were developed from discussions with representatives in the state jurisdictions.
What is a successful Re-entry program

There are a number of ways in which a re-entry program can be developed and implemented and realistically each jurisdiction should implement the program best suited to their needs. The Re-entry Policy Council in their report developed a series of steps which outline what should be considered when developing such a program.

Table 1 – How to plan a Re-entry initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning A Re-Entry Initiative 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The steps that any policy maker at the state or local level, will need to execute to ensure that a solid foundation exists from which to build a program, policy or practice that will improve the likelihood of success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting Started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Collaboration Among Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing A Knowledge Base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressing Core Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating Re-Entry Into The Organisations’ Mission And Work Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding A Re-Entry Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Systems Integration And Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Outcomes And Evaluation The Impact of a Re-entry Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating The Public About The Re-entry Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Of The Re-Entry Return To The Community Process: From Admission To The Institution To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission To The Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Of Intake Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Of Programming Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison And Jail Based Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children And Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours And Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education And Vocational Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making The Release Decision</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising The Releasing Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing The Key Transition Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Continuity Of Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation Of Employment Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development And Transition Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims, Families And Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification And Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Of Supervision Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Of Supervision Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Continuity Of Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Development And Supportive Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements Of Effective Social Service Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What improvements are required within systems other than correctional and justice agencies that will improve re-entry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Care Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children And Family Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Health Care Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the jurisdictions visited had utilised this program of activities with their focus being on different aspects. This report will outline how the various jurisdictions approached these factors and detail what was working well.
Getting Started

Encouraging Collaboration among Key Stakeholders

High level support is required for re-entry to be adopted as a program, in the USA this started with the re-entry being raised in the State of the Union Address in 2004 and subsequently endorsed by the passing of the Second Chance Act 2008.

In Michigan, the current Governor included a commitment to re-entry as part of her political platform. Upon election she appointed a Director of Re-entry who reported directly to the Commissioner of Corrections and to the Governors office. In Kansas the Commissioner of Corrections expressed strong support for the program and this support was replicated at the political level. A similar situation existed in Georgia where the steering committee for re-entry included heads of social services agencies and also membership from the Governor, the Superior Court and Treasury. In Israel the Prisoner rehabilitation Authority is managed by three committees the legislative committee the policy committee and the research committee these are attended by high level ministers, religious organisations, heads of agencies and academics.

It was clear that by having support at the highest level of government it was possible to get other agencies engaged in the program. Key people spoken to in each jurisdiction indicated that in order to achieve the outcomes required it was necessary to work with other agencies and to ensure that all realised that returning prisoners were an issue that confronted all of government and not just corrections agencies. They all indicated that it was important to have political support when approaching agencies to engage in the program otherwise they were more likely to see it as simply a Corrections issue.

The New York City Discharge Planning Collaboration is an example of how to successfully engage with a range of diverse stakeholders. The Collaboration began in 2003 when the Commissioner of Corrections and the Commissioner of Homeless Services noted that they were continuously servicing the same population. The mapping processes that underpinned this first collaboration identified the agencies that were either directly or indirectly involved in providing services to released prisoners, these were both government and non-government agencies. The collaboration now involves 36 organisations and agencies and oversees 25 programs. What was central to the success of the collaboration was the commitment of the key government agencies and two fundamental rules;

1. In order to participate each member had to contribute something.
2. Everybody who participates was there to work on achievable goals, not to point fingers or to complain.

One of the key stakeholders for every jurisdiction was the releasing body or parole board. In each jurisdiction a significant amount of consultation was undertaken with the parole boards to ensure that they supported the programs and were happy with the conditions under which the prisoners would be released. Interviews with the Parole Board in Kansas indicated that were supportive of the direction that the Department was taking in relation to re-entry and had confidence in the assessments and programs which were being delivered. Although they had a greater degree of confidence in their decisions, the board indicated that the move towards more individualised reports based on the needs of the offender was more labour intensive, as the file reviews took appreciably longer. The Board did however stress that they had adopted an evidence based approach to their decisions. They now focused on risk areas, programmatic accomplishments, institutional behaviours, patterns of crime...
and victim input. They stated that key issues which consistently supported the
decision to release were having stable housing, employment and some form of
community support.

Developing a Knowledge Base

The federal agencies and organisations involved in re-entry services provided
considerable support and expertise to the state jurisdictions. The key agencies
involved at a national level were:

The Re-entry Policy Council –

The Re-entry Policy Council (RPC) was established in 2001 to assist state
government officials develop and manage re-entry programs. The RPC was formed
with two specific goals in mind:

- To develop bipartisan policies and principles for elected officials and other
  policymakers to consider as they evaluate re-entry issues in their jurisdictions.
- To facilitate coordination and information-sharing among organisations
  implementing re-entry initiatives, researching trends, communicating about
  related issues, or funding projects.

The Re-entry Policy Council has a significant website and provides considerable
support to agencies and non government sector.

The National Governors’ Association

The National Governors Association (NGA) is a bipartisan organisation of the
governors of the 50 states, three territories and two commonwealths. The NGA
Prisoner Re-entry Policy Academy helps Governors and other state policymakers
develop and implement statewide prisoner re-entry strategies that reduce recidivism
rates by improving access to key services and supports.

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC).

The NIC is an agency within the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of
Prisons. The NIC provides training, technical assistance, information services, and
policy/program development assistance to federal, state, and local corrections
agencies. They are also responsible for the allocation of funds to support particular
initiatives. One such initiative is the Transition from Prison to Community (TPC)
program aimed at reducing the recidivism rates of released prisoners. The NIC has
implemented the TPC model in eight states (including Michigan and Georgia). Six
additional states were selected in September, 2009 to receive technical assistance in
order to implement the initiative.

The Centre for Effective Public Policy

The Centre for Effective Public Policy is a non-profit organization, which assists in the
development of criminal justice policy. They help agencies;

- Better define their vision, mission, and goals.
- Provide training and information to staff at all levels.
- Implement evidence-based practices.
- Enhance the administration of justice.
The Urban Institute

The Urban Institute gathers data, conducts research, and evaluates programs, on social and economic issues. The Urban Institute has a specific law and order unit and undertakes research and evaluation on Re-entry projects; they are currently a partner with the NIC on the transition from Prison to Community Project. The Institute is funded through grants and foundation money. A number of research projects were funded through the Jeht Foundation.

The JEHT Foundation

The JEHT Foundation was a grant-making non-profit foundation based in New York City. The Foundation’s name was an acronym that stood for the core values that underlay the Foundation's mission: "Justice, Equality, Human dignity and Tolerance." The Foundation's programs reflected these interests and values.

The Foundation had four primary areas of interest:
• Transformation of U.S. criminal justice policies and practices.
• Expansion of the role of international justice and the rule of law both at home and abroad.
• Making the electoral system in the United States fairer, more effective and responsive to all Americans.
• Expansion and strengthening the use of palliative care in a variety of health care settings in the U.S.

The money of the JEHT foundation was managed exclusively by Bernie Madoff - the foundation ceased operation in January 2009. The closure of the Jeht Foundation had repercussions across re-entry in the US. There is a reliance on foundations as a source of funding and the closure of the major foundation funding criminal justice programs resulted in the closure of a number of significant pilot programs.

Practitioners in Michigan indicated that they had utilised the national resources available when structuring the Michigan Prisoner Re-entry Initiative (MPRI) model. The MPRI model:

• Begins with the three phase re-entry approach of the Department of Justice’s Serious and Violent Offender Re-entry Initiative (SVORI).
• Further delineates the transition process by adding the seven decision points of the National Institute of Corrections transition from Prison to Community Initiative (TCPI).
• Incorporated into its approach the policy statements and recommendations from the Report of the Re-entry Policy Council.

A similar situation existed in Georgia where the Georgia Re-entry Impact Project (GRIP) was supported by

• The National Institute of Corrections (TCPI).
• The US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (SVORI).
• The National Governors Association (NGA) through the Re-entry Policy Academy.

The presence of experts who were available to help find resources, define the problems and provide advice on how to address problems was invaluable to state jurisdictions. This process allowed the jurisdictions to concentrate their efforts on tailoring the program to suit their needs rather than each jurisdiction being required to undertake the initial research and policy formulation themselves. Jurisdictions were then able to replicate this process within the state, the state jurisdiction directorates provided advice and policy recommendations down to a local level. The agencies and organisers at the local level were then able to translate this into solutions and programs designed to achieve change at the local level.
Thus although it was apparent that each jurisdiction had developed their own model and each county then developed an adaptation of this model, they were all following clearly defined parameters and policy strategies. This meant that each local area was clear on the outcomes and the overarching methodology; and were able to translate this into programs targeted at specific populations.

Each of the jurisdictions visited undertook a mapping exercise in order to understand the parameters of the returning prisoner population, where they returned to as well as their specific needs. This mapping exercise had developed a strong knowledge of the client base and allowed for the development of targeted interventions based on the policies developed by the central agency. However, like many criminal jurisdictions their ability to undertake this task was limited by the lack of comprehensive linked data systems.

Recommendation One

Any re-entry program requires the development of a high level interagency steering committee on re-entry which is supported at the highest level of government.

Recommendation Two

To develop a centre of excellence within the agency that has responsibility for re-entry policy development, grant applications, technical assistance and program development.

Recommendation Three

The planning and development of re-entry services should occur at the local level, with the central agency being responsible for overarching policy direction and the provision of expert advice.
Addressing Core Challenges

Incorporating Re-Entry into the Organisations’ Mission and Work Plans

Each of the jurisdictions visited had integrated re-entry into the mission statements of the agency and indicated it was core business.

In Michigan the mission of Michigan Prisoner Re-entry Initiative (MPRI) was to “reduce crime by implementing a seamless plan of services and supervision developed with each offender – delivered through state and local collaboration – from the time of their entry to prison through their transition, reintegration and aftercare in the community”.

In Georgia the mission of GRIP was to “…establish effective methods that permeate all levels of affected agencies and organisation to reduce recidivism through collaborative partnerships that support offender transition to the community”.

In Kansas the mission of KOR3P is “…by using evidence-based practices, we will increase compliance with conditions of supervision and the ability of offenders to reintegrate, which will result in safely reducing revocations among Kansas parolees and probationers through a risk reduction philosophy and a three-phase plan”.

The New York Department of Corrections states that the goal of the discharge planning unit “is to foster successful reintegration for individuals, families and communities. We seek to reduce the stigma and adverse consequences of homelessness and incarceration and to free public resources for other needs such as education, healthcare and housing. In this way we will improve public safety and further reduce the need for incarceration and shelter”.

The Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority in Israel states that their vision is “to offer the paroled prisoner the opportunity to rehabilitate and reintegrate into family and society”.

Three themes appear to dominate the mission statements:

- That re-entry results in a reduction in crime.
- That re-entry results in an increase in public safety.
- That re-entry is a cost effective way of delivering correctional services.

These themes were seen in all public documents relating to re-entry.

As well as incorporating re-entry into mission statements it was possible to observe how re-entry programs were integrated into the agencies’ work plans and organisational structure. In each of the jurisdictions the re-entry directorate was separate to both prisons and community corrections, subsequent to the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) some have had to merge re-entry and community corrections as a cost cutting measure. Separation allowed the directorate to develop work plans and processes outside of the normal operational environment and to work with the other areas of the agency in implementation. All the people indicated that they felt that the process worked better when re-entry was independent of the other operational areas, in their view, when it was placed in an operational areas it became secondary to the urgent and immediate operational requirements/imperatives.

Recommendation Four

Re-entry directorates are separate to the operational and/or statutory directorates of correctional agencies.
Funding a Re-entry Initiative

Most of the jurisdictions operated with little permanent funding for re-entry. Money was initially sourced from federal grants, foundations and state grants. Without the funding obtained from the Second Chance grants it is difficult to see how many of the programs would have started. These technical assistance grants allowed agencies to undertake considerable planning and to source non-traditional funding for other services. This non-traditional funding included accessing Federal Housing funding, Veterans funding, AIDS funding and Department of Labour funding, the key point made by many of the agencies was that considerable funding was available; it just needed to be identified and applied for. An important aspect of the national advisory bodies was their ability to help find this funding and also to provide assistance in applying for the funding and further to support agencies in the technical aspects of grant reporting.

The difficulty with piecemeal funding is the capacity of the smaller agencies to manage the variety of reporting requirements. Each funding source often has its own reporting time frames and data requirements, for smaller agencies this can become extremely time consuming. The provision of support to help in the grant reporting and acquittal process was invaluable to these agencies.

A key difference between the USA and Australia was the utilisation of philanthropy as a means of funding pilot programs. Various local initiatives relied heavily on the use of private foundations to sponsor programs and in some situations have a key person employed to solicit such funds. This process is not formalised within Australia and the smaller amount of charitable foundations limit the applicability of such funds. Even though charitable donations are rising within Australia the extremely low rate of donations make it unlikely that this will become a realistic means of program funding.

### Australian Charitable Donations

The Australian population donates at a far lower rate than comparable western countries. The US provides the greatest proportion of donations to Gross Domestic Product, Australia contributes approximately one quarter of the proportion of GDP given in the USA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total gifts/donations as a proportion of GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although donating at a lower rate than other western countries the number of people donating within Australia is rising. Between 2007 and 2008 there was a 5.7% increase in the number of people donating to charities in Australia. This increase was not observed in the UK or USA.

One of the benefits of obtaining funding from charitable foundations was that the requirements of a strong evidence basis, quarterly reporting and acquittal processes were less onerous than that required for government grants. This allowed agencies to acquire funds for pilot programs which were ‘a good idea’ that needed to be tested, without the requirement to demonstrate outcomes. This type of funding was rarely available from government sources.

Another key feature across the jurisdictions was the reallocation of funding rather than the provision of new funding. Across each jurisdiction visited it was very clear that the GFC and subsequent recession had had a major impact on the delivery of
services. One of the key features of the trip was the realisation of how Western Australia’s mining based economy had provided a buffer that allowed our economy to escape the more serious impacts of the GFC. Each jurisdiction had experienced significant funding cuts (up to 20% in some areas) and was expecting more cuts in the 2010 fiscal year. Michigan was the only state to receive new funding for re-entry and that funding was a direct result of the savings made by reducing recidivism and subsequently the prison population in previous years. Funding in Michigan increased from $12 million to $30 million as a direct result of the success of the MPRI program. In Michigan the prison population fell 8% between 2007 and 2009; in 2010 the government intends to close 8 prison facilities with a total saving of $192 million. In addition, parole revocations in 2009 were down 42%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An update on State Budget Cuts - Governors proposing new round of cuts for 2011; At Least 45 States have already imposed cuts that hurt vulnerable residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With tax revenue still declining as a result of the recession and budget reserves largely drained, the vast majority of states have made spending cuts that hurt families and reduced necessary services. These cuts, in turn, have deepened states’ economic problems because families and businesses have less to spend. Federal Recovery Act dollars and funds raised from tax increases are greatly reducing the extent, severity, and economic impact of these cuts, but only to a point. The cuts enacted in at least 45 states plus the District of Columbia in 2008 and 2009 occurred in all major areas of state services, including health care (29 states), services to the elderly and disabled (24 states and the District of Columbia), K-12 education (29 states and the District of Columbia), higher education (39 states), and other areas. States made these cuts because revenues from income taxes, sales taxes, and other revenue sources used to pay for these services declined due to the recession. At the same time, the need for these services rose as the number of families facing economic difficulties increased. These budget pressures have not abated and, in fact, are increasing. Because unemployment rates remain high — and are projected to stay high well into next year — revenues are likely to remain at or near their current depressed levels. This is likely to cause a new round of cuts. Based on new, gloomy revenue projections, governors have begun issuing their budget proposals for the 2011 fiscal year (which begins on July 1, 2010 in most states), and the proposed cuts go even further than those that states have enacted to date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Nicholas Johnson, Phil Oliff and Erica Williams, March 8, 2010)

The devolution from a central agency down to the local level was most obvious in Michigan. The Michigan Department of Corrections initially applied for funding from the federal government and the state budget through grant applications and budget submissions. The local re-entry providers then applied to access this funding whilst also applying for their own federal grants. Both the Department of Corrections and the local re-entry providers were required to develop consolidated re-entry plans that met key objectives in order to acquire the funding. Within Michigan the local re-entry plans were consolidated to form the state re-entry plan. A copy of a funding application for a local re-entry plan is attached as Appendix A.

What had been achieved on limited funding in each jurisdiction was impressive. One of the critical success factors was the consolidation of funding into a single agency. In Michigan the process had involved using local organisations as the holders of divested funds. For instance in Washtensaw County, Catholic Social Services was the locus for all re-entry funds. They were responsible for the employment of a re-entry services co-ordinator and the programs and services attached to the program, the organisation did not report to the government or state agency but rather was responsible to a board of directors. This method of funding reflected a true partnership with a local agency and also enabled Washtenaw County to seek funds
from sources other than government to expand their programs. This situation was similar across other counties within Michigan.

Across the re-entry programs in all jurisdictions there was a heavy reliance on volunteers as service providers. These volunteers primarily came from the faith based communities and offered services such as mentoring, trade training and support groups. There was also a reliance on the Volunteers of America agency, this is a not-for-profit agency, which supports the human services area, and in some cases young people provide a year of service to the agency. There was also a reliance on interns to provide support to the re-entry sector; they did not provide specialist interventions. This use of interns and volunteers enabled the agencies to effectively double the amount of services that they were funded to provide.

**Recommendation Five**

*That funding for re-entry initiatives is co-ordinated by non-government agencies, allocation and oversight of the funding should remain with the core correctional agency*

**Promoting Systems Integration and Coordination**

Each of the jurisdictions had previously operated within a ‘silo’ mentality, whereby each part of the agency managed their own component of the prisoners’ sentence with little or no communication between them. This process often left prisoners with minimal or little support upon release.

All of the jurisdictions undertook significant planning prior to developing a re-entry service. This initial planning involved developing a profile of the returning prisoners, understanding the current processes and looking at ways in which the process could be improved. As previously stated, the jurisdictions also created separate re-entry directorates which had primary responsibility for developing services for the returning prisoner. Developing key lines of responsibility was an important component to the success of the programs. The Kansas policy document 11-117 clearly summarises how this was operationalised; “release planning services shall be delivered and supported by the Director of Re-entry and the facility release planners, throughout the department….the director of re-entry and state-wide R3 staff shall work to develop partnerships and resources to support re-entry, release planning and risk reduction throughout the department”

One of the personnel employed effectively in Kansas was the ‘Boundary Spanner’. This position has responsibility for managing communication between individuals throughout the department and coordinates cross-agency activities. The Kansas Department of Corrections has found that the position has been able to form meaningful partnerships with law enforcement agencies and the position was key in the two agencies working together to achieve positive outcomes. The University of Kansas argued in its evaluation paper that the boundary spanner in Kansas was instrumental in achieving optimal systemic change.

---

24 Kansas Policy Directive 11-117
Information Communication and Technology

It did appear that, although able to rationalise the service delivery and coordinate re-entry services through a single directorate, most were not able to rationalise their information systems. There did not appear to be a single data system which would allow information on the returning prisoner to be shared freely. Each jurisdiction had a number of data systems which all contained information on the returning prisoner, efforts to combine the data systems were constrained by privacy legislation, confidentiality efforts and, importantly, cost. These issues were apparent both within the agency and between agencies.

Not only were there separate data systems within each jurisdiction there was also no ability to look at data across jurisdictions that impacted significantly on the ability to undertake effective evaluations and, at times provide seamless services. The majority of services worked on a consent principle – that the returning prisoner gave consent for information to be shared between agencies.

Given the current financial crisis it was unlikely that new data systems will be implemented in the near future.

Measuring Outcomes and Evaluation the Impact of a Re-entry Initiative

This was by far the least developed area of the re-entry programs observed. Most had little or no data collection processes in place to support a strong evaluation program and most had insufficient funds to undertake a full outcome evaluation.

The key measure for each jurisdiction was simply a reduction in recidivism, did more or less prisoners return to prison following the introduction of the program. It was apparent that in all of the jurisdictions this was achieved. The difficulty was in determining what was the measure of recidivism, who was being counted and were there any distinct differences in the returning populations. For example Michigan, Wayne Country included the city of Detroit, this mean that there success or failure had the most impact on state figures. They had an overwhelming number of the returning prisoners and their prisoners were clearly at the high end of offending severity. The development of a measurement framework for success should take account of this imbalance to accurately record the success of statewide re-entry rather than the impact of a single county, this did not appear to have been done.

The Boundary Spanner’s Role

Boundary spanners serve strategic roles in organisations by gathering critical information, obtaining feedback and perceptions from the external environment through their stakeholder networks and then interpreting and translating that information back into their organisation. Ultimately, if the boundary spanner is effective, the process can lead to innovations in strategy, processes or products.

The key activities of the role are as follows:

- Creating internal and external networks;
- Issue identification;
- Translating the knowledge back into the organisational culture;
- Influencing and educating internal and external stakeholders;
- Creating buy-in and support;
- Identifying internal senior-level champions.

A detailed evaluation framework was not apparent, the data collections processes were not automated and it was difficult to determine how the jurisdictions would be able to answer more detailed questions in the future. The distinct differences between jurisdictions will make it difficult for the NIC, Urban Institute or the Re-entry Policy Council to undertake meta-evaluations in the future. Given that re-entry has been ‘sold’ to the public as a law and order program and means of reducing crime any failure to produce results which answer these questions could jeopardize the long term future of the program. The Urban Institute in Washington was attempting to develop a project to evaluate the program but its capacity was limited by a lack of funds.

In Israel the prisoner Rehabilitation Authority had three committees that oversaw their operation; one of these committees was a research committee. This committee encouraged and supervised research regarding what made effective programs and evaluated the programs that were delivered by the authority. This research had demonstrated that the Authority was successful. Over a five year period they found that 90% of clients who completed the programs did not re-offend. The current research focus was on developing cost benefit models which could demonstrate why rehabilitation and community sanctions were as effective and more cost effective than incarceration in terms of recidivism, employment and family reunification.

**Recommendation Six**

Re-entry initiatives need to be underpinned by rigorous evaluation frameworks which allow for ongoing monitoring and reporting. These frameworks need to determine which aspects of a program work best and with whom.

**Educating the public about the Re-entry population**

Each of the jurisdictions visited had a consultation and communication strategy which was centered around the premise that at some time most prisoners were going to leave prison and come home, probably to a community such as yours. The provision of re-entry services reduced the likelihood that prisoners would commit crimes and thus good re-entry services made for safer communities.

The strategies primarily focused on informing the public about the number of individuals released from prison each year and the high cost of continuing to incarcerate offenders. These strategies were used at the agency and at the political level. As mentioned previously, in Michigan the present Governor had indicated her support by including re-entry in her political platform. This gave license to the agency to talk about re-entry and to publicise their successes.

Each jurisdiction and county had a number of publications and newsletters that outlined how the reentry program was helping their community and that re-entry programs effectively partner with their communities. There was also extensive press coverage of successful programs and successful individuals. One example of good media coverage was the ‘Weed and Seed’ program in Wayne County, Michigan. This program was focused on reducing gun violence in Detroit as this was a matter of concern to the community and it was considered that returning prisoners were a significant risk factor. The re-entry program provider worked closely with law enforcement agencies through Operation TIDE; a tactical law enforcement initiative aimed at targeting high risk neighborhoods. The re-entry provider informed parolees of the community’s commitment to reducing gun violence and then linked the parolees with community supports including job training, job placement, transportation and housing assistance. This partnership was viewed positively by the
community and resulted in an increased awareness of the positive outcomes that can be achieved through supporting prisoners through the critical release period.
Review of the Re-Entry Process: From admission to the institution to return to the community

The flow chart in Figure 1 (page 27) broadly illustrates the key events that occur within a person’s sentence within the USA. Australia and Israel may have slightly different processes but broadly these key decision points and critical events will occur for the majority of prisoners. There are some differences between this model and the Australian model, particularly in relation to distinctions between jail and prison. In the United States prisons are state or federal facilities and jails are short term locally administered facilities. The other distinction is in relation to probation and community sanctions and the lack of discussion on parole options in the USA. The key distinction between the USA and Israel is the use of parole options. In Israel prisoners are able to leave the prison for short periods of time during their sentence.

At various points there is the possibility of a positive intervention, which may influence a prisoners successful release back into the community. The key to successful re-entry is allocating funds to those interventions which will have the most impact and targeting interventions at the right prisoners.

Admission to the facility

The process of re-entry starts when the prisoner is received into the facility and is put in contact with release planners and case managers. In Kansas, Michigan and Georgia this involved a risk assessment process that determined the criminogenic and social needs of the prisoner. As most of the prisoners in these states would be serving a lengthy (over a year) prison term, this assessment was used to determine security rating and programming requirements.

New York City (NYC) due to its different prison population implemented a more comprehensive process at reentry. All of the prison population in NYC are held at Rikers Island and serve less than 12 months, 80% of all prisoners serve less than 60 days, if they have a longer sentence they are sent to a state prison. Given this high turnover of prisoners, NYC discharge planning is seen as a process which starts the moment the prisoner enters the facility. At the point of entry they are put in contact with the various agencies that provide support for housing, substance abuse, employment and family reunification. Prisoners are provided with information what service they provide, and how to access these services on release. Upon release prisoners are also provided with a bus service that takes them directly to the post-release services located in their boroughs.

The key component to the Rikers facility is that they do not have the time to provide a range of programs and vocational training to prisoners due to the short sentences. Their focus is on ensuring that prisoners have access to any support services or benefits that they are entitled to, thus reducing the likelihood that they will become homeless or reoffend. A key service offered is the Rikers Island Single Stop; this service provides benefits counseling, RAP (charge) sheet education, legal assistance and financial counseling. All of these issues had been identified as significantly impacting on the ability of prisoners to succeed upon release. These single stops had serviced over 1000 prisoners.

At Rikers Island considerable effort was made to reduce the replication of services and to streamline the processes that prisoners are required to undertake. This has resulted in prisoners now having access to birth certificates, Medicaid, social security cards and food stamps without needing to see multiple agencies or individuals.
Figure 1- USA Sentencing process
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The other jurisdictions have implemented an assessment process at intake, this assessment was then used to determine the case management approach for the offender. Two of the jurisdictions (Michigan and Georgia) used the COMPASS risk assessment and other used the LSI-R. These are validated risk assessment instruments that measure both dynamic and static factors and are similar to many of the assessments available, including the ones used in Western Australia.

Of the services observed, the most developed was the Michigan process which supported the MPRI model. The MPRI model was underpinned by the use of Transition Accountability Plans (TAPs), these were undertaken at four critical points during a sentence:

- **TAP1** - the expectations for the prison term that will help prisoners prepare for release (intake).
- **TAP2** - the terms and conditions of offenders release to communities (parole decision).
- **TAP3** - the supervision and services offenders will experience in the community (return to the community).
- **TAP4** - the elements of the case management plan for eventual discharge from parole (discharge from parole supervision).

The TAP is developed through collaboration between; prison staff, the prisoner, the releasing authority, community supervision officers, human services providers, victims and community and neighborhood organisations. The lead case manager is dependent on where the prisoner is in their sentence; at various points it is the prison staff, the parole staff or the community agency. The flow chart in Figure 2 (page 22) outlines the TAP process.

A key success point was that all of the agencies believed in the use of the TAP and saw it as an important document. There was a commitment across the agency to a single case management document, this commitment assisted the offender to understand the case management process and the reasons why he/she was being asked to undertake certain tasks. Offenders were able to talk to their case manager about their TAP and how they were addressing their specific issues.

It was apparent across jurisdictions that there was a commitment to the case management of offenders and the use of multi-disciplinary teams, including the use of community agencies. Case management was based on assessed risk and need and evidence based practice was implemented at all points in the sentence. When this worked well it allowed for a prisoner to work towards specific goals during their sentence that inevitably aided their ability to reintegrate back into the community.
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Figure 2 – Michigan, Re-entry flow chart
Prison and Jail Based Programming

Prisons in the United States have similar operational models to prisons in Australia. Prisoners are assessed as to their security level – maximum, medium and minimum. These security levels are dependant on the severity of their crime, their previous criminal history, previous sentences, previous in-facility behaviour and the length of sentence. Similar to other prison systems the level of movement and the opportunities afforded to a prisoner is dependent to a large extent on their security classification. Maximum security prisoners have limited movement in the prison and are subject to more intense security whilst those who are in minimum are often provided with opportunities to leave the prison or have facilities with little or minimal security.

One thing apparent that differentiates US prisons from prisons in Western Australia was a sense of space. Prisons in Western Australia had more open spaces, more vegetation, and a less institutional feel. There did not appear to be a commitment in the jurisdictions I visited to develop prisons such as Boronia Pre-release Centre and Bunbury Pre-release Centre where the focus was on developing a normalised living environment. Instead the prisons appeared to be more traditional designs and focused on containment and movement control.

All of the jurisdictions had made a commitment to the use of evidence based programs with a heavy emphasis on programs from a cognitive behavioural perspective. For the majority of offenders the key programs were cognitive skills and substance abuse. Previous to the introduction of the re-entry program it was clear that the use of programs in prisons was sporadic and the majority of prisoners had received little or no clinical interventions.

Specific Prison Issues observed in the USA

Smoking in Prison

Each jurisdiction I visited had banned smoking in all prison facilities including car parks. No staff member, prisoner or visitor was allowed to smoke in the facility or to in bring tobacco products, lighters or matches. In Kansas, staff who were found in possession of tobacco products in the prison were required to take two days unpaid leave, starting immediately. Each of the jurisdictions had not phased in the program but had advertised a date and then implemented.

Dogs in Prison

Kansas had undertaken to implement a program whereby minimum security prisoners were responsible for the rehabilitation of a pound dog. These dogs lived with the prisoner who was responsible for feeding and training the dog. Prisoners I spoke to were extremely supportive of the program and clearly close to the dogs. The presence of the dogs in the prison did enhance the atmosphere. The study of the education and therapeutic benefits of such programs was the topic of a 2009 Churchill Fellowship by Lynne Challinor, which is available on the Churchill Foundation website.

Prisoner employment

Prisoner employment is important for a successful transition into the community. Many prisoners have no experience of employment and need to acquire the knowledge of how to apply for a position, keep a position and the behaviours expected by employers. Each of the jurisdictions approached this is in a different way.
Kansas has developed a strong industries program within the prison system, prisoners have the opportunity to acquire job skills in competitive industries whilst serving their sentence. These industries are located within the prison facilities and outside of the prison facilities. This program is well integrated into Department of Corrections and continued to operate strongly despite the poor economic situation. The principal under which the program operates states that;

“Offender work programs and employment play a critical role in developing skills and abilities which will serve offenders on release, contribute to the good order and management of institutions, contribute to offenders success in the community and reflect our society’s belief in the value of work”.

The Kansas Corrections Industries (KCI) private industry program involves partnerships between the department and private businesses. The programs can not negatively impact workers employed by the partnership companies outside of the prison system or available workers in the locality of the host facility. The program offers benefits to the private industry by providing a stable and available workforce, reasonable wages (no need to provide benefits), gain a Federal Tax Credit for each inmate employee, no unemployment taxes and subsidised production space.

The prisoners benefit by being able to acquire work skills, earn the federal minimum wage, receive mandatory savings on release and are able to pay outstanding debts such as child support, fines and criminal compensation.

The Department of Corrections and subsequently the State, benefits by having high quality training given to prisoners at no cost, fine and criminal compensation paid whilst also having fewer disciplinary problems in prisons, reduced recidivism, meaningful jobs and the rent and utilities paid for by the private industry. There are a number of criteria for prisoners who wish to participate in private industry employment

**For Prison based Industries**

- Security classification of medium or maximum.
- No Class I or II disciplinary convictions in the preceding 6 months and of any drug related disciplinary conviction in the preceding 12 months.
- Privilege incentive of two or three.
- Medical classification appropriate to Industries.
- Mental health classification that indicates no presence of active emotional or mental health problems or chronic care issues.

**For Non prison based industries**

- Security classification of minimum.
- A minimum of 12 months to a maximum of 60 months remaining to serve on current sentence.
- No Class I disciplinary convictions for the preceding 8-12 months.
- Privilege incentive level two or higher.
- No program requirements that cannot be adequately addressed while participating in program.
- Must present a low risk of violence and for re-offending.
- Medical classification appropriate to industries.
- Mental health classification that indicates no presence of active emotional or mental health problems or chronic care issues.
- Individuals convicted of a sexually motivated crime cannot present a high level of risk to the community and cannot have a diagnosis of pedophilia.
- Individuals possessing a history of escape, assaultive behaviour and/or past or present involvement in organised crime activities, including gang or security threat group activities will be considered on a case by case basis.

Prisoners who participate in industries are required to pay the following from their pay checks:
- Federal income tax.
- State income tax.
- Social security.
- Room and Board (25% of gross wage).
- Dependent support.
- Victims compensation (5% of gross wages paid toward court ordered restitution or to victims reparation board).
- Mandatory savings – after deductions have been made, 10% of inmates remaining wage are deposited in a savings account for disbursement upon release.

In return the correctional facility is required:
- To release prisoners daily to industries – prisoners can not be kept in facility except for emergencies.
- To provide disciplinary officers to support private industry staff.

A copy of the standard agreement between industries and Department of Corrections is attached as Appendix B.

The types of industries partnered with Department of Corrections are diverse and include the following:

**Prison Based**
- Impact Design - a garment wholesaler and contract decorator.
- Jensen Engineering – a full service engineering company.
- Primewood - manufactures kitchen cabinets and other veneered products.
- VW Services – prep work for heating elements.
- BAC inc – manufacture leather belts, tool pouches etc
- Allied Material and Equipment Company – leading manufacture of national flags.
- Century Manufacturing – acrylic awards, promotional products and beer tap handles.
- Pioneer Balloon – printed celebratory balloons.
- Great Plains Manufacturing – Agricultural equipment manufacturing.
- Hubco – cloth, woven and non-woven packaging.
- Seat King – transportation seating.

**Non Prison Based**

- Henke Manufacturing – design and manufacture of snowplows and other attachments.
- Zephyr Products – design and delivery of engineering products.
- Laser Apparel – screen print and embroidery industry.
- Maico Industries – structural beams and girders.
- Moly Manufacturing – livestock handling equipment.
- D&M Auto Salvage – disassembles wrecked cars and trucks and salvages useable parts.
- Wifco – manufactures steel walkways, stairs and doors.
- Heartland China – design and decoration of fine china and glassware.
- MFL Industries – manufactures mattresses, toppers and pillows.
- Koch and Company – manufactures bi-fold doors, French doors, fire doors and kitchen cabinets.
- Great Bend Industries – custom designed welded, hydraulic cylinders.

Prisoners are required to undertake a variety of roles within these industries including factory hands, designers, supervisors, sales representation, customer service, stocktake and stock ordering, distribution and reception. Prisoners undertake all the work in the factories from low skilled work options to more highly skilled. The private industry may only employ one of two employees in the facility who are not prisoners.

The success of the program is based on the commitment that the agency has to encourage private investment. Prisoners are provided with meaningful work which has real world relevance and the capacity to get promotions and better paid jobs. Prisoners are also required to apply for the job as if it was in the community, they had to submit a resume and undertake an interview. Although the industries were connected to the prisons (either inside or outside) they were not ‘supported’ industries but real industries required to compete in the marketplace and make a profit.

Michigan had a number of prison industries but these were not developed to the extent of those in Kansas. The Prison Build Program was however an example of an industry which benefited both prisoners and the community. The Prison Build Program was a partnership between the Department of Corrections and Habitat for Humanity to build houses for low income earners and other disadvantaged groups. Prisoners are able to work within two streams - construction or horticulture. Prisoners who choose the construction stream apply for positions within industries and following an interview, if successful are then able to obtain trade skills in the industry, a similar process exists within the horticulture stream. To be successful prisoners have to display an aptitude for the program, a commitment to the program and the ability to work as part of a team. The curriculums are reviewed by union and non union contractors and the Michigan Nursery and Landscape Association, so on release prisoners have a recognised qualification. The houses are all completed.
within the prison and then trucked to the location, prisoners on release in work programs can finish the project by installing the completed house.

As well as the prison build program Michigan has a number of other industries which provide prisoners with skills, these include dairies, meat processing, printing, textiles and metal work. These were not competitive industries developed in partnership with private industry but rather traditional prison industries.

In both Kansas and Michigan program participants are linked to employers upon release. In both states the program co-coordinators stated that their graduates had excellent reputations and were in demand as employees. In some cases employers had held positions or changed work hours to suit the needs of the offender.

Georgia had the Prisoner Industry Enhancement Certification Program (PIECP). This was an in-prison industry program which was aimed at attracting private industry to work from within the prison. Similar to Kansas these private industries could develop industries which did not displace workers in the community, or occur in occupations where there was a surplus of workers or impair existing contracts for services. Similar to Kansas if a private industry partners with the prison they are required to pay the prisoner the prevailing wage, whilst the prisoner is required to:

- Pay taxes.
- Pay into crime victims fund.
- Pay a portion of their incarceration.
- Pay court ordered fines or restitution.
- Pay a portion to child or family support.
- Pay into a savings account for use upon release.
There were currently two prisons in Georgia where this program had been implemented and one company was interested in implementing the program but were not able to in the current economic climate.

All of the jurisdictions paid particular attention to preparing the prisoner for employment outside of the prison system. The key issues covered included:

- Writing a job application.
- Interviewing skills.
- Telling an employer you have a felony conviction.
- Telling an employer how you have addressed your offending behaviour.

In all jurisdiction prisoners were required to apply for any prison employment as if it was a competitive position outside of the prison. By having to utilise these skills in the prison industries prisoners were provided with the opportunity to practice these skills prior to having find employment on release.

**Recommendation Seven**

*Correctional agencies in Australia partner with not-for-profit agencies such as Habitat for Humanity. Building low cost housing will provide real work skills for prisoners, whilst also providing reparation and support to the community.*

**Recommendation Eight**

*Real partnerships with private industry need to be encouraged. These partnerships should provide prisoners with meaningful employment options within prisons and the potential to transfer to similar positions outside of the prison.*
Managing the Transition Period

Planning Continuity of Care

Managing and supporting the prisoner during the first months on release was seen as the key to keeping prisoners from returning to prison. Each jurisdiction had realised the need to support the prisoner during this time and primarily focused on housing, employment, relapse prevention and family support.

Michigan, Israel and one county in Kansas had separated re-entry staff from parole and probation staff, re-entry staff were responsible for welfare and support and parole and probation staff were responsible for meeting statutory reporting requirements. All of these jurisdictions felt this was the best model as it allowed re-entry staff to gain the trust of the offender, but only worked if they had strong links and partnerships with parole and probation staff. Kansas initially had separate re-entry and parole staff in all counties but due to budget restrictions they had been required to merge the two functions, this was a recent decision and they had not evaluated the impact.

It was evident that the separation of re-entry and parole staff was working effectively and provided the returning prisoners with a greater degree of support and services. When staff were not responsible for the statutory requirements associated with parole and probation they were able to concentrate on the welfare needs of the offender.

In each of the jurisdictions there was a sequence of events underpinning the range of re-entry service, these essentially outlined the minimum services each returning prisoner was entitled to during the period close to release, the release day and then key periods of time whilst on release. Within each state each county had slightly different processes but each met the key outcomes required by the overarching state plan/policy.

Kansas Wyandotte County – Re-entry

In Prison

18-12 months before release;

- Re-entry specialist meets with the prisoners and starts to identify risk areas and particular barriers to release.
- A risk assessment is undertaken.
- A release plan targeting risk areas is completed and the prisoner is referred to particular programs and classes:
  - Cognitive thinking – thinking for a change, social skills interventions.
  - Money management - finances and budgeting.
  - Employment – resume writing, job search assistance, job skill enhancement.
  - Re-entry planning – overcoming stigmas, goal setting, time management.
- The re-entry specialist introduces themselves to the key support people in the prisoners’ life (with prisoners consent).
- Prisoners are seen by their re-entry specialise at least once a month whilst in prison.
12-8 months;
- Prisoner is assigned a parole officer;
- Re-entry specialist develops a housing plan with the prisoner;
- At 8 months the prisoner is provided with a transition packet and a scheduled meeting with the Transition team.

8-6 months;
- Families are contacted about impending release.
- Prisoner and transition team review the transition packet and make adjustments to the plan, the prisoner is informed of requirements on release including the Community Accountability Panel, Welcome back home and other program requirements. Other requirements include:
  - Obtaining a drivers license, ID, Social security, drug and alcohol counseling, treatment options, educational needs, employment support.
- Parole officer reviews the housing plan and discusses with re-entry provider and determines if further support is required.

6-3 months;
- 90 day transition team meetings is scheduled release plan goals are initiated by the prisoner during this meeting.

90-30 days prior to release;
- Contact with community supports and appointments made.
- Release plan finalised.
- Confirms community appointments with prisoner.

Out of Prison
Day of release;
- Transportation provided to any community resource appointments if required.

First week of supervision;
- Offender reports to parole office within 24 hours of release.
- Re-entry specialist and parole officer meet to discuss program requirements and next visits.
- Community Accountability Panel – group of volunteers who provide a network of support and encouragement e.g. contact with mentors and employers to returning prisoners. Prisoners are also required to be accountable to these community volunteers.
- Offender put in contact with other community supports – housing assistance, job networks.

First 30 days of supervision;
- Dual supervision between parole officer and re-entry specialist.
- Release plan goals discussed and transitioned into parole case plan.

Months 2-4;
• Re-entry specialist and parole officer work together to address core issues.
• Utilise community accountability panels if required to address issues or concerns.

Months 5-6:
• Determine if the offender is ready to transition out of the re-entry program.
• Discuss impending graduation with offender and schedule graduation.

If the offender requires continued re-entry services past 6-8 months then this is discussed with the Director of re-entry services, however a conclusion time line is established and discussed with the prisoner.

In Washtenaw County, Michigan a similar process has been developed, the key difference is that more of the services are provided in the community than was observed in Kansas, the flow chart of services is illustrated in Figure 3. One specific issue faced by Washtenaw Country is the high number of returning sex offenders. The re-entry coordinator here has found that their wrap around service delivery and a high degree of acceptance has been invaluable in managing this high profile group of offenders.

One of the most successful aspects of the Washtenaw County model was that they made contact with all prisoners who were released into their county. The level and depth of the contact was dependent on the risk and needs of the offender. Those assessed as low risk or with strong supports had little contact with the service. They were greeted on their return, provided with a list of services that they could access and employment contacts, in comparison those offenders who were assessed as a high risk or high need were intensively monitored and supervised. By focusing on risk and need the county was able to target the most resources where they were most effective.

In Israel the Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority meets with prisoners 2-3 times in the six months before their release from prison, they were seen as the link between the community and the prison. They assessed the prisoners' motivation and willingness to engage in a program and also scheduled appointments for treatment programs outside of the prison. The Authority also made sure that the prisoner had contact with the local employment coordinator to find employment on release.

The Authority worked closely with the releasing agent and was responsible for collating the case management and program documents, they approved these documents and then forwarded on to the releasing agency. When the individual was released from prison the authority maintained contact for a 12 month period after release.

Israel favored a model referred to as ‘programs with borders’. That is, that programs and other rehabilitation models were implemented under strict control in the community. The police were also involved in the supervision regime if the offender was deemed a serious or dangerous offender. Their key problems were; remaining engaged with the Arab communities (40% of criminal prisoners were classified as Arab) as they had had difficulty in recruiting Arab staff due to language, cultural and political issues. The other significant group were the recent Russian immigrants (35% of the 60% Jewish prison population were Russian) where the language and cultural difficulties were also a serious problem.
Housing

Housing was seen as a critical factor in preventing re-offending, each jurisdiction had approached the delivery of housing in a similar manner. In Georgia they had developed the Re-entry Partnership housing program. They had identified 700 inmates who were past their earliest release date because they had no identified housing and had exhausted all their housing options. The program paid 3 months room and board subsidy to an approved housing provider so that these prisoners were able to exit prior to their ‘max out date’. They estimated that they had saved over $18 million by providing this service rather than continuing to incarcerate.

GEORGIA COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF PROVIDING HOUSING

Total cost spent to incarcerate at $49.00 per day past tentative parole month (TPM) to Re-entry Housing Service Provider (RPH) release date = $8,877,968.

Cost avoided calculated from RPH release date to max out date = $34,016,217.

Total spent for RPH year to date = $1,313,800.

Cost of Parole Supervision at $4.43 per day = $14,508.345.

Net cost avoided due to RPH placements = $18,376,072.
In both Kansas and Michigan the re-entry providers had employed specialist housing providers who were responsible for finding prisoners places to live, providing specialised tenancy advice to ensure that they were not unfairly evicted and supporting returned prisoners to apply for housing support. Both jurisdictions had a number of transitional housing options available for short term tenancy, these included boarding houses, apartments and houses.

The New York Department of Corrections had formed a direct partnership with the Department of Housing in order to find appropriate housing for offenders. They had a target of providing 500 units of supported housing for people leaving the criminal justice system who were homeless or at risk of homelessness. In addition the Frequent Users Service Enhancement (FUSE) project, targets frequent users of jails and shelters, this project aims to place these high risk/high need individuals into supportive housing whilst also providing a case management service aimed at gaining permanent housing.

Israel had a commitment to the provision of halfway houses for offenders; these were available for both males and females and were located in a number of major cities in the country. Prisoners on release could stay in a halfway house for up to nine months on release. If accepted into a halfway house they were required to participate in the household chores, such as cleaning and cooking, undertake program requirements in the evening and were required to have a job. All members of the house were required to undertake urinalysis and repeated infractions could result in a return to prison. The houses were staffed during the day with social workers and at night a graduate of the program was in the home. The halfway houses were run by both secular and religious groups. Men who applied to go to the religious house were required to demonstrate their commitment to orthodox religious principles prior to acceptance.

Following graduation from the halfway house offenders were supported in their search for a permanent home and often these were located close to the halfway house. Offenders were free to return to the house for programs or support after they had officially left the service. They were always invited to attend for holidays or festivals as these were considered high risk times.

Unlike many other jurisdictions Israel had a policy of placing offenders in halfway houses which were not close to their homes prior to imprisonment. It was felt that if they were close to old friends and localities they would have more chance of returning to their pre-incarceration lifestyle. Given the small distances between cities in Israel compared to Western Australia (WA), what was considered far in Israel would not necessarily be considered far in WA.

**Recommendation Nine**

**Halfway houses and/or supported hostels should be considered as viable post release options for long term or high need prisoners.**

**Creation of Employment Opportunities**

Regular employment has always been seen as a critical factor in keeping offenders from returning to prison. Unlike Australia the USA does not have a universal federally funded unemployment program which provides returning prisoners with financial assistance. Prisoners in the USA do not usually qualify for unemployment benefits as they do not have an employment history, this makes the acquisition of employment a high priority for re-entry service providers as without employment they are at particular risk of homelessness and subsequent re-offending.
Georgia had implemented the Corporate Take 5 program; this was a partnership between the Department of Corrections and the private industry in the state. Large successful corporations were asked to initially hire 5 ex-prisoners who would have undergone initial skills training within the prison. The goal was that these leading businesses were seen as a leadership group in the community and subsequently encourage other businesses and corporations to hire ex-prisoners. This program, had achieved a degree of success with 500 prisoners being hired through the program; these prisoners were employed in a variety of industries and included; janitors, factory workers and ICT consultants. The key success of the corporate take 5 program was that for large corporations 5 employees was a small risk to take, in comparison, for a small family business often taking 1 employee was a large risk. The major hurdle was that many businesses had policies that restricted the hiring of individuals with a felony conviction. This was a problem the Department had identified as a priority issue to be managed.

In all of the jurisdictions the key industries of construction, hospitality and laboring were targeted. It was the view of all employment coordinators that these industries were the most flexible in employing individuals with criminal histories. All jurisdictions in the USA made employers aware of the Federal Tax Credits available to employers who hired offenders. This tax credit was seen as the key advantage offenders had over the other unemployed.

Each jurisdiction had an employment coordinator whose role it was to find employment, support the prisoner in keeping the position, support the employer, help in providing training for the offender and inform the employer of possible financial support and/or tax benefits. Their key tasks were to run courses that focused on life skills classes, skills development, financial literacy, employment opportunities and interviewing skills. Each jurisdiction in the USA made use of 90 day supported employment opportunities, these were programs that provided ex-prisoners with subsidised employment that helped them transition into unsubsidized permanent employment.

The Ready4Work program in Detroit, Michigan was working well. This program focused on finding employment in the construction industry by restoring derelict properties. Similar to the partnership in the prison, this program partnered with Habitat for Humanity in order to then provide these renovated homes to disadvantaged families. In addition they have constructed 5-6 homes through this project. Wayne County also partners with Motor City Blight Busters to revitalise neighbourhoods in Detroit. Currently the returned prisoners are working on building a coffee shop and renovating an old theatre and demolishing known ‘crack houses’ for the benefit of the local community.

Saginaw County in Michigan had also created an employment opportunity for prisoners by working with the local councils to demolish condemned houses. The returned prisoners demolished the properties and then sold the products from the demolition. In order to sell the products they had leased a shop in town that sold items to the general public. They were slowly developing a niche market as they had a range of products from original period pieces such as floor boards, skirting and ceiling items to more common products such as toilets, sinks, baths and fittings. In addition the shop sold items of renovated found furniture. Everyone who worked in the shop was a returned prisoner.

In both Kansas and Georgia there was a reliance on mentoring and volunteers to find jobs for ex-prisoners. Both jurisdictions relied heavily on the ability to link returned prisoners to people connected with the program. In Kansas the key to finding employment on release appeared to be linked to the jobs undertaken whilst in prison. Prisoners who had substantial employment in the prison industries and in particular
in the minimum security outside industries were able to link into other employment as they had demonstrable skills and experience.

Finding permanent employment opportunities was identified as the single biggest problem for each of the jurisdiction. The deep recession being experienced in the USA and in particular in Michigan was resulting in high unemployment and ex-prisoners were finding it even more difficult to find employment and importantly keep employment. All of the agencies across the USA were dealing with this problem and recognised that the failure of many returned prisoners to find permanent employment was significantly impacting on the likelihood of their future success.

**Recommendation Ten**

*To implement a Corporate Take 5 program by working with large corporations to take small numbers of trained returned prisoners as employees.*

**Victims, Families and Communities**

Kansas and Israel both saw the value of working with the families of offenders and in particular with the children. When the prisoner is incarcerated families are often left to deal with debt, stigma and at times homelessness. Considerable research exists which supports the view that criminal behaviour can be intergenerational, the children of incarcerated parents are far more likely to be incarcerated themselves as Adults. By working with the families and in particular with the children this likelihood can be averted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children of prisoners ignored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Charity Barnardo's has said nine out of 10 local authorities do not give prisoners’ children the help they need. The charity has urged the government to do more to protect the 160,000 youngsters estimated to have a mother or father in jail in the UK.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They are more likely to develop mental health problems and become offenders themselves it warned... Children's Minister Dawn Primarolo said there had been improvements but admitted help remained patchy.... Describing them as invisible victims of crime, she said, “it's very worrying that this is a very large number of children whose needs aren't being addressed. “There’s very clear evidence that if noting is done to support these children, cycles of offending and deprivation can carry on from one generation to the next.” |

Prisoner support groups also say inmates who stay in touch with their families are up to six times less likely to re-offend.  

*BBC News October 27 2009*

The Prisoner Rehabilitation Authority in Israel is mandated by law to assist prisoners’ families during and after their imprisonment. As part of this program they have developed a program designed to assist the children of prisoners. A key part of this is the mentoring program for the children of prisoners. In this program university students participate in the Big Brother program, whereby they are matched with the child of a prisoner. As part of the program they participate in social activities with the children, talk about problems and help the child continue to visit the parent in prison. This is seen as a rewarding program as it directly helps the child and the incarcerated parent as well as providing support to the other parent.
Offenders who are placed in hostels are also encouraged to stay in contact with their families and children. The children of clients are invited to attend festivals and other occasions (where suitable) and are involved in the rehabilitation of their parent. This has been a very positive aspect of the work of the hostels and they have had significant success in reconnecting fathers with their children.

The focus on Domestic and Family Violence was very evident in Israel. Approximately 30% of prison inmates are incarcerated due to a family violence matter and the state has a no-tolerance policy towards this type of crime. The Authority runs a number of programs aimed at family violence perpetrators.

Kansas has developed a range of programs to aid parents who are incarcerated. These include the family transition program that is focused on developing better family communication skills and how to deal with family conflict. The family workshop program which works with the prisoners and his/her family to deal with the issues they will face on release and handle these challenges. The Child Support Enforcement program provides advice on managing child support payments, resources for non-custodial parents and how to establish paternity. Where possible the re-entry service providers are in direct contact with either the prison’s family and work with the family to help support the offender.

**Recommendation Eleven**

*To work with schools that have community engagement programs. These schools have the capacity to develop big brother/sister programs to support the children of prisoners.*

**Identification and Benefits**

All of the jurisdictions visited had programs in place to ensure that prisoners had valid identification before release. In some jurisdictions (Kansas and Michigan) this was seen as the responsibility of the dedicated re-entry staff. In other jurisdictions there was a specific person employed to manage the identification issue. New York Department of Corrections, due to its large throughput of prisoners had outsourced this function to a dedicated service provider.

In addition to ensuring that prisoners had valid identification all of the jurisdictions also made certain that prisoners were able to access all of their benefits. Compared to Australia where there are federal and state agencies who manage benefits, the process in the US appeared to be a complex and time consuming task. The complexity was increased due to the myriad of eligibility requirements which needed to be considered. Staff worked to ensure that returning prisoners who were entitled were registered for;

- Medicaid.
- Medicare.
- Food Stamps.
- Housing assistance/rental subsidies.
- Employment assistance.
- Unemployment.
- Disability pensions.
- Veteran’s assistance.

One of the difficulties experienced by staff in these areas; was that if a person applied for benefits and was rejected they had to wait, up to 12 months, before they
could re-apply. If the application was rejected because of a technical error rather than ineligibility this then caused significant emotional and financial distress to the individual. Given the impact of failing to receive benefits and the complexity of the application process some of the key documents produced by the Re-entry Policy Council have been concerned with helping returning prisoners access the benefits they are entitled to.
Conclusion

Re-entry in the USA is a relatively new process and it was apparent in each of the jurisdictions that they are slowly adjusting to changes in policy and service delivery. What was clear was that they had embraced the changes and worked to ensure that they were embedded across all agencies, both Government and non-Government. There was a sense of optimism from all of the staff that their programs would make a difference to the lives of returning prisoners and their families. Like most programs of this nature, although success was at times a result of an individual's dedication to the philosophy and the program, there were some key decisions that underpinned the successes.

The success that had been achieved in the US was related to the depth of planning that underpinned the re-entry programs. This planning was evident at the federal level, the state level and the county level. At no point did it appear that a simply a program was implemented, instead each jurisdiction had developed a policy framework, gained the support of the politicians and other agencies and then operationalised this framework. The operationalisation of the policies occurred at the local level where the co-coordinators were aware of their offenders, their community and their resources and so were able to target the interventions effectively.

Another factor that was important was that each jurisdiction/government level appeared to have a specific responsibility:

- Federal Agencies – responsibility for research, technical support and expert advice.
- State Agencies – policy development, funding and political support.
- County level – program implementation.

These distinctions resulted in a lack of duplication and thus a better use of the limited funds. The breakdown also utilised skills effectively, importantly the local coordinators had access to an extraordinary level of expertise. They did not have to develop the plans and programs instead they adapted the information to suit their specific needs. This resulted in community co-coordinators being able to engage directly with the community and the service providers rather than being required to undertake considerable and time consuming research.

The lack of duplication and the specific function of each level was important, given the level of funding. Funding in all jurisdictions was limited and, as this research was undertaken during the aftermath of the Global Financial Crisis, the situation for most jurisdictions had become critical. Despite this each jurisdiction had maintained funding for re-entry services, and re-entry providers had become creative in the use of the funds that they had and in seeking out sources of new funds.

High level support was critical for success, Governors, politicians (Federal and State) and Commissioners of Corrections all supported the program. There was a clear and distinct move away from seeing imprisonment as the only means of ensuring public safety. All of the jurisdictions viewed re-entry as a means of reducing crime and improving public safety and the public communications from the agency supported this message. The impact of this level of support is hard to quantify but it did result in an acceptance of the program throughout the agency.

Those jurisdictions that had strong interagency and interdivisional support for re-entry were the most successful. It was clear that the myriad of problems experienced by prisoners on release from custody were beyond the remit or the capacity of correctional agencies alone to manage. When agencies worked closely together and
were committed to the same philosophy they conserved financial and human resources and achieved more sustainable outcomes.

The focus on housing and employment was consistent across all jurisdictions, the use of hostels and half way houses was an example of a program which had been in operation for a long time and was embedded into the service delivery model. The hostels were a positive environment for both staff and offenders and clearly demonstrated successful outcomes.

The emphasis on families and family support was important; prisoners’ families and most importantly their children are often the hidden victims of their crimes. When the prisoner is incarcerated families are often left to deal with debt, stigma and at times homelessness. Considerable research exists which supports the view that criminal behaviour can be intergenerational, by working with the families and in particular with the children this likelihood can be averted.

The lack of developed and implemented evaluation plans and integrated ICT was a problem and one that will become more evident as time progresses. The inability to accurately measure success and to determine which aspects of the program are the most successful will hinder future developments and possibly future funding. The decision to use the available funding for program delivery rather than evaluation is one that all service providers invariably make – it is the immediate which is of most concern. However eventually someone will ask what worked and why did it work, without good data collection and defined evaluation plans it will be impossible to answer this question.
**A Re-Entry Plan for Western Australia**

Unlike the USA, Western Australia has a history of re-entry services and has all the requirements needed to develop best practice re-entry services. The Department of Corrective Services currently offers a range of re-entry services including; transitional housing, prisoner vocational training, employment opportunities and prison industries. All of these provide a range of services designed to support offenders in the community. What is described below is a re-entry services model based on the information obtained through the Churchill Fellowship.

Western Australia is comprised of six distinct regions plus the metropolitan area, each of these regions has a unique economy, climate and population group. The key to successful re-entry is to design programs uniquely suited to each of these regions. The US model of Federal, State and County is easily adapted to suit a regional focus. Figure four illustrates how these three key components of the US model can be modified for a two component model suited to a single jurisdiction – the directorate/state level and the regional level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US model</th>
<th>Australian Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td>State directorate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– responsibility for research,</td>
<td>Policy agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical support and expert</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– policy development, funding</td>
<td>Expert advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and political support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County level</td>
<td>Regional Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– program development and</td>
<td>Program development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The State directorate level would be responsible for setting the policy agenda, determining the parameters of the service delivery and also be a conduit for accessing the research and expertise available in the area.

The regional coordinators would be responsible for developing re-entry services at their local level. These coordinators should have the ability to contract in those services they require to provide the right services for their region. These local re-entry services need to be developed and submitted for endorsement at the directorate level. The re-entry plans need to be developed in conjunction with the Prison and Community and Youth Justice Office.

In order for re-entry coordinators to be able to develop the most appropriate re-entry services they need to have the data that provides detailed information on the characteristics of the prisoners returning to their region. This detailed information needs to provide information which supports the development of services and programs so should include information on; numbers, offending history, health needs, employment histories, educational attainment, substance abuse and family needs. As well as information related to the criminal justice system there is also need to look
wider environment. Such as the services and agencies available in the region, other funding sources which are accessible and local housing and employment opportunities.

Critical to the success of all re-entry programs is the need to have high level endorsement from the government, the agency and other supporting agencies. Without this support re-entry is seen as a program rather than an agency priority and does not develop the integrated programs required.

There should be a communication plan, one that highlights how re-entry is a cost effective method of reducing crime and improving community safety. This communication plan needs to focus on how reductions in recidivism are a means of reducing crime without being ‘soft on crime’.

A detailed re-entry plan needs to be developed; this plan should set targets for the program. The initial phase of the planning needs to undertake a full audit of current funding arrangements and look to see where rationalisation and reallocation of funding may provide stronger outcomes.

Although there are a myriad of factors that underpin recidivism, the key focus of re-entry should be

- Housing
- Employment
- Family support
- Substance abuse

Additional foci should be on educational and vocational training, health, life skills and cognitive skills development.

The structure to support re-entry is only aspect the other issues surround the links between assessment policies, program attendance, outcomes from education and vocational training and work in industries undertaken whilst in prison. One of the key successes in the jurisdictions visited was that all of these components worked together to support the prisoners’ eventual return to the community. It is important that the re-entry directorate is an equal partner in the same area of the agency as these other services and uses the information and services they provide when developing re-entry plans.

Data collection systems underpinning a strong evaluation framework need to be incorporated into the process. This data should allow for regular analysis of what is working within re-entry programs and with which prisoners. This will allow for the targeting of resources to where the better outcomes are expected, modifying programs over time and continuing to develop a high level of expertise in the area. This will allow for more targeted resources which will maximise the benefits to the offender, the department and the community.
Figure 4 – Re-entry organisational chart
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- Technical assistance
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**Prison services**

**Community Justice**

**Community Groups/volunteers**

**Government Agencies**

**Non government Agencies**

**Offender Services**

**Locally developed re-entry plans – Funding**
Recommendations

Recommendation One
The development of a high level interagency steering committee on re-entry.

Recommendation Two
To develop a centre of excellence within the agency which has responsibility for re-entry policy development, grant applications, technical assistance and program development.

Recommendation Three
The planning and development of re-entry services should occur at the local level, with the central agency being responsible for overarching policy direction and the provision of expert advice.

Recommendation Four
Re-entry directorates should be separate to the operational and/or statutory directorates of correctional agencies

Recommendation Five
That funding for re-entry initiatives is co-ordinated by non-government agencies, allocation and oversight of the funding should remain with the core correctional agency

Recommendation Six
Re-entry initiatives need to be underpinned by rigorous evaluation frameworks which allow for ongoing monitoring and reporting. These frameworks need to determine which aspects of a program work best and with whom.

Recommendation Seven
Correctional agencies in Australia partner with not for profit agencies such as Habitat for Humanity to provide real work skills for prisoners, whilst also providing reparation and support to the community.

Recommendation Eight
Real partnerships with private industry need to be encouraged. These partnerships should provide prisoners with meaningful employment options within prisons and the potential to transfer to similar positions outside of the prison.

Recommendation Nine
Halfway houses and/or supported hostels should be considered as viable post release options for long term or high need prisoners.

Recommendation Ten
To implement a Corporate Take 5 program by working with large corporations to take small numbers of trained returned prisoners as employees
Recommendation Eleven

To work with schools that have community engagement programs. These schools have the capacity to develop big brother/sister programs to support the children of prisoners.
Appendix A – MPRI funding application

| MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS |
| PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION |
| OFFICE OF OFFENDER RE-ENTRY |

MPRI Community
Comprehensive Prisoner Re-Entry Plan
Fiscal Year 2010

| MPRI Community |
| COMPREHENSIVE PLAN & FUNDING APPLICATION |
1. RESIDENTIAL STABILITY
Residential Stability Narrative –Strengths, Gaps, Barriers and Local Response Strategy

Part 1 – Identification of Strengths, Gaps and Barriers
In the space provided clearly identify the existing strengths, gaps and barriers within the local community to be planned for in promoting safe and secure housing for returning offenders.

- Strengths:
- Gaps:
- Barriers:

Part 2 – Local Response Strategy – Promoting Residential Stability
Address each of the following elements as the local response plan in utilizing existing community strengths and targeting requested resources to overcome gaps and barriers to promoting safe and secure housing for returning offenders.

Public Education and Outreach Plan
Describe the process of how local communities will be engaged when the selection of local housing options within their communities are undertaken for returning offenders. The plan must address working with local elected officials neighbourhood associations and law enforcement.

Parole Supervision and Monitoring Plan
Describe the orientation process for new providers, process for responding to local parolee incidents and home checks. Describe how standardised language will be employed within local agreements and contracts to require service providers meet any obligations as required by the local Co-Chairs (i.e. contacts to the local law enforcement and parole authority, GPS monitoring).

2. EMPLOYMENT READINESS
Workforce Development Narrative – Strengths Gaps, Barriers and Local Response Strategy

Part 1 – Identification of Strengths, Gaps And Barriers
In the space provided clearly identify the existing strengths, gaps and barriers within the local community to be planned for in promoting employment readiness for returning offenders.

- Strengths:
Part 2 – Local Response Strategy – Promoting Employment for Returning Offenders
Describe the local response plan in utilizing existing community strengths and targeting requested resources to overcome gaps and barriers to promote employment for returning offenders

3. SOCIAL SUPPORT

Social Support Narrative - Strengths, Gaps, Barriers and Local Response Strategy

Part 1 – Identification of Strengths, Gaps and Barriers
In the space provided clearly identify the existing strengths, gaps and barriers within the local community to be planned for in overcoming support barriers for returning offenders. Areas which fall into the definition of social support are transportation, Family Support Services, Victim Services, Entitlement Services and Law Enforcement Services.
- Strengths:
- Gaps:
- Barriers:

Part 2 – Local Response Strategy – Overcoming Support Barriers for Returning Offenders
Describe the local response plan in utilizing existing community strengths and targeting requested resources to overcome gaps and barriers meeting the needs of returning offenders. Planning may involve engagement of local victim advocacy groups and law enforcement agencies

4. HEALTH AND BEHAVIOURAL HEALTH SERVICES

Health and Behavioural Health Narrative - Strengths, Gaps, Barriers and Local Response Strategy

Part 1 – Identification of Strengths, Gaps and Barriers
In the space provided clearly identify the existing strengths, gaps and barriers within the local community to be planned for in overcoming health and Behavioural health barriers for returning offenders. Gaps must be clearly defined in terms of capacity,
Service capacity for a specific service type is not sufficient of is non-existent to meet the current demand.

- Strengths:
- Gaps:
- Barriers:

**Part 2 – Local Response Strategy – Overcoming Support Barriers for Returning Offenders**

Describe the local response plan in utilizing existing community strengths and targeting requested resources to overcome gaps and barriers meeting the recovery needs of returning offenders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPRI service Category</th>
<th>MDOC MPRI</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Residential Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Employment Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Behavioural health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Operations Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared By

Approved By

Submitted on behalf of MPRI co-Chairs
Appendix B – Kansas Department of Corrections and Private industry
DRAFT
LEASE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
AND
**

This agreement, entered into on this ______ day of ____________, ______, by and between the Department of Corrections on behalf of **** Correctional Facility and Kansas Correctional Industries, hereinafter referred to as KANSAS, and **, hereinafter referred to as **:

WHEREAS, K.S.A. 75-5288 authorizes the Secretary of Corrections to lease buildings or portions thereof on the grounds of a correctional facility to a private corporation for the purpose of operating a business; and,

WHEREAS, ** is a company desiring to operate a manufacturing related business from a building at **** Correctional Facility; and,

WHEREAS, ** desires to employ inmates from **** Correctional Facility in the conduct of this business; and,

WHEREAS, KANSAS believes that such employment would be consistent with the proper training and rehabilitation of inmates; and,

WHEREAS, the parties desire to enter into an agreement whereby ** leases building space at **** Correctional Facility for the operation of a business and to employ inmates in that endeavor on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth; and,

WHEREAS, it is the intent of both parties that the operations pursuant to this agreement not unreasonably disrupt the normal routine and management of **** Correctional Facility.

NOW, THEREFORE, IN CONSIDERATION OF THE PREMISES, the parties hereto agree as follows:

I. KANSAS shall lease a building of approximately __________ square feet located within **** Correctional Facility to **. Any improvements, renovations or alterations of the area by ** must have the express written approval of the Warden of **** Correctional Facility prior to being made. If the request includes potential expenditures from the Correctional Industries Fund, prior approval shall also be obtained from the Director of Kansas Correctional Industries.

II. Utilities:

(a) KANSAS shall provide water at no cost to ** for the first year of the agreement term. KANSAS reserves the right to charge for this service in
subsequent years of the agreement term in the event of an increase in volume as determined in KANSAS' judgment. Reimbursement of the cost of its proportionate share of any increase in water, if required, shall be made by ** to **** Correctional Facility within five (5) business days from the date that KANSAS invoices ** for the amount due. KANSAS shall not charge any fee, commission or service charge to ** in connection with **'s reimbursements to KANSAS, nor for KANSAS' payment to the utility.

(b) ** shall reimburse KANSAS for the cost of natural gas used as indicated by a meter for the leased space. Reimbursement of the cost of natural gas, such as, but not limited to energy surcharges, taxes or other like charges, shall be made by ** to **** Correctional Facility within five (5) business days from the date that KANSAS notifies ** of the amount due. KANSAS shall not charge any fee, commission, or service charge to ** in connection with **'s reimbursement to KANSAS, nor for KANSAS' payment to the utility.

(c) ** shall reimburse KANSAS for the cost of electricity used as indicated by a meter for the leased space. Reimbursement of the cost of electricity, such as, but not limited to energy surcharges, taxes, or other like charges, shall be made by ** to **** Correctional Facility within five (5) business days from the date that KANSAS notifies ** of the amount due. KANSAS shall not charge any fee, commission, or service charge to ** in connection with **'s reimbursements to KANSAS, nor for KANSAS' payment of electricity charges by the utility.

(d) ** shall provide refuse disposal. Any hazardous materials shall be disposed of by **, with associated costs the responsibility of **. Subject to the provisions of this agreement and the applicable rules, policies and regulations of KANSAS, ** may utilize outside contractors to provide refuse disposal service and shall have reasonable access to perform said service.

III. KANSAS shall provide one (1) correctional facility telephone extension line in the office of the building. Written approval from the Warden of **** Correctional Facility must be obtained before ** may have any additional telephone lines installed. ** shall pay for all long distance telephone calls, facsimile, or data transmissions. ** shall maintain all communication equipment, including but not limited to telephones, facsimile, and devices with Internet access capabilities in a manner that ensures that inmates do not have unsupervised access to such equipment. Inmates shall not be permitted to have access to any devices with Internet access regardless of whether they would be subject to supervision while using the device. If ** establishes Internet access within the leased space, ** shall utilize a firewall to prevent access to any sites other than those essential to conduct business. **'s firewall security precautions shall be subject to the review and approval of the Warden of **** Correctional Facility.

IV. ** shall pay to Kansas Correctional Industries $1.25 per square foot annually for
lease of the building. Said amount includes the cost of water subject to the provision of additional charges for the service in the event of material change in usage as set forth in Sec. II above. Payment shall be made to Kansas Correctional Industries by the 10th of each month in the amount of $_______. The presence of any property under the control of ** in the leased area during any part of the month shall entitle KANSAS to receive a full monthly payment of $_______.

V. ** agrees to employ a minimum of _____ inmates of **** Correctional Facility. ** reserves the right to expand the number of inmates employees up to a maximum of ______, as necessary to meet its needs. The Warden of **** Correctional Facility, however, shall determine the number of inmates available to ** as employees.

VI. ** agrees that performance of this agreement shall not displace any existing private sector jobs.

VII. KANSAS shall screen inmate applicants in advance relative to program and housing considerations and make those deemed eligible available for hiring by **. Employment decisions regarding skills, training and job assignments shall be made by **. Inmates employed by ** may be terminated at any time in the sole discretion of **, except that KANSAS may terminate an inmate’s employment at any time if necessary for security, custody or classification considerations as determined by KANSAS.

VIII. ** agrees to provide Workers Compensation and Social Security (FICA) for the inmates employed by **. For minor injuries to inmate employees, **** Correctional Facility medical facilities shall be used at no charge to **. If, in the discretion of medical personnel at said facility, any injury requires referral to a hospital or doctor, **’s Workers Compensation shall be charged.

IX. ** shall pay wages to inmate employees of not less than the midpoint between the Federal Minimum Wage and the lowest tenth percentile on the appropriate Kansas Department of Human Resources wage scale. ** shall deduct Federal, State and FICA/Medicare taxes from inmate payroll checks. ** shall make voluntary deductions from inmate employee payroll checks that are approved in writing by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility. ** agrees to send inmate employee payroll checks to the Centralized Banking Unit at Lansing Correctional Facility via Direct Deposit. KANSAS may deduct from said wages such amounts as necessary to reimburse KANSAS for it expenses in fulfilling its obligations under this agreement as required or provided by law, regulation or policy of KANSAS and applicable Federal statutes.

X. ** shall be allowed to operate up to eight (8) consecutive house per day, five (5) days per week, Monday through Friday inclusive. ** shall not operate on State holidays. Additional or alternative hours or days of operation shall be approved in writing by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility or the Warden’s designee. Requests to work additional or alternative hours or days shall be submitted to the
Warden of **** Correctional Facility, or designee, at least two (2) days in advance. KANSAS shall provide meals to inmates during a meal period not to exceed one-half hour. Inmate meals shall be served and eaten in the location designated by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility.

XI. KANSAS shall provide such corrections officers and coverage as KANSAS feels is necessary for supervision of inmates employed by ** at times when such inmates are working.

XII. ** shall provide civilian supervisors to supervise inmates employed by ** when they are at work. The ratio of **’s civilian supervisors shall not exceed twenty-five (25) inmate employees for each civilian supervisor. **’s inmate employees may not supervise other inmate employees.

XIII. Any civilian employee of ** shall be subjected to an initial and continuing security clearance by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility. A security clearance is required before entrance into the secure perimeter of **** Correctional Facility. ** shall submit the names of the civilian employees, together with an authorization for the release of information signed by the employee on forms provided by KANSAS.

XIV. All civilian personnel employed by ** pursuant to this agreement shall attend an orientation program and annual training designated by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility. ** employees shall comply with the published and written policies and procedures of KANSAS and the laws of the State of Kansas.

XV. Normal counts of inmates employed by ** shall be conducted on site and shall not unreasonably interfere with work in progress to the extent possible. In the event that emergency counts are necessary, KANSAS shall make a good faith effort not to unreasonably disrupt work in progress. KANSAS reserves the right to recall some or all inmates employed by ** if necessary to complete such counts.

XVI. In the event of a lockdown of inmates at **** Correctional Facility for any reason, inmates employed at ** shall be permitted to work if it is deemed feasible by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility. Any inmates employed by ** who refuse to report for work at times when ** is working shall be subject to termination. KANSAS reserves the right to search the building leased to **, and all property, fixtures, equipment and vehicles for contraband at any time.

XVII. ** shall be in compliance with all policies and procedures of **** Correctional Facility regarding the control of tools and caustic, toxic and flammable materials. An accurate tool and caustic, toxic and flammable material inventory shall be maintained by ** with the inventory subject to review on request of KANSAS. Any tools or equipment provided by ** shall remain the responsibility and property of ** and shall be removed by ** at the termination to this agreement if so requested by KANSAS.
XVIII. Any property of ** placed on the premises of **** Correctional Facility for the performance of this agreement shall be given the usual care and attention of KANSAS' staff to ensure its safety from loss, damage or other willful mutilation during those hours when ** personnel are absent from the premises. KANSAS shall not be liable for any damages to or loss of such property. Upon discovery of the disappearance of any property, ** shall report the disappearance to KANSAS; thereby avoiding further damage or loss. KANSAS shall release unto ** all of **'s property at the time this agreement is terminated. ** shall provide all equipment necessary for its operations at **** Correctional Facility, shall maintain an inventory of such equipment and shall promptly provide the Warden of **** Correctional Facility a copy of the inventory and any amendments thereto.

XIX. ** shall provide hazard insurance for the structure and its fixtures in which the space leased hereunder is located, covering all damage resulting from the negligent or intentional acts or omissions of **'s employees or guests. Said hazard insurance shall provide for single occurrence and aggregate policy limits acceptable to KANSAS. ** shall furnish a certificate of insurance at the time of execution of this lease and promptly thereafter at the time of each renewal of said hazard insurance policy. KANSAS' responsibility regarding insurance is set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Contractual Provisions Attachment, attached hereto as "Exhibit A".

XX. ** shall provide the Warden of **** Correctional Facility, or designee, notice of changes in work schedules for inmate employees. Both parties recognize that from time to time unscheduled and unanticipated events could necessitate ** to temporarily discontinue work of all or part of the inmate employees work force. It is the intent of this paragraph that ** not be required to maintain inmates on the payroll when there is no work to be performed. It is also intended that there be prior notification of irregular workdays or number of employees so that disruption of normal routine and management of **** Correctional Facility will be at a minimum. ** agrees to work in good faith to keep such unanticipated and unscheduled events to a minimum. ** shall immediately notify the officer or office designated by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility whenever an inmate employee fails to report to or leaves work earlier than scheduled.

XXI. ** shall notify the Warden of **** Correctional Facility of any operational problems pursuant to this contract. If either party believes the other party has violated the terms of this agreement, the party having such belief shall notify the other party, in writing, of the alleged violation. The parties shall then meet and confer on the issue within five (5) days of receipt of the written notice. Both parties agree to make a good faith effort to resolve any problems resulting from this agreement as promptly as possible.

XXII. KANSAS neither assumes nor accepts any liability for the acts or failure to act, professionally or otherwise, of **, its agents or employees. ** shall indemnify, keep, save and hold harmless the Department of Corrections and the State of Kansas, and its officers and employees, from any and all claims, demands, causes of actions,
damages, attorney’s fees, costs or liability arising from, or out of, any allegations or claim of intentional acts or actual negligence on the part of **, its agents or employees.

XXIII. In recognition of the sensitive nature of correctional facilities, ** agrees that in the event that KANSAS, in its discretion, is dissatisfied with any ** employee who is employed, whether fulltime or part time, at **** Correctional Facility, KANSAS may deny access of such employee to **** Correctional Facility. KANSAS shall give written notice to ** of such fact and the reasons therefore, and ** shall promptly remove the individual in question from employment at **** Correctional Facility and shall cover with other appropriate personnel until an approved replacement is found.

XXIV. **, its employees and others acting under its direction or control shall at all times observe and comply with all applicable rules and regulations, Internal Management Policies and Procedures, and General Orders of the Kansas Department of Corrections and **** Correctional Facility, as well as all laws and pertinent regulations of the State of Kansas and United States that are generally applicable, now existing or hereafter adopted, respecting operations and activities in and about property occupied by KANSAS. ** agrees that its personnel will assist KANSAS by reporting violations of inmate rules to KANSAS, writing disciplinary reports of such violations, as appropriate, and testifying in judicial or administrative hearings as requested by KANSAS regarding such violations. From time to time, it may be necessary to subpoena ** employees in judicial or administrative hearings as requested by KANSAS regarding such violations. ** personnel shall adhere to the same standards of personal appearance as are applicable to non-uniformed staff of the Department of Corrections. ** specifically agrees that its employees will comply with KANSAS’ policy regarding sexual harassment and discrimination.

XXV. ** agrees to comply with all applicable Federal, State and local laws, rules, regulations and ordinances; and all provisions required thereby to be included herein, are hereby incorporated by reference. ** agrees to indemnify and hold KANSAS harmless from any loss, damage or liability resulting from the violation of any of such laws, rules, regulations or ordinances.

XXVI. ** may not assign, sell or convey this lease without the prior written permission of KANSAS, which will not be unreasonably withheld. In the event of such assignment, sale or conveyance without proper permission, KANSAS reserves the right to terminate the lease effective upon thirty (30) days written notice.

XXVII. In the event of the sale, purchase, acquisition or transfer of ownership of **, KANSAS reserves the right to terminate the lease effective upon thirty (30) days written notice.

XXVIII. In the event that ** or its assigns file for bankruptcy protection, this lease may be terminated by KANSAS effective upon thirty (30) days written notice.
XXIX. Unless termination pursuant to Paragraphs XXVI—XXVIII occurs, this lease shall terminate five (5) years from the date first entered into.

XXX. This lease shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Kansas, without regard for principles of conflicts of law. The parties shall bring any and all legal proceedings arising hereunder in the State of Kansas, District Court of County. The United States District Court for the State of Kansas sitting in County, Kansas shall be the venue for any Federal action or proceeding arising hereunder in which the State is a party.

XXXI. The parties enter into the agreement in good faith and in the belief that this agreement, and actions pursuant to this agreement, are in accordance with appropriate State or Federal laws and regulations and do not violate the rights of any inmates who are employees of **.

XXXII. This agreement shall only be amended by written addendum executed by ** and KANSAS.

XXXIII. The provisions found in the Contractual Provisions Attachment (Form DA-146a), which is attached hereto as “Exhibit A” are hereby incorporated in this agreement and made part hereof. Should any of the provisions of this contract conflict with any provisions of the Contractual Provisions Attachment, the provisions set forth in the Contractual Provisions Attachment shall control.

XXXIV. Nothing herein or any amendment hereto shall be construed as a waiver of sovereign immunity from suit on the part of the State of Kansas or its agencies, including departments and divisions thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this agreement on the day first above written.

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  **

Secretary of Corrections

Warden, **** Correctional Facility

Director, Kansas Correctional Industries
EXHIBIT A

CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS ATTACHMENT

1. Terms and Conditions: The provisions found in this document are hereby incorporated into the contract to which it is attached and made a part thereof, said contract being the __ day of __________, __________.

2. Agreement With Kansas Law: All contractual agreements shall be subject to, governed by, and construed according to the laws of the State of Kansas.

3. Termination for Cause: If, in the judgment of the Director of Kansas and KDFW, the provisions of this agreement are not being performed in a timely manner, or if the provisions of this agreement are not being performed in a manner consistent with the stated purpose of this agreement, said contract shall be terminated for cause, and any payments made under this agreement shall be rescinded.

4. Disclaimer of Liability: Neither the State of Kansas nor any agency thereof shall be held harmless or indemnified by any contractor for any loss or damage incurred by the contractor while performing services under this agreement.

5. Anti-Discrimination Clauses: The contractor agrees to comply with all applicable laws, including but not limited to, the Kansas Civil Rights Act (K.S.A. 44-1001 et seq.), the Kansas Domestic Violence Protection Act (K.S.A. 58-2601 et seq.), and the Kansas Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (K.S.A. 44-1111 et seq.). The contractor shall not discriminate against any person because of race, national origin, sex or age.

6. Acceptance of Contract: This contract shall be considered accepted by written acknowledgment of the contractor.

7. Amendments and Extensions: Any amendments or extensions to this contract shall be in writing and signed by both parties.

8. Responsibility for Taxes: The State of Kansas shall not be responsible for, nor indemnify a contractor for, any Federal, State, or local taxes which may be imposed or levied upon the subject matter of this contract.

9. Insurance: The contractor shall maintain adequate insurance coverage for any loss or damage to any personal property to which this contract relates, in an amount satisfactory to the State of Kansas.

10. Information: No provision of this contract shall be construed as limiting the Legislative Division of Post Audit from having access to information pursuant to K.S.A. 44-1131 et seq.
DRAFT
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
AND
**
FOR NON-PRISON BASED INMATE EMPLOYMENT

This Agreement, entered into on this ___ day of ______, 20___ by and between the Department of Corrections on behalf of the **** Correctional Facility, a correctional facility of the Kansas Department of Corrections, hereinafter referred to as KANSAS, and **, a private sector business, hereinafter referred to as **.

WHEREAS, ** desires to employ inmates from the **** Correctional Facility in the conduct of their business; and,

WHEREAS, KANSAS believes that such employment would be consistent with the proper training and rehabilitation of inmates; and,

WHEREAS, the parties desire to enter into an Agreement whereby ** may employ inmates housed at the **** Correctional Facility for the operation of a non-prison based business and to employ inmates in that endeavor on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth; and,

WHEREAS, it is the intent of both parties that the operations pursuant to this Agreement not unreasonably disrupt the normal routine and management of **** Correctional Facility:

NOW, THEREFORE, IN CONSIDERATION OF THE PREMISES, the parties hereto agree as follows:

I. ** agrees to hire a minimum of _____ inmates and a maximum of _____ inmates of the **** Correctional Facility. Increases or decreases in either the minimum or maximum number of inmates employed by ** shall be subject to mutual agreement of the parties in an addendum to this Agreement.

II. ** agrees that performance of this Agreement shall not displace any civilian employees of the private company.

III. Inmates employed by ** may be terminated at any time in the sole discretion of ** except that, KANSAS may terminate an inmate employee at any time if necessary for security, custody or classification consideration.

IV. ** agrees to provide Workers Compensation coverage for the inmate employees as
provided in the Workers Compensation laws of the State of Kansas. For minor
injuries to inmate employees, ** Correctional Facility medical facilities shall be
used at no charge to **. If, in the discretion of medical personnel at said facility,
any injury requires referral to a hospital or doctor, **’s Workers Compensation shall
be charged. Any injury of an inmate at work will be immediately reported by ** to
the ** Correctional Facility staff.

V. Other company benefits may be offered to inmate employees but are not required by
this Agreement.

VI. ** shall pay wages to inmate employees of at least Federal minimum wage. ** shall
deduct Federal, State and FICA/Medicare taxes from inmate payroll checks. **
shall make only those voluntary deductions from inmate employees’ payroll checks
that are approved in writing by the Warden of ** Correctional Facility. ** agrees
to send inmate employee paychecks to the Centralized Banking Unit at the Lansing
Correctional Facility via Direct Deposit. KANSAS shall then deduct from said
wages such amounts as required by KANSAS policy (IMPP 04-109), including
victims compensation, room and board, court ordered restitution and mandatory
savings. The balance shall be credited to the account of the inmate. In the event
inmates work more than 40 hours per week, ** shall pay them overtime.

VII. ** shall provide transportation for the inmate employees from the ** Correctional
Facility to the work site and from the work site back to the facility. ** may charge
inmate employees for transportation from the facility to the work site and from the
work site back to the facility at a rate equivalent to the lesser of the private car
mileage rate established by the Secretary of Administration or one hour of pay per
day at the inmate employees hourly rate of pay. Any transportation charge shall be
paid via direct payroll deduction by **. Inmate transportation shall follow a strict
“no concealed carry” policy.

VIII. ** shall implement a policy which prohibits the concealed carry of firearms within
**’s buildings and in connection with the transportation of inmates. ** shall post no
concealed carry signs on each of its buildings, in such a manner as to comply with
the law.

IX. All supervisory civilian personnel employed by ** pursuant to this Agreement shall
attend an orientation program and annual training designated by the Warden of **
Correctional Facility. ** employees shall promptly notify ** Correctional
Facility staff of any security problems that come to their attention. All personnel of
** shall comply with the published and written policies and procedures of KANSAS
and the laws of the State of Kansas in connection with their supervision of inmate
employees.

X. **, its employees and others acting under its direction or control shall at all times
observe and comply with all applicable rules and regulations, Internal Management
Policies and Procedures and General Orders of the Kansas Department of
Corrections and **** Correctional Facility, as well as, all laws and pertinent regulations of the State of Kansas and the United States that are generally applicable, now existing or hereafter adopted. ** agrees that its personnel will assist KANSAS by reporting violations of inmate rules to KANSAS, writing disciplinary reports regarding such violations as appropriate and testifying in judicial or administrative hearings as requested by KANSAS regarding such violations.

XI. In the event that emergency counts are necessary, KANSAS shall make a good faith effort not to disrupt work in progress. KANSAS reserves the right to recall some or all inmates employed by ** if necessary to complete such counts.

XII. In the event that ** discovers that one or more of their inmate employees are missing from work after they have been transported to the worksite, ** shall immediately contact a designated staff member at the **** Correctional Facility to report the absence.

XIII. In the event of a lockdown of inmates at the **** Correctional Facility for any reason, inmate employees at ** shall be permitted to work if it is deemed feasible by the Warden of **** Correctional Facility. If they are included in the lockdown, KANSAS shall make a good faith effort to return inmates employed by ** to work as soon as possible.

XIV. Inmates employed by ** shall be allowed to work the regularly scheduled hours for other employees. The normal workweek shall be five days (40 hours) but may be changed upon mutual agreement of ** and the Warden of **** Correctional Facility. KANSAS shall provide a sack lunch for the inmate employees to take with them to the work site. KANSAS recommends that ** provide their inmate employees a one-half hour lunch period.

XV. ** shall notify the Warden of **** Correctional Facility of any operational problems pursuant to this contract. If either party believes the other party has violated the terms of this Agreement, the party having such belief shall notify the other party, in writing, of the alleged violation. The parties shall then meet and confer on the issue within five (5) days of receipt of written notice. Both parties agree to make a good faith effort to resolve any problems resulting from this Agreement as promptly as possible.

XVI. KANSAS neither assumes nor accepts any liability for the acts or failure to act, professionally or otherwise, of **’s employees. ** shall indemnify, keep, save and hold harmless the Department of Corrections and the State of Kansas, and its officers and employees, from any and all claims, demands, causes of actions, damages, or liability arising from, or out of, any allegation or claim of intentional acts or actual negligence on the part of **’s employees. KANSAS shall indemnify, keep, save and hold harmless ** [to the extent allowed under the Kansas Tort Claims Act (K.S.A. 75-6101 et seq.)] and its officers and employees from any and all claims, demands, causes of actions, damages, or liability arising from, or out of,
any allegation or claim of intentional acts or actual negligence on the part of KANSAS’s employees.

XVII. ** agrees to comply with all applicable Federal, State and local laws, rules, regulations and ordinances; and all provisions required thereby to be included herein, are hereby incorporated by reference. ** agrees to indemnify and hold KANSAS harmless from any loss, damage or liability resulting from the violation on part of ** of such laws, rules, regulations or ordinances.

XVIII. Either party may terminate this Agreement by giving 120 days notice of termination to the other party in writing. Unless termination pursuant to this paragraph occurs, this Agreement shall terminate five (5) years from the date first entered into.

XIX. This Agreement shall be governed by and constructed in accordance with the laws of the State of Kansas, without regard for principles of conflicts of law. The parties shall bring any and all legal proceedings arising hereunder in the State of Kansas, District Court of __________ County. The United States District Court for the State of Kansas sitting in __________ County, Kansas shall be the venue for any Federal action or proceedings arising hereunder in which the State is a party.

XX. The parties enter into the Agreement in good faith and in the belief that this Agreement, and actions pursuant to this Agreement, are in accordance with appropriate State or Federal laws and regulations and do not violate the rights of any inmates who are employees of **.

XXI. The parties do not enter into this Agreement for the benefit of any persons other than the parties to this Agreement. The parties do not intend that any person other than the State of Kansas be or become third party beneficiary to this contract and lease.

XXII. This Agreement may only be amended by written addendum executed by ** and KANSAS.

XXIII. The provisions found in the Contractual Provision Attachment (Form DA-146a), which is attached hereto as “Exhibit A”, are hereby incorporated in this Agreement and made part hereof. Should any of the provisions of this contract conflict with any provision of the Contractual Provisions Attachment, the provisions set forth in the Contractual Provisions Attachment shall control.

XXIV. Nothing herein or any amendment hereto shall be construed as a waiver of sovereign immunity from suit on the part of the State of Kansas or its agencies, including departments and divisions thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement on the day first above written.
KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Secretary of Corrections

Warden, **** Correctional Facility

Director, Kansas Correctional Industries