

EBDM Decision Point: State Reentry Planning

Why this Decision Point is Important:

- This decision point provides an opportunity to improve an offender's success in the community, thereby reducing recidivism, which will also reduce future incarceration costs and increase public safety.
- This decision point offers an opportunity to ensure access to health care and supportive services, and provide more humane wraparound services for the mentally ill.
- Successful transition of inmates into the community promotes increased public confidence and trust in the criminal justice system.

What Should Happen at this Decision Point:

1. Sufficient time is provided for release/reentry planning to be well-designed.
2. Social workers understand the barriers to successful release (licensing, housing, medications, programming, employment, etc.).
3. Social worker caseloads are manageable, and other institution staff is also involved in reentry planning.
4. Employers are incentivized to hire ex-offenders and landlords are incentivized to allow ex-offenders to live in their properties (through a state tax credit, etc.).
5. Sufficient resources are available to connect ex-offenders to educational systems (universities, technical colleges, trade schools, etc.).
6. Inmates are incentivized to participate in pre-release curriculum and pre-release planning.
7. The reentry planning process is evaluated to ensure that it is evidence-based.
8. Sufficient housing and placement opportunities are available for sex offenders reentering the community.
9. Adequate vocational training is available for offenders and is prioritized to meet the employment needs of high demand fields.

Selected Research:

- The Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiatives (SVORI) [a comprehensive program designed to prepare high risk offenders for successful community reintegration through both institutional and community-based programming] successfully reduced likelihood of recidivism in contrast to traditional parole services and supervision. *Primary Citation:* Bouffard & Bergeron (2006)
- Well-designed and implemented reentry programs (such as Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan (MCORP) which underscores a collaborative relationship between institutional caseworkers and community supervision agents) can effectively reduce recidivism rates and yield a positive return on investment. *Primary Citation:* Duwe (2014)
- Particularly in the absence of community supervision, reentry programs (such as Project Re-Connect in St. Louis, MO) that address multiple service needs and link offenders to important services (e.g., housing, education, transportation) play a crucial role in the successful reintegration of offenders. *Primary Citation:* Wikoff, Linhorst, & Morani (2012)
- Participation and immersion in the Preventing Parolee Crime Program (PPCP) – a multimodal treatment protocol – was consistently associated with lower rates of reincarceration and absconding compared with traditional parole. *Primary Citation:* Zhang, Roberts, & Callanan (2006)
- Reentry programs showing the most promise in reducing recidivism rates include vocational/work programs, drug rehabilitation programs, halfway house programs, and pre-release programs. *Primary Citation:* Seiter & Kadela (2003)
- Halfway house interventions with supervision geared to level of risk/need can be effective with higher risk offenders. *Primary Citation:* Andrews & Janes (2006)
- In general, there is support for the effectiveness of halfway house programs in reducing recidivism rates. However, one should be mindful of reserving these services primarily for moderate to high risk offenders. *Primary Citations:* Hamilton & Campbell (2014); Latessa, Lovins, & Smith (2010)

Resources:

Further resources on the topic

