

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA**  
**Department of Corrections**  
**Office of Planning, Research, Statistics and Grants**  
Phone: (717) 731-7149

September 30, 2003

**SUBJECT:**    *Research in Review*

**TO:**           Executive Staff  
                  Superintendents/Boot Camp Commander  
                  Other Readers



**FROM:**       Gary Zajac, Ph.D.  
                  Research and Evaluation Manager



Kristofer Bret Bucklen  
Research and Evaluation Analyst

Enclosed please find Volume 6, Number 3 of *Research in Review*. This issue of RIR continues with the series of special pieces authored by the Department's research partners, summarizing evaluation projects that they have conducted within the Department. The intent of this series is to take RIR beyond simply reporting on research that has been done in other jurisdictions and provide you with information and insight derived from the Department's own active evaluation agenda.

This issue of RIR focuses upon the process evaluation of the Department's Community Orientation Reintegration (COR) program, which was conducted last year in cooperation with a team of researchers from the Washington, DC-based Urban Institute. The COR program was conceived in 2001 at the direction of Corrections Secretary Dr. Jeffrey A. Beard in response to increasing interest in the reentry preparation given to the growing numbers of ex-offenders returning to Pennsylvania's communities. COR was designed as a "refresher" for the programming inmates had received during their incarceration and focused upon the last several weeks prior to release, as well as the first several weeks following release. The Department partnered with the Urban Institute during the first nine months of the COR program to evaluate the design and initial implementation of COR. This study provided valuable insight into how the program was functioning, and offered the Department the opportunity to make needed changes in the early phases of the program's operations.

As a companion to this evaluation report, we also present a review of a recent book by Professor Joan Petersilia of the University of California at Irvine, *When Prisoners Come Home*. Professor Petersilia is a recognized authority on the topic of inmate reentry and her latest book places this complex issue into a national context. With over 500,000 annual prison releases nationwide, the question of how best to prepare offenders for community reintegration is clearly one of the most pressing challenges in the criminal justice arena.

We welcome your feedback on RIR. It is our hope that this series of RIR issues will not only demonstrate the contributions that Pennsylvania is making to the national literature on offender rehabilitation and reentry, but will also demonstrate how knowledge gained from evaluation is incorporated into a policy and program planning process. Upcoming issues of RIR will feature discussions of other departmental evaluation projects, as well as article reviews and other pieces.

Thank you for your continued interest in *Research in Review*.

# Research in Review

Office of Planning, Research, Statistics and Grants

Editors: Gary Zajac and Kristofer Bret Bucklen (717) 731-7149

## Special Focus on *Pennsylvania DOC Evaluation Agenda*

Volume 6, Number 3 of *Research in Review* continues our focus on research and evaluation projects conducted within the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections. This issue is the third in a series of RIR issues intended to highlight contributions made by our own department to the national literature on effective correctional programs. As many readers of RIR know, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections maintains an active agenda for evaluating its inmate treatment programs. We have employed an effective evaluation model over the past six years, where we internally determine our needs for evaluation, identify an outside evaluator (typically university-based) to conduct the evaluation on our behalf, and work with that evaluator to leverage third party funding to support the work. Common funders have been the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD). With this model, we get the evaluation we need, without having to do it ourselves, and without having to pay for it. This model promotes the creation of high quality, objective information on program performance. Channeling third party funding directly to the evaluator promotes the independence and integrity of the evaluation. Information about the Department's evaluation agenda can be found on the Pennsylvania Department of Correction's website at <http://www.cor.state.pa.us/Evaluating%20Programs%20&%20Issues.pdf>.

The first feature in this issue of RIR is a summary of a process evaluation of Pennsylvania's Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR) program. The COR program is the Department's comprehensive reentry program intended to smooth the reintegration transition for released inmates by reinforcing critical skills and knowledge acquired in prison. The evaluation of COR was conducted by a team of researchers at the Urban Institute. The summary of the COR evaluation included in this issue of RIR was taken from the final COR evaluation report by the two principal researchers, Nancy La Vigne and Sarah Lawrence. This summary identifies strengths of the COR program and specific recommendations for improvement. Following this summary is the Department's response about how this evaluation has been used to improve COR.

The second feature in this issue of RIR is a review of a recently released book by Dr. Joan Petersilia entitled *When Prisoners Come Home*. In her book, Dr. Petersilia provides an overview of prisoner reentry in the United States and offers 12 concrete policy suggestions for reforming parole and enhancing prisoner reintegration. The review of Dr. Petersilia's book featured in this issue of RIR was authored by Bret Bucklen, the co-editor of RIR.

Upcoming issues of RIR will feature summaries of evaluations of other DOC programs, including the RSAT program, educational/vocational, and other program areas, along with Department responses to each evaluation. We will also continue to feature article/book reviews and special briefing papers. We at RIR hope that you find these reports to be informative, practical and relevant to your work in corrections.

## A PROCESS EVALUATION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA COMMUNITY ORIENTATION AND REINTEGRATION (COR) PROGRAM

by

Nancy G. La Vigne, Ph.D. and Sarah Lawrence  
The Urban Institute

In December 2001, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (DOC) began a pilot test of a comprehensive reentry program called Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR). COR is not designed as a treatment program, but rather as a “booster shot” intended to reinforce skills and knowledge already learned in prison. COR’s two broad goals are to smooth the reintegration transition for released inmates and ultimately to reduce recidivism. More specific goals of COR are:

- To establish a standard, coordinated release program based on known risk factors, needs, and best practices;
- To promote effective community linkages for released inmates;
- To enhance employability and job readiness of released inmates; and
- To promote healthy family and interpersonal relationships for released inmates.

The COR program is divided into two phases. Phase I is a two-week component that occurs approximately one month prior to an inmate’s release from a State Correctional Institution (SCI). Phase I focuses primarily on refreshing skills and reviewing information that inmates presumably learned through prior in-prison programming. Phase II is a four-week component intended to help facilitate the return of the soon-to-be-released inmate to his or her family, as well as to help with his or her reintegration into the community. Phase II focuses primarily on the practical application of recently refreshed skills by establishing positive linkages within the community and with family, and by securing employment to provide financial security upon release from prison. A community service requirement was also built into Phase II.

In March 2002, the DOC and the Urban Institute (UI) began a process evaluation of COR. The purpose of the process evaluation was three-fold: (1) to research “best practices” on reentry programming across the country; (2) to assess the needs of soon-to-be released Pennsylvania inmates and determine whether the COR curriculum matches those needs; and (3) to evaluate the extent to which the COR program is consistent with its original goals and objectives. UI research staff have prepared three products associated with this process evaluation. The first is a report entitled *COR Process Evaluation: Programming for Successful Community Re-integration*, which reviews the evaluation literature on reentry programs and related efforts across the country; presents a logic model of the COR program; and assesses the extent to which the COR curriculum is consistent with promising reentry practices identified in the literature. The second product is a report entitled *In Their Own Words: Staff and Inmate Experiences with Pennsylvania’s Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR) Program*. This report describes and interprets a series of focus groups on COR that UI conducted with staff and inmates at DOC SCI’s and Community Corrections Centers (CCC’s). These focus groups, including 92 individuals (staff and inmates) from 20 SCI’s and six

CCC's, were conducted to elicit first-hand impressions of the COR program and the way it has been implemented, as well as suggestions on improvement of the COR program.

The final product of UI's process evaluation, *Process Evaluation of the Pennsylvania Community Orientation Reintegration (COR) Program: Final Report*, draws from four data collection and analysis efforts, three of which served as the basis for the previous two reports. The fourth and final component of this process evaluation was a survey administered to Phase I and Phase II participants in SCI's and CCC's across the State of Pennsylvania. The survey captured the needs and views of 336 soon-to-be-released inmates participating in COR Phase I (response rate of 74 percent), as well as 125 released inmates participating in Phase II (response rate of 83 percent).

COR participants represented a range of ethnic, racial, social, and educational backgrounds. The typical participant is a 33 year old African-American male, is the parent of at least one child, holds a Graduate Equivalency Diploma (GED), and has had prior involvement with the criminal justice system. Many COR participants have extensive criminal histories, and the majority reported drug use in the six months before entering prison. COR participants had high expectations for their lives after release and were extremely optimistic about their ability to find and keep jobs, obtain financial support from family, reunite with family members, and stay out of prison. For example, twenty-seven percent of the Phase II participants in this study indicated that they already had a job (recall that these were very recently released inmates). Generally, they expected to need some, but not a lot, of help with certain elements of reintegration, such as finding a job (e.g. explaining their incarceration to prospective employers), receiving financial assistance, and obtaining health care. The areas that participants expected to be more challenging post-release included paying off debt and making child support payments. With regard to other post-release needs and challenges, COR participants were not concerned about finding housing (60 percent expected to live with family) nor with obtaining adequate health care and photo identification (80 percent already had an ID). Some COR staff, however, believed that educating COR participants about health care and referring them to health services in the community was a gap in the COR program.

UI research staff assessed the types of in-prison programs COR participants had taken part in before entering COR, as well as the subjects they were exposed to in the COR program. The results revealed that the majority of COR participants were exposed to most of the material in the COR curriculum, and that COR was indeed a refresher of subject matter provided to inmates in earlier in-prison programming. Consistency in program delivery appears to be lower for Phase II than for Phase I, with 50 percent or fewer of participants reporting that their instructors had covered several elements of the Phase II curriculum.

COR participants generally believed that the program would be helpful to them (although survey responses were more favorable than focus group results), and Phase I was viewed more favorably than Phase II. Participants also rated most of the individual COR lessons highly, especially the employability sections in Phase I. COR staff rated this section highly as well, although it is important to note that most of the COR Phase I employability material was new to inmates, rather than being a refresher. The level of difficulty, quality of materials, and quality of instructors were

also rated highly by COR participants. However, program delivery appeared to vary significantly across facilities. This may be a manifestation of the tension inherent in a program that was designed to be both standardized and responsive to individual inmates' needs. Survey findings and focus groups revealed an issue of poor communication and coordination between the COR phases, with inmates and staff alike expressing frustration regarding mis-information about what each phase was doing. This became problematic for inmates, whose expectations for Phase II of COR were often different from their actual experiences, and engendered negative attitudes toward the program among those participants.

The COR program is an ambitious initiative to comprehensively address prisoner reentry, and its overall design and content are consistent with the literature on promising practices. The process evaluation has demonstrated the creativity and dedication of the DOC in its design and implementation of what may very well be an effective reentry program. COR's strengths include the following:

- The employability segments in both phases, particularly the week-long employability segment in Phase I, which received high reviews from both inmates and staff.
- The consistency of program delivery for Phase I of COR, which is generally high.
- The community contacts made through COR, including: obtaining personal identification; applying for Social Security and welfare; getting mental health services referrals; identifying housing resources; and making employment contacts.
- The family reunification modules in both phases, which address the importance of managing expectations regarding family support and discuss the challenges of renewing relationships with partners and children.
- The Anger Management and Life Skills modules of COR, which teach coping strategies dealing with anger, and specific skills necessary to maintain healthy relationships with peers, family, and others in the community.

Recommendations for improvement include the following:

- Reconsider the community service requirement, which may be taking away valuable time from job search efforts.
- Allow Phase II inmates more flexibility to leave the CCC premises to conduct job searches and make other important community linkages.
- Improve the mentoring component of COR by assuring that all participants are assigned mentors.
- Provide referral or placement assistance for inmates interested in enrolling in educational and vocational training programs after their release.
- Add a health segment to COR and provide referral services for inmates in need of physical and mental health care after their release.
- Provide more opportunities for family visitation during Phase II of COR.
- Consider adding family counseling sessions to the family reunification module in Phase II.

- Provide more staff training and more communication from DOC administrators to enhance coordination and standardization of program delivery and encourage buy-in by line staff.
- Conduct a thorough needs assessment of each inmate prior to release to determine who would benefit most from COR.
- Conduct an impact evaluation of COR to determine the extent to which it is enhancing the reintegration of inmates and reducing recidivism.

**THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS RESPONSE:  
PREPARING OFFENDERS FOR REENTRY**

The COR program was initially conceived in early 2001 at the direction of Corrections Secretary Dr. Jeffrey A. Beard, with the goal of better preparing inmates for return to the community. Given that the Department releases over 10,000 inmates annually, upwards of one-quarter of our typical population, the significance of inmate reentry for the Department and for Pennsylvania's communities is self-evident. Inmates' successful return to jobs, family and society translates directly into increased public safety and reduced costs to the Commonwealth.

COR Phase I began in the State Correctional Institutions in December of 2001, with the Community Corrections Center-based Phase II commencing for inmates in the following month. The first nine months of COR (through August 2002) represented a pilot testing phase, wherein approximately one-half of inmates scheduled for pre-release and parole were randomly selected to participate in COR (see the discussion of a COR outcome evaluation at the end of this section). Full participation for all inmates being released from the Department was slated to begin in September of 2002. The first nine months of COR afforded the Department the opportunity to study the design and implementation of the program and to make any necessary modifications before it became a full coverage intervention.

This also required that an evaluation be arranged, conducted and completed in what is a very short time frame for this sort of work. The Department found a willing and capable research partner in the Urban Institute (UI). Urban Institute scholars had initially met with Department officials in 2001 while COR was in its design phase, offering feedback and advice on the program model. Full-scale evaluation of the activated program began in early 2002, with the final report and recommendations being submitted in the summer.

As with other Department evaluation reports discussed in previous issues of RIR, not all recommendations could find their way into the final COR program design. Many did contribute, though, to molding COR into the program in operation today.

One of the primary areas focused upon by the report was COR Phase II, which is delivered after the inmate is released to a Community Corrections Center. In some respects, delivering services in the community presents challenges not found within an institution, where programs have a "captive

audience”. Once released (either to a center or directly to the street), inmates face a variety of forces competing for their attention, including job search, family reunification, ongoing treatment, reestablishing social ties, etc. Acknowledging this, the Department has modified some aspects of COR Phase II, guided by the findings and recommendations noted above. First, the community service requirement was reworked so as not to compete with finding and working a job. Employment is known to be a key factor in the reintegration process. Job search is now the first priority for the ex-offender participating in Phase II. To the extent that an offender is unable or unwilling to engage in an active search for employment, community service assumes a larger role for that individual.

During the pilot period of COR, offenders entering Phase II were essentially restricted to the center premises for up to a month after arrival. The evaluation concluded that this practice significantly hindered their job readiness efforts. Accordingly, offenders in Phase II are now granted much more flexibility to leave the center to search for and work a job, as well as to pursue education and other social services. Educational and vocational guidance and support are also offered where appropriate. The Department acknowledges that this is much more in the spirit of community reintegration.

Phase II also now serves as an incubator for family reunification efforts. Residents in Phase II are now afforded greater opportunities to meet with family members and children, and to receive guidance on family relations from center staff and counselors. Referrals for family counseling and support services are also made where needed.

The mentoring component of Phase II was also strengthened. There was a problem during the first year of COR with finding enough qualified mentors for all offenders in need of one. In response, the Department enhanced its efforts at organizational outreach and networking, tapping into church groups and civic/community organizations. The resource pool of available mentors is greatly increasing, with upwards of 1,000 actively involved with offenders in need of them. These mentors are also becoming more closely involved with the activities of COR Phase II in the centers, and their roles are becoming more clearly defined and codified.

Another important aspect of COR program development has involved revisiting the notion that all inmates need to receive all aspects of COR. As has been the case with most of our other program evaluation reports, the Urban Institute evaluation suggested that we implement more rigorous methods for assessing the individual needs of inmates entering COR, to determine who can benefit the most from it. The previous two issues of RIR have noted the Department’s ongoing efforts to implement more standardized assessments of inmate risk and needs, which inform the development of individual treatment plans. The Department is also routinizing the transfer of information between COR Phase I and Phase II staff about what individual treatment needs may remain outstanding upon arrival at a center.

Beyond this, the Department is also moving away from the idea that *all* released inmates should be sent to a center, or should receive Phase II. Lower risk/need inmates may be ready for community readjustment without participating in Phase II. The Department’s assessment initiatives will contribute to our efforts to measure individual needs that can be met by Phase II.

As noted above, the Urban Institute report also suggested some changes to Phase I of COR. In response, the Department has added a standardized health and wellness module to the classroom-based curriculum of Phase I, to address the healthcare needs that many inmates will face upon release. Training for staff who deliver COR has also been increased, and a working group will be convened to periodically review and improve COR service delivery. Efforts are also being made to more effectively communicate COR's goals, methods and program developments to all institutional staff, promoting a consistent message about the program.

Finally, the Urban Institute report recommended that the Department undertake a formal outcome evaluation of COR, to explore the impact that the program has upon offender success in the community. The Department has begun this month such an outcome evaluation, in partnership with Dr. Linda Smith and the Correctional Education Association (CEA). CEA and Dr. Smith are also working on a comprehensive evaluation of the Department's education and vocational programs, which will be featured in future issues of RIR. Dr. Smith's COR outcome evaluation (like the education evaluation) is funded by a grant from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. This study will track key outcomes, such as recidivism and employment, for inmates who were randomly assigned to COR and to a control group during the nine month COR pilot test. A report is anticipated in early 2005.

### **BOOK REVIEW: *WHEN PRISONERS COME HOME***

Petersilia, Joan. (2003). New York: Oxford University Press.

In this new work, Dr. Petersilia, Professor of Criminology at the University of California – Irvine and past president of the American Society of Criminology, expounds upon the emerging importance of prisoner reentry to crime and the community. She reports that in 2003, well over half a million offenders will leave prison and return to society, dwarfing the number of returning offenders during any previous time in American history. These returning offenders are largely uneducated, unskilled, often without family support, and have the stigma of a prison record hanging over them. Many will not receive the transitional support necessary to survive in the community. Not surprisingly, a large majority of released offenders will return to prison, where the cycle begins again. Dr. Petersilia's book provides a background and overview of the current prisoner reentry climate in America and twelve specific recommendations for reforming current reentry practices.

Chapter one provides an introduction and overview of the book for readers who are in a hurry, including an explanation of the troubling state of affairs in prisoner reentry, strategies that are being used to address the problems associated with prisoner reentry, and specific recommendations for system reform.

Chapter two, entitled "Who's Coming Home", provides a profile of returning prisoners, including demographic data on their race, gender, criminal history, literacy and education, physical and mental illness, marital and parenting relationships, and substance abuse problems. The average inmate coming home today will have served a longer prison sentence than in the past, will be more



disconnected from family and friends, will have a higher prevalence of substance abuse and mental illness, and will be less educated and employable than those in prior prison release cohorts. While each of these factors is known to predict recidivism, Dr. Petersilia points out that few of these needs are addressed while the inmate is in prison or on parole. Prisoners are also disproportionately returning to a relatively small cluster of urban communities. These trends will have a profound impact on the cohesion and future stability of these communities.

Chapter three, entitled “The Origins and Evolution of Modern Parole”, discusses the early evolution of parole in the United States and its use in modern sentencing practices. Dr. Petersilia points out that parole has experienced dramatic changes in the past 25 years. Previously, more than 95% of U.S. prisoners were released from prison through discretionary parole. At the end of 2002, the proportion of prisoners released through discretionary parole has dropped to less than 25%. The majority of inmates (59%) are now released unconditionally, without appearing before a parole board. Proponents of abolishing the discretionary parole release mechanism had hoped that such a change would make sentencing more consistent across presumably similar cases and lengthen the time that inmates served in prison. The shift has led to more consistency in sentencing but has not led to longer sentences. While the overall average time served by U.S. prisoners has increased, recent research has demonstrated that offenders who are released discretionarily serve longer prison terms than those given mandatory release, even when controlling for a number of other factors (i.e., offense type, age, gender, and prior record). Perhaps more importantly, recent research suggests that inmates who max out have higher failure rates than those who are released with parole requirements. Dr. Petersilia recommends that discretionary parole release be widely reinstated and guided by objective risk prediction instruments and parole guidelines.

Chapter four, entitled “The Changing Nature of Parole Supervision and Services”, distinguishes parole supervision from parole release and describes its current practice in the United States. Parole supervision is quite different today than prior to the 1980s. Parole caseloads have risen while resources have declined. Today’s parole officers are often armed with weapons and serve more of a policing function. Parolees are responsible for adhering to a number of conditions and the parole system has become increasingly intolerant of failures to adhere to these conditions. The new mission of parole supervision is surveillance, not services. Dr. Petersilia states that “this situation will not change until parole shows that it can deliver services that work, and programs will not have an opportunity to work without sufficient funding and research”. Dr. Petersilia also holds that it is crucial to bring a greater balance to the handling of parole populations by singling out those offenders who present different levels of public safety risks and different prospects for rehabilitation.

Chapter five, entitled “How We Help”, documents the decline of inmate participation in prison work, treatment, and education programs, in spite of the growing amount of research documenting programs that work. The research indicates that certain program models can reduce recidivism and subsequent justice system costs. Dr. Petersilia states that in times of budgetary constraints, it is not easy or inexpensive to invest in treatment and reentry programs but it is possible - “It requires political leaders who are willing to think differently about prisons and their role in prisoner reentry”. Chapter six, entitled “How We Hinder”, discusses the growing number of citizens who have criminal

records and the ways in which those records are increasingly being openly shared with the public. The chapter also reviews the evidence on how a criminal record affects an offender's right to vote and ability to qualify for public assistance, find work, or retain parental rights. As a result of minority over-representation in all categories of criminal justice populations, these legal restrictions have taken an especially heavy toll on minority communities. While many of these restrictions serve an important public safety function (e.g., not allowing ex-convicts to work with vulnerable populations), they also hinder successful reintegration to the community in many cases. Dr. Petersilia suggests that such policies need review and that a finer balance must be reached between protecting the community and fostering successful offender reintegration. Dr. Petersilia believes that research will demonstrate that many of these policies are crime enhancing rather than crime reducing over the long run.

Chapter seven, entitled "Revolving Door Justice", presents data on the number of parolees recidivating as well as data on the contribution that parolees make to the overall level of crime in a community. This chapter also identifies the factors that are significant predictors of recidivism. Dr. Petersilia points out that now more than two-thirds of those released from prison will be rearrested and nearly half will be returned to jail or prison for a new crime or technical violation. The latest estimate is that ex-convicts account for about 5% of all serious crime arrests. The evidence also shows that the first year after release from prison is the period when most recidivism occurs. These results have important policy implications. They suggest that we need to invest in proven treatment and work programs that are cost beneficial in the long run. Also, the most intensive services and surveillance should begin immediately upon release and be front-loaded in the first six months to the first year. Since there is a miniscule risk that an offender who has remained arrest-free for five years will return to crime, then we must question what social or utilitarian purpose is served by further restricting that offender's liberty. As a result of an abundance of research on criminogenic risk factors (e.g., criminal history, antisocial personality, association with criminals, etc.), objective recidivism prediction instruments can now predict recidivism with about 70% accuracy. Dr. Petersilia points out that, ironically, as our scientific ability to identify criminogenic risk factors has evolved, resources to implement programs to address these risk factors have decreased. Dr. Petersilia reiterates the need for parole agencies to use formal risk prediction instruments to guide parole decision making.

Chapter eight, entitled "The Victim's Role in Prisoner Reentry", focuses on the potential roles that victims might play in managing successful prisoner reentry. In virtually all of the recent discussions on offender reentry, victim needs have remained largely ignored. Dr. Petersilia believes that victims have a vital role to play in managing the offender's return to prison. In nearly every state, victims now have a right to provide input at parole hearings and to be notified of inmate release dates. However, fewer than half of parole hearings have victim notification requests and victims attend only one-fourth of parole hearings. Dr. Petersilia suggests that victims should be consulted not only about the inmate's suitability for parole but also about the specific conditions of parole. These special conditions may increase victim safety and perhaps reduce offender recidivism. Finally, Dr. Petersilia suggests that involving victims more integrally in prisoner reentry is critical, since the political support of victims and victim advocates are crucial to implementing many of the proposed

system reforms discussed in this book.

Chapter nine, entitled “What to Do”, offers 12 concrete policy suggestions for reforming parole and enhancing prisoner reintegration. Dr. Petersilia’s 12 recommendations are as follows:

1. **Embrace the mission of prisoner reintegration.** Prisoner reintegration should be embraced at all levels, from prison administrators to line level staff.
2. **Implement in-prison treatment, work, and education programs that are found to be effective.** Effective programs include academic skills training, vocational skills training , cognitive skills programs, and drug abuse treatment (i.e., therapeutic communities (TCs) and TCs with aftercare but not outpatient counseling).
3. **Encourage inmate responsibility in prison through parallel-universe concepts.** The parallel-universe concept is premised on the notions that life inside prison should resemble pro-social lifestyle patterns outside prison as much as possible and that top priority must be given to assisting inmates to acquire values, habits, and skills that will help them be law-abiding citizens. Parallel-universe programs may include such components as requiring offenders to manage their account balance, renew medicine prescriptions, work or attend school, regularly do laundry and routinely clean their cell.
4. **Institute comprehensive prerelease planning for inmates.**
5. **Reinstitute risk-based discretionary parole release.**
6. **Encourage victims to submit statements requesting notification of inmates’ release and special parole conditions.**
7. **Support greater monitoring of high-risk, violent parolees (e.g., surveillance technology).**
8. **Provide treatment and work training to motivated parolees after prison.**
9. **Incorporate neighborhood parole supervision with the aim of strengthening parole’s linkages with law enforcement and the community.** Neighborhood parole supervision moves away from a caseload management approach towards a more activist supervision approach, where parole agents are a visible presence in the community.
10. **Establish and test reentry courts and community partnerships.** Dr. Petersilia describes four models of collaboration. The first model is reentry partnerships (e.g., the Department of Justices’ Reentry Partnership Initiative) in which law enforcement, courts, corrections, and local social service agencies are brought together to address the issues of prisoner reentry. The second model is police-corrections partnerships (PCPs) in which police take over much of the supervision role of parole officers so that parole officers can focus more attention on providing parolees with connections to treatment and services. The third model is reentry courts. This model draws from the drug court model and is more judicially centered. Judges use a case management approach to track and supervise offenders upon release. The fourth model is the therapeutic jurisprudence movement. Under this approach, offenders are actively involved in the process of reentry. For instance, offenders may develop and sign behavioral contracts and participate in a reentry graduation ceremony if the contract is completed. The model encourages offenders to take ownership of the reentry process.
11. **Implement and test goal-oriented parole terms.** Incentives should be built into the length

of a parole term. For instance, the length of a parole term could be reduced as a reward for participating in work and treatment programs. This shifts the responsibility from the corrections/parole agency to the parolee by investing them with the power to affect the length of their parole term.

12. **Establish procedures for ex-prisoners to regain full citizenship.** Nearly all other countries have recognized the value in doing this and have instituted laws to erase criminal records and restore convicts to full citizenship. One example is England's Rehabilitation of Offenders Act in which ex-offenders, after a specified period of rehabilitation, are not obliged to mention their criminal conviction when applying for jobs, housing, or other public benefits.

In chapter ten, Dr. Petersilia provides some concluding remarks on the political and practical challenges, as well as the potential payoffs, of enhancing reentry strategies. Dr. Petersilia criticizes the punitive policies of the criminal justice system over the past two decades. She holds that current laws and policies can produce unintended consequences that, over time, contribute to higher rates of criminal activity and exacerbate the very problems they are designed to address. While recent public opinion polls indicate that attitudes are shifting and that American's support for prison is waning, Dr. Petersilia describes how the influx of prison growth has created an industry that many communities have come to depend on and may be unwilling to see go. Dr. Petersilia evaluates the costs that such crime policies as the war on drugs have produced, not only on taxpayer dollars but also on communities and families. Dr. Petersilia stresses the need to be more selective and rethink who we send to prison and how we help reintegrate those who are currently in prison. She concludes that focusing on prisoner reintegration may be our best hope for keeping crime rates down over the next decade as nearly 600,000 inmates leave prison and return home each year.

Dr. Petersilia's book is both informative and thought provoking. While many of the ideas in this book have already been circulated, Dr. Petersilia presents them in a "down-to-earth", cohesive manner. Her thoughts and conclusions are certainly along the lines of what others have been saying in the reentry literature (e.g., Urban Institute, etc.). Perhaps the only criticism of the book is that it largely failed to disaggregate much of the trends and data to the state level. National trends are often misleading in that they mask important differences between individual states. Certainly it is too much to ask for one book to address reentry trends in every individual state but it would have been useful to hear more about innovative approaches that different states are taking in response to state-specific issues. Overall, the book is well-written. For those not familiar with the context of parole and prisoner reentry in America, the book provides a comprehensive overview. For all those involved in the criminal justice system, the book provides some useful and concrete recommendations for preparing offenders for successful prisoner reentry.