

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS COLLABORATIVE NETWORK:

SAFE AND SMART WAYS TO SOLVE
AMERICA'S CORRECTIONAL CHALLENGES

by Jason Zidenberg





DISCLAIMER

This Technical Assistance activity Project #13C5022 is funded by the Community Services Division of the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions expressed in the Technical Assistance report are those of the authors and do not represent the official opinion or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

FUNDING BY 
National Institute of Corrections

Abstract

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Community Corrections Collaborative Network (CCCN)—a network representing community corrections professionals—commissioned a position paper to explore the successes and challenges facing the community corrections field. The position paper, *Community Corrections Collaborative Network: Safe and Smart Ways To Solve America's Correctional Challenges*, finds that community corrections are a critical part of the public safety system that supervises individuals under the legal authority in the community to reduce crime and victimization.

Community corrections are changing lives, reducing harm, and helping build communities, and they have strong public support. To succeed in the future, community corrections and their partners need to refocus resources on approaches that are proven to work; change laws, policies, and practices that do not work; target treatment and supervision only to those who need it; and reallocate resources appropriately. Also to succeed in the future, community corrections and their partners need to expand the capacity of the field to take on new challenges and designate resources appropriately.

CCCN comprises the leading associations representing probation, parole, pretrial, and treatment professionals around the country, including the American Probation and Parole Association, the Association of Paroling Authorities International, the International Community Corrections Association, the National Association of Pretrial Service Agencies, and the National Association of Probation Executives.

This technical assistance activity was funded by the Community Services Division of the National Institute of Corrections. NIC is a federal agency established to provide assistance to strengthen state and local correctional agencies by creating more effective, humane, safe, and just correctional services.

The Community Corrections Collaborative Network would also like to acknowledge and thank the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) and American Paroling Authorities International (APAI) for its contribution to the project. APPA volunteered to design the position paper and executive summary and APAI volunteered to design the logo for the CCCN.

Onsite technical assistance was provided through a cooperative agreement at the request of the National Institute of Corrections. The direct onsite assistance and the subsequent report are intended to assist the agency in addressing issues outlined in the original request and in efforts to enhance the agency's effectiveness.

The National Institute of Corrections reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use and to authorize others to publish and use all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Safe and Smart Ways To Solve America’s Correctional Challenges 6

Chapter 1

The Five Core Domains of Community Corrections: Probation, Parole, Pretrial Services, Diversion Programs, and Community Treatment 9

Chapter 2

Reducing Reoffending, Recidivism, and Victimization in Your Community: Targeting Risk, Need, and Responsivity 12

Chapter 3

Community Corrections: Changing Lives, Reducing Harm, and Helping Build Your Community 14

Chapter 4

Community Corrections’ Emerging Leadership Role in Corrections and Public Safety 16

Chapter 5

Community Corrections Has Strong Public Support 18

Chapter 6

Helping To Solve the Nation’s Public Safety and Correctional Challenges 20

Chapter 7

What Community Corrections Needs from the Field and Our Partners To Meet the Public Safety and Corrections Challenges 22

Endnotes 26

Acknowledgments

The author would like to acknowledge and thank the following members of the Community Corrections Collaborative Network for their contributions to Community Corrections Collaborative Network: Safe and Smart Ways To Solve America's Correctional Challenges:

- Cherise Fanno Burdeen
- Susan Burke
- Robert Bingham
- Spurgeon Kennedy
- Peter Kiers
- Cynthia Mauser
- M. David McGriff
- Phillip Nunes
- Jeffrey Peterson
- Carmen Rodriguez
- Ronald Schweer
- Scott M. Taylor

The author would like to acknowledge and thank the following staff of the National Institute of Corrections for their contributions to this publication: Jim Cosby, Chief, NIC Community Services Division, and Correctional Program Specialists Gregory Crawford and Lori Eville.

The Community Corrections Collaborative Network would also like to acknowledge and thank the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) and American Paroling Authorities International (APAI) for its contribution to the project. APPA volunteered to design the position paper and executive summary and APAI volunteered to design the logo for the CCCN.



Introduction

SAFE AND SMART WAYS TO SOLVE AMERICA'S CORRECTIONAL CHALLENGES

Today, 2.2 million adults and approximately 70,000 juveniles are incarcerated in the United States. With prisons and jails absorbing the lion's share of the \$50 billion that states spend on corrections (and the \$28 billion that local governments spend on corrections), the nation's multibillion-dollar corrections spending makes it hard for government agencies to sustain the services we all need.¹

Taxpayers are not getting the public safety outcomes they desire or deserve for this huge investment in prisons and jails: about half (45.4%) of people released from prison in 1999 and 43.3% of those sent home in 2004 were reincarcerated within three years, either for committing a new crime or for violating conditions governing their release. Researchers, elected officials from both parties, members of law enforcement, and crime victims are beginning to recognize that incarceration is the least effective way to encourage long-term recidivism reduction, and it is the most expensive part of the public safety system.

Prisons and jails aren't the only ways to hold individuals accountable for their actions. There are other ways to enhance public safety by connecting people to treatment and job opportunities, repaying crime victims for the harm that has come to them, and reducing overall system costs while holding people accountable for their behavior.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLAY A LEADING ROLE IN MANAGING THE PUBLIC SAFETY SYSTEM AND IN SOLVING AMERICA'S MULTIBILLION-DOLLAR CORRECTIONAL CHALLENGES

Community corrections are a critical part of the public safety system that supervises individuals under the legal authority in the community to reduce crime and victimization. Probation, parole, pretrial services, and community treatment organizations work together to match the right supervision and service to the right person at the right time. Together, our field of professionals works with more than 5 million² juveniles and adults to try to help break the cycle of crime and offending, reserve costly prison and jail beds for violent people, and reduce the harm that criminal justice involvement can have for those who can safely remain in the community; and it helps save untold human potential.

Across the country—from Texas to California—a shift in thinking has occurred among state corrections leaders and elected officials that is quickly moving community corrections to the forefront of public safety work. Our field is rising to this new challenge, but to assume the role of managing five million juveniles and adults under our watch, we will need to revamp our partnerships.

With the right investment of public and private dollars, the Community Corrections Collaborative Network (CCCN) can help you focus on proven approaches to change people's behavior, and help save the untold human potential that is otherwise lost to the cycle of crime. Matched with the right kind of training, research, and technology, community corrections can work with our public safety partners in law enforcement and the courts and with policymakers to deliver the smart and cost-effective justice that the public wants.

CCCN—a network representing community corrections professionals—is working to help our field assume this leadership role, and CCCN wants to work with you as our partner to reduce recidivism, help taxpayers get better public safety results from community corrections, and help millions of people contribute to their communities.

THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS COLLABORATIVE NETWORK

The Community Corrections Collaborative Network is a collaborative network of the leading professional associations in the field that have come together to develop and work on emerging issues facing the field. CCCN is working together on:

- *Communicating a Shared Message:* CCCN is working to develop a common message on the importance of community corrections to federal, state, and local policymakers and to the public.

- *Representing the Field:* CCCN is working to inform the development of community corrections proposals and policy at the federal, state, and local levels.
- *Prioritizing Research and Evaluation:* CCCN is working to prioritize emerging areas of research from international and national operations that promote evidence-based practices and enhance the effectiveness of community corrections.
- *Enhancing Professionalism and Sustainability in the Field:* CCCN is working to develop the efficiency and sustainability of community corrections-related professional associations.

CCCN comprises the leading associations representing probation, parole, pretrial, and treatment professionals around the country, including:

- *American Probation and Parole Association (APPA):* The American Probation and Parole Association is an international association composed of members from the United States, Canada, and other countries actively involved with probation, parole, and community-based corrections in both adult and juvenile sectors.
- *Association of Paroling Authorities International (APAI):* The Association of Paroling Authorities International is the recognized voice for the highest professional standards of responsible parole practices.
- *International Community Corrections Association (ICCA):* The International Community Corrections Association is a membership organization dedicated to promoting community-based corrections for adults and juveniles to enhance public safety.
- *National Association of Pretrial Service Agencies (NAPSA):* The National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies is the national professional association for the pretrial release and pretrial diversion fields.
- *National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE):* The National Association of Probation Executives is dedicated to enhancing the professionalism and effectiveness in the field of probation by creating a national network for probation executives, bringing about positive change in the field, and making available a pool of experts in probation management, program development, training, and research.



Chapter 1

THE FIVE CORE DOMAINS OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS: PROBATION, PAROLE, PRETRIAL SERVICES, DIVERSION PROGRAMS, AND COMMUNITY TREATMENT

Community corrections professionals supervise and serve young people, adults, and their families through two distinct systems: the juvenile justice system and the adult justice system. It comprises five core domains, including probation, parole, pretrial services, community treatment, and diversion programs.

PROBATION

While there are 2.2 million adults in prison and jail, the largest number of people in the correctional system are the nearly 4 million sentenced to probation. Probationers follow certain conditions set forth by the court, such as to find, get, and keep a job; get treatment; make restitution to victims; and not reoffend. Probationers are often under the supervision of a probation officer. If they do not meet the conditions of the courts, a sworn officer can use a series of swift and certain sanctions to change their behavior, including restrictions on where they can be in the community, mandatory attendance at programs, and incarceration when appropriate.

PAROLE

Nearly 900,000 people in the correctional system are on parole. When offenders serve a sentence in prison, they may be under supervised release before the completion of their sentence. Similar to probationers, parolees must follow conditions, such as getting or keeping a job, completing treatment, and paying restitution to crime victims. Parolees are often under the supervision of a sworn parole officer who can enforce the terms of parole by responding to someone's behavior with swift and certain responses that can include community service, mandatory treatment, and reincarceration when appropriate.

PRETRIAL SERVICES

Pretrial services are community corrections programs that help guide judges and the courts in making decisions on whether someone can be safely monitored in the community while his or her case is being resolved. High-functioning pretrial systems use validated risk assessment instruments to aid the courts in making release or detain decisions, as well as selecting appropriate supervision conditions to mitigate risks should the person be released pretrial. With more than 60% of the 700,000 people in jail on any given day in a pretrial status, pretrial services can help communities manage jail populations while maintaining public safety and the integrity of the judicial process. Pretrial service programs can be run by probation departments, nonprofits, or other system stakeholders.

COMMUNITY TREATMENT

Probation, parole, and pretrial services programs partner with community treatment organizations to deliver services to people when they are under criminal justice custody but in the community. Government agencies, nonprofits, and community organizations provide treatment, job training, skill building, community service opportunities, and victim restitution programs that help people pay back their crime victims, as well as help people find and keep housing. Nonprofits and community organizations play a key role in building on the strengths of families and communities to help individuals correct their behavior. Along with the service they provide to individuals under supervision in the community, treatment providers help probation, parole, and pretrial services (and other justice system partners) keep another set of eyes on individuals under custody. The field delivers treatment to our clients in both residential and non-residential settings.

DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Diversion programs can remove individuals from further steps in the case process if they agree to take part in treatment, services, and various conditions set by the system. Law enforcement and the courts can divert individuals to community corrections prior to their arrest, after their arrest, or after they agree to plea to conviction.



Chapter 2

REDUCING REOFFENDING, RECIDIVISM, AND VICTIMIZATION IN YOUR COMMUNITY: TARGETING RISK, NEED, AND RESPONSIVITY OF THE PEOPLE WE SUPERVISE

Our approach to public safety involves developing an individualized plan for each client, backed up by scientific tools that allow our professionals to target the risk, need, and responsivity of individuals under our custody. The field uses assessment tools to get the right supervision and right treatment to the right people at the right time in the most cost-effective way.

Risk assessments are scientifically developed tools used to identify the key factors that might lead to reoffending or flight. They are based on serving thousands of individuals over time and seeing what factors relate to offending, such as a long history of serious offending or a history of drug abuse and crimes to support an addiction. These tools help our professionals tailor individualized supervision approaches and treatment plans that are likely to change an individual's behavior. They can:

- Target supervision and services to those people who require the most help;
- Develop cost-effective responses for those who need less from the system; and
- Identify which high-risk offenders to watch more closely.

When we can target resources based on a person's measured risk to reoffend, identify that person's treatment needs, and match both to his or her motivation and responsibility to learn better skills, community corrections can reduce reoffending by as much as 16%.³

RISK, NEED, AND RESPONSIVITY

Individualized Responses That Reduce Offending in a Cost-Effective Way

Assessment tools can help differentiate between high-risk offenders in need of receiving the highest level of services from those who need less from the public safety system.

Highest Risk, Highest Need—Intensive Supervision Combined with Treatment

When combined with treatment, intensive supervision of individuals on probation and parole can reduce reoffending by 10% and can cost as little as \$7,000 per individual served.⁴

Less Risk and More Need—Functional Family Probation

Juvenile probation combined with treatment and services under the Functional Family Probation Therapy model is a form of supervision that engages the family and community in young people's rehabilitation; it can cost less than \$2,500 per individual and reduce juvenile reoffending by 15%.⁵

Less Risk and Moderate Need—Drug Treatment in the Community

Drug treatment in the community can cost as little as \$600 per individual and can reduce reoffending by 9%.⁶ Outpatient treatment for people with addiction challenges means they can work, pay restitution and taxes, play a role in families, and contribute to the community while under the supervision of a parole, probation, or pretrial system.

Lowest Risk, Lowest Need—Pretrial Release on Recognizance with Court Reminder Program

People ranked at the lowest risk to flee or be rearrested while on pretrial can be released on recognizance without posting money. They can comply with a single condition of release - to return to court - by being reminded of their court date, much like people are reminded of doctor or hair appointments. Court reminder programs can be automated calls or done by staff or volunteers, and they can cost as little as \$1.50 per person (if using postcards - automated systems may be even less), allowing the system to focus more time, energy, money, and staff on individuals who have greater needs and are at higher risk to flee or be rearrested.⁷



Chapter 3

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS: CHANGING LIVES, REDUCING HARM, AND HELPING BUILD YOUR COMMUNITY

The “risk principle” that defines the community corrections approach to public safety includes an understanding that, when the system pushes into prisons and jails people who could be safely supervised and held accountable in the community, the system can do more harm than good.

People who have spent time in prison and/or jail have a harder time getting a job, earn less, have trouble returning or connecting to school, and may have seen health problems worsen. Children of incarcerated parents will be more likely to be in the foster care system and more likely to engage in criminal behavior. While the crushing cost of prisons affects all taxpayers, overreliance on incarceration has a concentrated effect among communities of color: the fact that two-thirds of those in prison and jail are African American or Latino means that the harm that comes with incarceration has a bigger impact in these communities.⁸

There will always be some individuals who need to be in prison or jail for a period of time to keep the community safe, but public safety is not enhanced when nonviolent individuals lose community connections to family, work, school, and housing as a result of incarceration.

People under the supervision of the community corrections agencies can stay employed, pay taxes and participate in local economies, remain parents and be involved in their families, pay their child support, and earn funds to pay restitution to crime victims.

Particularly among young people, incarceration in either pretrial detention or a commitment to a juvenile facility can increase the likelihood that they will reoffend. Since many young people will engage in some form of youthful misbehavior or delinquency before their twenties, community corrections offers the opportunity for youth to avoid lifelong offending by keeping them connected to their parents and school and involved in the developmental activities all kids need to transition to adulthood.⁹





Chapter 4

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS' EMERGING LEADERSHIP ROLE IN CORRECTIONS AND PUBLIC SAFETY

A perfect storm may be coming together that will push community corrections into a more central role in how the corrections system will manage its resources and overall approach. The combination of tighter state budgets, a growing awareness that prison and jail are not the answer for everyone, a growing body of research on what works to change people's behavior, and the need to prepare for the return of 95% of state prisoners is leading to policy changes. From California to Michigan and from Texas to New York, community corrections systems are assuming new responsibilities for the custody and treatment of tens of thousands of adults and youth who were once in prisons, jails, or juvenile facilities. These states are showing that community corrections can deliver a much more cost-effective public safety service and reduce crime and victimization at less cost than incarceration.¹⁰



CALIFORNIA

Adult and Juvenile Corrections Responsibility Transferred to Community Corrections.

California transferred to counties the responsibility for the supervision, treatment, and detention of tens of thousands of adults who were once under the custody of the state. California also transferred responsibility for the supervision of juveniles from the state Division of Juvenile Justice to county juvenile probation departments.



NEW YORK

“Close to Home” Community Corrections for City Juveniles and Drug-Involved Adults.

New York State Office of Children and Family Services Division of Juvenile Justice and the New York City Department of Probation recently developed a new partnership called Close to Home, where young people who used to be sent to state facilities will now be under the supervision of the city probation department. The state of New York also recently changed its drug sentencing laws and revamped treatment programs for drug-involved offenders, so more offenders could be paroled sooner, receive supervision in the community, and get treatment.



MICHIGAN

Drug Sentencing Laws Eased, Community Corrections Options Added

Michigan revised its mandatory minimum sentencing laws that kept people in prison for long sentences, and instead gave judges more discretion to reduce the length of time someone is in prison. Michigan also restructured its sentencing system so that more people could be referred to community corrections, and it increased state support for local reentry services for individuals on parole who need community treatment.



TEXAS

Reduced Prison Admissions by Shifting to Community Corrections

In 2011, Texas passed a law that said that if probation departments or other local agencies submitted a plan to the state to reduce the number of people sent to state prison, they could receive state funds to supervise, serve, and treat that person. The change was designed to support local, county-run probation departments and to reduce prison admissions and probation revocations.

Along with California, Michigan, Texas, and New York, in the past four years, Arkansas, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Ohio, and South Carolina have enacted legislation that creates the opportunity for community corrections agencies to supervise more people in the community who were once in jail or prison.¹¹



Chapter 5

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS HAS STRONG PUBLIC SUPPORT

The public supports a strong community corrections system that promotes public safety, holds people accountable, helps them get a job, helps them get treatment, pays back crime victims, and can respond to offending in a swift and certain fashion.

Recent national opinion polls¹ have shown that the public:

- *Supports the community corrections approach to public safety.* More than 9 out of 10 (95%) of those polled support the most effective community corrections approaches to public safety, including approaches that use technology to monitor people's whereabouts and requirements that people keep a job and perform community service.¹² When asked to rate terms used to describe a revised focus in the public safety system, about 6 out of 10 supported community corrections approaches such as intensive supervision (60%), alternatives to incarceration (60%), and swift and certain sanctions (58%).¹³

1 A full list of the questions used to measure public opinion is listed in the endnotes.

- *Sees risk assessments as effective ways to prevent crime, prevent flight, and assure appearance at trial.* About three-quarters of those polled say that risk assessments are an effective way to protect the public (75%), prevent flight, and ensure appearance at trial (73%).¹⁴
- *Supports reinvesting current prison spending in community corrections.* Nearly 9 out of 10 (87%) of those polled support reinvesting prison savings in community corrections by reducing incarceration for low-risk offenders, and 9 out of 10 (90%) support reducing the length of a prison sentence for certain low-risk, nonviolent offenders.¹⁵
- *Supports community corrections approaches that engage families in supervision and treatment of youth.* Nine out of 10 of those polled support community corrections approaches in juvenile justice that develop treatment and supervision plans that include a young person's family. Nearly 8 out of 10 (79%) support requirements that youth be placed in facilities close to their families and communities.¹⁶
- *Supports community corrections approaches for youth that emphasize treatment and prevention instead of incarceration and punishment.* Three-quarters (75%) of those polled support a juvenile justice approach that relies more on prevention and rehabilitation than on punishment and incarceration.¹⁷



Chapter 6

HELPING TO SOLVE THE NATION'S PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL CHALLENGES

Community corrections systems are already playing a critical role in solving America's public safety and correctional challenges. The community corrections professionals represented by the Community Corrections Collaborative Network (CCCN) are helping millions of people leave crime and reoffending behind them, get the treatment they need, get or keep a job, stay in school or complete the training they need, and pay back their victims and the community.

Right now, community corrections professionals are helping state and local policymakers reduce spending on prisons and jails. The field is assessing, supervising, serving, treating, and holding people accountable for their actions in the community, freeing up scarce and costly prison and jail beds for violent individuals, and reducing the harm that deeper system involvement can have for some people.

The field is rising to the challenge put before us by our partners in public safety. But to assume an ever more critical role in driving correctional practices and managing public safety spending, CCCN believes that *our profession* will need to work with *our partners* to improve how we do business so that we can continue to deliver these results.

WHAT COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS NEEDS TO DO

- Embrace evidence-based practices as a “foundation” to improve our work.
- Target research to identify what works.
- Target treatment and supervision only to those with assessed need.
- Embrace technology so the field can manage people effectively.
- Support workforce development, training, and skill building.
- Receive appropriate financial resources to support growing responsibilities.

WHAT COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERS NEED TO DO

- Revise laws, policies, and practices, such as sentencing and reliance on treatment for lower-risk, lower-need individuals so that they align with known risk reduction interventions.
- Partner with community corrections agencies to plan overall public safety approaches.
- Provide appropriate financial resources to our organizations and programs.



Chapter 7

WHAT COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS NEEDS FROM THE FIELD AND OUR PARTNERS TO MEET THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONS CHALLENGES

REFOCUSING RESOURCES ON APPROACHES THAT ARE PROVEN TO WORK AND CHANGING LAWS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES THAT DO NOT WORK

Until recently, many prison and juvenile justice systems used Scared Straight programs, where older prisoners would lecture youth on what would happen if they get into trouble. The theory was that “tough talk” would cut juvenile crime. In 2011, however, high-level U.S. Department of Justice officials said of Scared Straight that “the research tells us otherwise: “[S]cared [S]traight’ is not only ineffective but is potentially harmful. In light of this evidence, the U.S. Department of Justice discourages the funding of [S]cared [S]traight-type programs.¹⁸”

Just as the field is moving away from Scared Straight-type programs, community corrections must reduce our reliance on approaches that do not work (or that are harmful) and focus on using approaches that are proven to work. To refocus successfully on what works and what does not work to change people’s behavior, the field needs our partners to join in this shift.

Two key ways to shift the whole system from practices that do not work are:

1. *Adopt evidence-based practice as the foundation of the community corrections profession.* Many parole, probation, and pretrial service agencies are working with partners in the treatment community to question at every opportunity what approaches to continue or enhance because they work and what approaches to stop doing because they do not work. For community corrections, this means developing continuous quality assurance systems that study what we are doing, continually evaluate our effectiveness, and target limited resources on a cost-effective basis. Rather than rely on one program, the field needs to rely on an approach and a continual process to enhance and improve its practices to get the best outcomes with the resources it has.
2. *Revise laws, policies, and practices that do not work or that do more harm than good.* Along with a range of other options, probation, parole, and pretrial systems will still use incarceration to hold offenders accountable and protect the public. The system is spending huge amounts of money on currently incarcerated individuals but receives virtually no public safety benefit by incarcerating them.¹⁹ If the system were redesigned to allow community corrections the opportunity to supervise those who otherwise could be safely managed in the community, taxpayers could save billions of dollars and the field could achieve desired outcomes. The community corrections field needs to work with its partners to revise laws, policies, and practices that allow the system to make risk-based decisions on how to use the most expensive correctional resources.

TARGET TREATMENT AND SUPERVISION ONLY TO THOSE WHO NEED IT, AND REALLOCATE RESOURCES APPROPRIATELY

We all want to live in housing that is maintained and repaired, and we all want access to health care professionals who can keep us healthy. But you do not go to the emergency room for every medical issue, and the hammer is not the only tool you have available to fix something in your home. Justice systems should not, then, also use expensive and criminogenic tools like incarceration to respond to every law violation.

Based on the community corrections approach to analyze the risk, needs, and responsivity of the people we supervise, as well as the field's reliance on evidence and quality assurance to improve our practices, we know that some individuals require minimal to no treatment and/or minimal supervision. When the system pushes people into treatment or supervision that they do not need, at best the system wastes scarce resources on individuals who do not need them, and at worst the system increases the chances that someone will reoffend and causes needless harm.

The community corrections field needs to continually revise our approach to the total population we serve based on evidence, so that we can target the right supervision and treatment to the right individuals for the right period of time to change their behavior. Community corrections needs to work with our partners to ensure that we share a common understanding of the benefits of tailoring individualized treatment and supervision, and a common understanding of which individuals are low risk and low needs so that we can serve them with the most minimal, cost-effective approaches.

As part of local ways to solve local public safety challenges, community corrections and our partners need to be part of collaborative processes that look at the whole system's needs, and we need to work together to target our collective efforts in ways to meet common goals.

EXPAND THE CAPACITY OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS TO TAKE ON NEW CHALLENGES

From California to New York and from Texas to Michigan, probation, parole, pretrial services, and community treatment providers are rising to the challenges of serving whole new populations of people who were once in prison and jail, but are now back in our communities. To rise to the much larger challenge of helping corrections and taxpayers solve our billion-dollar corrections spending challenge, the field needs to help build the capacity of our profession and organizations so that it can continue to ensure the strong public safety outcomes that the public deserves and desires.

New technologies offer the opportunity for community corrections to serve individuals more effectively and to speed up the sharing of information with our public safety partners so that we can monitor our clients in real time and target supervision and services to the right people and to the appropriate parts of our communities. New technologies have huge potential for community corrections and the public safety field, but they also have significant implications for workforce development, skills, training, and staff development. To maximize public safety dollars, the field needs to make better and more appropriate use of electronic monitoring, computers, telecommunication devices, and information systems. Serving higher risk individuals means that community corrections has to adopt different approaches, requiring that the field train our staff on the best ways to change people's behavior.

DESIGNATE APPROPRIATE RESOURCES TO COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Ongoing state budget deficits and decades of prison population growth means that state policymakers are likely to continue to focus attention on ways that community corrections can help policymakers safely reduce reliance on prison, jails, and juvenile facilities.

The Community Corrections Collaborative Network (CCCN) agrees that community corrections approaches are some of the best antidotes the public safety system has to avoid future costs associated with prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities. If changes are not made to corrections, the rising costs of

prisons and jails will continue to burden taxpayers and reduce the resources available to solve this problem.

Community corrections systems are responsible for changing the behavior of seven out of ten individuals under correctional supervision,²⁰ but more than seven out of ten correctional dollars is spent on institutions. One survey of the multi-billion dollar increase in corrections spending over the last 25 years in eight states found that 88% of additional corrections spending since the early 1980s has gone to prisons.²¹

For community corrections to help the system successfully save money and improve public safety, our partners will need to do more than simply flood the system with additional offenders.

If what the system wants from corrections is “punishment,” then prison is an appropriate place to send an individual for a long time. If what the system wants is a smart, fair, just and cost-effective way of changing someone’s behavior, then funders need to resource community corrections appropriately, provide treatment and capacity building, procure new technology, and develop the workforce to meet the new demands of the system. Community corrections approaches can be delivered in a more cost-effective way than prison or jail terms for many individuals, but our profession must enhance the infrastructure to deliver the public safety services and provide the treatments that individuals need.

Among the eight states that want to shift people once destined for prison to community corrections, some have seen only a modest shift of funds to serve these individuals. Of the four states (Arkansas, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Texas) that passed bills in 2011 to reduce the number of people going to prison by sending them to community corrections systems, as of November 2012, none had appropriated funds to community corrections under these initiatives.²²

The field and its partners need to ensure that community corrections can receive designated funding to enhance the infrastructure that is getting the public safety system the results it wants and that the public deserves.

Policymakers should consider developing block-grant opportunities for states to address prison overcrowding and implementing evidence-informed practices in community corrections.

When someone is in prison or jail, generally, the corrections department funded by that community pays the full cost of treatment. Once individuals are in community corrections systems, it is possible to pay for their treatment through other funding streams that allow levels of government to share the costs of mental health and drug treatment, further reducing the burden on taxpayers in that community.

With the right resources, the community corrections field is ready to help the system plan to reduce overall correctional costs, supervise people in the community in a way designed to curb reoffending, reduce harm, and help people leave offending behind them and contribute to their communities.



Endnotes

- 1 According to the U.S. Justice Department, states spent \$47.8 billion on corrections in 2009 and all local government (counties, municipalities, and cities) spent \$27.5 billion on corrections. Kyckelhahn, T. (2012). *Justice expenditure and employment extracts 2009*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- 2 Glaze, L., & Parks, E. (2012). *Correctional populations in the United States, 2011*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- 3 Drake, E.K. (2011). "What works" in community supervision: Interim report (Document No. 11-12-1201). Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal justice costs, and crime rates*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- 6 Ibid
- 7 American Bar Association. (2007). *ABA standards for criminal justice. Pretrial release* 3rd ed.. Washington, DC: American Bar Association; VanNostrand, M., Rose, K., & Weibrecht, K. (2011). *State of the science of pretrial release recommendations and supervision*. Washington, DC. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Justice Department; Tomkins, A. Bronstein, B., Herian, M., Rosenbaum, D., & Neeley, E. (2012). "An experiment in the law: Studying a technique to reduce failure to appear in court," *The Journal of the American Judges Association*, 48 (3).

- 8 Petteruti, A., & Walsh, N. (2008). *Jailing communities*. Washington, DC: The Justice Policy Institute.
- 9 Mendel, D. (2011). *No place for kids*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation,.
- 10 Greene, J. (2010). *Downscaling prisons: lessons from four states*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- 11 Shames, A., & Rahdert, *Performance incentive funding: Aligning fiscal and operational responsibility to produce more safety at less cost*. New York, NY: Vera Institute for Justice.
- 12 Ninety-five percent of those polled favored “[a]n effective probation and parole system [that] would use new technologies to monitor where offenders are and what they are doing, require them to pass drug tests, and require they either keep a job or perform community service.” The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2011). *Key findings from a national survey of 1,200 registered voters conducted March 7-14, 2010*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- 13 “Respondents were asked to rate a series of terms used to describe a revised focus in our public safety system.” The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2011). *Key findings from a national survey of 1,200 registered voters conducted March 7-14, 2010*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- 14 Those polled said risk assessments were effective at preventing flight, ensuring appearance at trial, and protecting community safety based on these questions: “And how effective do you think risk assessment would be when it comes to protecting community safety? Do you think it would be very effective, somewhat effective, a little effective, or not effective at all?”; “And how effective do you think risk assessment would be when it comes to preventing flight and ensuring appearance at trial? Do you think it would be very effective, somewhat effective, a little effective, or not effective at all?” From National Association of Counties. (2012). *Communicating the need for pretrial justice reform*. Washington, DC: National Association of Counties.
- 15 Eight-seven percent of those polled favored or strongly favored “reduc[ing] prison time for low-risk, non-violent offenders and re-invest[ing] some of the savings to create a stronger probation and parole system that holds offenders accountable for their crimes.” Ninety percent of those polled favored or strongly favored “[a]llow[ing] inmates convicted of non-violent crimes to be released up to 6 months early if they have committed a non-violent offense, have behaved well in prison, and, based on an evaluation, are considered a low risk for committing another crime.” The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2011). *Key findings from a national survey of 1,200 registered voters conducted March 7-14, 2010*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- 16 Support was measured by the following question: “Next you will read some proposals that have been made to reform the juvenile justice system. For each, please indicate whether you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose that proposal: Design treatment and rehabilitation plans that include a youth’s family in planning and services (91%); Require that youth offenders be placed in facilities close to their families and communities (79%). Citizen Opinion and Greenberg Quinlan Rosner. (2011). *Advancing juvenile justice reform: A research-based message strategy*. Washington, DC: Citizen Opinion and Greenberg Quinlan Rosner.

- 17 Support for the concept was measured by the question, “Compared to the way things are now, when it comes to the juvenile justice system, do you think there should be more focus on punishment and incarceration or more focus on prevention and rehabilitation?” Citizen Opinion and Greenberg Quinlan Rosner. (2011). *Advancing juvenile justice reform: A research-based message strategy*. Washington, DC: Citizen Opinion and Greenberg Quinlan Rosner.
- 18 Robinson, L., & Slowikowski, J. (2011, January 31). Scary -- and ineffective. *The Baltimore Sun*, pp. A25.
- 19 “A recent study found that non-violent offenders in a number of states could have served prison terms between 3 months and 2 years shorter with little or no public safety consequences: 14 percent of all offenders released in Florida, 18 percent in Maryland, and 24 percent in Michigan. The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2012). *Time served: The high cost, low return of longer prison terms*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- 20 Glaze, L., & Parks, E. (2012). *Correctional populations in the United States, 2011*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- 21 “States spent about three-quarters of the corrections budget on correctional institutions.” Kyckelhahn, T. (2012). In FY2008, 34 states spent \$18.65 billion on prisons but just \$2.52 billion on probation and parole, a ratio of more than seven to one. Viewed over time, the spending gap looks just as substantial. For eight geographically diverse states that were able to provide data for the past 25 years, 88% of the increase in corrections spending was directed toward prisons, which now consume nearly nine out of every ten state corrections dollars. The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2009) *One in 31: The long reach of american corrections*. Washington, D.C: The Pew Charitable Trusts, Pew Center on the States.
- 22 California saw more than \$100 million transferred from the state to community corrections through SB 678. Ohio saw \$5 million allocated per year under HB 86 to community corrections, with additional funds for technological innovations, probation improvements, and other incentives. Kansas and Illinois saw \$4 million or less appropriated for community corrections. Texas’ SB1055—while passing unanimously in the legislature—has not been implemented because there was no budgetary provision to implement it. Shames, A., & Rahdert, L. (2012). *Performance incentive funding: Aligning fiscal and operational responsibility to produce more safety at less cost*. New York, NY: Vera Institute for Justice.

Network
sviluppo dello
Corrections
Community

CCCM

