

What We Know About Prison Conditions, Programs, Reentry and Release Planning for Longtermers

Roger Przybylski
Task Force Contractor

Defining Our Terms

For the purposes of this presentation, longtermers refer to individuals who are incarcerated for 10 years or more

A “program” is a planned, coordinated group of activities or services carried out according to guidelines to achieve a defined purpose (CrimeSolutions.gov)

- May be brand name (i.e., Moral Reconciliation Therapy®) or those that are home-grown, generic in nature (i.e., Cognitive Behavioral Therapy; substance use treatment) (Lipsey, 2010)

For our purposes, programs have the following features:

- Target and are delivered to incarcerated individuals
- Are intended to facilitate positive behavioral change
- Rely on sound theory and are considered to be effective according to rigorous evaluation (Przybylski, 2008)

Defining Our Terms (continued)

“Conditions” refer to the environment in which incarcerated people live and prison staff work

- Tied to security levels, programming opportunities, freedom of movement

“Reentry planning” begins at admission and extends beyond the time of release to prepare prisoners for long-term post-release success

“Release planning” represents a distinct part of reentry planning, focusing on the period of release and in the days and weeks that follow

Why Prison Conditions, Programs, Reentry and Release Planning Matter

Longtermers make up a large and growing share of standing prison populations

- CCJ research found longtermers make up 57% of the prison population (Council on Criminal Justice, 2022)

Most incarcerated individuals will be released, including longtermers (Congressional Research Services, 2015)

Evidence-informed programs

- Reduce recidivism and victimization (Lawrence et al 2002, Przybylski 2008, Duwe 2017)
- Promote redemption (Maruna 2001, Maruna 2011, Maruna et al 2003)
- Linked with reductions in disciplinary infractions in prisons, safer prisons (Gerber et al 1994, Gover et al 2008, Steiner et al 2008, Steiner et al 2014, Duwe 2017)
- Produce a positive return on investment (Aos et al 2006, Przybylski 2009, Duwe 2017)

Participation in programs has positive impact on institutional environment (Gover et al 2008, Steiner et al 2008, Steiner et al 2014, Duwe 2017)

- Enhanced safety for staff and incarcerated population

Obstacles to Safe and Rehabilitative Conditions, Effective Programs, and Reentry and Release Policies

Long termers tend to be housed within restrictive settings, which can affect program availability and participation

- Research finding: Higher security levels can contribute to increased recidivism rates (Gaes & Camp, 2009)

Statutory and administrative impediments:

- Housing restrictions and movement challenges
- Lack of incentives (Mohr et al, 2021)
 - Ability to reward with increased privileges, earn back lost sentence credits (“dead time”), and earn time off prison sentences
- Security concerns often override programming interests
- Competing demands (e.g., work assignment conflicts with program schedule)
- Inadequate funding, staff hiring and retention challenges

(Lynch et al 2001, Mumola et al 2007, Crittenden et al 2017)

Obstacles (continued)

Available program slots often prioritized for those near release (Bench and Allen 2003, Chen and Shapiro, 2007, Gaes and Camp)

- While longtermers constitute a large share of standing prison population, they account for a small share of overall prison releases

(Council on Criminal Justice, 2022)

Lack of specialized programs and reentry planning to meet the unique needs of longtermers, particularly older individuals (Foster et al 2006, Osborne Association 2018, Illinois Public Media 2020, Anderson 2003, Belenko et al 2012, The Impact of an Aging Inmate Population on the Federal Bureau of Prisons 2016, Crittenden et al 2017, The Osborne Association 2018)

Poor program integrity and delivery (Barnoski 2004, Przybylski 2008, Lipsey 2009)

Opportunity to Address Needs and Leverage Assets

Longtermers have not only unique needs, but also strengths and assets that can be leveraged in multiple ways (Maruna et al 2009, The Osborne Association 2018)

- Have unique health needs that place strain on correctional institutions during incarceration and the community upon reentry
 - Research shows that significant percentage of individuals who engage in chronic violent offending have traumatic brain injuries (McKinlay and Albicini 2016, Allely 2016)
 - Research shows that incarceration causes premature aging and can exacerbate age-related illnesses
- Most expensive cohort to incarcerate while statistically posing least danger to public safety (The Osborne Association 2018, Nellis et al 2021)
- Unique ability to positively influence incarcerated peers and culture (McNeill et al 2012, Barrenger et al 2018)

Opportunity to Promote Desistance

What is desistance?

- The process of ceasing engagement in criminal activities (Rocque, 2021)

Lessons learned from desistance research:

- **Desistance is a process, not an event** (Bushway et al 2001, National Research Council 2008, McNeill et al 2012, US DOJ 2021)
 - Characterized by ambivalence and vacillation
 - Stages of change (Prochaska et al 1992, Freeman et al 2001, Prochaska et al 2002, McNeill 2012)
- **Essential role of hope and supportive interpersonal interactions** (Burnett 2004, Burnett et al 2005, Farrall et al 2005, Skeem et al 2007, McNeill et al 2012)
- **Key facilitators:**
 - **Meaningful work, pro-social relationships** (National Research Council, 2008)
 - **Opportunity to contribute, peer-to-peer influence** (McNeill et al 2012, Barrenger et al 2018)

(Laub et al 2003, Weaver et al 2010)

Opportunity to Expand Effective Programs

There is a growing body of evidence-informed programs, proven to help promote desistance and reduce recidivism:

(MacKenzie 2006, Lipsey et al 2007, Przybylski 2008, Duwe 2017)

- **Education/vocational training** (Steurer et al 2001, Florida Department of Corrections 2001, MacKenzie 2006, Przybylski 2008, Davis et al 2013, Duwe 2017)
- **Cognitive-behavioral interventions** (Allen et al 2001, Wilson et al 2005, Golden et al 2006, Aos et al 2006, Lipsey et al 2007, Przybylski 2008, Duwe 2017)
- **Substance use disorder services** (Piehl et al 1999, Mitchell et al 2005, Belenko et al 2005, Aos et al 2006, Przybylski 2008, Przybylski 2009, Duwe 2017)
 - **Time in treatment, aftercare matter** (Griffith et al 1999, McCollister et al 2003, Dacosta-Sanchez et al 2022)
- **Mental health services** (Sacks et al 2004, New Freedom Commission on Mental Health 2004, Roman et al 2006, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration 2007, Osher et al 2007, Przybylski 2008, Mayfield 2009, Skeem et al 2011, Blandford et al 2012)
- **Treatment for sexual offenders** (Schmucker et al 2015, Przybylski 2015)
- **Restorative justice** (Nugent et al 1999, Latimer et al 2005, McNeill et al 2007, Strang et al 2013, Wilson et al 2017, Maryfield et al 2020)

Examples of Programs Specifically for Long-Termers

PA Long Term Offender Program (PA DOC program)

- Designed for lifers and individuals serving sentences with minimum expiration dates of 10 years or more
- Targets those in first 2-4 years of sentence
- Mandates use of peer assistants

GA Statewide Lifer's and Long-Term Offender Program (GA DOC program)

- Available to all lifers, individuals serving a 20+ year sentence.
- Designed to support pro-social thinking and behavior
- Upon successful completion, participants can become mentors or work in various capacities throughout the prisons system

Opportunity to Improve Reentry and Release

Comprehensive transition planning and community-based support:

- Life skills (Zhang et al 2019, Schrantz 2015)
- Housing
- Employment
- Post-release supervision
- Behavioral and medical health
 - Seamless aftercare
 - Access/transportation
- Community engagement/support (Burke 2008, Roman et al 2006, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration 2007)

Opportunity to Improve Policies and Operations

Improve assessment processes and case management practices:

- Classification reassessments; ongoing risk assessment (Schrantz et al 2018)
- Specialized screening/case management training
 - Trauma-informed, aging process, aging services (The Osborne Association 2018)
 - Cross-train between security and clinical staff

Longstanding but often underutilized best practices:

- Encourage/incentivize participation in programming by linking it to good time/earned release (Mohr et al 2021, Schrantz et al 2018)
- Use of longtermers and those with lived experience in program development and delivery (McNeill et al 2012, Barrenger et al 2018)

Opportunity to Improve Implementation

Thorough implementation and competent program delivery are key

- Sound delivery results in larger reductions in recidivism
- Poor delivery can not only degrade a program's effectiveness, but it can increase recidivism (Petersilia 1990, Barnoski 2004, Mihalic et al 2004, Rhine et al 2006, Przybylski 2008)

Adherence to principles of effective correctional intervention (Andrews 1995, Gendreau 1996, Gendreau et al 1999, Andrews et al 1999, Lowenkamp et al 2004, Andrews et al 2005, Andrews et al 2006, Smith et al 2009)

- Risk, Need, and Responsivity
 - More intensive programming for higher risk offenders (Sperber et al 2013a, Sperber et al 2013b, Lowenkamp et al 2004, Smith et al 2009)
 - Target dynamic criminogenic needs (Sperber et al 2013, Andrews et al 2006, Smith et al 2009)
 - Be responsive to the motivation, cognitive ability, age, gender, ethnicity and other characteristics of the participant (Andrews et al 2010, Blanchette et al 2006, Smith et al 2009)

Opportunity to Improve Implementation (continued)

Key considerations for effective program delivery:

- Sufficient funding and training
- Adherence to program model (core components; exposure/dosage)
- Quality of practitioner delivery (use of prescribed techniques/methods)

(Fixsen et al 2005, Mihalic et al 2004)

Requires dedicated focus on implementation:

- Change management
 - *Culture eats strategy/training for breakfast*
- Staff development (in-service training)
- Administrative supports (policy, data, evaluation)
- Leadership (especially adaptive leadership)

(Fixsen et al 2005, Bourgon et al 2011)

Key Takeaways

Most longtermers will eventually be released

- Recidivism reduction, redemption, and desistance from crime are key public safety concerns
- Evidence-based programs are effective at reducing recidivism, increasing safety for incarcerated individuals and staff, producing a positive return on investment
 - Programs can benefit everyone: incarcerated people, staff, and communities
- There is robust body of knowledge about what works
 - Opportunity to develop programs and policies for longtermers
- Implementation matters
 - Adopting what works is not enough; programs and policies must be properly implemented/delivered if they are to result in positive outcomes

Sources Cited

Allely, CS (2016). Prevalence and assessment of traumatic brain injury in prison inmates: a systematic PRISMA review. *Brain Injury*

Allen, L.C., MacKenzie, D.L., and Hickman, L.J. (2001). The effectiveness of cognitive behavioral treatment for adult offenders: A methodological, quality-based review. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 45, 498-514.

Anderson T. L. (2003). Issues in the availability of health care for women prisoners. In Sharp S. F. (Ed.), *The incarcerated woman: Rehabilitative programming in women's prisons* (pp. 49-60). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Andrews, D.A. (1995). The psychology of criminal conduct and effective treatment. In McGuire (ed.), *What Works: Reducing Reoffending—Guidelines from Research and Practice*. John Wiley, New York, NY.

Andrews, D.A., Dowden, C. and Gendreau, P. (1999). *Clinically Relevant and Psychologically Informed Approaches to Reduced Reoffending: A Meta-Analytic Study of Human Service Risk, Need, Responsivity and other Concerns in Justice Contexts*. Carleton, University, Ottawa, Canada.

Andrews, D.A., and Dowden, C. (2005). Managing correctional treatment for reduced recidivism: A meta-analytic review of programme integrity. *The British Psychological Society*, 173-187.

Andrews, D.A., and Bonta, J. (2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 4th Ed. Lexis/Nexis, Newark, NJ.

Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, S.J. (2006). The recent past and near future of risk and/or need assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 7-27.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16, 39-55.

Aos, S., Miller, M., and Drake, E. (2006). Evidence-Based Adult Corrections Programs: What Works and What Does Not. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Olympia, WA.

Barnoski, R. (2004). Outcome Evaluation of Washington State's Research-Based Programs for Juvenile Offenders. Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Olympia, WA. Available at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/pub>.

Barrenger, S., Hamovitch, E., & Rothman, M. (2018). Enacting Lived Experiences: Peer Specialists With Criminal Justice Histories. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 42(1).

Belenko, S., Patapis, N. and French, M.T. (2005). A critical review of the evidence for policy makers. Treatment Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Belenko S., Houser K. A. (2012). Gender differences in prison-based drug treatment participation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56, 790-810.

Bench and Allen (*The Prison Journal* 83(4):367-382, (2003) offer evidence that the assignment to higher security prisons produces elevated levels of misconduct independent of the individual's propensity to commit misconduct.

Blanchette, K., & Brown, S. L. (2006). *The assessment and treatment of women offenders: An integrative perspective*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Blandford, A., & Osher, F. (2012). A checklist for implementing evidence-based practices and programs (EBPs) for justice-involved adults with behavioral health disorders. Delmar, NY: SAMHSA's GAINS Center for Behavioral Health and Justice Transformation.

Bourgon, G., Rugge, T., Scott, T-L., Yessine, A.K., Gutierrez, L., & Li, J. (2011). An experimental demonstration of training probation officers in evidence-based community supervision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 1127–1148.

Burke (2008). TPC Reentry Handbook: Implementing the NIC Transition from Prison to the Community Model. Center for Effective Public Policy and the National Institute of Corrections.

Burnett, R. (2004). One-to-one ways of promoting desistance: In search of an evidence base. In R. Burnett & C. Roberts (Eds.), *What works in probation and youth justice*. Cullompton: Willan.

Burnett, R., & McNeill, F. (2005). The place of the officer–offender relationship in assisting offenders to desist from crime. *Probation Journal*, 52(3), 247–268.c

Bushway, S., Piquero, A., Broidy, L., Cauffman, E., and Mazerolle, P. (2001). An empirical framework for studying desistance as a process. *Criminology*, 39 , 491-516.

Chen and Shapiro (*American Law and Economics Review*, 2007) demonstrate that assignment to higher security level among inmates with the same classification scores increases post-release recidivism. Underlying both of these claims is the idea that the prison social environment is criminogenic.

Congressional Research Services (2015). *Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reentry into the Community, and Recidivism*

Council on Criminal Justice (2022). *Long Sentences by the Numbers*, <https://counciloncj.foleon.com/tfls/long-sentences-by-the-numbers/>

Courtney A. Crittenden & Barbara A. Koons-Witt, (2017). Gender and Programming: A Comparison of Program Availability and Participation in U.S. Prisons, 61 *INT. J. OFFENDER THERAPY & COMP. CRIMINOLOGY* 611.

CrimeSolutions.gov. (n.d.). *Why programs and practices*. Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from www.crimesolutions.gov/about_whyprogs_pracs.aspx

Crittenden, C. A., & Koons-Witt, B. A. (2017). Gender and Programming: A Comparison of Program Availability and Participation in U.S. Prisons. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(6), 611–644.

Dacosta-Sanchez, D., et al. (2022). Retention in treatment and therapeutic adherence: How are these associated with therapeutic success? An analysis using real-world data. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*.

Davis, L.M., Bozick, R., Steele, J.L., Saunders, J., & Miles, J.N.V. (2013). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-Analysis of Programs that Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Duwe (2017). *The Use and Impact of Correctional Programming for Inmates on Pre- and Post-Release Outcomes*. National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC.

Farrall, S., & Calverley, A. (2005). *Understanding desistance from crime*. (Crime and Justice Series). London: Open University Press.

Fixsen, D.L., Naoom, S.F., Blase, K.A., Friedman, R.M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, the National Implementation Research Network.

Florida Department of Corrections. (2001). *Analysis of the impact of inmate programs upon recidivism*. Available at: <http://www.dc.state.fl.us/pub/recidivismprog/index.html>.

Foster, Johanna E. and Sanford, Rebecca (2006). "Reading, writing, and prison education reform? The tricky and political process of establishing college programs for prisoners: perspectives from program developers", *Equal Opportunities International*, Vol 25 Issue:7, pp.599-610, <https://doi.org/10.1108/02610150610714411>

Freeman, A., & Dolan, M. (2001). Revisiting Prochaska and DiClemente's stages of change theory: An expansion and specification to aid in treatment planning and outcome evaluation. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 8(3), 224–234.

GA DOC website, <https://gdc.ga.gov/InmateInfo/FamilyInfo/Families-Friends/statewide-lifers-and-long-term-offender-program>

Gaes and Camp found that inmates with a level III security classification who were randomly assigned to a security level III prison in the California prison system had a hazard rate of returning to prison that was 31% higher than that of their randomly selected counterparts who were assigned to a level I prison. Thus, the offenders' classification assignments at admission determined their likelihood of returning to prison.

Gendreau, P. (1996). *The principles of effective intervention with offenders*. In A. Harland (ed.), *Choosing Correctional Interventions That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*. Sage, Newbury Park, CA

Gendreau P., Goggin C., and Smith, P. (1999). The forgotten issue in effective correctional treatment: Program implementation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 4, 180-87.

Gerber, J., and Fritsch, E.J. (1994). *The effects of academic and vocational program participation on inmate misconduct and reincarceration*. In *Prison Education Research Project: Final Report*. Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX.

Golden, L., Gatchel, R., and Cahill, M. (2006). Evaluating the effectiveness of the National Institute of Corrections' "Thinking for a Change" program among probationers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 43, 55-73.

Gover, A.R., Perez, D.M., & Jennings, W.G. (2008). Gender differences in factors contributing to institutional misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 88, 378-403.

Griffith, J., Hiller, M., Knight, K., and Simpson, D. (1999). A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of In-Prison Therapeutic Community Treatment and Risk Classification. *The Prison Journal* 79, 352-368.

Illinois Public Media (2020). Lack of Access, Long Waitlists: Education in Illinois Prisons. Accessed at: <https://will.illinois.edu/news/story/lack-of-access-long-waitlists-education-in-illinois-prisons>

The Impact of an Aging Inmate Population on the Federal Bureau of Prisons (2016). The Office of the Inspector General. Available at: <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/2015/e1505.pdf>.

Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 85(2), 127-144.

Laub, J. & Sampson, R. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age seventy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lawrence, S., Mears, D.P., Dubin, G. and Travis, J. (2002). *The Practice and Promise of Prison Programming*. Urban Institute, Washington, DC.

Lipsey, M. and Cullen, F. (2007). The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3.

Lipsey, M. (2009). The primary factors that characterize effective interventions with juvenile offenders: A meta-analytic overview. *Victims and Offenders*, 4(2), 124-147.

Lipsey, M. W. (2010). *Improving the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs: A new perspective on evidence-based practice*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform.

Lowenkamp, C.T., and Latessa, E.J. (2004). Increasing the effectiveness of correctional programming through the risk principle: Identifying offenders for residential placement, *Criminology and Public Policy*, 4, 501–528.

Lynch, J.P., & Sabol, W.J. (2001). *Prisoner Reentry in Perspective: Crime Policy Report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center.

MacKenzie, D.L. (2006). *What Works: Reducing the Criminal Activities of Offenders and Delinquents*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY. Pages 345-346.

Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association Books.

Maruna, S., & LeBel, T. (2003). Welcome home? Examining the “re-entry court” concept from a strengths-based perspective. *Western Criminology Review*, 4(2), 91–107.

Maruna, S., & LeBel, T. (2009). Strengths-based approaches to reentry: Extra mileage toward reintegration and destigmatization. *Japanese Journal of Sociological Criminology*, 34, 58–80.

Maruna, S. (2011). Reentry as a rite of passage. *Punishment and Society*, 13(1), 3–8.

Maryfield, B., Przybylski, R., & Myrent, M. (2020). *Research on Restorative Justice Practices*. Justice Research and Statistics Association, Washington, DC.

Mayfield, J. (2009). *The Dangerous Mentally Ill Offender Program: Four-Year Felony Recidivism and Cost Effectiveness* (Publication No. 09-02-1901). Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

McCollister, K.E., French, M.T., Prendergast, M., Wexler, H., Sacks, S., and Hall, E. (2003). Is In-Prison Treatment Enough? A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Prison-Based Treatment and Aftercare Services for Substance Abusing Offenders. *Law and Policy*, 25, 62-83.

McKinlay and Albicini, (2016). Prevalence of traumatic brain injuries and mental health problems among individuals within the criminal justice system. *Concussion*.

McNeill, F., & Maruna, S. (2007). Giving up and giving back: Desistance, generativity and social work with offenders. In G. McIvor & P. Raynor (Eds.), *Developments in social work with offenders. Research highlights in social work* 48 (pp. 224–239). London: Jessica Kingsley.

McNeill et al. (2012). Reexamining Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: Beyond “A Confined View” of What Works. *Justice Research and Policy*.

Mihalic, S., Irwin, K., Fagan, A., Ballard, D. & Elliott, D. (2004). Successful program implementation: Lessons from Blueprints. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Mitchell, O., Wilson, D., and MacKenzie, D. (2005). The Effectiveness of Incarceration-Based Drug Treatment on Criminal Behavior. Submitted to the Campbell Collaboration, Criminal Justice Review Group.

Mohr, G. & Maynard, G. (2021). The Case for Productivity Credits in Michigan: How Incentivizing People Sentenced to Prison to Complete Rehabilitative Programming Reduces Recidivism, Curbs Costs and Keeps Facilities Safe. Alliance for Safety and Justice.

Mumola, C.J. and Karberg, J.C. (2007 revised). Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington DC.

National Research Council. (2008). Parole, Desistance from Crime, and Community Integration. Committee on Community Supervision and Desistance from Crime. Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

Nellis, A. & Bishop, B. (2021). A New Lease on Life. The Sentencing Project, Washington, DC.

New Freedom Commission on Mental Health. (2004). Subcommittee on Criminal Justice: Background Paper. DHHS Pub. No. SMA-04-3880, Rockville, MD.

Nugent, W. R., Umbreit, M. S., Wiinamaki, L., & Pad-dock, J. (1999). Participation in victim-offender me-diation reduces recidivism. VOMA Connections, no. 3 (Summer): 5, 10.

The Osborne Association (2018). The High Costs of Low Risk: The Crisis of America’s Aging Prison Population.

Osher, F.C., and Steadman, H.J. (2007). Adapting evidence-based practices for persons with mental illness involved with the criminal justice system. Psychiatric Services, 58, 1472-1478.

PA DOC website, <https://www.cor.pa.gov/community-reentry/Pages/Treatment-Programs.aspx>

Petersilia, J. (1990). Conditions that permit intensive supervision. Crime and Delinquency 36(1), 126–145.

Piehl, A.M., Useem, B. and Dilulio, Jr., J. (1999). Right-Sizing Justice: A Cost Benefit Analysis of Imprisonment in Three States. Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute, New York, NY.

Prochaska, J.O., DiClemente, C.C., & Norcross, J.C. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1102-1114.

Prochaska, J.O. & Levesque, D.A. (2002). Enhancing motivation of offenders at each stage of change and phase of therapy. In M. McMurrin (Ed.), *Motivating offenders to change* (pp. 57–73). Chichester: Wiley.

Przybylski, R. (2008). *What Works? Effective Recidivism Reduction and Risk-Focused Prevention Programs: A Compendium of Evidence-Based Options for Preventing New and Persistent Criminal Behavior*. Prepared for the Division of Criminal Justice, Colorado Department of Public Safety. RKC Group, Lakewood, CO.

Przybylski (2009). *Correctional and Sentencing Reform for Drug Offenders*. RKC Group, Lakewood, CO.

Przybylski (2015). *The Effectiveness of Treatment for Adult Sexual Offenders*. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING INITIATIVE, Research Brief. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking, Washington. DC.

Rhine, E.E., Mawhorr, T.L., and Parks, E.C. (2006). Implementation: The bane of effective correctional programs. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5, 347-358.

Rocque, M. (2021), "But What Does It Mean? Defining, Measuring, and Analyzing Desistance From Crime in Criminal Justice," October 4, 2021, nij.ojp.gov: in US DOJ, National Institute of Justice (2021). *Desistance From Crime Implications for Research, Policy, and Practice*.

Roman, C.R., McBride, E.C., and Osborne, J. (2006). *Principles and Practice in Housing for Persons with Mental Illness Who Have Had Contact with the Justice System*. The Urban Institute, Washington, DC.

Sacks, S., Sacks, J., McKendrick, K., Banks, S., & Stommel, J. (2004). Modified therapeutic community for MICA offenders: Crime outcomes. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 22, 477-501.

Schmucker, M. & Lösel, F. (2015). The effects of sexual offender treatment on recidivism: An international analysis of sound quality evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, December 2015, Volume 11, Issue 4, pp 597–630.

- Schrantz, D. (2015). What Works to Reduce Crime, Recidivism, and Prison Populations? Seven Lessons Learned in Michigan. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, 28(2), 92–95.
- Schrantz, D., DeBor, S., & Mauer, M. (2018). Decarceration Strategies: How 5 States Achieved Substantial Prison Population Reductions. The Sentencing Project.
- Skeem, J. L., Eno Loudon, J., Polaschek, D., & Camp, D. (2007). Assessing relationship quality in mandated community treatment: Blending care with control. *Psychological Assessment*, 19, 397–410. McNeill et al. (2012).
- Skeem, J., Manchak, S., & Peterson, J.K. (2011). Correctional policy for offenders with mental illness: Creating a new paradigm for recidivism reduction. *Law and Human Behavior*, 35, 110-126.
- Smith, Paula & Gendreau, Paul & Swartz, Kristin. (2009). Validating the Principles of Effective Intervention: A Systematic Review of the Contributions of Meta-Analysis in the Field of Corrections. *Victims & Offenders*. 4. 148-169. 10.1080/15564880802612581.
- Sperber, K. G., Latessa, E. J., & Makarios, M. D. (2013a). Establishing a risk-dosage research agenda: Implications for policy and practice. *Justice Research and Policy*, 15(1), 123–142.
- Sperber, K. G., Latessa, E. J., & Makarios, M. D. (2013b). Examining the interaction between level of risk and dosage of treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40, 338–348.
- Steiner, B., & Woolredge, J. (2008). Inmate versus environmental effects on prison rule violations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 438-456.
- Steiner, B., & Woolredge, J. (2014). Sex differences in the predictors of prisoner misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41, 433-452.
- Steurer, S., Tracy, A. and Smith, L. (2001). Three State Recidivism Study, Preliminary Summary Report, Draft. Office of Correctional Education, United State Department of Education, Washington, DC.
- Strang, H., Sherman, L. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D., & Ariel, B. (2013). Restorative Justice Conferencing using face-to-face meetings of offenders and victims: Effects on offender recidivism and victim satisfaction. *A Systematic Review. Campbell System-atic Reviews*, 9(1), 1-59.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2007). Understanding Evidence-Based Practices for Co-Occurring Disorders, Overview Paper 5. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

US DOJ, National Institute of Justice (2021). Desistance from Crime Implications for Research, Policy, and Practice.

Weaver, B., & McNeill, F. (2010). Travelling hopefully: Desistance research and probation practice. In J. Brayford, F. Cowe, & J. Deering (Eds.), What else works? Creative work with offenders. Cullompton: Willan.

Wilson, D.B., Bouffard, L.A., and MacKenzie, D.L. (2005). A quantitative review of structured, group oriented, cognitive behavioral programs for offenders. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32, 172-204.

Wilson, D. B., Olaghere, A. & Kimbrell, C. S. (2017). Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Principles in Juvenile Justice: A Meta-Analysis. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Pro-grams, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. NCJ 250995

Zhang, R, & Srinivasan, S. (2019). SUCCESSFUL REENTRY: A COMMUNITY-LEVEL ANALYSIS. The Harvard University Institute of Politics, Criminal Justice Policy Group.

Culture eats strategy for breakfast is a phrase attributed to Peter Drucker but made famous by two business executives. In 2006, the Associated Press news service published an article about Ford and Mark Fields who was, at that time, the President of Ford America.

“The (Ford) team’s headquarters was a windowless conference room next to a long row of engineers’ cubicles. The walls of the conference room were papered with charts, goals and timetables. One of Fields’ favorite slogans on the wall: “Culture eats strategy for breakfast.”

“You can have the best plan in the world, and if the culture isn’t going to let it happen, it’s going to die on the vine,” Fields said.

The phrase is also linked with Richard Clark, a former Merck CEO. The Harvard Management Update in 2008 reported that the pharmaceutical executive had invoked the saying.