



ISSUE IN BRIEF: PRISONER REENTRY

JULY 2013



GEORGIA
CENTER for OPPORTUNITY

georgiaopportunity.org

Issue in Brief:
Prisoner Reentry



July 2013

INTRODUCTION

The number of people who are in prison, in jail, on parole, or on probation is far too high nationwide – 1 in 31 adults.¹ Far more startling is that 1 in 13 adults are under one of these forms of correctional supervision in the State of Georgia.² The state's prison population is currently the fourth largest in the nation at 57,570 offenders.³ With such a large prison population, Georgia releases a large number of prisoners each year (19,172 offenders in 2012 and an average of 20,537 offenders over the last five years reported).⁴ Of those released in 2012, 8,960 were paroled, 5,187 were released to serve a sentence of probation, and 1,379 maxed-out their prison sentence and were under no supervision at all.⁵

In recent years, the Governor's office and the Georgia Legislature has made significant strides in reducing the number of offenders entering into correctional supervision in the first place.⁶ Those efforts are showing good signs of slowing the pipeline to prison.⁷ At the same time, the Department of Corrections and various nonprofits have focused significant work on reentry, as offenders who receive the necessary support in transitioning from prison to the community are less likely to recidivate.⁸ State agencies, non-profits, businesses, churches, and other community stakeholders have identified barriers to reentry and many are doing excellent work. Some are collaborating in various ways to help offenders overcome the significant obstacles that they face.

While substantial efforts have been made toward this end – and those efforts continue to expand – several important gaps remain which call for greater attention. The following list is an effort to summarize the current gaps in Georgia's reentry system based upon the available evidence, including official state reports, site visits to prisons and reentry service providers, and over four dozen expert interviews conducted by GCO staff over the course of the last nine months. This list is not exhaustive; instead it is intended to provide a common footing for a robust discussion about the topic of reentry and serves as a summary of the most prevalent themes GCO staff discovered in the course of preparing for the launch of the prisoner reentry project.

GAPS

RELEASE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

While policy in Georgia's correction system is to begin preparing inmates for release when they enter prison through the completion of release plans,⁹ evidence suggests that those plans are not often (possibly, rarely) followed.¹⁰ This is despite wide acknowledgment that creating and following release plans are one of the keys to successful reintegration.¹¹ Failures to follow release plans include offenders not receiving the full scope of treatment, programs, and services prescribed to them in their release plans during their time behind bars. This is not only true during offenders' stay in prison but continues after release, as many lack the supervision and assistance that is necessary to follow transition plans successfully.

Identification

One of the most basic and impactful shortcomings of current release planning can be seen in the failure to secure identification for an offender prior to his or her release. This task is supposed to be dealt with by the Department of Corrections while an offender is in prison, but too



often it falls on the shoulders of transitional center staff and overburdened parole and probation officers.¹² Because their caseloads are so large, parole and probation officers are not always able to obtain offenders' identification and benefits in a timely manner.¹³ Part of the reason why some offenders are not receiving identification while in prison is because programs such as the The Offender Parolee Probationer State Training Employment Program (TOPPSTEP) – a program designed to ensure offenders' receive their identification prior to release – are being offered only to those being paroled, not those maxing-out.¹⁴ This leaves a large percentage of max-outs without identification upon release, making it difficult for them to secure a job and housing – two vital components for successful reentry. The other effect of not receiving proper identification is that prisoners in transition centers often face significant delays in beginning the job search process while waiting for identification to be provided.¹⁵ This means that these prisoners lose valuable months of transition time that could have been used to find a job, develop healthy work habits, pay debts, and start saving for release.¹⁶

LIMITED CAPACITY

With upwards of 60,000 inmates, over 160,000 probationers,¹⁷ and more than 25,000 parolees,¹⁸ state agencies are struggling to provide for the specific needs of each offender. According to a few experts, the right programs are in place, but there simply is not enough funding to serve the entire inmate population as needed.¹⁹

Transitional Centers

The limited capacity of transitional centers is worth highlighting because of their demonstrated success in reducing recidivism. According to the Georgia Department of Corrections, "Research has shown that offenders who have the opportunity to re-enter the community after a stay in a transitional center are up to a third more likely to succeed in maintaining a crime-free life."²⁰ These centers are successful because they allow for slow re-integration into society by providing offenders with increasing levels of responsibility, such as allowing offsite employment and greater interaction with family and friends. Transitional center beds also save the state money over traditional prison beds.²¹ However, a large percentage of eligible offenders are not able to benefit from this valuable means of preparation because of limited bed space. While Georgia releases some 20,000 offenders annually,²² there are currently only 2,986 transitional center beds available in 15 transitional centers statewide.²³ Further, a number of these beds are occupied by low-risk offenders who do not require the same preparation and supervision as moderate to high-risk offenders, who are at greater risk of recidivating.

Addiction

Another area where prisons have struggled to meet the needs of offenders is in treating those with drug addictions.²⁴ The U.S. Department of Justice estimates that "70-80 percent of offenders are under supervision for drug-related offenses."²⁵ A number of these offenders have substance abuse issues that require on-going treatment and detox; however, many are not receiving this necessary treatment because of limited resources. Effective evidence-based programs, such as Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) centers, are not available at every prison in the state. To make matters worse, addictions are being fueled inside of many prisons through easy access to drugs. One transitional center reported that it is easier for an offender to get drugs inside of a prison than outside.²⁶ As a result, offenders leave prison with the same addictions that contributed to their initial incarceration, increasing the likelihood that they will return to prison.



FORMING REAL CONNECTIONS

Isolation from the world beyond the prison walls remains a real impediment to offenders securing job opportunities, housing, transportation, and other supports prior to their release.

Employment

Our preliminary research suggests that not enough focus and energy is being placed on establishing real connections between employers and ex-offenders in order to reduce recidivism.²⁷ Too many offenders are leaving prison without substantive job prospects or real connections to potential employers. While they may have received job skills training, attended resume workshops, and practiced interviewing during their time in prison, once released, they have the daunting task of securing a job while having very few connections and the burden of a criminal record.²⁸

The longer an offender is unemployed, the greater his chance of recidivating.²⁹ In contrast, the faster an offender can secure a job, the greater his chance of successfully reentering society. Having a job enables an offender to pay for his basic needs (i.e. housing, food, clothing, transportation), as well as meet other obligations that are required of him (i.e. child support, court fees, damages, etc.). Further, it provides a strong incentive for him to remain drug free and gives him a sense of purpose and self-worth.³⁰ For all of these reasons, securing a job quickly and maintaining it is arguably the strongest factor in keeping an offender from recidivating.³¹

The concept of “rapid attachment to work,” is being tested by the city of Newark, New Jersey through its Prisoner Reentry Initiative (NPRI). The program, launched in 2009 with funding from the U.S. Department of Labor and with assistance from the Manhattan Institute, aims to tackle the overwhelming rates of incarceration and recidivism in Newark. Since the program’s inception in 2009, the city has seen remarkable results: More than 1,400 formerly incarcerated individuals have received job development, job retention, case management, and mentoring services, 73 percent of participating offenders have entered employment upon exiting the program, \$9 per hour is the average hourly wage for participants, and 70 percent of offenders have retained their job for at least 6-months. Those who participate in this initiative have a recidivism rate that is well below the state average.³²

In light of these results, job-connection services appear to be a very promising tool in reducing offender recidivism.

Housing

Some offenders remain in prison simply because housing cannot be located for them. This is especially true for sex-offenders who face a number of restrictions as to where they can live.³³ Offenders who do find housing discover that temporary housing is too short-term for them to successfully reintegrate into society. This is particularly true for those who sleep in state-funded beds.³⁴ Even worse is the outcome for offenders who fail to find housing and are sent back to prison after three attempts.³⁵

DEBT AND SAVINGS

For many prisoners reentering society, debts and the inability to save money while in prison create serious obstacles to a successful transition. The debts an offender incurs prior to entering



prison often continue to grow during his or her prison sentence.³⁶ While in prison, additional debts may be incurred, especially relative to transitional center per diems and travel expenses.³⁷ For those indebted offenders able to obtain paying work while still incarcerated, there is often little left to be saved after paying minimum amounts on the debts they owe. For those prisoners unable to work for a variety of reasons, savings is nonexistent. For both types of offenders, absent support from others, prospects for affording the very basic necessities of life – particularly housing, transportation and food - after their release are very low and their odds of recidivating high.

MAX-OUTS

Max-outs face somewhat unique problems relative to transitioning back into society. This group, containing both serious and chronic offenders,³⁸ is largely neglected in terms of preparing them for life outside of prison.³⁹ This practice is contrary to the best practice indicated by research, which recommends that high-risk offenders receive the most attention and resources while under correctional supervision.⁴⁰ The Pew Center on the States reveals that in 2010, 21 percent of max-outs in Georgia were released without probation to follow, indicating that they received no supervision at all.⁴¹ This lack of supervision leaves max-outs in a vulnerable state to reoffend, as they lack the accountability and assistance necessary for making a successful transition.⁴²

REENTRY COLLABORATION

There is a growing recognition that successful efforts will require much more robust collaboration between state agencies and existing non-profit organizations working in prisoner reentry.⁴³ There are numerous non-profits that exist to serve offenders in some capacity throughout Georgia, providing such needs as housing, employment, substance abuse treatment, food, clothing, transportation, and education.⁴⁴ Too often these organizations operate with little awareness of other organizations in their community who provide similar or complimentary services to ex-offenders. Whether this occurs because of a lack of communication or the inability to maintain a common vision, their isolation prevents them from combining services in a way that multiplies the reentry effort.⁴⁵

OUTCOME-BASED METRICS

A final gap – and one of the most daunting – is the lack of established outcome-based metrics for reentry services. Developing standardized metrics among those involved in the work of reentry (and a means for collecting and analyzing the results) will allow agencies to use real data in identifying lead and lag measures in order to make necessary adjustments and achieve reduced recidivism among offenders.⁴⁶ Such practice is necessary for any organization that wishes to demonstrate its effectiveness. The State Board of Pardons and Paroles has made great strides in the use of data through implementing an automated system that tracks the progress and risk levels of those on parole, utilizing such metrics as positive drug screens, residential moves, the number of days employed, and the number of months of program attendance.⁴⁷ However, such metrics are not used across government agencies, non-profits, and others involved in the work of reentry to measure and document effectiveness. The absence of these metrics leads to a loss of information about best practices, the continuation of ineffective programs, and, ultimately, slow progress in helping offenders successfully reenter society.



EMERGING SOLUTIONS

Despite the existence of these gaps, the State of Georgia has implemented evidence-based practices in several key areas to reduce offender recidivism. These include the development of residential substance abuse treatment centers, the introduction of specialized courts, and the use of risk and needs assessments.

RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT CENTERS

These centers are emerging as an effective form of treatment for offenders struggling with substance abuse. As cited previously, the U.S. Department of Justice estimates that “70-80 percent of offenders are under supervision for drug-related offenses.”⁴⁸ Through administering proper treatment, studies show that drug abuse can be cut in half, criminal activity reduced up to 80 percent, and arrests reduced up to 64 percent.⁴⁹ RSAT centers appear to have the ability to achieve such results. According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, “A meta-analysis of evaluations at 12 RSAT sites found positive outcomes from in-prison substance abuse treatment.” Not only do “RSAT programs increase offenders’ self-esteem, decision[-]making, and self-efficacy” as well as “reduce their levels of anxiety, depression, risk taking [,]....hostility [, and] [c]ognitive distortions (e.g., self-centeredness, blaming others, minimizing, assuming the worst),” completion of these programs also results in a decreased likelihood of being arrested or placed on a higher custody level.⁵⁰ As of now, Georgia has developed four RSAT programs within its prison system, which are located at Coastal State Prison in Savannah, Johnson State Prison in Wrightsville, Pulaski State Prison in Hawkinsville, and Valdosta State Prison.⁵¹

SPECIALIZED COURTS

State leaders have increasingly pushed for a statewide system of accountability courts to serve as alternatives to incarceration.⁵² Such alternatives include drug courts, mental health courts, and reentry courts.

Drug Courts

“Rigorous scientific studies and meta-analyses have found that drug courts significantly reduce recidivism among drug court participants in comparison to similar but nonparticipating offenders, with effect sizes ranging from 10 to 70 percent.”⁵³ They also result in significant cost savings for the state, as “[a] statewide study in Washington found average savings of \$3,892 per drug court client, and a benefit/cost ratio of 1.74.”⁵⁴ Other studies found similar results in California, Oregon, Kentucky, and St. Louis, where savings ranged from \$2,000-\$7,707 per client, with greater savings occurring the longer the studies were conducted.⁵⁵ Drug Courts have demonstrated to be most effective when they focus on high-risk offenders and when they limit the court to 150 participants or less.⁵⁶ As of 2011, Georgia has established 72 Drug Courts, which include 31 adult felony drug courts, 1 felony and DUI court, 1 felony drug and mental health court, 18 DUI courts, 9 family dependency treatment courts, and 12 juvenile drug courts.⁵⁷

Mental Health Courts

These courts have been created for the purpose of serving the large number of people with mental disorders in the criminal justice system.⁵⁸ Researchers estimate that “almost 17 percent



of individuals entering local jails are suffering from some mental illness and half of all jail and state correctional detainees with mental illness reported three or more prior convictions.”⁵⁹ In 2010, 62 percent of people who went to Gwinnett County Drug Court had a diagnosable mental health condition.⁶⁰ Georgia introduced the first mental health court in Douglas County in 2002.⁶¹ Since then, ten other mental health courts have been established in the state – two in Fulton County and one in each of the following counties: Hall, DeKalb, Clarke, Bibb, Muscogee, Chatham, Dougherty, and most recently Gwinnett.⁶²

Reentry Courts

Developed more recently, reentry courts “provide close supervision, links to social services, and intensive case management to offenders returning home after incarceration.”⁶³ They may prove to be a way of helping those most at risk of reoffending.⁶⁴ Currently, more than two dozen reentry courts are in operation nation-wide, with more on the horizon.⁶⁵ In Georgia, the Brunswick Division of the United States District Court established the Court Supervised Reentry Program in 2010. This reentry court program is modeled after two systems in Pennsylvania which have proven to be effective in reducing staggering recidivism rates among federal offenders.⁶⁶ State policy makers are advocating for the expansion of accountability courts, including those focused on reentry.⁶⁷

RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

The use of risk and needs assessments to identify offenders’ criminogenic needs have enabled state agencies to develop more effective supervision plans for offenders. As mentioned previously, the Parole Board developed the Georgia Parolee Risk Assessment instrument “based on research conducted on more than 6,000 Georgia parolees who completed supervision in 2001.”⁶⁸ This instrument “calculates an initial risk score at the time offenders are released from prison,” and then “automatically updates risk changes daily for each of the 21,000 parolees currently on supervision.”⁶⁹ Such a tool assists parole officers in effectively targeting those who pose the highest threat of re-offending in order to connect them to available resources in the community.

The GDC uses the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) to assess the criminogenic risk/needs factors of offenders under its supervision. This instrument measures such factors as violence, recidivism, flight/failure to appear, and technical violations. Through assessing these critical risk factors, the agency can identify which programs are best for each offender, providing intensive and comprehensive services for high-risk offenders, and minimal to no intervention for low-risk offenders.⁷⁰

REMAINING CHALLENGES

As evidenced above, significant progress has been made in implementing evidence-based practices in Georgia. However, the existing gaps present remaining challenges to be overcome by those involved in the work of reentry. These challenges may require new strategies to be taken by community stakeholders, or they may simply require better implementation of existing ones. In either case, effective collaboration among all players will be essential if we are to see reduced recidivism in our state.



NOTES

¹ Pew Center on the States, *One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections*, March 2009, 1, http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/pes_assets/2009/PSPP1in31reportFINALWEB32609pdf.pdf.

² Ibid., 5.

³ Georgia Department of Corrections, *Annual Report FY 2012*, 6, http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/Research/AnnualGDC_annual_report_FY2012.pdf; Governor Nathan Deal, Office of the Governor, “Deal, leaders seek commission on criminal justice reform,” Press Release, February 16, 2011, par. 3, <http://gov.georgia.gov/press-releases/2011-02-16/deal-leaders-seek-commission-criminal-justice-reform>.

⁴ Georgia Department of Corrections, “Total prison releases by home county for the past five complete calendar years,” Office of Planning and Analysis, February 18, 2013, 4, http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/Research/Standing/Inmate_releases_by_county_by_CY.pdf.

⁵ There were 3,646 prisoners released by the State Board of Pardons and Paroles under other forms of clemency. By including these releases as well as those who were granted parole, a total of 12,606 offenders were released by the Parole Board in 2012. See State Board of Pardons and Parole, *FY 2012 Annual Report*, 19, <http://pap.georgia.gov/sites/pap.georgia.gov/files/Annual%20Report%202012.pdf>. The number of releases required to serve a split-sentence of probation and the number of releases maxing-out without any supervision to follow was calculated by first subtracting the number of prisoners released by the Parole Board in 2012 (12,606) from the total number of offenders released from Georgia prisons by the Department of Corrections in 2012 (19,172 offenders). See Georgia Department of Corrections, “Total prison releases,” 4. Then, this number (6,566) was multiplied by the percentage of people released to serve a sentence of probation (79 percent) and the percentage of people maxing-out without any supervision to follow (21 percent), as determined by a 2011 study. See Len Engel, “Georgia Corrections System Assessment,” Pew Center on the States, August 25, 2011, Slide 21, www.arbeslaw.com/uploads/1/2/7/9/.../system_assessment_final.ppt.

⁶ See Georgia General Assembly, *Report of the Special Council on Criminal Justice Reform for Georgians*, November 2011, <http://www.legis.ga.gov/Documents/GACouncilReport-FINALDRAFT.pdf>; Georgia General Assembly, *Report of the Special Council on Criminal Justice Reform for Georgians*, December 2012, http://gov.georgia.gov/sites/gov.georgia.gov/files/related_files/press_release/Report%20of%20the%20Special%20Council%20on%20Criminal%20Justice%20Reform%20for%20Georgians%202012%20-%20FINAL.pdf.

⁷ See Walter C. Jones, “Georgia prison population declines,” *The Augusta Chronicle*, May 21, 2013, accessed July 12, 2013, <http://chronicle.augusta.com/news/crime-courts/2013-05-21/georgia-prison-population-declines>.

⁸ This focus includes the continuation of the Criminal Justice Reform Council for a third year with a focus on reentry and the creation of the new Governor’s Office of Transition, Support and Re-entry. See Governor Nathan Deal, Office of the Governor, “Deal announces appointments for leadership positions,” Press Release, June 20, 2013, para. 3, <http://gov.georgia.gov/press-releases/2013-06-20/deal-announces-appointments-leadership-positions-0>.

⁹ See Georgia Department of Corrections & State Board of Pardons and Paroles, *2012 Reentry Skills Building Handbook* (Milledgeville, GA: Baldwin State Prison Printing Technology, 2012), 3, 6-7.

¹⁰ GCO Interview, September 17, 2012; GCO Interview, April 18, 2013; GCO Interview, September 10, 2012.

Note: Interviewees are anonymous to protect their identities.

¹¹ GCO Interview, August 10, 2012; GCO Interview, March 20, 2013.

¹² GCO Interview, September 17, 2012; GCO Interview, April 18, 2013.



¹³ Ibid; Len Engel, “Georgia Corrections System,” Slide 20, 30. Engel reports that in 2010, the ratio of probationers to probation officer was 200 to 1, and parolee to parole officer was 81 to 1.

¹⁴ Len Engel, “Georgia Corrections System,” Slide 18. The exception is Coastal State Prison.

¹⁵ GCO Interview, April 18, 2013.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Georgia Department of Corrections, *Annual Report FY 2012*, 6.

¹⁸ State Board of Pardons and Parole, *FY 2012 Annual Report*, 19.

¹⁹ GCO Interview, September 7, 2012; GCO Interview, October 18, 2012.

²⁰ Georgia Department of Corrections, “Transitional Centers,” par. 1, <http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/Divisions/Corrections/Transitional.html>.

²¹ GCO Interview, September 27, 2012.

²² Georgia Department of Corrections, “Total prison releases,” 4.

²³ Georgia Department of Corrections, “Transitional Centers,” par. 2.

²⁴ GCO Interview, October 26, 2012.

²⁵ Georgia Department of Corrections, “Substance Abuse,” para. 1, <http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/Divisions/OPT/Reentry/RiskReduction/SubstanceAbuse.html>.

²⁶ GCO Interview, April 18, 2013.

²⁷ GCO Interview, November 8, 2012; GCO Interview, January 28, 2013; GCO Interview, May 3, 2013; GCO Interview, May 24, 2013.

²⁸ GCO Interview, May 3, 2013.

²⁹ GCO Interview, September 17, 2012; GCO Interview, April 18, 2013.

³⁰ GCO Interview, May 3, 2013.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Manhattan Institute, “Moving Men into the Mainstream: The Newark Prisoner Reentry Initiative,” Center for State and Local Leadership, par. 4, 7, http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cci_moving_men_into_the_mainstream.htm.

³³ Persons required to register as sex offenders on or after July 1, 2008 “cannot live within 1,000 feet of a child care facility, church, school, public park, private park, recreation facility, playground, skating rink, neighborhood center, gymnasium, school bus stop, public library, or public or community swimming pool.” See O.C.G.A. § 42-1-15(b); Law Office of the Southern Center for Human Rights, “2010 Revisions to Georgia Sex Offender Law: A Summary of Key Provisions of HB 571 for Members of the *Whitaker v. Perdue* Class,” 1, http://www.gachaplains.org/pdf/HB_571_Summary.pdf; GCO Interview, September 17, 2012; GCO Interview, October 29, 2012.

³⁴ The Reentry Partnership Housing program, established through the combined effort of the Department of Corrections and State Board of Pardons and Paroles, offers \$1,800 to service providers in exchange for three months of room and board assistance for a parolee. See Georgia Department of Corrections, “Reentry Partnership Housing,” para. 1, <http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/Divisions/OPT/Reentry/ReentryPartnershipHousing.html>; GCO Interview, Janu-



ary 28, 2013; GCO Interview, September 17, 2012.

³⁵ GCO Interview, September 17, 2012.

³⁶ “While there are no current national figures on child-support debt among prisoners, a 2002 estimate showed that a sample of Massachusetts inmates would leave prison in arrears by an average of \$31,000; in Colorado the figure among a group of parolees in 2001 was \$16,700. Until Michigan launched a project to adjust prisoners’ debts in 2004, inmates owed an average of \$28,000, according to figures from the state’s Supreme Court.” See Steven Yoder, “Prisoner’s Dilemma,” *The American Prospect*, March 14, 2011, accessed July 12, 2013, para. 10, <http://prospect.org/article/prisoners-dilemma-0>. With some 60 percent of state prisoners reporting having one or more children, child support is likely a major driver of prisoner debt in Georgia. See the following source for percentages of inmates with children: Georgia Department of Corrections, *Inmate Statistical Profile: All Active Inmates*, Operations, Planning, and Training Division, Planning and Analysis Section, November 1, 2012, 8, http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/Research/Monthly/Profile_all_inmates_2012_10.pdf.

³⁷ GCO Interview, April 18, 2013.

³⁸ Georgia General Assembly, *Report of the Special Council*, November 2011, 15.

³⁹ GCO Interview, August 7, 2012.

⁴⁰ GCO Interview, March 12, 2013.

⁴¹ Len Engel, “Georgia Corrections System,” Slide 21; See Endnote 5.

⁴² GCO Interview, August 10, 2012; GCO Interview, September 11, 2012; GCO Interview, March 20, 2013.

⁴³ GCO Interview, August 10, 2012; GCO Interview, September 17, 2012; GCO Interview, May 3, 2013; GCO Interview, December 6, 2012. Promising work includes the Gwinnett Reentry Intervention Program (GRIP) and Prison Fellowship’s Reentry Coalition approach.

⁴⁴ State Board of Pardons and Paroles, “Transitional Housing for Offender Reentry Directory,” <http://pap.georgia.gov/thor-directory>; Community Voices “Stakeholder Directory,” Morehouse School of Medicine, Georgia Reentry, <http://www.communityvoices.org/reentry-home/reentry-stakeholder-directory.aspx>; GCO Interview, January 28, 2013.

⁴⁵ GCO Interview, January 28, 2013.

⁴⁶ Danny Hunter, George S. Braucht, and John Prevost, “Improving Parole Outcomes with Performance Leadership and Data: Doing What Works,” *Topics in Community Corrections*, National Institute of Corrections, Annual Issue 2007, 42, <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/022782.pdf>.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 38.

⁴⁸ Georgia Department of Corrections, “Substance Abuse,” par. 1.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Bureau of Justice Assistance. *Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners (RSAT) Program*, U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ 206269, April 2005, 11, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/206269.pdf>.

⁵¹ Georgia Department of Corrections, “Substance Abuse,” par. 10.

⁵² Georgia General Assembly, *Report of the Special Council*, November 2011, 13.



⁵³ Roger K. Warren, *Evidence-Based Practice to Reduce Recidivism: Implications for State Judiciaries*, ExpressO, 24, http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=roger_warren.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ GCO Interview, October 26, 2012.

⁵⁷ Administrative Office of the Courts of Georgia, “Facts about Georgia’s Drug Courts,” revised February 23, 2011, 1, <http://w2.georgiacourts.org/gac/files/Facts%20Sheet%20Drug%20Court%20Programs%202-23-2011%281%29.pdf>.

⁵⁸ Dale E. McNiel and Renée L. Binder, “Effectiveness of a Mental Health Court in Reducing Criminal Recidivism and Violence,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 164 (2007): 1395, <http://ajp.psychiatryonline.org/data/Journals/AJP/3830/07aj1395.PDF>.

⁵⁹ Georgia Accountability Courts, “Georgia Mental Health Court Standards,” <http://www.gaaccountabilitycourts.org/MHCStandards2011.pdf>.

⁶⁰ GCO Interview, October 26, 2012.

⁶¹ Andria Simmons, “Mental health court program starts in Gwinnett,” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, January 12, 2013, para. 20, <http://www.ajc.com/news/news/mental-health-court-program-starts-in-gwinnett/nTtW5/>.

⁶² National Center for State Courts, “Georgia Accountability Courts,” http://www.georgiacourts.org/courts/accountability/image/acc_cts_7-24-07.pdf; Andria Simmons, “Mental health court,” para. 2.

⁶³ Robert V. Wolf, *Reentry Courts: Looking Ahead – A Conversation about Strategies for Offender Reintegration*, Center for Court Innovation, 2011, https://www.bja.gov/Publications/CCI_ReentryCourts.pdf.

⁶⁴ GCO Interview, March 12, 2013.

⁶⁵ Robert V. Wolf, *Reentry Courts*, 1.

⁶⁶ United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, Brunswick Division, “Court Supervised Reentry Program,” Memo, March 4, 2011, <http://www.gasd.uscourts.gov/pdf/csrporder.pdf>.

⁶⁷ Georgia General Assembly, *Report of the Special Council*, November 2011, 13.

⁶⁸ George S. Braucht, John Prevost, and Tammy Meredith, “Automating Offender Risk Assessment,” *Topics in Community Corrections*, National Institute of Corrections, Annual Issue 2004, 35, http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/ccjr/docs/articles/ticc04_final_complete.pdf.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ Georgia Department of Corrections, “Assessment,” <http://www.dcor.state.ga.us/Divisions/OPT/Reentry/RiskReduction/Assessment.html>.





Georgia Center for Opportunity

333 Research Court
Suite 210
Norcross, GA 30092