MARYLAND ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE REFORM

Working to end unnecessary incarceration and build strong, safe communities

Cooperating for Effective Statewide Reentry:

A report on the reality and needs for reentry in the State of Maryland

Francis, Crystal R., Caroom, P.

Maryland Alliance for Justice Reform (MAJR)

Author Note

Abstract

Nearly 4,000 people are released from correctional facilities and return to communities across Maryland each year. Almost half return to Baltimore City and Baltimore County. Of

those that return home, some experience challenges obtaining an education, employment, healthcare, and other social or support services, preventing a seamless reentry process. Realizing the reentry challenges that returning citizens in Maryland face, 122 stakeholders assembled at a Roundtable Forum to identify solutions to problems impacting reentry in Maryland. The participants comprised 30 government employees, 30 community-based reentry service providers, 30 policy advocates, and 22 returned citizens. The Roundtable discussions focused on the following themes: intake, risk assessment, and data sharing; reentry preparation for prisoners; designing an individual reentry plan; measuring progress; and post reentry success. This report summarizes the findings and recommendations agreed upon by participants at the Roundtable held on September 16, 2019, at the University of Maryland Law School, Westminster Conference Center in Baltimore, Maryland.

Keywords: collaborate, individual reentry plan, reentry, returning citizen, and transition.

Definitions:

Collaborate- refers to reentry stakeholders working in partnership throughout the various phases of the reentry process.

Individual reentry plan- is a strategy created to address the criminogenic behaviors and needs of a person arrested, convicted, and or confined for committing a crime.

Reentry- refers to the process of returning to the community.

Returning citizen- is a person transitioning from a correctional facility to community supervision.

Transition- refers to a change in a prisoner's supervision status.

Table of Contents

Many people exit prison after 5 or 10 years and find the community different than

when they left. Former prisoners describe reentry as an overwhelming process, specifically

for those who have served a long sentence or cycled in and out of jail over several years. The

following themes were derived from a breakout session on designing an individual reentry

Cooperating for Effective Statewide Reentry:

A report on the reality and needs for reentry in the State of Maryland

Introduction

How can Maryland prisons and its communities cooperate to improve reentry outcomes so former prisoners will never commit another offense? Marylanders most directly involved with prisoner reentry met last month finding consensus on several key points. The Maryland Alliance for Justice Reform (MAJR), invited more than 120 practitioners, state employees, and impacted persons to join in a day-long focus group [Reentry Roundtable] at the University of Maryland Law School's Westminster Hall on September 16, 2019. The keynote speaker, the Department of Public Safety & Corrections (DPSCS) Secretary Rob Green, made two significant announcements.

Giving higher priority to reentry, new DPSCS positions [Assistant Secretary for Reentry and Executive Director for Data] will be created so inmates data can be more transparent and available for collaboration with local reentry programs. Recognizing that "new [DPSCS] programs available only on the inside" can't meet the widespread need for reentry resources, the DPSCS will seek new "bridges and connectivity" through an improved reentry "Portal," working more closely with local governments, nonprofits, faith organizations, and other state agencies [Labor, Health and Humans Services, and others].In the next month [October/November], Green plans to send an invitation to 1,000 Maryland churches seeking increased involvement with reentry support for returning citizens.

Problem Statement

Each year about 4,000 people are released from state prisons and return to communities across Maryland. Also, more than 1,500 return from county detention centers after serving more than 90 days in jail. For many, incarceration coupled with a criminal record presents a myriad of challenges such as accessing essential resources (e.g., housing, stable employment, and healthcare) and other services that would facilitate a seamless transition process and reduce the rate of recidivism (e.g., family counseling, mediation, and therapy). Reentry is the process by which prisoners return to the community. Seamless reentry is an effective combination of services and resources to remove barriers and hurdles that prevent returning citizens from succeeding as productive members of society. There is a gap in understanding whereby stakeholders in Maryland can cooperate for effective statewide reentry.

Although Maryland reports a steady decline in its prison population, the rate of recidivism is about 40.5 percent, with many repeating the cycle of imprisonment within three years. States with effective inmate reentry plans report recidivism rates as high as 25 percent. Virginia currently leads the nation with the lowest recidivism rate in the country (23.4 percent), which most attribute to its sophisticated reentry system (VDOC, 2019). By comparison, fewer than one-third of Maryland counties (7 of 24 jurisdictions) have agreed with state prisons on a reentry transition framework.

If Maryland's correctional system and reentry supports were substantially more efficient, then the State's justice system would be less burdened, taxpayers' rates would decrease, and public safety would dramatically improve. The Council of Economic Advisors (2018) reported

that states could save up to $5.27 in correctional costs for each dollar spent on effective reentry services.

Research Questions and Methodology

In response to the problem returning citizen experience transitioning back to society, MAJR convened a focus group of 122 stakeholders during a Roundtable forum to identify solutions to challenges impacting reentry in Maryland. Of the 122 stakeholders, 30 were state employees, 30 community-based service providers, 30 reentry advocates, and 22 returned citizens. Stakeholders participated in six discussions regarding ways to improve the following: a) reentry intake, risk assessment, and data-sharing; b) reentry preparation for prisoners (education, other services, and planning within prisons); c) designing individual reentry plans; d) implementing individual reentry plans; e) measuring reentry success; and f) post-reentry needs (such as employment, housing, transportation) and relief from obstacles (such as excessive parole and probation requirements).

Participants recommended a variety of ways to enhance reentry resources and opportunities in Maryland. The theory of constraints provided the conceptual framework, resulting in three questions that guided the data collection and analysis phases (Francis, 2018). The research questions derived were relevant to themes that were absent from the available literature on reentry in Maryland:

1.   What exists but is not working in Maryland [what to change]?

2.   What should exist in Maryland [what to change to]?

3.   How do we achieve the desired outcomes [how to change]?

Each question aligned with the six reentry themes outlined in the introduction portion of the

report. Focus groups were used to explore participants' response to the research questions.

Moderators used semi-structured question to obtain participants insights panel discussions,

including an unstructured open-ended question and answer period. Breakout session facilitators

used unstructured approaches to explore participants' perceptions. Session monitors recorded

common themes and categories that were derived from each discussion according to the

conceptual framework discussed in Research Questions and Methodology portion of the report.

The themes deducted from participants viewpoints were reported as findings and

recommendations.

Findings and Recommendations

Roundtable participants agreed to recommend various ways to improve Maryland reentry

resources and opportunities. Several suggestions revealed unmet proposals documented in the

2012 Maryland Reentry Task Force Final Report:

1. To enact laws that provide significant incentives [such as diminution credits] to

    incarcerated individuals for participating in reentry programs and those pursuing a GED,

    or similarly valuable program.

2. To increase housing resources for returning citizens.

3. To review and revise institutional visiting policies and increase incarcerated individuals'

    access and engagement with family members.

 Other recommendations offered new insights:

1. To adopt universal reentry screening and risk assessment tools.

2. To educate judges on addiction treatment, behavioral science, and the value of risk assessments.

3. To encourage the expanded use of Reentry Court dockets, comparable to or connected with Drug, Mental Health, and Veteran Court dockets.

4. To expand the use of peer-counselors to increase the limited resources in prisons.

5. To focus reentry plans on the individual aspirations, needs, and resources of each inmate.

6. To provide opportunities [paid and volunteer] for successfully returning citizens to become coaches and mentors, resulting in better communication with inmates by people who have "been there" [individuals with a similar lived experience].

7. To improve communication between statewide reentry stakeholders and community-based providers.

Based on the applause, participants agreed that some of the best wisdom shared during the day was the significance of respect for prisoners and returning citizens. One moderator, a successfully returned citizen for over 40 years, offered a thoughtful sentiment; "Just because you made a mistake does not make you a mistake." The next section of this report provides a comprehensive analysis of the themes were derived from the morning plenary, afternoon plenary, and breakout sessions.

Comprehensive Analysis of Six Roundtable Discussions

Cooperating for Effective Statewide Reentry in Maryland

During the morning plenary session, participants heard remarks regarding Robert Green's [DPSCS Secretary] vision for reentry in the State of Maryland. Rob Green described himself as a professional "in corrections for 35 years," adding "reentry is my thing" and "I am a doer and a fixer." While his DPSCS portfolio is broad, including State Police, Prisons, Parole, and Probation as well as the Baltimore City detention center, he recognized that reentry to Maryland's communities from prisons is a vital part of the system.

Green asserted that reentry should begin at the arrest and that provision of services need to commence a person's lowest point. Using the term "returning citizen" rather than "ex-offender," he pointed to planned improvements, including replacing the old City jail in downtown Baltimore with a treatment facility purpose-built to address the mental health and addiction crises. "We're taking a wrecking ball to it, so it cannot possibly come back." DPSCS also soon will hire for two newly created reentry-related positions. The Assistant Secretary for Reentry to coordinate Reentry Services, including the six pre-release centers operated by DPSCS and the Executive Director for Data to improve the availability and clarity information.

"More than 4,000 persons will be going home [from state prisons] in the next [12] months," he acknowledged. "Currently, [only] seven counties have Memorandum of Understanding with DPSCS to house folks locally up to a year [before] going home, so that [DPSCS needs more] community resources [that] can come into the facilities and then continue community-based services after they leave custody." Rather than attempt to create new programs inside the prisons that cannot connect with the outside, Green said that, instead,

DPSCS's goal would involve better connecting with existing services. He plans a "Portal of Connection, a one-stop-shop" to help inmates better access programs available from other state agencies (HHS, Health, Labor), nonprofits, counties, and communities.

Green also hopes the prisons can increase connections with faith groups. He praised the "Welcome Home" program of Catholic Charities. He noted that a letter would be going out in the next month to more than 1,000 churches seeking further engagement. When asked about proposals to increase the availability of "peer counseling" programs employing successfully reformed returning citizens, he asserted that vetting and clearance must continue on a case-by-case basis. When questioned about the decrease in the number of Graduation Equivalent Degrees (GEDs) awarded since the 1980s and 90's, he noted that GEDs have increased from around 300 to about 400 in the past year [2018], despite changes in the test and inmate populations. He hopes to improve resources such as laptops but wants to ensure this is not a paid service "on the backs of [inmates' already disadvantaged] families." Green concluded with the following comment, "We are doing a good job, but we need to do a better job of telling you what we are doing."

Key Findings.

The following themes were derived from Green's keynote address and reaction to the question-and-answer session.

What to change?

1. *Better coordination*: Over 4, 000 people will be returning home from Maryland correctional facilities in the next 12 months, and many do not have a plan that continues after custody.

2. ***Focus on education***: There is a desire to extend educational opportunities and resources inside every jail cell and recreation room via tablet technology, but also by philanthropic means and not taxpayer dollars.

3. ***Focus on rehabilitation:*** There is a need to expand existing services. Consideration will not be given to new programs that are only available inside correctional facilities.

4. ***More cooperation:*** Only seven counties in Maryland have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with DPSCS to house prisoners locally for up to one year before release, so community resources are accessible during incarceration and then continue after they leave custody.

Recommendations.

The following recommendations were drawn from Green's remarks and participants' comments.

What to change to and how to change?

A. ***Better external communication***: DPSCS is doing a good job but needs to do a better job reporting its accomplishments to the community.

B. ***Building a bridge of connectivity***: DPSCS needs to work in partnership with Health and Human Services organizations and community-based nonprofits to facilitate a better hand-off to services after custody in the community.

C. ***Engaging the faith-based community***: They thought of "reentry" before corrections did. There is a need for more faith-based organizations to get involved in welcoming returning citizens back home and connecting them to hooks-for-change.

D. ***Portals of connection***: There is a need for more robust one-stop-shops that provide a comprehensive list of resources to many services for returning citizens.

Preparation: Reentry Intake, Risk Assessment, and Data Sharing

Prisoners and returning citizens have a significant need for services that are often provided by non-correctional agencies and community organizations. Creating and sustaining collaborative partnerships among correctional agencies and nontraditional partners improves access to the data needed to facilitate reentry. The panelists were:

Martha Danner, Director of Parole and Probation, DPSCS

Marsha Briley, Director of Reentry Services, DPSCS

Ronald Silkworth, Chief Judge, Anne Arundel County Circuit Court

Bonita McMorris, Executive Director, Bright Futures Ahead

Panelists were asked a series of questions during a moderated discussion to including:

- How are the risks and needs, plus educational and vocational assessments collected at intake used for reentry preparation inside Maryland correctional institutions?

- How can reentry organizations share data (prearranged by the zip code) about prisoners being released to their communities, and reentry providers, to better prepare and assist with reentry?

- How can reentry providers better communicate with prisoners and correctional personnel regarding the agreement to provide reentry services?

Key Findings.

The following themes derived from the panel discussion on preparation for intake, risk assessment, and data sharing.

What to change?

1. *Focus on employment:* Vocational skills screening is important to connect people to jobs while incarcerated and should be a part of the reentry plan.

2. *Focus on rehabilitation*: Maryland does a good job punishing and a bad job rehabilitating. The available reentry services "do not meet people where there are." Drug use and mental health are a big problem in Maryland, a large majority of convictions are tied these factors.

3. *Positive social supports*: People returning home are disconnected from families and lack community support.

4. *More cooperation*: Many providers are not willing to travel across the state to attend DPSCS' Exit Orientations for prisoner nearing release.

Recommendations.

The following recommendations were drawn from the panelists' remarks and participants' comments.

What to change to and how to change?

A. *Alternatives to incarceration*: Better utilization of Maryland Code, Health-General, Section 8-507, referring to a motion for reconsideration that asks the court to revise a sentence previously imposed in a criminal case to permit alternative substance abuse treatment.

B. *Continuum of care*: Rehabilitation should start behind the walls and continue after custody. DPSCS needs a better outreach strategy and more than one option to connect providers to prisoners before they return home.

C. *More education*: Practitioners outside the field of health and social work (e.g., judges, law enforcement, public administrators, prosecutors, and correctional officers) need education on addiction, behavior, and cognitive sciences.

D. *Universal risk assessments*: There is a critical need for mental health screening, drug treatment, and healing from trauma for people in custody in Maryland. Services should meet the individual needs of the person and should include wrap-around services (such as housing, treatment, education, employment, and life skills).

Reentry Preparation for Prisoners

Prisons view their primary role as safety and security behind the walls. As a result, correctional agencies are less concerned with prisoners after release. Parole or post-release supervision agencies view their role beginning once a prisoner is released. Despite the need for education, recovery, and employment-related services behind the walls, funding for such services has a low priority given the competing fiscal demands. Panelists included:

Greg Sanders, Coordinator, Prince George's County Problem Solving Court

Steve Steurer, Criminologist, Correctional Education Advocates

Vince Greco, Returned Citizen and Executive Member, MAJR

Anthony McNeil, Returned Citizen and Crime Prevention Lead, Farming 4 Hunger

Key Findings.

The following themes were drawn from the panel discussion on reentry preparation for prisoners.

What to change?

5. *Flexible scheduling*: Parole and probation requirements (such as classes, scheduled visits, or check-ins) are not flexible and obstruct returning citizens' work schedules.

6. *Focus on rehabilitation*: Prisoners are exiting corrections not prepared for reentry. There is a lack of credible comprehensive reentry programs that focus on behavior change as well as enhancing life skills (including financial literacy).

7. *Positive social supports*: Successfully returned citizens are not provided with opportunities to go back inside the jail to be mentors and role models.

8. *More inclusive stakeholders*: Education stakeholders have been absent from the reentry planning process. Obtaining a GED should not be the main educational goal but also obtaining a post-secondary education (e.g., college or trade school).

Recommendations.

The following recommendations were drawn from the panelists' remarks and participants' comments.

What to change to and how to change?

E. *Equity*: Prisoners should not be paying for applications and services that are free to the public.

F. *Information exchanges*: Correctional agencies need to obtain prisoners' school records, particularly those who did not graduate from high school and were in "special education."

G. *Innovative technology*: Prisoners should be allowed to check out a laptop or tablet with various education materials downloaded to the hard drive and take it back to their cell.

H. ***Mentors and role models***: DPSCS should provide opportunities for formerly incarcerated people to become mentors and role models and offer programs where families can reconnect with loved ones behind bars. Families should become an active part of the reentry preparation and planning process.

I. ***More resources***: DPSCS needs to decrease Parole officers' caseloads and to hire more staff exclusively for reentry. DPSCS needs to hire more social workers to work inside the jails to prepare prisoners for release.

Designing an Individual Reentry Plan

Many people exit prison after 5 or 10 years and find the community different than when they left. Former prisoners describe reentry as an overwhelming process, specifically for those who have served a long sentence or cycled in and out of jail over several years. The following themes were derived from a breakout session on designing an individual reentry plan. The facilitators were:

David Quinn, Street Reentry of Maryland

Debbie Ramsey, Law Enforcement Action Partnership

Key Findings.

What to change?

J. ***Universal risk assessments:*** There is no uniform assessment tool or process in Maryland. Each stakeholder "does its own thing" [assessment]. The results and plans are not shared with other stakeholders during process, which causes a lack of continuity in reentry support.

K. *Hire more social workers*: Case managers have heavy workloads. Visits average about 5 minutes per person, which is not efficient when helping individuals with the reentry process.

L. *Better coordination*: Management between stakeholders is necessary to sustain the continuum of care. Families and community-based providers (e.g., housing, employment, mediation, health, recovery) have not been engaged in the planning process to help identify positive supports during the first 90 days after a returning citizen's release.

M. *Comprehensive models*: It is unknown if Maryland is using a comprehensive reentry planning process. There is a lack of communication from DPSCS regarding their role in the reentry process. Community level stakeholders are unsure about which part of the planning process DPSCS is responsibility for and where "hand-offs" should occur.

Recommendations.

   What to change to and how to change?

N. *Adopt uniform comprehensive reentry planning process*: A model the comprehensive reentry planning process is the Allegheny County [Pennsylvania] Jail Collaborative Reentry Program (Urban Institute, 2014).

O. *Innovative technology*: Web-based technologies should be used to assist case managers with managing their workloads. DPSCS should considering agreements with other entities to assist with the coordination and hand-off process.

P. *Use justice circles*: Maryland should integrate "Justice Circles" as part of its planning process. Justice circles provide returning citizens, families, and community members an

opportunity to come together to address harmful behavior, needs, obligations, and necessary engagement.

Q. *Better communication*: DPSCS should map out the entire reentry process on its website and identify what the Agency responsibility is regarding reentry planning and implementation. DPSCS should enable periodic information exchanges between stakeholders that are involved in the reentry planning and implementation process.

Implementing an Individual Reentry Plan

To implement an individual plan, stakeholders must form partnerships to sustain engagement and ownership. Collaborative engagement results in a more seamless hand-off to community-based services providers for individuals with criminal backgrounds. Implementing a reentry plan makes communities safer, healthier, and economically viable. The section reports on the findings from a breakout session on implementing an individual reentry plan. The session was facilitated by Ford Rowan from Kairos Prison Ministry.

Key Findings.

What to change?

R. *A modernized referral process*: DPSCS' should improve its system of referring returning citizens to providers and to reevaluate its transition planning timeline.

S. *Family friendly policies*: DPSCS policies prevent many volunteers from better working with inmates and their families.

T. *Inclusive programming*: There is a lack in programming for different types of offenders [violent offenders and sex offenders in particular].

U. *More cooperation*: There is a lack of co-operation between service providers to keep online resources, which are often outdated, current.

Recommendations.

What to change to and how to change?

V. *Expand the transition planning timeline*: Transition planning should begin 12-18 months before release and DPSCS should initiate referrals within 90 days of release.

W. *Revise policies*: DPSCS policy should welcome peer-mentoring and encourage former inmates to become mentors. DPSCS should allow volunteers to continue helping inmates after release without jeopardizing their security clearance.

X. *More online resources*: Stakeholders must improve the availability of relevant and accurate online resources for returning citizens. Many service providers do not have websites or information regarding current ability to provide service (for instance, the number of beds).

Y. *More frequent collaboration*: Stakeholder should form diverse and inclusive workgroups that meet periodically to address reentry problems.

Measuring Reentry Success

Reentry practitioners struggle with what to measure and how to assess the impact of their programs. The expectation for funders and communities to measure performance is clear. Yet, finding the capacity and resources to measure outcomes may require support from other agencies and organizations. This portions discusses the themes derived from a breakout session on measuring reentry success. The facilitators were:

Marc Schindler, Director, Justice Policy Institute

Karriem El-Amin, Returned Citizen [Unger Case], Living Classrooms

Key Findings.

What to change?

Z. ***Better measures***: There is a lack of statistical significance in the metrics used to benchmark program outcomes. For example, a job readiness program that documents successful program completion instead of the number of successful hiring outcomes.

AA. ***Better reporting and more research***: Inadequate data gathering and reporting on program outcomes, plus inadequate amount of longitudinal studies of incarcerated and post-incarcerated individuals that impede efforts to evaluate program effectiveness.

BB. ***Equitable funding***: Poor allocation of public funding to assist the reentry population with service needs, such as education, housing, healthcare, employment, transportation, and treatment.

Recommendations.

What to change to and how to change?

CC. ***Funding for evaluation studies***: Increased public and private funding for evaluating and reporting on the success of correctional program activities directed at particular populations (aged, youthful offenders, felony murder participants, etc.) and pre- and post-release programs.

DD. ***Better coordination and service delivery***: Improved coordination and delivery of services statewide to pre- and post-release individuals on a fair and need-based manner.

EE. ***Inclusive reentry councils:*** Establish diverse statewide councils to improve juvenile justice outcomes.

FF. ***Expand and promote what works:*** Expand the type of services provided to persons

released under the Unger-decision who have demonstrated a minimal rate of recidivism.

Returning citizens should be permitted to go back inside prisons to serve as peer

counselors and mentors to pre- and post-release individuals.

<div align="center">

Post Reentry

</div>

People reentering society after incarceration face a myriad of challenges, including

limited education and job skills, employer bias, and limited social networks that can offer

legitimate job opportunities. Citizens may return to communities with very few jobs available.

This portion of the report discusses the findings from a breakout session on post-reentry

challenges. The facilitators were:

Olinda Moyd, Mercy Justice

Kim Haven, Returned Citizen, Interfaith Action for Human Rights

Key Findings.

What to change?

GG. ***Better coordination***: Lack of coordination and information about essential services and

supports.

HH. ***Second chance outcomes***: Remove impediments to employment, including parole and

probation requirements. Improve chances of obtaining sustainable housing and fully

restored voting rights for everyone who has served their time.

Recommendations.

What to change to and how to change?

II. *Advocate for second chance policies*: Stakeholders should support expungement,

expansion of ban-the-box, certifications of rehabilitation, and employer tax credits to help

individuals with criminal records secure adequate employment.

JJ. *Better communication*: Improve returning citizens awareness of available remedies and

resources and promote administrative policies that help rather than hinder individual

ability to find and maintain employment.

KK. *Securing housing options*: Develop options for returning citizens to secure housing.

Such options should include supportive structures that sponsor rehabilitation and

reintegration.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Analysis of Research Findings

Maryland's returning citizens face many obstacles that cause them to return to incarceration. These include scarcity of housing, jobs, and transportation, as well as disrupted family relations and dangers of negative (drug-abusing and crime-involved) social groups. Reentry plans can assist with such obstacles for the large percentage of inmates who lack the resources independently to do so. Yet, currently, reentry plans often fail because of communication gaps and shortage of reentry resources.

Communication Gaps

Even when reentry resources exist (housing, jobs, treatment programs, etc.), inmates during incarceration lack the means to communicate with those outside even if they are legally required to seek reentry services. When released as returning citizens, these Marylanders still the lack skills and lead-time needed to promptly locate, access, and make use of primary resources. A high percentage of new offenses, parole violations, and returns to incarceration occur in the first 90 days after release could be avoided or greatly reduced if gaps in reentry services were eliminated.

Shortage of Reentry Resources

Insufficient reentry resources fail to meet the demand both inside state prisons and in many Maryland communities. Particularly, low-cost housing units and employers are unwilling to accept individuals with criminal records. Affordable transportation, treatment and even parole appointments may be too expensive. The bus doesn't go, there; the taxi costs too much; the only car available needs repair or must be used by other family members to get to their own jobs.

Thus, well-intentioned reentry plans fail and returning citizens risk future imprisonment, which carriers higher costs to than supplementing the cost for the needed services.

Next steps

These two major areas may provide the focus for the next steps, beyond the 2019 Reentry Roundtable towards further progress for Maryland's returning citizens. As suggested by Secretary Green, measures are needed to keep the "portal of communication" open between state prison, parole and probation, local government, and community-based providers. Other states around the U.S. have resolved this difficulty through the establishment of local and statewide Reentry Councils. Such councils are recommended by the Council of State Governments, which completed a multiyear study of reentry best practices. Refer to the Reentry Councils: Report on 10 States and Best Practices (2013).

In some jurisdictions, Reentry Councils are government-sponsored and have policy-making abilities. Others are convened by stakeholders themselves and simply benefit from open communication. Regarding Maryland, a preliminary step has been taken to bring together government and stakeholders to consider our mutual interests via the recent Reentry Roundtable. As sponsor, MAJR calls on the State and Roundtable participants to form ongoing Reentry Councils or roundtables on the state and local levels [semi-annually or quarterly] to maintain open communication regarding reentry needs, opportunities, and challenges. Based on the findings from the 2019 Maryland Reentry Roundtable, such councils might begin by:

1. Working out details for local governments and reentry providers to have earlier contact with inmates to prepare returning citizens for seamless reentry.

2. Establish a commission of trained volunteers and community-based workers to support

    reentry efforts when there is a deficit in the number of state employees available to meet

    reentry planning needs inside prisons.

Feasible in-prison services would include:

3. Mentoring during incarceration.

4. Identifying gaps in reentry plans [filling-in-details and coordinating connections for

    reentry services].

5. Appoint liaisons for reentry programs to improve the DOC's awareness of community

    resources and reentry providers awareness of returning citizens' needs. Address the

    DOC's concerns regarding resource for tutoring, family mediation, and other support

    services.

Notably, Maryland already established a Reentry Initiative. However, the program currently

functions by providing contacts to pre-existing workforce development offices that are not

necessarily focused on the complexities of those with criminal records. Reentry Councils would

lift the Reentry Initiative to the next level by assisting inmates with employment plans before

release for example.

Next steps for reentry services in the community

Community-based reentry services are more or less available and accessible, depending

on the county to which returning citizens may come. Therefore, MAJR recommends that

DPSCS staff and county stakeholders, perhaps via each county's Criminal Justice Coordinating

Council, should join to hold meetings or otherwise to study and compare the number of returning

citizens expected each year and the availability of appropriate services to reduce re-offending

risks. Where services are substantially lacking, county reentry stakeholders should identify

needed resources, then make plans for funding or other steps to fill the reentry services gap(s).

Next steps for Reentry Policy

Roundtable participants agreed on how to improve Maryland reentry resources and

opportunities. Some recommendations were:

a. To seek opportunities to increase housing resources for returning citizens.

b. To enact a law to provide greater incentives through diminution credits for incarcerated

individuals to participate in reentry programs, and particularly for those pursuing the

GED [or programs of similarly valuable].

c. To review institutional visiting policies to increase incarcerated individual's engagement

with family members and involvement in the reentry planning process.

Other recommendation included:

d. To adopt a universal screening and risk assessment process.

a. To fund the use of innovative technology and modernized online resources.

b. To facilitate better communication, coordination, and collaboration among stakeholders

at each phase of the reentry process.

c. To hire more social workers to work inside Maryland prisons.

d. To allow successfully returning citizens to serve as mentors for prisoners and parolees

e. To advocate for and enact laws around second chance policies [such as expungement, fair

housing, equal employment].

Conclusion

In Maryland and around the U.S., many conferences have studied and discussed reentry issues in recent years. To make a difference and to improve reentry opportunities for Marylanders returning from incarceration, follow-through is indispensable. With the completion of the 2019 Maryland Reentry Roundtable report, MAJR calls on the State, local governments, and community stakeholders to join in the formation of statewide and local Reentry Councils to decide and collaborate towards the practical next steps for improving our Maryland's reentry resources. With better cooperation between the stakeholders, this logical next step in Justice Reinvestment can progress, further shrinking Maryland's costly prisons and growing the population of law-abiding returning citizens.

Anthony McNeil

Becca Rhudy

Bob Rhudy

Bonita McMorris

Brenda Jones

Crystal R. Francis

Darrell Hale

David Quinn

Debbie Ramsey

Ed Hagan

Ford Rowan

Greg Sanders

Karriem El-Amin

Kim Haven

Lynette Lewis

Marc Schindler

Marsha Briley

Martha Danner

Milt Tipperman

Olinda Moyd

Pat Marks

Perry Gaidurgis

P. Caroom

Ronald Silkworth

Secretary Robert Green

Stephen J. Steurer

Tara Carrington

Vince Greco

We look forward to ongoing support from these and other concerned Marylanders in the time to come as seamless reentry in our state becomes a reality.

References

Austin Travis County Reentry Roundtable (2013). Reentry councils for ex-offenders: A report on
        ten states and best practices. Retrieved from https://www.reentryroundtable.net/wp-
        content/uploads/2011/05/FINAL-Reentry-Councils-Report.pdf

Council of Economic Advisors (2018). Return on investments in recidivism-reducing programs.
        Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Returns-on-
        Investments-in-Recidivism-Reducing-Programs.pdf

Council of State Governments (2019). Collaborative comprehensive case plans: Addressing
        criminogenic risk and behavioral health needs. Retrieved from https://
        csgjusticecenter.org/nrrc/collaborative-comprehensive-case-plans/#other-cccp-resources

Council of State Governments Justice Center (2018). Best and promising practices in integrating
        reentry and employment interventions. [PowerPoint Presentation]. Retrieved from https://
        csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/7.17.18_Best-and-Promising-Practices-
        in-Integrating-Reentry-and-Employment-Interventions.pdf

Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (n.d.). FY 2020 budget overview.
        Retrieved from https://dbm.maryland.gov/budget/FY2020Testimony/Q00.pdf

Francis, C.R. (2018). Reentry practitioners' perception of constraints during ex-offenders' job
        search process. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/
        f227/991d8fba38050913ab058d4a18f872b5ed23.pdf

Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council (2015). Maryland criminal justice assessment and
        intro to policy development. [PowerPoint Presentation]. Retrieved from https://
        goccp.maryland.gov/jrcc/documents/presentation-20150911-justice-assessment.pdf

Maryland Department of Labor (n.d.). Maryland re-entry initiative-workforce development &
        adult learning. Retrieved from https://www.dllr.state.md.us/employment/reentry.shtml#

National Institute of Justice (2019). Problem-solving courts: Fighting crime by treating the
        offender. Retrieved from https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/problem-solving-courts-
        fighting-crime-treating-offender

Urban Institute (2012). The role of screening and assessment in jail reentry. [Transition from Jail
        to Community Initiative Practice Belief]. Retrieved from https://www.urban.org/sites/
        default/files/publication/25876/412669-The-Role-of-Screening-and-Assessment-in-Jail-
        Reentry.PDF

Urban Institue (2014). Evaluation of the Allegheny County jail collaborative reentry programs:
        Findings and recommendations. Retreived from https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/
        publication/33641/413252-Evaluation-of-the-Allegheny-County-Jail-Collaborative-
        Reentry-Programs.PDF

Virginia Department of Corrections (2019). Viriginia maintains the lowest recidivism rate in the
        country. [Press Release]. Retrieved from https://vadoc.virginia.gov/news-press-releases/
        2019/virginia-maintains-the-lowest-recidivism-rate-in-the-country/

Tables

Table 1: Reentry Statistics in Maryland by County

FY 2019 Parole & Mandatory Case Openings
Data as of August 1, 2019
Produced by DPSCS Research and Statistics Unit

Jurisdiction	Case Type		Total
	Parole	Mandatory	
Allegany	41	25	66
Anne Arundel	81	122	203
Baltimore City	399	772	1171
Baltimore Co	208	265	473
Calvert	33	29	62
Caroline	23	22	45
Carroll	21	26	47
Cecil	44	53	97
Charles	63	49	112
Dorchester	27	32	59
Frederick	46	44	90
Garrett	13	3	16
Harford	122	72	194
Howard	22	29	51
Kent	12	10	22
Montgomery	77	92	169
Prince George's	216	211	427
Queen Anne's	16	13	29
Saint Mary's	32	34	66
Somerset	32	9	41
Talbot	10	12	22
Washington	99	90	189
Wicomico	90	94	184
Worcester	50	15	65
Interstate-CMU	89	102	191
Total	**1866**	**2225**	**4091**

FY 2019

ANNUAL SUMMARY OF MARYLAND LOCAL JAIL STATISTICS

MONTHLY AVERAGES FOR MALES AND FEMALES BY JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction	Inmates	Departures	Pop Last Day Count	Avg Daily Population	Not in Confinement	Awaiting Trial 1-89 Days	Awaiting Trial Over 90 Days	Pre-Sentence Inv	Sentence 1-90 Days	91-180 Days	181-364 Days	365 Days	366 Days-18 Mos	Over 18 Mos	DOC	Federal & Other Jurisdiction	Work Release Last Day Count	Work Release Avg Daily Number	Home Detention Last Day Count	Home Detention Avg Daily Number	Avg Weekenders	Mental Commits	Suicides	Walkoffs	Escapes
Allegany	138	139	155	151	1	61	20	1	17	16	3	7	7	1	5	17	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	494	505	742	739	21	268	158	10	59	7	28	32	94	11	5	70	8	9	63	64	43	3	0	0	0
Baltimore City	952	994	1886	1896	0	1010	876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	23	13	9	0	0	0
Baltimore	772	777	1128	1148	0	554	229	24	43	41	21	61	136	0	10	10	7	7	45	51	12	5	0	0	0
Calvert	278	281	146	149	5	50	15	0	23	7	4	10	33	3	3	3	20	16	13	8	12	0	0	0	0
Caroline	80	80	52	52	0	20	4	0	1	3	6	7	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Carroll	135	133	186	182	33	72	31	0	11	9	3	20	35	0	3	0	4	6	5	4	4	0	0	2	0
Cecil	232	238	241	238	10	131	35	0	14	13	6	13	26	0	4	0	26	27	4	4	5	0	0	0	0
Charles	215	223	249	257	26	67	69	0	25	17	4	7	35	16	11	0	24	25	0	0	10	17	0	0	0
Dorchester	109	105	145	145	21	56	18	0	9	8	5	7	18	0	2	2	2	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	0
Frederick	205	207	289	294	12	157	59	0	15	11	25	3	9	5	4	0	21	17	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Garrett	50	50	62	63	6	20	6	3	4	4	6	3	9	5	3	0	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	0	0
Harford	391	380	354	357	8	105	64	0	51	22	36	22	39	4	6	4	14	14	0	0	40	0	0	0	0
Howard	215	219	300	302	0	73	39	3	9	11	6	13	28	0	4	115	25	25	0	0	9	1	0	0	0
Kent	36	37	52	58	0	15	4	0	2	2	0	2	4	0	1	21	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	475	477	823	828	0	315	207	0	95	74	90	0	23	8	11	0	110	108	1	1	2	65	0	0	0
Prince George's	789	801	813	818	87	383	356	23	15	10	2	27	29	1	28	0	11	9	83	82	16	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	79	79	98	100	13	44	7	0	9	5	10	8	9	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0
Saint Mary's	97	98	209	208	19	70	32	4	16	14	8	15	46	0	4	0	18	17	5	5	8	1	0	4	0
Somerset	66	61	65	66	0	28	10	1	5	2	2	5	4	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0
Talbot	78	78	71	72	5	23	21	0	4	2	2	2	10	2	0	5	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
Washington	156	154	316	317	19	135	87	4	10	9	3	17	38	4	5	3	1	1	24	24	0	1	0	0	0
Wicomico	394	397	323	319	18	114	86	2	20	9	25	18	24	6	12	7	18	13	4	4	3	12	0	1	0
Worcester	167	170	148	154	3	57	20	3	11	6	9	16	18	0	2	7	9	10	1	1	3	1	0	1	0
Total	6603	6683	8853	8913	307	3828	2453	78	468	302	304	315	682	75	125	269	325	311	288	288	203	120	0	8	0

Note: All data are provided by the respective local jurisdictions. Work release may include CARC, LIWO, and DWI for some jurisdictions.