



FINAL REPORT ON
PRISONER REENTRY

BY

Task Force on Prisoner Reentry
Gary Maynard, Chair

I. Executive Summary

The Maryland Taskforce on Prisoner Reentry recommends a significant restructuring of the state's criminal justice and correctional systems both to reduce the number of individuals incarcerated and to improve reentry programming and transitional services provided for those who remain. It calls for developing a plan to close one or more state prisons, and to reinvest savings into evidenced-based education, job skill training, and treatment programming in all prisons and community correctional facilities, implementing improved community supervision technologies and protocols, and developing new and revitalized partnerships with the state's county correctional systems, other government agencies, and non-profit and faith-based providers.

With funding from reduced prison expenditures, the Task Force envisions a statewide comprehensive and evidenced-based Reentry Initiative that involves multiple stakeholders including state and county corrections, law enforcement, social service government agencies, non-profit service providers, faith-based organizations, and the families of those incarcerated. The Statewide Reentry Initiative would include:

- A uniform and standardized risk and needs assessment beginning at sentencing, and continuing during incarceration and community supervision.
- An individualized reentry plan based on risk/needs assessment data that would prescribe education, treatment, family, medical, and work programs for individuals while in custody and under community supervision.
- Availability of sufficient high-quality education, job skill training, and treatment programming for all those individuals required to participate in order to hold individuals accountable for following their Reentry plan.
- Within the last several months prior to release from incarceration, transition through county correctional facilities where they would be closer to family and community resources that can provide them with important assistance.
- Rigorous data collection, performance outcome measurements, and electronic records to monitor the effectiveness of programs and allow for the sharing of appropriate information among many different stakeholders.

The Task Force believes that this strategy, called Justice Reinvestment, will improve public safety and reduce taxpayer-borne correctional expenses in Maryland; and, other states across the nation including Texas, North Carolina, Ohio, New York, New Jersey, and Rhode Island have adopted this strategy. Further, it believes that recent organizational changes within the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) that combine institutional and community correctional operations by region and a new Offender Case Management Information System provide the capacity for implementing these cutting-edge reforms.

In addition to the Justice Reinvestment strategy to change the structure of corrections, the Task Force advances four legislative bills to improve prisoner reentry.

1. A law to shield criminal records for nonviolent convictions from public view after an appropriate waiting/proving period with provisions for full access for law enforcement and relevant parties.

2. A “Ban the box” law that would restrict applications for state employment for non-sensitive positions to ask about criminal backgrounds, and instead allow state government hiring authorities to make individualized decisions on state employment after credential review and interview.
3. A law to automatically but temporarily suspend child support payments for indigent inmates during terms of imprisonment longer than 12 months, while providing an opportunity for the custodial parent to object.
4. A law that would provide greater incentives through diminution credits for incarcerated individuals to participate in reentry program, and particularly for those pursuing the GED equivalent diploma program.

Additionally, the Task Force recommends several administrative actions to encourage all stakeholders to engage in improvements to the reentry system. This includes:

- Embracing consistent and continued measurement of outcomes and impacts of interventions employed across the state;
- Utilizing technology to better communicate, share information, and improve resource management;
- Encouraging educational systems to streamline the transition process through information sharing and the use of transition teams;
- Reviewing institutional visiting policies to increase incarcerated individual’s access and engagement with family members;
- Encouraging the Public Housing Authorities through a joint letter from Secretary Maynard and Secretary Skinner to change policy on the timing of criminal background checks for housing eligibility determinations;
- Seeking opportunities to increase housing capacity through partnerships between developers, funding resources, construction companies, property management organizations and other stakeholders;
- Determining the programming that should be provided in jails versus prisons and the eligibility criteria to ensure the best use is being made of limited resources;
- Seeking the assistance of community service providers to address programming gaps;
- Utilizing this plan as a basis on which to apply for funding of reentry initiatives in conjunction with the comprehensive plan;
- Increasing the capacity of DPSCS’ Office of Policy, Planning, Research and Statistics to monitor the effectiveness of the Statewide Reentry Initiative.

Further, the Task Force believes that the judiciary can be of great assistance in the Statewide Reentry Initiative through:

- Increased collaboration and coordination between existing drug and mental health courts and future Reentry courts with corrections and community service providers;
- Implementing risk/need assessment instruments at the time of sentencing;
- Enacting changes in sentencing practices informed by evidenced-base practices that more effectively utilize correctional resources;
- Increased participation and information exchanges concerning sentencing and outcome measurement.

Finally, the Task Force recognizes the need to develop a detailed implementation plan to carry out this dramatic restructuring of the state correctional system, and calls for the Governor to appoint a Statewide Reentry Initiative Planning and Monitoring Committee composed of multiple stakeholders under the direction of the Public Safety Secretary that would develop a detailed plan of action by June 1, 2012 and monitor the implementation and outcomes over time.

Maryland's commitment to improving reentry is long-term. It will require changes in mindset and practice to impact reentry outcomes. This Final Report sketches a framework for moving forward. Continued monitoring of the recommended changes over time is essential to realizing the positive impact of this plan in the long run.

II. Reentry Task Force Legal Mandate

During the 2009 Legislative session, HB 637 was passed and signed into law by Governor O'Malley. This bill established a Task Force on Prisoner Reentry, and the provisions of the law are codified in Correctional Services Article, § 2-501. The law provides for the membership, chairmanship, and staffing of the task force and requires that certain issues be studied over the course of two years. It further requires that the Governor and General Assembly receive two reports on the findings and recommendations of the task force: 1) An interim report by December 31, 2010, and 2) a final report by December 31, 2011. This final report is being provided in conjunction with this requirement.

The Task Force was responsible for performing the following six tasks:

- (1) Examine ways to pool resources and funding streams to promote lower recidivism rates for returning offenders and minimize the harmful effects of offenders' time in prison, jail, or a juvenile facility on families and communities of offenders by collecting data and best practices in offender reentry from demonstration grantees and other agencies and organizations;*
- (2) Analyze the statutory, regulatory, rules-based, and practice-based hurdles to reintegration of adult and juvenile offenders into the community;*
- (3) Investigate guidelines and criteria to track outcomes of inmate reentry program participation, including program approvals, day-to-day program participation, and program graduation and other types of program completions and non-completions;*
- (4) Research longitudinal data tracking of the pre- and post-release impact of reentry programs;*
- (5) Investigate the number of idle inmates in each state correctional facility; and*
- (6) Develop a comprehensive strategic reentry plan as specified under the federal second chance act of 2007...*

III. Background

As a result of criminal justice policies, changes in criminal laws, and sentencing practices over several decades; criminal justice populations have steadily increased. Concomitantly, the dollars

spent by the nation's criminal justice system increased 171% between 1982 and 2007. State expenditures increased 208% between 1982 and 2002, but decreased slightly (5%) between 2002 and 2007 due to a drop in jail populations. During the 20 year span, even accounting for inflation, expenditures for law enforcement and corrections increased 126% and 255%, respectively.¹

Maryland experienced similar criminal justice population trends, and expenditures increased during the same time period mentioned above. In 1966 the incarceration rate in Maryland was 165 per 100,000 resulting in a prison population of 5,117. In fiscal year 2011, the incarceration rate was 412 per 100,000 with an average daily prison population of 22,500. Crime rates, on the other hand, decreased and are back to 1966 levels (3549 per 100,000).²

The logical conclusion of this disparity between crime rate decline and incarceration rate increase is the number of incarcerated individuals with long sentences and the rate of recidivism. In a study conducted by the Pew Charitable Trusts that looked at recidivism in over 40 states, more than four in 10 offenders returned to state prison within three years of their release,³ and parole violators accounted for 35.2 percent of state admissions in 2009.⁴

Maryland's data reflects similar circumstances. The average daily incarcerated population in FY 2010 totaled 34,494 (prisons and jails) -- approximately one out of every 167 Maryland residents. In 2006, 70% of the prison population was serving sentences greater than 5 years. Consequently, despite a steady decline in crime rates in the last decade, the incarcerated population has remained high. Maryland released approximately 13,900 offenders back to their communities, and the 2010 rate of return to state prison within three years of release was 47.8%.⁵ Parole violators accounted for 27 percent of state admissions in FY 2010.

While the incarcerated population has remained high and incarceration and reentry rates have remained steady, budgets across Maryland have been drastically reduced. Impacting the cycle of release and return to incarceration is essential to public safety and the State's fiscal responsibilities.

IV. Proceedings and Recommendations

The Task Force met a total of seven times, five times during CY 2011. Six subcommittees, formed to focus on specific topic areas, met in between and reported progress at the meetings of the full task force. The following 6 subcommittees were formed: 1) Resources and Funding Streams; (2) Research and Performance Outcomes; 3) Idleness and Programming; 4) Barriers and Practice Hurdles; 4) Juvenile Reentry; and 5) Comprehensive Plan. The Task Force members and participants on each subcommittee can be found in the Appendix.

¹Kyckelhahn, Tracey. *Justice Expenditures and Employment, FY 1982-2007- Statistical Tables*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2011.

²MD GOCCP (2010), Crime Statistics.

³Pew Center on the States, *State of Recidivism: The Revolving Door of America's Prisons* (Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts, April 2011).

⁴Sabol, W. & H.C. West. *Prisoners in 2009*. NCJ 231675. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010.

⁵DPSCS, *2010 RISC Report*, Baltimore, MD, DPSCS Office of Policy, Planning, Regulations and Statistics, 2011.

After thorough study and investigation, each subcommittee made specific findings and recommendations. A summary of those findings and recommendations by subcommittee topic appear below. Some of the subcommittees prepared written final reports, which are attached.

Resources and Funding Streams

The subcommittee took a two-pronged approach to this topic area. It reviewed existing human capital and financial resources available to both government agencies and community organizations. It also looked outside existing budgets to determine what other sources of funding are available to the reentry effort.

The subcommittee determined that, in general, existing public and private resources are simply insufficient to provide the necessary services. The economic downturn has overburdened an already inadequate system. However, with hardship comes opportunity. State agencies and community organizations are managing existing resources more wisely. They are reducing redundant processes by sharing information across stakeholder organizations, and providing services only to those presenting the highest risk. With these and other operational changes, state agencies and community organizations are realizing savings. Unfortunately, savings realized by state agencies are being used to fill budget gaps in unrelated areas.

Other funding resources are available at the national, state, and local level. The federal government provides funding opportunities through the Second Chance Act, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and other federal agencies. The Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention receives Maryland's allotment of federal block grant dollars, which are disbursed across the state through an application process. In addition, there are a number of private foundations that provide funding to initiatives that fit their areas of interest. These funding opportunities are quite competitive and require clearly developed plans.

Based on these determinations, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- 1) "Justice Reinvestment": Allow state agencies that utilize resources efficiently to reinvest their savings back into proven reentry programs. It is not appropriate to move such savings into unrelated programs and agencies.**
- 2) Position the state for future grant awards: Bolster data collection, coordinate plan implementation, and monitor progress of implementation strategies.**

Research and Performance Outcomes

The subcommittee, with the assistance of a graduate student at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, adopted a three-fold methodology to

discover best practices in reentry outcome research. This methodology involved: (1) a review of the literature on reentry outcomes from academic, practitioner, government, and policy organizational sources; (2) a survey, through phone and in-person interviews, of reentry programs in Maryland to determine what data is collected and how it is used; and (3) discovery of what administrative records exist across agencies and organizations through the use of a randomly selected group of 50 individuals released from incarceration during the period July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

The research literature indicated that the best methodology for measuring reentry program outcomes is to look at six different treatment domains: mental and physical health; alcohol and drug abuse; employment and education; housing; pro-social activities; and financial status. These domains of treatment have been found by researchers to address “dynamic” criminogenic factors that have the potential to impact future recidivism rates. While there is frequent interest by policymakers and laypersons to identify recidivism as the exclusive outcome of importance, researchers are increasingly recognizing that this proves to be a poor indicator of performance for reentry programs. Recidivism is most directly affected by: the “risk” of the population served by a program (i.e. risk includes criminal history, socio-economic background, mental and physical health, work and education background, substance abuse background, housing stability, and family/social support); specific policies and practices of stakeholders within the criminal justice system including police, probation and parole, prosecutors, judges, and the legislature that are outside the control of corrections (i.e. probation revocation policies); and the quality of the evaluation study and the availability of data. Good indicators of performance, by contrast, are linked directly to the specific activities, resources, and services provided by a program.

The survey and record review revealed that Maryland’s correctional and community-based agencies do not currently track, document or assess reentry programs systematically. Neither DPSCS nor county detention centers conduct formal assessments on short- or long-term outcomes based on the seven domains of treatment. Some contracted programs attempt to conduct process evaluations or recidivism studies; however, none of the interviewees knew of any contracted service providers that have conducted outcome assessments. Most county corrections departments as well as the State prisons collect output information about reentry services provided in their facilities, specifically enrollment and attendance data, completion and non-completion rates, graduation rates, and the number of sessions taught. However, there is a lack of centralized reentry databases in correctional institutions and in many community programs; rather, information is maintained in a paper case file for each person in a program. The individual’s progress is followed in that file only for that specific program, and is not generally shared with other stakeholders. In addition, the only formal calculation of recidivism rates is conducted by DPSCS with input from the county correctional systems and is reported in the Maryland Repeat Incarceration Supervision Cycle (RISC) report. The definition of recidivism, according to the RISC Report, is *“a new Maryland conviction that results in a return to incarceration in the DOC or to DPP probation supervision within three*

years of an inmate's date of release or a probationer's entry into community supervision."

Based on the literature review and the results of the survey and record review, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- 1) Adopt a nationally-developed assessment framework that links the goals and activities of reentry programs with direct "outputs" (desired results immediately following a program). short- (30 and 90 days after release) and longer-term "outcomes" (6 months, 1 year, and 2 years after release), and long-term "impacts" (change in the community such as reduced recidivism and increased public safety) arranged along the following treatment dimensions: Substance Abuse; Mental Health; Housing; Employment; Education; Family, Relationships, and Pro-Social Responsibility; and Financial Needs.**
- 2) Develop and reconfigure correctional data systems to track and monitor reentry over time to accurately measure outcomes.**
- 3) Expand and develop new data sharing partnerships within the community, including local and state government agencies, non-profits, and research organizations. While comprehensive outcome data collection may take time, simply getting useful information into the hands of the appropriate people and organizations today can assist in tracking outcomes.**
- 4) Correctional agencies and community-based partners must fully embrace reentry as a core mission. They must insist on a regular regime of data collection and analysis. They must adjust training programs, auditing processes, and corrections policies to make reentry data collection common practice.**
- 5) The State must develop a systematic methodology and create the administrative capacity to track the continued court involvement of individuals released from correctional institutions as a means to better understand the flow of individuals into and out of the state's correctional systems for purposes of determining policy and programmatic changes.**

Idleness and Programming

The subcommittee gathered data on the number of offenders engaged in programming in each institution based on institutional assignment records. A review of the limited data showed that most inmates are enrolled in some program activity, such as education classes, treatment programming, institutional work assignments, and correctional industries. However, participation in one activity for 1-2 hours a day does not remove the possibility of idleness for the remaining hours. In addition,

placing an inmate in a program simply to increase participation rates does not improve the reentry outcome.

DPSCS and the subcommittee also attempted to determine the need for specific types of programming versus resources available to deliver that programming. The programming staff to offender ratio of 400:22,500 alone provided insight into this issue. However, due to the status of current management information systems within corrections, the subcommittee found that an accurate programming gap analysis was not possible at this time.

DPSCS is in the process of reorganization to create a regional structure where correctional and community supervision personnel are managed at the regional level. This structure creates opportunities for improved offender transitions, relationship building with community resource providers, and information sharing. In addition, DPSCS is implementing a new case management information system. This system is available to local detention facilities should they desire to utilize or interface to it. There are also plans to bolster DPSCS' statistical analysis staff. With these three additions, the ability to document and address programming gaps will improve.

In the meantime, the staff to offender ratio allowed the subcommittee to conclude that insufficient resources exist in correctional agencies (both local and state) to meet the demand generally. In some instances, the community offers more opportunities to address the needs of the offender population. Consequently, changes in incarceration practices and the criteria and processes for determining the best intervention are needed.

Based on the subcommittee's investigation and analysis, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- 1) Review best practice literature to ensure the appropriate intervention is employed at the correct time.**
- 2) Consider changes in sentencing practices based on risk of re-offense criteria.**
- 3) Determine the programming that should be provided in jails versus prisons, and reform eligibility criteria to ensure the best use of limited resources.**
- 4) Revise policies and procedures for placement of offenders in programs, and re-evaluate those policies on a periodic basis to determine ongoing programming gaps and state of idleness.**
- 5) Utilize community resources to close programming gaps where possible.**

- 6) **Increase and improve the engaging of families as an additional resource in reentry planning and programming.**
- 7) **Ensure that programming emphasizes the importance of: education, job skills training and experience, behavior and thinking modification, substance abuse and trauma-informed treatment, problem-solving skills, financial responsibility, and understanding the impact of crime on victims.**

Barriers and Process Hurdles

Since convening in August 2010, the Legal Barriers and Practice Hurdles subcommittee met numerous times to explore the significant barriers faced by Marylanders with criminal records. These barriers fall into the following categories: 1) Employment; 2) Education; 3) Financial Stability; and 4) Housing.

There are no spare Marylanders. The ability to secure a job is crucial to the successful reentry of Marylanders returning to their communities from prison. *Peer-reviewed research shows that recidivism risks are highest in the first 3-5 years following incarceration.* A study funded by the National Institute of Justice examined more than 80,000 criminal records. The study found that there is a way to actuarially estimate a point in time when an individual with a criminal record is at no greater risk of committing another crime than other individuals of the same age.⁶ Given that recidivism declines steadily with time clean, the ability of employers to access stale conviction information unfairly bars Marylanders from job opportunities.

Similarly, utilizing the “box-check” format to obtain conviction information on job applications unfairly discriminates against qualified individuals being considered for employment. This format simply does not provide Marylanders with the opportunity to explain the conviction and their efforts since that time.

Education is also a key factor in an individual’s ability to obtain self-sustaining employment. While there are a myriad of reasons why offenders have not achieved at least a high school diploma, there are opportunities during incarceration to reach academic achievement or to build job skills. Maryland’s mandatory education law requires offenders serving 18+ month sentences who do not have a diploma to attend classes, but many simply never complete the program. It is critical that Maryland find a way to incentivize offenders to complete their education.

Attaining financial stability as soon as possible after release is important to reentry success as well. This is especially difficult for Marylanders who compound their employment difficulties with obligations to pay substantial child support arrearages that were accruing while in prison. For indigent ex-offenders, this crushing debt conflicts with their need to feed, clothe and shelter themselves. Suspending child

⁶ Blumstein, A., and K. Nakamura, “‘Redemption’ in an Era of Widespread Criminal Background Checks,” *National Institute of Justice Journal* (Issue No. 263): 10-17.

support payments for incarcerated indigents will reduce their likelihood of returning to the underground economy.

Access to affordable housing is a barrier that forces many offenders to return to situations that are not conducive to a crime-free life. Two factors contribute to this barrier: 1) lack of sufficient capacity; and 2) over-exclusive policies and practices of public housing authorities (PHAs). Despite funding programs for housing development, it is difficult to find private or semi-public organizations to build or improve property for the purpose of increasing the capacity of low-income or supportive housing. In addition, PHAs have broad discretion to set admission and termination policies for the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs. With the lack of capacity and consequential long waiting lists, there is little incentive for the PHAs to change their eligibility criteria.

After careful consideration, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

Legislative

- 1) The Maryland General Assembly should pass legislation to shield criminal records for nonviolent convictions. This legislation would make nonviolent felony convictions eligible for shielding after a five-year waiting period from the time of release from supervision. Nonviolent misdemeanors would be subject to a three-year waiting period. No subsequent convictions can occur during the waiting period. Law enforcement will continue to have full and unfettered access to the shielded records.**
- 2) The Maryland General Assembly should pass legislation to “ban the box” on state job applications that asks applicants to make a check mark if they have ever been convicted of a crime.**
- 3) The Maryland General Assembly should pass legislation to temporarily but automatically suspend child support obligations upon incarceration for non-custodial parents sentenced to 12 or more consecutive months of imprisonment. The obligor may not be on work release and must have insufficient finances to make child support payments. Before adjusting the order, CSEA must send written notice of the proposed action to the obligee, including the obligee’s right to object to the proposed action. Current policy allows for inmates to apply for a suspension of their child support order upon incarceration. However, the vast majority of obligors are not aware of this option and consequently wind up accruing large sums of arrearages during their sentence, arrearages that they will never be able to repay.**

- 4) **The Maryland General Assembly should pass legislation to provide a diminution credit completion bonus for adult education while incarcerated. Inmates currently earn 5 diminution credits per month for being enrolled in an education program. In order to encourage inmates to complete their degree, the legislation should establish a 60-credit diminution bonus to be awarded to those who earn their G.E.D.**

Non-Legislative

- 1) **Secretary Maynard and Secretary Skinner should write a joint communication to the local housing authorities referencing the June 2011 policy statement from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The HUD letter states that local public housing authorities should be more flexible in their treatment of people with criminal records as the PHAs have broad discretion to set admission and termination policies under the federal Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs. Specifically, the Secretaries should encourage the PHAs to conduct criminal background checks at the time the applicant reaches the top of the waiting list as opposed to at initial application. This policy change will benefit those with criminal backgrounds as it is possible that the look-back period for the PHA might be shorter than the waiting list for housing.**
- 2) **State and local authorities should seek opportunities to increase low-income housing capacity through partnerships with developers, construction companies, property management organizations and other stakeholders.**

Juvenile Reentry

The Juvenile Reentry subcommittee met several times in the last year. A review of the programs and initiatives being utilized in the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) was conducted and an inventory was created. Determinations were made on the existence of gaps or process hurdles and which current programs were considered best practices.

Based on this review, it became clear that successful reentry of juveniles committed to a residential facility is dependent upon the same strategies as incarcerated adults. Reentry preparation should begin as soon as the youth enters the juvenile justice system and should include a comprehensive risk and needs assessment and a treatment service plan. It also became clear that until recently there was very little information sharing occurring between the juvenile and adult systems. This sharing of information is especially important when a juvenile is charged and/or convicted as an adult and enters the adult jail or prison system. DPSCS is working with DJS to

incorporate the use of assessment tools geared to youth for those juveniles who enter the adult system. Further work is needed to increase communication and information sharing between these two departments to improve reentry outcomes and ensure public safety.

Both the adult and juvenile systems agree on best practices for improved reentry outcomes. Reentry initiatives should engage the youths' families. The priority focus of the plan should be education and employment. And, as the release date approaches, engaging in transition planning to include the necessary community supports is imperative.

Educating youth in residential placement can be difficult due to the length of stay. The approximate length of stay for youth in detention is 15 days. The length of stay in commitment is approximately 225 days. Treatment programs provide more opportunity for credit recovery. In 2002, Dr. Nancy Grasmick, State Superintendent of Schools, requested that each local school system (LSS) establish a central team to provide appropriate diagnostic, placement and monitoring services for juveniles transitioning between public schools and juvenile services facilities. These teams were to include, at a minimum, a representative from each of the following areas: Student Services, Special Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and the Department of Juvenile Services. Representatives from other agencies, such as Social Services, the Core Service Agency, and the Department of Health, should be part of the team as needed and should assist with wraparound services.

The strategies mentioned above have been combined and proven successful in an initiative funded by the Department of Labor called the Baltimore City Continuum of Opportunity Reentry Program and Services (CORPS). CORPS is characterized by intensive case management, educational and employment opportunity, career training, mentoring and community service opportunities. The initiative encourages youth and parent/guardians to participate in CORPS via a family conference. The process culminates in the completion of a *Personalized Education and Employment Plan* (PEEP) implemented by a youth advocate and transition specialist after the youth is released from DJS.

As a result of the subcommittee's work, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- 1) Encourage MSDE and local school systems to utilize technology to improve information sharing.**
- 2) Reinforce the need for, and work of, the Local School System Transition Teams.**
- 3) Continue and expand statewide the Continuum of Opportunity Reentry Program and Services (CORPS) initiative.**

- 4) **Improve coordination and communication between juvenile and adult systems.**

Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan subcommittee met after the other subcommittees had completed their work. The work of this subcommittee was based on the recommendations made by the other subcommittees and feedback from the full Task Force and culminated in the framework for moving forward contained in this document. Further work is required, however, to develop the detailed plan with clearly defined action steps.

As a result of the subcommittee's work, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- 1) **Create a Statewide Reentry Initiative Planning and Monitoring Committee composed of multiple stakeholders under the direction of the Public Safety Secretary to develop a detailed plan of action by June 1, 2012.**
- 2) **Monitor the implementation of the plan and utilize clearly defined outcome measures to evaluate systemic improvements over time.**

V. Conclusion

The Task Force believes that in order to impact reentry outcomes, improve public safety, and be fiscally responsible, Maryland needs to make many changes to systems, policies, practices, and laws. National reentry literature is full of best practices to employ to improve reentry outcomes. Maryland needs to restructure itself to be able to implement those best practices. It will take a commitment to justice re-investment strategies, the willingness to cooperate and share information across disciplines and organizations, and planning and oversight to ensure implementation occurs and that strategies employed are effective in accomplishing the goals of Maryland's Reentry Initiative.

The Task Force appreciates the opportunity afforded by the formulation of this committee and looks forward to continued dialogue to implement the recommendations made.

Appendix

Task Force Participants

Gary Maynard (DPSCS) Chair
J. Michael Stouffer (DPSCS)
Patricia Vale (DPSCS)
Sean Adgeron (MVA)
Susan Steinberg (DHMH)
Marian Bland (DHMH)
Darren McGregor (DHMH)
Alice Wirth (DLLR)
Jeff Beeson (DLLR)
Kevin McGuire (DHR)
Kara Hamilton (DHR)
Tammy Brown (DJS)
Mark Mechlinski (MSDE)
Verna Jones-Rodwell (Senate)
Jeff Waldstreicher (House of Delegates)
Stefan LoBuglio (Montgomery County Reentry)
Thomasina Hiers (Baltimore City Reentry)
Mary Lou McDonough (MCAA)
George Hardinger (MCAA)
Howard Wicker (Living Classrooms)
Jason Perkins-Cohen (Job Opportunities Task Force)
Edmund O’Leary (AFSCME)
Gregory Carpenter (Jericho)
Jacqueline Robarge (Power Inside)
Gray Barton (Judicial Liaison)
Hon. Emory Plitt (Judicial Liaison)
Linda Raines (MHAMd)
Dan Martin (MHAMd)
John Joyce (MLIS)
Ann Ciekot (Advocacy NCAAD)
Kevin Amado (DHMH – Carroll)

Research and Performance Outcomes Subcommittee Members

Stefan LoBuglio, Chair (Montgomery County)
Tamera Bream (DPSCS)
Karen Yoke (DHMH – ADAA)
Chad Basham (DHMH – ADAA)
Rebecca Gowen (DPSCS – Research)
George Mitchell (DPSCS – Research)
Marcy Plimack (DPSCS – DPP)
Ernest Eley (DPSCS – DPP)

Kenney Coleman (DPSCS – DPP)
Martha Kumer (DPSCS—DPP)
Caroline Bolas (DHMH Chrysalis House)
Kendall Gifford (DPSCS – DOC)
Heidi Fieselmann, Master’s Student (JFK School of Gov’t – Harvard)
Darren McGregor (DHMH – Jail MH and Trauma)
Tina Michaels (Montgomery County)
Jacqueline Robarge (Power Inside)
Bill Rusinkow (DHMH – ADAA)
Susan Steinberg (DHMH)
Bonita Cosgrove (DPSCS)
Howard Wicker, Project Serve
Kelis Stewart, Union Representative, AFSCME
Jeff Waldstreicher, House Delegate

Barriers and Process Hurdles

Jason Perkins-Cohen, Chair (Job Opportunities Task Force)
Sean Adgerson (MVA)
Kevin McGuire (DHR)
Andree Duvall (DLLR)
Gregory Carpenter (Jericho)
Melissa Chalmers Broome (JOTF)
Howard Wicker (Living Classrooms)
Jeff Beeson (DLLR)
Tamara Bream (DPSCS)
Ann Ciekot (Maryland Advocacy – National Council on Alcohol and Drug Dependence)
Jim Estepp (Business Roundtable)

Idleness and Programming

J. Michael Stouffer, Co-Chair (DPSCS – DOC)
Jeff Beeson, Co-Chair (DLLR)
Erin Julius (DPSCS – DOC)
Constance Parker (DLLR)
Andree Duvall (DLLR)
Gregory Carpenter (Jericho)
Diana Bailey (MSDE)

Resources and Funding Streams

Alice Wirth (DLLR)
Tammy Brown (DJS)
Roxanne Parsons (DJS)
Pat Vale (DPSCS - DPP)
Bonnie Cosgrove (DPSCS)

Juvenile Issues

Tammy Brown (DJS)
Mark Mechlinski (MSDE)
Alice Wirth (DLLR)

Comprehensive Plan

Secretary Gary Maynard (DPSCS)
Stefan LoBuglio (Montgomery County)
Philip Caroom (Judicial Liaison)
Jason Perkins-Cohen (JOTF)
J. Michael Stouffer (DPSCS – DOC)
Brian Weeks (Gov)
Katherine Klosek (Gov)
Kieran Dowdy (Gov)
Darren McGregor (DHMH)
Bonnie Cosgrove (DPSCS)