

**Department of Criminal Justice
Advanced Criminal Justice Seminar
Issues in Prisoner Re-Entry
Spring 2012**

**Professor : Ellen McCann
Email: emccann72@aol.com
Office Hours: By Arrangement**

I. Course Description:

This course is designed to further expand the students' knowledge of the offender's experience of release into the community. This course will review the organizational, individual, community and family factors at play in the lives of the released offender, as well as programs and policies that make or break that individual's future prospects for being a law-abiding citizen.

II. Learning Goals:

A Statement of Principles from the Department of Criminal Justice:

The Program Committee for the Program in Criminal Justice at Rutgers University in New Brunswick has adopted a series of learning goals for students who complete the major. These goals represent the consensus of the faculty regarding the concepts a student should grasp and the skills a student should acquire in the course of completing the major. These goals guide the choices faculty make about the structure of the curriculum and the requirements for our majors. Moreover, they guide faculty and instructors preparing course material and teaching courses.

The Program in Criminal Justice will provide students with a rich understanding of crime and criminal justice in the United States and abroad through an interdisciplinary approach that blends a strong liberal arts educational experience with pre-professional instruction in the field of criminal justice. Graduates of the program will be well-informed citizens on the topic of crime and justice, and qualified for graduate study or for employment as practitioners in a variety of legal, policymaking, and law enforcement fields.

Criminal justice majors graduating from a research university should be able to use critical thinking, factual inquiry, and the scientific approach to solve problems related to individual and group behavior. In addition, students should have an understanding of the legal, political and policymaking processes that affect criminal justice systems in the United States and elsewhere in the world. Finally, students should be familiar with the institutional structures and latest developments in the field in order to engage in meaningful debate about current public policy issues.

Learning Goals for Criminal Justice Majors

1. Competence:

Theory. Students who complete the major in criminal justice should understand and be able to articulate, both orally and in writing, the core theoretical concepts that form the foundation of analysis and research in criminology and criminal justice today. Core concepts are derived from explanations of crime from a variety of perspectives, including biogenic, psychological, and sociological approaches. There are myriad theories of crime that are informed by these perspectives, including, classical, control, critical, ecology, labeling, learning, strain, and trait-

based approaches. Theoretical literacy should extend to multicultural and international understanding.

Institutions. Students who complete the major in criminal justice should understand the special role of three types of institutions: Police, Corrections, and Courts. In addition, students should know how institutional forms vary across jurisdictions and how these institutions interact with and influence each other.

Research Methods. Students who complete the criminal justice major should be familiar with the tools, techniques, and data sources necessary for empirical analysis. Students should understand the various ways that empirical analysis is used in the scientific approach: for description, for developing, and for testing theories. They should be able to analyze data using computer applications and should be familiar with basic statistical techniques and regression analysis. They should be able to read and assess research from a wide range of sources, including general interest, academic, and government publications.

2. Critical Thinking:

Upon completion of the major students should be able to apply their understanding of core concepts and quantitative tools to analyze and research real world problems, and evaluate alternative policy proposals on a range of criminal justice issues, from micro-level analyses relevant to particular cases to management concerns to macro-level analyses of legislative and other broad-scale policies. Accomplishment of this goal will require that students can apply their literacy and numeracy skills to different institutional structures, within the U.S. and across countries.

3. Scholarship:

Qualified majors should have an opportunity through such avenues as advanced coursework, internships, and faculty interactions to conduct independent research on matters of central relevance to the field of criminal justice.

III. Course Requirements:

- Course readings as listed below. **THERE IS NO TEXT BOOK!**
- Additional readings will be assigned as necessary, including books and other materials available on Sakai.

IV. Assessments (Grades):

1. Midterm Exam	25%
2. Final Exam	30%
3. Discussion Leader	15%
4. Research Paper/Proposal	30%

V. Examinations

1. Midterm exam will be March 1st, and the format will be determined before that time and based largely on class participation levels at that time.
2. The Final exams will be similar to the Midterm Exam, and the degree of difficulty will be decided on by class performance, and a general consensus of the work involved in other portions of this course.

VI. Discussion Leader Assignments

1. Every student will be randomly assigned to a segment of the course two times at the discretion of the instructor. Those dates will be firm and final, unless students can give ample notice and proper documentation for an assigned presentation date that a student cannot attend due to an excused purpose.
2. On the dates of one's assigned presentations, there is a written assignment that will be distributed to the class for discussion leading, and each student assigned must do said work for all of the readings for that date:
 - If it is a study the hand out should include 3 elements:
 1. What was the purpose of the study?
 2. What were the main findings?
 3. One exam question based on this material
 - If it is not a study the hand out should include 3 elements
 1. What is the article about?
 2. What was most important thing you learned from the reading?
 3. One exam question based on this material
3. Because there is more than one student assigned per date, you will each bring an additional reading for the class to learn about. No one has to read it but you, and there is no need to make copies of it for folks, but you must share a copy with the professor two days in advance of the class via email. This segment does not require a handout, but will be used to enhance the discussion. When you email this to the professor 2 days in advance, you must also include your handout in MSWord format for posting online.
4. Student grades on this assignment will reflect several things, including:
 - The quality of and thought put into the hand outs
 - The amount of affirmative discussion leading
 - The quality of information shared with added articles

VII. Research paper

- The paper will be discussed and explained more thoroughly after the semester begins
- Here are the main elements to be considered:
 - What is something that can help prisoners make it?
 - What does the research say about it?
 - Has it been tried anywhere, and does it work?

VIII. Tentative Calendar¹:

¹ This schedule is provided solely for the convenience of students and is subject to change with reasonable notice by the professor. Any and all changes will be announced during class, and it is the student's responsibility to find out about changes should he or she miss a class.

January 23 Introduction
Martinson Report

January 26 Introduction

- i. Austin, J., & Irwin, J. (2001). *It's About Time: America's Imprisonment Binge* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning. [Chapter 1, pp. 1-15]
- ii. Maruna, S. (2001). *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. [Pp. 3-10, 19-35]
- iii. Roman, C.G. (2004). A roof is not enough: Successful prisoner reintegration requires experimentation and collaboration. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 3: 161-168.

January 30

- iv. Travis, J. (2000). *But They All Come Back: Rethinking Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- v. Glaze, L.E., & Palla, S. (2005). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2004*. Washington, DC: USDOJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics (Nov, 2005).

Organizational Barriers

The prison

February 2

- vi. Irwin, J. (1970) *The Felon*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. [pp.1-6, 36-60]
- vii. Sykes, G.M. (1958). *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton, NJ: The Princeton University Press. [pp. 63-83]
- viii. Cao, L., Zhao, J., & VanDine, S. (1997). Prison disciplinary tickets: A test of the deprivation and importation models. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25: 103-113.
- ix. Paterline, B.A., & Petersen, D.M. (1999). Structural and social psychological determinants of prisonization. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27: 427-441.

February 6

- x. Walters, G.D. (2003). Changes in criminal thinking and identity in novice and experienced inmates: Prisonization revisited. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30: 399-421.
- xi. Hochstetler, A., & DeLisi, M. (2005). Importation, deprivation, and varieties of serving time: An integrated-lifestyle-exposure model of prison offending. Journal of Criminal Justice, 33: 257-266.
- xii. Jiang, S., & Fisher-Giorlando, M. (2002). Inmate misconduct: A test of the deprivation, importation, and situational models. The Prison Journal, 82: 335-358.

Organizational Barriers

Employment

February 9

- xiii. Holzer, H.J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M.A. (2003). Employer Demand for Ex-Offenders: Recent Evidence from Los Angeles. Institute for Research on Poverty: <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/> (IRP Discussion Paper no. 1268-03).
- xiv. Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. American Journal of Sociology, 108: 937-75.
- xv. Holzer, H.J., Offner, P., & Sorensen, E. (2004). Declining Employment Among Young Black Less-Educated Men: The Role of Incarceration and Child Support. Institute for Research on Poverty: <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/> (IRP Discussion Paper no. 1281-04).

February 13

- xvi. Gordon, H.R., & Weldon, B. (2003). The impact of career and technical education programs on adult offenders: Learning behind bars. The Journal of Correctional Education 54: 200-209.
- xvii. Western, B. (2002). The impact of incarceration on wage mobility and inequality. American Sociological Review, 67: 526-546.
- xviii. Jengeleski, J.L., & Gordon, M.S. (2003). The Kintock Group, Inc. – Employment Resource Center: A two-year post-release evaluation study. The Journal of Correctional Education: 54: 27-30.
- xix. Harrison, B., & Schehr, R.C. (2004). Offenders and post-release jobs: Variables influencing success and failure. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 39 (3): 35-68.

Organizational Barriers

Education

February 16

- xx. Wald, J., & Losen, D.F. (2003). Defining and re-directing a school-to-prison pipeline. New Directions for Youth Development, #99: Fall 2003.
- xxi. Vacca, J.S. (2004). Educated prisoners are less likely to return. The Journal of Correctional Education, 55: 297-305.
- xxii. Haulard, E.R. (2001). Adult education: A must for our incarcerated population. The Journal of Correctional Education, 52: 157-159.
- xxiii. Ubah, C.B., & Robinson, R.L. (2003). A grounded look at the debate over prison-based education: Optimistic theory versus pessimistic worldview. The Prison Journal, 83: 115-128.

February 20

- xxiv. Brewster, D.R., & Sharp, S.F. (2002). Educational programs and recidivism in Oklahoma: Another look. The Prison Journal, 82: 314-334.
- xxv. Torre, M.E., & Fine, M. (2005). Bar none: Extending affirmative action to higher education in prison. Journal of Social Issues, 61: 569-594.
- xxvi. Harlow, C.W. (2003). Education and Correctional Populations. Washington, DC: USDoJ, OJP, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- xxvii. Ubah, C.B. (2004). Abolition of Pell Grants for higher education of prisoners: Examining antecedents and consequences. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 39 (2): 73-85.

Organizational Barriers

Parole

February 23

- xxviii. Fulton, B., Stichman, A., Travis, L., & Latessa, E. (1997). Moderating probation and parole officer attitudes to achieve desired outcomes. The Prison Journal, 77: 295-312.
- xxix. Pappozzi, M.A., & Gendreau, P. (2005). An intensive supervision program the worked: Service delivery, professional orientation, and organizational supportiveness. The Prison Journal, 85: 445-466.
- xxx. McLeary, R. (1992). *Dangerous Men: The Sociology of Parole* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harrow & Heston Publishers.

February 27

- xxxi. Healey, K.M. (1999). Case Management in the Criminal Justice System. Washington, DC: U.S. DOJ, National Institute of Justice, Research in Action (February, 1999).
- xxxii. Austin, J. (2001). Prisoner reentry: Current trends, practices, and issues. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47: 314-334.
- xxxiii. Horn, M.F. (2001) Rethinking sentencing. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5(3): 34-40.

March 1 MIDTERM EXAM

Social Reintegration
Family

March 5

- xxxiv. Hagan, J., & Coleman, J.P. (2001). Returning captives of the American war on drugs: Issues of community and family reentry. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47: 352-367.
- xxxv. Mumola, C.J. (2000). *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*. Washington, DC: USDoJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- xxxvi. Braman, D. (2004). *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in Urban America*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

March 8

- xxxvii. Barreras, R.E., Drucker, E.M., & Rosenthal, D. (2005). The concentration of substance abuse, criminal justice involvement, and HIV/AIDS in the families of drug offenders. *Journal of Urban Health*, 82: 162-170.
- xxxviii. Austin, J., & Hardyman, P.L. (2004). The risks and needs of the returning prisoner population. *Review of Policy Research*, 21: 13-29.

Social Reintegration

Community

March 19

- xxxix. Petersilia, J. (2000). *Sentencing & Corrections: Issues of the 21st Century: When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences*. Washington, DC: USDoJ, OJP, NIJ.

xl. Clear, T.R., Rose, D.R., & Ryder, J.A. (2001). Incarceration and the community: The problem of removing and returning offenders. Crime & Delinquency, 47: 335-351.

xli. Rose, D.R., Clear, T.R., & Ryder, J.A. (2001). Addressing the unintended consequences of incarceration through community-oriented services at the neighborhood level. Corrections Management Quarterly, 5 (3): 62-71.

March 22

xlii. McGarell, E.F., Hipple, N., & Banks, D. (2003). Applying Problem Solving Approaches to Issues of Inmate Re-entry: The Indianapolis Pilot Project. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

xliii. Pogrebin, M., Dodge, M., & Katsampes, P. (2001). The collateral costs of short-term jail incarceration: The long-term social and economic disruptions. Corrections Management Quarterly, 5 (4): 64-69.

xliv. Celinska, K. (2000). Volunteer involvement in ex-offenders' readjustment: Reducing the stigma of imprisonment. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 30 (3/4): 99-116.

Individual Barriers

Stigma

March 26

xlvi. Lemert, E. (1951). *Social Pathology: A Systematic Approach to the Theory of Sociopathic Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

xlvii. Young, W. (1976). *Impact of the Administration of Justice on Criminal Offenders: Perception of Stigma by Men on Parole*. [Dissertation] Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

March 29

xlviii. Dodge, M., & Pogrebin, M.R. (2001). Collateral costs of imprisonment for women: Complications of Reintegration. The Prison Journal, 81: 42-54.

xlix. Braman, D. (2002). Families and incarceration. [Dissertation, pp. 193-198]. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Individual Barriers

Mental Illness

April 2

l. Conly, C. (1999). *Coordinating Community Services for Mentally Ill Offenders: Maryland's Community Criminal Justice Treatment Program*. Washington, DC: USDoJ, Office of Justice Programs, Program Focus.

April 5

- i. Farabee, D., Shen, H., & Sanchez, S. (2004). Program-level predictors of antipsychotic medication adherence among parolees. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 48: 561-571.
- ii. Lurigio, A.J. (2001). Effective services for parolees with mental illness. Crime & Delinquency, 47: 446-461.
- iii. Alemagno, S.A., Shaffer-Kling, E., Tonkin, P., & Hammel, R. (2004). Characteristics of Offenders at Risk for Co-Existing Substance Abuse and Mental Disorder. Washington, DC: USDoJ, Office of Justice Programs.
- iiii. Edwards, K.A. (2000). Stigmatizing the stigmatized: A note on the mentally ill prison inmate. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 44: 480-489.
- lv. James, D.J., & Glaze, L.E. (2006). Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates. Washington, DC: USDoJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics (Special Report, September, 2006).

Individual Barriers

Substance Abuse

April 9

- iv. Farabee, D., Prendergast, M., & Anglin, M.D. (1998). The effectiveness of coerced treatment for drug-abusing offenders. Federal Probation, 62 (1): 3-10.
- ivi. Belenko, S. (2006). Assessing released inmates for substance-abuse-related service needs. Crime & Delinquency, 52: 94-113.
- lvii. Torres, S. (1998). Monitoring prescription medication use among substance-abusing offenders. Federal Probation 62 (1): 11-15.
- lviii. Butzin, C.A., Martin, S.S., & Inciardi, J.A. (2005). Treatment during transition from prison to community and subsequent illicit drug use. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 28: 351-358.

April 12

- lix. Prendergast, M, Hall, E., & Wellisch, J. (2002). An Outcome Evaluation of the Forever Free Substance Abuse Treatment Program: One-year Post-release Outcomes. Los Angeles, CA: Drug Abuse Research Center, UCLA Integrated Substance Abuse Programs.

- ix. Taxman, F.S., Byrne, J.M., & Thanner, M.H. (2002). Evaluating the Implementation and Impact of a Seamless System of Care for Substance Abusing Offenders – the HIDTA Model. Rockville, MD: University of Maryland Center for Applied Policy Studies.
- lxi. Mumola, C.J., & Karberg, J.C. (2006). Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004. Washington, DC: USDoJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics (Special Report, October, 2006).

Individual Barriers

Co-Occurring Diagnoses

April 16

- lxii. Abram, K.M., & Teplin, L.A. (1991). Co-occurring disorders among mentally ill jail detainees: Implications for public policy. *American Psychologist*, 46: 1036-1045.
- lxiii. Brochu, S., Guyon, L., & Desjardins, L. (1999). Comparative profiles of addicted adult populations in rehabilitation and correctional services. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 16: 173-182.
- lxiv. Brooks, A.J., & Penn, P.E. (2003). Comparing treatments for dual diagnosis: Twelve-step and self-management and recovery training. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 29: 359-383.

April 19

- lxv. Godley, S.H, Finch, M., Dougan, L, McDonnell, M., McDermeit, M., & Carey, A. (2000). Case management for dually diagnosed individuals involved in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 18: 137-148.
- lxvi. Hoff, R.A., Rosenheck, R.A., Baranosk, M.V., Buchanan, J., & Sonana, H. (1999). Diversion from jail of detainees with substance abuse: The interation with dual diagnosis. *The American Journal of Addictions*, 8: 201-210.

Individual Barriers

Physical Health

April 23

- lxvii. Hammett, T.M., Roberts, C., & Kennedy, S. (2001). Health-related issues in prisoner re-entry. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47: 390-409.
- lxviii. Belenko, S., Langlely, S., Crimmins, S., & Chaple, M. (2004). HIV Risk behaviors, knowledge, and prevention education among offenders under community supervision: A hidden risk group. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 16: 367-385.

- lxi. Harzke, A.J., Ross, M.W., & Scott, D.P. (2006). Predictors of post-release primary care utilization among HIV-positive prison inmates: A pilot study. AIDS Care, 18 (4): 290-301.
- lxx. Conklin, T.J., Lincoln, T., & Flanigan, T.P. (1998). A public health model to connect correctional health care with communities. American Journal of Public Health, 88 (8): 1249-1250.
- lxxi. Conklin, T.J., Lincoln, T., & Tuthill, R.W. (2000). Self-reported health and prior health behaviors of newly admitted correctional inmates. American Journal of Public Health, 90 (12): 1939-1941.
- lxxii. Braithwaite, R.L., & Arriola, R.J. (2003). Male prisoners and HIV prevention: A call for action ignored. American Journal of Public Health, 93 (5): 759-163.
- lxxiii. Tulskey, J.P., Shite, M.C., Dawson, C., Hoynes, T.M., Goldenson, J., & Schecter, G. (1998). Screening for tuberculosis in jail and clinic follow-up after release. American Journal of Public Health, 88: 223-226.
- lxxiv. Tappero, J.W., Reporter, R., Wenger, J.D., Ward, B.A., Reeves, M.W., Missbach, T.S., Plikaytis, B.D., Mascola, L., & Schuchat, A. (1996). Meningococcal disease in Los Angeles County, California, and among men in the county jails. The New England Journal of Medicine, 335: 833-840.
- lxxv. Edlin, B.R., Seal, K.H., Larvick, J., Kral, A.H., Ciccarone, D.H., Moore, L.D., & Lo, B. (2001). Is it justifiable to withhold treatment for hepatitis C from illicit-drug users? New England Journal of Medicine, 345: 211-214.

April 26

April 30

FINAL EXAM REVIEW