



**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY &  
PRETRIAL SERVICES AGENCY  
RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**MEMORANDUM**

DATE: October 6, 2003

TO: Paul A. Quander, Jr.

CC: Susan W. Shaffer

FROM: Claire Johnson

RE: Research Proposals: The Halfway House as a Transitional Alternative and Understanding Why Offenders Recidivate

The Research Review Committee (RRC) has reviewed the research request submitted by Dr. Charis Kubrin of The George Washington University to study the differences in recidivism rates for offenders released through halfway houses and neighborhood factors that influence recidivism. Our recommendation is for CSOSA to support the study, with conditions, as discussed in the recommendation statement, which is attached.

Please indicate below your acceptance or non-acceptance of this recommendation as soon as possible so that we may inform the researcher of the outcome of our review.

If you have any questions or would like a copy of the complete review file, please feel free to contact me at 202-220-5553 or [claire.johnson@csosa.gov](mailto:claire.johnson@csosa.gov).

Thank you.

<p>I <b>ACCEPT</b> the RRC recommendation</p> <p align="center">Signature</p>	<p>I <b>DO NOT ACCEPT</b> the RRC recommendation</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

Enclosure: Researcher Proposal  
RRC recommendation statement

**Research Review Committee**

**Janice C. Bergin**, Director of Operations, PSA • **Calvin C. Johnson**, Director of Research and Evaluation, CSOSA • **Claire M. Johnson**, Director of Justice and Community Relations, PSA • Rebecca Childress, Senior Program Analyst, Strategic Planning, Analysis and Evaluation, PSA • **George E. Pruden, II**, General Counsel • **Thomas H. Williams**, Director of Community Supervision Services, CSOSA



**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY &  
PRETRIAL SERVICES AGENCY  
RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE**

## **EXPEDITED REVIEW RECOMMENDATION STATEMENT**

### **I. RESEARCH PROPOSAL SUMMARY**

**Principal Researcher:** Charis E. Kubrin, Ph.D. Sociology Department, The George Washington University (with student Lisa B. Feldman, A.B.D., The George Washington University Institute of Public Policy)

**Title:** Back Home From Prison: Project 1 (The Halfway House as a Transitional Alternative) and Project 2 (Understanding Why Offenders Recidivate)

**Institution:** The George Washington University, Washington, DC

**Type of Data:** Aggregate-level data and interviews

**Subjects:** Data on individuals released from Federal prisons to the District of Columbia between October 1, 2001 and September 30, 2002; and interviews with halfway house administrators.

**Description:** The purpose of the study is twofold: 1) to determine whether differences in recidivism rates exist between offenders released through halfway houses and other releases; and 2) to determine whether neighborhood factors influence recidivism above and beyond the individual-level characteristics of offenders. The findings will be used to reinforce current processes of offender reentry, or to develop new and more effective mechanisms for reintegrating returning offenders.

### **II. QUALIFICATION FOR EXPEDITED REVIEW**

This proposal has been in the process of being developed for several months and the researchers have met on numerous occasions with CSOSA/ORE staff to discuss data and information needs and limitations. The data request for this study is the same that has been approved for release to the Urban Institute for the study that was approved earlier this year (03-01-Urban-CRoman). The level of data does not allow identification of individual offenders, and the data could otherwise be requested through FOIA.

**CSOSA/PSA RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDATION STATEMENT**

---

### **III. RECOMMENDATION**

The RRC recommendation for this study:

☐ Support                      ☑ **Support with Conditions**                      ☐ Do Not Support

The RRC recommends support of this request provided the following conditions:

- Regarding the researcher's request for offender rearrest data, CSOSA can provide rearrest data only for offenders while they are under CSOSA supervision. Rearrest for other cases will have to be obtained by the researcher from the Metropolitan Police Department and/or other law enforcement agencies.
- Regarding the researcher's request for offender criminal history data, CSOSA can provide data only for adjudicated charges resulting in the current supervision obligation. Charge history information not resulting in CSOSA supervision will have to be obtained by the researcher from the source agency.

### **III. SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

#### **Regulatory:**

The proposed study is compliant with Federal regulations regarding the protection of human subjects as certified by The George Washington University Institutional Review Board (MPA# M-1125-01). Because the researcher is using the requested data for two separate, but related projects, two applications were submitted. Project 1 is approved under IRB# U070313ER and Project 2 is approved under IRB# U070319ER.

The proposed research shows no evidence of non-compliance with Agency policies pertaining to research.

#### **Benefits to Agency:**

The proposed research is consistent with Agency priorities and/or interests as follows:

- Since CSOSA is the only agency responsible for supervising offenders released from prison to the District, research findings will help to improve supervision policies and practices.
- The lack of sound outcome research on the benefits of halfway houses makes it difficult for policymakers to convince the public that increasing the number of halfway houses is a logical and responsible policy solution. This

**CSOSA/PSA RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDATION STATEMENT**

---

study will validate CSOSA's policy decisions by ensuring they are rooted in empirical verification.

- In the District, the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) expects to see a sharp decline in the number of inmates placed in halfway houses. If the length of stay in a halfway house can be shown to decrease the risk of recidivism, thereby increasing the level of public safety, then CSOSA and other District stakeholders will be better able to advocate for a reversal of the BOP policy.
- Lastly, as a Federal agency, CSOSA has to report on progress toward specific programmatic benchmarks. This study will provide the Agency with the necessary data toward these benchmarks without using staff resources or time.

**Related Issues or Concerns:**

Issues associated with this request include:

- The RRC requested clarification from Dr. Kubrin regarding the designation of principal researchers for the projects. Her response is attached. The proposal implies that Ms. Feldman and Dr. Kubrin are the principal researchers for Project 1 and Project 2, respectively. Since Ms. Feldman is a student, she does not have the authority to accept responsibility for adhering to the requirements of the researcher agreements and/or holding others who might work on the study accountable for adhering to them. Therefore, Dr. Kubrin must be designated as the principal researcher.
- The proposal does not clearly state what deliverables the researchers intend to produce. The RRC requested additional information regarding this. Dr. Kubrin's response is attached.

Back Home From Prison: Understanding Why Offenders Recidivate  
Charis E. Kubrin, Ph.D.  
Lisa B. Feldman, A.B.D.

(1) A summary statement containing the specified information:

- **Charis E. Kubrin, Ph.D. Sociology Department, The George Washington University and Lisa B. Feldman, A.B.D., The George Washington University Institute of Public Policy, request data from Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) for the proposed project “Back Home From Prison: Understanding Why Offenders Recidivate.”**
- **The purpose of the study is twofold: 1) to determine whether differences in recidivism rates exist between offenders released through halfway houses and other releases; 2) to determine whether neighborhood factors influence recidivism above and beyond the individual-level characteristics of offenders.**
- **The findings will be used to reinforce current processes of offender reentry, or to recommend the creation of new and more effective mechanisms for reintegrating returning offenders.**
- **At such a critical policy juncture, when state, local and national policymakers are looking to solidify the policies created for absorbing returning offenders, it is essential to determine whether halfway houses are an effective transitional alternative and the extent to which community characteristics influence recidivism levels**
- **The duration of the study will be from October 2003 through May 2004 in Washington, D.C. To examine which factors affect recidivism, poisson regression analysis will be used. Data on individuals released from federal prisons to the District of Columbia between October 2001 and September 30, 2002 comprise the study sample.**
- **Agency resources will be needed to identify the sample.**
- **There will be no risk or discomfort to study subjects as we are only requesting data by the subject’s Police Department Identification Number (PDID). Using this number as an identifier, we will have no access to personal or descriptive information about any of our sample subjects.**
- **Our anticipated results will determine the viability of one release option—transition through halfway house—in comparison to all others, while controlling for factors related to recidivism. They will also determine how individual and community factors together influence recidivism levels.**
- **We will provide CSOSA and PSA with a final report detailing our findings and a review of the relevant literature. We are also interested in presenting our findings to CSOSA staff and staff from other relevant agencies.**

(2) A detailed statement, including the following:

*(a) Review of the Relevant Literature*

Researchers have extensively documented the impact of incarceration on offenders, families, and communities. Notably, however, there is sparse literature about the effectiveness of programs and policy options designed to ease the transition of offenders back home from prisons. Section one will provide an overview of what researchers have already established about the individual causes of recidivism, such as age, existence of a youth criminal history, race or other demographic factors, drug use, employment, or criminal history; and about the larger societal factors that influence recidivism, such as changing metropolitan areas, technology, segregation, and population turnover. Section two will review existing literature on community-based programs for offenders in general, followed by a review of research on the efficacy of halfway houses as a mechanism for reducing recidivism.

***Understanding Why Ex-Offenders Recidivate***

A 2002 Bureau of Justice Statistics study on outcomes of the rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration of 272,111 prisoners released from prisons in 1994, indicated that an estimated 67.5 percent of the released prisoners were rearrested for a new crime (either a felony or a serious misdemeanor) within 3 years following their release. Property offenders had the highest rearrest rate (74 percent); released drug offenders (67 percent); and public-order offenders (mostly those in prison for driving while intoxicated or a weapons offense), a 62 percent rate. Of 108,580 prisoners released in 1983, 62.5 percent reoffended within a three-year period, indicating a rise in the rate of recidivism from 1983 to 1994.

Although some social science researchers consider how neighborhood characteristics influence criminal behavior, most research looks at the individual characteristics of offenders that may help to explain offending behavior. The studies below summarize the findings on recidivism.

***Individual Characteristics as Predictors of Recidivism***

Studies consistently find that younger offenders with a history of drug abuse and criminal behavior are most likely to reoffend once released from prison. Considering that over 60 percent of offenders reoffend, the number of past arrests has been shown to provide a good predictor of the rate of future criminality. Recidivism studies indicate that offenders with a history of reoffending, or similar antisocial behavior, do in fact have the highest rate of recidivism (Gendreau, Little & Goggin 1996; Schwaner 1998; Stinchcomb & Clinton 2001; BJS 2002).

The presence of a juvenile criminal history is also a predictor of adult recidivism (Tracy & Kempf-Leonard 1996). Important predictors of repeat adult criminality among those with juvenile offenses have been found to include: beginning a delinquency career at a young age, continuing throughout adolescence, and being active at the end of the juvenile period (age 17). The severity of a delinquent's first few offenses, rather than the extent of recidivism or the average severity of

recidivism, was most predictive of adult criminal status (Tracy & Kempf-Leonard 1996).

Between 1994 and 1997, of all offenders released from state and federal prisons, men were more likely to be rearrested (68.4 percent) than women (57.6 percent); blacks (72.9 percent) more likely than whites (62.7 percent); non-Hispanics (71.4 percent) more likely than Hispanics (64.6 percent) (BJS 2002). Numerous other studies identify gender and age as primary determinants of recidivism (Stinchcomb & Clinton 2001; Schwaner 1998; Hepburn & Albonetti 1994).

Since the majority of paroled inmates have no savings, few skills, poor education, no immediate entitlement to unemployment benefits, and no ties to jobs, unemployment is considered by many researchers to be a primary determinant of recidivism. Post-release employment and drug abuse influence post-release behavior for some populations. In one study, however, age was found to interact with employment to affect the rate of self-reported recidivism. In this study, age was more of a predictor of recidivism than employment (Uggen 2000). This relationship was not significant for younger offenders however, indicating that employment is only a significant determinant of recidivism for those offenders who may already be “aging” out of crime (Hirschi & Gottfredson 1983). Another study found that one-year post release as many as 60 percent of offenders are not employed in the regular labor market (Petersilia 1999). Researchers studying ex-offender employment have shown that a parolee who does not obtain and keep a decent job is at a much greater risk of either making a living through illegal means or of turning to drug and alcohol use as a type of self-medication (Kassenbaum et al 1999).

#### Neighborhood and Community Context as Predictors of Recidivism

Notably absent from the body of criminal justice research about the causes of reoffending behavior are measures reflecting the neighborhood contexts in which individuals live. This may be due, in part, to the belief that the risk for reoffending is individually determined. However, given a large body of research that underscores the importance of neighborhood context for predicting individual-level outcomes, limiting the range of explanatory variables to individual descriptors is not justifiable.

For example, few studies document the types of neighborhoods that offenders are released into; few consider whether released offenders tend to disproportionately live in socially disorganized neighborhoods with high rates of poverty and joblessness—factors that can facilitate recidivism. And while individual-level factors play an important role in predicting who will reoffend versus who will not, one’s immediate environment is also likely to have a significant influence on rates of recidivism. Neighborhoods vary in the extent to which they provide residents with job opportunities, housing options, and services and programs that address the residents’ needs. Thus, individuals released into neighborhoods that provide resources to facilitate reintegration back into society may be less likely to reoffend than those who lack access to such resources.

**Relatedly, a small but growing literature examines the impact of worsening economic conditions in central cities in relation to ex-offenders, yet nearly all of this work is theoretical. Over the past decade, metropolitan areas have lost important manufacturing**

**jobs, with companies relocating out of urban centers to take advantage of cheap land, access to highways, and low crime rates (Wilson 1996; Downs 1998; & Powell 1998). As a result, a new type of city has emerged. Characterized by consumption and technology, local retail and plant-based manufacturing jobs have diminished, making way for a new “global” economy based upon vast networks of translocal markets, organizations, communications and distribution (Sellers 2002). In order to increase efficiency, the size of the unskilled labor force has been drastically reduced, resulting in a decline in the number of employment opportunities for a large segment of the urban population (Sellers 2002). Wider disparities between the working class and the middle class have grown rapidly in urban areas as services and technological innovation moved to the forefront of advanced industrial economies (Sellers 2002). As a result, undereducated residents were no longer able to obtain employment as laborers and the unemployment rate within central cities has continued to grow.**

Along with a declining job market in cities, many ex-offenders and lower income people lack contacts and have difficulty gaining knowledge about jobs and transportation, making it difficult to secure employment in the suburbs where most jobs exist (especially once released from prison). Employer reticence about hiring ex-offenders, especially when so many applicants are young, minority males also plays a significant role in understanding the difficulties ex-offenders may have in securing employment (Holzer 1996; Travis et al 2001). One survey of employers found that 65 percent of all employers said they would not knowingly hire an ex-offender regardless of the offense, while more than 30 percent had checked the criminal records of all their recent hires (Holzer 1996).

**Many experts assert that federal, state, local and regional policies have deliberately and systematically created areas of concentrated poverty, creating a poor quality of life and limiting social and economic opportunities for its residents (Powell 1998). Massey (2001) links high rates of black crime to extreme black poverty and high levels of intentionally created black segregation. He argues that segregation stems from the operations of three interrelated and mutually reinforcing forces in American society: high levels of institutionalized discrimination in the real estate and banking industries, high levels of prejudice among whites against blacks as potential neighbors, and discriminatory public policies implemented by whites at all levels of government. In a racially segregated city, Massey argues that any increase in black poverty is necessarily confined to a small number of geographically isolated and racially homogeneous neighborhoods. Not surprisingly, a disproportionate number of parolees return to these very same neighborhoods.**

**Wilson (1996) also looks at segregation to explain the difficulties urban residents have in securing and maintaining employment. He argues that segregated “ghettos,” the areas that absorb a disproportionate number of offenders, are less conducive to employment and employment preparation than other areas of the city because there are few job opportunities and little training available. Segregation leads to weak informal employment networks and contributes to the social isolation of individuals and families, thereby reducing their chances of acquiring the skills and training that facilitate mobility.**

Houses and residential buildings in low-income neighborhoods tend to be unhealthy places to live. They have numerous health and safety code violations, resulting in more accidents and fires. The neighborhoods surrounding these homes often lack recreational facilities and children are often forced to play under dangerous conditions. However, violent crime is the greatest stressor (Drier et al. 2001). When large numbers of offenders return to communities after



servicing years in prison, they have many needs that these communities, in most cases, lack the capacity to provide. Thus, certain offenders are more likely to recidivate upon returning to their communities. Increasing the capacity of neighborhoods to provide for returning offenders will go a long way for lowering recidivism.

### ***Community Corrections Programs: A Controversial Alternative to Lowering Recidivism***

In a “Get Tough on Crime” era of increasing penalties for offenders, rehabilitation and correctional halfway houses fly in the face of the punitive approach (Tonry 1995).<sup>1</sup> In general, the public fears criminals and wants them locked away from their neighborhoods. Studies support these fears, indicating that citizens support harsh penalties for offenders and overwhelmingly support the death penalty, even with all of its proven shortcomings (Gallup 2002). Consequently, to appeal to this public sentiment, politicians at all levels of government typically vote for harsh punishment bills even if they don’t believe that it will reduce crime (Tonry 1995). In elections, any opponent who rejects harsh penalties may be viewed as “soft on crime” as Michael Dukakis experienced in the 1988 presidential election when former President Bush pitted him as a pushover after an offender committed a crime while on furlough in Massachusetts (Tonry 1995; Culverson 1998).

Media driven misconceptions exacerbate the perceptions the public holds about criminals. Refuting the media’s portrayal of offenders as predominately violent, in 2000, 51 percent of offenders in state and federal prisons were non-violent offenders while 21 percent of this population was serving time for a drug-related offense (BJS 2003). The media has historically stereotyped some people, particularly black men, as dangerous implying that this population is deserving of punitive treatment (Kellner 1995). The War on Drugs has reinforced this stereotype by painting a portrait of crazed young minority crack addicts running around robbing and stealing (Fishman 1998). Studies from the early 1990’s, the time when prison rates first skyrocketed as a result of increased sanctions for drug use, have actually shown that in many cities around the country, whites tested positive more frequently than blacks for cocaine and marijuana use, in direct contradiction to the disproportionate number of blacks incarcerated on drug-related offenses (NIJ 1991; NIJ 1993).

Even with the tendency toward harsher penalties, residents acknowledge that undesirable populations, such as ex-offenders, need a place to live (Solomon 1983). In examining the role of informal influences on offenders once they are released from prison, Smith (2001) argues that community corrections facilities are effective mechanisms not only to improve an offender’s chances of succeeding in the community, but also to enhance people’s awareness about public safety within the community. He contends that risk—or the perception of risk—is enhanced when citizens feel threatened by potential ex-offenders because they are unfamiliar with them and have misconceptions about the level of danger offenders pose. Smith argues that supportive influences within the community can help to reduce this risk and to ensure that the potential offender does not violate potential victims.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on the punitive shift toward incarceration, see: “Too Little Too Late: President Clinton’s Prison Legacy.” 2001. Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, San Francisco, CA ([www.cjci.org/pubs/clinton/clinton.html](http://www.cjci.org/pubs/clinton/clinton.html)).

There is also empirical consensus among most criminal justice researchers that programs that assist offenders in finding jobs, housing, and social services in distressed communities can provide numerous benefits, including enhancing public safety and assisting in long-term reintegration of offenders into the community and their families (Donziger 1996). Most of the literature that examines community-based programs has studied the effectiveness of substance abuse treatment programs and employment programs for offenders.

Considering that about 75 to 80 percent of all prison inmates have substance abuse problems, and only about 13 percent of inmates receive any kind of treatment while in prison (ONDCP 1998), substance abuse may contribute to recidivism, and therefore outcome studies about substance abuse treatment are quite relevant to this study. Two studies of offenders who participated in community-based substance abuse treatment after release from prison found that treatment provided the greatest benefit to subjects in the study compared to the comparison group that received no treatment in terms of reducing recidivism (Belenko & Peugh 1998; Davidson-Coronado 2001). A Texas study found that almost 75 percent of the residents who successfully completed a community-based program instead of incarceration did not get a new arrest in the first two years after they were discharged (TDCJ-CJAD 1999).

Knight et al. (1997) examined the effectiveness of in-prison therapeutic communities. They found that 80 percent of the 222 offenders graduated from the therapeutic community had marked reductions in their criminal and drug use activity from six months before entering prison to six months after leaving prison. Those who completed the first phase of their aftercare program had lower relapse and recidivism rates than did the parolees in the comparison sample (Knight, Simpson, Chatham and Camacho, 1997). A three-year follow-up study of 291 eligible parolees found that those who completed both the therapeutic community program and aftercare were the least likely to be re-incarcerated (25 percent) as compared to 64 percent of aftercare drop-outs and 42 percent of untreated comparison groups (Knight, Simpson & Hiller, 1999). The Bureau of Prisons found that offenders enrolled in its TRIAD drug treatment program had a lower probability (31 percent) of rearrest than comparable offenders who did not receive substance abuse services (38 percent) (Bureau of Prisons 2000).

Wexler, Falkin & Lipton (1990) performed an evaluation of New York City's Stay'n Out program, a corrections-based substance abuse program called a Therapeutic Community (TC), based on over 1,500 participants. The quasi-experimental design compares the program participants (N=682) with inmates who volunteered for the program, but never participated (N=197) and inmates who participated in other types of in-prison drug abuse treatment program in different prisons (N=947). Results showed that after three years at risk, those who completed the TC program had a significantly lower arrest rate (26.9 percent) than those who had different drug treatment (34.6 percent, 39.8 percent) and those who received no treatment (40.9 percent).

Substance abuse programs also have been shown to provide tremendous cost savings to taxpayers (Belenko & Peugh 1998; Davidson-Coronado 2001). A 1997 study conducted by RAND found that an additional \$1 million contribution from the federal government toward drug treatment would reduce serious crimes 15 times more effectively than the current policy of incarceration. Another study conducted in California reported savings from treatment of \$1.5 billion over 18 months, with the largest savings coming from a reduction in crime. The study estimated that for every \$1 spent on treatment, approximately \$7 could be gained in future savings (Gerstein et al 1994). Texas realized savings of almost 40 percent of the cost of revocation and incarceration through its placement of offenders in a variety of community-based programs (TDCJ-CJAD 1999).

In studying the impact of employment programs, Saylor & Gaes (1997) evaluated the Post-Release Employment Project for offenders returning from prison, over a four-year period (1992-1996). Data were collected on over 7,000 Federal offenders comparing those participating in training and work programs with similar offenders who did not take part and with a baseline group of all other inmates. The longitudinal results demonstrated significant training effects on both in-prison (misconduct reports) and post-prison (employment and arrest rates) outcome measures.

These studies demonstrate the effectiveness of community-based programs in reducing the rate of drug use and combating recidivism. The section below will examine the literature about a particular type of community based program operated by the federal, state, or local correctional system—the halfway house—that supervises offenders who would otherwise be incarcerated in a traditional jail or prison in a residential setting.

### ***The Halfway House***

**While only a few outcome studies exist that test the effectiveness of halfway houses in reducing the rate of recidivism, Hartmann et al (1994) assert that these studies typically fall into two categories: 1) those that employ experimental or quasi-experimental designs to compare the effects of halfway house programming with the effects of an alternative intervention—most commonly regular parole (Allen 1975; Beck 1979; Dowell, Klein, & Krichman 1985); and 2) non experimental studies that use no comparison group but instead attempt to isolate variables associated with successful halfway house program completion (Donnelly & Forschner 1984; Walsh & Beck 1990; English & Mande 1991; Calathes 1991). There is strong consensus from both types of studies that halfway house participation reduces recidivism by increasing the level of community control and community safety.**

**Earlier studies conducted in the 1970s and 1980s highlight the success of specific pre-release programs. A quasi-experimental study of a California halfway house for women found that the average number of crimes in the halfway house group was half that of the control group that did not go through a halfway house, and that the halfway house group committed less severe crimes (Dowell 1985). This study concluded that halfway houses provide a social and economic haven that allows offenders to gain the skills necessary to reduce the impact of factors prompting crime.**

An evaluation of 3,629 offenders released from prison in 1999 in Ohio showed that high-risk offenders released into halfway houses have lower recidivism rates (63 vs. 68 percent), compared to high-risk offenders released directly onto parole supervision (Lowencamp & Latessa 2002). Some of the strongest support for gradual release through halfway houses comes from official sources in Canada. One Canadian study (National Parole Board 2002) found that offenders released into more intensive supervision, such as halfway houses, accounted for 17 percent of violent offenses while offenders on weekly reporting accounted for 69 percent of all violent offenses. According to the Correctional Service of Canada and the National Parole Board, offenders on “day parole, a restricted form of release whereby offenders remain in residential custody (e.g. halfway houses) but are permitted to work and participate in community activities during the day,” are more likely to complete their sentence without incident than offenders released on regular parole (Correctional Services of Canada 2002).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Most often, offenders become eligible for day parole six months before they become eligible for full parole. Most offenders in halfway houses are there on day parole.

In considering the type of offenders who have the greatest success in a halfway house setting, researchers have found that length of stay in prison was not a significant indicator. Generally, clients without a history of drug use, offenders who have been incarcerated on fewer occasions, older offenders, and offenders with a sound educational and employment history have better halfway house outcomes than other offenders (Gutierrez 2000; Donnelly & Forschner 1984).

**(b) Detailed description of the research method:**

Following are the questions that will guide our research. These questions comprise two related projects:

**Project One: Halfway House Outcome Study**

1. What are the profiles of felony offenders returning from federal prisons to Washington D.C. communities?
2. Which demographic and case characteristics are the best predictors of successful halfway house completion?
3. Do felony offenders from the District who were placed in Community Corrections Centers (halfway houses) upon release from prison reoffend at lower rates than other released offenders, controlling for a number of factors?
  - 3a. Do differences exist in the severity and types of crimes committed between the different populations?

**Project Two: Neighborhood Correlates of Recidivism Study**

4. To what extent do neighborhood characteristics account for variation in the reoffending behavior of subjects that is not explained by their individual-level characteristics?
5. How do individual-level and neighborhood-level characteristics interact to influence rates of recidivism?
6. Does neighborhood context help to explain why minority ex-offenders are more likely to reoffend than white ex-offenders post-release?

These questions are flexible and we welcome any additional inquiries from CSOSA or PSA to include in the design.

*Description of the Sample*

Data on individuals released from federal prisons to the District of Columbia between October 2001 and September 30, 2002 comprise the study sample (Approx. N=2,000). This study includes a treatment group and three comparison groups. The treatment group consists of Washington, D.C. offenders released from federal prisons and placed into one of six halfway houses in the District contracting with the Federal Bureau of Prisons. These offenders are compared to three other groups: (1) Interstate Offenders: Those offenders who were prosecuted in foreign jurisdictions, but requested to be supervised in the District of Columbia post-release from prison because they have a professional or social connection in the City; (2) Supervised Releasees: Those offenders who have served at least 85 percent of their sentence and who are released to the community under supervision; (3) Others: Those offenders who are released to

other community programs. Although research has shown that offenders have the highest likelihood of reoffending within 90 to 180 days post release (Callahan and Koenning 1995; Petersilia 2003), this study will track recidivism levels for a period of 12 months post release to ensure greater reliability of the findings.

### *Independent Variables*

#### Project One:

Data on all offenders released between October 1, 2001 and September 30, 2002 are requested from the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) and Pretrial Services Agency (PSA) in the District of Columbia. The data contain information ranging from demographic characteristics to case characteristics to program experience. The individual level predictors for the experimental and comparison groups can be classified into three groups of measures: (1) demographic, (2) case, (3) program. The demographic measures include *race* (black, white, other); *gender*, *age* (in years); *educational level* (highest grade completed); *marital status* (married, never married, divorced/separated/widowed); *employment status upon arrest* (employed, unemployed); *history of drug use* (yes/no); and *history of mental health problems* (yes/no). Case characteristics include the *number of current offenses*; *seriousness level of most serious offense* (index crime/non index crime); *number of prior arrests*; *classification level while in prison*; *time served while in prison* (in months); *risk/supervision level once released from prison*; and *post release option* (halfway house, direct release no supervision, direct release supervision, release to other community programs). Program characteristics include *halfway house facility* (of six); *length of time a subject spent in the halfway house* (in weeks); and *program success or failure* (e.g., whether a person completed the residential portion of the halfway house). All predictors were selected based on findings from other studies (Dowdy 1997).

#### Project Two:

In addition to the individual-level characteristics mentioned above, each offender's *post-release address* (census tract identifier) will also be obtained. Neighborhood measures that reflect levels of social (dis)organization will be drawn from the 2000 Census and include: percent poverty, percent unemployed, percent public assistance, percent divorced, racial heterogeneity, and residential mobility. We will also use a measure to tap into the number of social service programs available in each census tract.

### *Dependent Variables*

#### Project One:

Three outcome measures will be used: (1) Pre-release recidivism (e.g. the number of arrests resulting from violations—felony and misdemeanor—committed by the proportion of the sample that was released into a halfway house; (2) Post-release recidivism (e.g. the number of arrests resulting from violations—felony and misdemeanor—for subjects released through a halfway house compared to the recidivism of all other subjects in the sample). Post release-recidivism is measured as the number of known offenses committed after an offender was

released from the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Prisons<sup>3</sup>; (3) Seriousness of new offense—this will be categorized using the dichotomous variable “Index Crime” or “Non-Index Crime” to determine whether differences in the types and seriousness of offenses between subjects occurs with any significance. Causality for these differences will be explored by controlling for the relevant independent variables.

Although arrest data should not be presumed as indicative of actual criminal activity, for research purposes, arrest data provide the best estimate of criminal activity (Dowell et al. 1985). Arrest data are typically used in empirical studies instead of convictions for three reasons. First, arrests occur at or near the time when the offense was committed. Since recidivism data will be collected within a twelve-month period post release, many offenders in the sample may have pending court cases for new arrests, which would not be included in the sample. Second, there is less discretion involved in an arrest as opposed to being convicted; as the alleged offender moves further through the criminal justice system, s/he is subject to discretionary decisions that may result in being released, regardless of whether s/he committed the crime. Third, once an alleged offender reaches the court, a conviction is not guaranteed, as an offender may be released on technicalities. Therefore, arrest data are a more reliable measure of actual offenses than are conviction data and previous studies frequently use arrest data in lieu of conviction data (Dowdy 1997; Dowell et al. 1985; Hartman et al. 1994). Rearrest data will be collected through the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) database, a national data source on criminal offenders that keeps track of offenses committed by a person anywhere in the United States. The subjects will be identified using Police Department Identifiers (PDID), the number used to track people from the time they have been arrested throughout their involvement in the criminal justice system.

Project Two:

The dependent variable will consist of the number of rearrests twelve months post release for all subjects.

### *Analysis of Data*

Project One:

An ideal research design to compare the effects of halfway house programming with the effects of alternative interventions on recidivism would be a randomized experiment where offenders are randomly placed into the treatment or control options. In the current study, this design is not feasible because a formal process established by the Federal Bureau of Prisons determines placement in a halfway house. Instead, the current research mirrors previous outcome studies by employing a quasi-experimental design to compare the recidivism levels of the treatment and control groups (Allen and Seiter 1976; Beck 1979; Dowell et al. 1985; Lamb and Goertzel 1975).

This study will examine two stages of events: 1) number of rearrests from the first day of release from prison throughout the halfway house stay (halfway house residents only), and 2) number of rearrests one year post-release from the halfway house or prison (all subjects).

Because a large number of subjects will not reoffend, and those subjects that do reoffend will have a relatively small number of arrests, basic OLS regression is not appropriate. This study will, therefore, utilize a Poisson-based regression model. Poisson regression has the

---

<sup>3</sup> Technical violations are not used because the focus is on substantive recidivism (Dowdy 1997)

advantage of being precisely tailored to the discrete, highly skewed distribution of the dependent variable. However, the basic Poisson regression model is appropriate only if the data are not overdispersed; applying the basic Poisson regression model to overdispersed data can produce underestimation of the standard errors of the Betas, which in turn leads to misleading significance tests. A solution is found in the negative binomial regression model, best known and most widely available Poisson-based model that allows for overdispersion (Kubrin and Weitzer 2003; Osgood 2000). This study will employ counts for the number of rearrests as the dependent variable and will use the negative binomial regression estimation procedure to determine the relationship between type of release and rearrest.

In order to account for any qualitative differences between halfway houses, telephone interviews will be conducted with each of the halfway house directors. The questions that will be addressed can be found in Appendix A.

#### Project Two:

The analyses will be carried out in three steps. First, descriptive analyses will determine a) characteristics of subjects who reoffend versus those who do not reoffend, b) correlations between subjects' individual-level characteristics and neighborhood characteristics, and c) how recidivism levels vary for individuals of neighborhoods with different levels of social disorganization. Maps from ArcView GIS will be produced to visually determine whether, for example, the highest recidivating subjects in the sample tend to live in high poverty areas.

Second, individual-level regression models of reoffending counts (see Poisson Model explanation above) will examine the effect of individual-level characteristics on recidivism rates (controlling for other factors), and determine the extent to which factors such as race are significantly related to recidivism.

Third, the study will integrate levels of analysis (individual and neighborhood) by estimating multilevel models (using Bryk and Raudenbush's Hierarchical Linear Modeling Program). HLM models will examine whether neighborhood context influences recidivism rates above and beyond individual-level factors, and whether contextual variables interact with individual characteristics to influence outcomes. Thus, we can determine both whether neighborhood context helps to explain black-white differences in reoffending, and whether it explains why some African-Americans recidivate while others do not.

## **Limitations**

### *Measurement Validity*

For both projects, because the study design is not experimental, the issue of selection bias must be considered. For Project One, the placement of subjects into halfway houses is a selective process. Subjects are not randomly placed but are selected based on a number of factors including their prior criminal history, current offense, history of drug and mental health problems, and administrative factors. For Project Two, subjects do not randomly return to neighborhoods but likely self-select into certain types of neighborhoods based on factors including their socio-economic status, race, and educational level. If either set of factors is related to recidivism, selection bias must be considered as an alternative interpretation of the findings. This study will deal with selection-bias in two ways. First, the research will incorporate as many theoretically relevant individual and neighborhood-level variables as possible to reduce

the likelihood that unmeasured variables are influencing the recidivism levels of study subjects. Second, Heckman's (1979) two-stage model, a commonly used approach to address this problem, will be employed.

**(c) Significance of anticipated results and contribution to the advancement of knowledge:**

Although a growing literature on offender reentry exists—which considers the needs of urban communities and returning offenders—few outcome studies exist to validate the effectiveness of community-based programs aimed to ease the transition from prisoner to free citizen. As Federal, state and local policymakers explore possible release options, it is imperative that their decisions are informed by sound outcome data to ensure the successful reintegration of offenders.

This study uses data on release placements for offenders returning from prisons to the District of Columbia to determine whether differences in recidivism exist. The analysis will test the viability of one release option—transition through halfway houses—in comparison to all others while controlling for factors related to recidivism. It will also determine the extent to which neighborhood factors play a role in recidivism. Since the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the District of Columbia government, and many state and local jurisdictions around the country support the use of these facilities in transitioning returning offenders and few outcome studies support the efficacy of this option, release through a Community Corrections Facility was selected as the primary variable of release. Although small-scale studies have been undertaken to determine the effectiveness of individual halfway houses and other community-based programs, no large-scale studies that determine the efficacy of one release option in comparison to others have been attempted. This study will fill this gap in the research and assist policymakers in solidifying release options for returning offenders. Using data on offenders released from Federal prisons to the District of Columbia, three entities will particularly benefit from this research by providing policymakers with the information necessary to make policy decisions based on proven practices: the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA), the agency that supervises all felony offenders post-release; the Federal Bureau of Prison (BOP), the agency that has jurisdiction over all offenders actively serving sentences for a felony offense; and the District of Columbia Government, the entity responsible for working with CSOSA and the BOP to ensure ex-offenders have the resources they need to successfully reintegrate back into free society.

As offender reentry is a national issue and the challenges facing the District of Columbia also face local jurisdictions around the country, the findings from this study can also be used to incite discussion around effective policy mechanisms in other cities and states. Sound release options will in turn benefit offenders ensuring they receive the most effective and efficient services possible to assist them in their transition from prison back home, thereby increasing the level of public safety in communities everywhere.

**(d) Benefits of research and/or participation to CSOSA/PSA:**

Of the fifty-five thousand individuals that will be released from federal prisons in 2003 alone, more than 2,000 of these will be returning home to the District of Columbia (BJS 2003). As a small city, this returning population poses a difficult public safety issue and has become the



subject of increasing concern. Since CSOSA is the only agency responsible for supervising this population, the findings will help to improve supervision policies and practices.

Although intuitively, transitional release seems more logical than direct release into the community, scarce outcome research exists that looks at the efficacy of this policy option. There are a handful of studies that have examined the impact of halfway houses on recidivism, however, virtually no studies look at a cohort of offenders released from prison in various ways (e.g. direct release, community supervision, or halfway houses) to determine which outcome is most effective. Understandably, the lack of sound outcome research on the benefits of halfway houses makes it difficult for policymakers to convince the public that increasing the number of halfway houses is a logical policy solution. This study will validate CSOSA's policy decisions by ensuring they are rooted in empirical verification.

For all felony offenders in the District of Columbia and for all federal offenders nationwide, it is the responsibility of the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to solicit new Community Corrections Facilities and oversee the operations of all Community Corrections Facilities or "halfway houses" in the District. Offenders deemed appropriate for a halfway house are released from prison into this facility to serve the last 90-120 days of their sentence. As of March 2003 however, in response to an opinion issued by the Executive Office of the President's Office of Legal Counsel, the Department of Justice issued a directive that now restricts the Bureau of Prison's ability to place an offender in a halfway house until the last 10 percent of his/her term. As a result, the length of placement in a halfway house is shorter and inmates are staying in prisons longer before going to a transitional facility. In the District, BOP expects to see a sharp drop in the number of inmates in halfway houses. This change in policy increases the significance of this outcome study for CSOSA, because if the length of stay in a halfway house can be shown to decrease the risk of recidivism, thereby increasing the level of public safety, than the Department of Justice directive may be counterintuitive.

Lastly, as a federal agency, CSOSA has to report on progress toward specific programmatic benchmarks. This study will provide the agency with the necessary data toward these benchmarks without using staff resources or time.

**(e) Specific resources required from the Agency:**

Agency resources will be needed to identify the sample.

**(f-h) Description of all possible risks, discomforts, and benefits to individual subjects or a class of subjects, and a discussion of the likelihood that the risks and discomforts will actually occur; Description of steps taken to minimize any potential risks or discomforts; Description of physical and/or administrative procedures to be followed to: 1) ensure the security of any individually identifiable data that are being collected for the project; and 2) destroy research records or remove individual identifiers from those records when the research has been completed:**

There will be no risk or discomfort to study subjects as we are only requesting data by the subjects' Police Department Identification Number (PDID). Using this number as an identifier, we will have no access to personal or descriptive information about any of our sample subjects. The data will be locked in a file cabinet in Professor Kubrin's office during the duration of the project and will be destroyed once the research has completed.

**(i) Description of any anticipated effects of the research project on Agency programs and operations:**

This study will fill a gap in the research and assist policymakers in solidifying release options for returning offenders. Using data on offenders released from Federal prisons to the District of Columbia, three entities will particularly benefit from this research by providing policymakers with the information necessary to make policy decisions based on proven practices: the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA), the agency that supervises all felony offenders post-release; the Federal Bureau of Prison (BOP), the agency that has jurisdiction over all offenders actively serving sentences for a felony offense; and the District of Columbia Government, the entity responsible for working with CSOSA and the BOP to ensure ex-offenders have the resources they need to successfully reintegrate back into free society.

As offender reentry is a national issue, and the challenges facing the District of Columbia also face local jurisdictions around the country, the findings from this study can also be used to incite discussion around effective policy mechanisms in other cities and states. Sound release options will in turn benefit offenders, ensuring they receive the most effective and efficient services possible to assist them in their transition from prison back home, thereby increasing the level of public safety in communities everywhere.

**(j) Relevant research materials such as vitae, endorsements, descriptions of similar work undertaken, sample informed consent statements, questionnaires, and interview schedules:**

Please see Appendix for curriculum vitas.

We will provide copies of all deliverables and datasets to CSOSA and PSA at the conclusion of the project.

**(3) Employee and non-employee researchers (for non-Agency and Agency research involving human subjects) must also provide verification that the proposed research has been approved by an independent Institutional Review Board (IRB), including: Copy of application for review to IRB; and copy of certification statement from IRB:**

In order to ensure that we comply with Title 45, Part 46 of the federal regulations and restrictions around human subjects, and Title 28, Part 1 of the referral regulations around confidentiality. We will submit the proposed project to the George Washington University Internal Review Board for approval before commencing the work and provide written notification of approval or exemption to CSOSA/PSA. We will also work collaboratively with The GW Sponsored Research Office at each phase of the study. We are only requesting data by the subjects' Police Department Identification Number (PDID). Using this number as an identifier, we will have no access to personal or descriptive information about any of our sample subjects. Using this identifier, there is no risk or discomfort to subjects.

## **References**

Allen, H.E. and Seiter, R.P. 1976. "The Effectiveness of Halfway Houses: A Reappraisal of a Reappraisal." *Chitty's Law Journal*, 24: 196-200.

American Correctional Association. 2000. "A Survey of Correctional Agencies' Research Topics and Interests." Washington, D.C.: ACA.

Anderson, E. 1999. *Code of the Street*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

**Austin, J. 2001. "Prisoner Reentry: Current Trends, Practices, and Issues." *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 47, No. 3: 314-334.**

**Beck, J.L. 1979. "An Evaluation of Federal Community Treatment Centers. *Federal Probation*, No. 43: 36-41.**

Beck, A.J. 2000. "State and Federal Prisoners Returning to the Community: Findings from the Bureau of Justice Statistics." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

**Belenko, S. and J. Peugh. 1998. "Fighting Crime by Treating Substance Abuse" *Issues in Science and Technology* 15: 53-75.**

**Berk, R.A. Leniham, K.J. and P.H. Rossi. 1980. "Crime and Poverty: Some Experimental Evidence from Ex-Offenders." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 45, Issue 5: 766-786.**

**Bloom, B. and D. Steinhart. 1993. *Why Punish the Children: A Reappraisal of the Children of Incarcerated Mothers in America*. San Francisco: The National Council on Crime and Delinquency.**

Bridges, G.S. and J.A. Stone. 1986. "effects of Criminal Punishment on Perceived Threat of Punishment: Toward an Understanding of Specific Deterrence." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 23: 207-39.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1999. "*Correctional Populations in the United States, 1996*". Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Statistics.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2003. "*Prison Statistics: Summary Findings*." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Statistics.

Calathes, W. 1991. "Project Green Hope, a Halfway House for Women Offenders." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Vol. 7: 136-45.

Callahan, J.V. and K.A. Koenning. 1995. "The Comprehensive Sanctions Center in the Northern District of Ohio." *Federal Probation*, Vol. 59, No. 3: 52-57.

Caulkins, J.P., Rydell, C.P., Schwabe, W. and J.R. Chiesa. 1997. "Mandatory Minimum Sentences: Throwing away the Key of the Taxpayers' Money?" RAND Publication MR-827-DPRC.

Chilton, R and S.K. Datesman. 1987. "Gender, Race and Crime: An Analysis of Urban Arrest Trends. 1960-1980." *Gender and Society*, Vol. 1, No 2: 152-71.

Clear, T. and G. F. Cole. 1997. *American Corrections*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

T.R. Clear, D.R. Rose and J.A. Ryder. 2001. "Incarceration and the Community: The Problem of Removing and Returning Offenders." *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 47, No. 3: 335-351.

"Community Corrections Facilities Outcome Study." *Report Sponsored by the Residential Directors Council of Texas and the Community Justice Assistance Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, January 1999.*

Correctional Service of Canada. 1995. *Protecting society through community corrections.*

Correctional Service of Canada, Basic Facts About Federal Corrections, Information About Release (2001), [http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/faits/facts/facts07\\_e.shtml](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/faits/facts/facts07_e.shtml).

Davidson-Coronado, J. 2001. "Technically Disposed: Parole Violators and Prison Crowding in Hawaii." *The Justice Policy Journal: Analyzing Criminal and Juvenile Justice Issues and Policies*, Vol. 1, Num. 1.

D.R. Culverson. 1998. "The Welfare Queen and Willie Horton." Roxbury Publishing.

A.M. del Carmen Gutierrez. 2000. "Community-Based Corrections: offenders Characteristics and Success in a Halfway House Program.: Unpublished Thesis, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

A. Demaris. 1992. *Logit Modeling. Practical Applications*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-086. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

D. Denney. 1992. *Racism and Anti-Racism in Probation*. London, Routledge.

P.G. Donnelly and B. Forschner, 1984. "Client Success or Failure in a Halfway House," *Federal Probation* 48: 38-44.

S.R. Donziger. 1996. *The Real War on Crime: The Report of the National Criminal Justice Commission*. New York, NY: HarperPerrenial.

E. Dowdy. 1997. "Inside the Black Box of Community Corrections: Examination of the Influence of Halfway House Experiences on Program Success and Post-Release Recidivism." Dissertation, Colorado State University.

D.A. Dowell, C Klein and C. Krichmar. 1985. Evaluation of a Halfway House," 13 *Journal of Criminal Justice* 217-26.

A. Downs. 1998. "The Big Picture." *Brookings Review, Fall Issue*.

Drier, P. Mollenkopf, J. and T. Swanstrom. 2001. *Place Matters: Metropolitcs for the Twenty-First Century*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

P. Dressel and S. Barnholl. 1994. "Reframing Gerontological Thought and Practice: The Case of Grandmothers with Daughters in Prison." *The Gerontologist*, Vol. 34: 685-691.

English K.K. and M.J. Mande. 1991. "Empirical Support for Intervention Strategies in Community Corrections." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Vol. 7: 95-106.

J. Fagan. 1997. "Legal and Illegal Work: Crime, work and unemployment. In Burton Weisbrod and James Worthy (eds.), *Dealing with Urban Crises*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Federal Bureau of Prisons. 2000. "TRIAD Drug Treatment Evaluation Project Final Report of Three-Year Outcomes: Part 1." *Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation*, September 2000.

*Federal Bureau of Prisons Practice of Placing in Community Certain Offenders Who Have Received Sentences of Imprisonment*, December 13, 2002 (available at: <http://www.usdoj.gov/olc/bopimprisonment2.htm>).

L. Fishman. 1998. "The Black Bogeyman and Self-Righteousness." Roxbury Publishing.

D.R. Gerstein, R.A. Johnson, H.J. Harwood, D. Fountain, N. Suter and K. Malloy. 1994. *Evaluating Drug Recovery Services: The California Drug and Alcohol Treatment Assessment (CALDATA)*. Sacramento, CA: Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs.

Government of the District of Columbia. "Report of Housing Individuals under the Supervision of the Criminal Justice System in the District of Columbia," April 2002.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, T. and C. Goggin. 1996. "A Meta-Analysis of the Predictors of Adult Offender Recidivism." *Criminology*, Vol. 36, No. 4: 575-607.

Hagan J. and J.P. Coleman. 2001. "Returning Captives of the American War on Drugs: Issues of Community and Family Reentry." *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 47, No. 3: 352-267.

Hagan, J. and R. Dinovitzer. 2001. *Collateral Consequences of Imprisonment for Children, Communities, and Prisoners*. In *Prisons*, edited by M. Tonry and J. Petersilia. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hairston, C.F. 1998. "The Forgotten Parent: Understanding the Forces that Influence Incarcerated Fathers' Relationships With Their Children." *Child Welfare*, Vol. 77: 617-639.

Hammett, T.M. Roberts, C. and S. Kennedy. 2001. "Health-Related Issues in Prisoner Reentry." *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 47, No. 3: 390-409.

Harer, M.D. 1994. *Recidivism Among Federal Prison Releases in 1987: A Preliminary Report*, Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons. Pp. 28-30.

Hartmann, D.J., Friday, P.C. and K.I. Minor. 1994. "Residential Probation: A Seven-Year Follow-Up Study of Halfway House Discharges." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 22, No. 6: 503-515.

Hepburn, J.R. and C.A. Albonetti. 1994. "Recidivism Among Drug Offenders: A Survival Analysis of the Effects of Offender Characteristics, Type of Offense, and Two Types of Intervention." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, Vol. 10, No. 2: 159-179.

Hirschi, T. and M. Gottfredson. 1983. "Age and the Explanation of Crime." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 89: 552-84.

Holzer, H.. 1996. *What Employers Want: Job Prospects for Less Educated Workers*. New York: Russell Sage.

Irwin, J. and J. Austin. 1994. *It's About Time: America's Imprisonment Binge*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

**Johnston, D. 2000. "Effects of Parental Incarceration." In K. Gabel & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Children of Incarcerated Parents*, (pp.59-88). New York: Lexington Books.**

**Kassebaum, G., Davidson-Coronado, J. Silverio, M., and N. Marker. 1999. "Survival on Parole: A Study of Post-Prison Adjustment and the Risk of Returning to Prison in the State of Hawaii." Report of the Social Science Commission.**

Kellner, D. 1995. "Cultural Studies, Multiculturalism and Media Culture." In Gail Dines and Jean

Humez, M. (Eds.) *Gender, Race, and Class in Media: A Text-Reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Knight, K. and M.L. Hiller. 1997. "Community-Based Substance Abuse Treatment: A 1-Year Outcome Evaluation of the Dallas County Judicial Treatment Center." *Federal Probation*, Vol. 61, No. 2: 61-68.

Knight, K., Simpson, D. D., Chatham, L. R. and L.M. Camacho. 1997. An assessment of prison-based drug treatment: Texas' in-prison therapeutic community program. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 24 (3/4), 75-100.

Knight, K., Simpson, D. D. and M.L. Hiller. 1999. Three-year reincarceration outcomes for

in-prison therapeutic community treatment in Texas. *The Prison Journal*, 79(3), 337-351.

Krivo, L.J. and R. D. Peterson. 1996. "Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and Crime." *Social Forces*, December, 75(2): 619-650.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Ronald Weitzer. 2003. "Retaliatory Homicide: Concentrated Disadvantage and Neighborhood Culture." *Social Problems* 50:157-180.

P. A. Langan and D. J. Levin. 2002. "Special Report: Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994," The Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ 193427

Liker, J. 1982. "Wage and Status Effects of Employment on Affective Well-Being Among Ex-Felons." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 47, April: 264-283.

Lipton, D.S. 1995. "The Effectiveness of Treatment for Drug Abusers Under Criminal Justice Supervision." *National Institute of Justice Research Report*. NCJ 157642.

Lowenkamp, C. and E. LaTessa. 2002. "Halfway House and Community-Based Facility Evaluation." *University of Cincinnati, Division of Criminal Justice, Center for Criminal Justice Research*.

Lynch, M. 1998. "Waste Managers? New Penology, Crime Fighting, and the Parole Agent Identity." *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 32: 839-869.

Lynch, J.P. and W.J. Sabol. 1992. "Macro-Social Changes and their Implications for Prison Reform: The Underclass and the Composition of the Prison Population." Paper Presented at the American Society of Criminology, New Orleans, LA.

Lynch, J.P. and W.J. Sabol. 2001. "Prisoner Reentry in Perspective." *Urban Institute Crime Policy Report*, Vol. 3, September.

D.S. Massey. 2001. "Getting Away with Murder: Segregation and Violent Crime in America." *The University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol, 143: 1203-1231.

Massey, D.S. and N.A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Massey, D.S. and G. Lundy. 2001. "Use of Black English and Racial Discrimination in Urban Housing Markets." *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 36, No. 4, March: 452-469.

M. Mauer. 2000. *Race to Incarcerate*. Washington, D.C.: The Prison Project.

B. McCaffrey. 1998. "Drug Treatment in the Criminal Justice System." *Rockville, MD: Drug Policy Information Clearinghouse*.

- Menard, S. 1995. *Applied Logistic Regression*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-106. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miethe, T. D. and D. McDowall. 1993. "Contextual Effects in Models of Criminal Victimization," *Social Forces*, 71: 741-759.
- Mumola, C. 2000. "Incarcerated Parents and their Children." *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, Washington, D.C.
- National Institute of Justice. 1991. *National Household Survey on Drug Abuse: Population Estimates*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Institute of Justice. 1993. *Drug Use Forecasting—1992 Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- National Parole Board. 2002. *2000-2001 Performance Monitoring Report 15, 89* (July 2002), [http://www.npb-cnrc.gc.ca/reports//pmr\\_e.pdf](http://www.npb-cnrc.gc.ca/reports//pmr_e.pdf).
- Osgood, Wayne D. 2000. "Poisson-Based Regression Analysis of Aggregate Crime Rates." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 16:21-43.
- Petersilia, J. 1999. *Parole and Prisoner Reentry in the United States*. In *Prisons*, edited by M. Tonry and J. Petersilia. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Petersilia, J. 2001. "When Prisoners Return to Communities: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences." *Federal Probation*, Vol. 65, No. 1: 3-8.
- Petersilia, J. 2003. *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*.
- Powell, J.A. 1998. "Race and Space: What Really Drives Metropolitan Growth." *Brookings Review*, Fall Issue.
- Pollingreport.com. Retrieved February 20, 2003. *Gallup Crime Survey Summaries*, ([www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm](http://www.pollingreport.com/crime.htm).)
- Prendergast, M.L., Anglin, M.D., and J. Wellisch. 1998. "Treatment for Drug-Abusing Offenders Under Community Supervision." Pp. 113-124 in *Community Corrections: Probation, Parole, and Intermediate Sanctions*, edited by Joan Petersilia. New York: Oxford.
- Rhodes, W., Pelisser, B., Gaes, G., Saylor, W., Camp, S. and S. Wallace. (2001) Alternative solutions to the problem of selection bias in an analysis of federal residential drug treatment programs. *Evaluation Review*, 25, 331-369.
- Rose, D.R. & T.R. Clear. 1998. "Incarceration, Social Capital, and Crime: Implications for Social Disorganization Theory." *Criminology*, Vol. 36, No. 3: 441-478.



Rountree, P.W. K. C. Land, and T.D. Miethe. 1994. "Macro-micro Integration in the Study of Victimization: A Hierarchical Logistic Model Analysis Across Seattle Neighborhoods." *Criminology* 32: 387-414.

Saylor, W. G. and G.G. Gaes. (1997). Training inmates through industrial work participation and vocational apprenticeship instruction. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 1(2), 32-43.

Schwaner, S.L.. 1998. "Patterns of Violent Specialization: Predictors of Recidivism for a Cohort of Parolees." *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 23, No. 1: 1-17.

Seiter, R.P. 1975. "Evaluation Research as a Feedback Mechanism for Criminal Justice Policy Making: A Critical Analysis", Unpublished dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Seiter R. and K. Kadela, "Prisoner Reentry: What Works, What Doesn't and What's Promising." *Crime and Delinquency*, April 2003 (forthcoming).

Seymour, C. and C. Finney-Hairston. 2001. *Children with Parents in Prison*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Sherman, L.W. "Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising," *Research in Brief*, Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice 1998.

Simpson, D. and K. Knight. 1995. "Preliminary Results from the Institute for Behavioral Research's Prison-Based Treatment Assessment Project. Paper presented at the Fifth National Conference on Drugs and Crime, Orlando, FL. Reported in IBR's Quarterly Newsletter, Research Roundup, 5(2), Summer 1995.

Smith, D. A. and C. Visher. 1981. "Street Level Justice: Situational Determinants of Police arrest Decisions." *Social Problems*, Vol. 29: 167-77.

Smith, M. 2001. "What Future for 'Public Safety' and 'Restorative Justice' in Community Corrections?" *Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice*, Vol. 11.

Solicitor General of Canada, Corrections and conditional release statistical overview (2000)  
<http://www.sgc.gc.ca/Epub/Corr/eStatsNov2000/eStatNov2000.htm>.

Solomon, P. 1983. "Analyzing Opposition to Community Residential Facilities for Troubled Adolescents." *Child Welfare*, Vol. LXII, No. 4: July-August.

**Steffensmeier, D.J, E. A. Allan, M.D. Harer, and C. Streifel. 1989. "Age and the Distribution of Crime." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, No. 4: 803-831.**

Stinchcomb, J.B. and T.W. Clinton, III. 2001. "Predicting the Likelihood of Rearrest Among Shock Incarceration Graduates: Moving Beyond Another Nail in the Boot Camp Coffin." *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 47, No. 2: 221-242.

Tonry, M. 1998. "Evaluating Intermediate Sanction Programs" Pp. 79-96 in *Community Corrections*, edited by Joan Petersilia. New York: Oxford.

Tonry, M. 1999. "The Fragmentation of Sentencing and Corrections in America." *Sentencing and Corrections*, Issues for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, 1. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

**Tonry, M. 1999. *Malign Neglect: Race, Crime, and Punishment in America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.**

Tracy, P.E. and K. Kempf-Leonard. 1996. "Continuity and Discontinuity in Criminal Careers." *Crime and Justice Series*. New York, NY: Plenum Press

Travis, J., Solomon, A.L., and M. Waul. 2001. "From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry." Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.

Travis, J. 2001. Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Government Reform Subcommittee of the District of Columbia, July 20, 2001,  
See: <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=900419>

J. Travis and J. Petersilia. 2001. "Reentry Reconsidered: A New Look at an Old Question." *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 47, No. 3: 291-313.

Turner, S. and J. Petersilia. (1996). Work release in Washington: Effects on recidivism and corrections costs. *Prison Journal*, 76(2), 138-164.

Uggen, C. 2000. "Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Model of Age, Employment, and Recidivism." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 55, No. 4: 529-546.

Urban Institute. "Prisoner Reentry: Who's Coming Home?" *Transcript from December 5, 2000*.

C.L. Walsh and S. H. Beck. 1990. "Recidivism Among Halfway House Residents." *Journal of Criminal Justice*: 15: 137-149.

Western, B. and R. Petit. 2000. "Incarceration and Racial Inequality in Men's Employment." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 54: 3-16.

Wexler, H. K., Falkin, G. P. and D.S. Lipton. (1990). Outcome evaluation of a prison therapeutic community for substance abuser treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 71-92.

Wilson, W.J. 1998. *When Work Disappears*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Velez, M. 2001. "The Role of Public Social Control in Urban Neighborhoods." *Criminology*, 39: 837-863.

## Appendix A: Provider Survey Questions

1. How long has your organization been in operation?
2. Is your organization:
  1. A 501(c)3
  2. A for-profit private firm
  3. A non-profit but not a 501(c)3
  4. Other
3. In what type of facility is your organization located?
4. Do you have contact with clients before they leave prison?
5. If yes, what is your primary method of communication?
  1. Telephone
  2. In person
  3. Mail
  4. Other
6. What type of pre-release planning services do you provide?
7. If your organization has outside funders, how is it funded?
8. I'd like to ask you about the types of services your organization provides. Please tell me yes or no for each of the following services:
  1. Advocacy
  2. Recreation or sports
  3. GED, tutoring or literacy
  4. Mentoring
  5. Family counseling or other family related services (e.g.: parenting classes)
  6. Assistance in locating post-release housing
  7. Assistance in applying for subsidized housing
  8. Job training, vocational rehabilitation, computer classes or life skills classes
  9. Job placement or job referral
  10. Free or subsidized transportation services
  11. Medical services, health support services
  12. HIV/AIDS support services
  13. Mental health support services
  14. Substance abuse treatment services
  15. AA/NA meetings
  16. Other services

9. For those services that you do provide, can you give me a full description of them? (Ask about the following criteria)
  1. On-going in duration
  2. Administered by full time staff
  3. Administered by contractors
  4. Administered by volunteers
  5. Mandatory for clients
  6. Off-site partnerships provide services
  7. DC. Or Federal Government provides services
10. What are the requirements of the program (e.g.: employment, curfew)
11. Does your organization engage in community service or other community-related activities?
12. How would you describe the relationship your organization has with your neighbors?
13. The next few questions ask about the number of staff your organization has. If your organization is part of a larger organization, please answer about this particular location.
  1. How many full-time paid staff does your organization have?
  2. How many part-time paid staff does your organization have?
  3. How many full-time volunteers does your organization have?
  4. How any part-time volunteers does your organization have?
14. What would you estimate to be your rate of turnover for full and part-time staff during the past 12 months?
15. Do you work with a network of community based service providers in assisting clients?
  1. If yes, please name the three organizations you work most closely with.
16. The next set of questions asks about the clients served by your organization. How many beds are you contracted to serve? What was your estimated capacity during the past 12 months?
17. Do you serve clients other than BOP releasees? If yes, what other contracts does your facility have?
18. Are there any clients that you are not authorized to serve (e.g.: sex offenders)?
19. What population do you primarily serve (e.g.: drug offenders, property offenders)?
20. What would you consider to be the most innovative part of your program?
21. Is there any other information you would like for me to include about your program?

## Appendix B: Curriculum Vitae

CHARIS E. KUBRIN

### ADDRESS

#### Professional

Department of Sociology  
The George Washington University  
Phillips Hall 409  
801 22<sup>nd</sup> St.  
Washington, D.C. 20052

#### Personal

3003 Van Ness St. N.W.  
#W423  
Washington, D.C. 20008

Office: (202) 994-6349  
Fax: (202) 994-3239  
Email: charisk@gwu.edu

Home: (202) 244-6693

### EDUCATION

- 2000 Ph.D. Sociology, University of Washington  
Dissertation: *Neighborhood Structure and Criminal Homicide: Socio-Economic and Demographic Correlates of Homicide Types and Trends*
- 1995 M.A. Sociology, University of Washington
- 1993 B.A. Sociology / Spanish Language & Literature, Smith College

### EMPLOYMENT

- 2000-present Assistant Professor of Sociology, George Washington University
- 2000-present Senior Fellow, Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections, George Washington University
- 1997-2000 Senior Research Assistant, Seattle Police Department with Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, Department of Justice (Grant #s: 98SBWX0149; 97PRWX0535; 97CKWXK036)
- 1997 Senior Research Assistant, Department of Sociology, University of Washington  
(A Study *on Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Superior Court Bail and Pretrial Detention Practices in Washington State*)

## PUBLICATIONS

Kubrin, Charis E. and Jerald R. Herting. Forthcoming. "Neighborhood Correlates of Homicide Trends:

An Analysis Using Growth-Curve Modeling." *Sociological Quarterly*.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Ronald Weitzer. (2003) "Retaliatory Homicide: Concentrated Disadvantage and

Neighborhood Culture." *Social Problems* 50(2):157-180.

Kubrin, Charis E. (2003) "Structural Covariates of Homicide Rates: Does Type of Homicide Matter?"

*Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 40(2):1-32.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Tim Wadsworth. (2003) "Identifying the Structural Correlates of African-American Killings: What Can We Learn from Data Disaggregation?" *Homicide Studies* 7(1):3-35.

Steen, Sara, Christine E.W. Bond, George S. Bridges, and Charis E. Kubrin. Forthcoming (2003) "Explaining Assessments of Future Risk: Race and Attributions of Juvenile Offenders in Pre-Sentencing Reports" in Darnell Hawkins and Kimberly Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our Children, Their Children: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Differences in American Juvenile Justice*.

Austin, James, John Irwin and Charis E. Kubrin. Forthcoming (2003) "America's Imprisonment Binge"

in Thomas G. Blomberg and Stan Cohen (Eds.), *Punishment and Social Control*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Crutchfield, Robert D. and Charis E. Kubrin. (2002) "Urban Crime" in Joshua Dressler (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice: 2nd Edition*. Pgs. 1596-1602. New York: Macmillan Reference.

Kubrin, Charis E. (2000) "Racial Heterogeneity and Crime: Measuring Static and Dynamic Effects" in

Dan A. Chekki (Ed.), *Research in Community Sociology, Volume X*. Pgs. 189-218. Stamford, CT: JAI Press. (Peer Reviewed)

Crutchfield, Robert D., Joseph G. Weis, George S. Bridges, and Charis E. Kubrin, Eds. (2000) *Crime and*

*Society: Crime, 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Crutchfield, Robert D. and Charis E. Kubrin. (2000) "Criminology" in Edgar Borgatta and Rhonda J.V. Montgomery (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Sociology, 2nd Edition*. Pgs. 527-539. New York: Macmillan Reference.

Steen, Sara, Chris Bader and Charis E. Kubrin. (1999) "Rethinking the Graduate Seminar."  
*Teaching Sociology* 27(2):167-173.

### **GOVERNMENT REPORTS**

Thompson, Heather Lynn, Charis E. Kubrin, Scott Desmond, and Ross Bartley. *Final Report: Denny Regrade Problem Solving Partnership*. Seattle Police Department and Department of Justice, 2000.

Bridges, George S., Chris Bader, Christine Bond, and Charis E. Kubrin. *A Study on Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Superior Court Bail and Pre-Trial Detention Practices in Washington State*. Washington State Minority and Justice Commission, 1997.

### **OTHER PUBLICATIONS**

Kubrin, Charis E. et al. (1997) *Teaching Resources to Accompany Sociology: Exploring the Architecture of Everyday Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Steen, Sara, Charis E. Kubrin and Kristin A. Bates. (1996) *Instructors' Manual and Test Items to Accompany the Pine Forge Press Series in Crime and Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

### **WORK IN PROGRESS**

Kubrin, Charis E. and Ronald Weitzer. "New Directions in Social Disorganization Theory."  
Revised and  
Resubmitted to *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, April 2003.

Bond, Christine E.W., George S. Bridges, Charis E. Kubrin, and Chris Bader. "Perceptions and Process in Legal Decision-Making: Racial and Ethnic Differences in the Pre-Trial Assessment of Criminal Defendants."

### **GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS**

2003 "Predicting Who Reoffends: The Neglected Role of Neighborhood Context in Recidivism Studies." **National Consortium on Violence Research**. \$10,000.

- 10/03-12/04 Recidivism “Predicting Who Reoffends: The Neglected Role of Neighborhood Context in Studies.” **American Sociological Association/National Science Foundation.** \$3,250.
- 8/03 develop Dean’s Seminar Teaching Fellowship, **George Washington University**, to course, American Criminal Justice Philosophy: Myths and Realities. \$2,000
- 1/03 Public Policy Research Scholar Fellowship. “A Tale of Two Cities: Youth Crime, Detention Rates, and the Detention Diversion Advocacy Program in Washington, D.C. and Baltimore.” **George Washington Institute of Public Policy.** \$8,000.
- 8/02-12/03 “From Redlining to Reinvestment: The Effects of Access to Capital and Other Community Factors on Community Crime Rates in Disadvantaged Neighborhoods.” The Open Society Institute, **Soros Foundation.** Principal Investigator with Gregory D. Squires. \$94,000.
- 7/02 We Learn “Identifying the Structural Correlates of African-American Killings: What Can from Data Disaggregation?” Junior Scholar Incentive Award, **George Washington University.** \$5,000.
- 6/02-12/02 Hewlett Foundation Fellowship, **Hewlett Foundation** and **George Washington University** to develop inquiry-based course, American Criminal Justice Philosophy: Myths and Realities. \$4,400.
- 1/02 Program Evaluation of the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice’s Detention Diversion Advocacy Program in Philadelphia. **William Penn Foundation.** \$6,935.
- 8/01-1/04 “Racial Heterogeneity, Neighborhood Controls, and Violence.” **National Science Foundation.** Co-Principal Investigator with Ross L. Matsueda, Robert D. Crutchfield, and Avery M. Guest. \$303,000.
- 8/01-8/03 “Racial Heterogeneity, Neighborhood Change, and Violence: A Multi-Level Victimization Survey.” **National Consortium on Violence Research.** Co-Principal Investigator with Ross L. Matsueda, Robert D. Crutchfield, and Avery M. Guest. \$88,391.
- 6/01 D.C.’s “The Crime Drop: Socio-Economic and Demographic Correlates of Washington, Declining Crime Rates.” Banneker Faculty Research Grant, **Center for Washington Area Studies at George Washington University.** \$5,000.



- 6/01 Access to “The Decline in Urban Crime: Exploring the Connections Among Increased Capital, Residential Stability, and Urban Crime Rates.” Released Time for Research Proposal Writing Program, **George Washington University**. Course reduction.
- 2000 Demographic “Neighborhood Structure and Criminal Homicide: Socio-Economic and Correlates of Homicide Types and Trends.” Dissertation Fellowship, **Association for Women in Science Educational Foundation**. \$1,000.
- 1999-2000 Demographic “Neighborhood Structure and Criminal Homicide: Socio-Economic and Correlates of Homicide Types and Trends.” Kosciuszko Foundation Dissertation Scholarship, **The Kosciuszko Foundation**, New York. \$2,000.
- 1999-2000 Demographic “Neighborhood Structure and Criminal Homicide: Socio-Economic and Correlates of Homicide Types and Trends.” Social Sciences Dissertation Fellowship, **University of Washington**. \$4,000.
- 1995 Mexico City, Scholarship for “Contemporary Mexico” Seminar, **El Colegio de Mexico**, Mexico.

#### **GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS PENDING**

- 2002 “Structural Factors and Interracial Homicide: A New Look at the Causal Process.” **National Institute of Justice**. Co-Principal Investigator with Tim Wadsworth. \$33,731.
- 2002 Recidivism “Predicting Who Reoffends: The Neglected Role of Neighborhood Context in Studies.” **American Association of University Women**. \$29,840.

#### **AWARDS AND HONORS**

- 1998 Recipient of the American Sociological Association: Crime, Law, and Deviance Section Student Paper Competition Award
- Recipient of the American Society of Criminology Gene Carte Student Paper Competition Award
- 1997-98 Award for Excellence in Teaching, Department of Sociology, University of

## Washington

- 1993 Phi Beta Kappa, Smith College
- 1993 Cum Laude, Smith College
- 1993 First Group Scholar, Smith College
- 1993 Jean Fine Spahr Fellowship Fund for Graduate School, Smith College
- 1993 Pauline Fox Boorstein '20 Fellowship, Smith College

## **PAPERS DELIVERED**

Kubrin, Charis E. and Tim Wadsworth. "Identifying the Structural Correlates of African American

Killings: What Can We Learn From Data Disaggregation?" *American Society of Criminology*, Chicago 2002.

Feldman, Lisa and Charis E. Kubrin. "Community-Based Alternatives to Juvenile Detention: Problems

and Prospects in Changing Local Juvenile Justice Culture." *American Society of Criminology*, Chicago 2002.

Steen, Sara, Christine E.W. Bond, George S. Bridges, and Charis E. Kubrin. "Explaining Assessments of

Future Risk: Race and Attributions of Juvenile Offenders in Pre-Sentencing Reports." *American Society of Criminology* Chicago 2002.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Ronald Weitzer. "Retaliatory Homicide: Concentrated Disadvantage and Neighborhood Culture." *American Sociological Association*, Chicago 2002.

Bridges, George S., Christine E.W. Bond, Charis E. Kubrin, and Chris Bader. "Race, Typifications, and

the Pre-Trial Assessment of Criminal Defendants: Perceptions and Process in Legal Decision-Making." *American Sociological Association*, Chicago 2002.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Jerald R. Herting. "Neighborhood Structure and Homicide Trends: An Analysis of

Differing Types of Homicide." *American Society of Criminology*, Atlanta, 2001.

Kubrin, Charis E. and Jerald R. Herting. "Neighborhood Structure and Homicide Trends: An Analysis of

Differing Types of Homicide." *American Sociological Association*, Anaheim, 2001.

Kubrin, Charis E. "Longitudinal Profiles of Homicide: An Analysis Using Hierarchical Growth-Curve

Modeling." *Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences*, Washington, D.C. 2001

Kubrin, Charis E. "Neighborhood Correlates of Homicide Trends: An Analysis Using Hierarchical

Growth-Curve Modeling." *American Society of Criminology*, San Francisco, 2000

Kubrin, Charis E. "Structural Covariates of Criminal Homicide: Does Type of Homicide Matter?"

*American Sociological Association*, Washington, D.C., 2000

Kubrin, Charis E. "Neighborhood Structure and Homicide: Does Type of Homicide Matter?" *American*

*Society of Criminology*, Toronto, 1999.

Bridges, George S., Christine E.W. Bond, Charis E. Kubrin and Chris Bader. "Typification Biases in the

Pretrial Release of Criminal Offenders: Effects of Uncertainty in Legal Decision-Making." *American Society of Criminology*, Toronto, 1999.

Kubrin, Charis E. "Context and the Social Ecology of Murder." *American Society of Criminology*,

Washington, D.C., 1998.

Bond, Christine E.W., Charis E. Kubrin, Chris Bader and George S. Bridges. "Processing Defendants:

The Intersection of Legal, Extra-Legal, and Processual Variables in Bail Outcomes." *American Society of Criminology*, Washington, D.C., 1998.

Kubrin, Charis E. "Context and the Social Ecology of Murder." *American Society of Criminology*,

San Diego, 1997.

Kubrin, Charis E. "Racial Heterogeneity and Crime: A Study of Seattle." *American Society of Criminology*, Boston, 1995.

## **TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

1996-present

Courses Taught:

- Race and Crime (Graduate)
- Introduction to Criminal Justice (Undergraduate)
- Deviant Behavior and Social Control (Undergraduate)
- American Criminal Justice Philosophy: Myths and Realities (Undergraduate)

- The Sociology of Murder (Undergraduate)

*Additional Teaching Interests:*

Social Inequality  
 Criminology  
 Social Problems  
 Juvenile Delinquency  
 Sociological Research Methods

## **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

2002-03 Constitution and By Laws Committee, American Society of Criminology

2001-03 Treasurer, District of Columbia Sociological Society

2001 Chair, Awards Committee, District of Columbia Sociological Society

2000-present Reviewer, *Criminology*, *Criminology and Public Policy*, *Homicide Studies*,  
*Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Social Problems*,  
*Sociological Perspectives*

## **UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

2002-03 Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Development and Support

2001-03 Faculty Representative, George Washington University Hearing Board

2001-02 Faculty Senate Committee on Research

2001-02 Faculty Advisor, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences Freshman Advising  
 Workshop

2001-present Faculty Advisor, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences Colonial Inauguration

## **DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE**

2001-02 Departmental Curriculum Committee

2001-02 Chair, Web Development Committee

## **PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS**

American Sociological Association (Section Member: Crime, Law and Deviance)  
American Society of Criminology (Division Member: Women and Crime; People of Color and Crime)  
Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences  
District of Columbia Sociological Society

## **THESIS AND DISSERTATION COMMITTEES**

Julie Antinucci	M.A. 2002
Melissa Labriola	M.A. 2001 (Chair)
Victoria Marquez	M.A. 2002 (Chair)
Lee Pearson	M.A. 2002 (Chair)
Catherine Saidat	M.A. 2002

**Languages:** Able to read, write and speak Spanish fluently

*Lisa Beth Feldman*

**EDUCATION**

Ph.D. in Public Policy, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. Spring 2004  
(expected)

Field areas: Race Relations and Criminal Justice

M.A. in Sociology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 2001

*Thesis topic: Drug Policy in the United States*

B.A. in Sociology, Oakland University, Rochester, MI 1996

**HONORS**

The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Graduate Student Fellow: 2000-2001

Meritorious Achievement Award—The Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy: December 1999

Wayne State University—Magna Cum Laude Honors, Graduate Professional Scholarship: September 1997-May 1998

**Oakland University—Outstanding Scholar Fellowship: September 1992-December 1995, Cum Laude and Departmental Honors**

**PUBLICATIONS**

I. L. Feldman. "Citizen Engagement in Managing Offender Reentry: The Case for Community Correctional Facilities," *The Public Manager*, April 2003.

*Community-Based Alternatives to Juvenile Detention: Problems and Prospects in Changing Local Juvenile Justice Culture*. 2002. The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management: Washington, D.C.

Houghtby-Haddon, Natalie, Fairholm, Matthew R. & Feldman, Lisa B. 2002. *Public Service Reinvigorated, Public Trust Restored? A Case Study of the District of Columbia Government and the GWU Center for Excellence in Municipal Management*. The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management: Washington, D.C.

*From Concept to Practice: The Development of a School-Based Intervention Model*. 2002. The Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice: Washington, D.C.

*The Leadership Council for D.C. Youth: An Implementation Summary*. 2002. The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management: Washington, D.C.

*Participant Perceptions of the Program for Excellence in Municipal Management*. 2002. The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management: Washington, D.C.

*D.C. Child and Family Services Agency: Organizational Assessment*, 2001. The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management: Washington, D.C.

*Smart Practices in Child and Family Services: Literature Review*. 2001. The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management: Washington, D.C.

Feldman, Lisa B. Schiraldi, Vincent.& Jason Ziedenberg. 2001. *Too Little Too Late: President Clinton's Prison Legacy*. The Justice Policy Institute: Washington, D.C.

Feldman, Lisa B. Males, Michael & Vincent Schiraldi. 2001. *A Tale of Two Jurisdictions: A Snapshot of Youth Crime and Detention Rates in Maryland & the District of Columbia*. The Justice Policy Institute: Washington, D.C.

Office of National Drug Control Policy. 2000. *The National Drug Control Strategy, Performance Measures of Effectiveness: 2000 Report*. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C. (Contributing Author.)

### **CONFERENCE PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS**

The American Society of Public Administration, Spring 2003: *Managing Returning Offenders: The Halfway House Dilemma*.

The American Society of Criminology, Fall 2002: *Community-Based Alternatives to Juvenile Detention: Problems and Prospects in Changing Local Juvenile Justice Culture*.

The Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Fall 2002. *Exploring NIMBY: Real and Perceived Implications of Placing Adult Offenders into Community-Based Facilities in Washington, D.C.*

The American Society of Public Administration, Spring 2002: With Houghtby-Haddon, Natalie, and Fairholm, Matthew R. *Public Service Reinvigorated, Public Trust Restored? A Case Study of the District of Columbia Government and the GWU Center for Excellence in Municipal Management*.

### **TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

**The Department of Sociology, The George Washington University** Adjunct Faculty Professor (Fall 2002 & Spring 2003) Develop curriculum for course and teach undergraduate level sociology.

### **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

**The Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center—Doctoral Fellow** (Spring 2003-present)

- Conduct policy research around offender reentry and corrections policy.
- Draft research and policy reports to policymakers, practitioners, and the academic community.

**The George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management (CEMM)—Doctoral Research Fellow** (Fall 2000-Spring 2003)

- Researcher and staff coordinator for the Mayor's Community Corrections Facility Siting Advisory Commission in D.C. (September 2002-March 2003)—draft reports, conduct public hearings, and provide research assistance to the Commission regarding offender reentry in the District of Columbia.
- Manage evaluation research projects and conduct focus groups, surveys, and interviews related to improving local-level government. Recent evaluations include D.C. Child and Family Services Agency, and The George Washington University Program for Excellence in Municipal Management.

**Private Consultant** (Ongoing project)

- Develop and assist in the implementation of a program designed to reduce juvenile delinquency for D.C. Charter School students.
- Develop performance evaluation systems for public charter school-based delinquency prevention programs.
- Conduct focus groups with students, staff, and administrators regarding the programmatic needs of at-risk youth attending D.C. Charter Schools.

**The Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJ CJ)/Justice Policy Institute (JPI)—**  
Research Consultant (Fall 2000-Fall 2002)

- Research issues relating to criminal justice detention and sentencing reform. Draft research reports on behalf of JPI and CJ CJ (Funding Source: The Soros Foundation).
- Assist in the development of a school-based case management program for at-risk Charter School students (Funding Source: The Charter School Center for Student Support Services).
- Manage a project, in conjunction with D.C. Prisoners Legal Services, focused on the development of community-based residential facilities in the District (Funding Source: The Open Society Institute).
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the Detention Diversion Advocacy Program in Philadelphia, PA (Funding Source: The William Penn Foundation).

**The Executive Office of the President, The White House Office of National Drug Control Policy** (August 1998-January 2000)

- Developed, facilitated, and managed partnerships with state and local governments to reduce the rate of youth and offender drug use.
- Researched and analyzed state and local drug and alcohol policies. Drafted policy briefs for legislators and government officials.
- Facilitated focus groups with public and private sector representatives to develop a strategic plan for drug and alcohol use reduction.

**Oakland County Community Corrections, Office of Pretrial Services—Investigator** (1996-1998)

- Conducted background interviews on newly arrested defendants and prepared bond recommendations for judges and prosecutors.

**PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP**

- The American Society of Criminology (ASC)
- The Association for Public Policy and Management (APPAM)
- The American Society of Public Administration (ASPA)