

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction



Ohio Institute on Correctional Best Practices

Best Practices Tool-Kit: Family Involvement During Incarceration and Reentry



Ted Strickland
Governor

Terry J. Collins
Director

June 2008

The Best Practices Tool-Kit is published up to six times a year by the Institute for Excellence in Justice, a collaborative partnership between the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Institute on Correctional Best Practices and the Ohio State University's Criminal Justice Research Center. Please direct all questions to Coretta Pettway at Coretta.Pettway@odrc.state.oh.us.



BEST PRACTICES TOOL KIT

Prepared by: Coretta Pettway

Family Involvement During Incarceration and Reentry



This Best Practices Tool-Kit aims to systematically identify empirical evidence regarding strategies, programs and practices geared towards involving offenders' families during incarceration and reentry. It highlights practices and program strategies that are proven, promising or exemplary best practices and provides references for more extensive reading. The objective of this tool kit is to provide information that will better inform policymakers, practitioners and researchers on maintaining and strengthening appropriate family relationships during incarceration and community reintegration. For definitional purposes, best practices fall on a continuum ranging from those practices that are well established and have clearly demonstrated their effectiveness to those that show promise or may be exemplary, but have yet to be fully evaluated and their results documented (Wilkinson 2003).¹

The prison population in the United States is growing astronomically. Each year, over 730,000 people are admitted to state and federal prisons (Sabol, Minton, and Harris 2007)², and over 12 million are admitted and released from local jails (Solomon et al. 2008).³ At year end 2006, there were 1,570,861 persons incarcerated in either a federal or state prison in the United States. An additional 766,010 persons incarcerated in local jails brought the total number of prisoners to over 2.2 million persons (Sabol, Couture, and Harrison 2007).⁴ According to the Pew Public Safety Performance Project (2008), as of January 1, 2008 more than one in every 100 adults in the United States is incarcerated in jail or prison. Overall, incarceration is heavily concentrated among men, racial and ethnic minorities, and 20- and 30-year olds. Among men the highest rate is with black males aged 20-34 at one in nine and among females, it is with black females aged 35-39 at one in 100.⁵

Family of the Incarcerated

"Every individual sent to prison leaves behind a network of family relationships. Prisoners are the children, parents, siblings and kin to untold numbers of relatives who are each affected differently by a family member's arrest, incarceration, and ultimate homecoming" (Travis 2005:119).⁶ According to several researchers, many dimensions of family functioning undergo significant changes when a member is incarcerated, including changes in family structure, financial relationships, income levels, emotional support systems and living arrangements. Furthermore, wives and girlfriends of inmates experience significant personal changes, often gaining independence and self-sufficiency. Resulting changes in family composition that sometimes occur during incarceration can preclude the prisoner from resuming one's role upon returning to the community (Travis et al. 2005).⁷ As evidenced in a review of the literature and ethnographic study regarding families of the incarcerated, Braman and Wood (2003:171) state "incarceration powerfully affects a family's material welfare, structure, and mental health."⁸ Yet, even with the changes in family functioning, prisoners often characterize their relationships with family members as

¹ Wilkinson, R. 2003. "Best Practices: What Does It Mean In Times of Perpetual Transition?" International Corrections and Prison Association 2003 Meetings. Viewed July 25, 2006 at <http://www.drc.state.oh.us/web/articles/articles/article91.htm>.

² Sabol, W.; Minton, T.; Harrison, P. 2007. *Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2006*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, Washington, DC: U.S. DOJ, Office of Justice Programs. Viewed March 7, 2008 at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/pjim06.pdf>.

³ Solomon, A.; Osborne, J.; LoBuglio, S.; Mellow, J.; Mukamal, D. 2008. *Life After Lockup: Improving Reentry from Jail to the Community*. Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center. Viewed May 8, 2008 at <http://www.urban.org/publications/411660.html>.

⁴ Sabol, W.; Couture, H.; Harrison, P. 2007. *Prisoners in 2006*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, Washington, DC: U.S. DOJ, Office of Justice Programs. Viewed March 7, 2008 at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p06.pdf>.

⁵ Pew Charitable Trust. 2008. *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*. Pew's Public Safety Performance Project. Viewed March 26, 2008 at http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/8015PCTS_Prison08_FINAL_2-1-1_FORWEB.pdf.

⁶ Travis, J. 2005. *But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

⁷ Travis, J.; McBride, E.; Solomon, A. 2005. *Families Left Behind: The Hidden Cost of Incarceration and Reentry*. Urban Institute: Justice Police Center. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/310882_families_left_behind.pdf.

⁸ Braman, D. and Wood, J. 2003. "From One Generation to the Next: How Criminal Sanctions Are Reshaping Family Life in Urban America." In *Prisoners Once Removed: The Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families and Community*. (Eds) J. Travis and M. Waul. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press. Pp 157-188.

"close" during incarceration and think it would be "very easy" or "pretty easy" to renew those relationships following release from prison (Visher et al. 2004).⁹

During several structured discussion groups with African American women whose husbands or boyfriends were in prison or on parole, Hairston and Oliver (2006) report the following impact of incarceration and reentry the women experienced or observed:¹⁰

- Maintaining the relationship involved significant financial and emotional costs;
- Maintaining the relationship was time-consuming, demanding and demeaning in terms of prison rules and practices, which could involve searches, long waits and changing interpretations of dress codes;
- Visiting at the prison and accepting collect calls were very expensive;
- Loss of the financial resources that the husband or spouse provided prior to incarceration;
- Incarcerated men sometimes were selfish and demanding;
- When offenders returned home, they would attempt to assume a disciplinarian role when as prisoners they had not been involved;
- Feelings of resentment from older children when the offender attempted to assume a parenting role when returning home.

While many corrections departments recognize the value of communication between prisoners and their families, correctional practices—reflecting the security mission of prisons—often adds a challenge to maintaining family ties, including intimidating security procedures, long geographic distances between prison facilities and family residences, the time-consuming nature of visits, and the general lack of visiting arrangements conducive to parent-child interaction (Travis et al. 2005; Hairston 2003).¹¹ Yet, maintaining family ties has been shown to reduce the strain of separation and increase the likelihood of successful community reintegration for offenders following release from incarceration (Hairston 2003; Petersilia 2003; Travis et al. 2005).¹²

Families and Reentry

Following incarceration, many offenders will return home to their families, which could include a spouse, parents, siblings, grandparents and others, for some type of assistance. These family members become the "front line" of reentry by providing former inmates with critical material and emotional support, including housing, food, clothing, employment prospects, financial support, and encouragement in staying sober or avoiding criminal behavior (Bobbitt and Nelson, 2004; Naser and La Vigne 2006).¹³ Indeed, in their study of prisoners returning home to Cleveland, Ohio, Visher and Courtney (2006) report that after release, 78 percent of former prisoners received support from families and 80 percent lived with a

⁹ Visher, C.; La Vigne, N.; Travis, J. 2004. *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry: Maryland Pilot Study: Findings from Baltimore*. Justice Policy Center, Urban Institute. Viewed March 7, 2008 at <http://www.urban.org/publications/410974.html>.

¹⁰ Hairston, C. and Oliver, W. 2006. "Women's Experiences with Men's Incarceration and Reentry." *Women, Girls & Criminal Justice*. 7(5):65-80.

¹¹ Travis, J. et al. *But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*; Hairston, C. 2003. "Prisoners and Their Families: Parenting Issues during Incarceration." In *Prisoners Once Removed: The Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities*. (Eds) J. Travis and M. Waul. Urban Institute Press.

¹² Hairston, C. "Prisoners and Their Families: Parenting Issues During Incarceration."; Petersilia, J. 2003. *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York, Oxford University Press.

¹³ Bobbitt, M. and Nelson, M. 2004. "The Front Line: Building Programs that Recognize Families' Role in Reentry." Issues in Brief, Vera Institute of Justice. Viewed March 10 at http://www.dvinstiute.org/current/pdfs/249_476.pdf. Naser, R. and La Vigne, N. 2006. "Family Support in the Prisoner Reentry Process: Expectations and Realities." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 43(1):93-106.

relative.¹⁴ Family support was identified as the most important thing that kept them from returning to prison. Research also indicates that providing services to the families of recently released prisoners lower rates of physical, mental and emotional problems, drug use and recidivism (Sullivan et al).¹⁵

Maintaining and Facilitating Familial Involvement

The influence of family involvement, including parenting, during incarceration and reentry is contingent on the strength of the relationship before, during and after incarceration (Ganem and Agnew 2007; Naser and Visher 2006).¹⁶ It must also be noted that due to varying circumstances, such as a history of family violence or behavior resulting from substance use or criminal behavior of the offender, family members and relatives may not want to rebuild or strengthen family ties, and may instead use this period to sever their relationship with the prisoner altogether (Hairston 2003).¹⁷

Naser and La Vigne (2006), in their research examining prisoners returning to the cities of Baltimore and Chicago, show that families provide even more assistance than soon-to-be-released prisoners expected, lending additional evidence for the assertion that families take on a significant burden of the reentry challenges faced by prisoners following release. Based upon their findings, they have the following suggestions:¹⁸

- ❑ Social assistance and services should be designed not just for the prisoner alone, but should involve the entire family of support;
- ❑ Families should have a large role in the reentry process through the pre-release planning phase; however, care must be taken to ensure that family involvement is positive for both the prisoner and family members;
- ❑ Programs should be developed to capitalize on the family system that already exists;
- ❑ Care should be taken to identify and provide tangible and emotional assistance for released offenders who do not have a positive family support network.

The Reentry Policy Council (2005) provides several policy statements designed to facilitate and promote familial involvement when an offender is incarcerated and when he or she reenters the community. Some of the policy statements are specific to certain agencies, such as child welfare departments or corrections, but many focus on collaborative efforts among various agencies. The list below is an excerpt from the report and the reader should refer to the full report for an exhaustive list of policy statements, strategies to achieve, and examples of promising practices from across the U.S. that illustrate the principles of the policy statement and strategies.¹⁹

Policy Statements:

- ❑ Make available services and supports for family members and children of prisoners, and when appropriate, help establish, re-establish, expand and strengthen relationships between prisoners and their families.

¹⁴ Visher, C. and Courtney, S. 2006. *Cleveland Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*. Urban Institute: Justice Policy Center. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311359_cleveland_prisoners.pdf.

¹⁵ Sullivan, E.; Mino, M.; Nelson, K.; Pope, J. 2002. *Families as a Resource in Recovery from Drug Abuse: An Evaluation of La Bodega de la Familia*. Vera Institute of Justice. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.vera.org/publications/publications_5.asp?publication_id=163.

¹⁶ Ganem, N. and Agnew, R. 2007. "Parenthood and Adult Criminal Offending: The Importance of Relationship Quality." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 35(6): 630-643. Naser, R. and Visher, C. 2006. "Family Members' Experiences with Incarceration and Reentry." *Western Criminology Review*. 7(2): 20-31.

¹⁷ Hairston, C. "Prisoners and Their Families: Parenting Issues During Incarceration."

¹⁸ Naser, R. and La Vigne, N. "Family Support in the Prisoner Reentry Process: Expectations and Realities."

¹⁹ Council of State Governments. 2005. "Children and Families and Re-Entry: Highlights from the Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council." New York: NY. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://reentry.microportals.net/reentry/Document_View.asp?DocumentID=1048.

- ❑ Support interagency efforts to enhance child welfare and other human services programs supporting children and families; increase coordination among criminal justice, workforce, and human services systems; and expand the capacity of community-based programs serving children and families.
- ❑ Prepare family members, and other relevant community members for the offender's return to the community, and provide them with counseling, services and support as needed and appropriate.
- ❑ Establish a comprehensive, standardized, objective, and validated intake procedure that, upon the admission of the inmate to the corrections facility, can be used to assess the individual's strengths, risks and needs.
- ❑ Develop, for each person incarcerated, an individualized plan that, based upon information obtained from assessments, explains what programming should be provided during the period of incarceration to ensure that his or her return to the community is safe and successful.
- ❑ Provide cognitive behavioral therapy, peer support, mentoring, and basic living skills programs that improve offenders' behaviors, attitudes, motivation, and ability to live independently, succeed in the community, and maintain a crime-free life.
- ❑ Inform the releasing authority about the extent to which the prisoner is prepared to return to the community (and the community is prepared to receive the individual).
- ❑ Facilitate a person's access to stable housing in the community.
- ❑ Ensure that inmates exit prison or jail with appropriate forms of identification and that those eligible for public benefits receive those benefits immediately upon their release from prison or jail.

Strategies:

- ❑ Provide parenting and other programs to address a range of family needs and responsibilities of people in prison or jail.
- ❑ Facilitate contact between inmates and their children and other family members during the period of incarceration, when appropriate.
- ❑ Ensure family members receive adequate notification and information regarding the prisoners' release.
- ❑ Provide opportunity for family members and others, if appropriate, to inform the inmate's programming plan and provide inmates with services that address their need for basic life skills, including relationship skills.
- ❑ Consider the needs and strengths of the individual's family and then build community networks to provide counseling, safety planning, and other services to help the family cope with emotional, financial, and interpersonal issues surrounding the individual's return.
- ❑ Gauge the willingness and capacity of family members to receive the prisoner upon his or her release and ensure that they receive an opportunity to provide input into the terms of release.
- ❑ Evaluate the feasibility, safety and appropriateness of an individual living with family members after his or her release from prison or jail.
- ❑ Ensure that family violence risks are recognized and addressed.

- ❑ Increase collaboration between departments of corrections and child-support agencies to promote information about and access to the child-support process by incarcerated parents and their families.
- ❑ Create policies for child-support debt management and collection that encourage payment and family stability and engage family members in creating a viable support strategy.
- ❑ At intake, review current benefits and entitlements, such as Medicaid and TANF, and determine what steps will be needed to transition the individual back to those programs upon release.
- ❑ Assess all debts and assets and work with inmates to prevent build-up of child support arrears.
- ❑ Assess special needs of female offenders.
- ❑ Coordinate with the local Public Housing Authority to determine the eligibility of people leaving prison or jail for publicly managed or Section 8 housing.
- ❑ Leverage community-based networks to assist with the implementation of the supervision strategy, and consult family and community members regularly to determine their assessment of the person's adjustment to the home and/or neighborhood.
- ❑ Consult family members about graduated sanctions and incentives most likely to affect a change in behavior.

Exemplary Programs

Although an extensive search of the literature on family involvement during incarceration did not identify evidence-based prison programming, the rationale behind providing and promoting family involvement and programming has a strong research and theoretical base (Hairston 2003).²⁰ Research uncovered in this area focus on the benefits of family involvement as suggested by differences in return to prison rates for those offenders who had identified family support, including visits and consistent communication through letters during incarceration. In regards to community-based programming focusing on family involvement, one study was found which evaluated a community-based family program that targets substance abuse offenders and their families.

La Bodega de la Familia (Family Justice)

La Bodega de la Familia (translated as *"the family grocery"*), located in the predominantly Latino Lower East Side of Manhattan, New York, opened in October 1996. It is designed to assist drug addicted parolees, ex-parolees and probationers by offering as much support to family members as it offers to offenders. La Bodega loosely defines family to include girlfriends, boyfriends and other close associates of the offender and works on the premise that helping family negotiate life empowers them to become positive influences in the life of the offender.²¹ Participation is voluntary and to be eligible, participants must live within the 56-square block sector that constitutes the Lower East Side.

Services provided include helping the entire family deal with issues such as substance abuse, medical illnesses, mental health issues, housing, etc. and consists of an array of services, including Family Case Management, counseling and relapse prevention services, and 24-hour crisis intervention in the event of a

²⁰ Hairston, C. "Prisoners and Their Families: Parenting Issues During Incarceration."

²¹ Rubino, F. 2004. "Doing Family Time." *Hope Magazine*. March/April 2004. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.familyjustice.org/assets/press/Hope_Article.pdf; Shapiro, C. and Sawicki, K. 2003. "The Bodega Model: A Family Focused Approach for Returning Prisoners." A Newsletter of the National Abandoned Infants Assistance Resource Center. Volume 12, No. 1: p. 2-6. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.familyjustice.org/assets/publications/The_Bodega_Model.pdf; Shapiro, C. 1999. "Integrating Family Focused Interventions Into the Criminal Justice System." Vera Institute of Justice. December 1999: p. 2-14. Viewed March 10, 2008 at <http://www.nicic.org/Library/016005>.

drug-related emergency. La Bodega's is widely known for its "Family Case Management" approach. This approach to treatment is an inclusive process that engages the substance abuser, family members, criminal justice personnel, and treatment providers together to identify and mobilize a family's inherent strengths and resources and to build a network of healthy relationships to support the offender. Working in partnership with law enforcement, Bodega's family case managers collaborate with family members to develop strategies to help the offender stay in treatment and comply with supervision. They also find ways to deal with legal, financial, and emotional problems plaguing family members, which may prevent them from serving as a resource to the substance abuser. In addition, the program counsels and provides references for other family members dealing with mental illness or substance abuse, not just the substance abuser, offering prevention services as well as treatment.²²

The goals of the program include the following:

- to reduce interfamilial harms caused by drugs, including family strain, break-up, child placement, legal problems, voluntary family break-up, and theft;
- to bolster success of non-residential drug treatment placement;
- to reduce the harms associated with drug addiction in a given neighborhood;
- to reduce the use of custody (jail or prison) to punish relapse.

In May 2002, the Vera Institute of Justice released findings of a year-long evaluation of the program. The evaluation sought to measure the extent to which La Bodega de la Familia achieved its goals of increasing the success of drug treatment, reducing the use of incarceration to punish relapse, and reducing the harms addiction causes within families. Researchers used standardized instruments to measure physical and mental health, family functioning, and social support and ethnographic interviews for program enrollees and a comparison group of non-program participants at the beginning of the program and 6 months following participation in the program. Findings show that for those involved in the program, illegal drug use declined from 80% to 42% significantly more than the comparison group; a smaller number of the program group returned to prison within the first 6 months of release and the number of family members who reported they had unmet needs for medical, social, housing and mental health services dropped dramatically after 6 months of participation in the program.²³

Additional Reading on the La Bodega de la Familia Program:

- Shapiro, C. 1998. *La Bodega de la Familia: Reaching Out to the Forgotten Victims of Substance Abuse*. Bureau of Justice Assistance Bulletin. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Viewed May 2, 2008 at <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/170595.pdf>.
- La Bodega de la Familia/Family Justice, New York City. 2001. U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance. Viewed May 6, 2008 at <http://www.nicic.org/Library/016739>.
- For additional information, including links to articles, please visit the Family Justice website at <http://www.familyjustice.org/index.html>.

Suggested Readings on Family Involvement During Incarceration and Reentry

The articles identified below are not an exhaustive list of literature regarding family involvement during incarceration and reentry. They provide a starting point for the identification of research on the effects of incarceration and reentry on family, benefits of involving family in rehabilitative efforts and promising programs and practices.

Allard, P. and Lu, L. 2006. *Rebuilding Families, Reclaiming Lives: State Obligations to Children in Foster Care and Their Incarcerated Parents*. Brennen Center for Justice, NYU School of Law.

Description: Discusses the Adoption of Safe Families Act of 1997 and strategies for supporting family reunification.

²² La Bodega de la Familia/Family Justice New York City. n.d. Mother-Child Community Corrections Project, Silver Spring, MD. Viewed May 8, 2008 at <http://www.nationalinstituteofcorrections.gov/Library/016739>.

²³ Sullivan, E.; Mino, M.; Nelson, K.; Pope, J. 2002. *Families as a Resource in Recovery from Drug Abuse: An Evaluation of La Bodega de la Familia*. Vera Institute of Justice. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.vera.org/publications/publications_5.asp?publication_id=163.

Arditti, J. and Few, M. 2006. "Mothers' Reentry into Family Life Following Incarceration." *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 27(1): 103-123.

Description: Based upon interviews with 28 female probationers with at least one child under the age of 18, the authors examine how incarceration and subsequent reentry influence mothers' family relationships. Descriptive analyses reveal family support is an important factor in successful reentry and incarceration, even for short periods, is associated with shifts in family configuration on mothers' release by increasing the likelihood of divorce and decreasing the likelihood that mothers will reside with the father of at least one of their biological children.

Bobbitt, M. and Nelson, M. 2004. "The Front Line: Building Programs that Recognize Families' Role in Reentry." Vera Institute of Justice. September 2004: p.2-8. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.vera.org/publication_pdf/249_476.pdf.

Description: This *Issue in Brief* examines the trend towards providing family-focused reentry programming in prison and in the community, highlights ways that jurisdictions can and are structuring such efforts, and addresses the challenges involved. As an example of programming that engages family in reentry, the paper discusses the family reintegration program of Project Greenlight, a prison-based pilot program operated by Vera in partnership with the New York State Department of Correctional Services and the New York State Division of Parole.

Christian, J.; Mellow, J.; Thomas, S. 2006. "Social and Economic Implications of Family Connections to Prisoners." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 34:443-452.

Description: Using qualitative data, the authors examine the benefits and costs families incur as a result of maintaining a relationship with an incarcerated individual. Findings suggest there are significant costs, both economic and social, to a prisoner's family if they desired to maintain the most basic level of connection with the inmate.

Cooke, C. 2005. "Going Home: Formerly Incarcerated African American Men Return to Families and Communities." *Journal of Family Nursing*. 11(4): 388-404.

Description: Using data from a community-based, qualitative study of 17 African American men who were previously incarcerated regarding their experiences in finding and maintaining jobs. Study participants also discuss their perceptions of the effect of their incarceration and release on their abilities to restore, develop and maintain family connections.

Gavazzi, S.; Yarcheck, C.; Rhine, E.; Partridge, C. 2003. "Building Bridges Between the Parole Officer and the Families of Serious Juvenile Offenders: A Preliminary Report on a Family-Based Parole Programs." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 47(3): 291-308.

Description: Provides a description of the Growing Up FAST (Families and Adolescents Surviving and Thriving) program, a program targeting serious youthful offenders who have been release from juvenile correctional facilities and their families. The report includes demographic information the first set of families to participate in the program as well as discusses limitations and lessons learned.

Grinstead, O.; Faigeles, B.; Bancroft, C.; Zack, B. 2001. "The Financial Costs of Maintaining Relationships with Incarcerated African American Men: A Survey of Women Prison Visitors." *Journal of African American Men*. 6(1):59-71.

Description: The authors reported the findings from interviews conducted with women leaving a large state prison in California after visiting incarcerated men. Findings show women spend an average of \$292/month maintaining contact; those in the lowest income category spend 26% of their income on contacts and those in the highest income category spend 9%.

Hairston, C. 1999. "Kinship Care When Parents Are Incarcerated." In J. Gleason and C. Hairston (Eds.) *Kinship Care: Improving Practice Through Research* (189 - 211). Washington, DC: CWLA Press.

Description: Based on a review of the prisoners and families research literature, including several empirical studies by the author, the author discusses what is known, what can be used and what is needed in order to provide more effective, relevant and compassionate welfare services.

Harris, O.; Miller, R. (Eds.). 2003. *Impacts of Incarceration on the African American Family*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Description: An anthology of reprinted articles addressing the impact of incarceration on the relationships between African American fathers and sons, men and women and the social, emotional and financial costs incurred by families of the incarcerated. A section on policy changes to alleviate problems incurred by families of the incarcerated is included.

Herbert, Tony. 2005. "The Invisible Tenant: Living in Federally Assisted Housing after Prison." A Family Justice Publication. March 2005. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.familyjustice.org/assets/publications/The_Invisible_Tenant.pdf.

Description: Reports on the experiences of 15 ex-prisoners and their families, who live in subsidized housing.

Jeffries, J.; Menghraj, S.; Hairston, C. 2001. *Serving Incarcerated and Ex-Offender Fathers and Their Families: A Review of the Field*. Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Justice and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Vera Institute of Justice, New York, NY. Viewed August 15, 2007 at http://www.vera.org/publication_pdf/fathers.PDF.

Description: Provides the description, design, objectives, history, policy contexts, and other operating environments of 7 prison-based and 7 community-based programs designed for incarcerated and low-income fathers.

Johnson, H. and Young, D. 2002. "Addiction, Abuse, and Family Relationships: Childhood Experiences of Five Incarcerated African American Women." *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse*. 1(4): 29-47.

Description: The authors describe the childhood experiences of 5 incarcerated African American women who have extensive histories of drug addiction and criminal behavior. Through the use of personal interviews and qualitative analysis, the women's childhood experiences are explored with attention to the themes of alcohol and drug use, sexual abuse, and mother-daughter relationships.

La Vigne, N.; Naser, R.; Brooks, L.; Castro, J. 2005. "Examining the Effects of Incarceration and In-Prison Family Contact on Prisoners' Family Relationships." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 21(4): 314-335.

Description: Based on responses from 233 Chicago-bound male prisoners interviewed before and after release from prison, the authors examine the extent to which the quality of relationships prior to prison is related to the frequency and type of family contact during prison, as well as quality of family relationships and level of family support after release. Findings indicate that level and type of family contact typically mediate the effect of pre-prison relationship quality on both post-prison family relationship quality and support, but that in-prison contact can be a negative influence if intimate partner relationships are already poor.

Laub, J. and Sampson, R. 2006. *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Description: The authors analyze data collected on crime and social development up to age 70 for 500 men who were remanded to reform school in the 1940s. Combining long-term data with in-depth interviews, the authors find that men who desisted from crime were rooted in structural routines and had strong social ties to family and community.

Leverentz, A. 2006. "For the Love of a Good Man? Romantic Relationships as a Source or Hindrance for Female Ex-Offenders." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 43(3):459-488.

Description: Through an analysis of qualitative interviews with 49 female ex-offenders and their romantic partners, this article explores the impact of romantic relationships on the reentry experiences of female ex-

offenders. These women most often have relationships with not purely pro-social men or women and the relationships may be both destructive and conventionalizing at different points in time.

Lynch, J. and Sabol, W. 2001. "Prisoner Reentry in Perspective." *Crime Policy Report*, Volume 3. Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center. Viewed April 1, 2008 at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410213_reentry.PDF.

Description: Data are presented on changes in characteristics of persons released from prison and persons on parole. The authors identify several complexities associated with longer prison sentences and with prisoner reentry, including inmates returning to society are more likely (1) to have failed at parole previously; (2) not to have participated in educational and vocational programs in prison; and (3) to have served longer sentences, which attenuate ties to families. Reentry should be considered in concert with sentencing policies and corrections practice that determine who goes to prison, how long they stay, and how prepared they are for reintegration.

Naser, R. and La Vigne, N. 2006. "Family Support in the Prisoner Reentry Process: Expectations and Realities." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 43(1): 93-106.

Description: Drawing on a sample of 413 male offenders returning to Baltimore, MD and Chicago, IL areas following release from prison, the authors examine the role of family in the reentry process by exploring expectations of family support of prisoners prior to release, as well as support received after release. The authors report prisoners relied on family members extensively for housing, financial and emotional support; and expectations of family support were greater following release than when incarcerated.

Sullivan, E.; Mino, M.; Nelson, K.; Pope, J. 2002. "Families as a Resource in Recovery from Drug Abuse: An Evaluation of La Bodega de la Familia." Vera Institute of Justice. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.vera.org/project/project1_1.asp?section_id=3&project_id=23.

Description: Evaluation of the La Bodega de la Familia, a program in New York City that works with the families of drug users who are under justice system supervision. Researchers compared outcomes for Bodega participants with outcomes for a comparison group of drug users and family members, and conducted in-depth interviews with a sub-sample of both groups. The proportion of Bodega drug users who reported using illegal drugs declined from 80 percent to 42 percent over the six-month study period, significantly more than in the comparison group. Bodega family members also got medical and social service needs met at significantly higher rates than those in the comparison group.

Supporting Families with Incarcerated Parents. Policy Brief No. 8, September 2005. Family Strengthening Policy Center, National Human Services Assembly. Viewed May 7, 2008 at <http://www.nassembly.org/fspc/practice/documents/Brief8.pdf>.

Description: Provides information on long and short term consequences of parental incarceration; barriers to child visitation; goals and types of programs for families; federal and state initiatives; policy recommendations and includes a list of resources.

Szekely, A. 2004. "Marriage and Family Strengthening for Incarcerated Individuals." *Welfare Information Network*. 8(8): 2-5. Viewed March 10, 2008 at <http://www.financeproject.org/Publications/marriageandfamilyRN.pdf>.

Description: Discusses the benefits of marriage and family strengthening programs for incarcerated offenders and discusses program initiatives on the state and local level, including Horizon/Kairos, Oklahoma, Illinois, and Washington.

Thalberg, R. 2006. "Family-Based Re-Entry Programming: A Promising Tool for Reducing Recidivism and Mitigating the Economic and Societal Costs of Incarceration in California." Viewed May 2, 2008 at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=976967>.

Description: The author explores the possibility of introducing family-based re-entry programming into California's correctional establishments as a means of facilitating an offender's successful transition from prison into society. After examining various models of family-based programming employed in other states, both short-term and long-term family programming options are proposed.

Travis, J.; McBride, E.; Solomon, A. 2003. "Families Left Behind: The Hidden Costs of Incarceration and Reentry." Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. Viewed March 10, 2008 at http://www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/310882_families_left_behind.pdf.

Description: Provides statistics on family situation of incarcerated individuals to encourage collaboration between communities, social service agencies, health care providers and criminal justice systems in order to address the needs of family members of incarcerated individuals.

Walker, C. 2005. "Children of Incarcerated Parents (Full Report)." Pittsburgh Child Guidance Foundation. Viewed March 10, 2008 at <http://fdncenter.org/grantmaker/childguidance/incarcerated.pdf>.

Description: Provides information on the impact of parental incarceration on children. Conducted reviews of literature, focus groups involving children, formerly incarcerated parents, faith-based service providers, caregivers and interviewed social service staff and criminal justice staff.