



AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

**IMPROVING PRISONER REENTRY AND REDUCING
RECIDIVISM: SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES**

**INTRODUCTION:
MAURA CORRIGAN, AEI**

PANEL I: NONPROFIT EFFORTS TO REDUCE RECIDIVISM

**PANELISTS:
CRAIG DEROCHE, JUSTICE FELLOWSHIP;
BRYAN KELLEY, PRISON ENTREPRENEURSHIP PROGRAM;
HARRIET MCDONALD, DOE FUND;
HAROLD DEAN TRULEAR, HEALING COMMUNITIES PRISON MINISTRY;
ERIC COCHLING, GEORGIA CENTER FOR OPPORTUNITY (MODERATOR)**

PANEL II: LESSONS AND CHALLENGES FROM STATE LEADERS

**PANELISTS:
GARY MOHR, OHIO DEPT OF REHABILITATION AND CORRECTION;
JAY NEAL, GEORGIA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF TRANSITION, SUPPORT, AND REENTRY;
CHAUNCEY PARKER, NEW YORK COUNTY
DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE;
ROBERT DOAR, AEI (MODERATOR)**

**9:00 AM – 12:00 PM
TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2015**

EVENT PAGE: <http://www.aei.org/events/improving-prisoner-reentry-and-reducing-recidivism-successes-and-challenges/>

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY
DC TRANSCRIPTION – WWW.DCTMR.COM**

MAURA CORRIGAN: Good morning, Harriet. Good morning, Craig. Good morning, Eric. Let's see. Good morning, Kaitlyn. Good morning to all of you in the audience today. We're very happy you're here. And to those of you who are live on the web, may I say, Namaste. Namaste. Let's hear it.

GROUP: Namaste.

MS. CORRIGAN: My five-year-old granddaughter taught me that from yoga, and she said, Nana, it means the light in me speaks to the light in you. And that is what I hope happens here today at AEI.

I am Maura Corrigan. I'm a visiting fellow in poverty studies at the American Enterprise Institute. And this morning, on behalf of AEI and the Georgia Center for Opportunity, I welcome you to this truly delicious program that we're going to have.

We're looking at prisoner reentry and reducing recidivism this morning. And this is a serious problem in our country and it can use some light shed on it, can't it? We're here in a search for answers together, as human beings, which is what human beings do with their creative abilities. So thank you for it and we rejoice in today.

Let me say my background, what brought me to AEI for a moment. I've been a lawyer for 45 years, although I like to pretend I'm still 32. I spent many years as a state and federal prosecutor. I was a judge on our state court of appeals, chief judge of that court, then a justice of the Michigan Supreme Court, and chief justice of the Michigan Supreme Court. And like a crazy person, I turned down every lawyer's greatest dream, to be at the pinnacle in order to run human services in the great state of Michigan – the hardest job that I ever had in my whole entire life. And I had the good fortune then, of course, to come in contact with Robert Doar, and that brought me here, by providence, this morning with all of you.

I want to say a couple of things about my past and why it is relevant to what we're doing here today. In my long career, I have participated in literally tens of thousands of criminal cases over those years. And I am a Latin scholar and a French scholar of sorts. And I just want to remind you of a little history.

In court, in trials, we have a process that's called voir dire, to pick jurors. That means in the French, to see, to say, to see, to say whether you can tell the truth. And the word "verdict" from the Latin means veredicto – to say truly, can you say it truly. In our wonderful system of justice that's come down through hundreds of years, thousands of years, we have thought as human beings that when the truth is told, that that begins the process of healing. And that's what we're doing in the criminal justice system – telling the truth first and then attempting to heal those who are the defendants, the criminals, and the victims so that the whole process is a healing process.

We are really bad at this job in our country. Right now, 50 percent of our state prisoners in the United States come back within three years of the time that they're released. We missed healing, then, half the time for these people. This is unacceptable. It's unacceptable for victims. It's unacceptable for taxpayers. It's unacceptable for all the stakeholders in the system. But, most certainly, it's unacceptable for the prisoner and for the prisoner's family, and for the prisoner's children, who are harmed the most. The prisoners we have freed physically, but we haven't freed them mentally. Their failure is our failure as a society, and we know that we can do better.

Once a prisoner has served his or her sentence and is released, how is it that that prisoner's reformation can be real and sustained? What does freeing prisoners really mean? It means awarding each and every one their full dignity as a human being, and we have a little three-word mantra here at AEI that Robert Doar tells me we have to get into everything, and I'm going to say it: better off working. One of the ways that human dignity is advanced is through work. And that is true for prisoners, that they need jobs, that they need to experience the full dignity as human beings.

Well, our tremendous partner here from Georgia, Eric Cochling is here. And Governor Deal and the great state of Georgia has done a tremendous job around these issues. And you're going to hear from people this morning who have done a tremendous job around these issues.

Let me be judge like right now and remind each and every one of you in this audience to turn off your cell phones. And I will give you a moment to do that. I'm not hearing anything. OK.

And let me at this juncture close with a couple of Corriganisms (sp) that have been quoted over the years in various editorial pages.

First one, life is too short for stupid stuff. And what we have been doing in the criminal justice process in our country is in very many regards very stupid. And let me remind you of a couple of very important truths. When we talk about light, did you realize that human beings only see one-tenth of 1 percent that is – one-tenth of 1 percent on the spectrum of light. That's how truth is too. We see the truth – we see small glimmers of truth. And when we put it together, we get better access to the beauty of truth. And that's what we're here about today. So that's Corrigan waxing eloquent on things that she believes, and thank you for listening to me.

Now, it is my great pleasure to introduce Eric Cochling, who is on our first panel on nonprofit efforts to reduce recidivism. Eric is the vice president and general counsel of the Georgia Center for Opportunity. And, in that, he manages the public policy team. He is an honors graduate of the University of Georgia and has a JD and a master's in public administration from Georgia State. He was in private practice and worked at a think tank here I think but I forget which one. Which one was it?

ERIC COCHLING: FRC.

MS. CORRIGAN: OK. And he is the married father of three and a proud son of the state of Georgia. This proud daughter of the great state of Michigan is happy to welcome you, Lawyer Cochling. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. COCHLING: Maura, thank you very much. That was a great introduction. And I can't help but echo everything that you said leading up to introducing me. I also want to thank Robert Doar and the team here at AEI for taking on this issue. It's one that hasn't received quite the attention that it needs, although around the states we've had criminal justice reform efforts for as long as time has been. And, most recently, sentencing reforms and things like that but reentry I think – and as our panel will talk about – is where it's at because, as Maura said, we had 50 percent plus of our offenders who are going back into the system because they're not prepared to be in society with the rest of us when they're released – largely unprepared and no better off.

So it's my hope, and I believe the hope of this group that in this presentation, we can all learn and hopefully spark some interest by other states and even the federal government in the issue of – on the issue of reentry reform and the things that can practically be done to truly change the trajectory of an offender's life as he is finishing up his or her time in prison and after, when they're trying to reacclimate to society at large.

As Maura mentioned, our first panel – we're going to have two. Our first panel is going to be focused on the private, nonprofit and ministry efforts to do something about prisoner reentry. And when we talk about that, we're talking about the group of folks who are largely responsible for providing for prisoner's needs as they're getting ready to come out and as they're transitioning back into society. I don't think it's too much to say that without ministries, without the nonprofits that work in this field, prisoners wouldn't have a lot to turn to. They would be let out of prison with a bus ticket and maybe a good wish, and that would be it.

So that's what we're focused on today. These groups provide things as diverse as job training, housing, mentoring, and, in fact, in many ways prison fellowship, as one example, they help take care of the families of these prisoners while they're away. I'm excited to say that our panel is made up of some of the greatest panel I could have asked to be here to talk about these issues today. They are on the front lines of meeting the needs of returning citizens, and hopefully they're going to inspire us with telling us about what they do and also explaining to us since so many of you are probably in positions where you could help, what kind of challenges they face in their day-to-day work.

So I'd like to say you probably, somewhere in your information you received out front, you have more extensive biographies for each one of the panelists. I'm not going to spend much time on their introductions because I want you to hear what they have to say and not me talking.

So, with that, I want to introduce Bryan Kelley. Bryan is a reentry manager for the Dallas branch of the Prison Entrepreneurship Program. He is a product of the program himself, having spent about 22 years behind bars until 2014. And now he is in a position of leadership within this organization and doing terrific work.

Craig DeRoche, at the end of the table here, is executive director of the Justice Fellowship and senior vice president of Prison Fellowship Ministries. His expertise is in overcoming addiction, criminal justice reform, and alternative sentencing. He is also the former speaker of the Michigan House of Representatives.

Dr. Harold Trulear, to my right, is the national director of Healing Communities as well as an ordained American Baptist minister, and serves as associate professor of applied theology at Howard University. Dr. Trulear has authored over 70 published monographs, articles, essays, sermons, and interviews and reviews on topics such as religion, culture, and political affairs. I'll say that Dr. Trulear has a special connection with Georgia. He's helped us in our reform efforts. I've heard him speak and he is awesome, so I can't wait to hear what he has to say.

Finally, but not least of which is Harriet McDonald. It's a pleasure to see you. Sorry I didn't see you before now. She's the executive vice president and Doe Fund co-founder, also co-founder of Ready, Willing and Able, and the Community Improvement Project in New York City. Harriet develops and implements fundraising strategies, overseeing private campaigns that leverage more than \$13 million per year. She is also responsible for overall program development and oversight.

I want to thank each one of you for being here today. I look forward to what you have to say. Now, a word on format. Essentially, each panelist is going to have about 10 minutes to present. We're going to have some Q&A here, among the panelists after that, for about 15 minutes. And then, the rest of the time will be devoted to questions from the audience. So go ahead and start thinking about what you would like to ask, all right?

So, with that, we'll turn it over to Bryan Kelley.

BRYAN KELLEY: Good morning, everyone. It's a pleasure to be here. My name is Bryan Kelley. Good morning, everyone. I'm Bryan Kelley. And I have a working microphone now.

I am with the Prison Entrepreneurship Program. I'm the reentry manager in Dallas. I also facilitate character development on one of our units, so we are trying to transform lives from the inside out in more ways than one. So who are we?

Well, let me start with our mission statement. We're servant leaders on a mission to stimulate positive life transformation for (executives ?) and inmates by uniting them through entrepreneurial passion, education, and mentoring. It's a very innovative nonprofit organization started about 11 years ago by our founder, Catherine Rohr, to just utilize an underused human resource inside the prison. She spoke inside of a prison in

Texas and what she realized is there was a bunch of guys in prison who knew a lot about business, they just didn't know they did. You know, they know something about marketing, they know something about cost analysis and inventories and things like that; they just haven't applied that legitimately.

So we have two offices, one in Dallas, one in Houston, and we operate in two prisons in Texas, the Cleveland Unit and the Estes Unit. Both are just outside of Houston and Dallas respectively. We have a staff of about 25 people, most of which are released felons themselves. Our budget is about \$2.7 million per year. And most of that comes from charitable donations. And I would like to also just add that about one-fourth of the people that give to our program are past graduates that have gotten out. They are investing back into the program. (Applause.)

So the problem that we spoke about already this morning is recidivism. People are going back to prison to the tune of one out of every two within three years. That's terrible. We have gotten really good at warehousing folks, not so good at preparing them to succeed.

The collateral damage that goes out from that is seven in 10 children is incarcerated parents will themselves end up incarcerated. That's terrible. We've got to do something about that.

And the problem that we are really mainly trying to address is for those people that do back to prison, 90 percent were unemployed at the time. That's huge. We've got to do a better job at getting these guys employed and making a difference and feeling better about themselves. We spoke at a business networking event one day. And at the end, a lady stood up and said, please help these people because when people get out of prison, they can't get a job, they've got two choices: reoffend or hang themselves, like my best friend did. And the gravity of the situation came crashing down for everybody.

So our big idea: we're going to equip inmates to become their own boss, to start their own business so they don't have to go through that embarrassing and difficult question of, I see here you had a felony. Nobody wants them. Nobody wants to employ them. Nobody wants to house them. There are difficulties. And the sad fact is the guys on the inside really believe, if I just make parole, if I can just get out, everything will be fine. But that's when the fight really begins. And that's that we try to prepare them for.

So we offer a rigorous mini-MBA, if you will, on the side. We take the guys through a refining fire and we empower them more than they ever thought they would. We push, and we pull, and we stretch, and we make them uncomfortable, and we prepare them for live.

Our curriculum includes a small business focus on entrepreneurship that they go through and they have tests on and they have homework on every week. We go through "Living in the Village," which is a book on personal finance, most of which the guys

know nothing about, so we talk about credit and establishing an emergency fund and very practical financial things.

We go through “Rich Dad, Poor Dad,” so we talk a little bit about investment, most of which the guys don’t know anything about.

We put them through Toastmasters so they learn to stand and orate their own ideas. It’s amazing to see the transformation at the beginning of the class where a guy that can’t even look you in the eye and convey a thought, and at the end of the class he will stand and give a 15-minute business presentation complete with three-year financial forecast. And it is awesome to behold.

We take them through “The Quest for Authentic Manhood,” which details the Biblical model of manhood, most of which the guys know nothing about as well. If they knew their father, it’s probably a relationship they wish they didn’t have, so they just weren’t modeled any of the things that we’re going to show them. We’re not overtly a faith-based organization but we unapologetically stand on the truths of the Bible as well and so we’ll convey that to all of our participants.

They read “Crime and Punishment.” They go through the AP Style Guide to learn to better communicate with the written word. It’s a very holistic approach. We have an etiquette coach come in and talk to the guys. And it’s one of the funnest events that we have. And we bring in volunteer – business executives come in about once a month to just kind of hone the guys and hear about their business ideas and their plans and make sure it’s on point. We run a shark-tank type format where everybody can come in and embrace their inner Mark Cuban and listen to business plans and give feedback and make sure that they’re on point and headed in the right direction.

Our graduates receive a certificate of entrepreneurship from the Hankamer School of Business at Baylor. Baylor strongly supports us. One of their most senior professors is on our board. We have great turnout from the MBA candidates are Baylor, UT, University of Houston, and several other schools.

So that’s the inside portion but, you know, like any great football team, you can play a great first half but if you don’t show up in the second half, you’re going to fail. And so we meet them at the gate, pick them up, hopefully bring them to our transition house. About half of our goes go to an EP sponsored transitional house.

That’s my job as a reentry manager. We pick them up at the gate, get them their first meal, get their identification, make sure they have acquired food, clothing, everything they need. And to talk to something Maura mentioned earlier, we don’t want them to stumble over stupid stuff. We want them to, you know, get over the little humps in life. We want to be there to support them, make sure that no obstacle is stopping them.

Our reentry support team includes housing, case management, education, mentoring, job placement, start-up assistance if they’d like to do that. We have

transitional houses in Houston and Dallas with staff. And probably the biggest aid for them is the cohort of brothers that have been released before them, who are there to answer their questions. And maybe they've been out a week or a month or six months or a year, but they have – they have our staff, which is practiced at the art of helping them, but they also have their brothers they can lean on and talk to about the feelings they're having and the thoughts. And so it's amazing the support structure and network that we have for them.

But we also teach them to have fun. They've got to have fun in their new life or they're going to go back to their old one. So we have events, lake events, beach events, basketball, softball – a little bit of everything. We hook them up with our network of business advisors that came and ministered to them on the inside will do things with them on the outside, too. We've got a robust mentorship program. And so they have got a brand new network. They don't have to go back to their old neighborhoods, to the dope networks, and sometimes we even protect them from their own families. The sad fact is, you know, sometimes their home environment wasn't a very healthy one, and so we provide a new one for them.

All right. So our results: well, 100 percent employment within 90 days. Actually, we just did some figures on that. In the last six months, we've got the average starting date of a new job for our released felons below 20 days. Most of that is acquiring their documents, birth certificate, Social Security card, identification, which, sadly, they're not getting on the inside. There's a program in Texas to start ensuring that they have those documents when they're released, but it just hasn't been working functionally yet.

We have had over 185 businesses started by our graduates. We just did a new survey, and I think that's probably over 200 now. The three or four biggest examples have had sales of over \$1 million, but I like to think that even the guys that get out and never start their business but become a better father, a better employee, a better member of society is a success story.

Our recidivism rate over our 11-year history is about 7 percent – a lot less than the national average. And so the guys have really bought into the program. They continue on. Like I said earlier, they give back to their program, they help their brothers, and it becomes a perpetual thing.

And, as was mentioned earlier, you know, the program works. I know that, not just in theory. I'm a product of that program. I went to prison for almost 22 years for murder. I killed a man in a dope deal that went horribly wrong. Early on in my incarceration, I decided I can't live like this anymore. I need to do something different. I'm a disappointment to my family. I'm disappointment to my community. I'm a disappointment to myself.

And so I was ready to do something different, but I needed some help in doing that, and I found that most accurately, PEP was a launch pad for me. And, you know, after getting out of prison, after almost 22 years, I've never been on the Internet, never

sent an e-mail, you know, society had passed me by. It was an amazing thing to get started again and have all that support. So, you know, we're doing some great things and it's a pleasure to be here, you know. Last year, I was eating in a prison chow hall and today I get to be here with you. It's awesome. Thanks. (Applause.)

MR. COCHLING: Bryan, that was awesome. I know there are a ton of questions for you so we'll wait until question and answer time for that.

Craig, tell us about Justice Fellowship.

CRAIG DEROCHE: Yeah. Prison Fellowship and Justice Fellowship has some of the same formulas of the Prison Entrepreneurial Program in that we were founded by somebody who served time in prison by the name of Chuck Colson. Some of you might be familiar.

He went to prison – he was Richard Nixon's version of a Karl Rove or a James Carville, the architect of the 1972 presidential election. He was the first person to go to prison in the Watergate-related scandal. And he had his own life transformation when he saw what was going on in the prison and created Prison Fellowship when he got out. And we are now the largest prison ministry in America and in the world through our sister Prison Fellowship International.

Five years after starting Prison Fellowship at the request of leaders in the states and at the federal government, Chuck founded Justice Fellowship, which is the advocacy arm of Prison Fellowship, and that is what I lead because, in this country, we're invited to the debate.

The laws, the prison system itself is created by man, and government is, in fact, still – even though some mornings we wake up (and sigh ?), the government still is of the people and for the people and by the people in this country. And so we've created this. And there's a great deal wrong with it as Justice Corrigan, my good friend from Michigan and one of the people that I very much look up to and it's just a blessing here to be here with you, Justice. I can't tell you how honored I am.

But Chuck's model was to use his experience not only in running a government at the national level, but also as a prisoner. So he wasn't going to be one of those people that talked about those people. You know, what these people need or what those people need, people like me, what led me to crime – that's how he would speak, in the first person.

And my own story was that I was speaking on addiction in the criminal justice system. I was the speaker of the House in Michigan. I actually wrote a book – I'll show it to you – called "Highly Functional," which I have my tongue and my cheek with that title, "Highly Functional," where I spent 29 years in addiction, but I rose to being the youngest speaker of the House in Michigan's history before I got into this business the

same way Chuck did and the same way Bryan did, by being arrested twice in four months.

And when I got into recovery and I started using my voice and my experience that I understood how government was created to work the way it did, what I found was that the political leaders of our time were starting to realize that the criminal justice system structurally and practically was failing to do what it is that we promised to do, which was to keep people safe.

And for a generation or two of political leaders, what we did was we accepted those failures and we doubled down on, as Justice Corrigan called stupid – we doubled down on stupid.

When Chuck Colson founded our organization, there were 250,000 prisoners in America – federal, state included – and the recidivism rate was over 50 percent. When we incarcerated over 2.5 million people 40 years later, the recidivism rate was over 50 percent. I would propose to this audience, if we incarcerated 25 million Americans, the recidivism rate would be over 50 percent. We have a solution to a problem that is not working.

And so, structurally, one of the things – and I know you have another panel, so I'm going to talk about some structural things for the benefit of this group that I hope will open your minds to the message of not only what I'm saying but the other panelists.

The person that is committing the crime, it's not their problem. In America, and as leaders, we say, we have a crime problem, we have a violence problem, we have a theft problem, we have a problem with drugs. To the person that's doing the drugs, breaking into the house, causing the violence, that is their solution to their problem, not their problem. Understand that? When I was drinking alcohol and getting arrested, that was my solution. When Bryan chose violence, that was his solution to a problem.

So what we need to unlock as a society for the person individually, because this whole debate is about the value of human life, the value of the life of the person that has done the harm, the value of the life that has been harmed by it, and the value of the lives in the community that are affected by this crime. That is what it needs to return to rather than a spreadsheet style economic model. It's about justice.

Our forefathers thought this was so important. If you look at the Bill of Rights, if you look at the Constitution, if you look at our founding documents, it was by far and away the entire focus from a percentage standpoint was on how we were going to treat people as human beings and what our rights were from the hand of God.

And so, as we return to that, we awake today in a society here in Washington, D.C., where we have moral hazards, where we incentivize arrests and convictions rather than moving somebody away from crime. And that says to a police force, go and arrest

and convict people that can't defend themselves, run up the score there because that is where you'll get paid.

We have perverse incentives. If you treat somebody in one of these alternative programs in your county, that competes with your county sheriff and prosecutor salary. If you send them to the state prison, that's free, right? Those are structural hazards. And every time that there's a problem with these success rates – the failure rate. That's what recidivism is. It's a failure rate, right? We say what we need is to double down on that. What we need is more people, longer sentences, more stuff in the government.

Can you imagine that solution? And that's what's advanced by the conservatives traditionally over the last 40 years is the solution to what's wrong with health care or hunger in this country to grow the government bigger or is it to return to the value of the human lives that are affected by hunger and access to health care?

But, for some reason, conservatives don't attach that and they put in these incentives to grow the government. And then, in the three areas – we'll talk more about restorative justice later – I'm kind of a rant. I got a good night sleep last night, Eric. (Laughter.) Stick with me though. I've got some good stuff for you today.

There's three things that we get wrong. I've identified some of the structural stuff for you, but, in restorative justice, which we'll talk more about, there is a solution. I come bringing good news. The proportional punishment, the value of proportional punishment, the morality of that, of saying that when somebody does something wrong, it's on us, the sober, clear-minded folks of the government and of the citizenry of the community to try to align the punishment with what actually occurred. We have a moral obligation to do that.

When somebody's in prison, these good, government workers, believe me, this is what they want to do. Believe me. They've got to spend two-thirds of their life doing the same thing as a prisoner, OK? They get eight hours free for 20 or 30 years to live differently, otherwise they're in prison and they're sleeping, the same as a prisoner. They want a constructive culture inside our prisons.

With all that investment, why aren't we making people better? That's in our interest. And then, when people leave, the American value, I believe someone's created in the image of God; other people, from a secular view, would say fair is fair, you do something wrong, you pay it back, you move forward in your life. I think every American believes in that value.

Somehow that got tossed aside that you get a life sentence for anything you've done wrong in this country. We've allowed that to metastasize, where any conviction carries with collateral consequences and that destroys families, your ability to pay your own way through this life, which is in all of our interest. So I'm sure we'll talk more about those three values as we get into the debate.

I'm excited to be here. I thank the Georgia Center for Opportunity and the American Enterprise Institute for having me. (Applause.)

MR. COCHLING: Excellent, Craig.

Dr. Trulear, will you talk to us about Healing Communities, sir?

HAROLD DEAN TRULEAR: Only if you promise to call me Dean. No titles. Nobody else gets one.

My name is Dean Trulear. I direct a program called Healing Communities, which was founded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation in 2006. The question that we were asking at the foundation at the time was what will the faith community do with the record numbers of men and women who will be returning from prison in 2006?

And 2006 was a benchmark year. We knew about it from actuarial tables, going way back into the '90s with the draconian sentences that had been handed out. The estimates were that about 750,000 men and women would be returning from state and federal prison in the year 2006.

And so we met with faith leaders from around the country and asked the question, what is it that the faith community can do in response to this. And we had a number of people who were prison chaplains, scholars in religion, people who had done time. My own inmate number is 10002648, which is almost the same as my Amtrak guest rewards number. (Laughter.) I get them mixed up sometimes. The Amtrak people look at me and say, that's too many numbers. Oh, no. Sorry. Wrong number.

But we had – we discussed what it was that the faith community could do. And the conclusion we came to was that the faith community is best mobilized around reentry when it uses its best assets. And faith communities, irrespective of the religious tradition, all have two primary assets.

One is that they promote values or what in criminology we call pro-social attitudes. Faith communities also promote relationships, which in criminology we also talk about as pro-social relationships.

What's interesting is that although jobs are important, and I think one of the things that Bryan didn't have time to talk about was the life skill development that's part of the program. It's not just about jobs. One of the things that we know is that having the right attitude and having the right social network is twice as influential on recidivism outcomes as whether or not you're employed because the fact of the matter is I can get you a job, but if you still think the same way and you still hang with the same people, you'll lose the job.

So one of the things that we did was we began to go to the faith community and say, you are the answer to the reentry problem because you are the one institution in the

community that majors in the two primary needs – primary criminogenic needs of men and women who return from prison.

So we've been working with congregations now for the last – we started our – we launched our first church in Detroit, in 2008. Currently, we are working with five different denominations and congregations of approximately 25 different cities of a variety of faith traditions. And, basically, what we do is we provide training for the congregation not to be – not to have a reentry program, but to be a reentry church or reentry synagogue or reentry masjid.

What we do is we draw the parallel from the Christian tradition in Matthew 25, where he talks about sick people and prisoners. When you're sick, your whole congregation comes to see you. People write you letters. People call. People check on the family. When you're in prison, you get three volunteers from somebody else's house of worship. And so what we're saying is, let's find out who within the congregation has a family member that's incarcerated and let's mobilize around them.

I drove down this morning – last night rather – from Allentown, Pennsylvania. We just launched a Healing Communities in Allentown. And I preached at a church there and gave an altar call for families of the incarcerated. Half the church came forward.

A lot of people say, well, these guys aren't connected with any house of worship. You'd be surprised. I was locked up with five guys from my own church. I thought I could get away, you know, incognito, you know. Nobody would know who I was until someone came over and said, reverend, is that you? And, yeah, it was me.

So the reality is that many men and women have connections with faith communities but they're in their family. They may be a couple of generations removed but they have connections. And so what we do is we have the congregation start by identifying those people and providing services.

One of the women that was in the church in Allentown on Sunday said that her son was coming home on August 19th and that she needed help. And so we immediately began to put together a reentry strategy, reaching out to him in the prison, sending the pastor to the prison, making sure there was a support group around the family, making sure that the congregation's culture was such that it could receive him coming back home.

One of the things that makes this special for us is that by changing the culture of the congregation, the entire congregation then owns reentry as opposed to a couple of trained volunteers.

That church in Detroit, Russell Street Baptist Church, had a man come home from prison after 17 years. Now, one of the questions we're supposed to answer is evidence of success. When you're – when you're underfunded, you can't, you know, document stuff. And I know that the plural of anecdote is not data, but I can tell you tons of stories. But

this one is I think an important example of what we're seeing happening in congregations around the country.

A young man came home after 17 years for murder in the state of Michigan. And when he got to the back door of the church, the usher was there to greet him. But he took a step back because the usher was the sister of the man he had killed. She saw him and recognized him immediately and said, don't be afraid. Wait a minute. Come here. Come here. I forgave you a long time ago and I've been waiting for this moment. And she hugged him and said, welcome to Russell Street Baptist Church.

If that church had had a reentry program, he never would have gotten past the usher, but because the culture had changed and he was able to be embraced by the person at the back door – she's part of the reentry culture of the congregation.

And so we do – we spend about six hours with the congregation. We have handbooks. We have different training modules. We use video and audio resources. And all of it is basically designed to make sure that congregations understand the role that they can play in reentry. We don't try to get congregations to get people jobs. We're trying to make sure that congregations are networked with people who are job providers or housing providers.

Nobody – one of the weaknesses of the faith initiative as it emerged in the 1990s was that congregations were being asked to do things that congregations don't do, you know. You know, nobody ever went to a neighborhood and said, gee, there are no jobs here. Let's start a church. You know, that's not what they're there for. But there are other people that can do that. So it's essential that we develop partnerships between the faith community and these other agencies that are service providers.

The one thing that congregations can do that not many other agencies can do – some do if they have it structured in, but not many other social service agencies can do – is they can be available 7/24 to love, and support, and to listen. It's a ministry of presence. We tell congregations, you don't have to meet the entire need of a returning citizen.

And we demonstrate that by saying, when you work with sick people, you don't meet all the needs of a sick person. You know, when you go to the hospital, you're present. You're supportive. You don't provide surgery and you don't prescribe medicine. So, obviously, there's a lane for you, for people that are in distress.

We've been very excited about some of the congregations and how they've taken this framework and moved it to higher levels. Several congregations now are approached in robust numbers of men who've returned from incarceration.

We also provide resources for them to work with the children of the incarcerated from the Sesame Street curriculum that many of you may know about, a Muppet who has an incarcerated parent, to the prison alphabet coloring book by Dr. Bahiyyah

Muhammad, my colleague at Howard University, which is a resource for children between the ages of three and eight to do coloring around incarceration issues so they can understand exactly what it is that their parent or their loved one is going through.

Let me see what I missed. One of the dangers – one of the questions is what are the upsides and the dangers of faith-based efforts. And I think that one of the upsides is that this is something that anybody can do. Any congregation can love somebody. If you have a problem loving somebody, you don't have a reentry problem – you have a congregation problem.

So this is a real low-hanging fruit because we're starting with the families that are in the congregation. The other advantage is they're starting with people that they know and that they've had a relationship with. And so, it becomes a matter of restoration as opposed to meeting somebody from scratch. But once the culture is changed, then other people who are coming home are in a really good position to become part of that congregation by virtue of a culture shift that's happened because they've learned how to take care of their own.

One of our pastors said to me, he said, I've been going to the prison for years and ministering to inmates and I didn't realize that I was stepping over all the families in my church who have somebody locked up to work with somebody else's son. Now it's time for me to minister the people that come here, Sunday after Sunday, with the burden of having an incarcerated son or an incarcerated daughter and making them the focal point and changing the culture so that we could be a welcoming congregation for all returning citizens.

Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. COCHLING: Dean, that was excellent. And it's great to hear about the work to call the church back really to one of its first callings. So thank you for that very much.

I want to take a second and recognize Jay Neal. Jay is from our – my home state of Georgia. He's the director of the Office of Reentry, Support and Transition – flip it – Transition, Support and Reentry. Thanks for coming. I appreciate you answering the call to come today. I'm sorry I didn't recognize you before.

Finally, again, last but not least, Harriet, will you tell us about your work at the Doe Fund?

HARRIET MCDONALD: Absolutely.

MR. COCHLING: All right.

MS. MCDONALD: First of all, I want to thank Robert and Arthur because their support means the world to George and I, my husband and partner, so thank you.

You know, I love coming to AEI because this is an organization that's fearless. They have no fear of new ideas, and that is unusual and remarkable. So thank you.

We're a nation with a big problem and it needs a new solution. Our prisons are overflowing with men of color. We create more criminals than we reform. And, shamefully, we spend about \$17 billion dollars a year doing it. We cannot afford to send so many people back to prison, 50 percent of the people – not morally, not socially and not economically. But in order to prevent people from going back to prison, we need to really look at why they are there.

Sixty percent of men, in this period between 2003 and 1980 when there was no appreciable rise in violent crime, go to prison because of drug crimes. Their average sentence is five years, and violent offenders who are white also serve five years. So that's just a reality.

Liberals may tell you this is all because of racism and conservatives may tell you it's a combination of things – that it's the loss of a family unit, a loss of moral gravity and government dependence. They're all right, but they're all wrong because none of these things lead to a solution.

Drug crimes and even violent drug crimes are crimes of deprivation. Deprived of access to the mainstream economy, our poorest communities create their own economy instead. People in these communities commit crimes to generate revenue. It's an economic opportunity. It's work.

Back in 1990 when we started the Ready, Willing and Able Program, my husband and I actually were not focused on recidivism. We were focused on homelessness. A long 25 years later, poverty, unemployment and drug abuse that used to lead primarily to living on the streets now also includes spending your life involved in the criminal justice system.

As it turns out, the program we started all those years ago to serve homeless people, 70 percent of them who have been incarcerated and served an average of eight years in prison, works astoundingly well with people getting out of prison to help them not to go back.

We do this by providing economic opportunity for the very people who have been deprived of it. Everybody – and our program is about work, paid work, from the very beginning of when people enter. It's disciplined. We drug test randomly twice a week. And the work we do is to begin with for everyone cleaning 170 miles of New York streets every day. We have served 22,000 people since we started.

And I have to tell you that work in our experience and the preparation for a private sector job and then placement in a private sector job after people are with us for a full year is the solution. Everybody must go to work.

And if you offer people are paying job from the beginning and with holistic services and classes in finance management and fatherhood and case management to handle their other problems, they can achieve – and we have proved it – completely self-sufficient lives.

Harvard Professor Bruce Western, who's one of the leading sociologists in America, researched our program for more than three years. And what he found was that we reduced violent crime three years out by 60 percent. In addition to that, two-thirds of the people we serve do not ever go back to prison. And he studied three years out after graduation.

So everyone cleans the streets to begin with and they get paid every single they work, and we really fill their time. I mean, there is no not filling people's time. After that, they go into businesses that we operate that train and license them, but they're all our business, whether it's pest control, culinary arts, back office, driving with a CDL because we serve 1,000 people a day so there's a lot of people going to work. These are careers that people can go into and move up and support themselves and their families for a lifetime.

Financial independence is continuous. Every single day people earn money, but they also save money because when they graduate, we place them in private sector jobs. We have 450 employer partners who hire our people as they come out because they're such great appreciative and well-trained, I must say, by us, employees.

Also, and maybe the best part is, through the entire process, every man that is with us for a year, which is the length of the program, nine months to a year, pays their child support. And so that means that when they graduate, the mothers of their children welcome them back into their kids' lives because they're contributing an essential thing. It also, of course, lifts the family out of poverty and changes and breaks the generational homelessness, poverty, incarceration – that cycle.

On top of Bruce Western's report, we have an independent audit of the economics of Ready, Willing and Able. And what they found is that for every single dollar invested, we save taxpayers \$3.60 just in the cost of criminal justice.

The fact remains, though, that of every black young man that is born today, one out of three will go to prison, and we have to break this cycle. So about three years ago, when I saw this dramatic upsurge in the younger people coming into our program, from 18 to 24, I was shocked because we had served people in their 30s and 40s the whole time.

So we created a youth program, and it has also been very successful. It's the Ready, Willing and Able model, but we pay kids to go to school on site so that they don't get lost on their way, for going to school two days a week and they work in the field three days a week.

Why are we able to react so quickly when government fails? It is because of our private partnerships. We are not dependent completely, by any means, on government money. What government money does is it locks you in to doing things in a way that have clearly failed.

So one third of our budget is government funding, and that essentially pays for the 1,000 people and their housing and their food. One third of our money is revenue that we generate from the businesses we operate. And the final third is the generosity of individuals and philanthropists and foundations.

So, basically, we are all about paying jobs from day one. It's what helps people give up drugs because it's either a paycheck or get high, and we always know because we randomly drug test. And I propose that the core for these extremely underprivileged people who end up in our prisons, that paid work and economic opportunity and social services and support and training but the paid work is what's been successful for us. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. COCHLING: Thank you, Harriet, very much. Now it's time for our question and answer session. I'm just going to throw out a question to you guys and the first person that wants to take it, just go with it.

So we're familiar with the roadblocks that returning citizens face as they're coming back from prison. And I think we take that for granted because we talk about this stuff a lot. Part of this question is, can you describe what those issues are? We've talked a lot about work and a need for work and the scarlet letter essentially that they're up again in order to get a job, but are there other things – what is the role of the community in providing for those, for those needs? And there seems to be – we're focused on community but there's also a drawback to community, depending on what that community looks like, right? So can you talk about some of the roadblocks that offenders may face when they go back?

MR. KELLEY: I love to talk about that. And I deal with it every day both in the guys that I helped to, you know, reacclimate to society but also in my own life. And, you know, of course, housing is an issue. Nobody wants an ex-felon living by him. That's the facts. No apartment complex, at least of any size, wants to let somebody with a felony on their record in.

And so we struggle with getting the guys transitional houses coming out of our transitional house because, you know, nobody wants them, you know. And so the places that will accept them, the guys probably shouldn't go to. It's going to be an environment that they're going to struggle with. Now, hopefully, we've put them on some more stable legs and they can deal with that, but that's what I'm constantly looking for is better housing.

Employment is a huge issue, you know. That question on the application, you know – have you had a felony within the last seven or 10 years – is huge. Now, we try to

prepare the guys to answer that question and provide value to a company, and, hopefully, they will see that.

And, usually, with the network of the employers that we have coming in in our program to be a part of it, you know, we give the guys a leg up. We crack the door and let them get in there. And, usually, what employers will find is they love the PEP guys, and they'll call me and say, give me more. And so we open up avenues that way, but employment is a huge issue.

I would also say transportation – my guys struggle with a lot. You know, of course, they're on public transportation. We start out giving them a ride to the parole or to their job interviews and things like that, but then there's a natural transition in the public transportation. But, you know, when it takes you two hours to get to work and back to an eight-hour job that, you know, it's very entry level, it's not a career oriented job, and it becomes frustrating. You know, you work at it one month, two months, three months and you're not getting anywhere. You're not saving any money, it's frustrating, and the guys get to the point where they're like, you know, this is too hard. Selling dope was much easier. And that's, you know, why our case managers are there, to really process that and help them get a better job.

And so, you know, the last thing I would say is relationships. Our guys have been locked up for a long time and they're looking for a relationship. They're lonely. They miss companionship. And sometimes, all too often, they jump into a relationship much too quickly. And one of the things I tell the guys as – you know, if there's a lady out there that's going to accept you lock, stock and barrel coming right out of prison, there's a problem with her. (Laughter.) And, I mean, that's the sad fact. You know, a lot of times, our guys jump into relationships and it gets their focus way to the left. And they will just crash and burn.

And so, you know, we do relationships counseling and better preparations for that on the inside, too, because, you know, the guys are coming out and they're lonely and they're desperate for companionship, and sometimes they get in the wrong places. I usually tell the guys, there are times when I wanted things really bad, and that's exactly how I got them – really bad. So be careful with that.

MR. DEROCHE: You know, I love what you just said because that is universal. I want to just share a little bit of hope and perspective though for folks in here. We're talking a lot about the acute nature of people that are reentering today, but back up a step and look at America today.

We don't know the exact number because there's no accountability in the system for the law enforcement, the judges, you know, the corrections, where we keep good statistics but everybody that's looked at it, they say there's about 65 to 70 million Americans with a criminal record, 65 to 70 million. We know there's 2.5 million people incarcerated in America today.

So let's round it up to a large number and say five million people are currently living a criminal lifestyle in America. That still means there's 60 million people in America, nearly one in four American adults that have a criminal record that have moved away from a life of crime.

And how do we treat those people? Do we treat them like the asset and the experience that could be poured back into being the solution for America or do we continue to hold them back for the rest of their life? It's the latter.

I'll tell you a story about – in Michigan, a guy that I'm involved in the recovery group with was arrested for breaking and entering in 1968, went to work for the state of Michigan in 1973, worked his way up all the way to a deputy director position in one of our departments and been working from 1973 to 2013 when the director of another department tried to hire him and switch over there. They called and canceled the interview because they found out he had a felony record. He'd been working for the state of Michigan for 40 years – four zero years – for something he had done 45 years ago and paid back society.

Rather than seeing that person as an asset for people that are currently struggling in that work space, whether it be Ford Motor Company or Dow Chemical or anywhere else, in America, we say, for the rest of your life, you are toxic, when the truth is, those 60 million people are our greatest asset.

In the alcoholic community, who's the answer? It's the alcoholic who has found a way to recovery that we depend on to show the path to people that are still struggling. Somehow, we have it backward in America. We don't see the person that has paid back society as the answer to anything.

And what we do is we – in hurting them, we hurt ourselves, and we say, we'll raise your kids for you. We don't want you involved. What does that do? It leads to divorce. It leads to dependence on federal and state benefits and other things.

And so it's a massive cultural issue, if that's OK to say here, you know, Eric, that beyond what else we talk about that we need the leadership, the voice in America for people to snap out of it and say, for those of you – and there's people in this room – I'm not going to ask you to raise your hands, and in every congregation and in every business in America, to say, come out from where you've been hiding. We're going to recognize you as a value. Your experience is a value to this organization as opposed to it's a threat to this organization.

MR. TRULEAR: One of the things that we say to our congregation – this has a lot to do with stigma and shame. And our society stigmatizes individuals. And a congregation is no different. They may have people (or ?) citizens.

And so one of the things we tell them, if they're in the Christian tradition or even in the Hebrew tradition, if you can't deal with incarcerated people or people who are

formerly incarcerated, you're really in the wrong religion because there's incarceration in the Bible.

I had a student tell me, I can't deal with – I can't deal with prisoners. I said, well, then, give me your Bible. She handed me the Bible, said, what are you going to do? I said, I'm going to tear stuff out. I'll take out the Book of Genesis because Joseph was an inmate; we're going to take out the Book of Jeremiah because he was in solitary confinement; we're going to take out the Book of Daniel because he was indicted twice and – (inaudible) – go on death row. We're going to take out the Book of Revelation because John wrote that when he was locked up. We're going to take out the Book of First and Second Peter because Peter went to jail. The church prayed for him all night long, but when he got early release and came back, they wouldn't let him back in. So things really haven't changed. We're going to take out all the epistles of Paul because Paul was incarcerated, and then don't go around telling people you can do all things that – (inaudible) – because he wrote that while he was locked up. And even Jesus was crucified while he was in custody.

So if you can't deal with inmates, then you really should shut down the church because the heroes of our faith reflect that same kind of value with the same kind of history. And if one person objected – those are all good people – said, well, I did read about this one guy who was walking down the street, saw his friend being beaten up by his boss, he killed his boss. Would you lock that guy up? He said, yes. Well, you just locked up Moses.

MS. MCDONALD: I think that you're exactly right. And what our experience has been is that we see people as an asset. They're an untapped resource for America. And, believe me, people want to work. They don't want to go back to prison. They want to be fathers to their children. Their children need them if we're going to ever break this generational cycle of poverty and incarceration.

By people being with us for an entire year and building their resumes and employers knowing our people, and, in addition to that, seeing them on the street in blue uniform cleaning the street 365 days a year, people have a different view of them. I think if we've had any accomplishment, it's that. People don't – who used to be – people like on the Upper East Side used to be scared of our people. Now they depend on them to clean their streets, to show them directions.

And people often say to us, wow, you train them so well, they're all so nice. We don't do any of that. Human beings are nice. And if you teach them and treat them with dignity and respect – our residences are beautiful – they will respond in kind. And we've never in 25 years ever had an incident on the street. Quite the opposite. And that's because people, in their hearts, are all human beings and want to do good.

MR. COCHLING: Great. One more question before we turn it over to the audience questions. There's a lot that's been tried in prisoner reentry, both, you know, well intended but sometimes misguided, right, or things that haven't worked. Can you

talk to us about what you've tried in your experience or you've seen that looked like a great idea but just fell flat?

MS. MCDONALD: Yes. So my husband and I built this program from our kitchen table with nothing basically, except 70 people – homeless people we picked up off the floor of Grand Central terminal. And we believed them when they said they wanted to go to work. And, at that time, everyone said they were too lazy or crazy.

They aren't. Were they all drug addicts? Absolutely. Did they give up drugs in favor of employment and a good place to live and motivation and hope for the future? Yes.

But we built this from just our minds basically. And the first thing we realized really at the beginning was we used to pay people on Friday. Very bad idea. Very bad idea. So we started paying people on Wednesday. Good idea. People knew they needed to show up the next day for work. They knew that they had to be sober. And they were. And there have been a series of those things that we continually experiment.

One of our earliest supporters was Toyota Motor Company. And they taught us about constant improvement because that was in many ways the foundation of their business. And outcomes, keeping hard data, which we have done from the beginning because there are – I mean, there's a million guys I've cared deeply about. There's a million great stories, particularly with young people, all of whom are coming out of foster care or prison by the time they're 18. You can't kid yourself. You have to collect outcome data and then you have to analyze it. So I would say those are the keys to what we do and why we've been able to grow so much.

MR. COCHLING: Thank you.

MR. DEROCHE: From a public policy standpoint, the experiments that we've seen fail are forgiveness, a more liberal approach of we're done with each other here because what the person does, we believe that devalues the dignity of a person, too. That's why we talk about proportion. I was able to grow spiritually, emotionally, mentally, physically, you know, in my addiction because I was held accountable for what I did wrong.

And I believe – I'm seeing a head nod from somebody else that you dignify a person when they do something that they know is wrong by treating them justly and proportionately to what they did. So forgiveness devalues them and it sets them up to fail. Disproportionate punishment does the exact thing.

So what we see is – one last thing when you mix that in is that if you look for a replacement solution for somebody that comes up short – see, I had a good job. I was the speaker of the House in Michigan. I had a family. I had a college degree. You know, to say what somebody needs is a college degree or what they need is a job, they do. It's a big part of the equation. But blessed are the peacemakers for they'll be called the children

of God. That's the piece inside of us that we need to make sure that that person is becoming whole. So if you don't help that person make the changes that we're talking about inside of themselves with the value system, then the solution is going to come up short as well.

So accountability in treating the person as a human being so they can find the solution to be more at peace in the environment of work and relationships, those are what we learn. Absent those, you get failures.

MR. COCHLING: Excellent.

Robert?

Q: I have a question.

MR. COCHLING: Yes, please. It is time for Q&A so go right ahead.

Q: So in all these programs, I think there's a certain amount of aspects of people selecting into that by virtue of making a choice for themselves to join the program, to get sober, to face God. But is there any possibility or hope for programs that are more mandatory for people coming out of prison where we say to them, you need to go to this program. And I know this is bringing back some of the aspects of the criminal justice system that are a bit problematic. And if you don't, there will be consequences.

MR. TRULEAR: Programs don't work. People do. So the effectiveness of any program is going to depend on who's staffing it. You can have the best program in the world on paper and if you've got terrible staff, it's not going to work. You can have a lousy program but if you've got the right people in place, it's going to work. It's the right staff, not the right stuff. So even if the program is mandatory and you have the right people staffing it, it can work. If you have a program and someone self-selects into it and the people running it don't have their heart – it's not going to work. The first question that a returning citizen asks is not, can you help me. It's can I trust you?

MR. DEROCHÉ: The public policy that works to that is swift and sure sanctions, a consistent even-hand of accountability, and swift and sure. That's what it means. So if somebody is on probation or parole and they get drunk that night, they might get three days in prison. You know, that three years isn't going to fix the problem. It's going to push further away from reentry to society, but a swift and a sure accountability that's in proportion to what they did will force the issue to a head. That's why drug courts have much higher sobriety and success levels than incarceration for long periods of time is because they continuously increase the proportion of accountability, but they don't give up on the person.

So if you apply that – has anybody seen “Ant Man” here yet? Nobody? Well, then I can't make the joke. I was going to back up what Harold just said. But I'll pass. Thanks, Eric.

MS. MCDONALD: Actually, we are a program that don't choose who comes. Our residential facilities are fed by either the criminal justice system or the homeless system. And we have no choice about who comes in the front door. We've got to take them.

And it works great. I mean, it really does because, first of all, I know some of us know that inside everyone is a human being, and if you can inspire them and give them hope and they're part of a culture in which everybody is moving forward together, they will succeed. Not everybody but a significant number. So I know what it is not to be able to control your front door and it has not damaged us.

Plus we believe in a carrot and a stick. If the carrot is earning a living and improving your lives and seeing your children, and then you're going to get a private job and support yourself in your own housing, that's hope. The stick can be parole, where people are threatened to go – you know, could be – go back to prison if they don't do the right thing. And it could, in our case, also be the loss of income. If somebody messes up or test dirty, obviously, we don't put them out on the streets to clean New York City. And they feel that. If a parolee – and we have a huge number – doesn't live up to the program, they're in danger. And, you know, the carrot and the stick works in life. And it's no different for our people. So thank you.

MR. COCHLING: Very good. Let's see. Yes, ma'am.

Q: OK. Harriet.

MS. MCDONALD: Yes.

Q: As a former employer, I one time had someone apply who was a felon. I was considering employing him. And my manager is like, oh, we can't do that, all the suspicions. So one of the things I'm wondering is are the former – your graduates, are they better off working with other people from a program like yours or are they better off in an employment situation where everyone else, you know, has never gone to jail?

MS. MCDONALD: Well, 70 percent of staff are graduates, and that's enormously helpful in the process of healing and learning from success. I believe that the private sector is where people need to go – in regular, mainstream jobs because they can move up, because there is hope for a better career. And they do. I mean, it took us a while to develop 450 employer partners, but they're there because our guys do a great job. And that's how you enter the mainstream. So I'm totally for entering the real mainstream of America.

MR. KELLEY: Amen. I'd like to follow up on that too because I think if we don't engage the private sector, if we don't start getting people in there and finally reach that tipping point of getting everybody to see that, hey, these guys are human beings in need of a chance. Aren't we all in need of a chance? And they are no different. And so I think

when the guys get in the door and show their worth and show that they bring value to a company – you know, that’s what I talk to the guys about on the inside is preparing their response to that question, I see you had a felony, is I can provide value to your company. I can help you. Please don’t look at my past. I will help you today. And once we can do that, you know, the employers start seeing, hey, there is value coming out of prisons.

MR. COCHLING: OK. Anyone else? Let’s see. In the back here. There. Right there. Yeah.

Q: (Off mic) – first, I want to know if you – (off mic.) – the role that – can you speak to the role and if you’ve experienced PTSD associated with long-term incarceration – (off mic.) – the barriers that that can cause to somebody’s recovery and reentry and how your organizations deal with that.

And, secondly – and this might be specific to Ms. McDonald and Mr. Kelley, do your programs at all target female inmates? And do you know of any other programs, if not, that are specifically geared toward female inmates?

MR. TRUELAR: I can speak to the trauma question. And thank you for raising female inmates because we’ve very, very testosteroneish (sp) around here this morning, like women don’t go to jail. And every population, by the way, in the federal and state prison system is going down right now except for white women. White women continue to go up so that’s – I’m glad you brought that up, but I’ll let them answer the question.

One of the things that we do when we do our training with the congregations is we include a unit on trauma because it’s not only a matter of being traumatized while a person is in prison, but for people who are coming home there is the trauma of reentry. When Brian talked about the change in the world in that 22-year period, you experienced some stuff that no program could help you with.

It was just, you know, whether it was cell phones or – there’s a gentleman here in Washington named Roach Brown. He does a reentry radio broadcast and he talks about coming home and going to the bathroom at Union Station. And when he stood up from the commode, it flushed, because he wanted to know who snuck in the stall. And then, when he calmed down, he went to wash his hands and the water came on by itself. And he just ran out the station.

There’s so much change involved that one of the things we’re trying to get the congregations to do is to be sensitive to the trauma and to not re-traumatize. So we use material from Dr. Sandy Bloom at Drexel University, “The Sanctuary Model,” which helps – helping organizations not to re-traumatize people who have been through trauma. So dealing with trauma is a part of our training both with respect to the trauma of incarceration and the trauma associated with reentry.

MR. DEROCHE: Just real quick to the constructive culture in the prison. This is one of America’s greatest failings. I mean, and I’m going to pick on somebody right now.

Mike Huckabee has been in the news, you know, to perpetuate this culture. In the book that he just wrote, it says – one of the chapters is titled “Bend Over and Take It like a Prisoner.” This is from a Baptist preacher in a best-selling book. And that means prison rape for those of you who don’t know what that means. When we send people into an environment to pay back the damage that they did in our community, we should expose them to the way that we want them to live.

MS. MCDONALD: That’s right.

MR. TRULEAR: That’s right.

MR. DEROCHE: And we should have no – I mean, that’s like making fun of, I’m going to send you to a government hospital where everybody gets infected and dies. Is that really what you want of your government, you know, with all the investments that we make in these? Our public safety is riding on this. The future of whether or not you have more victims of these crimes is riding on it. And so I think that we really need to take a strong stand.

And I’m sorry that we haven’t addressed the women’s part of this question, but the first part flared me up, as you can see, that we’ve got to talk about what people get exposed to. When you say PTSD, that’s what it is, right? And that should not be there. People in the corrections system are not the victims of crimes. They’re people hired by the government to create an environment where the person moves away from a life of crime so they should be treating people in a way that they do not suffer PTSD – very simple.

MS. MCDONALD: I’d like to answer the women question. As you can imagine, as a woman, when we started doing this, I had real interest in serving homeless women. However, the largest population who the least people cared about were homeless men.

You can’t be an expert on everything. And it takes a real long time to be an expert on anything. And so, over the years, we’ve served men. And I don’t honestly think that I could do a good job serving women because I know as a woman, we have very different issues. We have children. We have to raise them no matter what. We’ve been traumatized in very different ways.

So we made a decision in the beginning, because of the need to serve men, I’m sorry that I haven’t had time, you know, and we as an organization have not done it.

MR. COCHLING: Yeah. One quick question.

Q: I think for Bryan and perhaps Craig because you spoke eloquently. Is this working? OK. You spoke eloquently about the problems of entrepreneurship and getting jobs – anybody, actually.

And I sat on plenty of cases as a judge where the employer was sued for making the mistake in hiring the ex-felon and would face damages because they screwed up and they were equally culpable for whatever wrong the ex-felon had done. And there are plenty of those cases out there.

Is there any movement afoot in the country that any of you know about to create immunity for employers who hire ex-felons? Has that been thought about? Have anybody in the Justice Fellowship or, Bryan, in what you're doing in Texas thought through? We should do some sort of an immunity program so that – you know, they're facing between a rock and a hard place as private employers. How do you deal with that?

MR. DEROCHE: The most prominent example of this is in Ohio. Governor Kasich passed a very progressive law for this exact reason. It's been introduced in a number of states I believe passed. Crunt Rendi (ph), one of our most distinguished guests in the audience, with the Koch Industries after this panel would have more answers.

But to the justice's question, that is one of the most important linkages here. When we had a problem with sexual harassment in our workplace that started as a tort in the early '90s. We didn't say, let's stop hiring men in the workplace. We found a way to work with the employers so they could deal with this in a professional way in that the victims of those situations would get recourse.

And I believe, to the justice's question, the same thing is available in the American jurisprudence system, but nobody's created the scheme yet. So that would be a great thing for us to work together to create that scheme so when and if there are failings, because there are failings in the sexual harassment area of law every day in America, but the employers feel comfortable allowing men and women to work together because they believe that it can work its way out through the system of accountability in that they will not be held disproportionately responsible as the employer so they feel comfortable in that environment. We've not done that for employers in America yet in this space.

MR. COCHLING: If I can, I'll take the last word because we're up against a hard deadline. But, in Georgia, we do have a certification program that limits liability for employers, and that's relatively new. Director Neal will talk about that in the next panel. That brings us to the next panel.

We're going to take just a few minutes because we're running behind. If you'll like three minutes, refresh your coffee, run to the restroom, we would appreciate it. Come back for the next panel. If you'll help me in thanking our panelists. Great job, guys. (Applause.)

ROBERT DOAR: I think we'll gather, start gathering again. This is good – that was good. This is going to be a – or that was or is a hard act to follow. That was a really outstanding panel to start our discussion of reentry and recidivism.

I am Robert Doar. I'm the Morgridge fellow in poverty studies here at AEI. And this session today is part of a long series of sessions that we've had over the last year and a half tackling some of these issues concerning low-income Americans. And it's taken us a while to get to this very important one. And I'm very grateful and glad that we did.

And it wouldn't have happened if it weren't for the help of some of the people who work here at AEI, most prominently of those is Brad – (audio break) – who is sitting very humbly, right there in the middle, but he is the one who put all this together. And thank you, Brad, for doing that.

So we're glad that you've – the other thing is, as you may have noticed, we've set this up in kind of a very purposeful way. We started with the not-for-profit community and the faith-based community and the advocacy community. And you might have heard some things they said about government. And some of those things are kind of common here at AEI. We often talk about the inadequacies of government. But for someone who has worked in government and human services, I know that government is important and solutions that come from government can make real differences and we can make improvements.

And to help us look at the government side of this issue, we have three very distinguished panelists. And I'm going to introduce them very briefly. Their bios are in the paperwork that you have. But they come from different perspectives.

So we have Gary Mohr from the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. He has worked for Governor Kasich since January 2011 and has more than 40 years' experience as a corrections professional and a national reputation for innovative and efficient prison management. So, Gary, we're very glad that you're here with us representing that community and the reforms that can happen there.

Next to Gary is Jay Neal, who is the executive director of the Governor's Office of Transition, Support and Reentry for Governor Deal in Georgia. He previously served in the Georgia House of Representatives from 2004 to 2013. He comes from the perspective of the governor's office, looking at the bigger picture.

And then from law enforcement, we have a former colleague of mine, Chauncey Parker, who serves as the special policy advisor in the Manhattan District Attorney's Office. He's also the director of the New York-New Jersey High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, a federally funded program that invests in federal, state and local law enforcement partnerships designed to build safe and healthy communities. Chauncey has been in the Manhattan District Attorney's Office, the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District, and then when I got to know him he was the director of criminal justice for Governor Pataki in New York State.

So, again, we have three very distinguished panelists coming at this from the government perspective, from three different perspectives. And we're going to start off with Gary, then go to Jay, and then have Chauncey. Gary, take it away.

GARY MOHR: Thank you, Robert. It is an honor to be here. And I will just say that the first panel described government pretty accurately in many regards. You know, I retired from our Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections in 2002 and was doing consulting and traveling the country and living very selfishly a great life with my wife. And, in December, 2010, after I said no to this position three times by the Transition Committee on December 27th of 2010, I met John Kasich. And, at that point, a 15-minute meeting to talk about what he was being advised to do with the criminal justice system, that 15 minutes turned into a three-hour discussion, some cases in argument, certainly a debate. And, at the end of the three hours, he called my wife in and he said, Linda, he said, I want Gary in this position and we're going to do it his way. I didn't know what my way was which was the issue there, but we'll talk a little bit about that. (Laughter.)

Folks, I know this is about rehabilitation but – you know, folks, we have to start at the beginning. We are over incarcerating too many Americans that are mentally ill, drug addicted, nonviolent people. And the problem with recidivism and with reentry starts with the number of people that are coming into our system. And I just happened to select six countries. I can pick 237 countries that I have in a file and talk about per capita incarceration in the world. And you know who is number one – the United States of America. And here's an example of just six countries as we take a look at prisoners incarcerated in our prisons in the world.

And let me just say this, and it was mentioned earlier. A six-month sentence can and is often a life sentence when it comes to an individual that has worked hard to turn his life around or her life around – and I will talk about women here in a minute – and they can't get a job because of this.

I started my profession in this business as a teacher's aide. I worked my way through Ohio State to become a teacher. And I started July 1st, 1974, and you can see that was a kind of pivotal time in our country. And you look at the stable population from 1920 to almost 1980 in our country in our prison population, and we see the huge spike of folks coming into our prison system – longer sentences.

And think about this in our legislature – from a state perspective. Every time – if you've witnessed a legislative session with criminal justice pieces of a proposed legislation coming in, it's almost always now a new law, a harsher penalty or a mandatory sentence. When is the last time you've sat in your legislature and listened to a criminal justice piece of legislation that hasn't been one of those three? And we see the continued piece of this.

We see truth in sentencing. It always fascinates me to talk about truth in sentencing. I think prisons and criminal justice is the only kind of human resource activity where in some cases it doesn't make a bit of difference of how someone behaves in terms of their outcome. A person's going home the same day a judge three or four years before said they're going to go home as long as they don't commit another felony

in our system. I think that's wrong. I think people have worked hard and there are evidence-based programs, and I think there should be some separation there.

Now, I want to talk just briefly before we get into the – to what I think is the hopeful side of this. Just during my career, folks – this is just during my career. I don't think I'm that old. My wife may debate that, but I don't think I'm that old. But look at just the numbers here.

When I started, the day I started working in our prison system, there were 8,300 people in Ohio's prisons. Now there's over 50,000 people, 50,400; seven prisons to 27 prisons in the state of Ohio during my career in the system. If we look – we'll start talking about the women in Ohio. The day I started in prison – the day I started in our prison work, there were 291 women incarcerated in the entire state of Ohio. Today, we have over 4,200 women incarcerated in the state of Ohio. And if you look at the rate of incarceration, it went from 5.3 women out of every 100,000 in 1974 to 68.1 – prolific growth. Twenty thousand folks are coming to our prison and leaving our prison every year.

And, from the economic standpoint, think about this: the day I started in prison, July 1st, 1974, 5.2 percent of all Ohio state employees were working in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections. Today, it's over 25 percent of all state employees work for me.

Other facts: we've had in the last three years – we think we're getting better. In the last three years, we've had an 8.1-percent increase in the mentally ill coming into our prison system. We have 10,596 inmates in this system in Ohio that have a designation of being mentally ill – the largest mental health provider by far in Ohio. Twenty-five point four, an interesting number, folks, and this gets at the first issue of over-incarceration.

As I look at the people coming to prison in Ohio, 25.4 percent or over 5,000 a year come to prison in Ohio that have never been arrested, have never been indicted, have never been convicted of a violent offense, ever, in their life, not just currently but in an entire life.

We take a look at the numbers, there are some promising things. Ten point four percent, you see there – if we look at the three-year success rate after someone is released from prison, 10.4 percent of the people that have gone through our therapeutic drug communities in Ohio – we started with two in 2011; at the end of this budget, we'll have eight. Ten point four percent return; 90 percent of people who have gone through a residential drug treatment program in prisons don't come back. Our state average is 27.5, and, as has been stated earlier, the national average is 49.7, about as close to 50 percent as you can get.

You know, I have professed time and time again publicly that I will never build another prison. If you think about the economic impact to build one prison in Ohio and, quite frankly, one prison in any state in the country and operate it for two decades, it will

cost the taxpayers \$1 billion. And relate that to the kind of people that are coming into prison, the nonviolent folks who are coming into prison.

So you ask why. That's why you've got 4:26 up there. At 4:26 a.m. in the morning – we've not even talking about the national news – but at 4:26 a.m. in the morning, local news comes on in Columbus, Ohio, and it's on all morning. And there's a lot of yellow tape on that film in the morning to keep things going, let alone the CNNs and the national, but 4:26 a.m. in the morning local news filled with crime information – (audio break). And yet, Ohio, according to the FBI crime index has the lowest rate of violent crimes since 1969.

Now, if you were to take all the data that I have just projected to you in the last five minutes and put that into any think tank or any academic setting, they would totally reject those findings. And, folks, I know this is about reducing recidivism and things but we have to talk about – we have to talk about that.

Now, what are doing? Reintegration units, so it's interesting to talk about this. Why don't we create prison environments where we expect and we reflect the community inside our prisons? That's what we started doing in 2011. We've created reintegration units inside our prisons. And what we say is we want folks to work eight to 10 hours a day productively. And, in my 41 years, most of that has never happened. Eight to 10 hours a day, we're wrapping it around 11 pathways, from education to vocational to faith-based, to families to victims – 11 of these pathways, 11 curriculums. Community service has to be part of it. And we expect people to behave the way they do are going to in the street, and that includes having them physically and emotionally pro-socially active for eight to 10 hours a day. Why don't we do that? It's not brain surgery in our system. Why don't we do that?

Medicaid expansion has been controversial. In fact, Governor Kasich was almost by himself as we did that and we actually got Medicaid expansion put in Ohio in a pretty unconventional way. But what a value that has been. You know, if you think about this, in 41 years – most of my 41 years, we thought about program completion is what an inmate gets done while they're in prison. That is absurd. Think about our recovery services journey. It's a lifelong journey.

Why are we thinking about completing things? We should be developing programs in prison that's then supported by Medicaid expansion and an expansion of services where people can have lifelong treatment in a way that is consistent with the outstanding program, quite frankly, that's going on in prisons. And that's what's happening in Ohio.

The budget, as we've addressed this; addressing addiction – we now will have a partnership with mental health and addiction services to increase treatment providers in our prisons by 50 percent. We're going to double the number of people that we can treat inside our prisons. And you know what? Because we're able to do that, we're going to start immediately – we're not going to let them languish in reception for three or four

months and then send them to a prison, and then they can't get treatment because they're too short of time. We get them started now because we will also have six contracts regionally around Ohio that will accept – will be able to take the electronic health records from where they've been treated in prison, take them exactly from where they are and continue that treatment both in the mental illness standpoint as well as the drug treatment standpoint.

And, folks, instead of building another prison, let's invest in the communities. In the recently passed budget, we've actually increased spending to the communities for community diversion programs that we know work, that we have seen work, by \$58 million over the next two years, new money in Ohio instead of putting money into prisons and handling people, sending people to prison for a lifelong sentence because of this mindset that many folks have.

And I did mention phone records, which may not seem like much to folks, but we recently – I was in a meeting with the governor and a number of religious folks, and one of the pastors had a son in prison, and he was excited about what we were doing. He says, how in the world can you charge those phones rates that you charge in Ohio? Fifteen-minute phone rate to mom and dad was \$5 to \$6 for fifteen minutes. The governor looks at me and says, what are you doing, Gary? And I said, well, this has been in existence for 20 years, governor. I said, we're paying teachers and those kind of things – he says, I'm going to support you, but get that phone rate down. And so many places around this country are making money off phone calls, which is exactly stopping the engagement with families. So we've reduced that phone rate from \$5 to \$6 to about 85 cents for a 15-minute call. No rate in charge.

And those are the pieces around – the 11 pathways that we talked about. We now have 12 of these centers all over Ohio and all over the prisons, bringing families in, family worship days, family days where kids are learning their homework and things from the families. And, quite frankly, I love this. I love being in these places. And I believe the softening of the hearts, and that's what we talked about in the earlier session, the softening of the hearts, if we can get public in to take a look at people engaged in these eight to 10 hours a day, it changes the mindset of incarceration.

And, finally, I'll just say this. We had a page and a half mission statement when we started. No one knew it. I traveled the state, asked 12,000 employees, and said, tell me our mission statement. No one could do it. It was a page and a half long. I didn't even know it. We changed our mission statement to simply say this: our mission in Ohio – the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction – watch what agencies call themselves. I think it says something. Rehabilitation and corrections, not just corrections – is to reduce recidivism among those we touch.

We'll run orderly systems, we'll put evidence-based programs, we'll think about reentry, we'll think about reentry coalitions that we have – critical. Treating the addition of these nonviolent people coming to prison is critical. We've got to continue to do that

and expand that. We have to think about transitioning people to the community. We have 72 of our 88 counties have reentry coalitions.

We have coalitions – sheriffs, prosecutors and judges doing welcoming home videos and sending them into the prisons saying, you’re coming back to our county, welcome home. Here are some numbers that – phone numbers that you may have.

And, as was stated earlier in the session – and this is the core of everything – people that we serve are human beings. And I believe there are too many people that don’t have that fundamental understanding and it’s the responsibility of people in this room to continue to take that message to people because that will be the tipping point of what makes change in this country. (Applause.)

JAY NEAL: Thank you all. Let me thank first AEI and the Center for Opportunity in Georgia for sponsoring and hosting this discussion. And I appreciate the way you started, by having the community here first. We’ve had the opportunity to work somewhat with Dean and we’re going to work with Dean in Georgia as we are developing Healing Communities of Georgia. We had an opportunity as we were looking at criminal justice reform to have Craig lobbying the legislature – lobbying me as a state representative, as a matter of fact, as we were looking at criminal justice reform back in 2011 and 2012.

I want to, first of all, share just a brief, very, very briefly about the way Governor Deal began his term in office. In the inaugural address in 2011, as Georgia was still very, very much in the thick of the recession and budgets were being cut and people were questioning government’s role – what is government’s role? – the first thing Governor Deal talked about in the inaugural address was the role of government. And he turned to the constitution.

Our state constitution provides that government is instituted for the protection, security and benefit of the people. And then he talked about the protection, security and benefit that governments provide. And he began by saying, keeping our citizens safe is one of the state’s primary responsibilities. The challenge is great. Presently, one out of every 13 Georgia residents is under some form of correctional control.

Director Mohr shared the statistic showing the incarceration rate in the United States. In Georgia, that’s not a misstatement. In Georgia, one out of 13 adults is under some form of correctional supervision. The national average is one in 31 so you might say that Georgia is one of the leading states in incarceration rates in the country that’s leading the world in incarceration rates. We had the 10th largest prison population and the fourth – the 10th largest population and the fourth largest prison population when Governor Deal came in office.

We had roughly 65,000 inmates that were under state sentence. Some of those were in county jails waiting on a bed, about 6,000 of those already sentenced and waiting on a bed. The state started paying a per diem of \$22 a day after – 15 days after the

sentencing packet was received and opened by corrections. It was snail mailed by corrections. When someone opened it after sitting on the desk for a little bit, then, 15 days after that, the state would start paying \$22 a day per diem. It would take 30 to 45 days on average before the county began to see any kind of per diem from the state.

When we started criminal justice reform in 2011, we were paying \$25 million a year in per diem to the county in spite of the fact that it was 30 to 45 days before the clock started ticking. This past year, with some things that happened in reform, one of the things we did was electronic sentencing packets. Now the sentencing packets, they're immediately, within 15 days after sentencing, the clock starts ticking. We've reduced from \$25 million a year to this year that we just closed out, we paid – (audio break) – dollars in reimbursements to county jails for per diems, \$25 million to \$6,000.

We've seen our prison population or those under sentence reduced from about 65,000 to about 53,000 or 54,000 in just four years. It's pretty remarkable some of the things that you've seen happen in the state of Georgia. Much like Ohio, we're incarcerating a lot of people that were nonviolent.

Governor Deal talks about how we incarcerate those nonviolent, those that are not criminally minded. We put them in prison with criminally minded people. They come out a few years later, now with a felony on the record, and they've been in this – housed in this environment with people who do have criminal mindsets and they come out worse than they are when they went in. People change when they go to prison. They do change. They don't come back the same person they went in. If we don't do anything, most of them are going to come back worse than they were when they went in.

So the key is, what are we going to do while they're there to make sure they come back better? And, even more importantly, what are we going to do to make sure that those prison beds are reserved for the people who truly need to be in prison and we're not incarcerating people who are not criminally-minded but they're behaving criminally as a result of addiction or mental illness. You get them in recovery, the criminal behavior goes away, right? So what are we going to do to get them in recovery and allow the criminal behavior to take care of itself by having them in recovery?

So in the state of Georgia, we've increased tremendously the presence of accountability courts and day reporting centers and other options for probation and parole to be able to provide graduated sanctions and treatment in the community to make sure that those prison beds are for those who truly need to be there.

And you can see that beginning to take place because four years ago we had about 58 percent of those who were incarcerated that were violent criminals. Now, that percentage rate is up to about 68 percent, which is getting closer to where it needs to be. I want to see that continue to increase. As we're learning more and more in Georgia how to separate out those who we're mad at and those who we're afraid of and save those hard prison beds for those that we're afraid of.

So when we're talking about criminal justice reform in the way Georgia – Governor Deal has led us in criminal justice reform, in the first year, we looked at sentencing reform for adult offenders. And I've shared with you a little bit of the success we've had as a result of that reform.

The second year we looked at juvenile. One of the things that we found when we began looking at the juveniles is that somewhere in the neighborhood of 60 percent of those who are – those juveniles who receive out-of-home placement are receiving out-of-home placement is based upon misdemeanors or status offenses. And, of course, you know what a status offense is. That means it wouldn't be illegal if they weren't a minor. Yet that's where a large percentage of our out-of-home placements were.

We've done some really innovative things, I believe, with some grant funding for the counties that are putting the greatest number of juveniles in out-of-home placement. If they would agree to reduce the number of commitments by 15 percent, we'll give them grant funds so that they can build out evidence-based programs in the community to provide services in the community for those juveniles, which is, as we all know, the best way to deal with those juveniles.

In the first year, the counties that received those grant funds, while we asked them to reduce the number of commitments by 15 percent, they actually reduced the number of commitments by 62 percent in the first year. And while we had many communities that did not have a single evidence-based program in the community for juveniles, now every judicial circuit in the state of Georgia has evidence-based community treatment programs for juveniles. So that's the second leg of reform.

The third leg of reform is the leg of reform that I am primarily responsible for and that's transition or reentry into the community, reducing recidivism for those who do go into the prison system. And Governor Deal made it very clear from the beginning that this is not an issue that can be resolved by government. This is a very complex issue that take a collaborative effort between government and community stakeholders if we're going to be successful in reducing recidivism and increasing the success of those who're coming out of the prison system.

So we're trying to divert those who don't need to be in prison to get the community-based services and support they need, to get in recovery, and avoid ever getting into the criminal justice system. And then, on the backend, we're making sure that we're providing better services for those who are coming out.

Governor Deal told me, when he offered me this position with the Governor's Office of Transition, Support, and Reentry that this is a community-driven program. We have, in the State of Georgia roughly 20,000 individuals a year who come out of the prison system. That's roughly 20,000 who are coming back to our communities every year.

The Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative, which we manage, is not about bringing more people home. It's just making sure that they're better prepared when they come home and that their communities are better prepared for them when they come home. One of the first things I did in the first month that I was in this position is I came to Ohio and spent some time in Ohio looking at some of the things that they're doing in community reentry – some very impressive work that's being done in Ohio. And I applaud Ohio for the work that they're doing there. Quite frankly, our goal is to do that and then some. We want to do the absolute best that we can for those individuals coming out of the prison system to make sure that they're able to successfully reintegrate back into the community.

So we began with a collaborative effort in developing out the Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative. And the way we started – and you mentioned coming from Human Services, and there's a wide background of representation here on this panel – the way we started is we got mid- and upper-level managers together from every department and agency and state government and we sat down and started talking about what do we do for those individuals coming out of the prison system, the barriers that they face to reentry, and what do we do to remove those barriers? What do we do to provide opportunities for them to be successful?

And there're many barriers that they face, as you know. And one of the things that happened repeatedly over the course of couple of days is someone from one of our departments or agencies would speak up in talking about a barrier and say, when we have someone facing this barrier, this is the service that we provide, this is what we do to try to help them overcome that barrier. And someone from one of our other departments or agencies would speak up and say, really? You do that? We have people all the time that we're working with who need that. We didn't know that was available.

I'm sure if you're aware of this, but government operates in silos sometimes. (Laughter.) You are – (laughs) – I guess you are aware of that. Quite frankly, corrections departments operate in silos, community supervision sometimes operates in silos, but certainly, when you're looking from department to department, there're a lot of silos. So we – the Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative was about coming out of the silos and collaborating together so that all of our departments and agencies with what they do in interventions with individuals coming out of the prison system, everything they do is consistent with the framework that's been developed that we're calling the Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative.

We utilize the TPC model by the NIC, the Reentry Policy Council report of 2003, and we developed 26 targets of change, with each of those targets of change having policy expectations and performance expectations. And we told our departments and agencies everything you do interacting with returning citizens, you need to make sure that it's being done under the umbrella of the Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative.

And then, we engaged the community because, quite frankly, as Governor Deal has said repeatedly, we can do everything that we can to rehabilitate, but it's ultimately

the faith community that brings redemption for these individuals coming out of the prison system. So we're engaging with the faith community. Within my – within my department, we have three divisions. We have an operations division, an evidence-based programming division, and we have a faith division. And we're working with Dean and some others to really build out the healing communities of Georgia. And we're on the beginning – just beginning this. We're just beginning to move forward with it. We're excited about where we believe we're going and the way the faith community is going to be able to make a real impact as we're moving forward with our Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative.

It is truly a collaborative effort. When we talk about Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative, we talk about one strategy and one plan. And the reality is, prior to this, we had so many different strategies and plans and agencies doing this and that. And we're bringing it together in one strategy and one plan. We've got a long ways to go, but we know this: There's not a silver bullet. It's a complex approach that takes a lot of agencies and stakeholders all working together with this one strategy if we're going to be successful. And that's the key to implementation and that's what we're trying to do in Georgia. (Applause.)

MR. DOAR: Thank you very much.

Chauncey. (Applause.)

CHAUNCEY PARKER: Well, it's great to be here. I want to thank Robert for inviting me. Robert is kind of one of my – well, we're friends and also he's kind of one of my heroes in public service. I think of him a little bit like Coach Taylor in "Friday Night Lights" who's also one of my heroes. (Laughter.) But the sort of the idea of clear eyes, full heart, can't lose, and his approach to government and public policy of this sort of agnostic, let's just get results done, and really that's the theme, I think, of all the speakers today.

So I'll tell you just my experience. I've been involved in criminal justice for 30 years and so the umbrella of what we talk about as prosecutors and police is the idea of safety, fairness, and justice, and so that's an aspirational goal of what we want to accomplish.

I think where we are right now in criminal justice, that the game changer, as Harry was saying, the idea of continuous improvement Six Sigma, the opportunity, if we really are committed to that, there's nothing I can think of that would be more meaningful than effective reentry strategies, and in fact, even more effective no-entry strategies in the first place.

So where I – what I'm sort of influenced by I guess most is that I – so I grew up in New York City and been involved in this for a long time, but I go back to 1994, when crime up until that point, we had about 2,200 murders a year in New York City. Crime was just absolute – New York was the ungovernable city. People, you know, sort of our

strategy to car theft was to put a sign in your car window that you didn't have a radio, but just in case people know you leave your car and walk, maybe even your windows down, just so they wouldn't have to break the window to break into your car. You put bars up. But really, the idea that crime is absolutely hopeless. It's out of control and there's nothing we can do.

And then, Bill Bratton became the police commissioner. And he brought, I think he's a high school dropout, but a guy named Jack Maple, who really changed the world of policing. He wore a Derby and if you ever sort of Google on the word – as a police officer – word Derby and bowtie and cream-colored suits, but he had this idea which influences me every day. But he basically came in and said, you know – and Bratton promoted him from wherever he was, I think a lieutenant, and brought him up to be the number two person, chief crime strategist in the NYPD. And this is 1994. And Maple said, you know, I think we're just doing this wrong. I think the basic principle of human behavior is what gets measured gets done. And we're measuring – and police we're measuring the wrong thing. We're measuring how many people get arrested. That's if you're precinct commander, that's your measure because what else are you supposed to do. The sort of the paradigm is crime's out of control, so the only thing you can do is how effectively do you respond to the 911 call.

Maple said, no, that's wrong. What we really should be measuring is crime reduction. That's the reason why we're in the public safety business in the first place. And that should be the goal is to reduce crime. People thought he was crazy in lots of ways. They thought he was crazy in particular with this idea. But he said, no, really the principles of successful business management in crime fighting is what's your goal, and the goal is to reduce crime. How are you going to – how would you measure success? Measure it by reported crime. So we have reported crime as our measure. Third, what's your plan? So how are you going to reduce crime? And then, fourth, how is it going?

So those four simple principles that he basically wrote on a napkin at a – that became the crime – called CompStat in New York City really changed the world. So in New York City, based on that strategy, he then – our murder rate has gone from 2,200 murders a year to last year we had 330 murders. All other crime categories have been reduced 80 or 90 percent. There's CompStat I think in every policy department in America. And I think there's CompState in police departments all over the world.

But that principle of what is your goal, to me is how you break down these silos, how you actually make government effective is that we don't take the time to sort of say what exactly is our goal? Why are we doing what we're doing? And how would you measure success against that goal because those measures can sometimes be very elusive, and then open up the sort of the power of imagination for what are you going to – your strategies, for how you're going to do it. So in policing, I think that strategy changed it.

Then, I went to work for Cy Vance, who's another one of these great – great imagination. He said so, when he came in, in 2010, as prosecutors, we're a little bit like police before Maple. You sort of respond to the radio run. Somebody gets arrested –

somebody calls 911, the police respond. Same thing as prosecutors is that we would – somebody gets arrested. They bring the case to us. We prosecute or don't prosecute. Somebody else gets arrested. We had no idea of really – that was sort of the goal is to effectively prosecute those cases.

But what Cy Vance did, he said, no, let's think exactly the same way that Maple had set up this goal. Let's set the goal up for our office. What we want to do is everything humanly possible to reduce crime in Manhattan. And that's the goal – to reduce crime. And it starts to – we'll sort of call intelligence driven prosecution, but it starts to get you out of the respond to the 911 business of a prosecutor's office and instead look at the map and say what can we do, everything we can possibly do to reduce crime.

So what's the kind of thing that happens when you start to think that way as a prosecutor? You start to see what we all know, but even though we get 100,000 arrests every year in Manhattan, really a handful of people in every community who are driving the violence, there may be 50 people in a gang, but there's really three or four that are really the ones that are the greatest threat to public safety, and the other ones really aren't. They're part of the group. But the key is to figure out who are the people, for us, from a violence perspective is who's actually driving the violence and then use the powers of being a prosecutor to incapacitate violent people.

So that's part of what we did. But then, where this leads to our conversation today is if you're really committed to public safety, then you'd say, well, what else could you do to reduce crime? You could also see, for example, what we saw is that most – a lot of our violence was young people on Saturday night, sort of like Jets and Sharks, one housing development against another. And I think it's no different in New York City than other cities. But it's really – but it's Saturday night and we saw – so that's when the crime is and it's young people getting involved in crime. But also, every gym in the Washington Heights, Harlem, and the Lower East Side of New York is closed on Saturday night.

So it's probably not a good lining up of strategies. So we use money that we – criminal asset forfeiture to open gyms. And so that becomes – that's a crime-fighting strategy, opening a gym on a Saturday night. So then it leads to this question I think when we think about prisoner reentry, you know, and I've been involved in it for a while, people were talking – this is years ago, maybe not – I don't think so much now – people were talking about prisoner reentry as if somehow, if you're talking about what to do with, you know, effectively reduce recidivism, somehow you're soft on crime. I don't know if people still use that term, but there was a term people used, "soft on crime." I think you're soft on crime if you're thinking about effective reentry strategies.

If nothing else, from a pure public safety strategy, in New York State – so crime is down dramatically, our prison population is down actually from 70,000 to 50,000, still 10 times more than it was in 1970. But in New York State, every year 20,000 people leave prison. I think to be soft on crime would be to have no plan for what to do to make sure – doing everything if just for pure public safety selfless purposes, do everything

humanly possible to make sure that those guys are on a path to a productive, safe, fruitful life if you're really serious about fighting crime. So that's a key part of what drives us.

Now, what can a DA's office do when it comes to prisoner reentry? There's really three things where I think that we – where you really – it has to be a holistic approach. I think the most important thing you could do is do everything you could to do prevention way, way, way downstream, like a Saturday night – what we Saturday Lights model after “Friday Night Lights.” But Saturday Night Lights, open gyms on Saturday night, but do anything humanly possible that you can to make sure that there's opportunity, there's pathway in the most challenged neighborhoods for kids never to get involved in the criminal justice in the first place.

Second would be to do everything possible when someone does intersect with the criminal justice system, be much more careful about who we put into jail in the first place – figure out the best alternatives for incarceration with evidence-based practices of what's the most effective strategies. And then, third, is to work with people who are coming out of prison to figure out we're making those connections and the strategies that we're working on to make sure that we make those connections to have those guys be as successful as possible.

But I think where we are is a crossroads in criminal justice and I think everybody agrees now that prisoner reentry is so important. Everybody agrees that is – whatever word you describe it, but the fact that America leads the world in incarceration is not something to be proud of and it's not something like poverty, and people should scratch their head and say, oh, I wonder how that happened. It's a horrible – it's something that we all have to come together and make that right and lead the world on other things. But I think that where we are now is – where our strategy is, is we've shown how effectively I think we can reduce crime. And it's reduced beyond people wildest imaginations in city after city, in community after community. But we haven't done so well in what we're doing in terms of our prison population.

And I think that this – that what we should be working on is kind of like the “Moneyball,” if anybody ever – the way “Moneyball,” is this – the book by Michael Lewis, but this baseball general manager who has this idea, he wants to win as many games as possible. Everybody wants to win as many games as possible, but my Yankees, for example, they don't mind how much money they spend as long as they win as many games as possible. But this guy says, you know, I want to win as many games as possible and spend as little money as possible, and the only way I'm going to do that with the Oakland A's is I'm going to have to use data. I'm going to be smart. I'm going to have to make good investments. But that really is what we need in criminal justice. We need to reduce crime as much as possible because that's what our, I think, our number one goal is for our communities, to be as safe as possible, but not use one more day of jail than necessary to get there.

And I think that that's where we're heading. It's to look almost like, I think it's Pekar (ph) who talked about the proportionality of our punishment. But we should be –

I have a vision that almost you'd be able to go to Rikers Island or state prison, whatever it is that we have, anybody who's in jail, someone should be able to come and audit our system and say, oh, Chauncey Parker is in Rikers Island for five days. What's the public safety value of that? Somebody is in state prison for five years as opposed to 10 years, what's the public safety value of that? There may well be the public safety, but we should really be – have the most sensitive hand on the dial and never use a day of jail any more than we need to.

Sometimes we need to do it for the rest of somebody's life. But far more often we don't need jail at all. We can be much more effective in our strategies or we need far less than what we're using. And those two things at the same time, that "Moneyball" approach to criminal justice of reducing crime, reducing jail, both at the same time, is where we're poised to go with our next steps.

MR. DOAR: Thank you very much. (Applause.) Those were very, very good presentations. And as I said, I think I'll open up with a couple of questions that come from the human services world with regard to recidivism and take off a little bit on Gary's comment about an important human service, which is public health insurance, and you mentioned Medicaid. And of course, for some conservatives, the idea of attaching people to public benefits that may allow them to afford their medications or health care, when they come out of prison causes some anxiety.

And I wondered could you talk a little bit more about your belief in what kinds of public benefits should or should not be available to people leaving the correction system and whether the correction system should be involved in helping make that attachment prior to their release.

MR. MOHR: Well, let me take off on what Chauncey said. This is a public safety issue. I mean, it clearly is. And it is a partnership. And we're in partnership with Medicaid and mental health. And I do think it's our business because our mission is reduced recidivism and reduced crime victims. So I believe that if we can take those people that – folks, we sometimes forget how difficult it is, I think, to reenter society. How many things are going on in somebody's mind the day they leave?

So the goal here is transition – to take people in prison that have been used to evidence based programs, mental health, drug programs that are working, to have Medicaid come in, case plan those people that are seriously addicted, seriously mentally ill before they leave; come in, meet with them, set up appointments before they leave. Do you realize how long it takes for someone to get an appointment with a psychiatrist? So we may leave someone with 14 days or 30 days of medication. Can they get in to see a psychiatrist to renew that script within that time? Probably not. But if we can case plan that with Medicaid coming into our prisons, linking them, saying, hey, hello, this is who I am. You're going to Cincinnati, Ohio, this is your service provider. We will be there. Your first appointment is next Wednesday. Here's the address. And we're going – and we've gotten your medical records because you have electronic health records now that

you've signed the waiver for. We know exactly what's going on. That is a public safety issue.

One, I do believe people can change and I believe it's a calling. I believe it's a calling of ours to help people change. I think that's our true measure. But bottom line, it is a public safety issue and some of the folks that have been the most difficult folks to manage inside prison have been mentally ill. I've seen almost miraculous results in the community when they've been handed off in a very systemic way to a community provider that's picking them up, that's finding housing for them. It is a public – and it is working. And I believe it's every bit of our business to be part of it.

MR. DOAR: And Gary, can I just push you a little bit on that? In the – you're a national leader in corrections or rehabilitation. Is that attitude common among leaders of state prison facilities?

MR. MOHR: Well, let me just say this. Here's the flaw. The average tenure of a state prison director is 2.8 years. And in fact, there's been 22 new prison – state prison directors in the last 12 months. So people are – it's very difficult to set a mission and then, as these – as both my colleagues have said, to make sure the litmus test of everything you do is aligned to that mission so staff don't say it's a new flavor of the month because your tenure is so short. So I think that's a serious flaw.

But I will tell you this, we meet as directors about four times a year, and I see – I'm seeing a growth. I saw a meeting in Washington three years ago where we turned the corner as state directors to say our job is not incapacitation, it's really to help people reenter successfully and to reduce recidivism. And that's why you see recidivism in almost every discussion of state corrections directors today.

MR. DOAR: Either of you guys wants to pipe in on this particular issue?

MR. PARKER: I mean, I think that the bottom line is that we should be doing everything we can to prepare – what are we doing with the time that people are in prison? If they're going to be in prison for whatever that time is, but to make sure that they have the benefits, they have the preparation. It's just commonsense. What would be the alternative, as difficult as that path is going to be, what would be the alternative? And I think that we miss an opportunity. I almost feel like our prison system should have CompStat, maybe some do, but almost like measure the – like what's the recidivism rate like the way what's the recidivism rate for a particular prison if the – how many people come back and for what, because there's a difference between coming back on a technical violation of this or that and coming back on a violent crime. So we would be proportional and accurate and clear about it.

But what are all those steps from a pure public safety perspective we can do while they're in to make sure they never come back?

MR. NEAL: Building on Director Mohr, one of the things that – you look at the TPC model that we’re building the Georgia Prisoner Reentry Initiative framework around, there’s a seamless transition from the time they come into the prison system to the time they leave not just the prison, but they leave community supervision. We have a transition accountability plan when they come in based on the risk-need assessment that outlines what we have to do to reduce the risk and address the needs and better prepare them and that evolves throughout the process.

In the last six months of so that they’re incarcerated, we introduced the community into the prison system. Right now, we’re doing it in some of our key areas around the state where we have a high number of returning seasons. We have a five-year plan that takes out statewide. But we began reaching into the prison system in those last six months to look at all those needs that they have coming forward. And that transition accountability plan is a very specific plan that shares very clearly for the returning citizen what expectations are, and it begins with their goals, their stated goals, what’s important for you if you’re going to be successful. And as that transition accountability plan is developed in that phase, the community service providers will be introduced into the prison system to begin that process of a warm handoff to the community.

We’re really early in this process. We’ve got it started in six counties around the state. We believe that’s a evidence-based approach. And one of the ways that you can prevent having them go out with a 30-day script and not be able to have an appointment for six weeks is you’ve already introduced them to that community service provider. You’ve already introduced them to the organization that’s going to be providing that service. Once they get out, the appointments are set very quickly, ideally in – we’re looking forward to seeing how this begins to develop out. We’re excited about it. But I think that’s a critical component.

MR. DOAR: I have one more question before I turn it over to the audience and this concerns a little bit of the New York City experience and a little bit of AEI’s history. James Q. Wilson was an AEI scholar and he was one of the originators of the broken windows theory of law enforcement and quality of life control. And I just wondered, is there anything about this effort, on all of these issues, both preventing incarceration and reducing recidivism with greater reentry efforts that worries you or that you wouldn’t do because you’re worried about it undermining the gains that we’ve made in crime? And I’ll start with you on that, Chauncey.

MR. PARKER: May I just ask you, how do you think this could possibly undermine – since this is all focused on reducing crime, how would it undermine it, what do you think –

(Cross talk.)

MR. DOAR: Well, let’s be honest, in New York City, since Mayor De Blasio was elected, there seems to be some sense that the enforcement of certain rules and sort of quality of life issues has diminished. And that is partly motivated by a feeling from the

new mayor that we were too tough and too strong and too difficult on street crime or street activity. And I'm just asking what do you sense that there is a place where law enforcement people who care about reducing recidivism and care about reducing incarceration won't go in this effort to – I gather you don't. Is –

MR. PARKER: I don't – I think it is – the way I look at it is very – I try to be clear-eyed about it in does this reduce crime. So I think that, you know, if you go back to – and you've talked about broken windows, in the 1990s, you know, that was the idea that there were people – they go – wherever the highest crime rates were, wherever you have the most violence and for broken – you know, they idea of one broken window is out and the rest of it is a sign of disorder and can lead to other crime.

But it was – that was a question of stopping somebody for jumping over the turnstile and they would find a gun in their waistband. That was a question of – those kind of relatively minor offenses could lead to enforcement strategies. So I thought that what Bratton and that strategy in the '90s was very, very effective. I think you think you always have to come back and say, is it really actually reducing crime or is it not reducing crime. Certainly what Bratton did in the 1990s did reduce crime because you can see it in the numbers just absolutely went through the floor.

I think for the work that we're doing now, I think if we always look at does this make us safer? Does it not make us safer? Then we don't have to get into philosophical discussions of who's tough on crime and who's not tough on crime. Let the data tell us whether this actually reduces crime. I think on the street that the question what Bratton is talking about now of that you could use a warning, rather than arrest somebody, if that's the amount of power – that's the amount of force that you need to get the job done, then I think that that's good.

I think – but if all roads always go back to that goal, which is that you want our neighborhoods to be as safe as possible, I think that strategy will keep us on line as we go forward. And I think it also is a strategy that tells us – I think we can increase crime by putting people in jail. You put people in jail, that can actually make them less prepared and could knock – like Sisyphus, knock the rock to the bottom of the hill and they're going to start all over. They might have been working, so –

MR. DOAR: So it sounds like that really what we've learned here is that it's not a policing strategy that needs to change. It's a prosecution – prosecutor strategy. That you can continue to enforce with your police, but you may not – you may want to stop the pathway to prison that happens in the prosecutorial process. Is that a fair?

MR. PARKER: I don't think it's just the prosecutor. I think it's all of us. I think it's the – I think that what happens on the street is very, very important. I think what happens with the prosecutor is very important. But I think for what prosecutors can do, I think when we are wondering, should, you know, this is a guy who's been arrested for the 20th time with cocaine in his pocket, you know, for personal use, should he – you know, what's the best public safety approach to that? Is it to send them to Rikers Island for 20

days as opposed to 10 days, since the last time they got 10 days? There may be more creative things that we can do. And we need exit ramps and we're working on it that really – what it really needs is a health – in a lot of cases is really a health-driven treatment program to get that person back on a different track. And the jail is not necessarily the answer. How much jail is the answer. But it should always go back – we have great data, does it work or does it not work? Are we finding recidivism?

MR. MOHR: You know, this is a great issue and I'm glad we have the opportunity to talk about this. And I may sound contradictory to my earlier comments, but I don't believe we should overlook anything. I don't believe that. I don't think that's what research says. But I think we talk about the earlier session of swift and certain sanctions, but measured. And if you look at the work of Pepperdine University as they looked at the HOPE model that was developed by Judge Alm in Hawaii 11 years ago, what they have found now is – they started looking at the impact of jail for a bad drug test or missing an appointment. They started with looking at months of sanctions. They went to weeks. They went to days. They're now measuring actual hours. If someone's behavior is disrupted for testing positive or missing appointment, bringing him into jail for a few hours. And what they've found there is absolutely no difference in whether or not a person is brought into jail for a few hours or a month or two in terms of whether or not they are going to test positive for drugs or miss appointments or other basic material.

So I'm a believer of this. I think we should pay attention to good behavior and reward it and negative behavior and sanction it, but I believe we have over-sanctioned and over-incarcerated some basic behavior way too much. And I think that's creating both jail issues and prison issues.

MR. DOAR: OK, last question, and by the way –

MR. NEAL: Can I just add one thing to that? I think we have so much good data to drive these decisions that our danger is when we have that anecdotal bad experience that happens, we throw the data out and the successes that come with the data and we make a reactionary to this one incident – a reactionary decision or policy shift or – public policy based on data is good public policy. Public policy based on an emotional reaction to an isolated circumstance is bad public policy. So we've got to make sure that we understand, based on this data, this is a good approach that is going to have a real impact, and not overreact to an exception that happens from time to time along the way.

MR. DOAR: One other area of social policy that comes up in reentry discussion is child support enforcement. It came up in the previous panel. We talked about paying child support. And I wondered if any three of you had any comments on whether that was – needed some reform or change or was a barrier or was an expectation that helped getting folks involved with their families was a way in which they helped them get off to a better start after they leave prison.

MR. MOHR: Just a – we, about two to three years ago, provided some grant funding with local judges and prosecutors that wanted to find an innovative way of

dealing with some of this because we had – I think the day that we came into office, in 2011, we had about 850 people who were in prison. And their offense was child support principally. So we've started these programs and fundamentally it's allowed – I have great confidence in judges, by the way. I really do. I believe in judicial discretion. And what's happened was we've allowed folks to find alternatives to keep people in the community, to find jobs, to find other sanctions where they're held accountable and maybe they do day reporting for employment or whatever, but you know, it's awfully expensive to watch people sleep at night. And that's what prisons and jails do.

So what we've found, we've reduced significantly the number of people in prison for that, significantly, and it's counterproductive, isn't it, to keep somebody away from a job, making \$18 a month inside a prison, when they owe and their kids are suffering. And we saw the data. And I thought it was six out of every 10. I learned it's seven out of every 10 children of the incarcerated come back to prison. It's far-reaching and that is part of our scope, part of our responsibility. And that's part of why instead of building prisons, we ought to be investing in the communities and quit this brick and mortar stuff. (Applause.)

MR. DOAR: OK, we're going to turn to questions. And we'll start with Gerard.

Q: Thank you. I work for a governor in Virginia and Florida and for a superintendent here in this city. So all of us know empirically exactly which zip codes send more people to prison than to college. We know that empirically. What can K-12 schools do to better support your work and what can state chiefs at state department of education do to break some of the silos so that education, justice, others are working together?

MR. DOAR: Jay, do you want to take that one?

MR. NEAL: Let's go to prison pipeline. It's – there're some real challenges there, I think. It's pretty evident, and Governor Deal has really taken a – I mentioned earlier, this comprehensive – there's not a silver bullet. The comprehensive – when you look at just how comprehensive this is, it begins in childhood. You can predict your prison population by third grade reading level. Those that are not on the read level by third grade are the ones that tell you what your future prison population's going to be.

So providing those opportunities in those areas for quality education has become an important part of what Governor Deal's doing. He's really moving forward with some pretty significant measures on charter schools, opportunities in those areas. We've seen some – we have a charter school, for example, in one of those zip codes that at somewhere in the neighborhood of 97 percent, if I remember correctly, the students are those who are in poverty and would otherwise be considered your real risk. And within the last couple of years, in that charter school, we've seen them with almost 100 percent passage of their state testing.

So there're some good things that are happening in Georgia. There's a lot of work still to be done, but there's a real effort to improving the education in those areas. And you're exactly right: That's critical. I also know that there's an interest with some on our Criminal Justice Reform Council. Our Criminal Justice Reform Council has looked at a lot of things over the last three or four years. And I don't know if we're going to look at this, this coming year, but I do know there's been some interest expressed from those on the Criminal Justice Reform Council to look at this go to prison pipeline, exactly what we need to do.

Our State Department of Education has a couple of pilot projects as well that they're working on. So it clearly has to be a part of the conversation. There's no question about that.

MR. MOHR: Real quickly, as an old teacher, I felt I needed to respond to this, but you know, the one thing, Governor Kasich keeps our cabinet meeting every week, so we spend a lot of time with each other. And I think we've got to make it relevant. I mean, you know, government thinkers, I think school systems thinkers, they don't reform. So one of the things that makes some sense in what we're attempting to do in Ohio is to get employers into the schools and let's the kids out to do practical work experience in something that they are interested in with some academic alignment.

So if someone wants to be involved in a trade or a mechanical piece, let's give them the basics, but let's give them some experience on school time and give them credit for it because they're enhancing and working through the academic portion, so I can learn to be a diesel mechanic, which we really, really need, and there's really employment, but we have a tendency to think that the only education that goes on is in a classroom. So we're attempting to make real life experiences with these.

And then, there's an interesting study in a study of Cincinnati, where we've actually had employers coming into this one school system in one of these precincts that we talk about, one of these zip codes we talk about. And the significant – it's a dramatic increase in graduation rates once we've had these employers come in and spend time weekly with these kids.

So there're some things that can be done, but you know what, you can't tinker. Life's too short to tinker. We need to – this is about changing lives and we need to be reformative and not just edging along, I think.

MR. DOAR: OK, way in the back, and then we'll come to Justice Corrigan.

Q: First of all, I'd like to say congratulations to the new attitude that I see in people, especially the administrator. I have considerable experience on the other side of the fence on this topic. And I'm coming – I'm two years short of being released 15 years ago for the last time, with two prior trips to prison before that. And what really changed my heart and changed my life were two things and they enabled me to stay out this time. And one, number one was the help that I received from people who love me. And number

two – and Einstein says it – that you can't solve a problem with the same mind that created it.

You know, until I began to work on some personal issues, because I come out of West Virginia and I'm the son of an angry Baptist preacher, you know. And there was a lot of confusion. There was a lot of misunderstanding. And until these things began to get worked on in my heart, in my life, nothing really changed. But when they did get worked on, everything changed.

You know, so I don't know that I have a question other than to ask you what are you doing to help people change their mindsets. And I already see answers to that with creating new programs and your teaching, you know, to – you know, that you have this option, rather than that option. Working with the people that are in the penitentiary is not hopeless thing.

MR. DOAR: Thank you. That was – I really greatly appreciate that testimony and I want to say that this is a very important point because in my experience in New York City with programs that help people who were returning from Rikers, we had good programs. We had people that were ready to help. But when we would ask people that were successful in those programs what was the key ingredient to their success, to their achieving a certificate or getting a job or paying child support or getting sober, they always said, I had to come to it first in my heart and then I was ready to accept help.

And that's what I think is very much – can't be forgotten when we set up programs or efforts to help people that we don't want to send a message to folks that we don't need their help, too, and that we think we can do it for them. And I think that's one of the key ingredients to some of the things that we heard in the previous panel.

Although, it does also raise the issue on some of these statistics, which are often the percent of people who went through the program and completed it, how well did they do? Well, that's pretty good. You want that to be good. But it really is what's the percent of all the people that were offered the program or exited the prison and what happened to them? And that's why I do think there is something to be said for mandatory, in some cases – that if you have a lot of programs and people who are leaving corrections facility are not taking advantage of an offering, there may be a place to sometimes say, in the way we do in welfare policy, in social services with often single mothers, if you want to receive assistance, you need to do certain things. And if you don't, a sanction will occur.

And I've often been said that the reentry world doesn't have that same kind of help and hassle aspect to help get more people, instead of just waiting for them to reach that point where they are ready to take full advantage of it. But that was a very, very helpful comment and I greatly appreciate it.

So now, Justice Corrigan, after you started off so well this morning, we're going to give you the last question.

Q: Thank you, boss.

MR. DOAR: Don't say that. (Laughter.) I've been called boss and Coach Taylor. I want to say that, you know, I really like Riggins. That's the guy I like. (Laughter.) It would have been – I would have really liked to be – (laughs).

Q: This is fun.

MR. DOAR: Yes. (Laughter.)

Q: All right, this is a question for Gary Mohr. I was fascinated for you to say that you have a huge problem in leadership and stability in the United States on corrections heads. We have a huge problem and one of my research interests at AEI is the instability of Human Services heads, particularly Child Welfare. The average tenure in the United States is 18 months. And leadership instability is one of the reasons that we can't get to reforms.

Now, I had a theory, which I've already advanced, that one of the reasons in the human services arena are child deaths. The news media and the legislators, and frequently governors will say, bring me the head of the Human Services director. Off with your head. Now, the system is fixed. I am suspecting that in the arena of corrections that what we have is bring me the head of the corrections director when something goes awry with a released prisoner who commits murder or whatever, a mistake in the system, because I've seen it in my own life as a professional. I have seen that happening and I'm guessing that could be. These are horrible, horrible jobs, very, you know, 24/7 fire-hose jobs.

It's hard enough to get folks to take them. So what – can we work together or what's your reaction to that? Can we do research together that would help us to stabilize leadership and get a media or a legislative approach that starts relying on data instead of these anecdotal, you know, this is the solution to everything, get rid of this person. Thank you for letting me emote. (Laughter.)

MR. DOAR: Gary.

MR. MOHR: You know, I would love to do that on behalf of this profession and I think it's – I think the timing would be great. Selfish, but I think it would be great because I think there is an underpinning and a movement to recognize helping people reducing crime victims by what we do, using evidence. And you know, isn't it interesting? The more and more we use evidence, it would seem to me that the more stable our leadership should be. But I think you're exactly right and I don't think at times it is a major prison incident or a major release. I think there's a whole myriad of things in our profession because we operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We have one fourth in Ohio of all state employees work for us. That means a lot of things can happen. And I think a lot of other governmental agencies are kind of 8:00 to 5:00 in office towers.

So I think it's a different kind of piece and I think if we could kind of provide a more crystallized picture of that responsibility, I would be glad to do that because I think it makes sense and I think it would enhance our profession. More importantly, I think it would help the people we serve and their families and people who love them ultimately by consistency in a policy that makes sense.

MR. DOAR: OK. (Laughs.) We have a little more time and I want everybody – yes, go ahead, Jay.

MR. NEAL: I just wanted, before we ran out of time, one of the things that came up in the previous was the Program and Treatment Completion Certificate in Georgia and I said that I would speak to that just for a little bit. There're a number of things that Georgia's doing to try to improve employability. One is the governor signing executive order banning the box for state applications. We're the first state in the South that we've done that. Another thing that we did in Senate Bill 365 this year was created the Program and Treatment Completion Certificate issue by the Department of Corrections that's similar to a transcript that shows the programs that the individual completed while they're incarcerated, programs that they should have done based on the risk-needs assessment that they were not offered or that they entered but didn't complete.

It's just a basic snapshot of who this individual is and what have they done to try to better themselves while they're incarcerated. And in Senate Bill 365, it very clearly states that if an employer hires someone that has a Program and Treatment Completion Certificate or a pardon from the Board of Pardons and Paroles, that that employer will have considered – will be considered to have done due diligence in hiring or licensing or admitting to school or admitting to housing or any of those opportunities that that individual is seeking. If the person has in hand that Program Completion Certificate, they will be deemed by the State of Georgia to have done due diligence in working with this individual coming out of the prison system.

MR. DOAR: OK. And now, Harriett and then we'll close.

Q: (Off mic.)

MR. DOAR: Hold – take the microphone.

Q: You posed a question that I want to answer or ask about. We have an ultra-liberal mayor in New York City now. Homelessness is at record numbers. It's doubled – street homelessness. And violent crime for youth is on the rise. Do you believe that the message from the top of the administration makes a difference? Because while I don't believe in the amount of stop-and-frisk that was going on previously, what I see from a human standpoint now is kids killing kids, and they have no fear anymore of carrying guns. And they throw their whole life away when they're too young to think straight. So I'm wondering if you believe that the message from the top and the policies that are instituted at the top of government make a difference.

MR. MOHR: I can't speak specifically to New York, but I think it does and I think that's why we changed our mission to reduce recidivism among those we touch. Even the staff that don't believe that that work for me – and there are quite a few – they know it. They know it. And I think – so the first thing I think is clarity in what our mission statement is. And I think then, as a leader we have a responsibility to use that as a litmus test for every initiative that comes along because we don't – those employees that don't believe in what we're doing will say flavor of the month, don't listen to him and you're not going to have the impact. So I think it does and, again, I'm not going to comment about the New York situation because I'm not knowledgeable on that.

MR. NEAL: I, too, will not comment about New York, but I know the leadership that Governor Deal has provided in Georgia is absolutely phenomenal. We passed substantial criminal justice reform legislation with unanimous votes in the House and the Senate two years in a row in the state of Georgia, which is unheard of. And his leadership from the top is the reason that that happened. It has been very clear from the beginning of where he was going and why he was going there and the approach that he has taken. And the buy-in from the legislature, the buy-in from the public, the buy-in from employees, from leaders of departments and agencies, the collaborative effort among all these agencies is absolutely unheard of in state government. And it begins with that leadership from Governor Deal at the top.

MR. PARKER: So – so my perspective on New York City, which we both live there –

Q: Which I know you know well.

MR. PARKER: Which I know, I do know. I think that Bill Bratton, who's the police commissioner, is about as good as they get ever in the history of policing. And he's the police leader. I think that, you know, 50,000 young men were arrested every year for possession of marijuana. That doesn't happen anymore. And so crime – I think we have to be careful about the top always because crime is actually down about 6 percent in New York City. And violent crime, I think there's maybe 12 more murders this year in a city of 8 or 9 million than there were a year ago to date, last year, something like that. But – and some point, like I think a week ago, shootings levels compared to last year was just the lowest year ever.

You know, so I just think – I think what the police department is doing, what the DAs are doing, we're really trying the best we can to make the city as safe as possible, but also, at the same time, to really focus on who's getting arrested, for what, do they need to go to jail, do they not need to go to jail. I think the paradigm, which I grew up with, which was 10 days is better than five days, an arrest is better – this is sort of how prosecutors thought, is not – not only not necessarily. It's not only – it's unfair, but it's also not efficient. You actually can make – it's not the best strategy necessarily to do those kneejerk reactions I think.

So I really think we should look to Bratton. Bratton is the police commissioner. And what he's doing – I think he changed the world of policing in 1994 when he brought in CompStat and set up – changed the paradigm from arrests to reducing crime, and that's why we have CompStat and education stat and housing stat and every stat in the world started – in my view – started with that strategy of what's your goal. And I think – I have full faith that Bratton is going to lead the way for New York City to make it as safe as possible, but also make this criminal justice system as fair as possible. And that's also, you know, for the person I work for, Cy Vance, I know that's his vision as well.

But I think that the – to me and the history of tabloid news and the city's out of control and we're going back to, you know, the days of putting signs in your window is – you know, of stolen cars and stuff like that, is not really an accurate reflection of where we are and I believe we're on the right track.

MR. DOAR: OK, I want to thank both this panel and the previous panel and for the really great day. Very good. (Applause.)

(END)