

Victims & Communities Impacted By Crime:
Perspectives on Offender Reentry

March 31, 2006

Final Report

Prepared by
Len Engel and Meghan Howe
Crime and Justice Institute

Sponsored by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety





Victims & Communities Impacted By Crime: *Perspectives on Offender Reentry*

Crime & Justice Institute Reentry Roundtable Series
March 31, 2006

OVERVIEW

A number of years ago, the victim rights movement identified a significant gap in the criminal justice system with regard to the system's response to the needs of crime victims. Other than attending to the victim's needs while the victim was a witness for the prosecution, involvement of the victim in the criminal justice system was hard to find. As a result of a well-organized effort, victims now play a more significant role in the criminal justice system, well beyond their role as a witness, and services available to victims throughout the criminal justice process have significantly improved. Yet, this web of victim services is not available to the majority of Massachusetts residents impacted by crime – the residents of high-crime communities.

The residents of the communities most affected by crime may or may not be direct victims, at least in the sense of qualifying for victim services, but they are victims of the criminality present in their neighborhoods. They are victimized by random incidents of violent crime, by so-called victimless crimes such as drug dealing, and by non-violent crimes, simply because they happen to live in a community with pervasive crime. Life in these communities is characterized by fear and lack of opportunity, common traits associated with victimization.

These same communities are where a majority of offenders return after incarceration. The residents of these communities must not only deal with the ongoing threat caused by the criminal activity but must also bear the burden of absorbing the returning offenders, who are the previous victimizers.

In order to gain a better understanding of the impact of victimization and offender return in high-crime communities, the Crime & Justice Institute, with sponsorship from the Executive Office of Public Safety, initiated a project that examined these complex issues. The project, the first in the Crime & Justice Institute's Reentry Roundtable series, involved an examination of the existing policies and practices and a review of innovative reentry programs that involve victims and community members. Further, in order to gain the perspectives of those living and working in high-crime communities a series of focus groups were convened. The project culminated in a Roundtable event, held on March

31, 2006, at the Boston Foundation, which brought together a variety of stakeholders for a frank discussion on the issues involved.¹

PHASE ONE: WHAT IS CURRENT?

The justice system actually reflects our values in the community at large and our values through the media, through elected officials... We saw the get-tough-on-crime era, the swing toward long sentences... we saw programs eliminated from correctional facilities and we saw what it brought us. We saw that it's very difficult to return folks home from incarceration... We all have to come to the table to decide that in returning folks to the community, is the community willing to accept them.

*-Associate
Commissioner
Veronica
Madden,
MA Dept. of
Correction*

The involvement of the victim of a crime during the criminal justice process peaks during the prosecution of the accused, when the victim is called on to give testimony, offer insight to the prosecution and judge, and access direct services from the system as needed. After sentencing, the victim receives notifications of the offender's status in prison or jail (assuming he or she was sentenced to a period of incarceration) such as when the offender is transferred to a lower level facility or moved from the prison to a hospital for medical attention. The victim receives notification if the offender is due to come before the Parole Board where the victim may offer testimony to the Board.

The victim is notified prior to the offender's release from prison. If a victim believes the offender poses a threat to them, they may apply for protection either through a court-issued restraining order or through local law enforcement. If the offender is on parole the victim may contact the offender's parole officer for additional information. The parole officers are trained to work with victims and are also able to refer victims to supportive services. If an offender is not paroled but uses the services of a Regional Reentry Center run by the Parole Board then the victim can contact the staff at the center. If an offender is on probation or has no supervision there is little structure in place to systematically respond to a victim.

The relationship of offender reentry, victim services and community impact has not been a focus of significant research or analysis. Yet, there are interesting programs that seek to broaden the scope of victim and community involvement early in the reentry process. In some instances, specifically in the programs that incorporate elements of restorative justice, victims are brought into the process in a manner designed to help the offender develop a better understanding of the impact his or her criminal behavior has had on other people. Some of the programs that were examined include:

Victim/Offender Mediation (Dialogue)

Under the supervision of a trained mediator, victim/offender mediation allows victims to meet their offender in a structured setting to engage in a discussion of the crime. This provides victims the opportunity to tell the offender how the crime has impacted their lives, to interact with the offender about the incident and his or her future, and to become directly involved in developing a restitution and reentry plan for the offender.

¹ See Appendix for List of Roundtable participants

*Rehabilitation
waits too long.
Rehabilitation
has to begin
before these kids
get to prison.
These kids are in
trouble early but
we don't do
anything until
they get to jail.
They start
criminal activity
at a very young
age but we wait
until they get to
prison before
they get any
rehabilitation.*

*-Commissioner
Ronnie Watson,
Cambridge, MA
Police Dept.*

Sentencing Circles

Sentencing circles bring together victims, victims' supporters, offenders, offenders' supporters, judges and court personnel, prosecutors, defense attorneys, police, and interested community members in a multi-step process to determine the appropriate sentence for an offender. After participating in sessions where both the victim and offender tell their stories, the group works to develop a consensus on a sentencing plan that addresses the concerns of all parties. Sentencing circles extend the responsibility of finding constructive resolutions to crime beyond the court system to include victims and community members. They raise awareness among community members of their capacity to find new and possibly more effective ways to resolve conflict.

Victim Impact Panels

Unlike victim/offender mediation, victim impact panels do not involve a meeting between offenders and their specific victims. Instead, these panels consist of victims, in unrelated cases, telling an offender or group of offenders about the impact of crime on their physical, emotional, and financial well-being. There is little dialogue between victims and offenders during these panels; offenders can ask questions, but the purpose of the panel is for offenders to listen to victims tell their stories, not for offenders to share their perspective.

Victim Impact Classes

Similar to victim impact panels, these classes, conducted in the prison or jail, are designed to help teach offenders about the human consequences of crime. Like the panels, class sessions often involve crime victims being invited to tell their stories. Representatives from victim groups also visit to share their experiences of helping victims reconstruct their lives. Unlike victim impact panels, offenders are encouraged to enter into a dialogue with the victim-speakers and the curriculum is designed to allow the offender to question and comment.

Community Courts

Community courts blend the interests of the neighborhood with the goals of the justice system to address quality of life crimes in a way that restores the community, conveys to the offender certain expectations and creates new relationships between the criminal justice system and neighborhood stakeholders. Community courts have the authority of traditional courts but the judges have more variety in the sanctions that can be imposed, such as performing an activity that pays the community back for the crime. The community, including the residents and the victims of crime, are involved in the justice process to the extent they wish.

[The trauma] goes so far beyond the specific victim... the whole community is a victim and then it leads one to the very blurred line between victim and offender because the offenders also grew up in the same community, therefore were victimized and may also have been a direct victims of crime themselves.

*-Liz Curtin,
Community
Resources for
Justice*

Community Accountability Boards

Community accountability boards (CABs), also called community restorative boards, work to develop a reparation plan and consensus on expectations for the offender's post-release behavior. The board is typically composed of a small group of citizens who conduct face-to-face meetings with offenders to develop this plan. The meetings often begin with a discussion of the nature of the crime and its negative consequences. Participants then develop the reparation plan for how to repair the harm to the community or victim, including a strict timeline for stages of completion.

Like the programs mentioned above, CABs provide an opportunity for offenders to take personal responsibility for their crimes and the harm they caused. But unlike victim impact panels and classes, CABs widen the scope beyond the direct crime victims to include communities. CABs allow community members to take ownership of the criminal justice system. They give voice and recognition to the fact that, though not the direct victims of crime, community members are impacted by crime and should be involved in developing solutions to it.

PHASE TWO: FOCUS GROUPS

The second phase of the project examined the perspectives of the people living in these victimized communities or working with the victims of crime. During the fact-finding phase of this project data was examined indicating where crimes are committed, where most victims of crime live and where most of the offenders return. The findings indicated that a handful of urban communities in the state have high concentrations of all three elements. These communities are also economically and socially destabilized, circumstances that are aggravated by the needs of the returning offender.

- 67% of the approximately 2600 offenders released from prison or jail to Suffolk County return to 25% of the county (mostly to sections of Boston)
- Of the 9 neighborhoods with the most returning offenders per capita:
 - All have poverty rates above the state average
 - 7 had poverty rates above 20%
 - 8 had as much as 50% of its households headed by females with children²

² L.E. Brooks, A.L. Solomon, S. Keegan, R. Kohl, and L. Lahue. *Prisoner Reentry in Massachusetts*, Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, Washington D.C. March 2005.

The fear is leading parents to keep their kids inside, which then limits the kids' access to resources and opportunities. They're locked in their home [and] potential gets stifled...

*-Mike Kozu,
Project Right*

To gain a better understanding of life in these communities CJI assembled four focus groups composed of residents and activists of high crime neighborhoods and victim service providers working in these areas.

Victim Services focus group

This focus group, made up of victim service providers including the mother of a murder victim, provided insight into the needs and experiences of victims.

- Victims should have the opportunity to express their concerns and needs
- All victims are not the same and experience different impacts despite similarities in the crimes
- Post-trauma effects do not necessarily occur within the narrow time frames of the criminal justice process
- The return of the offender from prison or jail is likely to trigger a new round of distress
- Attention and resources are, understandably, focused on the offender's return to society, but some attention should be directed to victims during this process

The mother of the murdered child offered a very emotional account of being a survivor and of losing one's child. She spoke of the remarkable path that has taken her to meet the person who murdered her son. She was preparing to participate in the first victim-offender dialogue to occur in Massachusetts in order to help this person understand the impact his actions has had on her and her family. She acknowledged that her path to restorative justice may not be for all victims; her surviving son does not share all of her views on this issue. But, she stated, the system should accommodate those victims who want to be a part of the habilitation of the offender, especially as the offender prepares to re-enter society.

Resident focus groups

Two focus groups were conducted, one composed of young residents of high-crime communities in the Boston area and the other of older residents of these same communities. The younger residents, mostly in their late teens and early 20s, talked about the fear and hopelessness that permeated these neighborhoods. One person's sense of hopelessness was expressed by her belief that all communities were like hers; unsafe and unstable. Yet, within a mile of where she lived were some of the most expensive homes in Boston. Another member indicated that when his brother and foster mother moved a few blocks away he could not join them because he was perceived as an enemy of the new neighborhood's gang. This group stated that they all knew kids their age that had died violent deaths; that they did not expect to continue to live in their neighborhoods; that they feared that their younger siblings would end up either dead or in trouble; and that their mothers were the only people they trusted. They distrusted

the police, generally finding them to be ineffective at maintaining public safety and reactionary to high profile crimes.

A number of the participants claimed to have never seen someone from a victim rights group or specialized services respond to a tragedy although all of them had close friends or family who had died violent deaths in the neighborhood. There was a sense among the participants that the traditional victim services such as trauma teams and counseling sessions are rarely evident when these communities experience tragedy. Interestingly, they explained that the community had developed its own mechanism for dealing with such trauma with most of the services being offered by community groups, volunteers and the faith community.

[Communities are good at] organizing street by street and building by building. [W]e can't just do it with victims alone or offenders alone, we have to do it together and having some sort of understanding on both sides to connect.

-Jeanne DuBois, Dorchester Bay Economic Development Corporation

The older residents of these neighborhoods held out hope that life would improve yet they despaired over the precipitous decline in the quality of life in their communities since they were young. Two issues received much of the attention. First, that young people seemed much less supervised and had far less to do than young people of a generation ago. The other issue was that organized community activism had increased with a very positive impact on the lives of the people living and working in these communities. While the focus group members were distressed at the level of violence and the lack of parental oversight and effective law enforcement, they were greatly encouraged by the work of community groups and volunteers that helped encourage business development, reduce crime in certain hotspots, and generally create a spirit of volunteerism that has improved the atmosphere in the community.

Community Activist Focus Group

This group of resident activists spoke about the system's failure with regard to the health and welfare of these communities. Their primary focus was on the lack of respect law enforcement and the criminal justice system had for their communities. They found law enforcement to be heavy-handed and disconnected from the needs of the community. They believed the corrections system returned offenders to their neighborhoods in worse condition than when they were taken off the street. And they found few resources from the system for the community to respond to the needs of the returning offenders.

Almost all of the focus group participants admitted being victims of crime at one point or another, but their anger and frustration was directed at the system rather than the offender. They knew first hand what it was like to be victimized and scared, yet they have become neighborhood activists in order to improve the lives of the previous victimizers and the residents who want to avoid becoming victims.

PHASE THREE: THE ROUNDTABLE

When a kid steals something from a candy store we need to make sure that they face the person they stole from. From the beginning they need to understand that what they did hurt somebody.

*-Tina Cheri,
Louis D. Brown
Peace Institute*

The intersection of returning offenders, the victims of crime and the communities to which they return is where 22 criminal justice professionals, community activists, service providers and policy makers met to discuss the impacts of offender reentry. The unique nature of this moderated discussion brought forth many issues beyond those that initiated this project. While the impacts of offender reentry on the victims and high-crime communities were at the heart of the discussion, the shortcomings of the system, the lack of resources from the state and the lack of creativity in dealing with the underlying problems in these communities triggered vigorous discussion and broadened the understanding of the audience members. Additionally, the problems of crime intelligence gathering, the rising rate of gun violence in the urban communities, the violence reduction strategies of the 1990s and what is missing from that formula today received attention from discussants.

The agenda for the roundtable included presentations from two criminal and social justice practitioners and an edited video of two of the focus groups, followed by extensive discussion among the roundtable discussants about the various issues presented.

Carol Shapiro, Family Justice Finding the Balance: Families, Social Networks and the Intersecting Circles of Reentry

The focus of “Finding the Balance” is on the importance of social networks to the success of the returning offender and in turn on the overall health and safety of the community. The definition of family includes the community – those people who have an influence on a person’s life. In this regard community (family) is at the heart of the victimization perpetrated by the offender and is the key to the offender’s successful return to society.

In communities we find dynamics similar to those in families. Thus, by looking at the similarities between communities and families we can see opportunities to apply the support inherent in families to communities. Like families, communities (both the people and the infrastructure) are present 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Houses of worship, healthcare clinics, housing and employment services and schools help communities connect to offenders. And ultimately, communities, like families, can be positive influences.

Engaging the community as a victimized member of the offender’s family is a new way of thinking about habilitating both the offender and the community. These opportunities must be recognized and acted upon by our leaders, those in the community and outside of it.

Some people want to lock them up [while] some people want to talk to the offender before they get out. This is important for people in public policy to listen to because policy makers are influenced by the conclusions of victims and the conclusions of victims are very, very different and to make public policy based on one set of conclusions is not necessarily making public policy that serves the whole community in the best way.”

*-Rep. Byron
Rushing,
Massachusetts
Legislature*

*Jim Kelleher, Western Massachusetts Correctional Alcohol Center
Sister Mary Quinn, formerly of Hampden County Sheriff's Department
Victim Impact Program and Community Accountability Board*

Hampden County's Victim Impact Panels involve a presentation from victims of crime to an inmate. The program not only requires the offender to revisit the scene of the crime but to also see the ripple effect of the impact of the crime. Virtually all re-entering offenders who go through the Victim Impact Panels have a better understanding of the long-term impact the crime has had on the victim.

The Community Accountability Board involves a group of resident volunteers from the community who meet with an individual inmate in a series of sessions a few months prior to the inmate's release. The board assists the inmate in identifying the victims of the crime and how the inmate can repair the harm, learning how the crime affected the community and how the inmate can make amends, and finally help the inmate understand what he or she needs to do to avoid returning to jail.

Video Presentation

A 20 minute video presentation of two of the focus groups presented the unique viewpoints of victim service providers and the mother of a murdered teenager; and a group of older residents of high-crime communities. Their comments offered perspective on:

- The issues that victims face when the offender is returning to the community
- The unique responses that individual victims have, which makes addressing their trauma a complex and ongoing mission
- The widespread impact of isolated incidents of crime on the communities in which they occur
- The unnoticed diminishing expectations of the residents for a quality of life that many people take for granted
- The capacity of a survivor to see potential in the offender who murdered her son
- The belief that the strengths of the community can overcome the lack of resources and the effects of unrelenting criminal activity

The focus group video provided the discussants and the audience with the stark realities of offender reentry and those most affected by the return of the offender. The victim service providers offered the discussants and the audience insight into the conflicting environment created by the return of the offender. Both victim and service provider understood that the offender was going to return and must be given the tools to maintain a lawful existence. The conflicted feelings were the result of the assumption that the victim was supposed to be okay now because time that had passed since the incident and the victimizer had been punished. The participants

The trauma affects the family life where everybody is cooped up inside and afraid to go outside or afraid to turn their lights on. Family relationships are damaged. It affects our educational system; you have young people afraid to go to school or to go back home without some form of protection. It affects work and job when you've got parents afraid for their kids; always worried about their kids so that affects (their ability to do) their jobs. It affects every aspect of life in these communities.”

*-Rev. Jeffery Brown,
Union Baptist
Church*

agreed that time did not necessarily heal all wounds and the return of the offender could often trigger a new round of trauma.

The mother of the murdered child spoke passionately about the impact of losing a child and showed extraordinary compassion toward the young person who killed him. After much thought she decided to reach out to the young man who killed her son and this led to her meeting him in a Victim-Offender Dialogue. The mother acknowledged that the path she had taken may not be appropriate for all victims and survivors, but forcefully explained that this should serve as an example of just how different victims are from each other.

Roundtable Discussion

The impact of victimization on the community

Fear and trauma are the words describing what life is like for residents of these communities. Fear is an inescapable fact of life and creates responses that further isolate the residents. The fear is traumatizing. It can lead people to hide and withdraw or it can lead people to arm themselves for protection.

The harm being caused to young people who grow up in the high-crime communities is difficult to quantify but readily apparent to those who live and work with these kids and in these environments. The kids, from a young age, are desensitized to aberrant behavior. Discussants were disturbed by the inability of the justice system to address some of the obvious and most basic needs of kids at risk that contribute to the dangerous environment in these neighborhoods. Things like education, after-school programs and summer jobs have all been shown, through research, to positively impact the lives of the kids at risk as well as the community. The lack of services in the correctional facilities also drew the ire of the discussants, due to the inability of returning offenders to get jobs, housing and treatment.

At the same time, argued one discussant, government is a reflection of society. It is the product of a political process and public attitudes often direct policy and practice. The responsibility for addressing these problems must be shared. Resources will always be lacking so better collaborations must be created in order to fill the gaps.

The criminal justice system

The systems of government came under scrutiny for the way they manage the people involved in the system. Leadership and resources are the primary elements of the success of any system, and government is no different. There is ample evidence, according to some discussants, of where the needs are greatest in these communities and research has identified the programs and services most effective in producing the

desired outcomes. Yet, government is unable to respond in a way that induces confidence let alone success. Why is this?

According to the service providers on the roundtable, the budget cuts that occurred in 2003 and 2004 fell hard on the programs that were most important to the issues of revictimization and recidivism reduction. These cuts continue to limit the ability of service providers, whether they are within the correctional system or in the community, to respond to the needs of those most at risk of being impacted by crime and those who are likely to commit crimes.

Various discussants offered support for the notion that governmental leadership and community responsibility are needed to reduce the burdens absorbed by the communities. Funding for reentry programs is rarely a priority but the research shows that reentry programs are effective. Leadership is necessary because long-term improvement is too often held hostage to short-sighted restrictions. At the same time the community must develop the capacity to drive this agenda. They must create the political capital and proven service delivery capacity to convince the governmental structures that these programs are necessary and important, and that the community is a capable partner.

What can be done?

The community, manifested in the people that live and work there, knows how to resolve some of the most difficult problems and it simply needs the resources to implement these strategies, according to a number of discussants. Communities know their strengths and have the capacity to organize at a very personal level.

In order to begin to improve communities we have to prevent crime, not just respond to it. Prevention is a public health issue as well as a criminal justice issue and therefore should be promoted by a broader range of providers. Inherent in the concept of prevention is that it directly involves services to children. Children are the next generation of employers and employees, business leaders, parents, and criminals. What they are exposed to has a significant impact on their development. If, at a young age, certain behaviors are not addressed and positive modeling is not reinforced, then the young person is likely to become a greater threat to the stability of his or her family and the community.

The resources that state and local officials provide should not be limited to financial support. Boston has been recognized internationally for its innovative policing methods and the success of involving the community in its public safety efforts. These efforts were highlighted during the focus group discussions as a missing ingredient in the current efforts to reduce crime and foster positive community relations. In addition to community

Being tough on crime is [currently viewed as] only punishment. Being tough on crime should be prevention programs, more street workers and intervention programs. Unfortunately, a lot of the things that we know work have been cut due to budget cuts. We shouldn't be surprised we have such crime and recidivism problems when we cut what works.

*-Mike Kozu,
Project Right*

policing, other measures that have been successful in linking the system with the community include neighborhood probation offices, reentry centers and activities that bring public safety officials and staff into these communities.

Advice from the Roundtable:

- Victims need to be part of the restoration and habilitation of the offender. Victims willing to participate must be included in the process and the state needs to facilitate this.
- The communities most impacted by crime have been dealing with crime for years. These communities need local and state support as they confront the impacts of crime, victimization and reentry. For example:
 - Community leaders collaborating with law enforcement
 - Police maintaining a personal relationship with the community in which they work
 - Effective community programs receiving adequate resources
- The correctional system has recently made progress in shifting the focus from punishment-only to recidivism reduction strategies. This shift must be embraced throughout the criminal justice system and in all of the county facilities so that offenders returning to their communities are better able to find housing, jobs and continue to receive the treatment that began in prison.
- The process of preparing offenders to return to the community must begin the day the offender enters prison or jail and services must continue through the offender's return to the community with the community's direct involvement.

Food for thought:

The Roundtable discussants and the focus group participants provided a view of the impacts of reentry and crime on the communities that are most impacted by crime. The solutions they recommended for reducing crime and for assisting offenders transitioning to the street drew from their experience in these communities. Not surprisingly, the research on what works in offender reentry and crime reduction supports many of these solutions.

Over the past few years, researchers have concluded that sound reentry and transition preparation reduces recidivism³. Additionally, the involvement of the community in the habilitation of the offender increases the offender's opportunities for success, reduces the anxiety of the community with the return of the offender and creates a structured environment in which positive behavior is modeled.

³ M.W. Lipsey. *Effective Correctional Treatment Enhances Public Safety*. International Correctional Association, Monograph Series Project, Publication #3. (2003)

It [the justice system] is a bit schizophrenic. Does it want to punish or to address recidivism? With fifth or sixth grade education levels of offenders [leaving prison], I think the answer is clear....

*-Teny Gross,
Institute for the
Study and Practice
of Nonviolence*

We have to be both optimistic and pessimistic. We don't have a (single) answer, although we have several little answers. But we have people willing to plug in the little answers ... We're not just talking about re-entry, we're talking about pre-entry ... we have to do many things at once.

*-Rep. Byron
Rushing,
Massachusetts
Legislature*

What do we know?

[Recidivism can be predicted.](#) This means that we can identify those offenders who are most likely to recidivate when they are released. Through an assessment of the offender early in his or her incarceration we can identify the factors we know lead to continued criminal behavior.

[Recidivism can be reduced.](#) This means that once we know who is likely to recidivate (higher risk offenders) we can take steps to address the risk factors that create this likelihood. These risk factors are identified during the assessment of the inmate and interventions/programs can be implemented both during incarceration and after release to reduce the likelihood of recidivism.

[High-return communities can be targeted.](#) The neighborhoods where offenders return should be able to provide support for returning offenders. Resources must be targeted so that services necessary to support offenders, such as behavior counseling, skills training and mentoring are available in these communities.

[Family support is vital.](#) The offender's family is a necessary part of the offender's success after release and should be part of the transition planning. Programs that enhance the health of the family and its ability to assist the offender should be implemented in correctional facilities and in the community.

[Bring the system to the community.](#) Community policing has been shown to not just reduce crime and improve crime solving, but it has improved the relationship between residents of high-crime communities and law enforcement. This model should also be applied to probation and parole departments as they monitor offenders in the community. These officials could locate offices within these neighborhoods in order to increase the visibility of the officers in the community. Meetings between the offender's family and the officers and contact between the victim, community members and the officers provide important connections for successful reentry.

[Pro-social activities must be present and available.](#) The creation of partnerships among law enforcement, including probation and parole officers, and the community must be used to create a pro-social environment, one where positive influences are the norm. Pro-social activities through jobs, church and community organizations are a vital component of the offender's eventual success on the street and are also important in modeling behavior in a preventive manner for the next generation.

CONCLUSION

In a handful of communities in the Commonwealth, crime is a fact of everyday life. These communities are home to the majority of crime victims in the state and they receive the majority of offenders returning from prison, jail or court. These communities and the people who live and work in them are rarely viewed as victims in the traditional sense. They are also not part of the reentry process.

[W]e don't realize how many resources we have in these communities. The people living there are resources and just need to be tapped. They have information and experience from living in these hot areas for years. (The) problem is that the system doesn't include them. We have to ask them.

*-Mike Kozu,
Project Right*

While returning ex-offenders further strain already disadvantaged neighborhoods, they are also the sons and daughters of these communities. They are at once the victimizers and those most in need of immediate assistance because of the potential for recidivism. The communities who receive them must deal with the multitude of issues in this complex environment. Should they welcome them back as their own? Should they respond to their return with services, knowing that recidivism will further destabilize the community? Or should they retreat to their homes out of fear and frustration at the prospect of being re-victimized?

As the numbers of offenders returning to these communities continue to rise and as recidivism rates remain unchecked, it is necessary that criminal justice professionals, community organizers, service providers, and the residents of these communities begin to examine new ways to address these threats. One thing remains clear in this effort: the communities most impacted by crime must be part of the solution.

APPENDIX

Moderator

- Bill Coughlin, Chief Operating Officer, Community Resources for Justice

Presenters

- James Kelleher, Assistant Superintendent, Western MA Correctional Alcohol Center
- Carol Shapiro, President, Family Justice

Discussants

- True See Allah, Operation Reentry Coordinator, Action for Boston Community Development, Inc.
- Michael Ashe, Sheriff, Hampden County
- Reverend Jeffrey Brown, Union Baptist Church, Cambridge
- Andrea Cabral, Sheriff, Suffolk County
- Tina Chery, Executive Director, Louis D. Brown Peace Institute
- Diane Coffey, SAFEPLAN Program Manager, MA Office of Victim Assistance
- Liz Curtin, Director of Adult Correctional Services, Community Resources for Justice
- Jeanne DuBois, Executive Director, Dorchester Bay Economic Development Corp.
- Teny Gross, Executive Director, Institute for Study and Practice of Nonviolence
- Kevin Hayden, Assistant District Attorney, Suffolk
- Michele Higginbottom, Assistant Director, Hastings House, Crittenton
- James Jordan, College of Criminal Justice, Northeastern University
- Paul Joyce, Superintendent, Boston Police Department
- Michael Kozu, Project Director, Project Right
- Doug Lomax, Substance Abuse Coordinator, Boston Municipal Court
- Veronica Madden, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Correction
- Kathleen Shultz, First Assistant Deputy Superintendent, Worcester County Sheriff
- Donovan Walker, Founder, Showdown Youth Development Organization
- Donald Giancioppo, Executive Director, MA Parole Board
- Ronnie Watson, Commissioner, Cambridge Police Department