

# **Building Bridges: From Conviction to Employment**

## **A Proposal to Reinvest Corrections Savings in an Employment Initiative**

Submitted to: Representative William Dyson  
Chair, Appropriations Committee  
Connecticut General Assembly

**Herbert Welte Hall  
Central Connecticut State University  
New Britain, CT**



**Council of State Governments**  
Criminal Justice Programs

**January 15, 2003**

The Council of State Governments (CSG) is a non-profit, non-partisan organization that serves all elected and appointed officials in the three branches of state government. Founded in 1933, CSG is unique in both its regional structure and its constituency-which includes state legislators, judges, and executive branch officials. The organization is funded largely through state government dues.

Points of view, recommendations, or findings stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Council of State Governments.

# Table of Contents

Proposed policy options.....	4
James Austin, Ph.D., George Washington University	
Michael Jacobson, Ph.D., John Jay School of Criminal Justice	
Supporting charts and tables.....	10
James Austin, Ph.D., George Washington University	
Maps.....	24
Eric Cadora, Open Society Institute	
Biographies of presenters.....	33

## PROPOSED POLICY OPTIONS

---

**To:** Rep. William Dyson, Chair, Appropriations Committee

**From:** James Austin, Ph.D.  
Michael Jacobson, Ph.D.

**Date:** January 8, 2003

**Re:** Conference Regarding the Employment of Ex-Offenders

---

We appreciate your invitation to participate in the landmark conference you will convene on January 15 regarding the employment of ex-offenders. We know of few, if any, jurisdictions in the U.S. in which key policymakers at your level (together with your staff and the various state government officials serving on the planning committee) have invested such considerable time and resources in this critically important issue.

To prepare our presentations, we requested extensive data files from the Department of Corrections, the Court Support Services Division, and other government organizations. We are grateful to the officials at these agencies, who spent considerable time fulfilling our requests for these data.

Based on the data we received and analyzed, and as per your request, we have developed several options for you and other state officials to review. In developing these options, we considered the current context of an initiative to employ ex-offenders in Connecticut. Despite some of the lowest crime rates in decades, the inmate census is at an all time high and continues to grow. In turn, the number of people who have been incarcerated, return to the community, and seek jobs increases steadily. Providing this swelling segment of the population with the services—such as life skills, job training, and job placement—that will translate into employment will require the allocation of additional resources. Of course, it is unrealistic to think that such resources can be made available for new or expanded programs when the state (like nearly every state) faces such a severe budget crisis. Every government agency and nonprofit organization receiving state funds is bracing itself for significant cuts in funding and potential layoffs.

Given this situation, we have organized the options we prepared under six headings: 1) new prison population management strategies; 2) cost savings; 3) reinvestment of some of the savings in an employment initiative; 4) development of a program model for a particular community; 5) additional resources for the initiative; and 6) obstacles to the employment of an ex-offender.

These options are presented here with only the briefest of explanations. Each, in its own right, is complicated, and we would be happy to discuss the implications of each in greater detail. To discuss these options and their implications for Connecticut with considerable insight, however, would require more than just the short review we conducted of the data files. Before providing that degree of analysis, we would request additional data, conversations with various policymakers and practitioners, and case studies.

Furthermore, we recognize that at least some of these options may not be appropriate for Connecticut. After all, every state is distinct, and simply analyzing data files does not begin to enable us to appreciate fully either the unique organization of the Connecticut's criminal justice system or the history of previous attempts to experiment with some of the ideas presented here.

## **1. New Prison Population Management Strategies**

Like states across the country, Connecticut's prison population has increased dramatically over the last two decades. Today, the state's prison system continues to grow, despite a crime rate that has declined steadily since 1990 and despite a fluctuating number of admissions. Several aspects of the prison population present state officials opportunities to decrease the prison population without compromising public safety: the very limited size of the parole population; the relatively small percentage of the prison population charged or convicted with a violent crime (30 percent); and the nearly 25 percent of prison beds occupied by probation violators.

Implementing any one or more of the following options could enable the Department of Corrections to reduce significantly the state's inmate population.

- a. Require all prisoners with sentences greater than two years to serve no more than 85 percent of their sentence unless they are special management problems.

*Bed Savings: 1,100 released prisoners with sentences greater than two years who were released via "time served" x 9.2 mos = 843 beds.*

- b. Reduce, on average, the amount of time paroled prisoners are incarcerated beyond their parole eligibility date from nine to five months (or a net savings of 4 months).

*Bed Savings: 1,377 prisoners released to parole per year x 4 mos. = 459 beds*

- c. Reduce the number of probation technical violation admissions by 25 percent.

*Bed Savings: 1,820 admissions x 25% x 13 mos = 488 beds*

- d. Reduce, on average, the length of stay for the remaining technical probation violators by three months.

*Bed Savings: 1,820 admissions x 75% x 3 mos = 341 beds*

- e. Release 25 percent of the prisoners with sentences under two years who are not being released via Transitional Supervision or Community Release who are now serving 6-7 months.

*Bed Savings: (4,466 time served releases x 25% x 3 mos = 279 beds*

- f. The other major action that could be taken that would have further and independent effects on the prison population would be to reduce the 1,700 persons being returned to the DOC from Transitional Supervision, Community Release, and from parole as technical violators and to reduce their current lengths of stay. Divert 25% of each type of violator from prison.

*Bed Savings: (700 parole violators x 25% x 10 mos = 146 beds) + (975 transitional supervision/community release violators x 25% x 6 mos = 122 beds)*

Although implementation of any of the above options is certainly feasible, each depends in part on extensive coordination with the courts, corrections, and parole. In addition, implementation of many of these options requires the reallocation of some resources to create community-based programs for the increased numbers of probationers and parolees.

## 2. Cost Savings Generated by the New Strategies

The Department of Corrections' Web site states that the average cost of incarcerating someone is about \$75/day. Nevertheless, in most cases, DOC officials will not, in fact, be able to recoup 100 percent of this cost for each bed per day saved. As the chart below indicates, however, with a more conservative estimate of \$50/day for each bed saved, exercising any one or more of the options still could generate considerable savings.

Option	Bed Savings	Cost Savings (In millions)
<b>a. 85 Percent Release Restriction</b>	<b>843</b>	<b>\$15.4 M</b>
<b>b. Parolees released, on average, no later than 5 months after their parole eligibility date</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>\$ 8.4 M</b>
<b>c. Reduce probation technical violation admissions, average, by 25%</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>\$ 8.9 M</b>
<b>d. Reduce, on average, the LOS of probation technical violators by three months</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>\$ 6.2 M</b>
<b>e. Release short term sentenced prisoners after having served 50% of the sentence</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>\$ 5.1 M</b>
<b>f. Reduce transitional supervision/community and parole technical violations</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>\$ 4.9 M</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,678</b>	<b>\$ 48.9 M</b>

### **3. Reinvestment of Some of the Savings in an Employment Initiative**

Options such as those above present policymakers looking for ways to balance the budget with ways to cut costs without reducing services to the community or laying off state employees. Accordingly, if state officials exercise any of the above options, they would no doubt return a certain percentage of the savings generated to the general fund. At the same time, state officials should also keep in mind the importance of investing some of these resources in improving community safety and in ensuring the successful transition of the ex-offenders to the community. For example, as indicated earlier in this paper, implementation of some of these options will require the expansion of alternative to incarceration programs. Some of the savings will need to be applied to these efforts.

The quality and availability of employment and job placement services will also have a significant impact on the extent to which probationers and parolees succeed in the community. In New York State, for example, 83 percent of all probationers and parolees who violate the conditions of their release and are returned to prison were unemployed.

State officials seeking to ensure that at least a portion of the savings generated through one of the new population management strategies described in this paper are protected for an employment initiative for ex-offenders have at least three options:

- a. Move the savings "off budget" into a newly created economic development corporation or other authority.
- b. Create a budget line or code in the central budget (or miscellaneous budget)
- c. Appropriate funds directly to a state agency and charge officials there (possibly in collaboration with other agency officials and community leaders) with the administration of the initiative.

### **4. Development of an Employment Services Program Model for a Community to which a Large Percentage of Ex-Prisoners Return**

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analyses of the neighborhoods in which probationers live (and in which inmates cite as their address when they were incarcerated) reflect that the majority of people with criminal records in the state hail from a few major urban areas in the state: Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, Waterbury, and Stamford. GIS analysis also illustrates that, within these urban areas, probationers and inmates are concentrated in particular communities.

Two other findings are relevant. These analyses demonstrate that probation caseloads are sufficiently concentrated in a limited number of small neighborhood areas to allow for caseload re-assignment according to probationer place of residence. Second, comparison of Department of Labor data with criminal justice data show that the populations served by each of these government agencies overlap substantially within these same small neighborhoods. It is also highly likely that a GIS analysis of Department of Social Service (DSS) data would show

that populations receiving TANF and other government needs-based program services also overlap substantially with criminal justice and Dept. of Labor populations.

States, local governments, and nonprofit organizations across the country have developed a number of program models, which vary in scope, to facilitate the employment of people released from prison or jail. Among the key issues that successful programs address include:

- Subsidized community service and transitional employment beginning on the day of release;
- Employment skills training and job placement linked to outreach and pre-arranged agreements with specific employers;
- Family strengths based counseling to involve the family or other intimates in helping the individual ex-offender overcome substance abuse and other barriers to employment.

Two basic options exist for policymakers considering program models for an initiative to employ people released from prison.

- a. Develop a low-cost initiative that will have some impact on the employment prospects of an offender.

This type of program model would include one week of life-skills training, which addresses topics such as interviewing skills. It also includes, for between three and six months, one day per week of job development and job placement until the person obtains employment. Operation of such a program typically costs about \$2,000 per participant.

- b. Develop a medium-cost initiative that will have a significant impact on the employment prospects of an ex-offender.

This type of program model also provides one week of life-skills training, but, in addition, includes 3-4 months of paid, supported work at minimum wage and one day a week of job training and job placement. Operation of this type of program averages around \$5,000 per participant.

Of course, there are considerable variations of each of these basic models; some programs include intensive housing elements, support for fathers, or other components. In addition, the costs described above can be somewhat misleading. For example, the additional expense of operating the medium cost initiative is often at least partially offset by the savings it generates: providing the state or city with free employees or reducing welfare rolls are two such examples.



## **5. Additional Investments to Support the Employment Initiative**

The community selected as the pilot site, which will almost certainly already suffer from high unemployment rates, will likely have limited job opportunities even for people without criminal records. To develop and maintain job opportunities for that population and the more-difficult-to-employ ex-offender, state officials will need to transform the savings generated from the population management initiative into a larger pool of resources. The following describes three options for Connecticut state officials to leverage the funds made available to the employment initiative so that they have a far greater impact.

- a. Leverage funds set aside for the initiative by investing in community development financial institutions that will place investments in small businesses, job creation and general community development targeted to low-income neighborhoods and/or criminal justice populations
- b. Match resources made available through the population management strategy with funds available through federal “pass through” grant programs such as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)
- c. Capitalize on tax incentives established to assist employers hire people without jobs or receiving public assistance

## **6. Obstacles to Employment Unique to People with Criminal Records**

- a. Conduct an inventory of state statutes and regulations that prohibit the employment of people with criminal records
- b. Modify those laws and regulations that employers and criminal justice officials alike agree unnecessarily impede the employment of people with criminal records
- c. Provide a mechanism (e.g., certificate of rehabilitation) that enables certain categories of people with criminal records to demonstrate to employers and others that they have successfully completed their obligations under the criminal justice system

### **Major Crime and Correctional Trends in Connecticut**

1. Connecticut's crime rate has been steadily declining since 1990 – similar to the reduction reported for the nation and other states.
2. One major reason for the decline in the crime rate has been an associated decline in the “at-risk” population.
3. Connecticut has substantially lower crime rates and prison incarceration rates than other states.
4. Among the northeastern states, Connecticut has the highest incarceration rate.
5. Connecticut's overall disparity in incarceration rates between whites, blacks and Hispanic is among the highest in the U.S.
6. The incarceration rate for whites is among the lowest in the nation, while the black incarceration rate is above the national average. The Hispanic rate is twice that of the national average.
7. For those sentenced to prison for a year or more for crimes of violence, the state has the nation's longest length of stay and the highest proportion of prison sentences served.
8. The parole board "grant rate" is relatively high compared to other states (65-70 percent).
9. The size of the parole population, while increasing, is one of the lowest in the U.S.
10. The Connecticut prison system is continuing to increase in size despite a fluctuating number of admissions. The major increases are within the sentenced population, which is being caused by longer lengths of stay. The un-sentenced population is relatively stable

11. A major reason for the increased length of stay for sentenced felons is directly related to the abolition of good-time policies by the legislature.
12. Of the 31,766 admissions to the DOC in 2002, nearly 4,000 were listed as probation violators, approximately 385 were Community Release violators, approximately 660 were technical parole violators, and another 590 were technical violators of Transition Supervision. In total, about 5,600 (or 18%) of all admissions are technical violations of some form of community supervision.
13. There are a minimum of 2,250 prisoners who are there for violating either the terms of probation or conditional discharge (Community Release, Transition Supervision, or Parole.)
14. Prisoners who are paroled and released via parole are incarcerated an average of nine months beyond their Parole Eligibility date.
15. Over 6,500 prisoners are 35 years or older and over 40 percent of the sentenced population is in the lower custody levels of I (9 percent) or II (32 percent).
16. Given that only 30 percent of the prison population has been convicted or charged with a violent crime, and that the largest other “offense categories” are drug distribution (17%), probation violation (14%), drug possession (6%), and theft/larceny (6%), it would appear that there is a significant portion of the prison population that could be managed in the community without jeopardizing public safety.

**TABLE 1**  
**COMPARISON BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CONNECTICUT ON KEY**  
**POPULATION, CRIME AND CORRECTIONS INDICATORS**

	<b>United States</b>	<b>Connecticut</b>
Total Population (7/1/01) <sup>1</sup>	284,796,887	3,425,074
Change in Population		
1-year change (7/1/00-7/1/01)	0.9%	0.4%
10-year change (7/1/91-7/1/01)	12.9%	4.1%
UCR Part 1 Reported Crime Rates (2001) <sup>2</sup>		
Total	4,160.5	3,117.9
Violent	504.4	335.5
Property	3,618.3	2,782.4
Change in Total Reported Crime Rate		
1-year change (2000-2001)	0.9%	-3.6%
10-year change (1991-2001)	-29.5%	-41.9%
Total Inmates (2001) <sup>3</sup>	1,406,031	19,196
1-year change (2000-2001)	1.1%	4.6%
6-year change (1995-2001)	24.7%	29.7%
Average annual change (1995-2001)	3.8%	4.8%
Incarceration Rate (Rate per 100,000 inhabitants) <sup>4</sup>	470	387
Inmates by Offense Type (State Prisons Only 2000) <sup>5</sup>		
Violent	49%	29%
Property	20%	12%
Drug	21%	23%
Other	10%	33%

\* Other offense types consist of probation violation, criminal attempt, immigration charges and other status offenses.

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Population estimates for July 1, 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Uniform Crime Reports, Crime in the United States, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

<sup>3</sup> Prisoners in 2001, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin (July 2002). Figures represent prisoners under state or federal correctional authorities.

<sup>4</sup> Prisoners in 2001, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin (July 2002). Rate represents prisoners under state or federal correctional authorities.

<sup>5</sup> Prisoners in 2001, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin (July 2002). Connecticut data provided by CTDOC

**TABLE 2  
CONNECTICUT DOC INMATE POPULATION  
BY TOWN OF RESIDENCE  
JULY 2002**

Town of Residence	N=19,216	%
Non-Connecticut	1,672	8.7%
Bridgeport	2,364	12.3%
East Hartford	346	1.8%
Hartford	2,729	14.2%
Meriden	461	2.4%
New Britain	749	3.9%
New Haven	2,882	15.0%
New London	307	1.6%
Norwalk	346	1.8%
Stamford	500	2.6%
Waterbury	1,326	6.9%
West Haven	307	1.6%
Other	5,227	27.2%

**TABLE 3**  
**CONNECTICUT ADMISSIONS POPULATION**  
**BY OFFENSE**  
**2002**

Offense	N	%
<b>VIOLENCE</b>	<b>4,952</b>	<b>16%</b>
Murder/Manslaughter	172	1%
Sex	497	2%
Assault	3,411	10%
Robbery	872	3%
<b>DRUGS</b>	<b>5,725</b>	<b>19%</b>
Drug Possession	2,380	8%
Drug Distribution	3,345	11%
<b>PROPERTY</b>	<b>4,475</b>	<b>14%</b>
Theft/Larceny	2,414	8%
Burglary/Other	2,061	6%
<b>OTHER OFFENSES</b>	<b>16,624</b>	<b>51%</b>
Weapons	641	2%
DWI & Related	2,405	8%
Probation Violation	3,998	12%
Other Non-Violent	9,580	29%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31,776</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

*Source: CT DOC produced data files*

**TABLE 4**

**CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
CROSS TAB OF ADMIT TYPES WITH LEGAL STATUS  
2002**

Admit Type	Legal Status				Total
	Sentenced>2 year	Sentenced<2 year	Un- sentenced	Federal	
New Admits	436	2,280	5,929	111	8,756
New Admits-Other	184	200	511	606	1,501
New Admits-Civil	25	60	1,040	80	1,205
Parole-Return	7	7	68	14	96
Parole Viol-Tech	529	42	60	69	700
Return Other	60	34	8	8	110
Return from Trans/Com	487	693	130	12	1,322
Readmission-Other	41	22	80	383	526
Readmission-Sentence	706	3,051	171	20	3,948
Readmission Continued	1,975	3,484	7,620	75	13,154
Return with New Charge	270	61	60	7	398
Readmission Parcom/Cuscom	3	2	37	8	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,723</b>	<b>9,936</b>	<b>15,714</b>	<b>1,393</b>	<b>31,766</b>

*Source: CT DOC produced data files*

**TABLE 5  
CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
CROSSTABULATION OF RELEASE TYPES WITH LEGAL STATUS  
2002**

Release Type	Legal Status				Total
	Sentenced>2 year	Sentenced<2 year	Un- sentenced	Federal	
Discharge to Court	319	845	6,195	109	7,468
Discharge to Feds	1	1	9	381	392
Discharge to Immigration	3	3	11	824	841
Fine Paid	2	26	136		164
Time Served	1,677	5,488	766	14	7,945
Escape	92	59	4	1	156
Death	34	11	12		57
Parole to Feds	16			1	17
Other Release	906	857	990	45	2,798
Release to Community	1,102	428		3	1,533
Release to Parcom	51	1	8		60
Release to Re-entry Furlough	69	29	3	1	102
Released to Supervised Parole	1,110	33	22	158	1,323
Transfer to Trans Supv	306	604	26	1	937
Un-sentenced Discharge on Bond	395	495	5,689	14	6,593
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,083</b>	<b>8,880</b>	<b>13,871</b>	<b>1,552</b>	<b>30,386</b>

*Source: CT DOC produced data files*




**TABLE 6**  
**CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**  
**INCARCERATED POPULATION BY OFFENSE**  
**DECEMBER 2002**


Offense	N	%
<i>Violent</i>	5,749	29.7%
Murder/Manslaughter	1,186	6.1%
Sex	950	4.9%
Assault	2,157	11.1%
Robbery	1,456	7.5%
<i>Drug</i>	4,453	23.0%
Drug Possession	1,193	6.2%
Drug Distribution	3,260	16.8%
<i>Property</i>	2,288	11.8%
Other Property	98	0.5%
Theft/Larceny	1,103	5.7%
Burglary	964	5.0%
Fraud	123	0.6%
Weapons	460	2.4%
DWI & Related	534	2.8%
Failure to Appear	329	1.7%
Purge/Civil Commitment	31	0.2%
Probation Violation	2,641	13.6%
<i>Other Non-Violent</i>	2,740	14.1%
Lifer	139	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,364</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: CT DOC produced data files

Historical Inmate Population by Gender




Historical Inmate Population by Legal Status (1990-2003\*)




\*Data for Jan. 1<sup>st</sup> vs. July 1<sup>st</sup>


### CONNECTICUT DOC GRANT RATE BY HEARING TYPE




**CONNECTICUT POPULATION VS. AT RISK POPULATION  
(HISTORICAL & PROJECTED)**




### Historical Supervised Population



Actual and Projected Inmate Population




# Persons Sentenced and Admitted to Prison Connecticut Towns, 2002







# Race and Single Parent Households

## New Haven Neighborhoods, 2002





# Persons Sentenced and Admitted to Prison New Haven Neighborhoods, 2002





Neighborhood	Prison Adm.	% of Total	PV	% of Total
Beaver Hills	72	4.1%	21	29.2%
Central Business District	17	1.0%	4	23.5%
Dixwell	101	5.7%	17	16.8%
Dwight	86	4.9%	7	8.1%
East Rock	24	1.4%	2	8.3%
East Shore	71	4.0%	11	15.5%
Edgewood - West River	151	8.6%	28	18.5%
Fair Haven	288	16.3%	63	21.9%
Heights	132	7.5%	25	18.9%
Hill (4 City Point)	387	21.9%	86	22.2%
Long Warf - Church St. South	26	1.5%	6	23.1%
Newhallville	173	9.8%	38	22.0%
Prospect Hill	43	2.4%	11	25.6%
Westhills	108	6.1%	19	17.6%
Westville	13	0.7%	1	7.7%
Wooster Square	69	3.9%	5	7.2%
Yale	3	0.2%	1	33.3%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>1,764</b>		<b>345</b>	

# Prison Expenditures New Haven Neighborhoods, 2002



Neighborhood	Expenditure	% of Total	PV Expenditure	% Total
Beaver Hills	\$4,084,175	4.6%	\$1,147,575	28.4%
Central Business District	\$1,184,625	1.4%	\$108,000	9.1%
Dixwell	\$4,891,050	5.6%	\$999,675	20.4%
Dwight	\$2,975,175	3.4%	\$208,125	7.0%
East Rock	\$996,750	1.1%	\$78,750	7.9%
East Shore	\$3,625,050	4.2%	\$586,750	16.2%
Edgewood - West River	\$8,242,200	9.5%	\$2,567,325	31.1%
Fair Haven	\$15,837,125	17.7%	\$3,949,125	25.7%
Heights	\$5,505,975	6.3%	\$1,393,500	25.3%
Hill (4 City Point)	\$19,885,050	22.9%	\$6,231,900	31.3%
Long Warf - Church St. South	\$1,092,525	1.3%	\$273,750	25.1%
Newhallville	\$8,647,950	10.0%	\$2,706,375	31.3%
Prospect Hill	\$1,765,950	2.0%	\$550,200	31.2%
Westhills	\$4,959,825	5.7%	\$1,099,875	22.2%
Westville	\$731,400	0.8%	\$97,500	13.3%
Wooster Square	\$2,768,625	3.2%	\$304,500	11.0%
Yale	\$177,000	0.2%	\$108,750	61.4%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$86,820,450</b>		<b>\$22,404,675</b>	


# Persons on Probation New Haven Neighborhoods, 2002




Neighborhood	Probationers	% of Total
Beaver Hills	93	3.4%
Central Business District	25	0.9%
Dixwell	133	4.9%
Dwight	123	4.5%
East Rock	66	2.4%
East Shore	155	5.7%
Edgewood - West River	272	10.0%
Fair Haven	447	16.4%
Heights	231	8.5%
Hill (4 City Point)	475	17.5%
Long Warf - Church St. South	28	1.0%
Newhallville	246	9.0%
Prospect Hill	53	1.9%
Westhills	248	9.1%
Westville	38	1.4%
Wooster Square	83	3.1%
Yale	3	0.1%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>2,719</b>	

# Probation Caseload Distribution Example



## New Haven Neighborhoods and the Hill Community




# Probationers, Unemployment Insurance Claimants, and TFA Recipients



# Employment Agencies and Banks New Haven Neighborhoods, 2002



# Non-Profit Organizations and Faith-Based Institutions New Haven Neighborhoods, 2002





### **James Austin**

*Director, Institute on Crime, Justice, and Corrections, George Washington University*

Dr. James Austin is the director of the Institute on Crime, Justice, and Corrections at the George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Prior to joining the GWU, he was the Executive Vice President of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency where he was employed for 20 years. He began his career in corrections in 1970 when he was employed by the Illinois Department of Corrections as a correctional sociologist at the Joliet and Stateville prisons.

Dr. Austin was named by the American Correctional Association as its 1991 recipient of the Peter P. Lejin's Research Award. In 1999 he received the Western Society of Criminology Paul Tappin award for outstanding contributions in the field of criminology. Since 2000, he has served as the Chair of American Society of Criminology National Policy Committee.

Dr. Austin has authored numerous publications including three books. His most recent book, *It's About Time: America's Imprisonment Binge*, was first published in 1996 (co-authored with Dr. John Irwin). The third edition was published this spring.

Each year the ICJC is awarded approximately \$1.5 million in research contracts from federal and state correctional agencies. Many State departments of correction, including those in Texas, Georgia, and California, have sought Dr. Austin's assistance in analyzing their prison population. Dr. Austin has also directed studies in 25 states that entail projections of correctional populations based on current and proposed sentencing reforms. In addition, the ICJC has recently conducted national evaluations of "Three Strikes and You're Out" laws, the privatization of prisons, juveniles in adult corrections, and prison classification systems. In 1999 Dr. Austin was designated by the U.S. Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division to serve as the Federal Monitor to oversee major reforms in the Georgia juvenile correctional system.

## **Michael P. Jacobson**

### ***Professor, John Jay College of Criminal Justice***

Dr. Michael P. Jacobson teaches at the City University of New York Graduate Center and the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in the Department of Law, Police Science, and Criminal Justice Administration. He has also served on the Graduate Faculty of the Wagner School of Public Administration at New York University, where he taught courses on public policy analysis and governmental budgeting. He has a Ph.D in Sociology from the CUNY Grad Center.

Dr. Jacobson retired from government administration in 1997. He had been appointed Correction Commissioner in 1996 by Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, after serving as Acting Correction Commissioner beginning in January 1995. While Acting Correction Commissioner, he continued to serve as Commissioner of the New York City Probation Department, having been appointed to that position in 1992.

Prior to his appointment as Probation Commissioner, he served as Deputy Budget Director at the City's Office of Management and Budget, where he worked for seven years. He previously served as Deputy Director of the Mayor's Arson Strike Force for five years, where he helped plan and coordinate the City's anti-arson strategies.

For two decades, Dr. Jacobson has specialized in the field of criminal justice, particularly in the areas of financial issues, technology initiatives, multi-agency operations and victims' rights. He also is a member of the Vera Institute of Justice Board of Trustees.