



The Returning Home Initiative

Ending the Cycle of Homelessness and Criminal Justice Involvement Through Supportive Housing—a Progress Report

INTRODUCTION

The Returning Home Initiative helps people who have been incarcerated reintegrate into their communities by linking them to permanent supportive housing. Supportive housing combines affordable housing with tailored, coordinated health, mental health, substance abuse, and vocational services along with advocacy for public benefits. Sobriety is not a precondition of receiving housing—supportive housing engages people, houses them, and provides support so they can improve their health and housing stability. Returning Home serves people who have cycled repeatedly through jails, homeless shelters, emergency rooms, and other public systems and often have a history of serious mental illness, substance abuse, or both.

Returning Home is a project of the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH), headquartered in New York City, and a leader in the national movement to end homelessness through supportive housing. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) has provided \$12 million for Returning Home since 2006; the current grant runs through May 2013. See [Appendix 1](#) for a list of people interviewed for this report.

WHAT IS RETURNING HOME ABOUT?

“Why would a foundation that has the mission of improving health and health care get involved with the criminal justice system?” asks Nancy Barrand, MPA, a senior advisor for program development and the Returning Home program officer at RWJF.

Then, she answers her own rhetorical question: “What we see in the jails is reflected in the health disparities in the community. If you want to do something about reducing health disparities, you need to take the jails into account. This fits as one of the social determinants of health.”

A familiar cycle unfolds across every major city in the United States. A man spends a few months in jail, followed by a few weeks in a homeless shelter. Then, he may have a health crisis of some sort that brings him to the hospital emergency room where his

substance abuse addiction becomes apparent. A stint at a drug detoxification center often comes next.

Like so many individuals with serious mental illness or substance abuse problems, this man is likely to move from one public service to another, over and over and over again. Everyone knows the system is failing such individuals, but few permanent solutions have been available. The criminal justice system does not have the resources to provide psychiatric help. Public housing may be closed to those with a history of incarceration, and social service providers may be reluctant to engage that population as well.

Without appropriate alternatives, jails in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York and other large cities have become *de facto* holding pens for people with behavioral disorders. Many jails house more mentally ill people on any given day than any hospital in the United States, according to the [Corporation for Supportive Housing](#) (CSH). Across the country, more than one in three jail inmates has some physical or mental disability and 75 percent have a history of substance abuse.

Public safety is also ill served by the current system. “Communities are recognizing that 99 percent of these defendants come back to the community at some time,” says advisory board member Evelyn Stratton, JD, an Ohio Supreme Court Justice. “If you don’t help them, they will either commit more crimes or will cost some system money, whether it is the shelters or the emergency room.”

CSH developed the Returning Home Initiative to intervene and end this cycle of criminal justice involvement and homelessness—focusing its two decades of experience with supportive housing on this problem. Short-term city and county jail populations are the primary focus, but some of the sites adapting the model also work with populations that have served longer sentences in state prison systems. By integrating affordable housing with coordinated health and social services, the idea is to pave a path to re-entry that allows these troubled people to lead more stable and productive lives.

The Seeds for Returning Home

Returning Home built on the Frequent Users Service Enhancement Initiative (FUSE), launched in New York City in 2006. Designed and implemented by CSH and a partnership of city agencies, the demonstration project initially placed 100 individuals into permanent supportive housing units.

FUSE recruits incarcerated, or recently incarcerated, individuals and provides them with intensive services until they are placed in housing and stabilized. Eligible participants had a minimum of four jail stays and four stays in homeless shelters over the previous five years.

In its first year, FUSE reduced the number of days participants spent in jail by 53 percent and reduced the number of days they used shelters by 92 percent, compared to a control group, according to an evaluation by John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Based on these evaluation outcomes, CSH conducted a cost analysis of public data that calculated savings to be almost \$3,000 per person.

“Part of the impetus [for Returning Home] was to take what we were learning from FUSE and use it as a gospel for spreading the word,” said Martin Horn, MA, distinguished lecturer at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City (and formerly the commissioner of correction and probation for the City of New York)

About the Corporation for Supportive Housing

The Corporation for Supportive Housing was launched in 1991 with \$4 million from RWJF, \$4 million from Pew Charitable Trusts and \$2 million from the Ford Foundation. It is the only organization in the country focused exclusively on creating supportive housing for people who are chronically homeless.

From 2002 to 2012, CSH played a role in developing more than 152,000 units of supportive housing for this vulnerable population. While some supportive housing is literally built from the ground up, most of it is created by securing and targeting the necessary combination of housing resources and linked health and social services.

One approach is to work with public housing authorities to designate a certain number of units for the target populations. Another pathway is the scatter-site model, in which private landlords agree to a rental, and CSH and its allies then secure the necessary public subsidies to make the housing affordable for a tenant.

In addition to creating housing opportunities, CSH:

- Promotes collaborations among a diverse array of public and private stakeholders and advocates for policies that will increase the availability of supportive housing
- Serves as a national resource center and policy advocate, providing expertise and financial support to federal, state and local policy-makers, service providers, community advocates, developers, and financial institutions
- Generates a body of research demonstrating that supportive housing improves the lives of individuals, generates significant cost savings to public systems, and helps to stabilize communities.

RWJF has provided \$33 million in funding to CSH since its inception.

Learn more about the history of CSH and RWJF’s work developing supportive housing in the 2006 RWJF [Anthology](#).¹

Other RWJF Initiatives Focused on Re-Entry

Returning Home complements two other RWJF projects that engage with the correctional system. “The overlap is how health care impacts, and is impacted by, the criminal justice system,” says RWJF’s Barrand.

- [The NetWork for Better Futures](#), in Minneapolis, offers high-risk adults—primarily African American men with histories of incarceration, homelessness, and mental illness—access to affordable housing, employment, primary health care, behavioral health services, and opportunities to build community. The project serves both individuals who have short jail stays and those who have served longer terms in state prisons.²

“This is a group that has a scarlet letter on its chest and society is afraid of them,” says Steven Thomas, project director of the NetWork. “Traditional supportive housing has not gone after that group.”

- [Community Oriented Correctional Health Services \(COCHS\)](#), based in Oakland, Calif., builds partnerships between jails and community health care providers. Its goal is to establish a medical home so that people involved with the criminal justice system can receive consistent appropriate care, regardless of where they live.³

To influence policy, Community Oriented Correctional Health Services and CSH often combine their efforts. COCHS President Steven Rosenberg explains. “I might have a good ‘in’ with the sheriff’s department. CSH might have a good ‘in’ with the county commissioner. The sheriff is looking at the jail population and the commissioner is hearing people complaining about the homeless on the streets. They don’t see it as the same folks, but we do, and we say, ‘We can solve both your problems. Here is what we need from you.’”

HOW DOES RETURNING HOME WORK?

Returning Home applies the core CSH supportive housing strategies to frequent users of jail systems. It is intended at once to improve the lives of people with a long history of homelessness and incarceration, most of whom are also mentally ill, and to make more efficient use of public resources.

¹ Green L. “Supportive Housing.” In *To Improve Health and Health Care*, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Anthology, Volume X, Chapter Six. 2006. Available [online](#).

² RWJF has supported this work with ID#s 63040 and 68465.

³ RWJF has supported COCHS with three grants: ID#s 55964, 65279 (see [Program Results](#)) and 67081.

The RWJF Grants

Beginning in 2006, RWJF gave three grants to CSH for Returning Home:

- The first grant focused on more fully developing the model of supportive housing for people involved in the criminal justice system in New York City, and then introduced the approach in Chicago and Los Angeles.⁴ “We said we are going to take on the three largest criminal justice systems in the United States,” said Andy McMahon, MPA, managing director of CSH. “They are immensely complex and we needed to go after these three.”
 - New York expanded its demonstration initiative, creating FUSE II to engage more public agencies and create more housing units.
 - Chicago adapted the FUSE model, helping to build capacity among local nonprofit housing developers and service agencies and engaging public officials in the effort to provide stable housing to re-entry populations.
 - Los Angeles worked closely with the sheriff’s department to create Just in Reach for people at risk for homelessness after leaving the county jail. The sheriff’s department provided \$1.5 million in funding for this initiative, which typically begins while the individual is still incarcerated. Just in Reach involves the integrated efforts of corrections, housing, and human service providers.⁵
- CSH continued to refine Returning Home under its second grant and began replicating it in other jurisdictions, including communities in Connecticut, Kansas, New Jersey, Ohio, and Rhode Island, and in Boston; Columbus, Ohio; Denver; Hennepin County, Minn.; and Washington. Returning Home also began to target two subpopulations with a history of recent incarceration—parents reuniting with their families and veterans.⁶
- The third grant, still underway, aims to institutionalize supportive housing as a core strategy in returning individuals who have been incarcerated to the community and reducing recidivism.⁷ With the third grant, said RWJF’s Barrand, “We needed to take this to a new level. There has to be advocacy and policy. We don’t need to show again that it works.”

CSH has leveraged RWJF’s investment in supportive housing for people involved in the criminal justice system with more than \$5 million in philanthropic resources from 2006 to 2010, including grants from JP Morgan Chase, the Hilton Foundation, the JEHT

⁴ Grant ID# 53461 (\$6 million, 2006–2009)

⁵ Roman CG, Fontaine J, Burt M. *The Corporation for Supportive Housing’s Returning Home Initiative: System Change Accomplishments after Three Years: Summary Brief*. Washington: The Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, November 2009. Available [online](#).

⁶ Grant ID# 65899 (\$4 million, 2009–2011)

⁷ Grant ID #68764 (\$2 million, 2011–2013)

Foundation, and the Open Society Institute. CSH has also leveraged millions of dollars from public agencies.

The FUSE Model

With CSH guidance, many municipalities have adapted FUSE to offer a locally tailored, intensive package of services, coupled with affordable housing, to their re-entry populations. FUSE has three core elements:

- **Housing and supportive services.** FUSE works to break the cycle of incarceration and homelessness with housing and services to well-defined populations at jails, shelters, hospitals, and other settings (in-reach).
- **Data-driven recruitment and measures of success.** Data are used to identify targeted populations served by multiple public systems. In New York, for example, populations eligible for FUSE II have had a minimum of a total of six stays over five years in jails and homeless shelters.

Measures of success emphasize both reducing costs to crisis public systems and demonstrating that individuals are able to avoid institutions altogether, rather than simply being “off-loaded” from one to another.

- **Policy and systems reform.** FUSE engages public systems and policy-makers in a collective effort to shift resources from costly crisis management and towards permanent housing solutions, and promotes the alignment and integration of resources and policies across systems.

Engaging Partners

To create re-entry supportive housing, Returning Home aligns public and private resources and policies and promotes broad participation by government agencies. In New York City, for example, the departments of Homeless Services, Corrections, Health and Mental Hygiene, the city’s Human Resources Administration and its Housing Authority, are all involved in the effort.

City and county criminal justice professionals almost always have welcomed the Returning Home model enthusiastically. “The criminal justice system was hungry to partner with us,” says McMahon, who remembers an early conversation with the Cook County sheriff in Chicago. “I was painting the picture of chronic users of the jail system and he said, ‘We can go to the jail, and I can find 300 of those people for you right now.’”

That was almost a universal response, McMahon recalls. “In talking to a sheriff or warden about these issues, they were delighted that we had reached out to them. They know better than we do that they have a subset of people languishing in their county jails who shouldn’t be there and who are taking up space in overcrowded jails, using immense resources.”

Health and social service providers are also key to successful supportive housing initiatives. Initially, some hesitate to become involved with people who have spent time in the criminal justice system. CSH reminds them that they probably already are. The message, says McMahon, is: “If you have worked with a lot of people with behavioral health issues and histories of homelessness, then the likelihood that you have already worked with this population is very, very high.”

Informing the National Conversation

Along with working with specific jurisdictions to expand supportive housing, CSH staff encourages the policy changes necessary to replicate the model more broadly. This involves identifying barriers and the key local, state, and federal officials positioned to dismantle them, and then engaging and educating these key policy-makers.

For example, CSH staff has discussed the Returning Home approach repeatedly with representatives of public housing authorities, including 70 top executives at a 2010 meeting of the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities. Other outreach has focused on the National Association of Counties (NACo), the Council of State Governments, and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, which is concerned about a population of veterans caught in the same cycle.

Advisory Board

Influential leaders in the criminal justice, behavioral health, and housing systems comprise the Returning Home advisory board, helping to increase the visibility of supportive housing as a tool for re-entry. “Their expertise and guidance, and their ability to create access to the criminal justice world have been hugely valuable to us,” says McMahon. (See [Appendix 2](#) for membership.)

The admiration goes in both directions. “I have benefitted far more from the opportunity to serve than I have contributed,” says advisory board member AT Wall, director of the Rhode Island Department of Corrections. “It has given me access to a very broad spectrum of views about the intersection of housing, homelessness, and the cycles of incarceration. I have been able to learn the landscape.”

WHAT HAS RETURNING HOME ACCOMPLISHED SO FAR?

New Housing Units and Their Impact

As of March 2012, CSH has facilitated the creation of 1,500 new units of re-entry supportive housing through Returning Home. Although most units are in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York, 75 are in Hennepin County, Minn., 31 are scattered among five Connecticut cities (with funding secured for 160 more), and Rhode Island has added 190

units of housing—“a significant number” for that tiny state, notes Wall. Work is underway in at least six other states.

Under FUSE II, public agencies in New York have supplemented CSH-led efforts by providing additional supportive housing for the re-entry population. “This is a great example of a nonprofit essentially acting as a catalyst to have government take ownership over something that is evidence-based and works,” said Glenn Martin, vice president of Development and Public Affairs at the Fortune Society in New York City. The Fortune Society provides services to previously incarcerated populations and has worked with CSH on other initiatives. “This is where you want to go in terms of impacting system change.”

Formal evaluations continue in many jurisdictions, but preliminary findings suggest that the use of some public systems has fallen, and cost savings have resulted.⁸ For example:

- In New York City, only 16 percent of Returning Home participants housed in supportive settings were admitted to a shelter over a 12-month period, compared to 98 percent of a comparison group.
- Participants in Hennepin County, Minn., reduced the number of days they spent in county jail by 39 percent and the nights spent in shelters by 43 percent over a 22-month period.

Gail Dorfman, MPA, a commissioner on the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners, called the availability of data generated on the first six individuals housed under the program “hugely helpful.” Each of them had cost the system an average of \$95,000 in public services in the year prior to their participation. One year after being housed, that cost had dropped to \$16,000.

“The data clearly pointed out to my colleagues on the county board that this is a program that is working and breaking the cycle and will save us money. And the downtown businesses liked it.”

Overcoming Regulatory Barriers

CSH staff has diminished the regulatory and administrative barriers that interfere with expanding supportive housing for the Returning Home subpopulation.

For example, a policy in place at the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) limited eligibility for homeless services to the population that had been in jail for 30 days or less prior to their release. “HUD was concerned about opening the floodgates,” acknowledged McMahon.

⁸*Returning Home: Ending the Cycle of Homelessness and Criminal Justice Involvement Through Supportive Housing, Emerging Evidence and Lessons Learned.* New York: Corporation for Supportive Housing, June 2011. Available [online](#).

But CSH staff did some research and discovered that significant populations of people serve between 30 and 90 days in jail before cycling back to the street. “CSH reached out to me to reconsider our policy based on their findings,” said Mark Johnston, MA, deputy assistant secretary for HUD’s Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs. And HUD responded, changing the policy to 90 days. “That was a huge policy impact and it wouldn’t have happened had it not been for this project.”

Another cross-cutting issue is that many jurisdictions bar people who have criminal records from receiving federal Section 8 vouchers, which provide subsidies for rental housing in the private market. Under federal statute, that restriction is permitted, but not required—the federal government says only that registered sex offenders and people who have been convicted of manufacturing methamphetamines in public housing are ineligible for Section 8.

CSH helped HUD and the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness design a meeting in Los Angeles, attended by representatives from dozens of public housing agencies, to help clarify that law. “We are encouraging them to house homeless people getting out of the jails. They don’t have to be scared of doing that,” explained Johnston. “I remind people that localities have the choice to serve those people.”

Partnering With the National Association of Counties

Counties typically shoulder most of the burden for jail costs, making them a natural ally in the cost-saving Returning Home strategy.

The National Association of Counties and CSH have a memorandum of understanding in place, set to run from September 2011 to August 2013, to strengthen their collective efforts to establish supportive housing. “It seemed like a perfect fit for our two organizations,” says Maeghan Gilmore, MPH, program director for Health, Human Services and Justice at the association.

Joint activities include educating county officials on the supportive housing model and providing technical assistance as officials explore ways to integrate Returning Home into some of the approaches counties are already using. A working group of about two dozen county government officials provides a platform for peer-to-peer discussions.

In February 2012, McMahan made a presentation to 100 county commissioners in Atlanta. With incoming NACo president Chris Rodgers making re-entry and criminal justice the focus of his signature presidential initiative, McMahan says, “We will have a great opportunity to educate and engage on this.”

Adds Gilmore, “While it is a cost issue, it is also a human issue to say, ‘We know that jail is not the place where individuals with mental health and substance abuse issues should

be going.’ We need to find some innovative solutions for individuals to get the care and support they need in the most appropriate place.”

WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES?

Dealing With Complex Bureaucracies

Creating supportive housing for the re-entry populations requires the cooperation of numerous complex public and private systems that must integrate resources and policies effectively. “Central to our success is the ability to collaborate across the housing, homeless, criminal justice, and behavioral justice systems,” explains McMahon. “Each of these systems has its own constraints. Some constraints are bureaucratic, some make perfect sense, others require some pushing.”

Whatever the constraints, making change is a long-term proposition. Particularly where governments are involved, he says, “You are not going to show them a paper, try something for six months, and have them sing Kumbaya with you.”

It takes determination on the part of a lot of people, says Kathy Coughlin, deputy director in the New York City Department of Probation.⁹ She emphasizes the value of champions who push the work forward. “In each of these agencies you can identify the person who owned it and made it happen, someone who says, ‘This isn’t going to fail.’”

Along the way, missteps occur, and they sometimes seem almost humorous. New York City officials spent a year convincing the public housing authority to set aside Section 8 funds for Returning Home people, piecing together funding for the supportive services, defining eligibility, and reaching out to the target population. Then, they helped clients complete the lengthy paperwork necessary to apply for Section 8 housing.

“So we have this program where you had to *have* a criminal record to be eligible,” says Coughlin. “And the housing authority denies the application of the first person we process because that person has a criminal record.” The city eventually made the necessary exceptions to move forward, but it was an example of the inevitable and unexpected obstacles that keep arising.

Martin Horn worries that supportive housing as a tool for re-entry remains subject to shifting political agendas. “It requires a continuing philosophical commitment to the idea that when you take a person’s liberty, government assumes a certain liability. And that when we take a high-need person into custody, it’s an opportunity to intervene for the better,” he says. “I am not convinced that this philosophical belief has been

⁹ Coughlin was deputy commissioner for Discharge Planning in the New York City Department of Corrections when the Returning Home initiative was designed.

institutionalized in government. My fear is that another administration could come in with different views.”

Despite the evidence that supportive housing saves money over the long haul, short-term fiscal considerations can also become a barrier. Budget cuts undermined plans to expand the New York City project to the state level, for example.

A Vulnerable Client Population

Making supportive housing available does not guarantee that the target population will welcome it enthusiastically. “We assumed that when we told people we were going to give them a place to live, they would line up for it,” says Coughlin. Instead, clients often failed to show up as planned. She ruefully recalls a man who vanished the day before he was scheduled to move into housing. “For this person, it was terrifying. He had never lived in a place where he could close the door and no one else was there.”

That was part of a larger lesson about understanding the perspective of vulnerable populations with a lifetime of reasons to doubt the word of officials with public systems. One social worker in New York City visited a client in the shelter system every Thursday for many weeks, trying to persuade him to apply for supportive housing. When Thanksgiving came, she didn’t change her schedule, knowing that her consistency was being tested and to do otherwise would be considered a breach of trust.

“Plan for lots of failure,” warns Mikkel Beckman, executive director of St. Stephen’s Human Services in Minneapolis, which develops supportive housing units in Hennepin County. “Behavior change is hard. On the street, people are used to sharing a resource so they invite friends to sleep on the couch or floor, [some of them] people with alcohol and drug use. You have to teach people to manage that behavior better so it doesn’t lead to passing out in the hallway and noise and evictions.”

WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?

CSH is increasingly working to institutionalize the concept of Returning Home, while continuing to help individual jurisdictions expand supportive housing. “Six years ago, this wasn’t on the radar of the criminal justice world, it was not seen as part of the solution to re-entry and recidivism in our country,” observes McMahon. “It is now.”

Supportive housing for individuals with histories of chronic health conditions and/or homelessness returning to their communities after incarceration should become the norm, according to McMahon. “It is essentially embedding supportive housing as part of the normal response to problems in the criminal justice system. It is a piece in the puzzle that you need to do to succeed.”

As a conduit to thousands of county officials, the presidential initiative with the National Association of Counties offers a particularly welcome opportunity to aggressively scale up. “We need to get more and more counties to buy in,” says McMahon. Future partnership plans with the association include offering an educational forum in June 2012, where counties will create their own action strategies, and a webinar open to all 3,068 of the nation’s counties.

Money, of course, is always a concern. CSH is working on the policy level to expand innovative financing mechanisms, including the wider use of Medicaid to fund the social and health services at the core of supportive housing. The agency also plans to create a “policy engineering toolkit” that will offer information, resources, sample memoranda of understanding, and other know-how to jurisdictions interested in replicating the model.

Federal legislators are currently considering the re-authorization of the federal Second Chance Act, which provides support to programs targeted at individuals returning to their communities after incarceration. CSH is providing education to congressional staff on this issue, and, with CSH general funds, a limited amount of lobbying. “If there is clear direction by Congress on the reauthorization bill, that does a lot in terms of being able to finance supportive housing,” says McMahon. “But what is also hugely important is that it continues to institutionalize and legitimize this broader issue.”

Finally, CSH and its partners will continue to refine, improve, and adapt re-entry supportive housing to meet the unique needs of jurisdictions; and to employ new evaluation techniques and predictive modeling tools to maintain its commitment to data and outcome-driven results.

Prepared by: Karyn Feiden

Reviewed by: Jayme Hannay and Molly McKaughan

Program Officer: Nancy Barrand

Grant ID # 53461, 65899, 68764

Program area: Vulnerable Populations

APPENDIX 1

Interviewees

Mikkel Beckman

Executive Director
St. Stephen's Human Services, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minn.

Kathy Coughlin

Deputy Director
New York City Department of Probation
Former Deputy Commissioner
Programs and Discharge Planning
Department of Corrections
New York, N.Y.

Gail Dorfman, MPA

Commissioner
Hennepin County Board of Commissioners
Minneapolis, Minn.

Maeghan Gilmore, MPH

Program Director
Health, Human Services and Justice
National Association of Counties
Washington, D.C.

Martin F. Horn, MA

Distinguished Lecturer
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Formerly, Commissioner
New York City Department of Corrections
Member
Returning Home Advisory Board
New York, N.Y.

Mark Johnston, MA

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs
Office of Community Planning and
Development

Department of Housing and Urban
Development
Washington, D.C.

Glenn Martin

Vice President of Development and Public
Affairs
Fortune Society
New York, N.Y.

Andy McMahon, MPA

Associate Director
Corporation for Supportive Housing
New York, N.Y.

Steve Rosenberg

President
Community Oriented Correctional Health
Services
Oakland, Calif.

Honorable Evelyn Lundberg Stratton, JD

Justice
Supreme Court of Ohio
Member
Returning Home Advisory Board
Columbus, Ohio

Steve Thomas

President and Chief Executive Officer
The NetWork for Better Futures
Minneapolis, Minn.

Ashbel T. (AT) Wall, JD

Director
Rhode Island Department of Corrections
Cranston, R.I.



APPENDIX 2

National Advisory Board Members

Nancy Barrand, MPA

Senior Advisor for Program Development
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Princeton, N.J.

Honorable Paul P. Beibel, Jr., JD

Presiding Judge
Cook County Criminal Courts
Chicago, Ill.

Steve Berg

Vice President of Programs & Policy
National Alliance of End Homelessness
Washington, D.C.

Dan Cain

Executive Director
RS Eden
Minneapolis, Minn.

Pete Earley

Author

Carol Fidler, JD

Director of Mental Health Courts
Center for Court Innovation
New York, N.Y.

Martin F. Horn, MA

Distinguished Lecturer
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Former Commissioner
New York City Department of Corrections
Member
Returning Home Advisory Board
New York, N.Y.

Betsy Lieberman

President
AIDS Housing of Washington
Seattle, Wash.

Fred Osher, MD

Director
Center for Behavioral Health, Justice & Public
Policy
Council of State Governments
Washington, D.C.

Regina Quattrochi, JD

Executive Director
Bailey House
New York, N.Y.

Honorable Evelyn Lundberg Stratton, JD

Justice
Supreme Court of Ohio
Member
Returning Home Advisory Board
Columbus, Ohio

Susan Tucker

Program Director
After-Prison Initiative
Open Society Institute
New York, N.Y.

Ashbel T. (AT) Wall, JD

Director
Rhode Island Department of Corrections
Cranston, R.I.

Carl Wicklund

Executive Director
American Probation and Parole Association
Lexington, Ky.