



**Overcoming Housing and Employment Challenges for Returning Citizens:  
Lessons Learned from Model Programs**

December 7, 2010  
Old Council Chambers  
441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC

**Summary Report**

**Facilitators**

Paul Quander, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for the District of Columbia  
Jesse Jannetta, Urban Institute  
Mannone Butler, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for the District of Columbia

**Panelists**

*Overview*

Jocelyn Fontaine, The Urban Institute

*Housing Focus*

Schroeder Stribling, N Street Village  
Richard Cho, Corporation for Supportive Housing  
Robert Davalos, Delancey Street New York  
John Hamilton, SC Strong

*Employment Focus*

Diane Williams, Safer Foundation  
Art Shanks, Cypress Mandela Training Center

*Next Steps in the District of Columbia*

Adrienne Poteat, Deputy Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency  
Devon Brown, Director, Department of Corrections  
The Hon. Milton Lee, Jr., Presiding Judge, Fathering Court  
Herman Odom, Jr., Director, Office on Ex-Offender Affairs  
Michael Smalls, Workforce Development Specialist, Dept. of Employment Services  
Fred Swan, Family Services Administrator, Dept. of Human Services

## Overview

Co-hosted by the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council and the Urban Institute, the *Overcoming Housing and Employment Challenges for Returning Citizens* symposium was held on December 7, 2010 in Washington, DC. The goals of the symposium were to facilitate dialogue and share lessons learned from housing and employment service-delivery models at the national level as well as model programs operating in Washington, DC. Separate panels focused on housing and employment-focused models, and some of the participating panelists represented organizations that address both. At the conclusion of the day, a panel of leaders from District criminal justice and human services agencies discussed their current and planned work to assist returning citizens with housing and employment, and the challenges that currently exist locally in these areas.

Invited attendees included persons involved in community supervision, law enforcement, the courts, research and policy, housing and employment, reentry services, the faith community, representatives from foundations, nonprofit and private sector organizations, and community members. Seventy-five people signed in for the event. Attendees received a packet with background research and material about program models discussed during the symposium.

Symposium attendees were encouraged to attend the Citywide Reentry Strategic Planning Forum for Public Safety (presented in partnership by the CJCC and members of its Reentry Steering Committee) on Saturday, December 11. The two events are complementary, with the symposium providing insight and information from existing reentry program models to serve as background in the planning forum.

The symposium began with Adrienne Poteat of CSOSA welcoming the panelists and the audience, and articulating the twin challenges presented by employment and housing for people returning from prison, and those who work with them. The first challenge is that those returning to the District from either the federal prison system of the DC Department of Corrections have a strike against them in the employment market, making getting gainful work difficult under any circumstances, and even more so in the current economy. The second challenge is that housing is very difficult to obtain in the District. There is very little affordable housing available, which leads many families to have to relocate to nearby communities in Maryland or Virginia. Much of the affordable housing that does exist in the District is in low-income housing developments that bar people with criminal records from residing there.

CSOSA works closely with criminal justice partners such as law enforcement and pre-trial services to meet these challenges, as well as agencies such as the Department of Housing and the Department of Employment services. The purpose of this symposium is to hear from prominent programs from across the country that work on employment and housing for returning citizens to learn from them and take things that might be applicable in the District, and to have the local government partners discuss what they are doing relative to these issues.

Broad points of consensus presented by the panelists during the event included:

- Employment and housing are interrelated, and also tied to many other challenges for returning citizens, such as the need to maintain sobriety. Interventions to assist them in succeeding need to be multifaceted and ready to address multiple needs.
- Needs vary with the population of returning citizens, and interventions need to be targeted accordingly. A program for self-motivated individuals such as the Delancey Street model would not work for the high need individuals with serious mental illness and chronic health and substance abuse issues targeted by Corporation for Supportive Housing's supportive housing program, and vice versa.
- Addressing housing and employment for returning citizens may require action at both the direct services level (providing job training or supportive housing) and the policy level (forbidding discrimination against former offenders in the housing and job markets).
- Building the right partnerships is the key to building a continuum of care, getting the right people to your program, and building and maintaining support for the program.

### **Lessons Learned from the Urban Institute's Reentry Portfolio**

Dr. Jocelyn Fontaine, Research Associate at the Urban Institute's Justice Policy Center and Deputy Director of the DC Crime Policy Institute, delivered a presentation on what is known from the Urban Institute (UI) research portfolio on employment and housing for people returning from incarceration. Dr. Fontaine noted that employment and housing are consistently identified by reentry research as among the most important issues to address in order to achieve successful community reintegration after incarceration. She also emphasized that many other pressing needs, such as for transportation, clothing, and maintaining sobriety, made obtaining stable housing and employment more difficult. Some individuals might need help with a single need, but often people face a bundle of needs that must be addressed if they are to be successful.

Challenges with employment for returning individuals include:

- Few prisoners receiving employment readiness or job training while incarcerated;
- Limited job skills;
- Fragmented work histories; and
- Lack of reliable transportation.

For housing, the challenges include:

- Housing affordability, particularly long-term housing;
- Reluctance among local residents to have residential facilities such as halfway houses located in their neighborhood;

- Private landlords may be unwilling to rent to people with criminal histories; and
- Formerly incarcerated individuals may lack means to pay rent or other housing costs.

She also listed reasons for optimism regarding the ability of communities to meet the challenges of employment and housing, including: the optimism often present among returning citizens, the fact that their families experience strain but are generally supportive, that communities are generally supportive as well; and, that there is growing interest in and knowledge regarding reentry among policymakers, practitioners and researchers.

Research findings highlighted by Dr. Fontaine included:

- Less than half the individuals interviewed post-release as part of the multi-site Returning Home study were employed, and of those employed; half worked full time.
  - Most found jobs through family and friends, and many were employed in “casual” or “under the table” work
  - Data from the same sample indicate more than 80% were living with family; and, 20-40% were paying rent
  - And, roughly 20% were living with someone else who had been incarcerated; 10% were living with someone who used illegal drugs
- Case managed reentry services increase the likelihood of finding and maintaining full-time employment (Opportunity to Succeed, Rossman et al. 1999)
- Full-time employment is associated with reductions in self-reported crime (Opportunity to Succeed, Rossman et al. 1999; Rossman and Roman 2003)
- Transitional job placement is associated with reductions in recidivism at one and two years post-release (Center for Employment Opportunities Program, Redcross et al. 2009)
  - Associated with greater benefits among high-risk offenders (CEO Program, Zwiig et al. 2010)
- Permanent supportive housing is effective in increasing residential stability of persons with histories of homelessness and mental health problems (CSH Returning Home Initiative, Burt and Anderson 2005; Culhane et al. 2002; Culhane et al. 2007)
- Individuals with histories of homelessness, incarceration, mental illness or other disabilities often cycle between the criminal justice, homelessness and other public crisis response systems (CSH Returning Home Initiative, Burt and Anderson 2005; Hall et al. 2009; Metraux and Culhane 2004)

Dr. Fontaine noted that evaluation of Chicago's Safer Return Demonstration Project, a multi-year initiative to build, implement and learn from a comprehensive community-based prisoner reentry model in a distressed neighborhood, would shed light on whether targeting different types of employment assistance to individuals with different needs was effective (and whether the instrument utilized by the Safer Foundation was adequate for effective targeting). It would also determine whether increasing employment retention and wages (should Safer Return succeed in doing so) reduces recidivism. Likewise, research into the Corporation for Supportive Housing's reentry permanent supportive housing models will help determine the successful components of reentry housing, how success differs across urban, suburban and rural locations, and whether permanent supportive housing increases housing stability and reduces recidivism.

In summary, Returning Home and other reentry programs have generated some broad lessons learned that can be transferred to efforts in other contexts:

- Look for and capitalize on opportunity
- Collaboration begets collaboration
- Cultivate champions within corrections
- Use data to inform the program/policy
- Gather data to document impact
- Expect implementation hurdles

### **Housing-Focused Panel**

N Street Village—Schroeder Stribling, Executive Director

N Street Village is a nonprofit organization located at 14<sup>th</sup> and N Streets, NW, in Washington DC. N Street Village serves homeless and low-income women in DC through an array of residential and drop-in programs, including emergency needs, substance abuse recovery, job coaching, and case management. Ms. Stribling's presentation focused on the N Street Village Recovery Housing operation, launched in 2006 in partnership with the DC Department of Mental Health. The Recovery Housing has 21 beds in two buildings, and serves approximately 40 women residents each year, with average lengths of stay of 6-9 months. The goal is for graduates to move to permanent or long-term transitional housing.

The program operates as a modified therapeutic community, with the modifications including not using traditional "encounter" group modalities, and incorporation of a focus on trauma (83% of women entering the program report an experience of trauma at some point in their history). The community is structured, and residents have responsibilities and advance through a leveling system, with residents providing peer leadership in the program when they reach the higher

levels. Higher levels also entail greater privileges. Trauma-specific groups for survivors or trauma offer a six-month curriculum co-facilitated by program staff.

Residents enter the program through referrals from DMH, other partner organizations, other components of N Street Village, or self-referrals. In-reach is conducted in the DC jail when possible. Residents have access to the full N Street Village continuum of programs, as well as having health, mental health, addiction and trauma-focused supports, and an N Street Village case manager and DMH core service agency linkage. Upon graduation, residents prepare a formal presentation for peers and staff, and receive feedback and support.

According to internal data tracking, 89% of residents had mental health stability while in residence in 2009; 86% maintained sobriety, and none had contacts with police or were re-arrested. The retention rate was 63% in 2009, and 37% achieved full graduation, with 88% of graduates achieving permanent or long-term affordable housing at exit. However, limitations on this data include having only partial or informal benchmarks (e.g. retention rates from studies of other programs for women with co-occurring disorders), and no formal longitudinal data beyond residential exit to track outcomes after leaving the program.

Barriers to success for N Street Village's Recovery Housing and its clients include:

- Complications in coordination at entry. With numerous agencies involved it can be difficult to schedule in-reach or peer contact, hard to predict time or release, and to assure transportation.
- There is limited availability of suitable, safe and permanent housing. When housing can be found, the timing may be inflexible, requiring the program to choose between prematurely discharging the client from the Recovery House program or losing the opportunity for them obtain permanent housing.
- Many struggle to obtain employment or income. There are numerous barriers to employment related to criminal history, credit history or skill level.

#### Corporation for Supportive Housing—Richard Cho, Director, Innovations and Research Team

The Corporation for Supportive Housing is a national non-profit organization that helps communities create permanent housing with services to prevent and end homelessness. It does this through advocacy for policy changes, providing expertise and innovative models, and lending and grant making. CSH does not operate housing directly [?] Richard Cho discussed the evolution of CSH's work on supporting housing for people leaving prisons and jails. The supportive housing model is intended to focus on the highest need group among those with housing and service needs, those whose serious mental illness, chronic health issues, and addiction issues. Permanent supportive housing provides them with the ongoing services and support necessary to avoid homelessness and re-incarceration.

Studies in New York City demonstrated a substantial interrelationship between homelessness and incarceration. Based on this, CSH created the Frequent Users Systems Engagement (FUSE) Initiative, with “frequent users” referring to use of both jail/prison and homeless shelter beds. This population is characterized by high rates of co-occurring addiction and mental health issues, histories of transience, limited independent living skills and lack of trust in service providers. They might have extensive criminal histories, but those histories consist largely of low-level misdemeanors (“quality of life” offenses). The premise of FUSE is that placing people with chronic issues that contribute to both homelessness and incarceration into supportive housing will improve their outcomes and more efficiently utilize public resources.

Beginning in New York City, FUSE brought together criminal justice (NYC DOC), social service (NYC Dept. of Homeless Services, NYC Dept. of Health and Mental Hygiene, NYC Housing Authority), government administration (NYC Office of Management and Budget), private funders (JEHT Foundation, Langeloth Foundation) and research entities (John Jay College, Columbia University) into a collaborative partnership. Supportive housing was developed, a mix of single-site housing (many units in a single building with services on site) and scattered-site housing (single units in various buildings with mobile services). Participating providers conducted in-reach and recruitment of frequent user clients in both the jail and homeless shelters. FUSE replications are underway or in the planning stage in a number of jurisdictions, including DC.

Evaluation of FUSE Phase I in New York found that, two years after placement into housing with services, there was a 91% housing retention rate, 92% reduction in use of homeless shelters, and 53% reduction in use of city jails. The reduction in jail and shelter use resulted in a net annual cost offset (the difference between program cost and savings) of \$2900 per person. In addition to these results, Mr. Cho offered the following early lessons from CSH’s reentry housing work:

- Data matching across agencies helped to define a specific target population and facilitate tracking of outcomes.
- Persistent in-reach and upfront engagement of individuals is the key to successful placement. Because the frequent user population most in need of help is often the most skeptical of and resistant to service providers, active recruitment is required. A prospective client might need to be contacted multiple times in the jail and/or shelter before coming into the program.
- Service providers need training around unique needs and behavioral adaptations to incarceration of justice-involved people.

- System-level implementation oversight involving multiple agencies and systems (corrections, homeless services, housing authorities) is needed to overcome bureaucratic obstacles.
- It is important to rethink how to use resources more flexibly and creatively.

A member of the audience asked Mr. Cho about the incentives for private developers to rent to the formerly incarcerated and noted that such entities often discriminate against such potential tenants, and suggested there is little protection for prospective tenants with criminal records. Mr. Cho noted that people with criminal records are not a protected class, meaning that discrimination against them is not illegal. He did note that there was the possibility at the policy level to enact ordinances that would forbid discrimination against them in specific contexts, such as the employment or rental markets. Mr. Cho discussed the role of non-profit organizations as a key “middleman” in the CSH FUSE model. Landlords signed the lease with the non-profit, which in turn sublet the apartment to the program client. This made landlords more willing to rent, because they were confident that the non-profit would ensure that they received their rental income.

Delancey Street Model—Robert Davalos, Facility Director, Delancey Street New York, and John Hamilton, Supervisor of Social Enterprises, SC STRONG

Mr. Davalos and Mr. Hamilton discussed the Delancey Street model, noting first of all that both of them had come into the program as returning citizens. They now work with Delancey replication sites, with the New York program directly operated by the Delancey Street Foundation, and SC STRONG an independently-operated replication of the model in Charleston, South Carolina.

Delancey Street sites are operated by residents, who are former substance abusers and/or the formerly incarcerated. Residents commit to a minimum stay at Delancey Street of two years, although the average stay is four years. Delancey Street operations are run entirely by residents, who begin their time working on their high school equivalency and receiving vocational training. It has an “extended family” model through which all residents are both contributors to and served by the program. It has only three set rules: no violence, no threats of violence, and no drugs. Social enterprises operated directly by Delancey Street sites are the vehicles for applied vocational training and advancement. Delancey Street social enterprises include restaurants, moving companies, and construction, among many others. SC STRONG is renovating old historic homes in Charleston, a catering and culinary arts business, a bakery, and a furniture renovation operation. People leave the program with at least three marketable skills. Facilities do not receive government support; 55-65% of operating funds come from the enterprises, with the remainder coming from financial or in-kind donations.

Both Mr. Davalos and Mr. Hamilton emphasized that the Delancey Street model is for individuals who are motivated to change their lives and are willing to work in that direction. Mr.

Hamilton described conducting jail in-reach in South Carolina. Bringing in appropriately motivated individuals is a key to the success of Delancey Street. Appropriate motivation is demonstrated by the individual writing a letter in which they ask for help, which leads to an extensive and rigorous interview while they are still incarcerated. They accept roughly one in ten individuals they interview, and they must then plead guilty and be sentenced to SC STRONG as an alternative to incarceration. Additionally, as the Delancey and SC STRONG model requires that everyone in the program work, only individuals who are ready and able to support themselves are appropriate for the program. Once in the program (either Delancey Street or SC STRONG), residents are constantly provided support by fellow residents, and are always doing things together with other residents. An example of this is public speaking about the model, which is always done in pairs as Mr. Davalos and Mr. Hamilton are doing in this symposium.

A member of the audience asked whether Delancey Street tracked recidivism outcomes for residents, and Mr. Davalos and Mr. Hamilton indicated that they did not do this formally.

### **Employment-Focused Panel**

#### Safer Foundation—Diane Williams, President and CEO

The Safer Foundation is a non-profit based in Chicago that has been operating for 38 years. Safer's mission is to work with people returning from incarceration to reduce recidivism by offering a full spectrum of resources. Most clients are in Chicago, but the Safer Foundation operates in 19 locations in Illinois and one in Iowa. Safer operates both pre- and post-release programming, with approximately 1,752 people engaged in some element of Safer's programming daily. Safer is committed to monitoring performance through a balanced scorecard approach, and three-year recidivism results indicate that rates for Safer clients are 62% lower than for releases from the Illinois Department of Corrections in general. Ms. Williams noted the importance of Safer bearing in mind the three groups it thinks of as its core customers: people with criminal records, employers and businesses, and legislators and the general public.

Safer's employment/retention services model involves client assessment to place people on one of three pathways: the Job Ready Pathway (with a focus on immediate employment and retention for those who have skills and substantial work histories), the Transitional Employment Pathway (involving job readiness training and career planning workshops for those with fewer skills and little prior work experience), and the Supportive Services Pathway (for those who need to be supported in addressing other critical needs before they are ready to engage in an employment-focused pathway). This work begins through Safer's secured institutional programs or adult transition centers. Safer also focuses a portion of their job training on emerging green job markets in areas of energy efficiency, renewable energy, waste reduction, urban agriculture, and horticulture industries. Finally, Ms. Williams noted that Safer has a public policy initiative that brings together over 100 state, local and national members in a Council of Advisors to Reduce

Recidivism through Employment (CARRE). The CARRE makes recommendations on public policy initiatives that can contribute to enhanced employment for returning citizens.

After providing the overview of how Safer operates relative to employment, Ms. Williams turned her presentation to key elements of Safer's success. The first is financial flexibility, including becoming self-sufficient, diversifying funding streams, and having an exigency plan already in place in the event of financial pressures. Doing these things lessens the impact of negative economic conditions and funding reductions from government, and allows the organization to respond in a more measured and strategic manner when it needs to adapt to these types of pressure. The second element is partnerships, building them broadly to enhance provision of services to clients, offer a continuum of care, expand resources and capacity, and push policy and legislative reform. Safer looks at key partner organizations such as the Department of Corrections, and makes sure that there is a clear lead person within Safer responsible for cultivating and maintaining the relationship with each key person within that organization. The third element is strategic investment in organizational development areas such as research, staff, efficiency assessment and improvement and leveraging partnerships. The final element is data, which allows the internal identification and improvement of weaknesses, and to demonstrate the importance of Safer's work to external partners.

Ms. Williams discussed a number of challenges to any program, and strategies to help address them:

- Challenge: Budget Crisis
  - Know your success factors and continue to make the case for your work with your data
  - Use cost-reduction strategies. Look to restructure programs as opposed to shutting them down. If you have to make staff cuts, do it based on performance, not blanket cuts.
  - Look to create multi-year contracts.
  - Partnerships. Coalitions have a strong political presence during fiscal crisis, and can also help you combine resources and find other ways to continue service offerings.
- Challenge: Program Threats
  - Recognize that not all threats are financial. Programs can be threatened because they are undervalued or because of other agendas.
  - Look to create jobs and opportunities in-house.

- Keep abreast of market trends and forecasts to recognize signs of trouble or potential opportunities.
- Use data to track every program and ensure they are yielding optimal results and furthering your mission
- Leverage, strengthen your partnership relations.
- Challenge: Political Upheaval or Change in Rhetoric
  - Align yourself with non-traditional partners who may not have the same goals, but work with a population that overlaps with yours and/or has goals that can complement yours
  - Cultivate positive relationships with policy-makers and legislators.
  - Cultivate positive relationships with the media.
  - Partnerships—building your base and having allies will help ensure your voice/cause is heard
- Challenge: Recruitment and Development
  - Cultivate leadership that is humble, but driven to do what's best for the organization.
  - Get the right people into the organization, and then be ready to try them in different positions to see where they work best.
  - Think of staff in terms of who gets the job done, and who shares your values. Those who do both will be the engine of success; those who do neither need to go. Those who share values only can be invested in to improve. Those who are effective but don't share your values are the hardest case; they also have to go.

In response to an audience question regarding what kind of education or cultivation, if any, of employers is necessary to employment program success, Ms. Williams says she doesn't worry about "educating" employers about hiring Safer's clients. She makes sure she educates Safer about what employers need, because referring clients for employment who are ready to meet employers' needs and be good employees is what will make those relationships work for Safer clients over the long term.

Cypress Mandela operates in Oakland, California, and has a particular focus on preparing youth to succeed in the job market by providing them with both skills and work experience. Mr. Shanks discussed the work of Cypress Mandela (which serves the Oakland community broadly and is not specifically for the formerly incarcerated), and how they prepare participants for work in construction trades. Program activities involve both classroom training and applied construction work. Cypress Mandela devotes particular attention to green industry skills.

Mr. Shanks indicated that Cypress Mandela has been engaged in the question of working with returning citizens because California is likely to release many more individuals from prison in coming years in order to deal with persistent overcrowding. Alameda County, and particularly the city of Oakland, will see a large number of those individuals. This gives the community a stake in facilitating their reintegration, and employment is a crucial part of that.

Mr. Shanks noted that many of the participants in Cypress Mandela's programs not only lack the technical work skills they are learning, but have little experience in the world of work. For this reason, instilling in them discipline and basic "soft skills" such as punctuality are core activities of the work that Cypress Mandela does. Cypress Mandela also works closely with unions, who are key players in the construction trades.

#### Next Steps: Overcoming Housing and Employment Challenges for Returning Citizens in the District of Columbia

The final event panel brought together a group of District of Columbia leaders in both the criminal justice and human services agencies to discuss the challenges to ensuring that returning citizens have employment and housing in DC, as well as what their home agencies are doing or planning to do to address those issues.

Summarizing the challenges, the panel listed:

- General reintegration
  - Re-socializing ex-offenders to return to the community;
  - Training and educating people who have, for the most part, never obtained the necessary skills to succeed in mainstream conventional society. This extends beyond specific job skills to understanding how to dress for a job interview or to meet a potential landlord, for example;

- Keeping returning citizens off the streets, out of environments that might lead them back to criminal behavior, or away from associates who are still involved in criminal activity; and
- Service system barriers to include stringent eligibility requirements for various programs that may be discouraging and excessive waiting periods to be housed or obtain services (3-6 months).
- Employment-specific
  - Getting the public to support job training and other needed interventions for returning citizens when millions of Americans without a criminal record are struggling to obtain jobs themselves; and
  - Court orders to pay child support placing returning citizens in an awkward position, perhaps wanting to do the right thing but unable to meet onerous conditions;
- Housing-specific
  - Convincing landlords to accept ex-offenders and provide housing;
  - Helping returning citizens who can't live with family members because they are in public housing and the returning citizen is barred from residing there;
  - Finding family members who may have moved; and
  - Working with people who have burned bridges with family members and other, and therefore have no one to support them.

In the face of these challenges, each agency discussed initiatives that have been implemented to address the challenges. Department of Corrections (Director Devon Brown)

- Developing release plans
- Working with the Corporation for Supportive Housing on their FUSE initiative
- Implementing programming at halfway houses that includes job readiness
- Delivering *Quenching the Father Thirst* curriculum for parenting

CSOSA (Deputy Director Adrienne Poteat)

- Conducting home investigations to determine whether a proposed residence is suitable for the returning citizen

- Launching a recent campaign to promote the hiring of ex-offenders
- Hiring Vocational Development Specialists to address employers' needs by pre-screening job candidates who meet desired skill and experience requirements
- Work with substance abuse and mental health services to get individuals ready to work or benefit from job training

Superior Court of the District of Columbia (The Hon. Milton Lee, Jr., Presiding Judge, Fathering Court)

- Continuing the Fathering Court program, which includes job training and placement assistance, for parents who have been out of compliance with child support payments over a long period of time

Office on Ex-Offender Affairs (Herman Odom, Jr., Director)

- Provide public education to employers and landlords about challenges faced by returning citizens
- Launched the Online Ex-Offender Resource Locator which enables users to locate reentry services provided in the District of Columbia
- Initiated a partnership with Department of Housing and Community Development to locate landlords receptive to renting to returning citizens

Department of Employment Services (Michael Smalls, Workforce Development Specialist)

- Continue providing the Transitional Employment Program (TEP) which provides assessment and case management, supportive services, job readiness/life skills training, Job Club, and job retention and follow up for DC residents
- Project Empowerment, which provides transitional job services, serves a clientele that is 80% ex-offenders

Department of Human Services (Fred Swan, Family Services Administrator)

- Maintain the Permanent Supportive Housing Program (PSHP) for chronically homeless individuals
- Launch the DC Fatherhood Initiative, with previously incarcerated persons as a target population

## **Participant Websites**

Model Programs

- Corporation for Supportive Housing: [www.csh.org](http://www.csh.org)
- Cypress Mandela Training Center: [www.cypressmandela.org](http://www.cypressmandela.org)
- Delancey Street Foundation: [www.delanceystreetfoundation.org](http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org)
- N Street Village: [www.nstreetvillage.org](http://www.nstreetvillage.org)
- Safer Foundation: [www.saferfoundation.org](http://www.saferfoundation.org)

#### Co-Sponsors

- Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for the District of Columbia: [www.cjcc.dc.gov](http://www.cjcc.dc.gov)
- Urban Institute: [www.urban.org](http://www.urban.org)
  - DC Crime Policy Institute: [www.dccrimepolicy.org](http://www.dccrimepolicy.org)

#### Participating DC Agencies

- Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency: [www.csosa.gov](http://www.csosa.gov)
- Department of Corrections: [www.dc.doc.gov](http://www.dc.doc.gov)
- Department of Employment Services: [www.does.dc.gov](http://www.does.dc.gov)
- Department of Human Services: [www.dhs.dc.gov](http://www.dhs.dc.gov)
- Fathering Court: [www.csed.dc.gov](http://www.csed.dc.gov), click “Fathering Court” tab on the left
- Office on Ex-Offender Affairs: [www.oEOA.dc.gov](http://www.oEOA.dc.gov)