Improving Prison Culture through Prison Reform Policies

Deborah McQueen

Abstract

The United States has the highest incarceration rate in the world, with almost two million of its residents in prison or jail. This paper examines the relationship between the existing culture of mass incarceration systems and its effects on the justice-involved and the implementation of meaningful prison reforms mandated by the Department of Justice's Bureau of Prisons to foster improvements within that system. A literature review will be conducted within the mass incarceration and prison reform framework. The historical culture of mass incarceration from the 1900s to the present will be compared and contrasted regarding legislative changes aimed at reforming that system, including policy changes that have not worked, and discussing the leadership approaches employed. This paper uses a chronological approach that traces the development of each source over 120 years. Evidence suggests that prison reforms are quick to legislate but slow to implement, which impedes the progress of much-needed reforms.

Literature Review

Introduction

This paper examines autocratic and transformational leadership and its applications within the incarceration systems of the United States since the early 1900s. It reveals the impact of these two diverse forms of leadership on leaders, staff, and the incarcerated. The main body of the paper discusses these two leadership styles within the context of a literature review in three distinct areas entitled: (1) Mass Incarceration, (2) Prison Reforms, and (3) Mercy and Justice. This section follows a summary of the literature review section, a glossary of definitions, and a bibliography.

- Most people recognize mass incarceration in the United States as ineffective in reducing crime, Incarceration, rehabilitation, and recidivism. This paper examines the history of mass incarceration, its evolution, and its weaknesses as an outgrowth of an autocratic leadership style.

- Since the beginning of the 20th century, prison reforms have been publicly debated for their efficacy. Incarceration numbers increased, and prison reforms moved in and out of public consciousness as either a priority or a liability. Reforms introduced under the umbrella of an autocratic system were bound to fail. New reforms are being implemented from a transformational leadership perspective which holds greater hope for improved outcomes.

- Mercy and Justice are two ideological goals defining our justice system, yet for the most part, neither of these ideals has been honorably achieved in incarceration. This paper examines how transformational leadership is better positioned to implement meaningful

prison reforms aligned with mercy and justice goals as they seek to restore each individual's right to respect and human dignity.

The scope of the literature review includes peer-reviewed articles, books, journal articles, and newspaper articles dealing with mass incarceration, prison reform, and Christian ethics. The United States Constitution is founded on Christian principles, yet the failures of mass incarceration weigh heavily as an indictment against this backdrop.

Discussion

Mass Incarceration

This paper examines traditional autocratic leadership and its effects on prison culture since the beginning of the 19th century concerning transformational leadership. John Maxwell states in his book *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership* that autocratic leaders show a disregard for the respect of others by exploiting a power dynamic. "Dictators and other autocratic leaders rely on violence and intimidation to get people to do what they want" (Maxwell, 2007, p. 71). This form of leadership is responsible for the poor and sometimes tragic outcomes of incarceration in the United States. Autocratic leadership within prisons has contributed to the rise of mass incarceration, the destruction of families, the deaths of thousands of prisoners, and the squandering of human lives. Autocratic leadership has led to the carceral state (the culture within prisons). Prisons strip individuals of their human dignity by replacing names with numbers, establishing stigmatizing identities such as "prisoners," thugs, convicts, criminals, and inmates, taking them away from their families, locking them up in cages, and imposing extensive prison sentences for non-violent drug offenses. This process removes respect for the individual and replaces it with fear of authority. The result is the destruction of an individual's human dignity.

In contrast, transformational leadership, as defined by Burns, is a "process, stating that leadership occurs 'when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality'" (Burns, 1978, as cited in Northouse, 2021, p.83). The Federal Bureau of Prisons has recently implemented broad reforms that, when examined collectively, aim to promote a more humane culture within prisons through transformational leadership. These reforms are examined in the Prison Reform section of the literature review.

Related theories to prison reform include the views of abolitionists. "Prison abolition is concerned with dismantling the prison–industrial complex and other oppressive institutions and structures, which restrict true liberation of people whom those in power have marginalized. These structures include white supremacy, patriarchy, capitalism, and ablest and heteronormative ideologies" (Martensen & Richie, 2021, para. 1). This theory will be discussed in context with mass incarceration and is located under the Prison Reform section of this study.

Mental Health & Covid related

In Hickson et al.'s article *A Consequence of Mass Incarceration: County-Level Association Between Jail Incarceration Rates and Poor Mental Health Days* (2022), the authors investigated the impact that local jail incarceration rates had on the mental health of the local non-incarcerated population.

While multiple studies have shown a strong correlation between incarceration and adverse effects on the incarcerated person's mental health, studies have not been conducted to assess the impact on the mental health of community members local to the facility. Hickson observed that jails had "the historical purpose of detaining people who were awaiting trial or

sentencing and were threats to the public or at risk of fleeing; instead, they have become massive warehouses largely for people too poor to post bail or too sick for community resources to help" (Hickson et al., 2022, Introduction para. 1). The result is "Local jails have been credited as the 'front door of mass incarceration' in the United States (Incarceration's front door | Vera Institute, n. d.)." (Introduction para. 1).

Hickson found that higher rates of incarceration were associated with "Elevated levels of violent crime … as well as compromising physical safety and psychological well-being" (2022, Covariates para. 2) in the local community, what Hickson referred to as a "spillover effect." The authors admit that since their study only used a cross-sectional design, no inferences regarding a causal relationship between incarceration rates and reported poor mental health days could be drawn. However, "it can be very suggestive of how high incarceration rates can affect mental health in communities" (Discussion para. 4).

Mass incarceration is associated with the broader population's poor mental health and well-being. In communities disproportionately burdened by high rates of local incarceration, the risk of widening existing health disparities through weathering persists. (Hickson et al., 2022, Discussion para. 5)

Sentencing

Hickson's article investigates the impact mass incarceration has on the communities local to the prisons. In Michael Tonry's article *Remodeling American Sentencing: A Ten-Step Blueprint for Moving Past Mass Incarceration* (2014), the author presents a list of sentencing and parole reforms designed to address many of the perceived inequities of the current system. The article first discusses a list of reasons the author believes the United States has developed a mass incarceration system. He states that the current sentencing guidelines for crimes are not

"just, fair, or effective," leading to an unacceptably high incarceration rate for "a country with comparatively low crime rates" (Tonry, 2014, p. 504). To address the unfairness, the author proposes ten changes – seven involving how people are sentenced and three regarding the adjudication of existing prisoners.

Six proposals regarding sentencing involve eliminating or severely limiting mandatory sentencing, including three-strike laws and life without the possibility of parole, and lowering the maximum sentence for serious crimes. The remaining proposed sentencing change is for states to establish a commission to review all sentencing guidelines to ensure they are fair.

The author also makes three proposals to address current prisoners. The first proposal includes establishing a parole system (since not all states have one) and requiring states to evaluate all prisoners for parole beginning at their fifth or third year of incarceration for older inmates. Moreover, to reduce the incarcerated population by at least half in the following six years.

The author believes these are necessary changes to address the inequities inherent in the current system. The author considers this a modest proposal given that a reduction by half of the number of incarcerated persons would still only lower it "to a level that will remain 3 to 3.5 times those of other developed Western countries" (Tonry, 2014, p. 504). Still, if implemented, Tonry's proposal would make significant changes to the justice system all at once that most people would not accept, so it appears too ambitious, though phasing in and testing the steps' effectiveness might be feasible.

Contemporary Prison Reforms

National efforts at prison reform have swung back and forth like a pendulum set in motion by increases in crime and violence over the last 122 years. In spite of legislative efforts

incarceration and recidivism rates continue to climb. However, "There is currently bipartisan support for criminal justice reform in the United States. One reform, recently passed through the Consolidated Appropriations Act/COVID relief package (December 2020) , restored need-based, higher educational aid for incarcerated persons." (Fantuzzo, 2022) Realizing that mass incarceration isn't working, political leaders have begun to carve out specific areas for reform. The Bureau of Prisons (BOP) which operates under the leadership of the Department of Justice, has carved out fifteen new areas for reform. These reforms are emblematic of transformational leadership and will require all stakeholders to rethink their prior positions regarding criminal justice. Burnout is high within prisons, and it is hard to employ steady Correctional Officers. These reforms have the ability to reduce stress and burnout among Correctional Officers and staff working within incarceration facilities. The BOP's reforms include: (1) From day one, identifying an inmate's individualized "criminogenic" needs, (2) Building a "school district" within the federal prison system, (3) Launching a tablet-based pilot program for inmate education, (4) Supporting the Second Chance Pell Pilot Program, (5) Encouraging inmates to develop marketable job skills, (6) Developing standardized, evidence-based programs to reduce recidivism, (7) Prioritizing mental health treatment for inmates, (8) Ensuring inmates receive appropriate substance abuse treatment, (9) Helping inmates maintain family ties while incarcerated, (10) Enhancing programs for female inmates, (11) Reducing the use of solitary confinement and other forms of restrictive housing, (12) Phasing out BOP's use of private prisons, (13) Reforming and strengthening federal halfway houses, (14) Helping inmates obtain government-issued ID prior to their release, (15) Equipping inmates with information and resources as they return to the community (Prison reform, 2017). It is beyond the scope of this

review to investigate each of these reforms. What is notably absent from the BOP reforms are sentencing reforms.

Education

In 2017, Sally Yates, the Acting Director for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, issued a memorandum titled Building a School District in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The Acting Director emphasizes providing inmates with educational and employment training opportunities in the memorandum. Yates explains "that inmates who participate in correctional education programs have 43 percent lower odds of returning to prison than those who do not, and that every dollar spent on prison education saves four to five dollars on the costs of re-incarceration." Yates states that the goal of the Bureau of Prisons is "to create pathways for inmates to succeed, regardless of their educational progress when they enter the system." In furtherance of this goal, a pilot program was established to create "school districts" inside prisons to ensure inmates have access to educational opportunities. The goal was to give special attention to those with disabilities and those without strong English skills. Education not only serves the practical purpose of reducing recidivism rates but also helps restore the inmates' respect. With respect, the inmate can reintegrate into a new identity and see themselves differently. Inmates shed their criminal stigmas by becoming students, thereby rebuilding their human dignity. "People in prison should have access to education not simply to reduce the likelihood of recidivism; they should have access to an education because having the opportunity to learn is fundamental to human dignity" (Fantuzzo, 2022, p. 86).

Sentencing

Another area commonly cited for reform is the area of criminal sentencing since the large number of people convicted and sentenced has led to the U.S.'s high incarceration rates. Mugambi Jouet's article *Criminal Law Mass Incarceration Paradigm Shift?: Convergence in an Age of Divergence* (2019) examines how the United States incarceration system has evolved over the last century. Jouet states that the U.S. has diverged from all other western countries in the severity of sentences, leading to the mass incarceration phenomenon. Jouet concludes "that justice in the United States is inherently harsher than in Europe, where more humane conceptions of punishment are influential."

The author discusses the history of the American and European justice and penal systems and how, while European countries have sought "dignity, proportionality, legitimacy, and rehabilitation," the American system has instead imposed more severe penalties, even for minor crimes. A review of major legal cases has shown how the courts have rarely found harsh sentences to be "cruel and unusual," including life sentences for juvenile offenders. The author presents arguments for the alignment of sentencing to be proportional to culpability and for the elimination of life without the possibility of parole, three-strike laws, and the standard imposition of sentences that create a "virtual life sentence" since they exceed the person's life expectancy. Jouet notes that the United States has diverged from its Western peers, but a movement to address inequities has begun. That movement, which the author calls a "paradigm shift," looks to make sentences more humane and may cause the United States now to move toward converging back with its peers. However, the author notes that this change regarding the rights and dignity of prisoners is a more recent trend, so it is uncertain if it will be an ongoing endeavor or is simply an oscillation of a pendulum.

Costs

Leaders attempting to reform the U.S. incarceration system have encountered multiple barriers, which have impacted the motivation of the reformers. Some barriers were foreseeable, while others manifested after reforms were initiated. In Sarah Cate's article *The Mississippi Model: Dangers of Prison Reform in the Context of Fiscal Austerity* (2022), the results and consequences of Mississippi's reduction in the state's prison budget are analyzed.

In 2014, Mississippi began reducing the budget for its state prison system. The legislature intended to force the prison system to reduce the number of inmates, which had an incarceration rate almost twice the national average. However, instead of causing a reduction in the number of inmates, the budget cuts had unanticipated consequences. State officials found that "reductions in correctional budgets do not signal to downsize, but rather a mass incarceration on the cheap" (Cate, 2022).

In response to the cuts, the prisons cut costs by laying off 60% of the guards, and reducing "optional" expenses, mainly to the detriment of the inmates. Following these cuts, the prison system experienced up to a 90% guard turnover rate annually, dramatically increasing violence and gang activity inside the prisons. Additionally, the economies of the communities surrounding the prisons were heavily dependent on the prisons' spending, which, when cut, caused significant hardship in these communities.

Additional consequences included reduced cheap labor created by the utilization of inmates. This labor included "roadside litter pickup, building maintenance, grass cutting, construction projects, trash pickup, reading water meters, fighting fires, cleaning abandoned or neglected cemeteries, cleaning up state fairgrounds, filling potholes," to name a few (Cate, 2022). The state found it "cannot even afford free labor." The state was forced to utilize paid workers to replace the inmates, thereby costing the state more than what it intended to save

through the budget cuts. Counties, the major employers for these "free" workers, also incurred

substantial cost increases and were forced to subsidize the housing for inmates they utilized.

Limitations and Problems

Comparing the United States incarceration system to other Western countries highlights

many problems in the U.S.'s current system. It is natural then to look to other countries' systems

to seek ideas to reform the system. A 2022 Op-Ed by Sharon Dolovich in the Los Angeles

Times, titled *A New Bill Would Model California Prison Reform on Norway's Success. Here's*

Why It Misses the Mark analyzes a proposed law to "reform" California prisons to more closely

resemble Norway's. The motivation for the Law is California's high recidivism rate of 50%,

compared to Norway's, which is currently about 20% (down from 70% in the mid-1980s).

Norway replaced its prison model in the early 1980s. The model allowed prisoners to live in

community settings. The arrangements included private rooms with doors and a bathroom.

Inmates purchased groceries and cooked their meals. They also did their laundry and socialized

with other inmates and guards on a first-name basis, including eating together. This model also

emphasized providing inmates with access to education, therapy, and drug rehabilitation. The

Norway model aims to treat the prisoners with dignity and prepare them for reentry into society

once released.

The California law, however, while claiming to be based on the Norwegian model,

incorporates only a few of the changes implemented by Norway. While it claims "to house

program participants 'in a community campus ... away from the prison setting, no specifics are

given as to how this separate campus should operate" (Dolovich, 2022). The Law's primary focus

"appears to be to give employers access to an untapped pool of workers in a tight labor market,"

with little else to aid the person's eventual reentry into society. While the bill will help a small

number of inmates, it will not have the sweeping effects promised by its authors. This reform

concept fails to be viable because it needs to consider all aspects of transformational leadership.

It is not enough to transform a few; the transformation must be thorough in transforming the

system.

Indeed, all suggested reforms have pros and cons, and the people and our representatives

must weigh and evaluate the benefits and costs to determine what reforms to try. In Maya

Schenwar and Victoria Law's book *Prison by Any Other Name: The Harmful Consequences of*

Popular Reforms (2020), the authors investigate and analyze the consequences of many of the

currently proposed prison reform initiatives.

The authors first provide a history of the United States prison system, in particular, that

its creation was promoted as a "kinder substitute for the whip, the stocks, and the branding iron"

(p. 12), which were the primary means of punishment employed at the nation's founding. They

then note that the tightening of sentencing laws beginning in the 1970s, mainly how reforms

designed to reduce crime, such as the war on drugs, increased the racial inequities in the U.S.

justice system. Likewise, while mandatory sentencing laws were intended to remove judicial

discretion and, therefore, judicial bias, during sentencing, the real-world consequence was a

significant increase in the number of people of color being incarcerated and for longer terms and

a ballooning of the number of inmates. As the negative impacts of the newly created mass

incarceration system became known to the general public, calls for prison reform emerged,

ranging from changes in the prison environments to the complete elimination of the prison

system.

Schenwar and Law examine proposed reforms and find they will not solve the problems.

For example, many of the reforms incorporate having offenders finish serving their sentence

outside the prison but inside a controlled and restricted environment, such as house arrest, what they term "replacing one wall with another prison." They argue that these reforms "often focus on decreasing prison populations, not on releasing more people from state control altogether." The authors characterize "the latest reform movement as a drive to find a new 'Somewhere Else' to stow away criminalized populations." They note that reform advocates find "reform is palatable only if control and confinement, preferably taking place far from the rest of society, continue to be central" (p. 17). As such, most proposed reforms in the United States merely change the appearance, not the substance, of the situations that create the issues. While this reform resembles transformational leadership, it fails to address the restoration of respect and human dignity, often lost in wrong-doers long before their first arrest.

Abolitionism

At the extreme of prison reform movements is the call to eliminate prisons. The authors proposed how prisons could be abolished in Bagaric, Hunter, and Scilar's article *Prison Abolition: From Naïve Idealism to Technological Pragmatism* (2021). The article first reviews the history of the United States shift to mass incarceration, the reasons behind the call to abolish prisons, the difficulties inherent in such abolition, and a proposed framework for "effectively incarcerating offenders" outside of prison utilizing technological mechanisms (p. 352).

The paper discusses how society's approach to dealing with offenders has barely changed for hundreds of years, namely, to "simply lock offenders behind high walls" (Bagaric et al., 2021, p. 351). Due to calls for harsher criminal penalties, the prison population has quadrupled in the last four decades, resulting in the United States being "the highest incarceration in the world." The U.S. "imprisons more people than any other nation" at a rate "ten times higher than that of some other developed nations" (p. 356). As a result, mass incarceration has created large

disparities in the prison population, such as "African Americans are still incarcerated at a rate that is more than three times higher than that of the rest of the population" (p. 356), and living conditions viewed as inhumane by a majority of the American voters. In response, a growing movement has begun calling for the abolition of prisons, but a consistent roadblock presented in opposition is the lack of viable alternatives to prisons. Lee states, however, that this phenomenon was never the intention "Mass incarceration did not arise from white hatred of blacks but from the exploitation of poor and working-class whites, as white elites sought to divert resentment against them toward African Americans instead" (Lee, 2018).

Abolitionists are transformational leaders who lack a practical alternative to the problem of incarceration. The authors present in their paper a framework using technological mechanisms to allow the vast majority of prisoners, up to 90% by their estimation, to live outside of prison. Their proposal calls for a two-part approach. First, the offenders would be tracked and monitored to detect if they engage in a prohibited activity, such as visiting a forbidden location, interacting with an off-limits person, handling a disallowed item like a weapon, or performing a suspicious action like running. A person's restrictions would be tailored based on the seriousness of their crimes and what threats they are considered to pose to society. The second part of their proposal involves the ability to enforce the imposed restrictions should a violation occur or potential harm to others be detected. The authors advocate for a Conducted Energy Device, essentially a Taser, that the offender would be forced to wear that could be remotely activated to immobilize them. The authors believe applying debilitating electrical shocks to offenders as punishment or for protective actions is more humane than forcing inmates to live in the current incarceration system. This reform is at odds with the abolitionist mission of equity and dignity. There is

nothing dignified about disabling an individual through a tasering tool that could conceivably

cause a heart attack.

Justice and Mercy

The US penal system removes human dignity by stripping wrong-doers of their identities.

They become a number, living in cells inside cell blocks, subjected to lockdowns and strip

searches, and at any time, their personal belongings can be removed. This system places power

into the hands of the system and the staff, ensuring an environment of autocratic control at all

times. Public outcry against reported ongoing violence only exacerbates the problem. State

governments construct penitentiaries to accommodate this demand, encouraging local

governments to incarcerate more people. Meanwhile, penitentiaries do not burden state budgets

enough to limit incarceration rates, so local officials who face public pressure to reduce crime

have strong reasons to send as many defendants as possible to state penitentiaries. As Stuntz

explains, "Once the punitive turn got rolling, it kept rolling; there was nothing to stop it" (Lee,

2018). This lack of creativity in problem-solving is characteristic of autocratic leadership. Rather

than reforming the process, it rejects input from other sectors and diminishes out-of-the-box

problem-solving.

Public Opinion

Indeed, studies have found that people's perception of the incarceration system tends to

be a sterile evaluation based on limited knowledge or experience, lacking the incorporation of

justice and mercy. In Jessie Harney's article *The Power of Empathy: Experimental Evidence of

the Impact of Perspective-Focused Interventions on Support for Prison Reform* (2022), the

author researched to test whether a person's support for prison reform when surveyed was

affected by first being asked to empathize with an inmate. The author surveyed 2,229 people and employed two different devices to survey participants. Participants were given a personal narrative from an inmate to provide their perspective, known by the author as "perspective-getting." Part of the transformational leadership process is to raise others to higher levels of morality. Harney accomplishes this by asking individual survey participants to abandon their identities long enough to imagine what it must be like in prison. Other participants were asked "to put themselves in the shoes of the incarcerated individual when reading their narrative," what the author termed "perspective-taking." Together, the author termed these pre-survey actions as "perspective-focused interventions." The survey results found that performing perspective-focused interventions increased support for prison reform in respondents. This exercise is an example of transformational leadership in action, as respondents reacted favorably when studying other narratives that focused on institutional violence and insufficient access to mental health services. These areas had the most significant influence on increasing respondents' support for prison reform.

It is, therefore, important for people to consider the impact on the inmates from a personal perspective when seeking a just and humane way to reform the system. Gregory Lee establishes an argument for defending the moral identity of inmates in his paper *Mercy and Mass Incarceration: Augustinian Reflections on "The New Jim Crow"* (2018) by reflecting on St. Augustin's writings in The City of God. He notes that Augustine "stresses the importance of both justice and mercy." However, Mass incarceration has focused primarily on retributive punishment as a form of rehabilitating wrongdoers and has failed in this approach. Incarceration rates continue to increase, and recidivism rates are nearly 89% over nine years. The statistics do not factor in prisoners that may have died after they were released. Therefore the adequate

numbers might conceivably be higher. This phenomenon is often called "Engineered Recidivism," as the lack of social services for returning inmates has real consequences. Without assistance, returning ex-convicts must face the difficulties of finding employment, a residence, and avoiding gangs, alone. These factors and intrinsic trip-wires within the parole system contribute to high recidivism rates. Mass incarceration fails to recognize the importance of balancing mercy with justice, and as a result, the human dignity of prisoners is eroded by an autocratic carceral environment. As Fantuzzo notes in Recognizing Human Dignity Behind Bars: A Moral Justification for College-in-Prison Programs, "human dignity should be afforded to all, regardless of age, culture, complexion, sexual orientation, and - a critical point for our purposes - the blameworthiness of their actions" (Fantuzzo, 2022). Every human has the potential for redemption. Furthermore, we as a society mimic Satan (who has no hope for redemption) when we do not afford that possibility to wrongdoers. Seeking to restore every human's right to respect and human dignity aligns with transformational leadership principles, which include building positive relationships through mentoring and understanding individuals' value and potential.

Summary

In summary, we have examined the traits of autocratic leadership in helping to create, maintain, and insulate an incarceration system that is inhumane, indefensible, and unsuccessful. Mass incarceration, as a by-product of autocratic leadership and principles, neither succeeds in creating a safer and more just society nor does it successfully rehabilitate wrongdoers. We understand that this system must be dismantled and a new one installed. Implementing transformational leadership within the carceral system opens the door to constructive improvements. The literature guides us toward a better tomorrow as it outlines methods for prison reforms that have yet to achieve their intended outcomes fully but which are full of hope

and promise for a better tomorrow. We as a society can and must do better. The temptations that entrap vulnerable populations to wrongdoing are ours as well. The desire for goods is "a systemic reality that implicates even unwitting actors" (Lee, 2018). Gaps in the literature exist in regard to the availability of solid statistics on new BOF reforms.

Research questions that arise from this study include:

1. Is it practical to build a "school district" within prisons, or would it be better to dedicate buildings that are owned by facilities toward teaching and have established Universities teach within?
1. How do lockdowns affect on campus schools and what is a better fall back approach?
2. Can technology play a meaningful role in the dismantling of prisons or is it equally as inhumane?
2. How would the release of a sizable percentage of the current prison population impact the general population - safety, job opportunities, public assistance, housing?

References

Bagaric, M., Hunter, D. & Svilar, J. (2021). Prison abolition: From naïve idealism to

technological pragmatism. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 111*(2), 351-

406.

Cate, S. D. (2021). The Mississippi model: Dangers of prison reform in the context of fiscal

austerity. *Punishment & Society, 24*(4), 715-741.

https://doi.org/10.1177/14624745211006176

Dolovich, S. (2022, August 8). Op-Ed: *A new bill would model California prison reform on

Norway's success. Here's why it misses the mark*. The Los Angeles Times.

https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2022-08-08/norway-model-california-prison-

reform-bill

Fantuzzo, J. P. (2022). Recognizing human dignity behind bars: A moral justification for

college-in-prison programs. *Theory and Research in Education, 20*(1), 26–43.

https://doi.org/10.1177/14778785221102035

Harney, J. (2022, October 22). The power of empathy: Experimental evidence of the impact of

perspective-focused interventions on support for prison reform. *Criminal Justice Policy

Review*, October 2022. https://doi.org/10.1177/08874034211061326

Hickson, A., Purbey, R., Dean, L., Gallo, J. J., Thorpe, R. J., Porter, K. P. & Chandran, A.

(2022). A consequence of mass incarceration: County-level association between jail

incarceration rates and poor mental health days. *Health & Justice, 10*(1):31. doi:

10.1186/s40352-022-00194-6

Jouet, M. (2019). Mass incarceration paradigm shift?: Convergence in an age of divergence.

Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 109(4), 703-768.

Lee, G. (2018). Mercy and Mass Incarceration: Augustinian Reflections on "The New Jim Crow". *The Journal of Religion, 98*(2), 192-223. https://doi.org/10.1086/696227

Martensen, K. M. & Richie, B. E. (2021, June 28). Prison Abolition. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, online. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.013.625

Maxwell, J. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership: Follow them and people will follow you*. Thomas Nelson.

Northouse, P. G. (2021). Leadership: *Theory and practice* [9th ed.]. SAGE Publications.

Prison reform: reducing recidivism by strengthening the Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2017, March 6). U.S. Department of Justice. https://www.justice.gov/archives/prison-reform

Schenwar, M. & Law, V. (2020). *Prison by any other name : The harmful consequences of popular reforms*. The New Press.

Tonry, M. (2014). Remodeling American sentencing: A ten-step blueprint for moving past mass incarceration. *Criminology and Public Policy, 13*(4), 503-533. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12097

What we mean by "mass incarceration". (n.d.). Institute to End Mass Incarceration. https://endmassincarceration.org/what-is-mass-incarceration/

Yates, S. Q. (2017, January 9). *Building a school district in the Federal Bureau of Prisons*. U.S. Department of Justice. https://www.justice.gov/archives/doj/page/file/923986/download

Glossary of Definitions

Abolitionists - A person who favors the abolition of some law, institution, or custom.

Autocratic Leadership - Autocratic leadership is an authoritarian model in which leaders have absolute control. Key characteristics include: Limited input from stakeholders, highly structured environment, clearly defined rules and processes.

Criminogenic - characteristics, traits, problems, or issues of an individual that directly relate to the individual's likelihood to commit another crime, such as low levels of educational and employment performance, or substance abuse.

Federal Bureau of Prisons - A government agency set up to protect public safety by ensuring that individuals that commit federal crimes serve their sentences in federal prisons.

Justice-Involved - means a person who is currently or formerly incarcerated in a California correctional facility, or currently or formerly detained in a juvenile facility.

Mass Incarceration – "Mass incarceration is a network of policing, prosecution, incarceration, surveillance, debt, and social control that is rooted in, builds upon, and reproduces economic and racial inequality and oppression. Some refer to this network as the carceral state, the penal state, or the criminal legal system" (What we mean by mass incarceration, n.d.).

Restorative Justice – an approach to justice that seeks to repair harm by providing an opportunity for those harmed and those who take responsibility for the harm to communicate about and address their needs in the aftermath of a crime.

Transformational Leadership - a process by which one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality (Northouse, 2021, p. 43).

The United States Department of Justice - is an executive branch of the United States government tasked with the enforcement of federal law and the administration of justice in the United States