# NC Shell

A. Interpretation – aff must advocate a federal reentry program. Evidence clarifies intent.

B. The aff plan isn’t a reentry program.

C. Standards

1. Key to limits. Here’s a caselist. **Nielson 11** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

Rehabilitation has been considered a primary goal of the prison system throughout the twentieth century, even though it has not been in vogue for many decades (Harvard Law Review, 2010). The debate about rehabilitation has a long, complex history in the US. Bottom line: "Effective programming requires money, effort, and a recommitment to rehabilitation. But it is not only an investment in safe prisons and jails. It is also an investment in safe and healthy communities" (Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006). Rehabilitation is a critical to overcome the collateral consequences of being a convict which limit the convicted individuals social, economic, and political opportunities after release (Pinard, 2006). If society wants ex-prisoners to succeed, to be rehabilitated, then it has to provide them tools while they are still incarcerated to prepare for the moment of release to reenter society and reenter their families and communities. Reentry begins inside the prison with programs that provide inmates with the stability necessary to transition back into their communities (Muhlhausen, 2010). **Offender reentry programs would be an excellent way to narrow a debate about rehab**ilitation, but before I get to the sorts of affirmative and negative I think are viable under a prison rehabilitation topic, I would like to discuss the benefits of prison reform as a controversy area to the debate community.

**[…]**

The following discussion is focused around mainstream reentry and **rehab**ilitation **programs** which **could be** increased (**created** or expanded) **by Congress.**

**One clear option** for prison reform **is** the improvement of and increase of **education** and training programs. "Prisoners--who are less likely to have completed high school or obtained a General Equivalency Diploma (GED) than the general population--typically enter prison with an educational disadvantage. In fact, there is a direct correlation between a lack of education and the probability of incarceration" (Colgan, 2006). Leaving prison with that same education deficiency has been linked to recidivism; in contrast, educational programs are linked with lowering recidivism (Colgan, 2006). Basic education, vocational programs, & post-secondary education are all possible affirmatives on a prison reform topic (Nixon et al, 2008). Affirmatives may mandate vocational programs offering particular career training to fill holes in the economy (Colgan, 2006). Affirmatives could reform the fees system used by education programs which would encourage enrollment in education programs. Affirmatives could provide incentives for community colleges to offer programs for prisoners to help with applications, necessary testing, and financial aid.

**Another** affirmative option **is work release**. The unemployment rate for ex-offenders is 33% (Burt, 2010). "There are a number of studies that demonstrate that employment is a fundamental component of the reentry process, and that ex-offenders who are able to find stable employment are much more likely to succeed in their rehabilitation than those who cannot find work" (Nuñez-Neto, 2008). Without income offenders are likely to commit another crime as a means of support (Burt, 2010). "Employment is one of the strongest predictors that an ex-offender will be successful after release and not backslide into crime" (Nuñez-Neto, 2008). If ex-offenders face continual rejection in the labor market, then they are more likely to give up looking for a job and turn to criminal activity to provide an income. Work release allows prisoners to engage in full-time or part-time employment in order to facilitate their re-entry into the labor market after release. Legislation could introduce partnerships between the states Department of Corrections and businesses to provide incentives for businesses to hire prisoners from work release programs post-release (Colgan, 2006). The federal government could also create temporary job programs for ex-prisoners (Burt, 2010).

**Drug** and alcohol **treatment programs** are a practical necessity that many affirmatives could advocate. "Nationally, at least 30 percent of convicted persons report they used illegal drugs at the time of their offense" (Colgan, 2006). Roughly 80% of prisoners report drug use in their history, even if not at the time of the crime (Colgan, 2006). Providing chemical dependency treatment programs would help a large segment of the prison population. The general population believes that putting an addict in prison eliminates their ability to access the substances of their addiction which cures the addiction, but after release without a treatment program many recovering addicts return to substance abuse (Kendrick, 2011). There is solid empirical evidence that ordering inmates into treatment programs and getting them to participate in treatment reduces recidivism (Kendrick, 2011).

**Health** services are a fundamental need in prisons. Health care costs are a huge issue for prison systems and when the state is completely responsible for footing the bill the quality of inmate care may suffer (Quinn, 2009). Inmate health care "is frequently so inadequate that "preventable suffering and death behind bars" has been "normalized" (Dolovich, 2009). There are facilities with four or five thousand prisoners and only three or four doctors and some physicians are limited to work in correctional facilities because they are not qualified to care for the general population (Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). Courts have held that inmates have the right to health care, but the quality of the care is still up for debate (Quinn, 2009). 30 states have some form of co-payments for health care required of inmates which discourages prisoners from seeking treatment (Quinn, 2009; Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). The Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons recommends co-pay laws be revoked and Medicaid and Medicare be extended to eligible prisoners (Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). Mental health services are desperately needed in prisons. The prevalence of mental illness in prisons is 2 to 4 times higher than that of the general public (Colgan, 2006). Many prisoners do not receive any treatment for mental illness. There is a lack of staffing, medication, and supervision for prisoners with mental illnesses. "The consequences of failing to provide mental health care include suffering, self-mutilation, rage and violence, unnecessary placement in segregation, victimization, and suicide" (Colgan, 2006). The lack of mental health care also poses a risk to inmates who are not ill because inmates with mental illness are more likely to cause disciplinary problems than other inmates. Another significant problem is the inability to reenter society; untreated mental illness makes it more difficult for inmates to become productive, law-abiding citizens (Kendrick, 2011). The most common treatment is segregation which mental health professional argue often worsens the illness (Colgan, 2006). Children **& family services** are an important part of successful rehabilitation. 1.5 million children have parents in the DOC (Colgan, 2006). There is significant evidence about the impact of prisons on family and social networks. Children are taken from parents when they are incarcerated and often there is no visitation once the children are removed. Family structures face intense strain when prisoners reenter the family (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). Parents strain to reconnect with their children and children can go through serious trauma as parents reenter their lives; neither have had a chance to build a relationship during incarceration (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). The racial disparities in incarceration rates have a devastating impact on communities practically dissolving important social networks, particularly in black families (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). There will be affirmatives providing services for prisoners to interact with their children (Colgan, 2006).

**The largest aff** on the topic **would be comprehensive transition**al service programs, which are all in one programs including education, job training and placement, life skills, family reunification services, assistance, chemical dependency treatment, and mental health services (Colgan, 2006). Several states (Tennessee, Hawaii, & New York) have comprehensive programs that could be modeled on a federal level (Colgan, 2006). Holistic reentry services provide for prisoners needs across the board instead of in small pieces. Comprehensive reentry programs recognize the linkages between jobs, education, and social services. "By starting a prisoner with a Plan which identifies all of his or her needs and addresses them holistically, the likelihood of success while in prison and upon release are improved" (Colgan, 2006). In general, access to social services which some are explicitly denied would help convicts overcome significant obstacles to reentry.

Predictable limits are key to fairness and education because I can’t do in depth prep for the specific aff if there are 100s of affs to prepare for.

Limits are an independent voter. **Harris 13** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

I understand that there has been some criticism of Northwestern’s strategy in this debate round. This criticism is premised on the idea that they ran framework instead of engaging Emporia’s argument about home and the Wiz. I think this criticism is unfair. Northwestern’s framework argument did engage Emporia’s argument. Emporia said that you should vote for the team that performatively and methodologically made debate a home. Northwestern’s argument directly clashed with that contention. My problem in this debate was with aspects of the execution of the argument rather than with the strategy itself. It has always made me angry in debates when people have treated topicality as if it were a less important argument than other arguments in debate. Topicality is a real argument. It is a researched strategy. It is an argument that challenges many affirmatives. The fact that other arguments could be run in a debate or are run in a debate does not make topicality somehow a less important argument. In reality, for many of you that go on to law school you will spend much of your life running topicality arguments because you will find that words in the law matter. The rest of us will experience the ways that word choices matter in contracts, in leases, in writing laws and in many aspects of our lives. Kansas ran an affirmative a few years ago about how the location of a comma in a law led a couple of districts to misinterpret the law into allowing individuals to be incarcerated in jail for two days without having any formal charges filed against them. For those individuals the location of the comma in the law had major consequences. Debates about words are not insignificant. Debates about what kinds of arguments we should or should not be making in debates are not insignificant either. **The limits debate** is an argument that **has real** pragmatic **consequences.** I found myself earlier this year judging Harvard’s eco-pedagogy aff and thought to myself—I could stay up tonight and put a strategy together on eco-pedagogy, but then I thought to myself—why should I have to? Yes, **I could put together a strategy against any random argument** somebody makes employing an energy metaphor **but** the reality is **there are only so many nights to stay up all night researching. I would like to** actually spend time **play**ing **catch** with my children occasionally or maybe even **read a book or go to a movie** or spend some time with my wife. **A world where there are** an **infinite** number of **affirmatives** is a world where the demand to have a specific strategy and not run framework is a world that **says this community doesn’t care whether** its **participants have a life** or **do well in school or spend time with their families.** I know there is a new call abounding for interpreting this NDT as a mandate for broader more diverse topics. The reality is that will create more work to prepare for the teams that choose to debate the topic but will have little to no effect on the teams that refuse to debate the topic. Broader topics that do not require positive government action or are bidirectional will not make teams that won’t debate the topic choose to debate the topic. I think that is a con job. I am not opposed to broader topics necessarily. I tend to like the way high school topics are written more than the way college topics are written. I just think people who take the meaning of the outcome of this NDT as proof that we need to make it so people get **to talk about anything** they want to talk about **without having to debate** against **t**opicality or framework arguments are interested in constructing a world that **might make debate an unending nightmare** and not a very good home in which to live. **Limits**, to me, **are a real impact because I feel their impact** in my **everyday** existence.

Default to small limits for LD because **(a)** the massive number of philosophies means aff has large limits already **(b)** Massive limits exclude small-school debaters because there is not enough time in the day for one person to cut 100 case negs.

2. Reentry is key to criminal justice education. **Swanson et al 10** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Reentry is an important topic among policy-makers** in national government. It is generally defined as the use of programs, practices, and strategies targeted at promoting the successful reentry of prisoners back into the community Faced with significant numbers of newly released prisoners, including those convicted of serious crimes, the Bush administration created a Prison Reentry Initiative (Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, n.d.). Designed as a cooperative effort among several federal agencies, it funds state reentry programs. In addition, Bureau of Justice Assistance grants are awarded to state departments of corrections for developing prerelease services for prisoners transitioning back home. In April, 2008 President Bush also signed the Second Chance Act that creates an interagency council on reentry, provides additional funding for state programs, and authorizes direct grants to non-profit organizations for mentoring and other services for returning adult and juvenile offenders. The 2009 federal budget allocated $25,000,000 for reentry (Browning 2009). The Obama administration has budgeted $100,000,000 for these programs for 2010, a four-fold increase if appropriated (Browning 2009). **Reentry is of consequence for criminal justice education because every facet of the c**riminal **j**ustice **s**ystem, policing, courts, and corrections has contributed to the creation of this problem and **will be affected** by the large numbers of inmates returning from prison. Police will be faced with large numbers of prior offenders who are known to reoffend. The courts will have to deal with the increased work load produced by returning offenders, and ultimately the correctional system will face having to house large numbers of offenders who return to their already overcrowded facilities. Criminal justice education can play a significant role in helping society to come to grips with the legal, political, and public policy issues raised by reentry. **We are** currently **educating the next generation of criminal justice scholars** and practitioners **who will be called upon to provide** the data and **policy initiatives to deal with** the issues raised by **reentry.**

It is our belief that **reentry offers numerous opportunities for research and teaching. There will also be increased opportunities for** bachelor's educated practitioners to **work with the reentry population.** However, working with this population calls for specialized skills tailored to meet the needs of these offenders. Skills related to case management and increased **understanding of substance abuse,** mental illness, housing, **job training,** vocational training, **and education**al opportunities **will be required for** our **students** to take advantage of these opportunities. In addition, there is a need for theoretical understanding of the reentry process as well as knowledge of research methodologies that are helpful for understanding the problem. Legal issues and discretionary decision-making are also relevant to the success of reentry efforts. Will the curriculum in criminal justice education at all levels, but particularly at the undergraduate level, sufficiently prepare students for these new challenges brought about by reentry?

Empirics confirm. Reentry is the most important and least discussed form of criminal justice education. **Swanson et al 10** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

In this research, **the authors utilize a survey** of members of a national criminal justice organization (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences) in an effort **to gauge the coverage of reentry** issues **in criminal justice education.** The selection of reentry issues is based on the review of reentry literature. The survey is designed to assess the relative amount of time respondents devote to each topic in fractions of a 16-week semester. The survey was administered electronically through an email link to the instrument. The survey was sent to a total of 1,631 individuals. Thirty-seven were returned as undeliverable or as automated out- of-office replies and another 35 potential participants were bounced out of the survey by the program. A total of 408 respondents completed the survey out of the remaining 1,559 potential participants, resulting in a response rate of 26%. While this response rate is relatively low, web-based surveys commonly result in lower response rates than telephone or male surveys (Couper 2000; DiNitto et al. 2008; Tourangeau 2004). There are several explanations for the relatively low response rate. Recipients included criminal justice educators, practitioners, students, and others interested in criminal justice. The sampling frame does not provide for discerning which recipients teach classes in academic settings. Correspondence from numerous recipients indicates that many members of the national organization do not teach classes. Those individuals who indicated that they did not teach were asked not to complete the survey. In addition, the first two survey questions asked whether the respondent taught in a four- or two-year program, respectively. Only those respondents indicating that they taught in either a four- or two-year program were included in the analysis. Furthermore, the email message introducing the survey identifies its purpose as obtaining information about reentry issues. Return emails from recipients indicates that many of them did not participate because reentry is not their area of interest or expertise. While recipients who showed a reluctance to participate were encouraged to complete the survey, the authors believe that many recipients did not contribute because they felt their responses were not relevant to the research. Thus, it is likely that the results actually overestimate the treatment of reentry issues in criminal justice education due to the self- filtering of many recipients who do not cover such issues in their courses. Those who teach research methods, policing, and courts are possible examples Results Of the 408 respondents, 92.1% indicated that they taught in either a four- or two-year program (see Table 1). Since the focus of this analysis is on criminal justice education, only those respondents indicating that they taught were included in the analysis, resulting in 372 total cases for analysis. Due to the relatively small sample size, pairwise deletion was utilized to maximize the sample size for each analysis. The percentage of cases missing data ranged from 3.2% to 15.6% for the variables used in the analysis. While the missing data produce the potential for biased results, the authors feel that the data provide a solid baseline for this exploratory analysis. The overwhelming majority of respondents, 88.7%, teach in four-year programs. The mean number of majors in their programs is 429 students, with an average of nine faculty members in their departments and average class sizes of 34 students. There is a relatively even split between academic ranks for the respondents: 27.2% hold the rank of professor; 26.2% hold the rank of associate professor; and 32.5% hold the rank of assistant professor. The remaining 15% of respondents are either instructors or adjunct faculty. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents have a PhD, while just over 17% earned their highest degree at the master's level. For the majority of respondents, 55%, their highest degree is in criminal justice, criminology, or justice studies. Seventeen percent hold a degree in sociology, while 14.5% of respondents indicate "other" for their degree field. Open-ended responses indicate that the "other" category primarily includes education, public administration, and psychology. In addition, one-third of respondents designate employment experience in the corrections field. The majority of respondents teach courses in introductory criminal justice and corrections, **while a substantial percentage teach criminology,** policing, **theory, and research** methods courses. **Only 2%** of respondents report **teach**ing **a course on** prisoner **reentry**, while 4% teach a drug-related course. Thus, it appears that when reentry issues are addressed, they are largely covered in more general courses.

**Over 60%** of the respondents **reported that** offender **reentry is** a **very important** topic **in criminal justice education, while another 28% view the topic as important.** Table 2 provides the survey findings for the treatment of numerous reentry issues in criminal justice education. A majority of respondents address 13 of the 14 reentry issues listed. The most commonly covered topics are those involving drug and substance abuse, mental health, and the impact of prisoner reentry on communities with over three-quarters of respondents reporting that they provided some attention to these issues. The least addressed reentry topics are parenting, case management, literacy, and anger issues. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the amount of coverage of each reentry issue for only those respondents who reported they addressed the topics.2 While the previous table shows that a majority of respondents covered reentry issues, the findings in Table 3 indicate that the treatment of those issues with respect to time-frame is very limited. For each issue, **over two-thirds** of the respondents **report** that they provide the **minimum** amount of **coverage**, one to two weeks. Community impact, mental health, and victim issues are most likely to receive additional attention, with over one-third of respondents reporting at least three to four weeks of coverage in their courses.

In an effort to better understand the context under which reentry issues are taught in criminal justice education, a reentry scale was created which measures the overall coverage of all reentry issues. The scale had a range of 1.0 to 5.0, with 1.0 representing no coverage and 5.0 indicating maximum coverage. Means tests were utilized to determine the effects of courses taught, academic rank, and degree field of respondents on reentry coverage. Table 4 reports the findings of the means tests broken down by courses taught. The findings show that those teaching courses on reentry, drug issues, corrections, and theory generally provide the most coverage of reentry issues. There is a significant difference in the amount of attention provided to reentry issues among those who teach these courses and those who do not teach them. This finding is not surprising given the nature of these courses, although our discussion on the relevance of reentry to a variety of topics might provide useful examples of how reentry issues can be more broadly integrated into criminal justice curricula. Tables 5 and 6 display the findings from means tests examining the effects of academic rank and degree field, respectively, on the reentry scale. In most cases, no statistically significant differences were uncovered. However, there is a significant difference in the treatment of reentry subjects by instructors. It appears that instructors cover reentry issues to a greater extent than instructors of other ranks. Perhaps this finding emerges because instructors are more likely to have work experience in the field and are more acutely aware of the importance of reentry issues.3 It is also possible that instructors are more likely to teach courses in which reentry issues are deemed more relevant to the focus of the course. Future research should examine the forces behind this finding. Discussion and Implications The results of the survey provide a positive picture with regard to reentry issues in criminal justice education, yet also indicate several areas for improvement.

Table 6 Comparison of mean level of coverage of reentry issues by degree field

 Degree field

CJ/Criminology Other Significance

1.93 1.87 .454

Sociology Other

1.82 1.92 .335

Social work Other

1.81 1.90 .850

Political science Other

1.73 1.91 .245

Law Other

1.61 1.92 .061

The upside is that it appears that reentry issues are being addressed in criminal justice education. Students are exposed to many of the important reentry issues primarily in courses on corrections, drug abuse, and in those few courses offered specifically addressing prisoner reentry. But teachers also address reentry subjects broadly in other courses, often classified as core subjects. Nevertheless, given the implications of the vast numbers of offenders who will be returning to society as a result of decades of punitive crime policies, prisoner reentry arguably could assume greater prominence and more wide- spread coverage in criminal justice education. **While** the findings reported here indicate that **reentry issues are addressed, depth and breadth** of coverage **appear**s to be **lacking** as measured by the amount of time devoted to the subject and the variety of courses in which reentry is addressed. As indicated in Table 4, respondents teaching courses in policing, courts, research and statistics, and introductory criminal justice and criminology are less likely to cover reentry issues. As noted earlier, it can be argued that **the impact of reentry** issues **on all aspects of** the **criminal justice** system **points to a need to cover the topic** in courses in which reentry can be thought of as relevant. Our contention is that reentry is relevant to these courses. The central question, it seems, is this: Is criminal justice education adequately preparing students to address the needs of contemporary criminal justice in practice?

Criminal justice education is a voter. **Nielson 11** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

Second, **if a large percent**age **of debaters enter** into **law** school, **political science, or social justice** work post their undergraduate studies, **then the prison topic would be valuable** as practical **research for** their **future studies. Debate skills, such as research**, listening, public speaking, personal expression, problem-solving skills, **are highly transferable** in these areas of graduate study. We are all familiar with research indicating **70% of judges recommend** participation in **intercollegiate debate as a precursor to law school** (Freely & Steinberg, 2009). **Debaters** themselves **list law school prep**aration **as one** of the **advantage**s **of** intercollegiate **debate** (Williams, McGee & Worth, 2001). You aren't likely go to law school and skip over a discussion of the penal system. **The debate community has an opportunity to prepare** our undergraduates **for** work in **a field they are most likely to go into.**

D. Drop the debater

1. The NC was skewed. I can’t redo it after the 1AR shifts.

2. Key to deterrence. Drop the arg means aff will run abusive cases for the timeskew.

3. Jurisdiction. Can’t vote for a nontopical plan.

Prefer competing interpretations because reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention.

## AT Plans Good

1. Not offense for the aff. My interp forces the aff to read a reentry plan.

2. TURN – limits are the key internal link to plan focus. I can’t debate the specifics of the plan without research.
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