

Title: A Call to Action: A blueprint for Academic Health Sciences in the era of mass incarceration

Introduction

Over the last forty years, the number of individuals incarcerated in the U.S. has risen by 700% and the incarceration rate is seven-fold higher than most developed Western European countries (1). Approximately 100 million Americans have criminal records (2). The burden of incarceration disproportionately affects people of color and ethnic minorities (3). Seventy percent of African American men who do not graduate from high school have been incarcerated by age 40 (4). For men born between 1965 and 1969 and surviving to 1999, the lifetime risk of incarceration for White men was 3.2% (1:31) but for Black men was (1:4.5) or 22% (3). Of the 11 million people cycling through jails annually and over 700,000 releases from prison, 95% of incarcerated persons will return to communities. In the absence of evidence-based intervention, 5-year recidivism rates hover at 75% (5), perpetuating an unbridled cycle of incarceration. Estimates further indicate that 80% of all arrests are linked directly or indirectly to drug and alcohol use (6) with over 15% of incarcerated people having co-morbid serious mental illness (7). Medical and psychiatric co-morbidity in prisons is increasingly common, especially as the population ages. Consequently, 30-40% of detainees have a chronic medical condition including blood-borne infections associated with drug injection (8). In consideration of the scope of the problem and the downstream impact on the lives of individuals, families and society, there are compelling arguments placing criminal justice involvement as one of the most important root causes of poor health (9-11). This is particularly true for racial/ethnic minorities where disproportionate incarceration rates and the impact on the social determinants of health suggest that criminal justice involvement is a key contributor to health disparities. In turn, over the last

15 years, there has been a slow but growing interest in the impact of criminal justice involvement on health.

In 2004, a call for collaboration between the criminal justice system and academic disciplines was published followed by planning for a national academic conference; the inaugural Academic and Health Policy Conference on Correctional Health was held in 2007 with selected proceedings laying out a blueprint for academic engagement in correctional primary care, infectious diseases and mental health (12-15). Leaders of key stakeholders organized and the Academic Consortium on Criminal Justice Health was formed with a mission to advance the science and practice of healthcare for individuals and populations within the criminal justice system.

Given the prevalence of justice involvement in the U.S. and the evidence for an impact on health outcomes, we now call on academic health science institutions, including universities, affiliated institutions providing healthcare and grant-making institutions to harness their capabilities to tackle one of the country's most vexing crises. This commentary will put forth a blueprint for engagement including research, training, clinical care and collaboration with the academic criminal justice establishment.

Research and Recommendations for Future Research

Criminal justice involvement extends beyond the 20% of Americans with criminal convictions. Annually, >14 million adults are arrested in addition to the nearly 7 million adults that are already under some type of correctional control. Involvement with the justice system is no longer unusual or limited to a small percentage of Americans. The sheer magnitude of interfacing with the criminal justice system is now common for Americans, and for minorities

and individuals that are poor, the likelihood of criminal justice involvement is magnified and negatively impacts 30% of socially vulnerable people.

Surprisingly most epidemiology surveys like the U.S. Census, National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcoholism and Related Conditions, Collaborative Epidemiology Surveys (CPES) and American Community Survey don't capture information about criminal justice involvement, including past or current involvement. . The National Household Survey on Drug Use and Health (NHSDUH) is the only national survey that inquires about justice involvement, and this is generally confined to one question about whether the individual is currently on probation or parole within the past 12 months. NHSDUH does not include past arrest or incarceration history or any indication of prior involvement with the justice system.

The NHSDUH is therefore the only survey to understand how the justice population compares to the general population. This survey has documented that those currently on probation and/or parole have substance use disorders at four times the rate of the general population and mental health disorders occur at twice the rate of the general population (16). The NHSDUH data was recently used by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to compare the prevalence of chronic or infectious diseases of the general population with inmates in federal and state prisons and local jails (17). The BJS study found that incarcerated jail and prison populations had higher rates of both infectious and chronic diseases when controlling for sex, age, race, and ethnicity. Nearly 44% of state and federal prisoners compared to 31% of the general population reported having a chronic disease. Significantly different between the two groups is that nearly 45% of jail inmates versus 27% of the general population have a chronic disease. For the most part, incarcerated individuals are made aware of their chronic disease while incarcerated (18). Except for the NHSDUH, most of our knowledge about the health needs of

justice-involved individuals is from studies that are limited in size, to populations specific to the study aims, and inconsistent measurements used in the different studies. And, as noted recently, only 0.1% of National Institutes of Health (NIH)-funded grants focused on elements of criminal justice health from 2007-2012. NIH funded a meager \$40.9 million or 1.5% of the \$2.7 billion health disparities budget in 2012 (19). The 3 most commonly funded topics were substance use or HIV (64%), mental health (11%), and juvenile health (8%), with the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the National Institute of Mental Health funding 78% of these grants.

The meager funding of criminal justice health research coupled with the huge societal costs of the justice apparatus suggests that there is an enormous gap in our understanding of how justice involvement affects health status and health conditions, and how health conditions are addressed when individuals are in different justice settings (i.e. jail, prison, probation, parole, pretrial, etc.). Moreover, because 95% of justice-involved persons transition to the community, it is crucial that the benefits gained during incarceration are continued post-release. Given the paucity of research and understanding of the health services utilization by justice involved individuals, the following outlines an extensive agenda to expand our knowledge. The overall recommendation is that in every way possible there is a need to measure criminal justice status of the individual (i.e. pretrial defendant, pretrial detainee in jail, sentenced to jail, sentence to prison, probationer, parolee, drug court participant, diversion, etc.), criminal justice setting, and criminal justice risk level. Criminal justice risk indicates the likelihood that an individual will have further involvement in the justice system. (20) These should be core measures incorporated into any study to capture key information about how justice involvement affects an individual's behavioral health and chronic health conditions. The following are the recommendations:

1. Prevalence studies. All major epidemiology surveys should harmonize their measures and include measures of the type of justice involvement and the status of the individual. This should be a responsibility for all publicly-funded population surveys across the spectrum of agencies including the census bureau, CDC, BJS, and Department of Education. This ensures that it is possible establish national prevalence rates that allow for surveillance of key indicators by health agencies.
2. Intervention Studies. Given the specific comorbid condition of many justice-involved individuals (either a combination of behavioral health conditions, complex medical needs, or behavioral health and chronic diseases), many evidence-based interventions that are effective in the community are also presumed to be relevant for justice-involved individuals. Studies have found, however, that interventions are not always transportable without adaptation for the justice population or for delivery in justice settings (21). More site-specific (e.g., jail, prison, probation, parole) and culturally-adapted intervention studies are needed to understand how to engage clients in care, how to address various types of comorbid conditions with integrated care models, and the effects of certain intervention on both health and justice outcomes.
3. Implementation Science. The justice system is designed to promote public safety, as well as to punish individuals. Implementing programming, healthcare, and service delivery meets with unique challenges given the punitive culture, the security needs that occur in incarceration settings, and the balancing act between addressing programming needs and managing the offender population. Implementation science is needed to understand how to deliver evidence based practices and treatments in justice settings.

4. Development or Adaptation of Evidence-based Practices and Treatments for Justice Clients. There is a presumption that the clinical practices, studies of evidence-based practices and treatments on the general population, and efficacy trials will generate evidence based practices and treatments that are relevant for justice populations. More efficacy trials are needed to generate outcome studies that can address the myriad of health and behavioral health conditions.
5. Participatory Research. The justice system is one area where stakeholders are infrequently involved in the design, execution, and interpretation of studies. To extend the significance and relevance of the research, there is a need to include justice actors, treatment providers, justice involved individuals, individuals in recovery or formerly involved in the justice system, and other key players in research studies. Community-based participatory research (CBPR) is an applied approach that has been widely used in public health research to gain a deeper understanding of societal problems and develop applied solutions by identifying and engaging a diverse set of community stakeholders who collaborate with researchers in all aspects of a research project, including study design, data collection, data analysis and dissemination (22-24).
6. Affordable Healthcare Act. A major focus of ACA is to provide integrated care which generally presumes that integrating behavioral health services in primary care. A number of unanswered questions exist of how the ACA may impact provision of health services to justice involved individuals, and whether integrated care can be provided within justice settings or to justice involved individuals. A number of unanswered questions exist about how ACA may transform justice settings into service providers. Attention is needed on how ACA reduces health disparities among justice involved individuals.

7. Facilitation of access to both health and criminal justice data is needed to meet the above stated recommendations. Human subjects protection is rigorous, and transportability of data cumbersome with many involved gatekeepers, which slow and impede access and utilization of vital data for analysis. Mandates to address the myriad of system barriers in a timely manner is ultimately a cost-effective measure to address efficacious treatment for this population.

Education and Training

With nearly 12 million individuals released from jails and prisons annually and the additional 2.2 million incarcerated inmates on any given day (5), it is likely that nearly every healthcare clinician provides care for justice-involved persons. Moreover, with increased access to healthcare under the Affordable Care Act, it is certain that they will provide care for such individuals and their families over the course of their careers. Care delivery in such settings also requires a unique set of competencies seldom taught in traditional training (25). This population differs from other vulnerable groups because of their incarceration experience affecting behavioral challenges through learned dependency behaviors, maladaptive survival skills and lost normative behaviors (26-29) that interfere with their ability to engage in expected patient-provider behaviors. Inadequate preparation of clinicians increases burnout, turnover, poor outcomes, and higher costs in an already fractured clinical care system. With the exception of supervised rotations and internships that are routine in psychiatry and nursing, health profession schools have been slow in developing curricula and training opportunities. For example, while curricula on such topics as health disparities, social determinants of health, and cultural competence are common, only 22 primary care training programs include correctional healthcare

(30). Training students in correctional settings demonstrates the impact of social determinants on health outcomes directly.

In 2012, the American Osteopathic Association (AOA) in collaboration with three colleges of osteopathic medicine, adopted standards for accreditation for a fellowship in correctional medicine and a Certificate of Added Qualification (CAQ) (31). With the planned joining of the AOA with American Council for Graduate Medical Education into a single system, this CAQ will likely be expanded. Models for such fellowships were first piloted in FL and MA (32). A two-year accredited fellowship in correctional medicine, with an integrated requirement for an MPH, now exists in Connecticut, where the University of Connecticut is contracted to provide care in prisons and jails. (33).

Beyond medicine, clinicians in other disciplines such as nursing are responsible for a majority of the care delivered and receive neither adequate clinical preparation nor adequate continuing educational support. Nurses are among the largest group of healthcare providers in criminal justice systems. Standards of clinical correctional nursing care (34) exist but few aspects of correctional nursing have been empirically tested and translated into practical and applied competencies (26, 27). As a result, the quality of nursing care is irregular and correctional systems of care remain fragmented. Nurse preparation, job satisfaction, and retention are poor; clinical evidence and best practices are not entering these systems.

Academic preparation of nursing students through clinical orientations, use of simulation, and clinical rotations/placements can positively impact recruitment. One academic program (35, 36) has developed a structured orientation introducing nursing students to the criminal justice environment. This program has resulted in 25% of students subsequently working in correctional

settings. Programming includes both service learning opportunities and clinical research projects through a public-academic partnership.

While recommendations for interprofessional education to train health professions students for the 21st century have received wide attention, care systems in prisons and jails, particularly models of integrated medical and behavioral healthcare, are lacking. Fostering curricula designed to be interprofessional with a focus on justice-involved populations would help to accelerate integrated correctional care and spread existing systems for efficient and effective care transitions to the community upon release. The development of patient centered medical homes in correctional settings and tailoring community-based medical homes to the needs of released detainees offer the real potential for enhanced workforce satisfaction, quality improvement, and cost effectiveness.

Recommendations to academic health science institutions:

1. Undergraduate, predoctoral and postdoctoral degree and training programs should address the need to prepare its learners to care for justice-involved populations in every healthcare discipline.
2. Accreditation organizations should require a core curriculum on criminal justice health.
3. Congress and the Executive branch should support federal agencies to fund innovative models for training. For example, Title VII and VIII funding for medicine and nursing could offer grants to support innovative training programs for undergraduate, predoctoral and postdoctoral training. Additionally, Foundations which support innovations in health professions' training should prioritize training to prepare individuals to provide care for this at risk population.

Clinical Care

Access to and quality of healthcare across the nation's jails, prisons and community-based systems is inconsistent. While there are some model programs that meet or exceed community standards, many fall short of even the limited healthcare delivery available in community settings. Substantial improvements in correctional healthcare followed the US Supreme Court decision in *Estelle v. Gamble* (37) that held that deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of convicted inmates violates the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution on the grounds that it is cruel and unusual punishment. These findings were soon thereafter extended to mental health (38). Pretrial detainees were found to have a similar standing (39) on the basis of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Much successful class action litigation followed that led to substantial improvements in correctional healthcare; this avenue was limited by the subsequent 1996 Prison Litigation Reform Act (40). The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice (DOJ), however, still actively pursues these concerns (41).

The work of the National Commission on Correctional Health Care (NCCHC) and the American Correctional Association (ACA), and in rare cases the Joint Commission, led to development of standards and some systems voluntarily agree to be held to those standards. However, most systems are marginally funded and most do not participate in accreditation with only 17% participating in NCCHC review (42). In turn, many systems have been required to improve by court mandate. Clinician staffing inadequacies are routine in many correctional facilities, as are compromised conditions of confinement. Health consequences due to such issues were evident in the Supreme Court case *Brown v. Plata* (43), which noted that conditions in California prisons compromised healthcare delivery and resulted in a culture of "cynicism and fear."

During court-mandated oversight, improvements are made; there is sadly and predictably a subsequent regression after completion of oversight due to the inevitable pressures of budget reductions and changes in administration. Furthermore, federal funding is precluded to states and counties due to exclusion of inmates from Medicaid and Medicare participation (44,45). Prior to incarceration, justice-involved populations generally have low utilization rates of community-based care (46). Correctional systems however have the potential to become integrated into medical home models and to build upon continuity-of-care systems (47).

At this time, very limited information is available regarding treatment quality and access. Some evidence of very positive health outcomes exists for selected facilities and systems in metabolic and infectious disease treatment (48, 49). Indeed, 40% of people are first diagnosed with a chronic disease during incarceration in a prison (50). In contrast, while over 70% of people in state prisons need treatment for substance use disorders, only 13% receive care (51).

a. Opportunity for academic health centers

AHCs have much to offer correctional partners: expertise in evaluation, quality improvement, evidence-based practice, and implementation science (47, 49, 50). Correctional care allows academic physicians, nurses, pharmacists and other health professionals to develop population health skills and may stimulate new approaches to community based population health initiatives. While relatively few AHCs are currently working in this arena, the convergence of need, opportunity, and mission argue forcefully for more extensive commitments. Correctional healthcare provides opportunities to address health inequities. Such settings are excellent environments for AHCs to develop and hone the skills needed to improve the experience of care for individuals, improve the health of populations, and lower per capita costs (52, 53). Further,

correctional care delivery provides settings for refining Accountable Care Organization (ACO) capacity.

b. Recommendations

Given the opportunities noted here, we strongly believe that AHC's should engage in planning efforts to:

1. Seek contracts to assume primary care for individuals incarcerated in their local jails and regional prisons, as well as community-based service settings such as primary clinics and skilled nursing facilities;
2. Adapt and refine best community practices for chronic disease prevention and management, gender-specific care, and care for aging populations in correctional settings;
3. Develop secure, model outpatient referral centers for subspecialty consultation and care;
4. Develop agreements to serve as post-release referral hospitals and medical homes with coordinated care transition; and
5. Further develop telemedicine skills for correctional use.

Collaboration across the academic disciplines of Health Sciences and Criminal Justice

Recent strategies to reduce mass incarceration focus on the “front end” through alternatives to sentences, changes in mandatory minimum sentencing and on the “back end” collateral consequences are being proposed. With respect to community reentry interventions, most are focused on reducing barriers to employment, housing, food security and vocational services for successful reintegration of released inmates into communities (55). Few efforts focus on

expanding healthcare services including preventive services and self-management, accessing behavioral health treatment and transitional services, or addressing the myriad of behavioral health and comorbid chronic diseases. This division between justice reforms and integrated healthcare follows from reforms proffered by different disciplines with different agendas. The justice based sentencing reforms are appropriately borne out of the justice system and justice actors that tend to develop through the lens of criminal justice reforms absent input from the healthcare system or interdisciplinary teams. This reinforces the disinterest of healthcare leaders and health policy experts. This means that behavioral health services-- mental health and substance abuse—which affect criminal behavior (including violent crime) are neglected in the cadre of reforms.

Recommendations:

1. It is critical that scholars in the fields of criminal justice and healthcare begin to collaborate.
2. Grant-making organizations should encourage and foster these collaborations.
3. Interdisciplinary health professional associations would take leadership to promote attention to policy reform through collaborative or coordinated efforts, develop a clearing house for partnerships to address cross cutting issues effecting these populations.

Conclusions

The dimension in growth of incarceration in the United States and the downstream impact on the quality of life and health of affected individuals and families is staggering. It is appropriate that scholars and policymakers in the field of criminal justice tackle this problem. However, the downstream impact on social determinants of health as a result of incarceration, the racial, ethnic

and socioeconomic disparities of justice involvement and the influence of behavioral conditions on criminal behavior are equally compelling. In turn, the authors believe that academic health science centers and governmental organizations concerned with health care, health training and health services research have an equivalent responsibility to address the American mass incarceration phenomenon. Unless more multidimensional justice and healthcare reforms are offered, the efforts to prevent recidivism, to reduce health disparities and to mitigate the economic and societal consequences of incarceration will be lost.

References

1. Drucker E. A Plague of Prisons: The Epidemiology of Mass Incarceration in America. New York, NY: The New Press; 2011:37-47.
2. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of State Criminal History Information Systems, 2012 (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014) available at <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bjs/grants/244563.pdf>
3. Pettit B, Western B. Mass incarceration and the life course: race and class inequality in U.S. incarceration. *American Sociological Review*. 2004; 69:151-69.
4. ADAM II. Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program. Office of National Drug Control Policy. April, 2009. Available at: <http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/pdf/adam2008.pdf>
5. Western B, Petit B. Incarceration and social inequality. *Daedalus*. 2010;139(3):8-19.
6. Freudenberg N, Daniels J, Crum M, *et al*. Coming home from jail: The social and health consequences of community reentry for women, male adolescents and families and communities. *Am J Pub Health*. 2005;95(10):1725-36.
7. Behind Bars II. Substance Abuse and America's Prison Population. 2010. The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University. Available at: http://www.casacolumbia.org/templates/publications_reports.aspx
8. National Institute of Mental Health, "Serious Mental Illness (SMI) Among U.S. Adults," <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/prevalence/serious-mental-smi-among-us-adults.shtml> (accessed July 20, 2015).
9. Binswanger IA, Krueger PM, Steiner JF. Prevalence of chronic medical conditions among jail and prison inmates in the United States compared with the general population.

- J Epidemiol Community Health. 2009 Nov;63(11):912-9. doi: 10.1136/jech.2009.090662. Epub 2009 Jul 30.
10. Brinkley-Rubinstein, L. Incarceration as a catalyst for worsening health. *Health & Justice*. 2013;1(1), 3.
 11. Cloud, D H, Parsons J, Delany-Brumsey A. Addressing mass incarceration: a clarion call for public health. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104(3) 389-391.
 12. Dumont DM, Brockmann B, Dickman S, *et al*. Public health and the epidemic of incarceration. *Ann Rev Public Health*. 2012;33:325-39.
 13. Kendig N. Introduction. *J Correct Health Care*, 2008;14(4): 260-2.
 14. Appelbaum KL. Correctional mental health research: opportunities and barriers. *J Correct Health Care*. 2008;14:269-277.
 15. Paar D, Bova C, Baillargeon J, *et al*. Infectious Disease in Correctional Health Care: Pursuing a Research Agenda. *J Correct Health Care*. 2008;14(4): 263-8.
 16. Hale JF, Brewer AM, Ferguson W. Correctional Health Primary Care: Research and Educational Opportunities. *J Correct Health Care*. 2008;14(4): 278-89.
 17. Results from the 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Summary of National Findings, 2013; NSDUH Series H-46, HHS Publication No. (SMA) 13-4795. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Rockville, MD; 164 pages. Available at: <http://store.samhsa.gov/home>
 18. Maruschak LM, Berzofsky M, Unangst J. Medical problems of state and federal prisoners and jail inmates, 2011-12, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2015, NCJ 248491. 22 pages. Available at: <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/mpsfpi1112.pdf>

19. Wang EA, Hong CS, Shavit S, *et al.* Engaging individuals recently released from prison into primary care: a randomized trial. *Am J Public Health.* 2012;102(9):112-113.
20. Ahalt C, Bolano M, Wang EA, *et al.* The state of research funding from the National Institutes of Health for criminal justice health research. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(5):345-52. Doi: 10.7326/M14-2161.
21. Taxman FS, Cropsey KL, Young D, *et al.* Screening, assessment and referral practices in adult correctional settings: A national perspective. *Crim Justice Behav.* 2007;34(9):1216-1234.
22. Portillo S, Rudes DS, Taxman FS. The transportability of contingency management in problem-solving courts. *Justice Quarterly.* 2014;1-24. Doi: 10.1080/07418825.2014.902490.
23. Krieger J, Allen C, Cheadle A, *et al.* Using community-based participatory research to address social determinants of health: Lessons learned from Seattle Partners for Healthy Communities. *Health Educ Behav.* 2002;29(3):361-382.
24. Garcia AP, Minkler M, Cardenas Z, *et al.* Engaging Homeless Youth in Community-Based Participatory Research a Case Study from Skid Row, Los Angeles. *Health Promot Pract .* 2014;15(1):18-27.
25. Wallerstein NB, Duran B. Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities. *Health Promot Pract.* 2006 July 7(3):312-323.
26. Haley HL, Ferguson W, Brewer A, *et al.* Correctional health curriculum enhancement through focus groups. *Teach Learn Med.* 2009;21(4):310-7.

27. Shelton D, Weiskopf C, Nicholson M. Correctional nursing competency development in the Connecticut Correctional Managed Health Care program. *J Correctional Healthcare*. 2010;16, 299-309.
28. Shelton D, Panosky D, Reagan L, *et al.* (2015, July). Correctional Nurse Baseline Indicators and Implementation Strategies Applied to a Statewide Correctional Nurse Competencies Program – Midyear report. *J Contin Educ Nurs*. (Accepted.)
29. Cordilia, A. (1983). *The making of an inmate: Prison as a way of life*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company.
30. Clemmer, D. (1958). *The prison community*. New York, NY. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
31. Min I, Schonberg D, Anderson M. A review of primary care training programs in correctional health for physicians. *Teach Learn Med*. 2012;24(1):81-9. doi: 10.1080/10401334.2012.641492.
32. American Osteopathic Association. Title Available at: https://www.acofp.org/ACOFPIMIS/acofporg/PDFs/Program_Directors/Basic_Training_Standards/FM/Basic_Standards_for_Correctional_Medicine_8_12.pdf , accessed 7/20/15.
33. Ferguson WJ, Thomas D, Medeiros M. *Growing Your Own: Correctional Health Fellowships*. Presented at: 3rd Annual Academic and Health Policy Conference on Correctional Health, Fort Lauderdale, FL, February, 2010. Available at: <http://www.correctionalhealthconference.com/2009-presentations>
34. Trestman RL. Academic-correctional partnership: Connecticut's mental health services program. *Corrections Today*. 2006:42-44.
35. ANA (2007). *Corrections Nursing: Scope and Standards of Practice*. Silver Spring, MD.

36. Shelton D, Panosky D. (2009). Correctional nursing: An orientation for nursing students. Conference proceedings: 10th Biennial International Conference on the Nurse's Role in the Criminal Justice System. On-line at:
<http://www.usask.ca/nursing/custodycaring/index.htm>.
37. American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (2012). Employment of New Nurse Graduates and Employer Preferences for Baccalaureate-Prepared Nurses. On-line:
http://www.aacn.nche.edu/leading_initiatives_news/news/2012/employment12.
38. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 97 S. Ct. 285, 50 L. Ed. 2d 251 (1976).
39. *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 99 S. Ct. 1861, 60 L. Ed. 2d 447 (1979).
40. *Bowring v. Godwin*, 551 F.2d 44 (4th Cir. 1977).
41. Herman S N. Prison Litigation Reform Acts. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*. 2012;24(4), 263-267.
42. Stolz BA. (2015). The Growth of Federal Criminal Justice Policy Making: The Role of U.S. Civil Rights Legislation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 2015;26(5), 463-487.
43. Stern MF, Greifinger RB, Mellow J. Patient safety: moving the bar in prison health care standards. *Am J Pub Health*. 2013;100(11):2103.
44. *Brown v. Plata*, 131 S. Ct. 1910, 563 U.S., 179 L. Ed. 2d 969 (2011).
45. Wakeman SE, McKinney ME, Rich JD. Filling the gap: the importance of Medicaid continuity for former inmates. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2009;24:860-862.
46. Trestman RL, Aseltine RH Jr. Justice-involved health information: policy and practice advances in Connecticut. *Perspect Health Inf Manag*. 2014;11:1e.
47. Ramaswamy M, Diaz F, Pankey T, *et al*. Correlates of Preincarceration Health Care Use among Women and Men in Jail. *J Correct Health Care*. 2015;21(3):286-297.

48. Wang EA, Hong CS, Shavit S, *et al.* Engaging individuals recently released from prison into primary care: a randomized trial. *Am J Public Health.* 2012;102:e22-e29.
49. Reeves R, Brewer A, DeBilio L, *et al.* Benefits of a Department of Corrections Partnership with a Health Sciences University New Jersey's Experience. *J Correct Health Care.* 2014;20(2):145-153.
50. Meyer JP, Cepeda J, Wu J, *et al.* Optimization of human immunodeficiency virus treatment during incarceration: viral suppression at the prison gate. *JAMA.* 2014;174(5), 721-729.
51. Taxman FS, Perdoni ML, Harrison LD. Drug treatment services for adult offenders: the state of the state. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 2007;32(3): 239–54.
52. Trestman RL. Academic-correctional partnership: Connecticut's mental health services program. *Corrections Today.* 2006:42-44.
53. Trestman RL, Ferguson W, Dickert J. Behind Bars: The Compelling Case for Academic Health Centers Partnering With Correctional Facilities. *Acad Med.* 2015;90(1), 16-19.
54. Butler B. Health Information Exchange and Jails. *Health Aff.* 2015;34(6):1069-1070.
55. Travis J, Western B. The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences. In: Committee on Causes and Consequences of High Rates of Incarceration; Committee on Law and Justice; Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education; National Research Council, eds. Washington, DC: National Academies of Science, 2014.
56. Osher F, Steadman HJ, Barr H. A Best Practice Approach to Community Reentry from Jails for Inmates with Co-Occurring Disorders: The APIC Model. *Crime & Delinquency.* 2003;49(1):79-96.

