

Policy Paper

By:

Kanasha L. N. Blue

Niagara University

ADS 720: Process, Politics, and Evaluation of Public and Social Policy

Fall 2017

In his 2004 State of the Union Address President George W. Bush stated, “America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life (Bush, 2014). This quote refers to one of America’s great debatable problems; life after incarceration for ex-offenders and their access to employment. This paper will use Eugene Bardach and Eric Patashnik’s book, *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving* to understand, analyze and address the problem of access to employment for ex-offenders in New York State.

Step One: Define the Problem

The first step in Bardach and Patashnik (2016) problem-solving process and policy analysis is to define the problem. There are many effects of imprisonment and felony convictions on future employment. John Schmitt and Kris Warner (2010) argues that a prison, jail term, or felony conviction has a negative impact on this population's future job prospects. As discussed by Peter Finn (1998), there is a strong correlation between high recidivism rates and unemployment. Circumstances that affect an ex-offender’s employability according to Finn (1998) includes lack of job-seeking experience, occupational skills, a work history, and a criminal record. These characteristics make it difficult for many ex-offenders to find well paid and permanent employment after incarceration (Finn, 1998). Apart from the corrosion of workers human capital described above, there is also a stigma or negative attitude that encourages employers not to employ ex-offenders according to Schmitt and Warner (2010). Other reasons for barriers to employment for ex-offender include legal restrictions on professional licensing or limitation in employment sectors such as government employment (Schmitt and Warner, 2010).

Author Joan Petersillia found that despite no federal or state institution track employment rates of prisoners after release; available statistics point to a high rate of unemployment amongst the ex-offender population (Petersillia, 2003). According to Petersillia (2003), a year after release in California an estimated 80 percent of ex-offenders remained jobless. According to an independent Committee on Reentry and Employment, 60 percent of ex-offenders are unemployed in New York State one year after release (Smith, 2009).

Step Two: Assemble Some Evidence

The second step in the Eightfold Path according to Bardach and Patashnik(2016), is to assemble some evidence. Assembling some evidence means to collect information and data about the topic at hand to assess the extent and nature of the problem, along with the policies created to solve similar issues (Bardach and Patashnik, 2016). In 2010, Schmitt and Warner assessed the extent of the problem being evaluated by this essay. Schmitt and Warner (2010) conducted a study which used five common approaches quantify the impact of felony convictions and incarceration on the labor market. The five approaches used included tracking ex-offenders using surveys and administrative data before and after incarcerations and conducted surveys of the attitudes employers had towards ex-offenders. The study also compared job applications with and without felony-level to see the difference in employment prospects and used data from state and/or city levels to relate labor-market outcomes amongst different incarceration levels and demographic groups. Each area independently and collectively showed a substantial negative impact of imprisonment and a felony conviction on employment scenarios for ex-offenders (Schmitt and Warner, 2010). According to the research ex-offenders, difficulties finding employment affects the employment rate in the United States by between 0.8% and 0.9%

which costs the country between \$57 to \$65 billion per year as reflected by Gross Domestic Product (Schmitt and Warner, 2010).

Current Policy Solutions:

This section discusses some of the current policies that are attempting to increase accessibility to employment for ex-offenders. New York State and nine other states have lift unnecessary restrictions that prohibit ex-offenders from obtaining professional licenses according to the Center for the Study of Social Policy(2012). These 10 States have prohibited blanket employment bans that “prevent occupational licensing agencies and employers from considering arrests that did not lead to convictions in hiring decisions” (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 2012). These states understand in many conditions; a criminal record is not applicable to hiring decisions and therefore should not be considered. The Center for the Study of Social Policy(2012) states, “There must be a direct, rational, or reasonable relationship between the criminal conviction and the license sought for a denial of licensure ” in the following 10 states: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Utah, and Wisconsin. In addition, the following states Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York provide rehabilitation certificates and civil rights restoration for ex-offenders to find employment and attain occupational licensure (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 2012).

New York State provides numerous initiatives to encourage employers to employ ex-offenders such as the Federal Bonding Program, the Work Opportunity Tax Credit and the Work for Success Program. The Federal Bonding Program provides bond cover for hard to place job seekers and those considered at-risk, this bond guarantees the honesty of these candidates to the employer for six months at no cost to either party (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 2012).

The Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) and Work for Success Program provides employers with up to \$2,400 in federal tax saving for each qualified individuals with barriers to employment including an ex-offender that is employed with the business (Tax incentives for businesses, n.d.).

Step Three: Construct the Alternatives

The third step in Eightfold Path Policy Analysis is to construct alternatives for solving the problem. Bardach and Patashnik (2016) highlight the importance identifying all possible solutions by thinking broadly at first, then simplifying to a narrower more focused list of alternatives.

Alternative 1: The Status Quo

The first alternative is the Status Quo alternative, as Bardach and Patashnik (2016) states, “Let present trends (or business as usual) continue undisturbed...because the world is full of naturally occurring, ongoing changes, some of which may mitigate, or worsen the problem” (p.21). For New York State continuing present trends means each institution, public, private, and not-for-profit organizations, will continue providing assistance to mitigate barriers of employment for ex-offenders. Natural effects that may occur with the Status Quo alternative that either help or worsen the problem at hand includes changes in political climate. If elected officials make changes to the budget, it may affect several services each institution, public, private, and not-for-profit organizations can offer to this population.

Another natural change that may impact the scope of the problem may be the changes in the overall prison population, therefore creating a change in the ex-offender population. According to the Bureau of Justice and Statistics (2017), in 1980 the total correctional population was 1,842,100, then 7,055,600 in 2005 and 6,741,400 as of 2015. The definition of the total

population is “All offenders under the supervision of adult correctional systems, which includes offenders supervised in the community under the authority of probation or parole agencies and those held in the custody of state and federal prisons or local jails (Bureau of Justice and Statistics, 2017). In 2015, the largest early release of prisoners took place with 6,000 federal prisoners released as a means of reducing jail overcrowding and adjustment to federal drug penalties according to New York Times journalist Erik Eckholm (2015).

Alternative 2: Record Sealing

October 7, 2017, New York State’s new sealing law took effect which allows ex-offenders to have their criminal records sealed as reported by Thomas MacMillan (2017) of The Wall Street Journal (Macmillan, 2017). The new law will allow New Yorkers with criminal records to apply to have two convictions sealed, including one felony that is not a sex offenses or violent felony, after ten years release or sentencing (Collateral Consequences Resource Center, 2017). The new law automatically rules out any ex-offender with more than one felony or more than two convictions (Collateral Consequences Resource Center, 2017). The proposed alternative is to eliminate the limit on the number of convictions an ex-offender can have to qualify for this restoration of justice. MacMillan (2017) reports there are 2.3 million New Yorkers with criminal convictions, and broadening the number of ex-offenders who have access to this benefit and reduce the likeliness of repeating the outcome of a 2009 New York sealing law (MacMillan,2017). The 2009 law resulting in only 500 ex-offenders being able to get their record sealed between 2009 and 2016 due to the narrowness of the law (MacMillan,2017).

Alternative 3: Funding for Prison College Education Programs

According to Malcom Young (2014), “Odds of obtaining post-release employment among inmates who participated in correctional education programs are 13 percent higher than

for inmates who did not participate” (p.3.) In the early 1990’s New York State had a large prison college education program that spanned 70 different correctional institutions and accounted for 1078 college degrees awarded to inmates as reported in The New York Times, article A College Education for Prisoners, 2016). Due to federal and state cuts to New York’s prison college education program in 2004, there are only four institutions of this nature remaining and only 141 inmates had earned college degrees while incarcerated (“A College Education for Prisoners,” 2016).

In 2014, New York Governor, Andrew M. Cuomo proposed a bill to reinstate funding for prison college education programs in the amount of 1 million dollars but withdrew the proposal after strong opposition and political fire (“A College Education for Prisoners,” 2016). With available funding, New York State can follow the best practices of Bard College a private prison education program that has seen large success rates. According to the article, College Education for Prisoners (2016), the Bard College prison education program has an inmate recidivism rate of 4 percent for participants and 2.5 percent of program graduates.

Alternative 4: Funding and Staffing for Vocational Training in Prison

Christopher Zoukis (2017) states, “Those who participated in vocational training are 28 percent more likely to be employed after release” from prison. Zoukis reports that recidivism reduction increases safety inside institutions, reduction of mass incarceration, and a more employable and skilled workforce are the benefits of offering a range of vocational and certification programs to inmates (Zoukis, 2017). Despite the benefits and potential of prison vocational programs, the Correctional Association of New York reports a noteworthy reduction in resource allocation and staffing for these programs in New York State (“Educational and Vocational Programs in New York State Prisons,” 2013). The Correctional Association of New

York identified that resources are lacking to meeting vocational needs in New York State, where from 2000-2009 there was a 25% decline in vocational program participation (“Educational and Vocational Programs in New York State Prisons,” 2013). This decline is the result of the program’s long wait list, programs not matching job availability in the community, reduction in staffing, and lack of variety of classes most limited to construction and maintenance (“Educational and Vocational Programs in New York State Prisons,” 2013). Reallocation of funding to increase vocational budget would allow for vacant instructor positions to be filled, including hiring bilingual staff, offer proper material, equipment, and updated technologies to meet course requirements. The budget should also allow for research and expert input on industry growth and tailor vocational programs accordingly.

Step Four: Selecting the Criteria

The fourth step in the Eightfold Path to policy analysis is selecting criteria for evaluating the results of the alternatives chosen above. Bardach and Patashnik identify numerous types of criteria commonly used in outcome evaluations such as hitting the target, efficiency, equity, process values, legality, political acceptability, and policy sustainability to name a few (Bardach and Patashnik, 2016). The following criteria will be used to evaluate the four alternatives described above; evaluative criteria of efficiency, and equity, and practical criteria of policy sustainability. When applying the criteria to the alternatives, note that “Evaluative criteria are not used to use the alternatives, or at least not directly. They are to be applied to the projected outcome” (Bardach and Patashnik, 2016, p.28).

Criteria 1: Efficiency

Deborah Stone states, “Efficiency is a comparative notion. It has come to mean the ratio between input and output, effort and result, expenditure and income or cost and benefit” (Stone,

2012, p.62). The criteria of efficiency set out to evaluate if the cost savings and benefits of the alternative outway the cost of implementation and operation. According to Bardach and Patashnik (2016), the goal of efficiency is maximizing the net benefits for individuals and public interest and taking into account the welfare of all involved. A benefit-cost analysis can be applied to each alternative to determine the efficiency of their outcomes. In a benefit-cost analysis, money or utility by individuals are used to evaluate the output. There are three areas of cost with the problem at hand. The human cost, the life lost to prison and the victims that are impacted when a crime occur. There is also a cost to incarcerate an inmate, which in New York State is about \$69,355 annually per inmate as reported by Chris Mai and Ram Subramanian (2017). There is also required an increase in cost to implement and operate the alternatives about except the status quo. To receive a favorable rating after applying this criterion to each alternative, the benefits have to outway the cost. A low or unfavorable rating will occur if the cost outway the benefits.

Criteria 2: Equity

The political science definition of equity as stated by Deborah Stone is, ‘ The Study of who gets what, when and how. Distributions-whether of goods and services, wealth, and income, health and illness, or opportunity and disadvantage’ (Stone, 2012, p,39). The goal or solution to the problem of ex-offenders’ lack of access to employment is providing fair and equal distribution of opportunity for each stakeholder. The idea that taxpayers are paying \$69,355 annually per inmate is inequitable and adding the cost of rehabilitation would create more unfair burdens. On the other hand, once ex-offenders have paid their obligation to the state, should they have a fair chance of being a contributing member of society? Both sets of stakeholders are seeking equality based on their vision of what is at stake and fair distribution of said item (Stone,

2012). According to Bardack and Patashnik (2016), a discussion of the idea of equity is an important component of any analysis. A favorable rating for the criteria of equity for each alternative is the outcome produce equal access and justice to all stakeholders. A low or unfavorable rating, on the other hand, means a disparity or injustice was produce to stakeholders. Remember, “ Equality of voice is the most important equality issue of all...the distribution of political power shapes all other distributions”(Stone, 2012, p.62).

Criteria 3: Policy Sustainability

“Sustainability refers to the capacity of a policy to maintain its integrity and deploy core principles to stave off unwarranted political pressures for debilitating changes” (Bardack and Patashnik, 2016, p.41). This criterion answers the question of the genuine ability for an alternative implementation and its maintainability with change. Is the policy able to withstand changes in the political climate, including elections and other proposed policies? The alternative has to produce social benefits and also have key constituent support (Bardack and Patashnik, 2016). Will taxpayer support the proposed alternatives, will they have bipartisan support to be passed and get necessary funding each year. A favorable rating when this criterion is applied to the alternative is evaluated by the outcome of the support by key actors. Lack of support will reflect an unfavorable to low rating.

Applying Weights

All the criteria listed above are important and creates a difficulty in determining which one is most important. Bardach and Patashnik (2016) identify three approaches to applying weight to criteria including the political process takes care of it, the analyst imposes a solution, and the distribution of right precludes some solutions and forwards others. For this paper, the analyst will pick the weights for each criterion. This approach was chosen based on the following

idea discussed by Bardach and Patashnik (2016), “Because certain interests, perhaps philosophies, are typically underrepresented in government policy (p.34),” and the analyst can see and understand the underrepresentation. The problem identified by this paper is an example of an underrepresented population, who have lost their rights to vote in some states. For a majority of the alternative proposed in this essay, the idea that the beneficiaries of the alternatives should have to pay for their own programs could easily be made.

Since the ex-offender population is a server underrepresented group and the problem itself is creating a larger disparity for ex-offenders, the analyst will rate the criteria of equity as the most important. As a result, a weighted value of .35 is applied to this criteria. As three of the four alternatives require some financial cost, it's important to take into consideration New Yorkers' view of changes to the budget. In a 2010 Empire State Poll; 46 percent of New Yorkers would prefer to cut state programming to balance the budget, while 30 percent surveyed would borrow the money to balance the budget and 24 percent would raise taxes (Lowery, 2010). As a result, the criteria of efficiency weight is .40. Suitability is granted the remaining .25 as it is the only criteria left.

Step Five: Project the Outcomes

Bardach and Patashnik (2016) note step five is the hardest step in the Eightfold Path as it is now time to project the impact and outcome of each alternative by applying the different criteria. Each alternative will be given a ranking of Very Favorable, Favorable, Moderate, Unfavorable, Very Unfavorable once applied to each of the criteria's. While identifying outcome that may be important to actors and the analyst, Bardach, and Patashnik (2016) believe the following should be kept in mind; policy is about the future, be realistic, and to not treat 51 percent confidence the same as 100 percent confident.

Alternative 1: The Status Quo

Overview:

Let present trends continue undisturbed, which means each institution, public, private and not-for-profit organizations will continue providing assistance to mitigate barriers to employment for ex-offenders. This leaves a number of options for ex-offenders but not standard statewide mandate.

Criteria 1: Efficiency

Since this alternative requires no additional implementation or cost it ranks very favorable in regards to cost efficiency. The status quo results in no changes to current policy and would allow all current policy to continue as is.

Criteria 2: Equity

Equity is very unfavorable in the status quo alternative as each organization, or state institution can offer as much or as little rehabilitation services and programs as they see fit. This creates an unfair distribution advantage for some ex-offender while negatively impacting others. Some ex-offenders will have a better chance to reduce their barriers to employment based on which institution the service time at and where they are released to and the services and organizations nearby.

Criteria 3: Policy Sustainability

This alternative ranks very favorably when the outcome is evaluated based on sustainability as the policy is already in place and will likely continue until major support is gathered to pass a replacement policy.

Alternative 2: Record Sealing

Overview:

Update existing policy by eliminating the limit on the number of convictions an ex-offender can have to qualify for having their criminal records seal from potential employers. This will broaden the number of ex-offenders who can utilize this restorative justice benefit and remove barriers to employment by not having to disclose seal convictions.

Criteria 1: Efficiency

When applied to the efficiency criteria the record sealing alternative is ranked as moderately favorable. This rank is given because there is a major cost associated with the implementation of this alternative. More personnel would be needed to process the numerous request by the hundreds of thousands of ex-offenders who can take advantage of the benefit. More work hours would be necessary for District Attorney Staff to review records and cases and file a necessary injunction stopping the request. Each petition must be answered within 45 days of receipt (Macmillan, 2017). On the other hand, ex-offenders will have more access to employment reducing recidivism rate and incarceration cost. Better job equals more tax contributions. Many ex-offenders may have difficulty staying out of trouble for ten years to even be considered for this benefit, reducing the favorability of this alternative.

Criteria 2: Equity

When applied to the equity criteria the record sealing alternative is ranked as favorable as a large group of ex-offenders are not eliminated because of numerous convictions and are not being punished for mistakes made early on in life. The cost associated with sealing a conviction is minimal, and a lawyer is not necessary to complete this process as information regarding requirements is relatively available. Judicial biases may come into play as the same body that

sentenced the ex-offender is proceeding over the record sealing. Once the record is sealed employees, do not have to disclose matter, allowing employees to be evaluated on their work experience, not their rap sheet. This alternative restores ex-offender ability to apply for education grants, vote, and apply for licensure.

Criteria 3: Policy Sustainability

When applied to the policy sustainability criteria the record sealing alternative is ranked as very favorable as a criminal sealing bill was passed in 2009 and was still on the books until the current bill took effect on October 7, 2017. This bill has bipartisan support and may stakeholders were considered in the implementation of this bill. From a safety standpoint, police will still have access to seal record is necessary, and seals can be overturned if ex-offender commits a crime. The cost to taxpayers is offset by the potential of lower incarceration cost. Ex-offenders get a clean slate.

Alternative 3: Funding for Prison College Education Programs

Overview:

Reimplementing successful 1990's policy that allowed inmates at State prison to take college-level courses and earn a degree. A college degree increases an ex-offender employability and reduces the recidivism rate. Cuts to state and federal budgets have defunded this initiative.

Criteria 1: Efficiency

When applied to the efficiency criteria the funding for prison college education programs alternative rating is very favorable. Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2017), cost-based result found adult correctional post-secondary education program cost on average of \$1,248 per inmate and have a net savings of \$23,462 per inmate with a benefit to cost ratio of \$19.79, although this data is reflective of Washington State, the outcome for New York would be

similar for saving taxpayer money in the long run while reducing ex-offender reoffending and being reincarcerated.

Criteria 2: Equity

When applied to the equity criteria the funding for prison college education programs the rating is moderately favorable as it creates a leveler playing ground for inmate while in prison and upon release. Before incarceration some inmate did not have access to quality education, this provides the education without the distractions of the world. This alternative would make up for some of the human cost that occurs because of tough sentencing laws on minorities. The rating for this alternative was reduced because criminals would get a free college education while citizen leaves college with large student loan debt.

Criteria 3: Policy Sustainability

When applied to the equity criteria the funding for prison college education programs the rating is very unfavorable as this alternative have little support in the New York Legislator forcing Governor Cuomo to withdraw this proposal. If this bill were to pass it would easily be overturned as with a change in political climate.

Alternative 4: Funding and Staffing for Vocational Training in Prison

Overview:

New York State has reduced funding for vocational training programs in State penitentiary despite research and data showing that participation in vocational training reduce issue in jail and reduce recidivism after release by giving ex-offender job skill they can use after release. Reinstating funding with help taxpayers and ex-offenders in the long run/

Criteria 1: Efficiency

When applied to the efficiency criteria the funding and staffing for a vocational training program in prison alternative very favorable based on the result of the following cost-benefit analysis. Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2017) conducted a cost-benefit analysis for vocational education in prison and found a \$1,495 average cost per inmate, with a net savings of \$16, 286 per inmate with a benefit to cost ratio of \$11.89. According to the report taxpayer benefit would be \$4,923 per inmate while the benefit to the non-taxpayer or inmate would be \$12,858.

Criteria 2: Equity

This alternative with applied to the equity criteria is favorable. This alternative has a favorable rank because nothing is being given away for free, an inmate is getting hands-on experiences for their trade while they are learning and giving back to the prisons. Both taxpayers and inmates are getting a share of the positive outcome. Some vocational work sites and private company's take advantage of inmates by working them for low wages. Colorado inmates took home between \$.74 and \$4 per day to raise goat and Papalia for the Whole Foods Supermarket chain, where the products were sold for between \$5.99 and \$10.00 per night ounce (Kim, 2015). Inmates are learning new skills that will be helpful upon release, but the pay disparity after fees are shocking.

Criteria 3: Policy Sustainability

The rating of moderately favorable is given to this alternative when the criteria of policy sustainability are applied. The alternative is more favorable than the previous because the inmate is giving back to the prison they are working in, and the prison does not have to hire outside staff to complete the work. The prison workforce does not compete with private-sector business which allows support to be garnered from numerous stakeholders.

Criteria and Alternatives Qualitative Matrix

Matrix summarizes and clarify the results of project the outcome

ALTERNATIVES

CRITERIA

	<i>Alternative 1: Status Quo</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Record Sealing</i>	<i>Alternative 3: Funding for Prison College Education Programs</i>	<i>Alternative 4: Funding and Staffing for Vocational Training in Prison</i>
<i>Criterion 1: Efficiency</i>	Very Favorable: Cost not changed	Moderate Favorable: major implementation cost	Very Favorable: benefit to cost ratio of +\$19.79	Very Favorable: benefit to cost ratio of +\$11.89
<i>Criterion 2: Equity</i>	Unfavorable: Not standardized	Favorable: Available to a broad group	Moderately Favorable: distribution conflict, free for prisoner not for student	Favorable: New skill and finances for worker, reduce labor cost for prison
<i>Criterion 3: Policy Sustainability</i>	Very Favorable: current political climate	Very Favorable: Bipartisan support	Very Unfavorable: Withdrawn due to lack of support	Moderately Favorable: non- competing sectors

Matrix project outcome by quantifying criteria weights and qualitative data

ALTERNATIVES					
CRITERIA		<i>Alternative 1: Status Quo</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Record Sealing</i>	<i>Alternative 3: Funding for Prison College Education Programs</i>	<i>Alternative 4: Funding and Staffing for Vocational Training in Prison</i>
	<i>Criterion 1: Efficiency (.40)</i>	$5 \times .40 = 2.00$	$3 \times .40 = 1.20$	$5 \times .40 = 2.00$	$5 \times .40 = 2.00$
	<i>Criterion 2: Equity (.35)</i>	$2 \times .35 = .70$	$4 \times .35 = 1.40$	$3 \times .35 = 1.05$	$4 \times .35 = 1.40$
	<i>Criterion 3: Policy Sustainability (.25)</i>	$5 \times .25 = 1.25$	$5 \times .25 = 1.25$	$1 \times .25 = .25$	$3 \times .25 = .75$
	TOTAL SCORE:	3.95	3.85	3.30	4.15

Ratings: 1=Very Unfavorable, 2=Unfavorable, 3=Moderately Favorable, 4=Favorable, 5=Very Favorable

Rating x Weight=Score

Step Six: Confronting the Trade-Off

Baradach and Patashnik (2016), identifies confronting the trade-off as the six-step in the Eightfold Path analysis. Confronting numerous trade-offs allow at least one good alternative to being reached, resulting in a solution for the original problem. To confront trade-offs, alternatives need to be converted into outcomes and in the case of this analysis different weights can be applied to each criteria. The different weights would represent, different interest groups who would priorities different criteria. Below are two additional table showing the changes in outcome when the criteria weights are changed. After the alternative outcomes are compared using commonality.

Criteria-Alternatives Quantitative Matrix

Matrix projected outcome by using heavier criteria weights for equality

		ALTERNATIVES			
CRITERIA		<i>Alternative 1: Status Quo</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Record Sealing</i>	<i>Alternative 3: Funding for Prison College Education Programs</i>	<i>Alternative 4: Funding and Staffing for Vocational Training in Prison</i>
	<i>Criterion 1: Efficiency (.35)</i>	5 x .35 = 1.75	3 x .35= 1.05	5 x .35 = 1.75	5 x .35 = 1.75
	<i>Criterion 2: Equity (.40)</i>	2 x .40= .80	4x .40= 1.60	3 x .40 = 1.20	4x .40= 1.60
	<i>Criterion 3: Policy Sustainability (.25)</i>	5 x .25 = 1.25	5 x .25 = 1.25	1 x .25 = .25	3 x .25 = .75
	<i>TOTAL SCORE:</i>	3.80	3.90	3.20	4.10

Ratings: 1=Very Unfavorable, 2=Unfavorable, 3=Moderately Favorable, 4=Favorable, 5=Very Favorable

Rating x Weight=Score

Criteria-Alternatives Quantitative Matrix

Matrix projected outcome by using heavier criteria weights for policy sustainability

		ALTERNATIVES			
CRITERIA		<i>Alternative 1: Status Quo</i>	<i>Alternative 2: Record Sealing</i>	<i>Alternative 3: Funding for Prison College Education Programs</i>	<i>Alternative 4: Funding and Staffing for Vocational Training in Prison</i>
	<i>Criterion 1: Efficiency (.35)</i>	$5 \times .35 = 1.75$	$3 \times .35 = 1.05$	$5 \times .35 = 1.75$	$5 \times .35 = 1.75$
	<i>Criterion 2: Equity (.25)</i>	$2 \times .25 = .50$	$4 \times .25 = 1.00$	$3 \times .25 = .75$	$4 \times .25 = 1.00$
	<i>Criterion 3: Policy Sustainability (.40)</i>	$5 \times .40 = 2.00$	$5 \times .40 = 2.00$	$1 \times .40 = .40$	$3 \times .40 = 1.20$
	<i>TOTAL SCORE:</i>	4.25	4.05	2.90	3.92

Ratings: 1=Very Unfavorable, 2=Unfavorable, 3=Moderately Favorable, 4=Favorable, 5=Very Favorable

Rating x Weight=Score

The table below compares the different alternatives and give common ground to narrow and eliminate bad alternatives.

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Original Outcome Matrix</i> <i>Efficiency Weighted Heaviest</i>	<i>Second Outcome Matrix</i> <i>Equity Weighted Heaviest</i>	<i>Third Outcome Matrix</i> <i>Policy Sustainability</i> <i>Weighted Heaviest</i>
Most Favorable Alternative	Alternative 4	Alternative 4	Alternative 1
Second Favorable Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 2
Moderately Favorable Alternative	Alternative 2	Alternative 1	Alternative 4
Most Unfavorable Alternative	Alternative 3	Alternative 3	Alternative 3

Step Seven: Stop Focus, Narrow, Deepen, Decide

The seventh step of the Eightfold Path analysis is to make a decision after evaluating the different possible outcomes and apply the results of confronting the trade-offs. Use all this information to decide which of the alternatives best address, solve and mitigate the original problem. The comparison above gives a clear an unfavorable alternative so Alternative 3: Funding for Prison College Education Programs can be eliminated. Alternative 4 is the clear winner with two placeholders in the most favorable alternative square. The question then is if alternative four is so good why didn't anyone think of it already? In the case of accessibility to employment, alternative four was thought of before but lost funding over the years, but its track record shows it the best practice.

Step Eight: Tell Your Story

Tell your story is the final step in the Eightfold Path to problem solving and policy analysis. The criteria for telling your story includes redefining the problem, has the problem change or evolve since step one. The next step is to apply the Grandma Bessie Test according to Bardach and Patashnik (2016). The test is your ability to use layman's terms and explain your problems, alternatives, projection, trade-offs without boring or losing your grandma. Your ability completes this task without getting confused yourself, shows your comprehension of the task at hand. Quick examples, A lot of ex-inmates are leaving prison and having difficulty finding employments. By offering these ex-prisoners job training, college course, sealing their criminal record they will have a better change at finding a job. Extra job training and sealing their criminal records maybe the best bed for getting this done as both option has been implemented in other states. Either of these two options to address the problem we can ask other people which one is more important to them to help see the picture from a different perspective. Know your audience, Grandma Bessie doesn't understand Statistics so don't use it to tell your story. Give your story in a logical narrative and follow the eightfold path.

References

- Bardach, E., & Patashnik, E. M. (2016). *A practical guide for policy analysis: The eightfold path to more effective problem solving* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: CQ Press/SAGE.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics Key statistic: Total correctional population. (2017, February 24). Retrieved October 9, 2017, from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=kfdetail&iid=487>
- Center for the Study of Social Policy, *Results-Based Public Strategies for Promoting Workforce Strategies for Reintegrating Ex-Offenders*. (2012, April). Retrieved October 9, 2017, from Center for the Study of Social Policy website: <https://www.cssp.org/policy/papers/Promoting-Workforce-Strategies-for-Reintegrating-Ex-Offenders.pdf>
- A college education for prisoners [Editorial]. (2016, February 16). *The New York Times*, A16. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/16/opinion/a-college-education-for-prisoners.html>
- Educational and vocational programs in New York State prisons* [Fact sheet]. (2013, February 27). Retrieved October 9, 2017, from <http://www.correctionalassociation.org/resource/educational-and-vocational-programs-in-new-york-state-prisons>
- George W. Bush: "Fact Sheet: President Bush Signs Second Chance Act of 2007," April 9, 2008. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=83862>.
- Hollander, J., Johnson Jr, M. P., & Whiteman, E. D. (2016). Supporting Shrinkage: Better Planning and Decision-Making for Shrinking Cities.

- Lowery, G. (2010, July 6). New Yorkers divided on how to balance state budget. Retrieved October 9, 2017, from <http://Lowery>
- MacMillan, T. (2017, October 5). New law aims to help ex-convicts move on. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://New Law Aims to Help Ex-Convicts Move On>
- Mai, C., & Subramanian, R. (2017, May). The price of prisons. Retrieved October 9, 2017, from <https://www.vera.org/publications/price-of-prisons-2015-state-spending-trends>
- New York surprises with broad new sealing law [Editorial]. (2017, April 19). Retrieved October 9, 2017, from Collateral Consequences Resource Center website: <http://ccresourcecenter.org/2017/04/19/new-york-surprises-with-broad-new-sealing-law/>
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When prisoners come home: Parole and prisoner reentry*. Oxford University Press.
- Schmitt, J., & Warner, K. (2011). Ex-offenders and the Labor Market. *WorkingUSA*, 14(1), 87-109.
- Smith, A. (2009, November 11). Out of prison, out of a job, out of luck [Editorial]. Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2009/11/11/news/economy/convict_employment/
- Stone, D. (2012). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (3rd ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Tax incentives for businesses* [Fact sheet]. (n.d.). Retrieved October 9, 2017, from New York State Department of Labor website: <https://www.labor.ny.gov/formsdocs/factsheets/pdfs/p438.pdf>
- Thousands Start Life Anew With Early Prison Releases*. (2015, November 1). Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/02/us/with-early-release-thousands-of-inmates-are-adjusting-to-freedom.html>

Young, M. (2014, November 12). *The returning prisoner and the future of work* [White paper].

Retrieved October 9, 2017, from

<http://www.law.northwestern.edu/legalclinic/prison/documents/ReturningPrisonerandtheFutureofWork.pdf>