

University of Washington Tacoma

UW Tacoma Digital Commons

MSW Capstones

Social Work & Criminal Justice

Spring 3-10-2023

Integrity Housing: Providing Residence and Social Capital for Persons with Sex Offense Records

T.B. Huber
hubertb1@uw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/msw_capstones



Part of the [Community Psychology Commons](#), [Social Justice Commons](#), [Social Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Huber, T.B., "Integrity Housing: Providing Residence and Social Capital for Persons with Sex Offense Records" (2023). *MSW Capstones*. 40.

https://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/msw_capstones/40

This Masters Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work & Criminal Justice at UW Tacoma Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in MSW Capstones by an authorized administrator of UW Tacoma Digital Commons. For more information, please contact taclibdc@uw.edu.

**Integrity Housing: Providing Residence and Social Capital for Persons with Sex Offense
Records**

T.B. Huber

Master of Social Work Program, University of Washington- Tacoma

TSOCW 533: Integrative Practice II

Dr. Anindita Bhattacharya, PhD., MSW

March 10, 2023

Introduction

Integrity Housing (IH) is a Thurston county-based housing program that will provide residence and social support to individuals formerly incarcerated for sex offenses. IH will serve adults in transition to community life from jail or prison, are on parole or probation, and present risk of homelessness. Applications are open to individuals who meet the above criteria, are also actively involved with their own treatment, and wish to maintain a clean and sober lifestyle as members of a supportive community. Placement referrals will be accepted from Department of Corrections (DOC), Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program (SOTAP), sex abuse treatment providers, and qualified substance use disorder treatment facilities.

Persons with sex offense records need housing and social supports in order to reduce homelessness and prevent recidivism. While community reintegration is a challenge for formerly incarcerated populations in general, individuals with sex offenses face significant additional barriers which can be summarized by two interrelated components. First, registered sex offenders (RSOs) are subject to unique policies and laws—primarily sex offender registry, residence restrictions and public notification—that carry unintended consequences of creating instability and housing insecurity among RSOs. Because instability is the strongest predictor of recidivism, personality disorders aside, policies that exacerbate homelessness also increases risk of recidivism, in full contrast to their intended purpose, which is to prevent sexual violence (Datz, 2009; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004, 2005; Harris & Hanson, 2004; Mercado, Alvarez & Levenson, 2008). At the same time, because of the stigmas and social ostracism associated with a sex offense conviction and the sex offender label, RSOs tend to lack social capital, or personal networks and connections upon which most individuals rely to access support and resources (Evans & Cubellis, 2015; Levenson, 2008, 2016). Not least among these resource needs is housing. Integrity Housing's goals, which are to increase housing opportunities and social capital for individuals formerly incarcerated for sex offenses, are situated at the crux of solutions to homelessness and prevention of sexual violence.

Background

Washington was the first state to implement registration requirements for individuals formerly incarcerated for sex offenses as part of the Community Protection Act (CPA) of 1990. Washington's CPA was implemented the same year that U.S. Congress passed the Federal Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, including the Jacob Wetterling Act, which requires that every state implement a registry for sex offenders (Bonnar-Kidd, 2010). Local Sheriffs' offices assign a risk level to individuals with sex offense records based on End of Sentence Review Committee (ESRC) recommendations. Essentially: Level 1 offenders are considered a low risk to re-offend, and Level 3 offenders are considered a high risk to re-offend in the community. Levels II and III (and transient Level I) offenders are subject to public notification, meaning that their pictures and identifying information are posted on the Sherriff's website (www.waspc.org). Additionally, some communities mail out notification flyers. Offenders at Levels II and III are supervised by the Department of Corrections (DOC) in the community.

In a broad sense, we may consider sex offender (SO) management policy to consist of three components: sex offender registry, public notification, and residence restriction requirements. However, these requirements are not universally applied to all offenders. For example, only some communities distribute community notifications, and, as will be further described below, not all offenders are subject to residence restrictions. DOC policy and statewide policy differ from the regulatory measures implemented by Courts and Boards. Requirements may be imposed upon offenders uniquely, or on a case-by case basis. Further, laws and policies may vary between municipalities, and in accordance with local law enforcement policy. Sex offender management policy, then, may be considered as a broad set of measures or as sets of requirements that are unique to individual offenders. In any case, the purpose of this section is to provide a cursory explanation of challenges and barriers that are unique to sex offender reintegration, in their many forms.

As a part of release planning, offenders must state where they want to live, and the DOC is tasked with approving or denying each residence request. Factors include offender risk level, location of property, proximity to their survivor/ victim, and whether the offender has been convicted a crime against a minor. Other agencies may assert discretion, such as the local Sheriff's Department. The DOC may not approve any residence in a Community Protection Zone, which is typically 880 feet (informally referred to as "viewing distance") from a school, playground, or daycare. High-risk offenders—especially those offenders who have committed crimes against children—are restricted from occupying these zones, or being anywhere near children, often at distances defined by circumstance or the discretion of law enforcement. Violation of this restriction is an arrestable offense, as are failure to register, or failure to check in with law enforcement at required intervals.

Current research points to lack of evidence to support efficacy of current sex offender policy in improving public safety or reducing incidence of sexual violence (Ackerman, Greenberg & Sacks, 2014; Levenson, 2008). A policy review written by Washington State's Sex Offender Policy Board (SOPB; 2014) states that residence restrictions have "no deterrence effect" on sex offense recidivism, and continued:

[Our] research empirically identified a number of negative consequences, including homelessness, transience, loss of housing, loss of support systems, and financial hardship that may aggravate rather than mitigate offender risk (p. 13).

A body of research illuminates the tendency of RSO management policy to create barriers to housing and stability in the lives of RSOs (Datz, 2009; Call, 2017; Levenson, 2008). Because instability and unemployment are the strongest predictors of re-arrest, RSO policies unintentionally stimulate recidivism, thereby making our communities less safe (Datz, 2009; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004, 2005; Harris & Hanson, 2004; Mercado, Alvarez & Levenson, 2008).

At this point in the discussion, it is helpful to recognize that the purpose of SO management policy is to keep our communities safe. Community safety is imperative and is central to the goals of Integrity Housing. However, discernable discrepancies exist between public perceptions of safety and evidenced data related to the occurrence of sexual violence and RSO recidivism (Griffin & West, 2006). For example, Department of Justice data reveals that RSOs are the least likely of offenders to face re-arrest for another sex crime (Langan, Schmitt & Durose, 2003). Or that the overwhelming majority—an estimated 93%-- of sex crimes against

juveniles are committed in the home or are perpetrated by someone familiar to the survivor (Bureau of Justice, 2000). Biases and misconceptions such as the stranger danger myth, that sex predators are lurking about, awaiting prey, directs public attention from truer dangers and, consequently, away from effective sexual violence prevention, erstwhile stripping the rights, the dignity, and the humanity away from this marginalized group of people.

The Integrity Housing program is a social work intervention, which means that its approach to this problem is founded in the Ethical Standards of Social Work as well as the Grand Challenges for Social Work and Society (NASW, 2020; Uehara, Barth, Coffey, Padilla, & McClain, 2017). At the forefront of these responsibilities is social workers' commitment to promote the well-being of clients, aligning with an Ethics of Care (Held, 2006). This program holds a relatively unique position in serving two sets of clients: the program participants and the larger community. Therefore, Integrity Housing is bound ethically and professionally to promote the health, safety, and well-being of both its residents and its larger community. The following section will provide both theoretical framework and existing models that inform the foundation of this program.

Housing is a basic human right. Individuals with sex offense records hold this right, contrary to the pervasive assumption that "sex offenders forfeit their human rights because of the crimes they have committed" (Ward, Gannon, & Birgden, 2007). The latter perspective is unethical as well as antagonistic to effective treatment and successful community integration. Persons with sex offense records, like all human beings, should be afforded the rights to better themselves and to be treated with dignity and respect. Social workers are ethically bound to respect the dignity and "worth of the person" and to "promote the right of clients to self-determination" (NASW, 2020). Therefore, it is the responsibility of social workers to promote these rights. It is also the responsibility of social workers to promote communities' right to safety, and victims' rights to freedom from sexual violence. Integrity Housing is purposed to promote both clients' and communities' rights. Integrity Housing's core concepts hold that the rights of no persons or entities diminish the rights held by others.

The label of sex offender itself can be detrimental to lived experience and self-perception of the individual (Evans & Cubellis, 2015). Stigmas promote ostracization and limit social networks for offenders in the processes of community reintegration. Stigmas associated with individuals convicted of sex offenses are not only harsh, and subject to misleading stereotypes, but their personal information and details about their conviction are often publicly available. Because the negative stigma of sex offenders may extend to associates and relatives, offenders may not have the support of family or friends. *Social capital*, term used to describe the networks and supports that individuals tend to rely upon to move about in our world, is beneficial for most offenders in practical matters, such as finding a place to live, and because loneliness and isolation correlate with risk for recidivism and rearrest (Edwards & Hensley, 2001; Evans & Cubellis, 2015; Levenson, 2008).

Researchers Evans and Cubellis (2015) interviewed twenty registered sex offenders (RSOs) with a focus toward social stigma and the RSOs' experience in navigating their respective processes of community reintegration. Their data revealed that some of the participants tended toward secrecy and isolation as coping mechanisms, while others tended toward "grouping," or seeking out support and understanding. The participants indicated valuing

personal communications as well as interactions held in treatment groups. Those that socialized with other sex offenders indicated feeling a sense of comradery and equality that they would be unlikely to find outside of relationships with other RSOs. The data illuminates the value of support that RSOs can provide to each other, as they are similarly stigmatized and can relate to one another. Integrity Housing is purposed to provide social support to its participants while enhancing the unique support they can provide one another.

Restorative Justice is an approach to justice that is generally recognized as the framework in which survivors of crimes engage in dialogue with the perpetrators of the crimes against them. Practical application of restorative justice (RJ) is purposed to promote healing for victim/survivors, communities, and for the perpetrators as well. The documentary film *Beyond Conviction* illustrates this approach: it follows three survivors of violent crimes as they meet with their perpetrators, each of whom is incarcerated at the time (Libert, 2006). The film illuminates the capacity of RJ to cultivate healing, understanding, and, at times, redemption, which are elements of human experience that the criminal justice system is utterly unable to nurture. It is within the framework of restorative justice that we may recognize the integrity of healing for perpetrators of violence and the role of repair in the promotion of community safety.

Solid Start, based in St. Louis, Missouri and run by a Catholic charity organization, is a one-year voluntary housing program that is open to high-risk offenders upon or soon after release from prison (Pleggenkuhle, Huebner & Kras, 2016). Central to the Solid Start program is the provision of emotional support. While enrolled in the program, clients meet with case managers and attend therapy on a weekly basis. Additionally, clients attend weekly group meetings called “Stay Out” (i.e.: “stay out of prison”). Collected data indicates that the participants value the motivational and therapeutic support provided by Stay Out (Pleggenkuhle, Huebner & Kras, 2016). In terms of personal agency and attitude change while in the program, participants reported feeling confident and secure in their current living environment as well as feeling optimistic, while concurrently pragmatic, about their future. Participants in the comparison group, who had been released from prison in the same time frame but had not enrolled in Solid Start, expressed frustrations and anxiety related to the non-permanence of their respective housing situations. More than providing meaningful support at a crucial, post-incarceration interval, this program supported its participants in acquiring their own autonomy and independence going forward.

Aligning with social workers’ ethical responsibility to promote clients’ self-determination, Integrity Housing is committed to improving clients’ quality of life (QOL). Healthier, contented offenders present less risk to reoffend (Williams, 2003). Further, practitioners that concern themselves with improving quality of life will likely build therapeutic alliances with their clients, fostering personal growth, and further reducing risk of recidivism. Researcher Williams (2003) interviewed RSOs in a halfway house in Utah that combined reentry management with treatment services. The interviews focused on how participants define quality of life, how the participants view this concept in a correctional setting, and how to incorporate QOL measures into rehabilitation practices. Williams asserts that understanding quality of life is relative to strengths-focused treatment intervention and that improved QOL for offenders will likely motivate clients toward personal change and treatment goals. The work represented in this article provides a useful framework for the design and implementation of programs centered in healing.

Program Description

Integrity Housing (IH) will provide residential housing for 25 to 30 individuals. Therefore, the program's genesis requires the purchase of tangible property. The IH budget is designed for the acquisition of an already existing apartment complex that includes an office and a community room that will serve as a space to hold group therapy meetings and functions. All residents will be provided with clean, functioning units, laundry facility, Wi-Fi, parking, and reasonable accommodations. IH will be staffed by two social workers and a residence manager. Program staff will provide individualized case management to residents in weekly appointments. Staff will communicate with local law enforcement to enhance supervision and management of residents; space will be provided for on-site appointments with law enforcement, probations officers, and other treatment providers.

Residents will be required to remain clean and sober and to attend weekly therapy and support groups on-site. Staff will be trained in the provision of therapy oriented to principles of restorative justice (RJ). Group therapy will focus toward support and healing for residents as perpetrators of sexual violence. Treatment goals will focus on the unique needs of individuals as well as the needs of the residential community. Case management and therapeutic goals will also focus toward improving quality of life for residents. Finally, and importantly, treatment goals will cohere with individualized goals and recommendations included in residents' release plans.

The purpose of this program is to enhance community safety. The goal of this program is to foster successful community integration for 40- 50 individuals formerly incarcerated for sex offenses and at risk of homelessness. Successful community integration means that participants are housed, stable, law abiding, and not sexually re-offending. IH will meet these goals by providing housing and social support for participants, thus improving quality of life and reducing risk of recidivism. Successful housing for participants will be measured as participants are housed upon program entry and again in six months. Participants that move on to alternative residence will be counted as program successes. Well-being and social capital among residents will be measured in surveys conducted upon program entry and again in six months. The surveys, which will be further detailed below, contain both quantitative measures and qualitative input from program participants.

Project Timeline

The timeline for this project designates six months from project kickoff to resident placement. The first three months are dedicated to the acquisition of desired property, project organization, and project marketing (see timeline chart). The following three months are dedicated to property repair and upgrading, staff development, and resident placement processes. The first program participants will be placed in residence at the six-month mark, thus engaging program initiation. Staff will orient residents in the three core components of living in the IH program: on-site individual and group counseling, community guidelines, and law enforcement supervision. Each resident will be surveyed upon program initiation for the purposes of project assessment, with follow-up surveys at six months. What follows is a further description of the processes outlined above.

Project Kickoff: First Three Months

The program director will make educated assessments regarding the selection of an appropriate property, prioritizing Best Practices as defined by Department of Corrections' Standards and Expectations for Housing Providers (n.d.) and for approval by a DOC Regional Housing Specialist (RHS). For instance, the property must be in or around Thurston County, adequate to meet the functional criteria mentioned above, and located on a bus line. The program director will survey the property and its surrounding geography to ensure that its location is not near any schools, playgrounds, churches, or other safety zones.

Upon purchase, the property must be rental ready or in such condition such that repair and preparations should not push project readiness past the six-month mark. The projected budget for this project accounts for time, materials and labor required to ensure project-readiness. It is reasonable to expect that any property will need a minimal amount of repair and upgrades for safety, zoning, or aesthetic reasons, some of which will require outsourcing of contractors. Staff will organize and implement repair and upgrade projects when purchase of property is secure.


IH will meet or exceed all requisites of DOC Standards and Expectations for Housing Providers housing as well as those of Washington Alliance for Quality Recovery Residence (WAQRR; see Appendix C), including State and County building, health, and zoning requirements. A housing administrator for the DOC will determine whether the project is approved for DOC use, based on input from the assigned RHS and local law enforcement. WAQRR approval will certify IH as a certified substance use recovery residence per and will establish IH on the recovery residence registry maintained by the Health Care Administration (See Appendix B). Timeliness requires that the program comply with DOC and WAQRR standards before initiating pre-placement processes. Therefore, staff will begin certification processes at program kickoff, alongside application for nonprofit status and business licensing.

At this point, it is important to emphasize the importance of gaining stakeholder buy-in, which will, by necessity, include a significant degree of public approval. Stakeholder buy-in begins with project design: the opinions and needs of city council members, local law enforcement, and community corrections officers are integral to the short- and long-term goals of Integrity Housing. This project was conceptualized in response to input from local Community Corrections Officers, most of whom indicated a need for housing for offenders, but also pointed to housing's potential benefits in enhancing the efficacy sex offender management. Laws and policies related to the management of registered sex offenders (RSOs) are predicated upon the assumption that our communities are safer when law enforcement can identify the whereabouts of any given offender. This knowledge is strengthened when former offenders are housed, and more so when multiple offenders are housed in one facility. These concepts inform the design of this program and, in turn, will inform its presentation to the public.

Project Marketing, which will be presented to the public as Community Safety meetings, is an activity of top priority to successful implementation of this project. The program director and staff will begin planning and conducting Community Safety meetings at project kickoff. The meetings will be held at the community center nearest the neighborhood intended to house the project, and will be purposed to:

1. Provide education in the goals and intentions of the project,
2. Address public concerns related to the project, and
3. Include the public in shaping the project’s output by accepting and honoring input from community members.

The meetings will be held in a Town Hall-style approach, in which stakeholders will provide presentations and then community members will be asked to share their concerns. Staff will begin planning the first meeting as a potential property is being assessed. Current projections indicate that staff will hold three Community Safety meetings before the designated move-in start date but IH staff is prepared to extend public awareness measures if necessary. Staff will encourage stakeholders consulted in the design of this program to attend Community Safety meetings.



Months Four to Six

The service of social workers is integral to the program’s function. Therefore, IH will employ two social workers; one will function as program director. Both social workers will be trained to provide both individual and group therapy as well as tailored case management. Group therapy is purposed to create a space in which residents can provide support and guidance for one another. Individual therapy sessions are purposed to meet specific needs, including recommendations made by treatment providers as conditions of release. Case management will focus toward assisting residents in identifying and achieving their own goals for autonomy and independence while integrating into community life. To best provide these services, IH social workers will be trained in the principles of restorative justice (RJ) with special attention to ethics of care and the improvement of quality of life (QoL) for residents. Additionally, the social workers will be trained to provide treatment coherent with the Good Lives Model, an intervention utilized by Washington’s Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program (SOTAP).

The program director will hire the alternate social worker and implement training procedures. The director will advertise for the position through the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abuse website and ListServs, as well as LinkedIn and resources available through the NASW career center. Trainings will be collaborative as well as instructional. While involved in

training, the two will document learnings and training procedures as a means to produce a reference manual for other, similar programs. Some elements of training will be outsourced: for instance, an external provider will provide training in the Good Lives Model intervention. The program director and the alternate social worker will be trained in all areas such that either are prepared to perform the duties and functions of the other, if needed.

Month Five

The program director will hire a property manager to begin working sixty days before the first projected move-in date. The property manager will assume the duties and functions of a typical onsite manager: collecting and processing rental applications, collecting rent payments, overseeing the property, managing evictions, and record keeping. Therefore, the individual hired for this job should have some experience in bookkeeping, landlord-tenant law, and property management. Additionally, the property manager will need to be oriented to circumstances unique to operating transitional housing for this population, such as the DOC's reentry program, but also to the potential threat of vigilantism, or misguided hostility from community members. The onsite property manager will assert themselves as the sole attendant to tenant concerns, freeing therapy providers to focus on provision of therapy and strengthening of therapeutic relationships.

Department of Corrections does not guarantee that they will fill vendors' available beds. However, IH expects that 70% of beds will be filled with DOC referrals. The remainder of available beds will be filled with referrals from the Department of Health's recovery residence registry, Sex Offense Treatment Providers, and local law enforcement. IH staff will utilize objective measures to assess potential participants for placement, considering Risk Level Classification (RLC), release recommendations, and offenders' documented history of compliance with treatment while incarcerated. Staff will also conduct face-to-face interviews, selecting individuals deemed most likely to collaborate with and be supportive to others in a community residential setting. Persons at risk of homelessness will be prioritized for placement.

Participation is open to persons in transition from incarceration to our community and are at risk of homelessness, are actively involved with their own treatment, and wish to maintain a clean and sober lifestyle as members of a supportive community. Enrollment referrals will be accepted from Department of Corrections (DOC), Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program (SOTAP), sex abuse treatment providers, and qualified substance use disorder treatment facilities. Demographics of program participants are difficult to predict: current literature lacks evidence related to the demographics of persons with sex offenses. However, the overwhelming majority of individuals convicted of sex offenses are men. Additional factors that correlate with sex offense records mirror those of that predict homelessness, including poverty, mental illness, veteran status, and race (Kohan, 2020). Therefore, these factors will likely evidence among prospective participants. Exclusion criteria include personality disorders and active substance or alcohol use.

Month Six: Resident Placement

The IH Program will be move-in ready six months from the original kickoff date. Because several residents will move in at the designated start date, the initial orientation meetings will be large, group meetings, and subsequent orientations should decrease in size over time. The orientations will introduce residents to IH life in three dimensions:

1. To each other, as each individual is part of the IH Community;
2. To each resident's roles and responsibilities, and
3. To the structure of the IH program, including treatment, risk management, and supervision.

Staff recognize that integrating into community life after a period of incarceration involves processes that may look or feel different to each individual. This project is designed to provide a means of strengths-based support for every resident from staff members and fellow residents alike. Therefore, reciprocity and accountability are concepts central to the orientation process. Likewise, guidelines for resident conduct will be presented as integral to the structure of the program's therapeutic residential setting, in contrast to rules and regulations imposed by carceral institutions. Residents will be scheduled for individualized case management appointments with appropriate staff, group therapy meetings, and one-on-one therapy appointments. Group therapy meetings will occur weekly; one-on-one appointments will be scheduled according to risk and needs assessment. Staff will facilitate monthly check-ins with law enforcement on premises, as necessary.

Group and one-on-one therapy interventions will be grounded in principles of Restorative Justice (RJ), which situates emotional healing as its central component. Group therapy, which will be attended by all residents, is the primary means by which social capital will be introduced and strengthened among IH residents. Put in simple terms, this is where residents will get to know each other and provide each other with emotional and social support. Thus, no resident at IH will need to face challenges of community integration alone. Therapy provided in one-on-one counseling sessions will focus on risk management and treatment goals tailored to individuals' needs. Similarly, staff will provide case management appointments to support and guide residents in gaining autonomy and independence, thus assisting residents in improving their own quality of life.

Staff will assist local law enforcement in the supervision and management of IH residents. For instance, the layout of the facility's office will include space within which law enforcement professionals may conduct monthly check-ins. Staff will provide compliance reports or similar documentation upon request. IH is committed to open communication with law enforcement. At the same time, IH is a provider of mental health services and, as such, must adhere to codes of client confidentiality. Staff will maintain strict codes of ethics and professionalism that reflect Integrity Housing's commitments to both clients: the residents and the community.

Potential barriers

The first barrier to program implementation is that of funding. Startup costs for Integrity Housing will incur approximately four million dollars. In ordinary terms, this is a big ticket with a hard sell. Funders willing to involve themselves with this unbeloved population may be difficult to find. However, this is not an insurmountable barrier. Burgeoning research lends support to shifts in allocating funds toward prevention of sex crimes, as opposed to the hegemony of carceral measures (Assini-Meytin, Fix, & Letourneau, 2020; Letourneau, Roberts, Malone, & Sun, 2023). Existing programs provide evidence for the usefulness and benefits of this and programs like it. The Connecticut model provides an excellent point of reference, correlating support for persons incarcerated for sex offenses with a 0% rate of sex-offense recidivism. The implementation of this program will put Washington State at the forefront of progressive solutions to this ubiquitous social problem. This writer predicts that this program will find its funding when the information provided in this document is presented intelligently to the appropriate funder in a timely fashion.

Opposition from local community members, alongside a foreseeable element of NIMBYism, will present significant barriers to project. As a social group, persons with sex offense records may be the targets of the harshest, most firmly held biases. Simply put: people do not want sex offenders living nearby. It is not only socially acceptable to promote biases against individuals with sex offense records, but it is socially acceptable to do so with vehemence and open contempt.

A prominent example can be observed in the local news cycle. At the time of this writing, concerned citizens are organized to protest Supreme Living's proposed facility in rural Thurston County, Washington. Supreme Living, an Olympia-based residential care provider, purchased a commercial residence intended to house five individuals transitioning to Least Restrictive Alternatives (LRA) upon release from McNeill Island Civil Commitment Center. Tenino activists have organized public protests, town hall meetings, a march into the State Capitol, and, at one point, a human chain blocking employee entry to the proposed facility. The protesters are active on Facebook and have been featured in local news articles and FOX 13 News (Bilbao, 2023b; Fitzgerald, 2023; T90 PAC, n.d.). The Sheriff's department has responded to alleged death threats made toward Supreme Living employees in relation to this controversy (Bilbao, 2023a). And their activism appears to have forestalled the opening of the facility. On February 28, 2023, Supreme Living announced on its website that "it will not proceed with providing supportive housing services at its Tenino property."

While the purpose and function of Integrity Housing differs from the proposed Supreme Living facility, it is reasonable to expect similar backlash from local community members. That is why a marketing campaign is integral to IH program design. Program director and staff will prioritize community safety meetings for the purpose of providing public education and open dialogue with concerned neighbors. IH staff and stakeholders will include neighbors and concerned citizens in open dialogue. Staff will solicit input from local law enforcement professionals in the design of the program to meet their needs and to ensure cohesion with program implementation. Further, visible support from local law enforcement is imperative to any hope of gaining much-needed acceptance from the community at large. Integrity Housing will strategize marketing measures to prevent the spread of misinformation.

Program Evaluation

The program's success will be determined by both internal and external assessments. The first measure of success will be indicated by the number of participants housed in the program. Staff will identify, record, and document the number of housed program participants at six months and again at twelve months. Program discharge data will be included in surveys: residents that progress from IH to live elsewhere will be counted as indicators of program success.

The strengthening of social capital for residents in the transitioning process is the second measurable outcome of Integrity Housing. To enhance validity of test measures, and outside agency will be recruited to conduct surveys. Researchers will utilize the PCS-16 tool to measure social capital (Wang, Chen, Gong & Jaques-Tiura, 2014). Program success will be determined by an increase of 2 points on PSCS-16 scale utilizing test-retest method at program entry and again at six months [see Appendix C]. Researchers will utilize the Quality of Life Questionnaire (Greenley, Greenberg, & Brown, 1997; Williams, 2003 at program entry and again at six months. The QoL tool utilizes both quantitative and qualitative measures; program success will be evidenced as program participants indicate improved quality of life [see Appendix D]. The secondary purpose of the QoL tool is to provide researchers with a more complete picture of participants' perspectives on the IH program, its effectiveness, and its shortcomings. Researchers will utilize collected data to inform the next stages of the program's improvement. The opportunity to advance scholarship in this arena provides ample incentive for external researchers to involve themselves with this project.

Budget Analysis

Integrity Housing hereby proposes Washington State Department of Commerce fulfill a grant request to the amount of \$3,850,000 [see Appendix E]. Start-up costs include an allotment of \$3,100,000 for purchase of a multi-unit rental property in Thurston County. IH requests that the property grant is provided as a forgivable loan, and contingent upon Integrity Housing's contractual obligation to provide housing as described in this document and to the population described in this document for no less than forty years. The purchase price estimate is based on real estate market values current at the time of this writing. Perpetuity of the Integrity Housing program intuits a \$100,000 Operations and Maintenance grant, renewable annually, and subject to reasonable inflation increases.

The projected cost to employ a program director, social worker, and property manager is a combined \$351,520 annually. The proposed budget includes allowances for office supplies, laptops, and cell phones for each employee. General operating expenses include property insurance and business insurance. Also included in the startup budget is an allowance for the purchase and operation of a vehicle to be utilized by staff. IH expects to fill beds to at least half its capacity in the second half of the first year of operations; therefore, IH expects to generate \$99,000 in rental fees in its first year. Rent price is based upon maximum allowable amount subsidized by Section 8 or DOC Housing vouchers. Income accrued through collection of rental payments will supplement operating costs of the program.

This program is designed to function as intended in perpetuity. It will sustainably house and support individuals formerly incarcerated for sex offenses for the entirety of its existence. At the same time, IH should be recognized as a pilot program for other, similar programs. The

success of this program will inspire and guide other programs in communities across the United States. To ensure sustainability and duplication of this project, staff will assess progress as designed, and will also rely upon collaborative processes to inform potential program improvements over time. Goals and outcomes pertaining to program as well as its staff members will be assessed and recorded to foster improvement over time and to inform the next generation of staff members.

References

- Ackerman, A. R., Sacks, M., & Greenberg, D. F. (2014). Legislation targeting sex offenders: Are recent policies effective in reducing rape? *Justice Quarterly*, 29(6), 858-887. Doi: 6895775988
- Assini-Meytin, L., Fix, L., & Letourneau, E. (2020). Child sexual abuse: The need for a perpetration prevention focus. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 29(1), 22-40, DOI: 10.1080/10538712.2019.1703232
- Barkfors & Barkfors. (2014). *Pervert Park* [Film]. Final Cut for Real.
- Bilbao, M. (2023, January 30). *'Unacceptable death threats allegedly sent over Tenino sex offender home, sheriff says*. Chronline.com. Retrieved March 1, 2023 from <https://www.chronline.com/stories/unacceptable-death-threats-allegedly-sent-over-tenino-sex-offender-home-sheriff-says,308231>
- Bilbao, M. (2023, February 21). *Got questions about a Supreme Living facility near Lacey? Here's what to know*. The Olympian.com. Retrieved March 1, 2023 from <https://www.theolympian.com/news/local/article272541833.html>
- Bonnar-Kidd, K. K. (2010). Sexual offender laws and prevention of sexual violence or recidivism. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(3), 412–419. doi:10.2105/AJHP.2008.153254
- Bureau of Justice. (2000). *Sexual assault of young children as reported to law enforcement: Victim, incident, and offender characteristics*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from

<https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/sexual-assault-young-children-reported-law-enforcement-victim-incident-and>

Call, C. (2017) How acceptable are their obstacles to reentry? Attitudes of community corrections professionals toward collateral consequences for sex offenders. *Corrections*, 2(4), 237-257. DOI: 10.1080/23774657.2017.1305878

Chen, X., Stanton, B. Gong, J., Fang, X., & Li, X. (2009). Personal Social Capital Scale: An instrument for health and behavioral research. *Health Education Research*, 24(2), 306-317. doi:10.1093/her/cyn020

Clarke, M., Brown, S., & Völm, B. (2017). Circles of support and accountability for sex offenders: A systematic review of outcomes. *Sexual Abuse*, 29(5), 446–478. <https://doi-org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/10.1177/1079063215603691>

Datz, A. L. (2009). Sex offender residency restrictions and other sex offender management strategies: The probation officer perspective in Florida. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Probation and Parole Field Services.

Edwards W., Hensley C. (2001). Contextualizing sex offender management legislation and policy: Evaluating the problem of latent consequences in community notification laws. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 45, 83-101.

Fitzgerald, E. (2023, January 16). *Tenino area housing facility that would include sex offenders sparks community backlash, safety concerns*. Chronline.com. Retrieved March 1, 2023 from <https://www.chronline.com/stories/tenino-area-housing-facility-that-would-include-sex-offenders-sparks-community-backlash-safety,307383>

- FOX 13 News Staff. (2023, February 28). *Controversial housing for violent sex offenders in Tenino shuts down*. q13fox.com. Retrieved March 1, 2023 from <https://www.q13fox.com/news/housing-community-for-violent-sex-offenders-in-tenino-shuts-down-before-it-ever-opens>
- Greenley J. R., Greenberg J. S., Brown R. (1997). Measuring quality of life: A new and practical survey instrument. *Social Work*, 42, 244-254.
- Griffin, M. P., & West, D. A. (2006). The lowest of the low? Addressing the disparity between community view, public policy, and treatment effectiveness for sex offenders. *Law & Psychology Review*, 30, 143–169
- Harris, J.R., & Hanson, R.K. (2004) Sex offender recidivism: A simple question 2004-03. *Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada*. Retrieved from: www.researchgate.net/publication/241298823.
- Hanson, R.K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. (2004). Predictors of sexual recidivism: an updated meta-analysis. *Public Works and Government Services*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Hanson, R.K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1154-1163. [dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154)
- Held, V. (2006). The ethics of care as moral theory. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, political, global*. University Press: Oxford.
- Kohan, S. (2020). Registering Home When Homeless: Case for Invalidating Washington's Sex Offender Registration Statute. *Washington Law Review Online*, 95, 205-244.

- Kuzyk, I. (2012). *Recidivism among sex offenders in Connecticut*. State of Connecticut Office of policy and Management Criminal Justice Policy & Planning Division [pdf]. Retrieved from http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/cjppd/cjresearch/recidivismstudy/sex_offender_recidivism_2012_final.pdf
- Langan, Schmitt & Durose (2003). Recidivism of sex offenders released in 1994 [PDF file]. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Retrieved from www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsorp94.pdf.
- Letourneau, E. J., Roberts, T. W. M., Malone, L., & Sun, Y. (2023). No Check We Won't Write: A Report on the High Cost of Sex Offender Incarceration. *Sexual Abuse*, 35(1), 54–82. <https://doi-org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/10.1177/10790632221078305>
- Levenson, J. (2008). Collateral consequences of sex offender residence restrictions. *Criminal Justice Studies* 21, 2: 153-166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14786010802159822>
- Levenson, J. (2016). Hidden challenges: Sex offenders legislated into homelessness. *Journal of Social Work*, 1-16. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1468017316654811>
- Libert, R. (2006). *Beyond conviction* [Film]. Tied to the Tracks Films, Inc.
- Mercado, C. C., Alvarez, S., & Levenson, J. (2008). The impact of specialized sex offender legislation on community reentry. *Sexual Abuse* 20(2): 188-205. DOI:10.1177/1079063208317540
- National Association of Social Workers (2020). Ethical standards. *Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Washington DC.

- National Alliance for Recovery Residences. (2019). Introduction by the National Alliance for Recovery Residences. *WAQRR Quality Standard* [pdf]. Retrieved from https://www.waqr.org/_files/ugd/6eb80f_733b1c062afa4216b25d5ae9dc1fa24e.pdf
- Pleggenkuhle, B., Huebner, B. M. & Kras, K. R. (2016). Solid Start: supportive housing, social support, and reentry transitions, *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 39(3), 380-397, DOI: 10.1080/0735648X.2015.1047465
- Policy Research Associates. (2022). Strategies for post-release housing for people with a sex offense conviction. Retrieved from <https://www.prainc.com/gains-housing-sex-offense-conviction/>
- Sentencing Guideline Commission and Sex Offenders Policy Board (2014). Sex offender housing [PDF file]. Retrieved from: https://sgc.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/sopb/documents/sex_offender_housing_2014_12.pdf.
- T90 PAC (n.d.). *Keep Washington Safe* [Facebook Page]. Facebook. Retrieved March 1, 2023 from <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1207180946554980/>
- The Chronicle Staff. (2023, February 28). *Supreme Living backs off plans for sex offender housing near Tenino*. Chronline.com. <https://www.chronline.com/stories/supreme-living-backs-off-plans-for-sex-offender-housing-near-tenino,314755>
- Uehara, E. S., Barth, R. P., Coffey, D., Padilla, Y., & McClain, A. (2017). An introduction to the special section on Grand Challenges for social work. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*. 8(1), 75-85. Doi: 2334-2315/2017/0801-0005.

- Wang, P., Chen, X., Gong, J., & Jacques-Tiura, A. J. (2014). Reliability and validity of the Personal Social Capital Scale 16 and Personal Social Capital Scale 8: Two short instruments for survey studies. *Social Indicators Research, 119*(2), 1133–1148. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24721474>
- Ward, T., Gannon, T. A., & Birgden, A. (2007). Human Rights and the Treatment of Sex Offenders. *Sexual Abuse, 19*(3), 195–204. <https://doi-org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/10.1177/107906320701900302>
- Williams, D. J. (2003). “Quality of life” as perceived by sex offenders on early release in a halfway house. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 38*(2), 77-93, DOI: 10.1300/J076v38n02_05

Appendix A

STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR HOUSING PROVIDERS

The Department of Corrections' mission statement is to improve public safety; the department hopes to achieve this goal through our vision statement to work together for safe communities. Providing referrals to safe and responsibly managed transitional housing resources in the community is in the best interest of both the formerly incarcerated individual and the community. To encourage best practices and sound transitional program development the department has worked with government and non-government stakeholders to develop guidelines and recommendations for prospective and existing transitional housing providers.

Department Requirements

The department will provide referrals and, if necessary, financial assistance to the releasing individuals for transitional housing facilities or programs which meet the basic standards and expectations documented below. The department will also provide individuals with information about transitional housing programs to include their requirements, restrictions and range of services provided to help them make an educated decision on which facility or program would best meet their needs.

Minimum Expectations

- Rent will be inclusive of all expenses associated with the tenancy. o All rents, fees, service charges, utilities, supplies and/or fuel. • Fee Schedules will be fully disclosed. • All program contracts, rental agreements and house rules should be fully disclosed. • Heating equipment will be provided which is adequate for the living space should be legal and operational. • Electrical facilities and lighting should be adequate, functioning and in compliance with local building codes. • Private or shared bathroom facilities will be available to the tenant, to include running hot and cold water, a functioning sink, toilet, and shower. • Accommodations will comply with local building or health codes and individual room capacity limited a maximum of two tenants unless otherwise agreed with the Regional Housing Specialist. • Furnishings and linens will be provided and include at a minimum: o Bed, clean sheets, blanket(s), pillow, towel • Security and safety features for the individual unit or shared living space should be adequate to protect the health or safety of a tenant and include functioning security locks and adequate lighting. • Tenants should be provided with keys and 24-hour access to their private or shared living space as appropriate.

STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR HOUSING PROVIDERS (CONTINUED)

Best Practices

- Involvement, support, coalition building for program from Community Stakeholders • Local government and law enforcement, community groups, religious and charitable organizations, advocacy groups • Pre-placement interviews (meeting with individuals in person or by telephone) • Release and intake date transportation, coordination. • Transportation information (bus schedules, maps, information on necessities) • Local social service provider information •

DSHS, Veterans Administration, Work Source, employment agencies, community colleges. • Emergency service provider information • Food banks, emergency clothing, hospitals, or health clinics

Legal Compliance

All companies and organizations which conduct business with the department are expected to maintain legal compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations. While the department is not a regulatory authority or responsible for conducting inspections, licensing, or permitting activities for businesses in Washington State, the department does expect the companies or organizations who provide services to our clients to obtain and maintain all required business licenses, use permits and building and health code standards required in the local municipality. At a minimum the regional housing specialist will advise prospective vendors of their requirements to secure and maintain the necessary licenses and permits to legally operate as a transitional housing provider.

Business Licenses

All municipalities or unincorporated areas within the state require at least one type of valid business license to engage in commerce. Providing transitional housing will require at least one if not multiple types of business licenses. Depending on how the business is structured these licenses will be issued by local municipalities but additional licenses may be required by a state agency, usually the Department of Health. It is the responsibility of all business owners to obtain and maintain all required business licenses.

Building/Health/Zoning Requirements

All municipalities or unincorporated areas within the state require residential, commercial, and industrial buildings to comply with local, state and sometimes federal building, safety and/or health code requirements. The specific requirements for a transitional housing facility will differ depending on the nature of the facility and where it is located. The Department of Corrections recommends that anyone operating or planning on operating a business of this sort contact their local building, code enforcement, or environmental services authority to determine what the specific requirements are. An example of common municipal requirements and restriction is provided for review as an attachment to this packet.

STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR HOUSING PROVIDERS (CONTINUED)

Housing Rights Protection (Landlord/Tenant Rights)

Various federal, state, and local laws and ordinances protect housing rights. The Federal Fair Housing Act of 1968 makes it illegal for a landlord to discriminate because of a person's race, sex, national origin, or religion. Some local laws forbid discrimination based on age, marital status, physical and mental disability, personal appearance, sexual preference, family responsibilities, military/veteran status, political affiliation, prior arrest or conviction record, source of income, or others. Washington State has a Residential Landlord-Tenant Act (RCW 59.18), which defines the minimum duties of landlords and tenants of residential dwellings. These laws also impose certain restrictions and provide remedies if one party fails to carry out a

duty. The remedies include eviction, reduced rent, self-help repairs, the right to sue for monetary damages, and an award of attorneys' fees to the successful party. Generally, the provisions of the act may not be waived by the landlord or tenant. Furthermore, in many communities, additional housing codes, local ordinances and requirements have also been enacted to set minimum standards for living conditions and to further regulate landlords' and tenants' rights and duties. As a housing vendor, it is incumbent on you to be well-versed and compliant on these rights and duties. For information pertaining to local housing rights protection, contact the city council, city attorney, or other officials where transitional housing is to be provided.

Appendix B

RCW 71.24.660 Recovery residences—Referrals by licensed or certified service providers.

Beginning January 1, 2023, a licensed or certified service provider may not refer a client who is appropriate for housing in a recovery residence, to support the client's recovery from a substance use disorder, to a recovery residence that is not included in the registry of approved recovery residences maintained by the authority under RCW 41.05.760. This section does not otherwise limit the discharge or referral options available for a person in recovery from a substance use disorder to any other appropriate placements or services. [2019 c 264 § 5.]

RCW 41.05.760 Recovery residences—Registry. (1) The authority shall establish and maintain a registry of approved recovery residences. The authority may contract with a nationally recognized recovery residence certification organization based in Washington to establish and maintain the registry. (2) The authority or the contracted entity described in subsection (1) of this section shall determine that a recovery residence is approved for inclusion in the registry if the recovery residence has been certified by a nationally recognized recovery residence certification organization based in Washington that is approved by the authority or if the recovery residence is a chapter of a national recovery residence organization with peer-run homes that is approved by the authority as meeting the following standards in its certification process: (a) Peers are required to be involved in the governance of the recovery residence; (b) Recovery support is integrated into the daily activities; (c) The recovery residence must be maintained as a home-like environment that promotes healthy recovery; (d) Resident activities are promoted within the recovery residence and in the community through work, education, community engagement, or other activities; and (e) The recovery residence maintains an environment free from alcohol and illicit drugs. (3) Nothing in this section requires that a recovery residence become certified by the certifying organization approved by the authority in subsection (2) of this section or be included in the registry, unless the recovery residence decides to participate in the recovery residence program activities established in this chapter. (4) For the purposes of this section, "recovery residence" means a home-like environment that promotes healthy recovery from a substance use disorder and supports persons recovering from a substance use disorder through the use of peer recovery support. [2019 c 264 § 2.] Findings—2019 c 264: "(1) The legislature finds that substance use disorder is a disease impacting the whole family and the whole society and requires a system of care that includes prevention, treatment, and recovery services that support and strengthen impacted individuals, families, and the community at large. (2) The legislature

further finds that access to quality recovery housing is crucial for helping individuals remain in recovery from substance use disorder beyond treatment. Furthermore, recovery housing serves to preserve the state's financial investment in a person's treatment. Without access to quality recovery housing, individuals are much less likely to recover from substance use disorder and more likely to face continued issues that impact their well-being, their families, and their communities. These issues include death by overdose or other substance use disorder-related medical complications; higher health care costs; high use of emergency departments and public health care systems; higher risk for involvement with law enforcement and incarceration; and an inability to obtain and maintain employment. These challenges are compounded by an overall lack of affordable housing nationwide. (3) The legislature recognizes that recovery is a long-term process and requires a comprehensive approach. Recognizing the RCW (10/5/2022 10:42 AM) [1] potential for fraudulent and unethical recovery housing operators, this act is designed to address the quality of recovery housing in the state of Washington." [2019 c 264 § 1.]

Appendix C

“WAQRR Quality Standard (Effective July 1, 2019) Introduction by the National Alliance for Recovery Residences (NARR) NARR was founded in 2011 by a group of organizations and individuals with vast experience in recovery housing from across the country. From the beginning, NARR has been committed to developing and maintaining a national standard for all levels of recovery housing. The term “recovery residence” denotes safe and healthy residential environments in which skills vital for sustaining recovery are learned and practiced in a home-like setting, based on Social Model principles. The Social Model is fundamental to all levels of recovery residences. Social Model philosophy promotes norms that reinforce healthy living skills and associated values, attitudes, and connection with self and community for sustaining recovery. This NARR Standard operationalizes the Social Model across four Domains, 10 Principles, 31 Standards and their individual rules. The Standard is tailored to each of NARR’s four levels” (NARR, 2019).

Appendix D

The PSCS-16 (Wang, Chen, Gong & Jaques-Tiura, 2014) was adapted from the 42-item PSCS scale (Chen, Stanton, Gong, Fang, & Li, 2009). The first section, consisting of 8 questions, measure bonding capital, defined as “the extent to which a person is embedded in their groups of family members, relatives, neighbors, friends, co-workers [...] and old classmates” (Wang, Chen, Gong & Jaques-Tiura, 2014). Sample questions:

- How do you rate the number of your friends?
- Among your coworkers/ fellows, how many can you trust?
- How many of your friends will definitely help you upon your request?

The second section measures bridging capital, defined as “the extent to which a person is embedded in two types of organizations: governmental, political, economic, and social groups/organizations; and cultural, recreational, and leisure groups.” Sample questions:

- How do you rate the number of cultural, recreational, and leisure groups/organizations in your community?
- How many of these groups and organizations possess great social influence?
- How many of the governmental, political, economic, and social groups/organizations represent your interests?

Participants answer questions utilizing a Likert Scale, ranging from “a few” to “a lot” or from “none” to “all.”

Appendix E

The Quality of Life scale (Williams, 2003) was adapted from a survey instrument written by Greenley, Greenberg, and Brown (1997). The first four questions are open-ended:

- “What is quality of life?”
- “What do you want from life?”
- “What kind of person do you want to be?”
- “What do you want to accomplish during your lifetime?”

In the second portion of the survey, participants are asked, “How often do you think about... [for example]

- The amount of time you spend with other people”
- The amount of freedom you have there [in the residential facility]”
- Your health in general”

Response options to these questions range from “almost always” to “often” to “sometimes” to “rarely” to “never” on a five-point Likert scale. At the end of the survey, participants are asked to add any comments they feel are relevant to describing their quality of life.

Appendix F

Integrity Housing Startup Budget						
Revenue						Notes
Individual Contributions						
Private Grants						
Grant 1						
Grant 2						
Government Grants						
Grant A						
Grant B						
Program Fees						
In-Kind						
Other						
TOTAL REVENUE						
Personnel Expenses						
	FTE	Hrly Wage	Annual Wages	Taxes & Benefits	Cost to Program	
MSW Case Manager	1.0	\$ 40.00	83,200	24,960	\$ 108,160	
Program Director	1	\$ 50.00	104,000	31,200	\$ 135,200	
Property Manager	1.0	\$ 40.00	83,200	24,960	\$ 108,160	
Total Personnel Expenses						\$ 351,520
Non-Personell Expenses						
Property purchase						\$ 3,100,000
Education						\$ 2,500
Communications						\$ 1,800
Supplies						\$ 5,062
Marketing						\$ 800
Equipment						\$ 4,500
Client Support						\$ 25,000
General Operating						\$ 20,000
Transportation						\$ 62,010
Other Expenses						\$ 16,808
Subttl Non-Personell Expenses						\$ 3,238,480
Subtotal All Expenses						\$ 3,590,000
Admin/Indirect Costs						\$ 359,000
TOTAL EXPENSES						\$ 3,949,000
Net Revenue (Deficit)						\$ -