



Some jurisdictions in the U.S. have already implemented policies that are similar to ones in other nations.

POLICY OR APPROACH	COUNTRY THAT DOES IT	U.S. JURISDICTION
Community-Based Policing	<i>Finland:</i> Finnish police have a lot of contact with people in the community without higher incarceration rates.	<i>San Diego, California:</i> Police in San Diego adopted a neighborhood policing strategy to reduce “quality of life” offenses, like graffiti and loitering. San Diego’s crime and arrest rates dropped.
No Commercial Bail	<i>All comparison nations:</i> No other comparison nations permit commercial, for-profit bail in which a 3 rd party, usually a bailbondsmen, posts bail on behalf of a person in jail.	<i>Oregon, Illinois, Kentucky, and Wisconsin</i> abolished commercial bail and require down-payments to the court, which are refunded only upon the person’s appearance in court.
Limited Use Of Mandatory Minimum Sentences	<i>Canada and Australia</i> both only use mandatory minimums for violent offenses, usually murder. ¹ In Australia, the Western Territory is the only territory to use mandatory minimums for nonviolent offenses. ²	<i>Michigan:</i> In 2002, Michigan ended the practice of using mandatory minimums for drug offenses. ³ <i>U.S. federal government:</i> In 2010, the United States scaled back mandatory minimum sentencing related to crack cocaine, reducing the disparity in sentencing for cocaine versus crack from 100 to one to 18 to one. ⁴
Treatment, Not Incarceration	<i>Switzerland:</i> The Four Pillars approach to drug use focuses on prevention, treatment, harm reduction, and enforcement in that order of priority. ⁵ <i>Vancouver, Canada:</i> The Four Pillars policy in Vancouver follows a similar model to Switzerland and includes other life skills, like job preparation. ⁶	<i>California:</i> The Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA), or Proposition 36, went into effect in California in 2001 in order to reduce the use of incarceration for people charged with nonviolent offenses, reduce drug-related crime and increase public health. It requires the use of drug treatment as an alternative to incarceration for for adults convicted of non-violent offenses and for drug possession for personal use. From its passage in November 2000 to December 2005, the rate of people incarcerated for drug possession in California dropped by 34.3 percent, from 89 to 58 people per 100,000. Implementation of SACPA may not be the sole cause of this rapid decrease; there were, however, no other major public policy changes during this time. ⁷

POLICY OR APPROACH	COUNTRY THAT DOES IT	U.S. JURISDICTION
<p>Day Fines</p>	<p><i>Germany and Finland:</i> In lieu of short-term incarceration an individual is fined based on the calculation of offense and the cost of an individual's day of freedom (the amount of income an individual would have forfeited if incarcerated for a day).⁸ The fine is meted out in day increments, for example a 20-day fine or a 60-day fine. Defaulting is rare, but responses to default can include jail.</p>	<p><i>Maricopa County, Arizona; Bridgeport, Connecticut; Staten Island, New York; various counties in Oregon; and Polk County, Iowa</i>⁹ all tried a version of day fines during the 1990s with various levels of success.¹⁰</p>
<p>Increase Conditional Release</p>	<p><i>Australia:</i> If the federal sentence is less than 10 years, the person is automatically released after the non-parole period without the discretion of government officials. If the sentence is over 10 years, the Minister makes the release decisions.¹¹ At the state or territory level, there are similar practices related to non-parole periods.¹²</p> <p><i>Finland:</i> People who have not been in prison at some point in the prior three years of the current offense, can be released after serving half of the sentence. If the offense was committed when under 21 years of age, the corresponding time is one-third. Otherwise, people sentenced to prison can be released on parole when they have served two-thirds of their sentence or half of the sentence if the offense was committed when the person was under 21 years of age.¹³ On certain conditions, people serving life sentences can be released after serving 5/6 but at least three years of the sentence.</p>	<p><i>Mississippi:</i> In 2008, the state legislature passed a law allowing people serving sentences for non-violent offenses and people who have not committed multiple offenses to become eligible for parole after serving 25 percent of their sentence,¹⁴ which scales back a 1995 law that required people in prison to serve 85 percent of their sentence.¹⁵</p>
<p>Parole Services Over Supervision</p>	<p><i>Finland:</i> Supervision is required in only one out of five cases, but services are available to all people released from prison.</p> <p><i>Canada:</i> Cognitive Behavioral Treatment approach is used to address a person's individual responses to their environment, as well as the environment itself.¹⁶</p>	<p><i>Kansas, New Jersey and Georgia</i> have implemented initiatives designed to create a service-centered, graduated response approach to parole with less concentration on surveillance. All have reduced parole revocations.¹⁷</p>

POLICY OR APPROACH	COUNTRY THAT DOES IT	U.S. JURISDICTION
<p>Youth Development Approach to Juvenile Justice</p>	<p><i>Finland:</i> Finland focuses heavily on welfare, using “Care Orders” that connect youth to social services and supports. In 2007 only three people under the age of 18 were in custody.</p> <p><i>Germany:</i> Instead of detention, the German system focuses heavily on “educative and disciplinary measures” that provide for social and economic supports and reparation for the offense.¹⁸ Sentences of educative measures are often available to people up to the age of 21 for a first offense.</p>	<p><i>Missouri:</i> Missouri invests in community-based alternatives to incarceration for youth and uses its long-term secure confinement facilities to provide counseling and education in a more home-like setting.¹⁹ In 2006, Missouri’s recidivism rate was 8.7 percent, lower than other states.²⁰ The state also realized significant cost savings, spending approximately \$94 for each youth aged 10-17, compared to the surrounding eight states that spent, on average, \$140 per young person.²¹</p> <p><i>District of Columbia:</i> In 2009, the District of Columbia opened the New Beginnings Youth Development Center to serve youth committed to the care of the Department of Youth Rehabilitative Services. The facility and the continuum of care built around it are similar to the Missouri Model.</p>

1 Department of Justice Canada, “Fair and Effective Sentencing – A Canadian Approach to Sentencing Policy,” October 2005. www.justice.gc.ca/eng/news-nouv/nr-cp/2005/doc_31690.html

2 Kate Warner, *Mandatory Sentencing and the Role of the Academic* (Brisbane, International Society for the Reform of Criminal Law: 2006). www.isrcl.org/Papers/2006/Warner.pdf

3 Associated Press, “Michigan to Drop Minimum Sentence Rules for Drug Crimes,” *New York Times*, December 26, 2002.

4 Drug Policy Alliance, “Press Release: Historic Legislation to Reduce Crack/Powder Cocaine Sentencing Disparity Heads to President Obama’s Desk,” July 28, 2010. www.drugpolicy.org/news/pressroom/pressrelease/pr072810.cfm

5 The Swiss Four Pillars Policy: An Evolution From Local Experimentation to Federal Law, www.great-aria.ch/pdf/Infos/Beckley_Briefing_2009.pdf

6 The City of Vancouver, Four Pillars Drug Policy, “Four Pillars Drug Strategy Fact Sheet,” December 3, 2010. http://vancouver.ca/fourpillars/fs_fourpillars.htm.

7 California Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs, Office of Criminal Justice Collaboration. Fact Sheet: Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000.; California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Data Analysis Unit. Characteristics of Population in California State Prisons by Institution, June 30, 1999, December 31, 1999, and June 30, 2000 reports; Prison Census Data, December 31, 2000- December 31, 2005 reports.

8 Kristen Allen, “Most Criminals Avoiding Jail in

Germany,” *The Local*, October 13, 2009. www.thelocal.de/national/20091013-22543.html., George F. Cole and Christopher E. Smith, “Day Fines in Germany: Could the Concept Work in the United States?” in *American System of Criminal Justice Eleventh Edition* (Canada: Thomas Wadsworth, 2007), 467., *Bureau of Justice Assistance, How to Use Structured Fines (Day Fines) as an Intermediate Sanction* (Washington, DC: Vera Institute of Justice, 1996). www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/156242.pdf, George Cole and Christopher Smith, eds. “Day Fines in Germany: Could the Concept Work in the United States?” in *The American System of Criminal Justice, 11th edition* (Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2007).

9 George Cole and Christopher Smith, eds. “Day Fines in Germany: Could the Concept Work in the United States?” in *The American System of Criminal Justice, 11th edition* (Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2007).

10 Susan Turner and Joan Petersillia, *Day Fines in Four U.S. Jurisdictions* (Washington, DC: Rand Corporation and National Institute of Justice, 1996). <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/pr/163409.pdf>

11 Australian Law Reform Commission, “Same Crime, Same Time: Sentencing of Federal Offenders,” Report 103, April 2006. www.alrc.gov.au/sites/default/files/pdfs/publications/ALRC103.pdf, Australian Government Attorney-General’s Department, “Release Conditions,” September 2009. www.ag.gov.au/www/agd/agd.nsf/Page/Federaloffenders_Releaseconditions

12 Australian Law Reform Commission, “Same Crime, Same Time: Sentencing of Federal Offenders,” Report 103, April 2006. www.alrc.gov.au/sites/default/files/pdfs/

publications/ALRC103.pdf

13 Criminal Sanctions Agency, "Prison Services," January 16, 2011. www.rikosseuraamus.fi/16939.htm

14 PEW Center on the States, *Public Safety Performance Project: Reforming Mississippi's Prison System* (Washington, DC: PEW Center on the States, 2009). <http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewcenteronthestatesorg/Initiatives/PSPP/MDOCPaper.pdf?n=8407>

15 John Buntin, "Mississippi's Correction Reform: How America's reddest state – and most notorious prison – became a model of corrections reform," *Governing*, August 2010. <http://www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/courts-corrections/mississippi-correction-reform.html>

16 Joan Petersilia, "What Works in Prisoner Reentry? Reviewing and Questioning the Evidence," *Federal Probation* 68, no. 2 (2004): 4-8.

17 National Institute of Justice, "Parole Violations Revisited: Innovations in Four States," January 14, 2011. www.paroleviolationsrevisited.org/4states

18 Jörg-Martin Jehle, *Criminal Justice in Germany*, Fifth Edition (Berlin: Federal Ministry of Justice, 2009).

19 Missouri Juvenile Justice Association. 2003. *Celebrating 100 Year of Juvenile Justice in Missouri: 1903-2003*. Online at <http://mjja.org/images/100Years.pdf>. Mendel, Richard A. 2001. *Less cost, more safety: Guiding lights for reform in juvenile justice*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. Online at www.aecf.org/upload/PublicationFiles/less%20cost%20more%20safety.pdf.

20 Missouri Department of Social Service. 2006. *Division of Youth Services Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2006*. Online at www.dss.mo.gov/re/pdf/dys/dysfy06.pdf.

21 Richard A. Mendel, *Less cost, more safety: Guiding lights for reform in juvenile justice*. (Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum, 2001). www.aecf.org/upload/PublicationFiles/less%20cost%20more%20safety.pdf.