Published in final edited form as:

J Soc Work Pract Addict. 2014 October ; 14(4): 405–420. doi:10.1080/1533256X.2014.962141.

Community Wise: Development of a Model to Address Oppression in Order to Promote Individual and Community Health

Liliane Windsor, Ph.D.,

Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Rogério M. Pinto, Ph.D.,

Associate Professor, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

Ellen Benoit, Ph.D.,

Principal Investigator, Special Populations Research, National Development and Research Institute, New York, NY, USA

Lauren Jessell, LSW, and

Project Director, School of Social Work, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Alexis Jemal, J.D.

Doctoral Candidate, School of Social Work, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Abstract

Communities with histories of oppression have shown great resilience. Yet few health interventions focus on structural oppression as a contributor to health problems in these communities. This paper describes the development and active ingredients of Community Wise, a unique behavioral-health intervention designed to reduce substance use frequency, related health risk behaviors, and recidivism among individuals with a history of incarceration and substance abuse residing in distressed and predominantly African American communities. Community Wise, developed through the collaborative efforts of a board of service providers, researchers, consumers, and government officials, is a 12-week group intervention that aims to address behavioral-health problems by raising critical consciousness in distressed communities.

Keywords

community; oppression; intervention; substance abuse; health risks

Literature supports the effectiveness of many interventions in reducing psychological distress, substance use frequency, related health risk behaviors, and criminal recidivism (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 2012; Clark, 2011; Feldman, Silapaswan, Schaefer, & Schermele, 2014; Wikoff, Linhorst, & Morani, 2012; Windsor, Jemal, & Alessi, in press). These interventions tend to overemphasize individual-level deficits instead of personal and communal resilience. Therefore, researchers have challenged generalized claims of treatment effectiveness, especially when imposed on specific oppressed groups such as impoverished African Americans (Atdjian & Vega, 2005; Windsor & Dunlap, 2010; Windsor et al., in press). For instance, when addressing substance use frequency among

impoverished and oppressed populations, it is crucial to understand substance use as a complex phenomenon interrelated with poverty, violence, and low social capital (Dunlap & Johnson, 1992; Schnittker, Massoglia, & Uggen, 2011). Treatment of oppressed individuals and families in isolation from their socioeconomic and political contexts does not address the impact of oppressive forces on the lived experiences of these individuals (Dunlap & Johnson, 1992; Windsor, Benoit, & Dunlap, 2010; Windsor & Dunlap, 2010).

Literature on oppression is complex and rich, offering several definitions and perspectives on mechanisms of oppression, its consequences and origins. For the purposes of this paper, oppression is defined as a system of power imbalance maintained by controlling images and unrealistic social norms and expectations that make it nearly impossible for certain groups to fit in and excel (Windsor et al., 2010). Early oppression studies included the works of Du Bois (1903), Fanon (Fanon, 1967, 1968), Manoni (Manoni, 1962), and Hegel (Hegel, 1966). These authors focused on explaining the mechanisms by which oppression occurs and how it is perpetuated in society. The next wave of oppression research included the contributions of authors such as Gramsci, Foucault, and Freire. Gramsci (1971) introduced the idea of hegemony while Foucault (1980) developed a theory on the dynamics of power relations. Freire (2000) went beyond the understanding of mechanisms of oppression and developed a pedagogy of liberation, where he proposed ways to combat oppression by leveraging the strengths of oppressed groups and increasing access to education.

Mullaly (2002) applied these theoretical foundations in critiquing traditional social work and creating an anti-oppressive social work framework. According to his critique, traditional social work addresses the suffering caused by oppression, such as poverty, substance abuse and unemployment, while ignoring the oppression and social injustice at their source. He further argues that traditional social work practice unwittingly controls and monitors oppressed people while “teaching” them how to conform to a mainstream culture that views them as inferior. Mullaly calls for social workers to adopt an anti-oppressive practice, in which oppression theory is applied to social work interventions to help empower oppressed groups. Several methods can be used to achieve this type of practice, such as creating alliances between social workers and oppressed groups, who can leverage their strengths and work collaboratively in resisting oppression. Additionally, reflecting social work’s strength perspective, Mullaly proposes that anger can be used as a motivating force that can propel social workers and oppressed populations to address injustices they observe and experience in the world around them.

Reflecting our concern about the disempowering nature of many traditional interventions that focus on individual deficits, our team has been involved in practice and research that foster the strength and resilience of those who may benefit from behavioral interventions. In this paper, we introduce and describe *Community Wise*, a unique, manualized behavioral-health intervention designed to empower adult men and women with a history of incarceration and substance abuse to adopt healthier lifestyles and engage with their communities in civic and public action, thereby increasing their own and their communities’ social capital (see Figure 1). *Community Wise* is grounded in the work of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (2000), structural social work (Mullaly, 2002), empowerment theory (Zimmerman, 2000), and Community Based Participatory Research principles (Israel,

Checkoway, Schulz, & Zimmerman, 1994). *Community Wise* draws on individual-and community-level strengths (e.g. a community collaborative board, individuals' experiential knowledge) as the basis for combating oppression, a contributing factor in health disparities (Laveist, Gaskin, & Trujillo, 2011).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Critical consciousness theory is grounded in the belief that individuals and groups have within themselves the capacity to change the socioeconomic conditions under which they live (Freire, 1976). It argues that oppressed groups, such as individuals residing in predominantly low-income and African-American neighborhoods with a history of substance abuse and incarceration, are disempowered and dehumanized within society through objectification and silencing. For example, being African-American, poor, and having a history of substance abuse and incarceration makes a person more likely to be underrepresented in positions of power (Alexander, 2010; Raphael, 2011). Yet these individuals carry within themselves a great deal of knowledge and skills (Anderson, 1999; Dunlap, Johnson, & Manwar, 1994). By drawing from these strengths and joining other oppressed individuals in dialogue, critical consciousness is developed and groups of people become empowered to create community change (Freire, 1976; Mullaly, 2002).

Critical consciousness was defined by Freire (2000) as the ability to “perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality” (p.19). Freire showed that developing critical consciousness is a process that occurs in stages (Freire, 1976; Watts, Diemer, & Voight, 2011). By engaging oppressed individuals in critical dialogues about social problems, a synergy is created that helps oppressed individuals engage in both social and political action. The critical dialogue takes place when individuals share their experiences with others who have similar life histories. They are encouraged to question, discuss, reassess and redefine their deeply held assumptions, and together, draw on their strengths to develop new meanings and narratives for their lives and/or social conditions (Freire, 1976). Through critical dialogues, oppressed groups have been shown to reclaim their voices in society and become more empowered (Freire, 1978; Hernandez, Almeida, & Vecchio, 2005; Watts et al., 2011). Empowerment is the process by which oppressed individuals engage in a systematic approach called praxis to resist their oppression. Praxis is the process by which individuals first combine their experiential knowledge with theory to develop solutions to common problems, then apply the solutions and finally, evaluate the outcomes (Freire, 1976).

From a critical consciousness perspective, oppression lies at the heart of most social problems experienced by oppressed individuals (Freire, 2005). Thus, substance use frequency, related health risk behaviors, psychological distress, and reoffending are conceptualized as manifestations of structural and internalized oppression. For instance, research has shown that residents in predominantly low-income African-American communities sometimes turn to illegal activities, such as drug dealing, due to ongoing economic insecurity stemming from a pervasive lack of access to mainstream opportunities and power (Fesahazion, Thorpe, Bell, & LaVeist, 2012; Laveist et al., 2011). While participating in underground economic activities may work as a way to earn money and gain

prestige for all individuals in the U.S, African-Americans are much more likely to be arrested and incarcerated for illegal activities than Whites (Alexander, 2010). Former inmates are often perceived by community members and society at large as being threatening and immoral (Binswanger et al., 2011; Wolff & Shi, 2011). Thus, individuals transitioning from incarceration into the community often face feelings of alienation from mainstream society. While some individuals overcome this background and become successful members of society, others may internalize negative images or turn to violence in order to obtain respect in the community (Anderson, 1999; Jimerson & Oware, 2006; Windsor et al., 2010; Windsor & Murugan, 2012). These experiences of structural and internalized oppression are significant predictors of psychological distress (Bryant-Davis & Ocampo, 2005). Other oppressed individuals may turn to alcohol and/or other drugs to numb the pain of discrimination, oppression, poverty, and hopelessness. Substance use increases engagement in health risk behaviors such as prostitution, sharing needles, and unprotected sex thereby exacerbating HIV/HCV risk (Arasteh & Jarlais, 2009; Freudenberg, 2011).

HEALTH DISPARITIES, SUBSTANCE ABUSE, AND INCARCERATION IN URBAN COMMUNITIES

Health disparities are concentrated in marginalized, low-income, predominantly African-American communities that have high crime rates (Braveman et al., 2011; LaVeist, Pollack, Jr., Fesahazion, & Gaskin, 2011; Nuru-Jeter & LaVeist, 2011). These communities suffer significantly harsher consequences from substance use than do those living in more affluent and predominantly White communities (e.g., higher rates of incarceration and HIV/ HCV infection) (Centers for Disease Control, 2011; Rubin, Colen, & Link, 2010). Yet, in spite of elevated needs, residents of these communities have considerably less access to effective HIV/HCV and substance abuse interventions (Alegria et al., 2008; Perron et al., 2009; Schmidt, Greenfield, & Mulia, 2006). Distressed communities also have high concentrations of formerly incarcerated persons. Most incarcerated people return to distressed communities with high rates of poverty, unemployment, crime, drug trafficking, and depleted social service systems (Blitz, Wolff, Pan, & Pogorzelski, 2005).

Community Wise is a program developed to address substance abuse, HIV/HCV risk behaviors, psychological distress, and reoffending among individuals transitioning into Newark, New Jersey from incarceration. Newark is the largest city in New Jersey and it has historically struggled with high rates of poverty, crime, unemployment, people living with HIV/HCV, and an aging population of intravenous heroin users (New Jersey Department of Health and Human Services, 2013; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2014). Newark also receives large numbers of individuals leaving prison, primarily because Newark has a concentration of social service agencies that provide support to marginalized populations. However these agencies are often underfunded and overwhelmed by the population's need for services (Mellow, Schlager, & Caplan, 2008; Windsor & Murugan, 2012). The majority of the Newark population is African American (52.4%), the median household annual income in 2010 was \$34,387, and 28% of the population is living below the poverty level (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2014). Despite these challenges, Newark has a rich history of resilient working people, very much involved in their city politics, and committed to building a

stronger community. Over the past few years crime rates have been shrinking and many new businesses have been attracted to Newark in order to create employment and strengthen the economy (Bohrer, 2012; Richardson, 2013).

METHODOLOGY

The development and pilot testing of Community Wise was funded by the Center for Behavioral Health Services and Criminal Justice Research at Rutgers University which is funded by the National Institute on Mental Health (grant # P30MH079920; PI: Nancy Wolff). The project was approved and overseen by three Institutional Review Boards: One at the North Jersey Community Research Initiative, one at Rutgers University, and one at Columbia University. Participants and members of the Newark Community Collaborative Board (with the exception of researchers) received payment for their participation in the study.

Community Wise is a manualized group intervention consisting of 12 weekly sessions with critical consciousness-raising at its foundation. By raising their critical consciousness, participants enhance their understanding of how and in what ways they have internalized oppression and been impacted by structural oppression. The goal is to draw from participants' experiences to build critical consciousness through a dialogue and empowerment process (Freire, 1976). The dialogue explores the ways in which particular dimensions of oppression impact participants' lived experiences and behavior, including psychological distress, substance use frequency, related health risk, and reoffending behaviors. In order to foster empowerment, participants formulate specific personal goals and a social change project that engages the participant in community mobilizing and civic action.

A unique feature of *Community Wise* is a departure from didactic and paternalistic approaches. *Community Wise* is not intended to "teach" oppressed populations how to become "productive members of mainstream society;" rather, this approach aims to foster a safe space in which systematic and experiential knowledge is combined to help participants process the frustration, stress, anger, and obstacles resulting from experiences with oppression. These issues are confronted and critically analyzed so that solutions can be both formulated and implemented within the community.

Applying Community Based Participatory Research in Developing *Community Wise*

CBPR is a collaborative approach that combines methods of scientific inquiry with community capacity-building strategies (Israel et al., 1998). CBPR can help social work researchers develop novel treatments by facilitating the inclusion of community perspectives in all phases of research so as to increase participation rates, decrease loss of participants, strengthen external validity, and build individual and community capacity (Baker et al., 2012). Following recommended steps (Pinto, Spector, & Valera, 2011), the Newark Community Collaborative Board (NCCB) was created with a great deal of effort to ensure that both researchers and community members engaged in dialogue and conducted the entire research process, from the problem formulation to the intervention testing and analysis

(Windsor & Murugan, 2012; Windsor, 2013). Figure 2 shows a modified version of the framework we used to emphasize a multidisciplinary organizational structure.

Establishing the Newark Community Collaborative Board

Five steps were used to establish the NCCB, followed by a formal evaluation:

Step #1. Engaging board members: Based on building trust and establishing a common vision that addressed members' roles, responsibilities, and expectations related to the board. First, a community needs assessment was conducted to establish a working relationship with members of the community and stake holders (Windsor, 2013). Once this project was completed, email was sent to key community leaders identified in the project and disseminated to researchers, community members, and consumers inviting them to apply to become members of the NCCB. The email explained the purpose of the new project and the concept of CBPR. All applicants were then invited to attend a mixer where the project was discussed, and applicants interviewed and rated one another on their fit with the goals of the project. Those with the highest ratings were invited to become NCCB members and those with lower ratings were invited to become guests who could eventually become members. Members and guests collaboratively developed the NCCB's mission statement, the vision, and a memorandum of understanding. One year later, NCCB became a community collaborative board of sixteen community residents, consumers, researchers, service providers, and government representatives who have been working together since 2010 (See Table 1 for NCCB demographic information). The NCCB vision is "to build a community where vulnerable individuals are empowered to freely exercise their civic rights and advocate for equitable opportunities for all." Its mission is to "advocate for and empower individuals with a history of substance use issues who are transitioning from incarceration into Newark's communities through community engagement, critical thinking, improved mental health, and civic participation."

Step #2. Building professional relationships: Accomplished through formal weekly and later on bi-weekly board meetings led by a researcher and a community representative. The NCCB met 36 times between 2010 and 2012 while using several techniques to engender effective group processes, cohesion, and trust, and to address conflicts (e.g., equitable participation, use of agendas, workshops about diversity and oppression, transparency).

Step #3. Exchanging information: Development of a common language, which was achieved by training (e.g. critical consciousness, community culture, research methods) and transparency (e.g., distributing information about the project's budget). During the initial 6 months of meetings and trainings, the NCCB obtained funding to conduct an ethnographic and a photo-voice study to better understand the lived experiences of those transitioning from incarceration into the community. As part of the photo-voice project, the NCCB hosted an exhibit of photos taken by study participants where the community engaged in dialogue about reentry in Newark, NJ (King & Ivanova, 2012).

Step #4. Sharing decision-making: Continued exchange of information and other resources. The major task was for NCCB members to share social influence. This took

place through honest, democratic dialogue where members expressed their views and tried to reach consensus.

Step #5. Maintaining the NCCB: Development of sub-committees to facilitate the sharing of decision-making and power. The NCCB has a governing sub-committee, a membership subcommittee, and task-related subcommittees (e.g. theme development committee responsible to identify dimensions of oppression relevant to individuals with a history of incarceration and substance use in Newark). The development of *Community Wise* took place one year after the formation of the NCCB. Below we provide the details about this process.

Evaluation: In order to assess the work progress and ensure the application of CBPR principles, an independent researcher conducted a qualitative process evaluation where NCCB members were interviewed twice over the course of one year and archival data including meeting videos and attendance records were analyzed. A manuscript reporting the findings is currently being reviewed for publication. Results showed that board members felt comfortable expressing their opinions in the meetings, and there was a high level of satisfaction with the project (Smith & Jemal, revise and resubmit).

Community Wise Manual Development

In order to develop the current manual, the NCCB met 24 times for 2 hours each meeting. A total of nine meetings were dedicated to training NCCB members on: the Criminal Justice System; Critical Consciousness Theory; Community Reentry in Newark, NJ; Substance Abuse Modalities; Substance Abuse Treatment in Newark, NJ; the Role of Drugs and Alcohol in Newark, NJ; Community Based Participatory Research; Grant Writing and Funding; and Manual Development. Trainers were selected by the NCCB and included researchers and community members who were experts in the field. Some of the trainers were NCCB members and others were national experts who traveled to New Jersey to provide training. Trainings were evaluated through a satisfaction survey and pre/posttests designed to evaluate knowledge gained after the training. Members who had to miss a training session were able to access a recording of the training and submit their pre/posttests through a website that was developed for the project.

The remaining meetings were used to address NCCB governmental/executive issues and to develop *Community Wise*'s manual. Subcommittees were developed as needed. Specifically, there was a governance committee which developed the memorandum of understanding; a referral list committee that developed a list of available services for individuals re-entering the community; a civic engagement committee responsible for developing civic engagement opportunities for NCCB members; a rotating meeting planning committee; a rotating manual writing committee, and a rotating grant writing committee.

Manual sessions were developed by a subcommittee composed of NCCB members and experts in oppression among this population, and were then presented and discussed at full board meetings. Once the session themes were finalized and approved, the NCCB engaged an artist who created the illustrations that were used in the critical dialogues. The images correspond to themes shown in Table 2 (sessions 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This strategy was

adopted from Freire's work with pictographs developed to engage rural workers in praxis in Brazil (Freire, 2005).

To write the manual, a five-member committee was formed. The committee presented the first draft of the manual to the remaining members of the NCCB at meeting 19 (at that time the board was meeting approximately every two weeks). Based on feedback from board members, the manual was revised and refinements were made to the intervention (e.g., NCCB members agreed that individual assessments should be conducted by the group facilitator with each group member prior to the first group session).

Community Wise Intervention Approach—*Community Wise* was developed to combat oppression through critical consciousness-raising. Participants develop critical consciousness by engaging in 1) anti-oppressive thinking and 2) anti-oppressive action. Anti-oppressive thinking develops largely through group discussions prompted by thematic images (see Table 2) and helps participants develop the ability to critically appraise and describe oppression in general, and particularly in the United States. Anti-oppressive action is a form of empowerment and may include group dialogue, community meetings, joining organizations, voluntarism, and participation in local politics.

Facilitation

Community Wise was developed to be co-facilitated by trained and licensed social workers and *Community Wise* alumni. Thus, participants who successfully complete *Community Wise* may receive training to become *Community Wise* facilitators themselves. The facilitator is neither a “teacher” nor an “expert.” The facilitator's beliefs and values should never be forced onto the participants in the group discussions. Moreover, facilitators must not pressure the participants to act or think in certain ways using peer pressure or shaming techniques. Facilitators encourage participants to develop critical consciousness, and create projects based on their own priorities, needs and interests. This approach discourages pushing conformity among the participants. Group members should not be viewed and treated as passive subjects, but rather active participants in the creation of knowledge. It is expected that by facilitating the group, facilitators will also learn and change.

Mechanisms of Action

In *Community Wise*, critical consciousness-raising is hypothesized to happen through group dialogue, participatory action, and empowerment. This process takes place during weekly group sessions lasting two hours each that alternate in focus between anti-oppressive thinking and anti-oppressive action. During anti-oppressive thinking sessions, participants of *Community Wise* come together to talk about problematic conditions within their communities, how these conditions impact them, and how to join together in taking action to improve their individual lives and their communities. Through dialogue guided by thematic illustrations, it is expected that participants will learn about themselves, particularly about how they think and limit themselves through deeply held assumptions and beliefs that reflect internalized oppression (Chronister & McWhirter, 2006). Participants are encouraged to challenge the forces of oppression that are identified and to channel their feelings, such as

anger, sadness, and frustration, into motivation for civic engagement (e.g. writing letters to elected officials, volunteering at a community organization).

Anti-oppressive action sessions are used to develop, implement, and evaluate individual goals and social change projects. These sessions were designed to provide the forum where participants can gain feedback and support to engage in anti-oppressive actions outside of the group. It is crucial to the success of *Community Wise* that personal goals and the social change projects be chosen by the participant, not the facilitator. Participants are also partnered with volunteer community members who help them develop, implement, and evaluate the social change projects.

During *Community Wise*, the individual's identity is deconstructed by challenging deeply held assumptions, identifying and questioning internalized oppression, and contextualizing one's life within structural oppression. Individuals are empowered through the visualization of a new life and engagement in social change projects. A new identity is developed, informed by critical consciousness. Thus, marginalized individuals transitioning from incarceration into the community not only change the way they perceive themselves and the world, but are reconnected with strong community resources, and empowered to improve their own communities.

The critical dialogue takes place in every session; however, it is concentrated in anti-oppressive thinking sessions where participants meet in a safe space to critically assess themselves and their communities. Images that reflect oppression themes are used to stimulate the critical dialogue. Each session has a specific theme, objectives, group process, critical questions, homework assignments and take home messages (see Table 2). The group process starts with a discussion about the previous week's homework. Then the facilitator shows participants an illustration that depicts the theme that is being featured. Participants are asked to describe what they see in the illustration and the facilitator poses critical questions that stimulate dialogue, eliciting participants' experiential knowledge about the themes, until they reach the suggested take-home message that participants can critically discuss, either accepting or rejecting its applicability in their lives.

Social change projects are discussed in the anti-oppressive action sessions. These sessions provide the forum where participants can gain feedback and support to engage in anti-oppressive actions outside of the group. In the first anti-oppressive action session participants discuss potential solutions to the community problems they identified during the anti-oppressive thinking sessions. The group reviews a list of methods that have been previously utilized successfully in effecting social change. They apply these methods in developing a plan to change an issue they care about. Each participant can choose their own project or the group can work collaboratively in one project. It is critical that a social change project: (1) have a clear and measurable goal; (2) be feasible (i.e., short duration) so that it can be implemented and evaluated within one month; (3) be a topic about which the participant is passionate. The unique strengths and capabilities of *Community Wise* participants will be utilized throughout the intervention in developing, implementing, and evaluating personal goals and social change projects.

Limitations and Future Directions

Thus far, a great deal of time and effort has been invested in merging evidence-based and experiential knowledge in the development of *Community Wise*. Many of the claims made in this paper have been supported in the literature. For instance, increased investment in institutions such as family, community, and work reduces the likelihood that people will abuse substances and/or reoffend (Epperson et al., 2011; Seiter & Kadela, 2003). However, we do not yet know if *Community Wise* will in fact impact these outcomes as we hypothesized in this paper. A pilot study to implement this program, with a sample of 56 adult men and women, is testing the following hypotheses: 1. That engagement in *Community Wise* will help occupy participants' idle time with community strengthening activities. 2. That participants will increase their social capital by acquiring skills and developing supportive networks. Such support will ultimately improve participants' mental health by decreasing stress, anxiety and loneliness. 3. That participants will increase their investment in institutions such as family, community, and work, reducing the likelihood they will reoffend or abuse substances (Seiter & Kadela, 2003; Wikoff et al., 2012). 4. Participants will learn that their actions have an impact on their neighbors and vice versa. 5. They will feel empowered by their new identity and community engagement, thus feeling motivated to take responsibility for changing their behavior so that their communities can also change (Chronister & McWhirter, 2006; Garcia, Kosutic, McDowell, & Anderson, 2009). The findings will be published in the future.

Conclusion

Scholars have argued that traditional social work practice ultimately contributes to the maintenance of an oppressive system by "teaching" marginalized individuals to conform to a mainstream culture that views them as inferior (Mullaly, 2002; Sakamoto & Pitner, 2005). We are working to reduce this paradox by developing *Community Wise*, an innovative manualized intervention approach that social workers can utilize to combat oppression among individuals with histories of substance abuse and incarceration residing in distressed communities. We are currently working to pilot test the intervention's feasibility and optimize the manual. Future research will include a randomized controlled trial to test the intervention's impact on substance use frequency, related health risk behaviors, psychological distress, and recidivism. The intervention development process described in this paper can be replicated to develop other empowerment-based social work interventions targeting myriad health and social conditions.

References

- Alegria M, Chatterji P, Wells K, Cao Z, Chen C, Takeuchi D, Meng X. Disparity in depression treatment among racial and ethnic minority populations in the United States. *Psychiatric Services*. 2008; 59(11):1264–1272. [PubMed: 18971402]
- Alexander, M. *The New Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press; 2010. p. 312 Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=_SKbzXqmawoC&pgis=1
- Anderson, E. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: Norton and Company, Inc.; 1999.

- Arasteh K, Jarlais D. At-risk drinking and injection and sexual risk behaviors of HIV-positive injection drug users entering drug treatment in New York City. *AIDS Patient Care & STDs*. 2009; 23(8): 657–661. [PubMed: 19591610]
- Atdijian S, Vega W. Disparities in mental health treatment in U.S. racial and ethnic minority groups: Implications for psychiatrists. *Psychiatric Services*. 2005; 56(12):1600–1602. [PubMed: 16339626]
- Baker JL, Brawner B, Leader A, Voytek C, Jemmott LS, Frank I. Incorporating Community Based Participatory Research Principles for the development of a HPV prevention program for African American adolescent females and their parents/guardians. *American Journal of Health Studies*. 2012; 27(1):1–7. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=79702150&site=ehost-live>.
- Binswanger IA, Nowels C, Corsi KF, Long J, Booth RE, Kutner J, Steiner JF. “From the prison door right to the sidewalk, everything went downhill.” A qualitative study of the health experiences of recently released inmates. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*. 2011; 34(4):249–255. [PubMed: 21802731]
- Blitz CL, Wolff N, Pan K-Y, Pogorzelski W. Gender-specific behavioral health and community release patterns among New Jersey prison inmates: Implications for treatment and community reentry. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2005; 95(10):1741–1746. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=18461116&site=ehost-live>. [PubMed: 16131640]
- Bohrer JR. Mayor friendly. *New Republic*. 2012; 243(10)
- Braveman PA, Kumanyika S, Fielding J, LaVeist T, Borrell LN, Manderscheid R, Troutman A. Health disparities and health equity: The issue is justice. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2011; 101:S149–S155. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=74980850&site=ehost-live>. [PubMed: 21551385]
- Bryant-Davis T, Ocampo C. Racist incident-based trauma. *Counseling Psychologist*. 2005; 33(4):479–500. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ689435&site=ehost-live>;
- Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. Rockville, MD: 2012. Brief Interventions and brief therapies for substance abuse. Retrieved from <http://store.samhsa.gov/product/TIP-34-Brief-Interventions-and-Brief-Therapies-for-Substance-Abuse/SMA12-3952>
- Centers for Disease Control. HIV among African Americans. 2011
- Chronister KM, McWhirter EH. An experimental examination of two career interventions for battered women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 2006; 53(2):151–164. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=20712140&site=ehost-live>.
- Clark PM. An evidence-based intervention for offenders. *Corrections Today*. 2011; 73(1):62–64. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=59533380&site=ehost-live>.
- DuBois, WEB. *The souls of Black folk*. New York: Bantam Classic; 1903. p. 196
- Dunlap E, Johnson BD. The setting for the crack era: Macro forces, micro consequences (1960–1992). *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*. 1992; 24(4):307–321. [PubMed: 1491281]
- Dunlap E, Johnson BD, Manwar A. A successful female crack dealer: Case study of a deviant career. *Deviant Behavior*. 1994; 15(1):1–25.
- Epperson, M.; Wolff, N.; Morgan, R.; Fisher, W.; Frueh, BC.; Huening, J. *The next generation of behavioral health and criminal justice interventions: Improving outcomes by improving interventions*. New Brunswick: 2011. Retrieved from http://cbhs-cjr.rutgers.edu/pdfs/The_next_generation_Monograph_Sept_2011.pdf
- Fanon, F. *Black skin, White masks*. New York: Grove Press; 1967. (Original work published in 1952).
- Fanon, F. *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press; 1968.
- Feldman MB, Silapaswan A, Schaefer N, Schermele D. Is there life after DEBI? Examining health behavior maintenance in the diffusion of effective behavioral interventions initiative. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2014; 53(3–4):286–313. [PubMed: 24499926]
- Fesahazion RG, Thorpe RJ, Bell CN, LaVeist TA. Disparities in alcohol use: Does race matter as much as place? *Preventive Medicine*. 2012; 55(5):482–484. Retrieved from <http://>

search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=83166827&site=ehost-live.
[PubMed: 22940615]

- Foucault, M. Two lectures. Gordon, C., editor. New York: Pantheon; 1980. p. 78-108.
- Freire, P. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, NY: The Continuum Publishing Company; 1976. p. 164
- Freire, P. Pedagogy in process: The letters to Guinea-Bissau. London: The Seabury Press, Inc.; 1978.
- Freire, P. The banking concept of education. 7th ed.. Bartholomae, D.; Petrosky, A., editors. New York: St. Martins Press; 2005. p. 255-267.
- Freudenberg N. HIV in the epicenter of the epicenter: HIV and drug use among criminal justice populations in New York City, 1980–2007. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2011; 46(2–3):159–170. [PubMed: 21303236]
- Garcia M, Kosutic I, McDowell T, Anderson SA. Raising critical consciousness in family therapy supervision. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*. 2009; 21(1):18–38. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=36438227&site=ehost-live>.
- Gramsci, A.; Hoare, Q.; Nowell-Smith, G. Selections from the prison: Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci. London: Lawrence & Wishart; 1971.
- Hegel, G. The phenomenology of mind. London: Allen & Unwin; 1966.
- Hernandez P, Almeida R, Vecchio KD-D. Critical consciousness, accountability, and empowerment: Key processes for helping families heal. *Family Process*. 2005; 44(1):105–119. [PubMed: 15807081]
- Israel B, Checkoway B, Schulz A, Zimmerman M. Health education and community empowerment: Conceptualizing and measuring perceptions of individual, organization, and community control. *Health Education Quarterly*. 1994; 21(2):149–170. [PubMed: 8021145]
- Israel, B.; Schultz, A.; Parker, E.; Becker, A.; Allen, A.; Guzman, R. Critical issues in developing and following community based participatory research principles. Minkler, M.; Wallwestein, N.; Hall, B., editors. New York: Thousand Oaks; 1998.
- Jimerson JB, Oware MK. Telling the code of the street. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 2006; 35(1):24–50. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=19638648&site=ehost-live>.
- King, S.; Ivanova, T. Prisoner reentry: Breaking the cycle. Newark, NJ, USA: 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0udmYxCyJw4>
- Laveist T, Gaskin D, Trujillo A. Segregated spaces, risky places: The effects of racial segregation on health inequalities. 2011 Retrieved from [http://www.jointcenter.org/sites/default/files/upload/research/files/Segregated Spaces-web.pdf](http://www.jointcenter.org/sites/default/files/upload/research/files/Segregated%20Spaces-web.pdf).
- LaVeist T, Pollack K Jr, R T, Fesahazion R, Gaskin D. Place, not race: Disparities dissipate in Southwest Baltimore when Blacks and Whites live under similar conditions. *Health Affairs*. 2011; 30(10):1880–1887. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=66792997&site=ehost-live>. [PubMed: 21976330]
- Manoni, O. Prospero and Caliban: The psychology of colonization. New York: Praeger; 1962.
- Mellow J, Schlager MD, Caplan JM. Using GIS to evaluate post-release prisoner services in Newark, New Jersey. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 2008; 36(5):416–425. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=34296080&site=ehost-live>.
- Mullaly, B. Challenging oppression: A critical social work approach. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press; 2002. p. 232
- New Jersey Department of Health and Human Services. New Jersey HIV/AIDS report. Trenton: 2013. Retrieved from http://www.state.nj.us/health/aids/documents/hiv_aids_report_123113.pdf
- Nuru-Jeter A, LaVeist TA. Racial segregation, income inequality, and mortality in US metropolitan areas. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2011; 88(2):270–282. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=60017621&site=ehost-live>. [PubMed: 21298485]
- Perron BE, Mowbray OP, Glass JE, Delva J, Vaughn MG, Howard MO. Differences in service utilization and barriers among Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites with drug use disorders. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*. 2009; 4(3)

- Pinto RM, Spector AY, Valera PA. Exploring group dynamics for integrating scientific and experiential knowledge in Community Advisory Boards for HIV research. *AIDS Care*. 2011; 23(8):1006–1013. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=2011214435&site=ehost-live>. [PubMed: 21390878]
- Raphael S. Incarceration and prisoner reentry in the United States. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2011; 635(1):192–215.
- Richardson L. Deserted no longer. *Economic Development Journal*. 2013; 12(1)
- Rubin MS, Colen CG, Link BG. Examination of inequalities in HIV/AIDS mortality in the United States from a fundamental cause perspective. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2010; 100(6): 1053–1059. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=50615796&site=ehost-live>. [PubMed: 20403885]
- Sakamoto I, Pitner RO. Use of critical consciousness in anti-oppressive social work practice: Disentangling power dynamics at personal and structural levels. *British Journal of Social Work*. 2005; 35:435–452.
- Schmidt L, Greenfield T, Mulia N. Unequal treatment: Racial and ethnic disparities in alcoholism treatment services. *Alcohol Research & Health*. 2006; 29(1):49–54. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16767854>. [PubMed: 16767854]
- Schnittker J, Massoglia M, Uggen C. Incarceration and health of the African American community. *Du Bois Review*. 2011; 8(1):1–9.
- Seiter RP, Kadela KR. Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency*. 2003; 49(3):360. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10110539&site=ehost-live>.
- Smith V, Jemal A. Addressing the health of transitioning ex-offenders in a distressed neighborhood through a community collaborative board (CCB). *Health Promotion Practice*. (revise and resubmit).
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. State and county quick facts, Newark, NJ; 2014. p. 60. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/34/3451000.html>
- Watts, RJ.; Diemer, MA.; Voight, AM. Critical consciousness: Current status and future directions. In: Flanagan, CA.; Christens, BD., editors. *Youth civic development: Work at the cutting edge*. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development. Wiley: 2011. p. 43-57.
- Wikoff N, Linhorst DM, Morani N. Recidivism among participants of a reentry program for prisoners released without supervision. *Social Work Research*. 2012; 36(4):289–299.
- Windsor L. Using concept mapping for Community-Based Participatory Research: Paving the way for community-based health interventions for oppressed populations. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. 2013; 7(3):274–293.
- Windsor L, Benoit E, Dunlap E. Dimensions of oppression in the lives of impoverished Black women who use drugs. *Journal of Black Studies*. 2010; 41(1):21–39. [PubMed: 21113410]
- Windsor L, Dunlap E. What is substance use all about? Assumptions in New York's drug policies and the perceptions of drug using low-income African-Americans. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse*. 2010; 9:64–87.
- Windsor L, Jemal A, Alessi E. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy: A meta-analysis of race and substance use outcomes. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*. (n.d.).
- Windsor L, Murugan V. From the individual to the community: Perspectives about substance abuse services. *Social Work Practice in the Addictions*. 2012; 12(4):412–433. [PubMed: 23243393]
- Wolff N, Shi J. Patterns of victimization and feelings of safety inside prison: The experience of male and female inmates. *Crime & Delinquency*. 2011; 57(1):29–55. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=55532534&site=ehost-live>.
- Zimmerman, MA. Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational, and community levels of analysis. In: Rappaport, Julian; Seidman, E., editors. *Handbook of community psychology*. London: Kluwer Academic/Plenum; 2000.

Figure 1.
Community Wise Model

Figure 2.
NCCB Modified Framework

Table 1

NCCB Demographic Information (N=16)

	Mean (SD) or Number
Age	45.27 (6.52)
Race	
Asian	00
Black	08
Mixed	04
White	04
Ethnicity	
Hispanic	03
Not Hispanic	13
Gender	
Female	10
Male	06
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	04
Homosexual	12
Highest level of education	
Graduate degree	06
Undergraduate degree	08
Completed high school or GED	02
Less than high school	00
Employment	
Full time	10
Part time	05
Unemployed	01
Role on the NCCB	
Consumer	02
Community resident	03
Government representative	01
Researcher	04
Service Provider	06

Table 2

Overall sessions' themes and goals

Session # and Theme	Overall Goals
Session 1: Icebreaker and Welcome	To introduce participants and facilitators to one another, To introduce Community Wise To establish ground rules.
Session 2: Critical Thinking	To examine materials about critical thinking and learn how to evaluate one's own way of thinking
Session 3: Solar System	To explore power distribution in the community and the role of community building and civic engagement as empowerment tools
Session 4: Empowerment-Introduction and Development	To engage participant in the development of personal goals To explore participant's ideas for a social change project
Session 5: Funhouse Mirrors	To explore the role of and relationship between internalized oppression and structural oppression and their impact on participants' behaviors
Session 6: Empowerment: Implementation	To engage participant in the development and implementation of personal goals and social change project
Session 7: Walls	To explore specific structural obstacles faced by participants and how to overcome them
Session 8: Empowerment: Implementation	To engage participant in the implementation of personal goals and social change project
Session 9: Historical Trauma and Evaluation	To explore the impact of historical trauma on participants' lives in the present To evaluate outcomes, and make adjustments to their goals and social change projects
Session 10: Empowerment: Implementation & Evaluation	To engage participant in the implementation and evaluation of personal goals and social change project
Session 11: Families/ Relationships	To explore how family structure and functioning may support and/or help the perpetuation of oppressions
Session 12: Termination and Plans For the Future	To help participants articulate their perceived success in the intervention and share their long term plan to maintain perceived success.
Graduation	Participants celebrate their work, and engage with community members to raise awareness about substance abuse, related health risk behaviors, and reoffending in the community.