THE INSTITUTE

MULTI-SITE EVALUATION OF BOOT CAMP PROGRAMS

Final Report

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency
and
The Institute on Crime, Justice, and Corrections
at The George Washington University

August 15, 2000

This project was supported by Grant No. 96-SC-LX-0009 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Washington, D.C. Office

1819 H Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20006

202.496.6320 phone
202.496.6342 fax

New York City Office

1133 Broadway
Suite 718
New York, NY 10010

212.924.6616 phone
212.924.6442 fax

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals and several agencies have contributed to this report. We would first like to thank the National Institute of Justice (Jeremy Travis, Director) for their financial support. Dr. Voncile Gowdy from NIJ served as the program manager and provided much guidance and support over the two-year evaluation effort. Additionally, we wish to thank Dr. Thomas Castellano and his staff at Southern Illinois University who were extremely helpful in working with facilitating the collection of necessary data, the analysis of evaluation results, and the resolution of research methodology issues. We would also like to thank the sites who were willing to have their boot camp programs examined as part of the national evaluation. It is our hope that the research results summarized in this report will provide much needed practical information on the possible benefits of boot camps and decisions on whether to implement such programs in the future.

PROJECT STAFF

James Austin
Donna Camp-Blair
Alethea Camp
Thomas Castellano
Terri Adams-Fuller
Michael Jones
Steve Kerr
Richard Lewis
Susan Plant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

List of Tables - continued

Executive Summary

The evaluation built upon several studies that had been initiated by National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and several local and state correctional agencies. The original evaluation called for the process evaluations of ten of adult and juvenile boot camp programs operated by state, county, and private agencies. For each of these programs, descriptive process data were collected for all sites. In those sites that showed a potential for impact, outcome data were collected using a mix of experimental and quasi-experimental designs.

The results show that boot camp programs are not having the impact on offenders or corrections as originally envisioned. Although many of the programs are well administered and popular with public officials, they are not demonstrating a significant impact on recidivism, prison or jail crowding, or costs -- the three core goals of boot camps.

The lack of impact on recidivism is probably tied to the fact that many boot camp participants are low risk by definition of the selection criteria employed by correctional agencies and the courts for determining who is eligible for admission. Another factor that diminishes the programs recidivism effect is tied to the lack of treatment "dosage." Although it's clear that many boot camp participants improve their education levels and "pro social values," these levels of improvement are not sufficient to overcome the more powerful social and economic forces that facilitated their involvement in criminal activities. And it does not appear that promise of "aftercare services"adds much to the lack of treatment effects.

With regard to averted cost savings, these programs are simply too small in terms of capturing a sufficient "market share" of the prison or jail population to have an impact on population growth and the associated operating and construction costs. Furthermore, boot camps tend to be more staff and program service intensive than traditional correctional facilities.

The future of boot camps is not promising. It is unlikely that we will see more boot camps implemented. However, it also true they will completely disappear from the correctional scene. As long as they offer a setting where low risk offenders can be exposed to a more intense level of services in a safe correctional environment without being overly expensive to operate, the need for them to exist will continue -- regardless of their limited therapeutic and cost benefits.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

As of 1998, it was estimated that there are 49 (adult) boot camps functioning in the United States with a total population of 6,857. There were also another 30 juvenile boot camp programs with an unknown bed capacity (Camp and Camp, 1998; MacKenzie and Rosay, 1996). These boot camp programs are operated by state, county, and private agencies that target both adult and juvenile offenders. Despite the widespread popularization of these programs, which promise to reduce crime and costs, there have been few studies conducted to evaluate or compare boot camp programs or the impact these programs have on their participants.

In 1996, the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice (NIJ) awarded a competitive grant to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to conduct a national multi-site impact evaluation of public and private boot camp programs. The study's team initially selected ten adult and juvenile offender programs operated by state, county, and private entities for possible evaluation. Subsequently, two sites were dropped from the study due to either the programs being terminated or the fact that the site's client base was too small. Evaluative efforts then focused on eight of the boot camp programs. They include the Camp Summit (Indiana); Impact Incarceration Program (Illinois); Twin Pines Academy (California); Work Ethic Camp (Washington State); Abraxas Leadership Development Program (Pennsylvania); Cook County Boot Camp (Illinois); Maricopa County's After Shock Program (Arizona); and SUMMIT Boot Camp (Oregon).

Some of the sites selected were part of another Office of Justice Program initiative funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) referred to as the Corrections Options program. Other sites were conducting their own evaluations and still others had contracts with either NCCD or The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections (ICJC).

It should be emphasized that this report attempts to summarize the results of various studies which were being conducted by different correctional and research agencies. As noted above, the original NIJ award was made to the NCCD with a subcontract to Southern Illinois University. Toward the end of the project, The George Washington University's ICJC received a subcontract from NCCD to complete the study due to a change in the organizational affiliation of the project director. All of these changes resulted in a difficult organizational situation for the completion of a multi-site evaluation with multiple funding sources. Due to these difficulties this report can best be described as an overview of how diverse the structure and operations of boot camps have become along with some indication of what, if any, impact can be documented.

II. THE CONTEXT OF THE BOOT CAMP MOVEMENT

Perhaps the most pervasive problem challenging modern corrections is the nexus of overburdened correctional systems and rising confinement costs. Prison and jail populations are increasing rapidly, and this growth is paralleled by rising operational and capital costs. In 1998, more than 1.8 million inmates were held in the nation's prisons and local jails. More than 1.3 million offenders were incarcerated in state and federal prisons, and almost 592,462 were housed in local jails at midyear 1998. Recent estimates also show that there were more than three million offenders on probation and almost 700,000 on parole in 1998.

There are approximately 5.8 million adult men and women under some form of correctional supervision. This compares with only 1.8 million persons under the supervision of the correctional system in 1980. These exponential increases are not limited to the prison system and have been observed among all forms of correctional supervision. Despite recent reports of declining crime rates, jail and prison populations are projected to continue rising. State and local governments have responded to the crisis with unparalleled prison construction efforts. These efforts have increased operating costs, and data collected over the last decade show that confinement costs have more than doubled in the United States. These findings emphasize the need for more efficient and cost-effective alternatives to imprisonment.

In response to increased correctional crowding and confinement costs, the first boot camps emerged in 1983. Over the next decade, the boot camp phenomenon expanded from adult male prisons to include local jails, juveniles, and women (Toby and Pearson, 1992; Austin, Jones, and Bolyard, 1993). As indicated earlier, there are as many as 49 adult state and federal correctional boot camps in more than 32 states (Camp and Camp, 1998) and over 30 juvenile boot camps in operation (MacKenzie and Rosay, 1996).

Boot camps have been viewed as a means for reducing the high rate of recidivism between offenders and for reducing prison crowding. Often categorized as an intermediate sanction, boot camps were designed to punish and treat juvenile and adult offenders convicted of less serious, nonviolent crimes for relatively short periods of time. In confining offenders for shorter periods, it was hoped that boot camps, would simultaneously reduce the lengths of stay (LOS) incarcerated and reduce recidivism (Parent, 1989). In so doing, the costs of imprisonment would be reduced by inmates spending a shorter period of time in custody and not returning to prison once released.

While a number of scholars greeted the earliest boot camps with a good deal of skepticism, they were fully embraced by many correctional systems (Morash and Rucker, 1990; Sechrest, 1989). However, as is often the case with many criminal justice reforms, boot camps have recently begun to fall from favor in some circles, which has led to the closure of a number of these programs (Allen, 1997). Indeed, there is culminating empirical evidence suggesting that, in many instances, they simply do not work as intended (Nossiter, 1993; MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994; Parent, 1996).

TABLE 1

CORRECTIONAL POPULATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES 1990-1998

Year	Prison	Jail	Parole	Probation	Total
1990	773,919	405,320	531,407	2,670,234	4,380,880
1991	825,559	426,479	590,442	2,728,472	4,570,952
1992	882,500	444,584	658,601	2,811,611	4,797,296
1993	970,444	459,804	676,100	2,903,061	5,009,409
1994	1,054,702	486,474	690,371	2,981,022	5,212,569
1995	1,125,874	507,044	679,421	3,077,861	5,390,200
1996	1,183,368	518,492	679,733	3,164,996	5,546,589
1997	1,242,153	567,079	694,787	3,296,513	5,800,532
1998	1,302,019	592,462	704,964	3,417,613	6,017,058
Percent Change 1990-1998	**68.2%**	**46.2%**	**32.7%**	**28.0%**	**37.3%**

Sources: Probation and Parole in the United States, 1998; Prisoners in 1998; and Prison and Jail Inmates, 1998.

Images of a typical boot camp have generated a tremendous level of popular appeal. Images of inmates rising early in the predawn night, being forced to adhere to a rigorous regime of physical exercise led by a mean and dog-faced drill instructor and marching up and down the prison yard in precisely choreographed drill ceremonies have much allure for the general public. These images not only reflect the desired infliction of pain upon criminal offenders, pain that is often found wanting in traditional prisons; they also have the utilitarian effect of developing character and discipline among the prisoners -- characteristics associated with the good and law-abiding, which are almost invariably lacking in the young men and women who find themselves confined in correctional facilities.

However, some observers of the boot camp movement not only withhold their support for such programs, but they view boot camps as repulsive -- the anathema of enlightened and progressive penal practice. Boot camps are seen as degrading and futile attempts to change people based on erroneous psychological principles. In short, these programs are not "clinically relevant or psychologically informed" -- in fact, they are at odds with sound and effective correctional treatment principles (e.g., Andrews and Bonta, 1994).

In recent years, there is some evidence that suggests an evolution in boot camp

programming. Specifically, boot camps are progressing away from the military type regime toward programs that place increased emphasis on education, therapeutic, and treatment services, and community aftercare and less on the boot camp regime (OJJDP, 1997).

III. RESEARCH FINDINGS ON BOOT CAMPS

Notwithstanding these trends and continued growth in the number of boot camp programs, questions abound regarding the appropriateness, desirability, and effectiveness of boot camp programs in correctional settings (e.g., Sechrest, 1989; Morash and Rucker, 1990; MacKenzie and Brame, 1995). The available research has been limited in its ability to address the above issues. Most relevant research, primarily descriptive in nature, has focused on adult boot camps, emphasizing the great variability in boot camp programming (Parent, 1989; Austin and Bolyard, 1993; Cronin, 1993; Cowles and Castellano, 1995). These studies highlight the sometimes contradictory goals, the limited treatment, and modest aftercare programming associated with many boot camps.

Nonetheless, many observers have commented on the positive features of boot camps, including movement toward the inclusion of stronger treatment components in newer program designs, as well as the generally safe and orderly program environments found within boot camps (Gransky, Castellano, and Cowles, 1995; Bottcher and Isorena, 1996; Erwin, 1996). Georgia and Oklahoma were among the first states to establish correctional boot camps in 1983. Early boot camp programs were designed to be similar to military basic training. These programs placed emphasis on characteristics including intensified discipline, drill and ceremony, and physical challenge. The limits of early contemporary boot camps were widely recognized, and as a result we have witnessed a positive evolution in boot camp programming (Gransky et al., 1995; Parent 1996b).

The earliest boot camps, sometimes referred to as "First Generation" camps, tended to have a heavy emphasis on military-based program activities but provided little in terms of treatment or aftercare programming. "Second Generation" boot camps followed the lead of some of the earlier treatment-oriented programs (e.g., New York's Shock Incarceration Program, see Clark, Aziz, and MacKenzie, 1994). They toned down the military emphasis and began to increase substance abuse, educational, and cognitive programming. Importantly, attempts were made to provide boot camp graduates with greater levels of post-release supervision and services (Castellano and Plant, 1996).

Some observers of correctional boot camps suggest that "Third Generation" programs are now emerging (Parent, 1996b). These programs involve the search for alternative boot camp models (e.g., empowerment, leadership, work ethic) that move away from an emphasis on militaristic program components and establish daily regimens which are program-rich. Importantly aftercare programs that are integrated into institutionally-based interventions and which emphasize a continuity of treatment and services once offenders re-enter the community, are a hallmark of these more advanced programs. These latter programs are still quite

uncommon, and especially so in relation to boot camps for adults (Castellano and Plant, 1996).

A. Prison Crowding and Costs

The impact of correctional boot camps on reducing crowding and costs has been the focus of a number of studies (MacKenzie and Piquero, 1994; Parent, 1994). The two fundamental forces that drive crowding and costs are the number of admissions and the length of stay. These forces have the potential to impact a corrections system from both the front-end and back-end. Because boot camps share this potential, many jurisdictions have enthusiastically embraced these programs as alternatives to incarceration. This enthusiasm, however, is tempered by studies showing that many of these programs have not met expectations in terms of reducing prison crowding and system costs. In general, the relatively small size of the boot camps and their apparent inability to capture a larger share of the prison and jail populations make this goal virtually impossible to achieve. This is especially true for jail-based boot camps where the average length of stay is measured in weeks and not months or years. Any jail-based boot camp that requires a period of incarceration well beyond what is normally experienced by similarly situated offenders will likely increase rather than decrease a correctional population and the associated operational costs.

In this report, we will look at several boot camps (both state prison and local jails) that have the potential to show savings of some kind due to their size and/or the likelihood that they are either reducing admissions or reducing the projected length of stay.

B. Impact on Boot Camp Participants while Institutionalized

Some evaluations have examined the impact of boot camps on offender adjustments while institutionalized (e.g., MacKenzie and Shaw, 1990; Hunter, Burton, Marquart, and Cuvelier, 1992; MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994). In general, these studies indicate that boot camps -- as compared to traditional prisons -- seem to result in the more positive adjustments of inmates to institutionalization. These studies are consistent in finding that boot camp offenders tend to develop more pro-social attitudes and more favorable reactions to the correctional environment than do offenders incarcerated in more traditional correctional facilities.

For instance, MacKenzie's multi-site evaluation of eight state-level adult boot camps found that, across all sites, inmates who went through the boot camp programs developed more positive attitudes toward their prison experience over time and displayed more pro-social attitudes than did comparison samples of inmates incarcerated in conventional settings (MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994). Some studies also suggest that boot camp participants witness significant increases in a number of desirable short-term outcomes, such as improved self-esteem and improved scores on standardized measures of educational achievement (Clark and Aziz, 1996; Bottcher and Isorena, 1996; Peters, Thomas, and Zamberlan, 1997). It remains unclear, however, whether these effects are attributable to anything unique about these boot camps. For instance, these findings may be simply the result of the boot camp participants being directly and

intensely supervised by staff, suggesting these effects may extend to a variety of treatment-oriented, non-boot camp programs (McCorkle, 1995). Some of these findings may also be an artifact of initial surveys being conducted after boot camp inductions have taken place, which may result in decreased pretest scores on the measures of adjustment administered.

In this report we will report of attempts in some of these sites to measure change in a boot camp participant's "pro-social" values.

C. Offender Recidivism

1. Adult Boot Camps

The area of greatest concern, however, has been the effectiveness of boot camps in reducing offender recidivism. MacKenzie's multi-site evaluation of eight correctional boot camps has been the most important research in this area (e.g., MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994; MacKenzie, Brame, McDowall and Souryal, 1995). This multi-faceted study of eight state-level adult boot camps found that in most instances boot camps do not appear to reduce offender recidivism rates. Of the eight states studied, only in three states did boot camp participants, who successfully completed the programs, have lower recidivism rates than comparable inmates who served longer prison terms in conventional prisons on at least one measure of recidivism. These three state boot camp programs have some common characteristics. First, post-release intensive supervision of boot campers is a program component in all three states, while prison releases from those states are not generally as intensively supervised upon release from prison (see Karr and Jones, 1996). Second, the institutional phase of these programs tend to be longer, contain a stronger rehabilitative focus, and generate higher in-program dropout rates than the other boot camp programs examined. Other apparently unsuccessful programs also share some of these characteristics, so it is unclear how these program characteristics influence failure rates. The analyses could not disentangle the effects of particular program features (e.g., intensive supervision), although the authors do suggest that it is quite unlikely that the military boot camp atmosphere alone had much impact on program participants.

In general, research results on the effectiveness of adult boot camps show no significant difference in recidivism between program participants and others, including those who either served longer sentences in prison or are on probation (MacKenzie et al., 1993; MacKenzie and Shaw, 1993; Flowers, Carr, and Ruback 1991; Florida Department of Corrections, 1990). Other results show that in boot camps where substantial numbers of offenders were dismissed prior to program completion, the recidivism rates for those who completed the program were lower than the rates for those who were dismissed (MacKenzie et al., 1995). Still other results show some continuity across boot camp programs where releases had marginally lower recidivism rates than comparison groups on some measures of recidivism. Some common characteristics of promising boot camp programs that were identified through research include counseling, drug treatment, and follow-up of offenders upon residential program completion (Maryland Report to Congress, 1997).

2. Juvenile Boot Camps

During the late 1980s, the use of juvenile boot camps increased dramatically in response to rising crime rates and drug-related arrests of youthful offenders. This growth was sustained by wide political support and the popular appeal of such programs. Studies of the impact of juvenile boot camps on offender recidivism are quite limited at this point in time. Preliminary evidence, however, from a number of studies that have or are employing experimental designs are not very encouraging. These include the California Youth Authority's internal evaluation of its LEAD boot camp program (Bottcher and Isorena, 1996) and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's sponsored evaluation of juvenile boot camps in Cleveland, Mobile, and Denver (Peters, Thomas, and Zamberlan, 1997). In general, research on the effectiveness of juvenile boot camps programs conclude that the boot camp experience does not appear to impact re-offending among juveniles released. Among these studies were field experiments utilizing random assignment to evaluate the effect of boot camp programming on recidivism. The California Youth Authority's internal evaluation of the LEAD boot camp program found no statistical difference between experimental and control groups in terms of future repeat offending. Calibar and associates' evaluation of three boot camps in Cleveland, Mobile, and Denver, revealed that, although there were gains made by the participants while they were enrolled in boot camp, there was a great deal of recidivism among the boot campers. In all three of the sites, the experimental group (boot campers) had a higher recidivism rate than those in the control group (those who were sentenced to traditional confinement centers).

Each of the boot camps models were developed to provide intervention and needed support to juveniles at risk and included military, education, and treatment components. While each program has the same basic goals, each site places varying degrees of emphasis on different aspects of the program. Cleveland concentrates on their treatment component, Denver places greater emphasis on the military aspects, while Mobile highlights education.

D. Summary

In summary, adult and juvenile boot camps have not proven to be viable options in terms of crime control and delinquency prevention. Moreover, boot camps do not appear to address problems concerning the reduction of corrections crowding and confinement costs. There are methodological factors that should be considered in interpreting some of these findings. Among these factors are the relative few formal evaluations of state sponsored boot camp programs and considerable variance in evaluation strategies (United States GAO, 1993). While the evidence in support of the efficacy of boot camp programs is sparse, the use of these programs as alternatives to incarceration continues. This finding reveals that corrections policy makers must reconcile the need to implement alternative sentences with the fact that the general public and many elected officials may support more punitive programs in the absence of demonstrable positive results.

Despite the lack of empirical support regarding the efficacy of boot camps in terms of reducing rates of offender recidivism and prison costs, and the common concerns articulated about the military model as it has been employed in correctional settings (Morash and Rucker,

Sechrest, Dickey), it is also fairly clear that the boot camp movement has generated a number of benefits for corrections. These benefits, which may be maintained even if boot camp program models witness continued growth and modification, include:

- Boot camps have become a politically acceptable form of intermediate sanctions for offenders;
- Boot camps have become one of the few types of corrections programs where it has become politically acceptable to emphasize treatment programming;
- Boot camps are safer, more secure, and orderly environments than traditional prisons;
- Boot camps often result in the more positive adjustments of inmates to institutionalization;
- Very powerful and effective group processes of individual change have emerged in many boot camps; and
- Boot camps often result in the revitalization of correctional staff.

The actual sources of these benefits are uncertain at this point. It does seem, however, that having inmates engaged in various tasks continuously and productively throughout the day, sharing both positive and negative experiences with other inmates in a highly structured group context, coupled with an intensive direct supervision style by staff who are trained to be active agents of change, may be the underlying source of most of these benefits.

Despite the positive gains realized by offenders while assigned to a boot camp, they appear to diminish once the offender is released to the community. A major challenge for the "next generation" of boot camps will be developing effective aftercare components that will sustain the gains realized in the institutional phase of the program. Furthermore, most boot camps are relatively small in size and have problems operating at full capacity. Unless a larger pool of incarcerated offenders are made eligible for these programs, they cannot function as a viable means for controlling prison crowding or reducing the costs of the correctional system.

Thus, today there is only limited promise, but no consistent evidence that boot camps are capable of achieving their primary goals. The research does indicate that particular correctional goals are more likely to be achieved if boot camps exhibit certain program components and features. Experience with the boot camp movement suggests that pro-active offender management, involving the frequent and direct supervision of offenders by staff serving as role models and change agents in the pursuit of tasks framed and viewed by the inmates as being potentially beneficial and not inherently punitive, may generate very tangible benefits for correctional systems. Perhaps with a more potent aftercare component coupled with an expansion of the eligibility criteria, boot camps could become an effective intermediate sanction. However, the "promise" of boot camps remains unproven and must be the subject of much more empirical scrutiny.

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH METHODS

I. INTRODUCTION

This evaluation focused on a wide variety of boot camp programs that, for the most part, have been in existence for several years and have made modifications in their program design (both institutional and aftercare components) to overcome previous deficiencies in their program structures and procedures. In particular, these programs have developed more intensive and better administered aftercare components which should greatly enhance the programs' ability to reduce recidivism and other impact measures. Furthermore, the diversity of the six sites to be evaluated ensures that important findings will be gathered regarding how best to structure adult and juvenile boot camps in the future. The methods used for the evaluation can be separated according to process and impact designs which are described below.

II. PROCESS EVALUATION

A process evaluation describes how well a program was planned and implemented and modified over time. It also serves as a valuable guide for interpreting impact research findings that can help answer questions of how the interventions actually operated. In conducting a process evaluation, the five following elements of program development and implementation need to be addressed:

Program Context: The set of conditions and assumptions that operationally and conceptually define the distinctive features of the program. Included are the theoretical assumptions guiding participant selection criteria and intervention strategies (supervision and services) as well as the financial, historical, and organizational characteristics of the program.

Program Goals: The measurable outcomes of the program's interventions that can be used to determine its effectiveness.

Organizational Linkages: Those formal and informal conditions and relationships with other organizations that may hinder or support program operations.

Selection Process: The combination of procedures and criteria employed to define program eligibility and selection.

Program Interventions: The full range of activities and services provided to program participants as well as the staffing pattern required to deliver the program services.

In general, process evaluations document each of these five program components and then evaluate the extent to which each component is implemented and how they relate to each other. The data used in an evaluation consists of both qualitative and quantitative data.

Qualitative data in the form of interviews with staff, program participants, observations of program activities, and a review of program documents and reports. Quantitative data are used to describe the numbers and types of offenders admitted to the programs and the level of services provided to program participants. While this may seem to be rather straightforward, it often is the most difficult form of data to secure due to a lack of organizational structure or poor record keeping systems.

III. IMPACT EVALUATION DESIGN

The basic question to be answered by an impact evaluation is, "what would have happened to the offenders if the program did not exist?" The best test of such a question is a true experimental design with random assignment of the eligible offenders into experimental and control groups. The basic design of a boot camp program for a true experimental design can be graphically portrayed as follows:

R/M O_1 X_1 O_2
R/M O_1 X_1 O_2

where:

R/M reflects either random assignment or a matching process to establish comparable experimental and control groups;

O_1 reflects the pre-boot camp observation or measurement of the experimental and control populations;

X_1 reflects the institutional phase of the boot camp;

O_2 reflects an impact observation taken prior to the offender leaving the boot camp (generally 4-6 months after admission);

Two sites were able to conduct a true random assignment design (Indiana Camp Summit and the California Youth Authority), while the remaining sites relied upon a quasi-experimental design. Many sites were unable to maintain their programs for a sufficient period of time to generate the necessary cases to conduct meaningful analysis.

The lack of cases coupled with the relatively small size of these programs, made the cost benefit analysis an academic exercise. It's clear from these projects that very little if any money was being saved via the boot camp programs. Nonetheless, costs analyses were performed using various assumptions about either marginal or full operating costs depending upon one's assumptions on the actual or potential size of the boot camp program. Recidivism comparisons, as measured by re-incarceration rates, were also made at the impact sites.

CHAPTER 3

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE BOOT CAMP PROGRAMS

This chapter provides the process analysis of each of the boot camp programs. As suggested earlier, the data are largely descriptive. These data should give the reader a better understanding of each program's overall structure, historical development, goals, selection process, and range of services provided to the participants. For some programs, we have noted implementation problems that may have impacted the program's ability to operate as originally designed. These program descriptions reflect the status of each program at the time of the evaluation (1996-1999) based on on-site visits plus follow-up contacts to update the on-site data.

I. ABRAXAS LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (Pennsylvania)

A. Program Context

The Cumberland County Probation Department and the Abraxas Foundation, Inc. of Pennsylvania was funded by BJA to develop a novel type of juvenile boot camp. Abraxas is a private treatment foundation that has operated a number of residential treatment facilities. The fifteen-week Leadership Development Program (LDP), designed for male youthful offenders between the ages of 14 and 18, was based on an experimental learning model which incorporates a wilderness stress challenge program (e.g., Outward Bound type program) with educational, life skills training, and substance abuse programming. The original grant proposal also indicated that an intensive aftercare component would be put in place once the youth graduated the institutional program and entered the community, which would be part of the program intervention. This would include supervision, case management services, and family interventions. This boot camp program was attractive to study not only because of its unique programming features, but also because it represented a joint venture between a public criminal justice organization and a private, nonprofit treatment provider.

The program site is located on the grounds of the South Mountain Restoration Center, South Mountain, Pennsylvania. Located within Michaux State Park, it is a very isolated and rural area near Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. The 72-bed facility is also close to the Appalachian Trail, which is used as the site of the wilderness-stress challenge program component. The facility, formerly a tuberculosis clinic, is a large complex that is currently being rented to Abraxas for $1 a year.

Like several of the correctional options grants awarded by the BJA, the Abraxas central office staff wrote the original grant proposal which established the basic parameters of the program. Local program staff were given much autonomy in modifying the program design and amending the original approach to make it operational. A strong team approach has been utilized in developing, implementing, and refining the program, and there is a clear sense of program ownership among the staff leaders.

Program modifications have moved the design from one that was considered too ambitious, bulky, detailed, and militaristic, to one that has emphasized educational, clinical, and wilderness stress challenge programming. The military components have been de-emphasized and are currently conceived as supplementing the core programming elements by providing added levels of program structure.

Abraxas' strategic plan is to replicate this program over the next three years in West Virginia, Ohio, and Washington, DC. The goal is to diversify Abraxas' program offerings and to create stable revenue streams in the face of impending state reductions in substance abuse treatment reimbursements. There have also been some discussions of expanding programming efforts at the current facility, perhaps even adding some secure juvenile beds if the state decides to privatize.

The program is designed to develop self-discipline, change irresponsible thinking, and create positive self-esteem among a serious delinquent population within a milieu that is physically, mentally, and morally challenging. It is hoped that by exposing youth to these interventions, recidivism rates would be lowered. It was also expected that the youth who would otherwise have been sent to the state's youth corrections system would be assigned to this program thus admissions to secure confinement.

V. Selection Process

The target population includes males between the ages of 14 and 18 with no more than one or two prior juvenile court adjudications. Program clients must have an IQ of at least 80, not be on psychotropic drugs, and not have a long or serious mental health history. Individuals convicted of arson and murder, and those who cannot meet the physical challenges of the program are not eligible for the program.

The LDP is a dispositional option for juvenile court judges throughout the state of Pennsylvania. Local probation officers most often initiate the process of having a juvenile sent to the LDP. Probation officer referrals are made to an Abraxas court liaison, who then reviews the court intake packet and conducts a screening. The screening involves an interview and completion of the Adolescent Personality Severity Index. This information, and a recommendation, is forwarded to LDP staff who make the acceptance decision. Upon a positive LDP decision, the sentencing judge makes the final disposition, and in most instances, the youth is sent to the LDP.

Abraxas staff are satisfied with the number and types of referrals they have been receiving. It is felt that most of the youth sent to the LDP would have been placed in secure or long-term residential placements if the program was not in place. This assumption warrants empirical examination. Most of the placements to date have been white juveniles (67%) of whom 71% have been adjudicated for a non-violent offense. Approximately 30% of the juveniles have a prior local juvenile commitment, and only one percent have ever received a prior state juvenile commitment. Slightly over 50% have violated probation immediately prior to their admission. The majority of the juveniles have self-reported alcohol and/or marijuana use, but only five percent have self-reported cocaine or heroin use. These profile data, in general, are

not consistent with that of a chronic, high-risk delinquent population. Staff acknowledge that the first class of the LDP represents the "cream of the crop". They are the "best" kids that could be found to "help get things going." This is realized in that 23 of the 24 youth in the first class of the LDP graduated the program.

Significantly, referrals are not being received nor solicited from the state's two large juvenile courts (Philadelphia and Pittsburgh) which further suggests that the LDP is not dealing with extremely delinquent youth. Interviews with cadets, however, indicate they would have been committed to a long-term, secure residential placement had they not agreed to being assigned to the LDP.

W. Program Interventions

Groups of 24 youth, referred from throughout the state, enter the program at a time. The 15-week program -- considered by staff to be the length of time necessary to establish a short-term, cost-effective program -- is composed of three five-week phases. The first emphasizes discipline, the second responsibility and leadership, and the last wilderness survival. Cognitive skills development and the establishment of a positive peer culture is the focus of program interventions across all phases. To a certain degree, a criminal personality model is endorsed and underlies program interventions. Experiential elements are emphasized, and includes a five-week Outward Bound type component. A military, regimented environment has been established. While the military emphasis is not geared to be an overriding element of the program, all staff and youths wear military fatigues throughout the program day (youths are not allowed any personal property except for pictures). Daily programming begins at 7:00 A.M. and runs till 10:00 P.M. on weekdays. The schedule is very flexible on weekends because of staff shortages, and this reflects a flaw in the program.

Abraxas has hired a very young and enthusiastic staff to administer the program. Many were recent college graduates who want to work with children, have an outdoor orientations, and exhibit strong interpersonal skills. The fact that Abraxas is a private corporation with relatively unconstrained control over hiring decisions has facilitated the hiring of a very energetic and committed staff. While the staff is very committed and enthusiastic, staff experience and qualifications are limited. The counseling staff tends to be paraprofessional without formal clinical training or certification. Although the facility director has a doctorate in Education, with extensive work experience in corrections, his staff does not include any trained mental health professionals. This may be partially explained by the nature of the targeted juvenile population (youth without major mental health needs) and the relatively low pay scales.

1. Physical Training

Each morning starts with outdoors formation that leads to calisthenics, drill, and ceremony exercises. Calisthenics and a run are also daily program features that occur after school. Much physical activity and exercise take place on the weekends. Recreational sport activities, outdoor survival skills, and mastery of a ropes course are also emphasized.

2. Educational Programming

Abraxas provides a full licensed private school staffed by 10 teachers. Classes run daily from 9:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M. and include history, math, English, science, reading, health, and physical education.

The educational staff share information with the clinical staff, and engage in joint programming efforts (e.g., Life Skills Curriculum). Weekly progress reports on each juvenile are submitted to the counseling staff and sometimes clinical staff participate in educational staff meetings. Thus, educational programming is viewed and operationalized as being more than teaching literacy and a basic educational curriculum -- it represents a holistic approach to learning that includes a survival and independent living skills curriculum. This is represented in the title of the educational programming structure: The Learning Center.

The Woodcock/Burns Learning Style Inventory is administered at intake, but post-tests are not administered. Based on the intake assessment, an individualized educational program is developed. A GED track and a public school track is in place. Towards the cadet's release date, the Educational Administrator works with the Continuing Care Supervisor in fashioning the educational component of a continuing care plan, and all educational files are forwarded to the youth's probation officer. The interviewed cadets uniformly praised the school's program and felt that the education they were receiving was much superior to that received in their public schools.

3. Chemical Dependency Program

The chemical dependancy program is not a distinct program component, but drugs and alcohol issues are featured in weekly group meetings. Specific substance abuse interventions appear limited and psycho-educational in nature.

4. Counseling Program

Group meetings of the entire class/platoon (24 youth) are held daily for one hour and range from issue groups that involve group problem identification and problem-solving to "week in review" groups that take a game approach to reviewing information and skills presented the previous week. There is also a smaller group comprised of six youth -- treatment teams -- that meets once a week for approximately one hour. This ongoing group is more therapy oriented than the larger daily group meeting. Individual counseling between each juvenile and his primary counselor is also offered on an as needed basis, with a minimum of one meeting per week.

5. Life Skills and Related Programming

A primary orientation of the program is to develop leadership skills among the youth. This is accomplished, at least partially, by designating ranks for the clients, with ranks being assigned on the basis of Phase completions. Youth with rank are asked to engage in leader functions, such as leading activities, yelling cadence during drills, etc. The interviewed youth spoke very positively about getting "stripes." Mock job interviews are also a part of life skills training.

6. Transition Programming

A Continuing Care Coordinator develops discharge plans for every program participant. The discharge plans are developed in conjunction with the youth, his primary counselor, and the youth's family. The wilderness stress challenge component is implemented during the last five weeks of the residential program. This interferes somewhat with the development of a strong reintegration process.

Discharge plan recommendations are targeted to both the juvenile and his probation officer. Most graduates enter a probation status upon release and the quality of aftercare received depends on the probation services offered by the jurisdiction in question. The Continuing Care Coordinator feels that some jurisdictions provide good aftercare in terms of having the youth receive needed community services, but in most instances probation officers are not skilled enough or do not have the time to engage in the desired, or needed, follow-up activities.

Abraxas has an aftercare program of its own called Supervised Home Services (SHS). The five counties that currently buy these services know that the children they send to the LDP will be in the SHS component upon their release. Abraxas is actively trying to market the SHS to other counties, and extend the continuing care component to as many LDP graduates as possible.

7. Program Disciplinary Mechanisms

Major disciplinary infractions (fights and serious assaults) have not occurred. Neither has an AWOL, despite the fact that the facility does not have a secure perimeter. Staff members are very pro-active in managing the cadets and try to solve problems before they erupt. Surprisingly, given the military orientation of the program, a demerit system has not been implemented.

Recycling of cadets who exhibit a lack of progress is one option. A special unit was recently created to handle the very incorrigible cadets (roughly five youth in the second class). This unit is called the IT squad (Intensive Treatment Squad), and placement in this squad results in more intensive supervision and treatment.

Group sanctions are sometimes applied, but these are not emphasized. Rather, confrontations based on negative behaviors and attitudes are common, and are often group-based. Passive restraints have been used infrequently (early in the program). This is done to de-escalate an acting out situation and is followed up by counseling and the placement of the cadet in his room. Interviewed cadets indicate that the control and sanctioning mechanisms in place are fairly and effectively applied.

8. Aftercare Intervention Program

Post-release services were not well developed. Program administrators are aware of this issue but have suggested that aftercare is a county function and that Abraxas will provide

aftercare services only to those counties that purchase their aftercare package. Of the 23 youth who graduated from the first platoon, only a few entered the Abraxas continuing care program. Currently, most of the graduates are from jurisdictions that require six months of post-release probation supervision, but there is no formal programming linkage with Abraxas or a continuity of care. The lack of continuing care is a concern among local program staff, and they would like to see a stronger marketing of the continuing care package to judges and probation officers, as well as an expansion in the number of continuing care counselors.

II. THE TWIN PINES RANCH (California)

A. Program Context

This six-month program is "designed to rehabilitate habitual juvenile offenders through a comprehensive treatment program, emphasizing a short-term, highly structured institutional program which utilizes a military-like milieu, followed by an equally intensive aftercare period of probation supervision." The Twin Pines Ranch is located in a very remote and rural area of Riverside County. High in the hills, this non-secure facility is a complex of barrack-styled structures, classrooms, vocational buildings, and a gymnasium, all built by former inmates.

Since implementation of the boot camp component, the site has been renamed the Twin Pines Juvenile Correction Academy because it was felt that the term "boot camp" does not adequately describe the program. Program staff distinguish this from what they regard as a traditional boot camp by likening it to a ROTC-model in which the military training and regimen is compartmentalized, rather than forming the total program environment. Program staff regard military training and regimen as one phase of the total program. While engaged in this phase, cadets are in uniform and during other parts of the day, they need not be. Drill instructors conduct the military training, but group counselors supervise other program activities. Military-style programming does not interfere with daytime academic classes and vocational training because it is run in the evenings in conjunction with various counseling programs. Thus, military training is used to promote order and discipline, but is not over-emphasized like in the majority of the more traditional boot camps.

The actual articulation of a "military academy," or school model, was made only after the federal grant was received and a local six-month planning process was undertaken. The planning process involved a committee of key program staff and stakeholders, who were hesitant about employing a full military model. They recommended an academy approach, and urged special precautions be taken to ensure no physical intimidation or verbal abuse of inmates take place.

The program was fully operational by September 1994, and the entire ranch population has been transitioned into the boot camp activities. The implementation process has been somewhat difficult. Some of the correctional counselors on staff were adamantly opposed to the boot camp component and continue to display resistance. Because of this situation, counselors could volunteer to become Drill Instructors (DI), and those with prior military experience tended to volunteer. Currently, of the 18 full-time counselors there are four in DI roles, and of the six full-time vocational staff, two are DIs. It has taken some time to develop the role of the DI viz-a-viz other staff, and role conflicts still persist. The DI role is limited to conducting inspections,

drill and ceremony, running the obstacle course, etc. Once these activities are completed, DIs are expected to perform other counseling duties. The DIs tend to feel that they are expected to work harder than the other counselors, and feel that the program would benefit if the military component was expanded to pervade the entire programming regime. Although a formal staff training program was not implemented due to time constraints, it may ameliorate staff conflicts.

Another implementation problem related to shortening the program length to six months from the average of nine to 12 months. In effect, compressing programming activities into a shorter time period requires very creative planning. This process has advanced well, but has resulted in some turbulence and staff morale problems. Many staff prefer that the program's duration be increased to its original length.

The entire transition process took place while juveniles were being processed through the original Ranch program. Thus, "ranch hands" -- the term for the juveniles in the pre-existing program -- were being mixed with the newer arrivals -- "cadets" -- for an extended period of time while the new program was being implemented. The entire conversion from one program format to another was very complicated and program inconsistencies linger.

Nearly all staff agree that the introduction of the boot camp component to the Twin Pines Ranch has resulted in a much stronger program. They note the emergence of a greater sense of order and discipline within the camp. This extends to staff behavior as well as to cadet behavior. The program day is now much more structured and the cadets seem to respond well to this situation. The wards follow directions better than in the recent past and tend to display more positive attitudes towards the program. The therapeutic potential of the environment, overall, has improved. Most staff indicate that the program reflects a good balance between a "boot camp" and a "treatment environment." Despite these perceived benefits, there can be some improvement in the articulation of the military program components and other program activities. Group processes of change can be better reinforced across program areas by de-emphasizing individual achievement and accenting team building processes. Greater levels of staff training, weeding out immature and inexperienced staff, and greater utilization of group-based change efforts within the platoon structures would be desirable, and would be a significant enhancement to the aftercare program.

The primary goal of this program was broadly stated as "rehabilitation." Staff believed that youth who were exhibiting the early signs of a delinquent career could be diverted into the boot camp program to correct or counter those social and psychological factors that were contributing to the youth's delinquent activities. It was also hoped that reductions in the number of youth being committed to either the California Youth Authority (CYA) or the county's own secure facilities for adjudicated youth would also be achieved. If this could occur in large enough numbers, one could argue that the program was averting costs to both the CYA and the county's own detention system.

B. Selection Process

The target population are mid-level, adjudicated delinquents, ages 15 to 18, who are failing to respond to community-based resources, yet who appear "treatable" in a residential

placement. Targets are not deemed appropriate for placement with the California Youth Authority. Twin Pines is viewed by the local judiciary as the last available local placement, short of state confinement, and is seen as a necessary intermediate sanction. The exclusionary criteria for Twin Pines placement are limited, and even those with histories of violence are allowed into the program despite statements in program documents to the contrary. Arsonists, those with a mental illness, and those that cannot be medically cleared for strenuous activity are excluded from the program. Targets include those who have a history of substance abuse, or high risk for abusing substances, and who voluntarily consent to participate in the program. The Juvenile Courts of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties are the referral sources.

Like most boot camps, the number of youth being admitted each year is relatively small. Between March 1994 and January 1995, a total of 172 cadets entered the program. While 78 cadets graduated (45%), a total of 55 cadets went AWOL, and 40 cadets were removed from the program (55% failure rate).

X. Program Interventions

The institutional program consists of four phases: pre-placement (one to two months prior to placement), introduction (Month 1), basic training (Months 2 to 4), and reentry (Months 5 to 6). Military oriented programming, including living unit maintenance, occupies 20 to 30 hours per week. Education takes 30 hours per week, vocational training takes 20.5 hours per week, individualized counseling -- including gang awareness and group therapies -- takes 10 hours per week, community service is six hours per week, and athletics occupies 10 hours per week. A comprehensive assessment of each youth is completed in the pre-placement phase and guides individualized program interventions. Cadets are involved in some form of structured activity for most of the 5:30 A.M. to 9:20 P.M. programmed weekday.

1. Education Programming

- A certified high school program is in place, with focus placed on acquisition of a high school diploma or GED. The school day is six hours, with one hour for vocational theory, two hours of classroom instructions, two hours of vocational education, and one hour of physical education. A competency-based curriculum is in place with the expectation that each cadet will achieve 60 credit hours in the six-month program (each credit received is based on successful completion of standardized tests). Special education and testing is available on an as needed basis. Three full-time credentialed teachers, an aide, and a part-time principal are employed through the Riverside Office of Education. Pre and post-tests were administered and indicate average students have grade level gains of 1.5 for reading, 1.4 for math, and 2.3 for language. During the 1993-94 academic year, 14 high school degrees and five GEDs were awarded.

2. Vocational Programming

Vocational training is offered in the following trades: building technology, automotive, masonry, culinary arts, plumbing/landscaping, and agriculture. Training is provided by a total of six skilled craftsmen in their respective vocations.

3. Counseling Program

A clinical staff of 1.5 full-time employees work through a cooperative effort with the Riverside County Mental Health Department to provide individual, group, and family psychotherapy to select wards in need of these services. This complements a staff of 18 correctional counselors. Each cadet is assessed during the pre-placement phase for individual needs. Teen parenting (one psycho-educational group per week with 12 cadets at a time), alcohol and drug abuse (a program the majority of cadets participate in, run by paraprofessional staff), gang awareness, and victim awareness groups are provided.

4. Allied Programming

A vision program and community service projects, including working with disabled children, working on county park projects, and athletic programs, are offered. An eight-hour furlough is awarded to each cadet at the completion of the basic training phase. Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings are held weekly, and Narcotics Anonymous (NA) meetings are held every two weeks at the ranch.

5. Reentry

The re-entry phase involves a collaborative effort between probation officers, school officials, and program therapists (one probation officer is physically housed at the ranch) to engage in discharge planning and preparation for aftercare probation. This phase begins by following each cadet's four-month behavioral and achievement evaluation, and continues until the cadet is discharged from the ranch. A reentry group meets one time a week for one hour. The reentry group is a mental health, psychotherapy group that utilizes reflective skills, support-confront techniques, cognitive-behavioral therapy, life redirection and planning techniques, and problem solving tools. All cadets also receive individual treatment one time per week and as needed.

6. Aftercare

After successfully completing the reentry phase, each cadet is closely supervised by a team of two probation officers for approximately six months. The probation officers are expected to administer random urine drug testing, develop job contacts in the community, monitor attendance in community counseling groups, have twice weekly face-to-face contacts, and develop family counseling contacts for each graduate. Failure in the community can result in placement back at Twin Pines.

The aftercare component as it currently exists is viewed by program staff as being deficient. Discussions have focused on creating aftercare groups for program graduates that include ranch staff as well as probation officers, and creating a halfway house program for graduates who have transitional living needs.

III. WORK ETHIC CAMP (Washington State)

A. Program Context

Washington State's Work Ethic Camp (WEC) is part of a larger correctional options program (also including a community track) for inmates sentenced to the Washington Department of Corrections. The camp, an alternative to traditional imprisonment that has the potential to result in significant cost savings to the Department of Corrections, reflects some of the essential characteristics of correctional boot camps. However, the program is a novel correctional innovation; it has moved away from a military model, and instead has adopted a workplace model. The camp focuses on creating an intensive employment environment for offenders that is integrated with vocational and educational programming. The mission of WEC is to "provide offenders the opportunity to develop a positive work ethic and crime-free lifestyle through a regimented program."

The emergence of WEC may represent a strong case study of how external political pressure for a punitive boot camp program was transformed by strong leadership in corrections, resulting in the development and implementation of an innovative program model. The following is a short synopsis of this process that illustrates why the development of the WEC program presents lessons for a better understanding of correctional innovation associated with the boot camp movement.

The WEC program is the result of a number of factors converging in the early 1990s that have implications for the entire boot camp movement. The primary impetus came from the State Legislature which wanted the Department of Corrections (DOC) to develop a boot camp program along traditional military lines. The Secretary of the DOC was fundamentally opposed to establishing a traditional boot camp program, but was under political pressure to do so. At the same time that the Secretary was trying to forestall pressure and persuade/educate legislators that boot camps are not desirable, he was heavily involved in crafting legislative bills that would allow the DOC flexibility in developing a desirable program. Legislation was passed in July 1993 authorizing the "work ethic camp." The original bill demanded that the program contain work (more than anything else the legislature wanted inmates to be busy) and education components. It did not contain language regarding substance abuse (SA) treatment, but after some negotiation, relevant SA provisions were included in the bill that was eventually enacted.

The legislation mandated that the program be operational by November of 1993, giving the DOC only a few months to develop and implement the program. A statewide planning group was created after the legislation was passed, to develop a fleshed-out program model. Most of the planning responsibility, however, was delegated to the newly hired Superintendent of the MacNeil Island Minimum Security Facility. This facility is composed of both the WEC and the pre-existing minimum security program (The Annex). Drawing on her own experience as an employment counselor, visits to other boot camps, and the literature, the new superintendent was responsible for developing the full program model. The resulting model satisfied the punitive demands of legislators -- a short-term political goal -- and simultaneously represented a true alternative to traditional prisons. This was apparent in the observations of relevant legislative

hearings which indicate that members of the Senate Subcommittee on Corrections are very favorably disposed to WEC.

While certain programming issues are apparent at the WEC, initial observations of the WEC indicate that sound offender programming efforts have been actualized. Staff perceptions of the program indicate that it goes "beyond the vengeance psychology that dominates." Public reaction to the program has also been positive. As one staff person revealed:

> "it has been well-received politically as well. There has been very positive media attention for the most part. The program is safer, more secure, and more orderly than most prisons -- it's a hell of a way to run a prison. It has even positively impacted the regular minimum security prison." (DOC staff interview, 1/17/95)

WEC, thus, represents a good case study of how external political pressure for a punitive boot camp program was transformed by strong leadership in corrections. This analysis reveals a positive and innovative program model that is now politically quite popular in that state despite its small numbers.

Program goals include providing a cost effective, sound alternative to traditional incarceration without compromising public safety. The program also seeks to provide a unique environment with programs that enhance the likelihood of long-term diversion from incarceration. This is done by providing structured programs, all oriented to work ethic development, that intend to provide offenders with the opportunity to develop a sense of self-discipline, self-control, and self-esteem.

There is a strong emphasis on the value of the work ethic concept. The WEC Superintendent described WEC as a "co-educational four-month program designed to frame your whole life experience, to develop behaviors that enable you to do the right and appropriate thing." She states that WEC's goal is:

> "to have inmates be able to work successfully by getting them hooked on the rewards associated with work. The notion is to socialize people into the world of work, to have them buy into the culture of work. This is done behaviorally, by teaching the inmates hundreds of little behaviors that turn into positive work habits."

If all of these goals can be realized, it was then hoped that recidivism rates could be reduced.

B. Selection Process

The enabling legislation prescribes those persons eligible for WEC. Judges can sentence individuals directly to WEC, within the Sentencing Guidelines, if the defendant had an original sentence length of 22 to 36 months. Individuals with a current or prior conviction for a sex or violent offense are ineligible for the program. The overall eligibility criteria makes it unlikely

that the WEC would result in net widening of the prison population. However, the relatively small size of the program as well as a substantial failure rate suggests the program can have minimal impact on overall population growth, crowding, costs, and recidivism. As of 1998, the program capacity was only 127 (including 27 beds for females), with average daily populations around 102 to 105. At the time of this analysis , 400 participants have entered the program. The average termination rate for program participants is 30%.

C. Program Interventions

The WEC shares an entire facility with a regular minimum security prison on MacNeil Island. There is much interaction among WEC and non-WEC staff and inmates. For instance, non-WEC staff supervise WEC inmates during the evenings and weekends, and WEC inmates work on labor crews with non-WEC inmates during months two through four. This dilutes and contaminates the ethos of the WEC. The remote physical location also promotes problems of accessibility to meaningful real-world work assignments and constrains dramatically the potential involvement of private industries.

Staff are taught to behave as employers, not guards, and to assist inmates to understand the links between behaviors and responses. Thus, the program is based on behavioral approaches that feature rewards for the exhibition of socially desirable behaviors, defined by what is considered appropriate behavior in the work place. Clearly, WEC has adopted a very different theoretical approach from most boot camps in its attempts to change offenders; yet it retains the regimented, highly structured, and intensive nature of correctional boot camp interventions.

All program participants are assessed for educational level, chemical dependencies, physical fitness, aptitudes, and skills. Based on initial assessments, individualized program plans are developed that are implemented within the constraints of a fairly rigid daily program schedule. Most of the non-work programming assignments take place during the late afternoons, evenings and weekends. Offenders are kept quite busy each week day with limited personal time allowed in the 5:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. program day.

Individuals are brought into the program as a group (the term platoon is not used) and go through four one-month phases together. Inmates get a stripe for passing each phase. Below are details on the four phases of the program.

1. Basic Work Skills and Job Training

As should be expected by the name and underlying philosophy of the program, work activities are the defining feature of the work ethic camp. Throughout the four-month program, inmates work from 6:30 A.M. to 2:30 P.M.. During the first month, offenders are assigned to island cleanup crews composed solely of WEC participants. They are supervised by one of three correctional officers who teach basic work habits and skills. Of all the WEC personnel, the correctional officers' tasks most closely resemble the functions of DIs. During this period, the work assignments change every three days in order to expose participants to a wide range of job learning experiences.

During months two through four, WEC inmates are assigned to one of 38 regular island work crews. They are mixed with minimum security inmates housed at the Island Annex and supervised by correctional staff that are not formally part of the WEC program. These work crews support all of the operations of MacNeil Island, including road repair, construction, painting, boat operations, etc. Most are menial jobs. This is a clear deficiency in the program, and one can easily argue that work activities are designed to support and maintain corrections operations on the Island as much or more than to provide WEC inmates with meaningful work experiences and training.

This criticism is blunted somewhat because, to the program's credit, the work ethic philosophy pervades all programming efforts at WEC and staff/inmate interactions. Classroom instruction activities, group counseling programming, and vocational programming efforts all revolve around real world work issues, concerns, and lessons. WEC staff/inmate interactions assume the nature of employer/employee roles, and reflect a marked departure from the Drill Instructor/inmate interactional patterns found in traditional boot camps. The level of interaction between staff and inmate is as extensive in the WEC program as in correctional boot camps, but appears much less confrontational. Interactional patterns are much more natural, less blatantly power-coercive, and perhaps more likely to result in attitudinal and behavioral changes that transcend the boundaries of the program setting.

2. Educational Programming

A contract is in place with a local community college for the provision of educational programming. A minimum of five teachers work with participants every evening and Saturday. These teachers also provide special programs on topics such as victim awareness. The teachers utilize the "I-CAN" curriculum, which is based on workplace scenarios.

The education focuses on helping students obtain a GED (if needed). Only 30% of the program participants already have a high school/GED degree upon program entry. By the program's end, 60% have obtained their GED and all participants have completed at least three of the five GED tests. Workplace math, reading, and writing skills are emphasized for all other clients.

The educational programming at WEC is very broad based, and borders on counseling. There are clearly life skill elements to the educational program. For instance, during the first two weeks, the focus is on anger and stress management. The second two weeks focus on "unlocking your potential" -- self-esteem development. The next eight weeks focus on career and life skills; "I-CANS" -- competencies based on work situations (e.g., budgeting, resumes). The last four weeks are devoted to transition programming -- identifying individual strengths and the ability to articulate those strengths -- developing community resources. The above programs all occur Monday through Friday. Weekends are devoted to basic skill classes -- GED and literacy. Those who need instruction for English as a Second Language (ESL), are provided relevant classes during the evening and all day Friday and Saturday.

3. Chemical Dependency Program

One full-time certified chemical dependency counselor is on staff to provide individual and group therapies. The chemical dependency counselor assesses all inmates when they first arrive. A substance abuse screening interview is done, and a variety of tests (MAST, DAST, Washington Alcohol Screening Inventory) are administered. PSI's, criminal histories, and driving records are also reviewed. The counselor then delivers treatment to those whose "chemical dependency is most closely aligned to criminality." It is estimated that 85% of the inmates are chemically dependent. "Moral reconation therapy" (MRT) is employed, which is similar to 12 step programs in many respects, to about 45 inmates at any one point in time. There are three separate process groups (therapy groups) that meet twice a week for two hours at a time. The counselor describes his approach as cognitive/behavioral therapy. Inmates in the treatment program are also required to attend two AA meetings per month. The educational component is an eight-hour program which provides an overview of substances. This component is required of the entire inmate population. Some individual counseling is also provided.

4. Life Skills and Related Programming

Life skills, anger/stress management, health and fitness, employment readiness (job interview skills, developing resumes, etc.) are taught throughout the program. Special two-day programs on parenting, family relationships, victim awareness, and interpersonal skills are also offered. Three correctional counselors are on staff that facilitate classes on current events and anger/stress management, above and beyond their more typical counseling duties.

5. Transition Programming

Development of viable release plans for each inmate is considered a key program component. Program emphases change during the course of the 120 days to reflect an increasing focus on transition needs as the participants near the program's completion date. Staff from the Division of Community Corrections are stationed at the camp two days a week to assist with the transition process. They coordinate releases with community corrections, review community housing options and plans, coordinate with INS for detainees, provide a workshop of the conditions of community supervision, and are to develop community follow-up mechanisms and documentation. The final two weeks of the program involve finalizing a release plan, assisting the offender with transition issues, and developing referrals for employment. Much of the transition programming is coordinated by the Transition Manager. The Transition Manager provides inmates with individual assessments and one-on-one counseling for career development. This staff person also develops transition packets including community resources for employment opportunities and supportive services, resume, tax credit information, federal bonding information, social security cards, and state identification. He or she registers inmates into the Employment Security Department's statewide Job Net system and directs job referrals to the offender. The Transition Manager also develops employment workshops focusing on topics such as employer expectations, interviewing skills, job retention and transition planning, and is also expected to follow-up once the offender is released into the community and track the offenders in community job placements.

6. Disciplinary Mechanisms

No physical punishments other than extra work duty are imposed at WEC. There is also very little yelling and "in your face" style behavior. All disciplines are directly related to the misbehavior, and geared toward teaching acceptable work behaviors. Discipline is used as a true "learning experience" (i.e., there is a heavy reliance on written and oral projects at WEC), much more than at other boot camps, even those that nominally use similar language to describe their disciplinary mechanisms. In a related vein, group accountability for individual misbehavior does take place but is not preferred or emphasized. Serious behavior problems will generally result in termination from the program, although recycling is an option. If no behavior improvement is evidenced in the first 30 days of the program, an inmate may be forced to restart the program.

7. Aftercare

Post-release services are not very well developed at this point. By statute, WEC graduates are intensively supervised. There is at least weekly contact between the graduate and his/her officer, with weekly urinalyses or breathalyser tests, and periodic monitoring by the officer of the offender's work and residential status. There is no continuity in care between the WEC and community supervision phases of the criminal sanction, however. Graduates are released throughout the state, and are distributed across the caseloads of individual community custody officers. There are no specialized caseloads, and minimal links exist between institutional and community-based programming. For instance, there has been no attempt to maintain group processes of change or to maintain the work ethic concept in the community. In addition, there's no mandated SA treatment during the aftercare period.

V. MARICOPA COUNTY'S AFTERSHOCK PROGRAM (Phoenix)

A. Program Context

Arizona's 120-day Aftershock program (Shock) became a sentencing option in 1988, and judges began to sentence cases to Shock in May of 1989. Shock is considered a diversion from prison for serious young offenders who are immature and in need of structure and discipline. The following eligibility criteria apply: the offender must

- Be between the ages of 18 and 25
- Never have been incarcerated in an adult prison
- Be granted Intensive Probation Supervision by the courts
- Have no obvious or known communicable disease
- Have no known physical or mental impairments which would prevent participation in physical activity

Shock fully endorses a military model that emphasizes hard work, physical training, and drill and ceremony as the primary program components -- it was modeled after Florida's Boot Camp. While an academic program (32 hours over the four months) and social skills program (said to employ rational motive therapy) is offered; practically no meaningful clinical, counseling, life skills, or vocational programming is offered. Shock represents a program unlikely by itself to generate meaningful or durable levels of offender change.

Intensive probation is required by statute for all Shock graduates. Probation services are provided by the county probation department in the offenders county of residence. Soon after Shock commenced, it became apparent that failure rates among the Maricopa County Shock graduates were very high -- revocation rates were as high as 50%. Over half of the revocations took place within 90 days of graduation. This resulted in more system overcrowding and suggested that the needs of Shock offenders were not being met by the existing intensive probation structure. In particular, offender problems appeared centered around lack of suitable housing, employment, and basic living skills.

As a result, in May 1991, the probation department unsuccessfully sought funding from the federal government for a transitional living center. At about the same time, the IPS staff in the county created a specialized IPS caseload for Shock graduates. Programming and surveillance are enhanced, and there is an effort to maintain some of the structure experienced in the boot camp. To foster continued cohesion among Shock graduates, group activities such as community service, athletics, and employment search efforts are structured for the Shock graduates.

In January 1992, probation staff collaborated with The New Day Educational Center, a local transitional living program, in seeking funds for an After Shock Transitional Center. External funding was not achieved, but with rent paid by the Shock graduates and assistance from the Center, the program was implemented in April 1992.

At the time of the BJA grant application, Maricopa County had only one specialized IPS Shock Team to supervise boot camp graduates from the county. The supply of graduates exceeded staffing abilities so specific restrictions were established on which graduates would enter the After Shock program. These included location of residence within the county and likelihood that those selected would benefit from the Transitional Living Center. Arsonists, sex offenders, and violent offenders are excluded from the Living Center. A probation staff member (Shock Coordinator) assesses each graduate from the Shock Program prior to graduation, and determines which graduates participate in the After Shock program. Shock graduates assigned to other IPS caseloads may be transferred to After Shock, if their situation suggests this would be an appropriate assignment.

In 1993, there were 119 Shock graduates from Maricopa who received intensive supervision (an 11% increase over 1992). The original grant proposal estimated that 196 new Shock graduates would be placed on intensive supervision during the 18-month grant period. Of these, 36% (70 offenders), were to be selected for the After Shock program.

This overview of After Shock's origins indicates that the program emerged slowly and as result of perceived inadequacies in existing aftercare services for Shock graduates. Most importantly, it must be emphasized that the program's emergence was driven by street level probation staff who had been working with the Shock offenders. Increased surveillance and services were being delivered without a formal program. There were no additional staff, funds or resources for them; the extras were being provided only because a few probation officers believed in their benefit and were willing to work long hours to deliver those services. As one staff member commented: "We were responding to a problem without a formalized process.

Only now is it beginning to become formalized." As another stated, ". . . with or without the grant, we would have some After Shock programming."

One major premise of the emerging After Shock program was the perceived necessity of maintaining group cohesion (started in the boot camp) among Shock graduates. Probation officers began running After Shock meetings on Wednesday nights. This would allow the graduates to get together and talk about common problems. On many occasions, Drill Instructors from the boot camp would donate time and attend the meetings to enhance the support function of the meetings. Group activities then expanded to Friday nights and revolved mainly around recreational events. Saturdays were devoted to community service projects, at which Shock graduates would work alongside probation officers. Then, job searches took on a team approach: Groups of Shock participants and probation officers would seek jobs together. These efforts proved quite effective, with most persons finding employment. Employers are beginning to view Shock graduates as reliable and hard-working individuals. The graduates realized this was happening, and their commitment to the group encouraged them not to jeopardize employment prospects of their peers. Finally, probation staff realized that suitable and supportive housing arrangements were lacking for a good number of Shock participants. Thus, the search for a transitional housing facility.

This staff-driven process, in which service delivery efforts were incrementally added to the foundation of intensive probation supervision, reflects the following view of the change process among program participants:

> "Boot camp is the start. It strips down the offender, takes down their defenses; and they become ready for change. The After Shock program builds them back up . . . puts on the finishing touches. It helps give them the individual skills they need to survive." (After Shock staff member).

Since 1992, 677 Maricopa residents have been sentenced to Shock. About 75% of the screening for Shock in Maricopa result in a sentence to the program. Among those who have entered Shock, 51% have graduated from the program (346). The remaining have left for disciplinary reasons (34%), medical reasons (13%), or have been removed for other administrative reasons (2%).

The Maricopa County Probation Department was awarded a $1 million BJA grant in 1993 to develop the Youthful Offender Program (YOP), a program designed to fill gaps in the existing continuum of sentencing options for youth ages 16 to 25. YOP's two program components include a Day Reporting Center Furlough program designed to divert jail inmates from a minimum jail stay of 30 days, and an After Shock Transition program designed to provide a smooth transition back into the community for cases successfully exiting the Shock Incarceration Boot Camp program.

The original grant application stated that grant funds would be used to develop three Day Reporting Centers for probationers discharged from boot camp and for early releases from the Maricopa County Jail. An estimated 350 youthful offenders ages 16 to 25 were expected to

participate in the jail furlough program and 70 graduates from the Arizona DOC boot camp were expected to participate in the After Shock Program.

The focus of this site summary is the After Shock Program. Despite this limited scope, observations of functioning program indicate that the YOP has been utilized in a manner that well exceeds the common boundaries of correctional options efforts. In particular, the program illustrates the tremendous potential benefits of community corrections endeavors that foster strong partnerships with local citizens. Probation staff appear to be true community-based advocates and assistance providers for their clients.

The YOP has been used to develop linkages between the Probation Department and local citizens. For instance, the Day Reporting Centers open their doors and programming efforts to the local citizenry. The YOP's literacy program, in particular, seems widely used by non-probation populations. The buildings and the programs within them, are marketed to the public as community resources and can be used by anyone who can benefit from them. Public reaction has been very positive as the Day Reporting Centers have had a positive impact on the neighborhood.

B. Selection Process

The Arizona Shock Incarceration program is for individuals 18 to 25 years old. Most of the Maricopa Shock participants are in the lower end of this age range; very few have been 24 or 25 years old. About six or seven new cases arrive to After Shock each month. This represents about half of the Maricopa County graduates from Shock. All graduates are considered high risk, so placement in After Shock is based on need. Staff indicated that those with housing and substance abuse needs are sought out, and probationers from Central Phoenix are given priority. Some staff, however, stated that most Shock graduates are eligible for After Shock and that they self-select into the program. Clearly, admission criteria are unclear, and actual practices may be quite varied and unstandardized.

An After Shock Probation Officer (PO) screens eligible cases prior to sentencing and makes a recommendation for Shock before sentencing is imposed. Interviews with indicated personnel show that most probation officers believe the Shock offenders would have been sent to prison had Shock not been available.

C. Program Interventions

Upon entry into the After Shock program, a Case Management Plan is prepared by the supervising PO based on risk and need factors. Cases are under the house arrest and supervisory requirements of IPS. Length of stay generally spans 90 days or more. Successful stay in the program results in transfer to another IPS caseload for supervision.

After Shock teams include two surveillance officers and one probation officer. Team staff are encouraged to interact extensively and to support community service, recreation, and

employment searches as a team. There are currently two distinct After Shock caseloads, one for offenders who are not in the transitional living component (about 30 offenders) and the other for those in residence at the Living Center (maximum of 28). The total caseload is generally between 40 and 50, with an attempt to have no more than 25 probationers on either caseload.

Phase 1 requires four face-to-face contacts per week by *each* of the two surveillance officers (total of eight contacts). A house arrest policy is in effect throughout this time. Someone with a drug history will also receive random urinalyses at the officer's discretion. Phase 2 requires two face-to-face contacts per week and Phase 3 requires one face-to-face contact per week. Expected contacts are the sole responsibility of surveillance officers. A separate probation officer manages community service requirements while a court clerk monitors restitution orders.

The BJA grant money was also used to provide additional resources to the Shock graduates and to provide closer, more long-term, and more specialized supervision. Included in the grant appropriations were funds for four federally funded surveillance officers (DASO IIs), which comprise half of the required probation staff for the Day Reporting Center program. Within After Shock, each surveillance officer is paired with a PO to provide "team supervision." DASOs spend most of their time on the streets, providing surveillance and supervision; while the POs usually work out of Garfield House. One additional DASO II was recruited to develop, coordinate, and supervise probationer community restitution projects. Two staff were hired for clerical support and two full-time educational instructors were hired to provide instruction at the Literacy Center. Funding is also available for 12 urinalyses per client, for intensive outpatient chemical dependency counseling, and vocational and employment services.

Program interventions include community restitution, community service, educational/vocational activities, general and substance abuse counseling, and random urinalyses. The After Shock component provides transitional housing for the neediest cases. The After Shock component also emphasizes community service, athletics, and job search skills. There is a strong emphasis on the use of existing community services.

1. Chemical Dependency Program

A private drug treatment firm was contracted to provide Shock participants with treatment programming -- Mountain Valley Counseling Associates, Inc. They have implemented a 11-week outpatient program that takes a cognitive/behavioral and psycho/educational approach to drug treatment. Some similar elements to the 12-step model have been incorporated into the program though this is not a designated program philosophy. Since May 1994 when the grant was implemented, the program is delivered by a full-time, certified substance abuse counselor. He works with Shock participants and any other offender at the Day Reporting Center who seeks his services.

All individuals from Shock are screened and assessed with the Addiction Severity Index when they enter the program. The counselor reports less than five percent of the clients do not exhibit some trace of substance abuse problems. As a group, they need this type of intensive intervention. He indicates that while few Shock offenders exhibit full-blown alcoholic

personalities (10%), most are poly-substance abusers (80-85%), with speed and alcohol as the preferred substances of abuse.

2. Counseling

The core of the program for most Shock participants is primary group counseling. Each client is required to complete a total of 33 groups (11 weeks, three times per week, two hour sessions). Primary group members are also expected to attend three outside Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous (AA/NA) meetings per week. The counselor seeks stability in group membership. Upon completion of the primary group counseling phase, offenders enter the aftercare phase. Two-hour sessions offered once a week, are required for 12 weeks. It is also expected that during the aftercare phase, Shock participants attend AA/NA meetings twice weekly. Individual counseling is also a program component. Biweekly sessions are held, and the contract specifies up to six sessions per client. Further sessions can be provided if need is shown.

It appears that a bona fide chemical dependency program has been implemented. The SA counselor reports that the probation staff have been very supportive of the CD program. For instance, scheduling conflicts are generally resolved in favor of the program. He feels comfortable with the length and intensity of the program and reports that exit interviews with clients indicate a very favorable client response to the program. While suggesting that the facility does not truly represent a therapeutic environment and some staff are not the best of role models (foul language, overly-friendly behavior with the probationers), the counselor's general impression is that the program has positive impacts on the clients.

3. Transitional Living Program

This program component is found in one wing of the Garfield House, and has the capacity to house up to 28 Shock participants. It is designed to be a "temporary, safe place for Shock graduates to reside, find employment, and return to the community, being self-sufficient." While in residence, most of the individuals work during the day and participate in programming during the evening (education, chemical dependency). There are separate probation staff (called Judicial Administrators) who are the house managers (a total of six staff). The facility is fairly Spartan, and most of the work done to refurbish the building has been done by the residents. Unfortunately, there are no funds available for capital improvement/development.

The "Shock House," as it is called, accepts anyone about to graduate the boot camp. A probation officer, who has been in contact with the participants since their referral to Shock, informs them about the program. Everyone from Maricopa County is offered the residential program, and entry is self-selected. To date, lack of space has not caused anyone to be turned away; a waiting list has not been necessary. The goal is to have a resident stay no more than 90 days, but some have stayed up to six months (due to dependency problems in some cases).

The residential component is not strictly administered. Although an operations manual and house rules have been formalized, there appears to be need for more clarity on expectations.

From an institutional perspective, operations could be clarified considerably (e.g., allowable length of stay, termination procedures, basic security measures).

4. Employment Services

In addition to the Job Developer (federally funded to help Shock participants set up savings accounts, engage in financial planning, and broker jobs), all of the probation staff -- including surveillance officers -- have given priority to the goal of finding work for their clients. They actually go to prospective employers and try to create jobs for the Shock graduates. They have been very successful: at the time of the site visit, all of the individuals on one caseload were employed the previous week. During a probation ride-a-long, it became quickly apparent that the probation staff had been able to get help from a number of large companies (primarily construction and manufacturing) that were willing to hire groups of Shock graduates. For instance, three graduates who were living together all worked for the same employer, and another Shock participant was working for a company that regularly hired from these groups.

Another illustration of probation's commitment to employment for participants in aftercare is that POs will provide transportation to work sites if the individuals have no other transportation.

5. Educational Programming

A strong educational program is present at all three Day Reporting Centers. Termed literacy centers, 15 certified teachers work across the three sites and offer daytime ESL and GED classes and a nighttime ESL class (all open to the public). The Centers are all well equipped with computers, software programs, and written instructional material. BJA funds have been used to hire a Life Skills Educator, who presents a six-week parenting program (soon to be offered in Spanish as well). The Educational Program Coordinator has received grants for these programs ($50,000 from Department of Education and $115,000 from Department of Economic Security).

All Shock program participants have their educational records sent from the Shock facility to Garfield House. Based on these records and an initial assessment (e.g., Test of Adult Basic Education - TABE scores), an individualized educational plan is developed -- ranging from pre-Literacy to GED preparation. An educational curriculum is prepared for three months at a time, and both individualized tutoring and classroom instruction is available. Students are in educational programming 2.5 hours per day four days a week. On Saturdays, they participate in life skills class for two hours (over a six-week period) and a parenting course for two hours (provided without federal funding). At the time of the site visit, no Shock graduates were in ESL, but all were either in life skills or GED. The overall GED passing rate for the YOP program is 85%. Unfortunately, there is no standardized post-testing on TABE scores.

While the educational program is quite strong, the life skills program could be enhanced. This is currently limited to a three-hour session on writing a resume. The Educational Coordinator would like to see the implementation of a vision and learning disability screening process, more cognitive skills development, some vocational programming, and a Family Literacy program.

6. Community Linkages

As discussed earlier, After Shock is well integrated into the local community. Judicial support for Shock and After Shock appears very strong (based on interview with one local judge), although judicial knowledge of actual programming efforts appear limited. The After Shock program is well coordinated with the DOC Shock program. No major organizational rivalries are apparent -- DOC staff and probation staff work closely together to aid the transition from Shock to After Shock. The senior probation officer who screens individuals for After Shock and manages all program transitions has gone through the Academy for Shock training, and another After Shock PO worked at Shock as a correctional counselor.

VI. INDIANA JUVENILE CAMP SUMMIT

A. Program Context

Indiana's Department of Corrections, Juvenile Division developed a boot camp program for youthful offenders as a response to the growing concern about increasing rates of juvenile crime. On April 6, 1995, the Indiana Department of Corrections began receiving juvenile male offenders into Camp Summit in La Porte, Indiana. Camp Summit is a self-contained juvenile facility that houses adjudicated juveniles who have been classified as minimum or medium custody. The program is based on the "Normative Model" which clearly establishes expectations and norms for those involved in the program. The daily routine is tightly structured and incorporates physical activity and academics, as well as classes in life skills, military protocol, and military type ceremonies.

Similar to most boot camps, the program is relatively small with a capacity to house three sets of platoons of 14 recruits, for a total of 42 program slots at any given time. It is located in the rural area of La Porte in Northern Indiana. It is an isolated area surrounded by farmland. Camp Summit is a self-contained facility with adequate space to facilitate all activities on its camp grounds.

The Camp Summit's boot camp program listed the following seven goals: (1) divert appropriately selected youth from further criminal activity; (2) provide a program of physical training and challenge, which will elevate self-esteem and increase perceptions of self worth; (3) provide a military model which includes drill, ceremony, and a regimen to provide self-discipline, team building, and a sense of community living; (4) provide a program of personal development which includes basic skills needed to function effectively in society; (5) provide education and guidance directed toward personal growth; (6) develop standards and measurements designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the program; and (7) provide follow-up support as the youth move through a less structured phase of the program.

B. Participant Selection

Participant selection for Camp Summit is determined by the Indiana Department of Corrections once the youth has been committed to the agency by the juvenile court. A classification officer at the reception center makes the initial recommendation based on a general criteria list established by the agency. The preferred initial selection process looks for first-time non-violent male offenders. In addition, all participants in the program must have a current

residence in three counties which are geographically close to the boot camp program and that can provide aftercare services.

Once initial eligibility has been established, a risk and needs assessment is completed on each potential Camp Summit applicant, as well as a Camp Summit Evaluation form. The checklist requires a check on each of the following factors:

1. Does the offender fall between cells seven and 12 on the risk assessment scale (low risk)?
2. Is the offender on any medication currently?
3. Did the offender score about 70 on the Helmon-Nelson inventory?
4. Does the offender have a signed medical clearance form from the doctor in his medical packet? (If no, please see that one is completed)
5. Can the offender return home upon his release?
6. Does the offender have a history of psychiatric treatment or medications?
7. Is the offender between the ages of 13 and 16?
8. Is the offender able to understand and follow basic staff direction?
9. Does the offender have any significant health issues in his past?
10. Is the offender a recommitment to the DOC?
    If yes, was he at Camp Summit previously?
11. Is the offender recommitted from and living in either Marion, Allen or St. Joseph's county?
12. Is the offender recommended for Camp Summit either by his clinician or the county?
13. Does the offender want to go to Camp Summit?

Some of the items on this instrument are not required to carry a certain answer for placement into the Camp Summit program. For example, repeat offender and repeat program participants can be admitted to the program. Once all factors are weighed, the classification officer recommends placement into the program.

C. Program Interventions

Camp Summit receives 14 new youth every 30 days and each group remains in the program for 90 days. The 90 days are divided into three phases, which designate the stages of growth for the participants: recruit, cadet, and senior. After each 30-day phase is over, each participant is tested and evaluated to see if he can progress to the next phase of the program. If an individual has not passed the test or evaluation, he is kept at the same phase of the program until he is able to meet the qualifications for movement forward to the next phase. The intent of the program is to provide a safe, secure, and supportive environment for the youth while assisting them in their personal growth and development. It is hoped that this will lead to their re-integration with family, school, and community.

In accordance with the goals set for the program, the boot camp maintains a highly structured daily routine which emphasizes military structure and decorum, physical fitness, academic education, life skills, peer group resolutions, and individual challenge.

1. Physical Training

The physical training component of the program was designed to give the youths a sense of accomplishment and heighten their self-esteem. The physical training has various components including, an obstacle course, running, and strength training. Each person who enters the boot camp goes through a fitness assessment testing their level of fitness and skills at the time of intake, during each phase of the program, and then again at the time of release to monitor progress.

2. Work Details

Each person in the Camp Summit program is given a work detail that they are responsible for completing each day, which ranges from cleaning the kitchen to doing laundry.

3. Education

Camp Summit provides an educational program that includes English, Math, and Social Studies. The academic courses are covered during a three-hour time span in the morning. Students are encouraged to strengthen their Math, English, and Social Studies skills so they can either return to school to complete their high school degree, or attain their GED. Two of the downfalls of the educational component of the program are that it is not accredited, and (as there are only two separate classrooms) there is a mix of skill levels within each group that makes it harder to target the individual learning needs of each child.

4. Life Skills

The life skills course addresses substance abuse, health and nutrition, and family living. The goal of this aspect of the program is to help reintegrate the youth back into society armed with healthy habits and new and improved coping skills.

5. Aftercare

Upon completion of the boot camp program, the youths are required to participate in an aftercare program in the community. The aftercare program was designed for youth who were in need of limited supervision, skill enhancement, and community service, but did not require full, 24-hour supervision. At the time of the evaluation of Camp Summit, there were eight aftercare programs, six of which were privately operated and two operated directly by IDOC. In total these eight programs had a capacity to support 175 youths' transition back into society.

The aftercare program provides educational services (including remedial education and tutorial assistance), counseling, a community service site, job training, and recreation. Youth are required to check-in and participate in the program activities once a day, either in the morning or the evening depending on their outside activities (school or employment schedules). The juvenile's parent(s)/care-givers are strongly encouraged to participate in this process, and they are considered an essential component of the aftercare program. At the inception of the program, the aftercare component had difficulty developing contracts with private providers to deliver

aftercare services. Over time, the ability of these agencies to provide services improved significantly.

VIII. OREGON ADULT SUMMIT PROGRAM

A. Program Context

Established in 1994, Oregon's SUMMIT Boot Camp Program was designed as an alternative to traditional incarceration for adult offenders. SUMMIT is an acronym for "Success Using Motivation, Morale, Intensity, and Treatment," which describes the overall mission of the program. The program operates within a military style framework, which is designed to encourage self-control, self-discipline, and teamwork. The key features of the program include, education, cognitive retraining, substance abuse treatment, and work squads.

SUMMIT has program capacity to house 150 males and 16 females, for a total of 166 program slots. The facility is located in North Bend Oregon at Shutter Creek Correctional Institution.

B. Selection Process

Program participants are admitted into the program on a voluntary basis under the recommendation of Oregon's Department of Corrections. Oregon's Department of Corrections has a set of criteria that offenders must meet in order to be considered eligible for the program. Offenders must be 18 years of age or older, although individuals under the age of 18 are considered for the program if they have been convicted of a crime upon remand from juvenile court. Potential clients must be assigned to minimum custody status and have no more than 36 months to serve at the start of the boot camp platoon cycle. Inmates convicted of the most serious crimes [including: manslaughter, kidnaping, sex crimes (rape, sexual abuse, sodomy, incest, contributing to the sexual delinquency of a minor), arson, and robbery] are not eligible for boot camp.

In order to be accepted into the program, inmates must submit request in writing to participate. The request letter must include a signed statement that they are physically and mentally able to withstand the rigors of the program and that they have reviewed the program description and agree to comply with each of the program requirements. Program slots are offered to eligible inmates whose offense history is reflected by the selection priority scale. Priority is given to individuals who are United States citizens who have no prior felony convictions, whose current offense is drug related or statutory, and whose risk assessment is minimum. Inmates with the least time served on their current commitment are first offered the opportunity to participate in the SUMMIT Program.

C. Program Interventions

The SUMMIT boot camp program operates within two distinct phases. Offenders are required to spend six months at the boot camp, followed by transitional leave and an aftercare program which is supervised by parole officers. Offenders are admitted into the program in

platoons of 60, and each offender is committed to the institution for a period of 26 weeks. There are four major program features of the SUMMIT program: education, cognitive retraining, substance abuse treatment, and work squads. The program operates on a tight schedule seven days a week; inmates are required to start their day at 5:30 A.M., and they have scheduled activities throughout the day until lights are out at 9:30 P.M. The inmates' days are composed of a variety of activities that start with physical training, and include participating in work squads, program classes, community meetings, drills, ceremonies, and extensive memory exercises.

Although SUMMIT operates within a military style framework, the core of the program rests on the development of a therapeutic community that is based on the idea that changing thinking results in a change of behavior. The cognitive retraining component of the program is an essential aspect of the overall programming goals. The cognitive retraining programming pools together several different cognitive approaches for maximum efficacy. Inmates are encouraged to examine their belief systems and make necessary changes in their thinking to foster better decision making. A variety of topics are addressed, including communication, job readiness, anger management, team building, time management, and problem solving. The program also includes personal health and spiritual awareness programming. The overall goal is to make the offenders reevaluate their place in society and change their behavior patterns to reflect positive values.

1. Physical Training

The inmates are required to participate in physical training once a day, seven days a week. The physical training aspect of the program is designed to help stimulate better self-awareness and a sense of achievement.

2. Work Squad

Three days a week, inmates work off-site performing community service and labor for nonprofit agencies under the supervision of correctional work crew supervisors. The work done in the community in work squads is believed to build cooperative work experience, time management skills, teamwork, and pride in accomplishments.

3. Educational Classes

The educational component of the program is designed to increase the inmates' cognitive and practical skills. Each inmate's intellectual abilities are tested, and follow-up modules are designed to enhance learning abilities. Basic education classes are offered approximately 13 hours a week, and inmates (those who dropped out of high school) are encouraged to work toward their GED certificates, computer skills, and written resume's.

4. Substance Abuse Classes

Alcohol and drug abuse services entail approximately 12 hours of education classes, discussion groups, and a 12-step meeting. This aspect of the program highlights concepts of alcohol and drug addiction, recovery planning, and the social and physical effects of addiction.

5. Community Meetings

In an effort to facilitate a sense of community among the inmates, community meetings are held daily. The meetings are facilitated by staff members, and inmates take turns leading the discussions. During these meetings, inmates discuss their progress and testify as to what works for them. They are also encouraged to report on progress that they see in others. Community issues that affect the general inmate population are brought up and discussed in an effort to create a more productive environment.

6. Drills and Ceremonies

During the course of the day inmates are required to move about the facility in formation, either in squads or platoons. In an effort to motivate the proper formation cadences are used, which are mostly created by the inmates with approval from the program manager and drill sergeant.

7. Aftercare

After the initial 120 days of boot camp participation, the inmates are required to complete 90 days of intensive supervised transitional leave in the community. If for any reason the inmate goes against the rules of conduct, he is subject to being returned to the boot camp. Inmates who successfully complete both phases of the program receive an average reduction of 311 days off their original sentence. Because the program is rigorous, many of the inmates are not able to complete the program. Those that fail to complete the program are transferred to traditional correctional facilities to complete the rest of their sentence.

IX. ILLINOIS ADULT BOOT CAMP

A. Program Context

Consistent with other jurisdictions, Illinois developed a correctional boot camp in response to a growing prison population. Between June 30, 1983 and June 30, 1990, the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) adult prison population doubled (from 13,735 to 27,295 inmates), requiring numerous bed space construction projects. With the realization that the increase was influenced largely by youthful lower-level drug offenders, the IDOC considered the correctional boot camp, an option that was then gaining national attention.

The Illinois governor and General Assembly enacted legislation to operate a correctional boot camp on August 20, 1990. Accordingly, the IDOC implemented its first boot camp program, termed the Impact Incarceration Program (IIP), two months later (October 15, 1990). Since then, the program's statutory eligibility criteria and aftercare supervision policy have been altered. However, a strong focus on rehabilitative programming, which served as an original defining characteristic of the program, remains in the forefront of IIP operations.

The IDOC currently operates three IIP sites with a total capacity of 670 beds. The initial IIP site gradually has increased capacity from 210 beds (200 males, 10 females) to its current

capacity of 270 beds (220 males, 50 females). The second and third IIP sites were established exclusively for male inmates in March 1993 and August 1994, respectively, each having a 200-bed capacity.

IIP-eligible inmates are screened at a reception and classification (R&C) center, for a period of usually up to two weeks. Under ideal circumstances, their contact with traditional inmates is limited. However, at times, there has been a backlog of IIP-approved inmates waiting for boot camp slots. This has resulted in establishing pre-IIP holding sites within isolated housing units at traditional prisons, enhancing potential exposure to traditional inmates.

The IDOC notes that when a backlog of IIP-approved inmates evolves, the IIP-denial rate increases. Because IIP-eligible inmates are primarily nonviolent offenders, their expected time to serve is relatively short. The traditional prison and regular supervision option becomes a viable alternative to the potential rigors of boot camp and subsequent electronic monitoring as the IIP-approved inmate's release becomes more imminent. Also, IIP-approved inmates discover the lengthy wait before entering the program (after expecting to be admitted immediately after R&C processing) and become discouraged. These factors increase the likelihood of refusing to enter the boot camp or acquisition of disciplinary infractions while awaiting transfer. To combat the backlog, the second IIP site was established. The third IIP site was opened to alleviate a potential backlog of IIP-approved inmates sentenced under modified statutory eligibility criteria which had potential for increasing the IIP-eligible pool.

All three IIP sites are satellite facilities located several miles from their parent facilities, thereby limiting contact with traditional inmates. One site is located in southern Illinois in the Shawnee National Forest, another is located in west-central Illinois near the Mississippi River, and the other is located on State Fairgrounds property. Daily, each site serves a visible role in community projects of the surrounding rural areas. During the flooding of the Mississippi River in 1993, the program garnered national attention in *The New York Times* and on CBS's "48 Hours" for labor services provided to assist flood relief.

B. Participant Selection

Selection for the IIP is a bifurcated process whereby a judge must recommend an eligible offender in the sentencing order, and the IDOC screens the inmate according to statutory eligibility criteria for the final placement decision. Ideally, this bifurcated process will limit net-widening, while reserving valuable prison bed space for more serious offenders. Originally the statutory eligibility criteria primarily targeted nonviolent first-time offenders. However, as the IIP received considerable recognition and preliminary evaluation findings were positive, the criteria were modified by statute on August 20, 1993 to increase the number of eligible offenders. Briefly, paraphrased from the Illinois Compiled Statutes 730 5/5-8-1.1, an eligible offender must: (1) be not less than 17 years of age nor more than 35 years of age[1]; (2)

[1] Prior to the expanded statutory eligibility criteria, the limitation was between 17 and 29 years of age.

not have served more than one sentence of imprisonment for a felony in an adult correctional facility[2]; (3) be serving a sentence of eight years or less[3]; (4) be able to participate in strenuous physical activities or labor; (5) not have any mental disorder/disability that would preclude participation; (6) not be serving (or have served) a sentence for the conviction of a Class X felony (first or second degree murder, armed violence, aggravated kidnaping, criminal sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual abuse or a subsequent conviction for criminal sexual abuse, forcible detention, or arson); (7) provide written consent indicating program participation; and (8) not have a history of escape or absconding (any outstanding warrants or detainers), or pose a safety or security risk to any person (as determined by the IDOC).

Through June 30, 1998, 13,058 inmates had been admitted to the IIP. Of this number about two thirds had successfully completed the boot camp program (8,943 or 69%) while one third had failed to complete it (3,509 or 27%). A participant can be removed if he or she voluntarily terminates participation, commits a major disciplinary rules infraction, or commits a series of minor disciplinary rules infractions indicating noncompliance with program guidelines. Of the 3,509 failures, 2,271 (65%) were voluntary and 1,238 (35%) were involuntary terminations.

In accordance with the eligibility requirements described above, court-recommended offenders may be denied IIP participation. Through June 30, 1998, 6,149 inmates had been denied participation for one of the following six reasons: refusal to consent voluntarily, not meeting instant offense or offense history criteria, outstanding warrant or detainer, escape risk, medical or psychological problem, or voluntarily 'quitting' or committing a disciplinary infraction while awaiting transfer to the IIP.

C. Program Interventions

During the planning and implementation of the IIP, IDOC staff visited correctional boot camp sites located in New York, Michigan, and Georgia. Also, an evaluator for a National Institute of Justice (NIJ) sponsored study of correctional boot camps toured the IIP facility making suggestions and recommendations regarding program design. These site visits, along with a document review of correctional boot camps operating nationwide, assisted with the development of the IIP, providing impetus for structuring the program into three core components: (1) physical activity and military regimentation; (2) program services; and (3) gradual post-release community integration. Combined, these components promoted public safety and lawful behavior, the two stated IIP goals.

The IIP was designed around a basic military training model, stressing a highly structured routine. Order and discipline are instilled through military regimentation, physical training, and

---

[2] Prior to the expanded statutory eligibility criteria, entrance into IIP was limited to offenders serving their first adult felony incarceration.

[3] Prior to the expanded statutory eligibility, only inmates sentenced to a term of imprisonment of five years or less were placed into the IIP.

labor over a 120-day period of active participation.[4] Similar to other "second generation" correctional boot camps, the IIP also incorporates extensive residential program service elements.[5] A 90-day electronic monitoring aftercare component follows the in-program phase.

1. Physical Activities and Military Regimentation

One of the core features of the IIP is its incorporation of activities involving physical fitness and labor. Typically, as in numerous correctional boot camps operating nationwide, the IIP emphasizes training in military bearing, drill, and formations. The physical activities include exercise (i.e., calisthenics and running) and labor-intensive work details (i.e., IIP grounds and facility cleanup, community service projects, highway cleanup, and brush cutting).

2. Substance Abuse

The IIP is the only state correctional boot camp program that offers multilevel drug treatment. Subsequent to assessment, each inmate is classified into treatment programming based on individual need. Both education and treatment aspects are included.

(a) Substance Abuse Education. Each inmate receives two weeks of substance abuse education services. During this time, inmates discuss communication and daily living skills. Further, they learn to identify and distinguish between the different types of drugs and their effects.

(b) Intensive Therapy Groups. These groups include up to ten weeks of participation in both group and individual therapy. A variety of topics are discussed and include, for example, the twelve steps of AA/NA, stress management, decision making, co-dependency, communication, and effective parenting. Upon an inmate's release from the IIP contracted substance abuse treatment staff provide referrals for continued treatment.

3. Education

During orientation, each inmate is administered a Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) to assess school placement while at the IIP. An objective of the education element is to increase educational level, with an ultimate goal of obtaining a General Equivalency Degree (GED). Instruction is provided in five general areas including mathematics, science, English, literature

---

[4] According to statute, an inmate's period of active participation may be extended up to an additional 60 days based on institutional adjustment, health issues, etc.

[5] According to Gransky, Castellano, and Cowles (1995), second generation programs are those that transitioned from a basic military program to a more therapeutically oriented regimen.

and arts, and social science. Through June 30, 1998, 1,871 inmates had taken the GED examination, with 1,634 inmates receiving a passing score (87.3%).

The education element includes life skills instruction in self-esteem improvement, health awareness, employment preparedness, and financial planning. An objective of this instruction is to instill a positive value structure and knowledge base prior to the inmate's return to the community.

4. Pre-release Preparation

Each IIP inmate also participates in pre-release preparation program services. The curriculum covers pursuit of educational and employment opportunities, and issues in community reintegration. During these sessions, staff assist each inmate in the development of an Individual Treatment Plan (IDP). Included within the IDP is an identification of inmate needs, a plan/mechanism to address those needs, and an outline of short and long-range goals. Additionally, the inmate becomes familiar with electronic monitoring rules and equipment for the impending aftercare component requirements.

5. Aftercare

In the aftercare component, IIP graduates are monitored via electronic detention for a minimum of 90 days. IIP graduates gradually move through a series of supervision levels that become less restrictive as the individual demonstrates a positive adjustment to the community.[6] Post-release program services includes mandatory education, job service, public service or volunteer work, substance abuse counseling or support groups, group therapy, or family group therapy. Certain IIP graduates are required to enter literacy programs, while others are encouraged to enroll in training programs. Drug and/or alcohol counseling is mandatory for those identified as needing such services, and all graduates are required to register and work with local job services until employed. Further, a minimum of 40 hours of program services, public service, or volunteer work is required. After completion of the electronic monitoring element, each graduate is placed according to the regular supervision requirements, largely based on instant offense.

VI. COOK COUNTY IMPACT BOOT CAMP (Chicago)

A. Program Context

The Cook County Sheriff's Boot Camp relies upon partnership between the state's Department of Corrections and the local court system. The 12-month program includes an 18-week military style boot camp and a 240-day intensive aftercare program. The 18-week boot

---

[6] Prior to November 1, 1992, IIP graduates were placed in a 90-day restrictive intensive supervision element after completing the 90-day electronic monitoring element. This practice was abolished primarily due to low new offense recidivism rates during the first year after release from the IIP.

camp period is designed to provide non-violent offenders a program based on military discipline and fundamental vocational skills. The program was designed to benefit the offender with a change in lifestyle and increased knowledge in an educational setting. The pre-aftercare program provides tools for re-integration into the community and training to develop job skills. The aftercare program provides a myriad of support systems, including substance abuse treatment and job counseling.

At maximum operating capacity there are eight platoons comprised of 48 inmates in each platoon. The first class of inmates entered the program in March of 1997. Due to the constraints of the intensive aftercare services, managers are comfortable with an inmate population of approximately 270.

The new facility (constructed in 1996) used the model of a military barracks complex. The program site is in an urban setting adjacent to the Cook County Department of Corrections complex. The fully self-contained facility is convenient to the community it serves.

The sworn boot camp staff members are selected from corrections officers assigned to the Sheriff's Department of Corrections. Sworn staff members of the Department of Corrections follow a union sanctioned bidding process. Corrections Officers submit a bid for the drill instructor's job and are selected through a process of physical fitness requirements and a psychological interview process. Once selected, the Corrections Officer is placed on an acceptable list. Before placement as a drill instructor in the boot camp, sworn staff members must attend an intensive two week training program conducted by the United States Army in Fort Leonard Wood Missouri. The training is equivalent to training the U. S. Army provides for its military drill instructors. The boot camp program is budgeted for 115 sworn positions; it is currently staffed by 81 personnel. Supervision of the sworn staff is managed by one captain, one lieutenant and ten sergeants.

The civilian staff is headed by a director. The current director has an extensive background in education. The education module is managed by teachers with previous public education experience. The aftercare program is supervised by a sworn staff position and a civilian staff position, and is staffed by drug rehabilitation counselors, substance abuse counselors and inmate case managers (currently staffed by 29 personnel). The positions include one director, one assistant director, one drug rehabilitation counselor, one doctor (part-time), three nurses, one psychologist, one secretary, six teachers, two education background counselors, five substance abuse counselors, and seven case managers. Overall, the staff members, both sworn and civilian appear to be very competent, enthusiastic, and adequate for managing the Cook County Boot Camp program.

The partnership developed between the state prison system, the state court judges and the Cook County Sheriff's Department is instrumental to the success of the Cook County Boot Camp program. Cooperative effort is essential to the life of the program.

The original intent was for the program to serve as an alternative to state prison. But in order for that to occur within the context of a county jail system, it was critical to develop a screening process that would admit offenders who otherwise would have been sentenced to

prison. These concerns led to a very lengthy implementation process (lasting several years) before the program admitted its first platoon.

A major obstacle was an inability of the prosecutor and public defender to agree on how the referral process would function. The public defender was concerned that if the defendant was admitted too quickly in the criminal justice process, the defendant would not have sufficient information to determine whether the boot camp sanction would be in his or her best interest.

The Cook County program has a unique blend of sworn and civilian Sheriff's Department personnel staffing the boot camp. Multiple skills are provided by staff, including strong education backgrounds, extensive experience in the military, and previous corporate job careers. The complete program, the disciplined military style training, intensive education module, and aftercare program have the support of the entire staff. The Cook County Boot Camp has a model facility, quality equipment, and well-qualified staff.

B. Selection Process

The target population is primarily adult males between the ages of 17 and 35 years, however, the facility does have a barracks and accommodations dedicated to female inmates. Inmate candidates are not accepted into the program if they are convicted of, or have a history of, violent or sexual crimes. The inmate must not have been a member of a previous boot camp program, nor could they have served more than a year of imprisonment in an adult correctional facility. Inmates convicted of misdemeanors (due to their short length-of-stay) are not admitted to the program. The screening process includes a medical evaluation conducted by full-time medical staff and informal screening by sworn boot camp staff. The screening process selects inmates for the boot camp who are primarily narcotics related offenders.

The Cook County program is a sentencing option for state court judges used in the Chicago city area. All inmate admissions are initiated at the recommendation of the court. Only state court judges have the authority to sentence inmates to the boot camp program. The judge recommends a candidate for boot camp, the inmate is screened by boot camp staff and referred back to the court. Finally, the judge formally remands the inmate to a 12-month boot camp sentence in lieu of a state prison sentence. An additional probationary period, following successful completion of the boot camp portion of the program, is also used in some cases.

C. Program Interventions

Platoons comprised of 48 inmates enter the program to complete the nine phase program as a group. The 18-week military/discipline program is supported by an exemplary 240 day aftercare program. The education of boot camp inmates is accomplished primarily in the first 18 weeks; the program consists of pre-GED and GED preparatory courses. The inmates are also given fundamental vocational courses to enhance employment opportunities. The substance abuse programs provide both group and individual counseling opportunities. Inmates complete

the first 18 weeks in a strict military type environment. Uniforms are worn by all inmates; the uniform colors denote their tenure in the 18-week program.

Daily programs start at 5:30 A. M. with reveille and conclude with lights out at 9:30 P.M. An average day for inmates, during the first 18 weeks, consists of physical training, work details and education classes. The education program begins at 8:30 A. M. and concludes at 3:30 P. M. The education program focuses on two groups of inmates: those who are ready for the GED prep course and those whose skills need development to bring them up to the GED prep-course level. For those inmates with high school diplomas, the program provides computer related classes and some vocational courses.

The program is divided into two broad scheduling areas: boot camp and reintegration. The boot camp schedule contains phases one through five. The reintegration schedule contains phases six through nine. The following summarizes activities identified within each phase:

1. Orientation and Assessment - Phase I Boot Camp Orientation

Phase I emphasizes the introduction to boot camp life and program development. During this phase, orientation and development of program requirements for treatment and education are the objectives. The goals are to establish community standards and rules of conduct/general orders and encourage participation in community meetings.

2. Development of Program Skills - Phase II Beginning

In Phase II, the inmates are introduced to intensive drug education and community skills. During this phase, the objective is development of individual and community responsibility. The goals are the individual's use of learning strategies, participation in substance abuse sessions, initiation of formal evaluations, and personal goal setting.

3. Learning Structure and Discipline - Phase III

In Phase III, the inmates work within the camp and the community. During this phase, the objectives are to have contact with inmate families and strict emphasis on education. The goals are to build commitment to establishing individual and group goals and developing family/parent responsibility.

4. Self - Awareness and Discipline - Phase IV Responsibility

In Phase IV, inmates begin to look toward the reintegration phase. During this phase, the objective is to see the end of the incarceration phase and look toward release. The goals are to teach anger/stress management, financial management, and violence intervention.

5. Completion of Boot Camp Phase - Phase V Commencement

Phase V emphasizes planning for the inmate's individual reintegration schedules. During this phase, the objective is final preparation for release into the community and establishing the mentor program with inmate and mentor. The goals are to develop job readiness, time and resource management, family/mentor involvement, and completion of the change into a "whole person."

6. Community Reintegration - Phase VI, VII, VIII, and IX

In Phase VI, the emphasis is on the inmate's return to the community with close supervision (up to 45 days of electronic monitoring), established group contact, and support. During this phase, the objective is to provide supervision in the BC Day Reporting Center and reinforce and acquire additional living skills. The goals are to ensure the initial return to the community under electronic supervision and build on the idea of responsibility to self and others through the boot camp group participation.

In Phase VII, the inmate is supervised within a community setting, receives job readiness training, and continues participation in support groups. During this phase, the objectives are for the inmate to report to Day Reporting Center, accentuate job skills, and practice newly acquired independent life skills to achieve short-term goals. Patterns are established for living and achieving short term goals.

In Phase VIII, the emphasis is continued supervision and preparation for transition into the community. During this phase, the objective is continued contact with the inmate regarding life in the community and job readiness skills. The goals are to help the inmate set long-term goals and focus on living in recovery.

In Phase IX, the post release life/program development is introduced and continued development of skills for the job market. During this phase, orientation is given to ongoing education and treatment program requirements. The goals are for the inmate to stay clean, establish random urinalysis standards, and learn rules of conduct while in reintegration contact (during meetings) with boot camp alumni.

7. Aftercare

The purpose of the Cook County Boot Camp Aftercare program is to assist the inmate with reintegration into the community. The primary goal is to return the inmate to the community with close supervision and establish a support system based on staff and inmate group contact. The inmate may be subjected to as many as 45 days of electronic monitoring. During the Aftercare phase of boot camp, inmates report to the Day Reporting Center to accent building job skills and to practice newly acquired independent life skills for short-term goals.

The aftercare program begins at the time the platoon of 48 inmates is formed and a case manager is assigned to the platoon. The case manager's job at this juncture is to identify individual aftercare needs for each inmate. After the platoon of inmates have been in the program four weeks, the case managers monitor the pre GED and the GED preparatory classes. During this period of time, there is an intensive exchange of information relative to the

individual inmate among drill instructor staff, education staff, and aftercare case managers. The inmates enter phases of training that prepare them for reintegration into the community.

At the 16th week, prior to the 18-week boot camp graduation ceremony, inmates are involved in an intensive program to prepare them for aftercare. The inmates receive social security cards, state identification cards, and driver licenses; and they are taught to develop job resumes. During this phase, several private corporations work in partnership with local government to provide employment training.

Once the inmate has graduated (18th week), the individual enters the aftercare program. During the initial 45 days of aftercare, the inmate is subject to electronic monitoring by boot camp staff members. The boot camp staff manages its own electronic monitoring program. Some inmates have jobs immediately upon entering the aftercare program and those who do not receive continuous job counseling. Most inmates are subject to daily reporting to case managers until they complete the 240-day aftercare program. Daily reporting consists of numerous counseling sessions which include substance abuse counseling and random drug testing. The inmates who are not successful in passing the high school equivalency test are required to attend classes four days a week until they are successful on the GED examination. During any phase of the boot camp, inmates who become discipline problems or reject the program are subject to re-sentencing to state prison by the state court judge.

CHAPTER 4

MEASURING THE IMPACT ON BOOT CAMP PARTICIPANTS' COPING SKILLS[7]

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter represents an assessment of the psychometric properties of a number of scales which purport to measure some of the key dimensions relating to individual coping and problem solving skills in four of the boot camps listed in Chapter 3. As noted earlier, many of the boot camps attempt to alter so-called "criminal thinking" or "clarify values." Others attempt to promote "moral reasoning," "life skills," "anger management skills," "conflict resolution skills," and the like. " Social competency," "cognitive-behavioral," and "interpersonal skills " are some of the umbrella terms that have been used to categorize and describe these interventions.

Despite the widespread prevalence of social interventions based on such a perspective, and the support their theoretical underpinnings generate both politically and empirically, not much progress has been made in the development of measurement strategies designed to assess the effectiveness of such interventions. Traditional studies have tended to focus on the measurement of behaviors sought to be reduced (i.e., delinquency, crime, violence), with identified decreases in these behaviors commonly used as evidence of program effectiveness. Such studies tell us less about why programs are effective or ineffective.

What has been lacking are systematic measurement strategies that can be used to measure, validly and cost-effectively, changes in the coping and social problem solving strategies of program targets -- the commonly targeted intermediate outcomes of such interventions. Short of very labor intensive and costly clinically-based assessments involving lengthy face-to-face structured interviews between clients and well-trained staff, researchers and program evaluators have been at a loss in identifying whether the desired intermediate outcomes -- increased self-restraint and improved coping/problem solving skills -- of such interventions have been achieved. Without such knowledge, we will continue to know little about levels of desired change that occur within the proverbial "black box" of program interventions.

This chapter summarizes the results of assessing the impact of such interventions for four boot camps on a variety of intermediate outcomes many consider essential to effective offender rehabilitation (Abraxas Leadership Development Program, Twin Pines Ranch, Washington State's Work Ethic Camp and Arizona's Shock Incarceration Unit. As reported in Chapter 3 two of these sites targeted juveniles and three of the four exposed its participants to interventions designed to enhance their "mature coping" skills. The Arizona program represented a more traditional and militaristic program with few treatment services.

---

[7] This chapter was primarily authored by Irina Soderstrom, Pd.D. and Thomas Castellano, Ph.D. and is drawn from a paper presented at the 1999 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Orlando, FL. March 9-13, entitled "Measuring 'Mature Coping' Skills among Adult and Juvenile Offenders: A Psychometric Assessment of Relevant Instruments."

A "mature coping" perspective, which states that the key to establishing a truly effective rehabilitative program is establishing correctional environments that generate positive psychological impacts on the inmates' abilities to deal with life stresses and problems in a constructive and acceptable manner (e.g. Johnson, 1996), guided the above research effort. The mature coping perspective is quite compatible with the many social interventions described above, and the battery of instruments utilized in this study may be usefully applied in a wide variety of program contexts which target both juvenile and adult populations.

II. THE "MATURE COPING" FRAMEWORK

Borrowing most directly from the writings of Robert Johnson (1996), "mature coping" is a construct he utilizes to argue for the establishment of meaningful offender rehabilitation and prison reform efforts. The ideas contained within this construct are consistent with many of the intervention principles associated with effective correctional treatment programs (e.g., Andrews and Bonta, 1994; Gendreau, 1996) and those associated with the broad range of social interventions that attempt to improve the decision making skills of program targets. According to Johnson, mature coping:

> . . . means, in essence, dealing with life's problems like a responsive and responsible human being, one who seeks autonomy without violating the rights of others, security without resort to deception or violence, and relatedness to others as the finest and fullest expression of human identity (p. 98).

Although Johnson agrees that most inmates have not been equipped or trained to behave in these ways, he believes that all people have inclinations toward autonomy, security, and relatedness to others. The incarceration experience should build on these inclinations, rather than thwart them.

For Johnson, an essential element of mature coping is dealing with problems by meeting them head on and using all legitimate resources at one's disposal. This involves assertiveness, a sense of personal efficacy, an internal locus of control: Persons who exhibit this aspect of mature coping are "more autonomous than their passive counterparts" (1996: 99). They display choice and control over their lives. Yet they do so without being hedonistic, impulsive, or predatory. Generally, mature coping in this respect is uncharacteristic of the offender population, which is full of ineffectual people who display faulty coping mechanisms -- such as aggression, hostility, and denial -- that tend to aggravate their problems (Sykes and Messinger 1960; Toch 1977; Zamble and Porporino 1990).

Johnson asserts that the second characteristic of mature coping "is addressing problems without resort to deception or violence, except when necessary for self-defense" (Johnson, 1996: 104). Unfortunately, many observers of prison life have noted that deception and manipulation are central features of prison culture (Clemmer, 1940, Empey, 1982). Lying, cheating, and aggressiveness are staples of survival in most prison settings.

The third characteristic of mature coping, according to Johnson, "is making an effort to empathize with and assist others in need, to act as though we are indeed members of a human community who can work together to create a more secure and gratifying existence" (p. 107).

Clearly, most accounts of prison life are replete with observations that such settings do not promote the development of secure and gratifying communities. Nonetheless, these core elements of mature coping demand that measures of coping strategies and problem solving skills be utilized as central intermediate outcomes in evaluative designs that attempt to assess the effectiveness of interventions that attempt to promote mature coping.

Johnson also contends that "self-esteem mediates coping behavior in any environment and must be enhanced if mature coping is to occur" (1996: 123). The difficult process of building self-esteem lies at least partially in the existence of mature problem-solving efforts. These efforts are likely to succeed, which in turn builds self-esteem and encourages more mature behavior. Success breeds success, while failure (immature problem solving) breeds failure (less self-esteem and more immature behavior). Thus, measures of self-esteem should be utilized to assess improvements in the mature coping of individuals.

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A series of self-administered questionnaire packets -- each varied slightly to reflect unique issues at each site and testing period -- and each containing various measures consistent with the mature coping construct was developed. Before being administered to the present study subjects, the instruments were pre-tested at each site. The pre-tests indicated that the vast majority of subjects had no difficulty completing the instruments and those that did were willing to accept help. This experience guided the testing procedures that were utilized at each site.

The instruments were administered within a small group format either by research staff or program staff who had been trained on the instruments. At one site, a researcher administered all the testing efforts throughout the study period. At the other sites, research staff administered the instruments to the first few groups of program entrants and trained local program staff to continue data collection efforts thereafter. Educators or clinical staff were primarily used as test administrators at these sites in an attempt to reduce potential response biases that might derive if custodial staff/drill instructors were perceived as involved in the study. Subjects with reading difficulties were provided one-on-one help if necessary. At the sites with large Hispanic populations, a Spanish-speaking staff person often aided in the survey administration process. The total package of instruments took between one-half hour to one hour to complete at each administration.

The following data were derived from the administration of testing instruments either immediately before the boot camp program participant's entry into the program or immediately prior to the participant's exit from the program. All program entrants and successful program completers were eligible for participation in the data collection effort. Individuals terminated from the program prior to graduation were to be tested prior to their exit, but program realities at most sites precluded this from occurring (e.g., runaways, persons terminated from the program and immediately transferred could not be reached for testing).

Subjects participated on a volunteer basis and were allowed to drop out of the study at any time. Over 90% of the subjects who were asked initially to participate in the study volunteered to do so. All subjects were assured of their anonymity and the confidentiality of the

information they provided. Once the subject completed the instrument, he or she was allowed to place the forms in an envelope and to seal the envelope. The forms were then delivered to the researchers without program staff ever being privy to the responses. Subjects were made aware that this process was designed to ensure the confidentiality of their responses. These data collection efforts took place between May 1995 and June 1996.

All tested subjects were included in the following statistical assessment of the psychometric properties of the measures. If a subject was tested at two points in time (both the pre-test and post-test), only the subject's pre-test scores were included in the analysis presented here.

A total of 545 adults from the two adult boot camps completed the testing instruments at least at one point in time. The comparable number of juveniles included in this study is 370. The average age of the juvenile subjects was 17, while the average age of the adult subjects was 24. Slightly over 30% of the adults were White, 36% were Hispanic, and 28% were African-American. Forty-five percent of the juveniles were White, 32% were Hispanic, and 18% were African-American. The remaining adult and juvenile subjects identified themselves of being from a differing ethnic or racial category (e.g., Native American or Asian). Consistent with prison populations in general, both sets of subjects had achieved low levels of formal education and exhibited weak employment patterns. The modal highest educational level achieved among the juveniles was ninth grade, and among the adults less than 20% had completed high school. Almost half of the adults reported being unemployed during the six months prior to their incarceration, as did about 60% of the juveniles.

Each of the boot camp programs had eligibility requirements that restricted the entry of offenders who had histories of prior incarceration and violent offenses. Accordingly, most of the subjects in this study had been convicted of drug and/or property offenses and did not have long histories of involvement in the penal system.

III. MEASURES OF "MATURE COPING"

A variety of measures that tap directly into the conceptual domain of mature coping were utilized. In addition, a few other measures relevant to the present inquiry which have been usefully applied in other boot camp studies were also administered.

A. The Coping Strategy Indicator (CSI)

The Coping Strategy Indicator (CSI) is a 33-item, self-administered measure that asks subjects to respond to items in relation to a stressful event that has occurred within the past six months (Amirkhan 1990). The CSI is composed of three sub-scales: Problem-Solving, Seeking Social Support, and Avoidance. The Problem-Solving scale has 11 items and is seen as an instrumental strategy involving manipulation of one's surroundings. The Seeking Social Support scale has 11 items and measures the degree to which people actively recruit human contact for aid. The Avoidance scale has 11 items and is seen as a strategy entailing some form of withdrawal. A variety of studies have examined the psychometric properties of the CSI. They have found it to exhibit strong test-retest reliability (Amirkhan 1990) and favorable levels of

convergent, discriminate, and criterion validity (Amirkhan, Risinger, and Swickert 1995; Clark, Bormann, Cropanzano, and James 1995).

B. Social Problem-Solving Inventory (SPSI)

The two forms of the Social Problem-Solving Inventory, one designed for adults (SPSI-R, D'Zurilla and Nezu 1990) and the other for adolescents (SPSI-A, Frauenknecht and Black 1995) used in this study are based on theoretical problem-solving models which tap into how individuals define, assess, and then respond to perceived problems. While the adult and adolescent versions of the SPSI differ in terms of item composition and sub-scale structures, each instrument measures key aspects of mature coping. Included is dealing with problems by meeting them head on and using all legitimate resources at one's disposal, assessing problems and possible response strategies, utilizing rational problem skills, assessing consequences of one's decisions, and seeking social support in the resolution of problems. These would be considered constructive problem-solving behaviors; while responding impulsively, in an avoiding manner, or carelessly, would be associated with dysfunctional problem-solving.

The SPSI-R has been the subject of more research than the SPSI-A, but both appear to exhibit sound psychometric properties. A series of studies by D'Zurilla and his colleagues on the adult version of the SPSI have found, based on a series of factor analyses, that the internal structure of the SPSI-R overlaps well with the theoretical model on which it is based (D'Zurilla, Nezu and Maydeu-Olivares 1995). Coefficient alphas for the SPSI-R scales exceed .70 and test-retest reliability coefficients have been reported to range from .71 to .88 (D'Zurilla, Nezu and Maydeu-Olivares 1995). Positive evidence for the validity of the SPSI-R is reported in D'Zurilla et al.(1995), Sadowski, Moore and Kelly (1994), and D'Zurilla and Chang (1995).

Frauenknecht and Black (1995) have reported, based on studies with three samples of adolescents, internal consistency reliability coefficients for the adolescent version of the composite SPSI above .93, with sub-scale reliability coefficients exceeding .70. The SPSI-A is a relatively stable instrument based on a 2-week test-retest correlation coefficient of .83 for the total scale score, and acceptable test-retest correlation coefficients for the seven sub-scales. Furthermore, the construct validity of the SPSI-A appears strong. Frauenknecht and Black (1995) report a correlation of .82 between the SPSI-A and the Problem-Solving Inventory (Heppner & Peterson 1982), which demonstrates a high degree of commonality between these two measures of problem-solving.

C. Anti-Social Attitudes Scale

The Anti-Social Attitudes Scale, a 30-item scale found within the Jesness Inventory (Jesness 1983), measures antisocial attitudes and refers to a generalized disposition to resolve social or personal problems in ways that show disregard for social customs or rules. It taps into attitudes toward social deviance and the acceptability of cheating, lying, and stealing. It has been reported to be associated with recidivism and short-term change in behavior (MacKenzie and Souryal 1994). Further, it has been utilized in a number of boot camp studies (MacKenzie and Shaw 1990, MacKenzie and Souryal 1994, McCorkle 1995). Positive results for both the reliability and validity of this scale are reported in Jesness (1983), and Jesness and Wedge

(1985). MacKenzie and Souryal have reported that this scale exhibits high levels of internal consistency reliability when applied to inmate and boot camp populations (MacKenzie and Souryal 1992: 33).

D. Program Attitudes Scale

The Program Attitudes Scale consists of 12 items that measure general attitudes of program participants toward the program and staff. Applied in MacKenzie's multi-site evaluation of boot camps (MacKenzie and Souryal 1992; 1994), it was designed to assess expectations about the program's positive impact on the offender and the offender's motivation to change. MacKenzie and Souryal report it to be a two-factor scale (i.e., beneficial expectations and personal change scales), with each sub-scale exhibiting high levels of internal consistency reliability (MacKenzie and Souryal 1992: 33, Table 37).

E. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI):

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI; Coopersmith 1981) is designed to measure self-evaluative attitudes regarding social, academic, family, and personal areas of experience (Adair 1984). Both the School Form (appropriate for juveniles aged eight through 15) and the Adult form were utilized in this study. The School Form consists of 50 self-esteem items and an eight-item lie scale, while the Adult Form consists of 25 items. The SEI is composed of a dichotomous response set where the choices are either "like me" or "unlike me." The SEI has found many uses in classroom screening, instructional planning, program evaluation, and clinical studies, and both forms of the SEI have been reported to be valid and reliable for a variety of ethnic groups and special populations (Kimball 1972; Donaldson 1974; Kokenes 1978; Cowan Altmann, and Pysh 1978; Coopersmith 1981; Ahmed, Valliant, and Swindle 1985; Reiter and Constanzo 1986). A recent application of the Adult Form to adult prisoners found it to exhibit only a moderately high level of internal consistency reliability (Cronbach alpha of .60) but to exhibit positive indications of construct validity (Castellano and Soderstrom 1997).

F. *Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Inventory (CES-D):*

The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Inventory (CES-D; Radloff 1977) is a 20-item, self-administered paper and pencil instrument designed to measure state levels of depression with a normal adult population, aged 18 and older. The instrument was developed through factor analytic techniques and face validity judgments involving the selection of items from previously validated depression scales (e.g., Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, and Erbaugh 1961; Gardner 1968). Radloff (1977), Barnes and Prosen (1984), and Orme, Reiss, and Herz (1986) have reported findings indicative of the CES-D's internal consistency reliability and construct validity. Castellano and Soderstrom (1997) have also reported that when applied to an inmate population, the CES-D and the State-Trait Anxiety Index (Spielberger 1981) appear to be measuring the same construct domain. Thus, the CES-D appears not only to measure "state" levels of depression, it may also be viewed as a broad measure of demoralization. This scale was administered because it is assumed that depressed and demoralized individuals are less likely to engage in mature coping behaviors than others and because these boot camp interventions actively attempt to raise the morale of their participants.

G. Psychometric Properties of "Mature Coping" Measures

In order to assess the psychometric properties (i.e., reliability and validity) of scales intended to tap into the mature coping construct, efforts were made to explore the factorial validity, construct validity, and internal consistency reliability of these questionnaires after being administered to all adult and juvenile subjects. When generating the factor analysis results a number of extraction and rotation options were used in order to test the robustness of a solution across factor analysis constraints. The ultimate decisions regarding the number of factors to interpret were assisted always with the use of Cattell's scree plot, a factor loading requirement of |.40| or higher, and the use of the Kaiser Normalization Rule. Also, when it was concluded that construct validity coefficients were in the expected directions, the conclusion was based on the fact that a scale reflecting a positive attribute would be positively associated with other positive attribute scales, and would be negatively associated with other negative attribute scales (and vice versa when negative attribute scales were at focus). Also, all adult and juvenile subjects for whom pre-test measures on these scales existed, were used for their respective analyses.

Because the primary purpose of assessing the psychometric properties of these instruments was to see if a battery of measures intended to tap into the "mature coping" construct could be employed validly and reliably on special populations of adult and juvenile offenders, the psychometric results for each of these scales are discussed only briefly. In fact, the vast quantity of quantitative findings resulting from the multitude of analyses performed on these data precluded the reporting in tabular form of statistics specific to each factor analysis (e.g., factor loadings, commonalities, and correlational information).

IV. PSYCHOMETRIC RESULTS FOR ADULTS

Five separate factor analyses (N=522) were conducted to investigate the factorial validity of the Program Attitude Scale (PAS). Three analyses were principal components analyses, and two were principal-axis factor analyses. Again, the point of conducting multiple factor analyses was to investigate whether or not a stable factor structure appeared across the various extraction and rotation conditions. Due to the similarity in obtained results across the various model constraints, the principal components analysis was determined to adequately represent the underlying factor structure of the PAS, and thus was used to summarily report the obtained factor solution.

As can be seen in Table 2, the principal components results suggested that while a two-factor solution could be confirmed, a one-factor solution was considered to best fit the data. This single factor accounted for 38% of the total variance in adult responses on the PAS. The scale's internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha=.83) was found to be acceptable as well. Further, the obtained construct validity coefficients (see Table 3) were in the expected directions, although they were in the low to moderate range regarding the magnitude of the observed relationships.

Four separate factor analyses (N=503) were conducted to investigate the factorial validity of the Coping Strategies Inventory (CSI). Three analyses were principal components, and one was a principal-axis factor analysis. Once again, a similar underlying factor structure was

indicated by the four analyses and thus, only the principal components solution is summarized in tabular form. The principal components results suggested that the three-factor solution (accounting for 40% of the total variance in adult responses on the CSI) was the most robust factor structure interpretation, thereby confirming the three subscales of the CSI (see Table 2). The first dimension was comprised of problem-solving items and resulted in a Cronbach's alpha of .87. The second dimension was comprised of seeking social support items and indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .88. Avoidance items comprised the third dimension of the scale and resulted in a Cronbach's alpha of .75. Thus, it was concluded that all three of the sub-scales displayed acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability. Further, the observed moderately strong construct validity coefficients (see Table 3) were in the expected directions.

Three separate factor analyses were conducted (N=503) to investigate the factorial validity of the Social Problem Solving Inventory (SPSI-R). All three analyses were principal components with varimax rotation, but each analysis was constrained to extract a specified number of factors. All three factor solutions suggested that a two-factor solution was the most robust across the analyses (thereby confirming the two primary scales of the inventory). Also, it was concluded that the five subscales of the instrument could not be confirmed. One of the principal components solutions is reported in Table 2. The obtained two-factor solution accounted for 40% of the total variance in adult responses on the SPSI-R. The first factor confirmed the dysfunctional problem solving scale, and the second factor confirmed the constructive problem solving scale. Both of the inventory's scales demonstrated very high internal consistency reliability since each resulted in Cronbach's alpha values of .94. Also, the observed construct validity coefficients for both scales (see Table 3) were quite high and in the expected directions.

Due to their wide use and well-established psychometric properties, the factorial validity was not assessed for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, The CESD Depression scale, nor the Anti-Social Attitudes scale. All three of these unidimensional inventories did display acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability (see Table 2), with respective Cronbach's alpha values of .80, .88, and .73. In summary, this battery of instruments administered to the adult sample in order to measure "mature coping" abilities was found to demonstrate desirable psychometric properties.

TABLE 2

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF SCALES, ADULT SAMPLE

Scale/Description	Factor Analysis	Subscales	Mean Scale Score	Standard Deviation	Internal Consistency Reliability (Alpha)
Program Attitude Scale -12 item scale that measures general attitudes towards staff and program -expected 2 factor solution	-2 factor solution confirmed, but 1 factor solution fits data well; accounted for 37.5% of total variance; N=522	PAS	22.22	7.12	.83
Coping Strategies Inventory -33 items that measure coping responses in relation to a stressful event -expected 3 factor solution	-3 factor solution confirmed, accounted for 40% of total variance; avoidance factor weakest; N=503	"Problem Solving" "Seeking Social Support" "Avoidance"	25.37 22.43 20.45	5.18 5.14 4.20	.87 .88 .75
Social Problem Solving Inventory - Revised -52 items that measure orientation, assessment, and decision making processes used to respond to problems -expected 5 factor solution	-5 factor solution rejected; 2 factor solution best fits the data; accounted for 40% of total variance; N=503	"Dysfunctional Problem Solving" "Constructive Problem Solving"	35.51 57.35	20.38 18.73	.94 .94
Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory -unidimensional	X	SEI-Total	72.81	17.53	.80
CESD Depression Scale -unidimensional	X	CESD-Total	17.37	10.79	.88
Anti-Social Attitudes -unidimensional	X	AAS Total	11.13	5.04	.73

TABLE 3

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, ADULT SAMPLE

	PAS	PS	SSS	AV	DYS	CON
Program Attitudes Scale (PAS)	1.00	-0.18**	-0.19**	-0.09	0.02	-0.12
CSI-Problem Solving (PS)		1.00	0.36**	0.01	-0.29**	0.44**
CSI-Seeking Social Support (SSS)			1.00	0.17**	0.02	0.31**
CSI-Avoidance (AV)				1.00	0.37**	-0.07
SPSI-R Dysfunctional (DYS)					1.00	-0.14*
SPSI-R Constructive (CON)						1.00

*P = .05 ** P= .01

V. PSYCHOMETRIC RESULTS FOR JUVENILES

In a similar fashion as was used with the adult sample, the psychometric properties of juvenile-administered instruments were assessed. Again, the psychometric results for each of these scales, which were used to operationalize the "mature coping" construct, are discussed only in summary fashion.

Five separate factor analyses were conducted (N=363) to investigate the factorial validity of the Program Attitude Scale (PAS). Three analyses were principal components analyses, and two were principal-axis factor analyses. The results were found to be quite similar to the results obtained when analyzing the adult responses on the PAS, since support was found for a one-factor interpretation of the inventory. Results from one of the principal components analyses are summarized in Table 4. The obtained unidimensional factor solution accounted for 36.6% of the total variance in juvenile responses on the PAS. Further, it was observed that the PAS displayed good internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha=.82), and good construct validity (see Table 5) since the moderately strong correlation coefficients were in the expected directions.

Four separate factor analyses were conducted (N=343) to investigate the factorial validity of the Coping Strategies Inventory (CSI). Again, the results were very similar to those obtained when analyzing the adult data set, since support was found for a three-factor interpretation, thereby confirming the three sub-scales of the inventory. The results from one of the principal

components analyses are summarized in Table 4. The three-factor solution accounted for 40% of the total variance in juvenile responses on the CSI. The first confirmed sub-scale, the Problem-Solving Scale, resulted in a Cronbach's alpha of .87. The second confirmed sub-scale, the Seeking Social Support Scale, indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .88. And the third confirmed sub-scale, the Avoidance Scale, had the lowest indicator of internal consistency reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .74. Thus, it was concluded that all three of the CSI sub-scales displayed acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability. It also was concluded that these three measures of "mature coping" displayed adequate construct validity (see Table 5), since the moderately strong correlation coefficients were in the expected directions.

Eight separate factor analyses were conducted (N=338) to investigate the factorial validity of the Social Problem Solving Inventory--Adolescent Form (SPSI-A). Five of the analyses were principal components, and three were principal-axis factor analyses using image extraction. When rotation of the factor solution was appropriate, an orthogonal (i.e., varimax) rotation was employed. The results of these factor analyses provided support for a three-factor solution (confirming the inventory's three primary scales). The results of one principal component solution is reported in Table 4. The three-factor solution accounted for 45% of the total variance in juvenile responses on the SPSI-A. The internal consistency reliability results did not contradict a three-factor interpretation. The obtained Cronbach's alpha for the Automatic Process Scale was .82, for the Problem Orientation Scale was .83, and for the Problem-Solving scale was .95. Furthermore, on the basis of the observed construct validity coefficients (see Table 5) it was concluded that these three sub-scales of the SPSI-A did appear to be measuring the intended social problem-solving constructs, since all observed correlations were in the expected directions and ranged low to moderate in magnitude of association.

Six separate principal components analyses were performed (N=316) on responses to the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) School Form. The first three analyses were conducted using all 58 items contained in the instrument. The latter three analyses were conducted using only 50 of the items, since the "lie" scale was removed. The principal components results were somewhat discouraging in that neither the five sub-scales of the 58-item questionnaire, nor the four sub-scales of the 50-item questionnaire (lie scale removed) could be confirmed. An equivalent lack of support was found for a unidimensional factor structure interpretation of the 50-item instrument. In contrast to these discouraging factorial validity results, the internal-consistency reliability results (Cronbach's alpha=.84) for the 50-item instrument (lie scale removed) supported a unidimensional interpretation (see Table 4) and could not be improved by removing any items. Further, since many of the observed construct validity coefficients (see Table 5) were of moderate strength and in the expected directions, it was concluded that evidence (other than factorial validity) did exist to support the construct validity of the SEI.

TABLE 4

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF SCALES, JUVENILE SAMPLE

Scale/Description	Factor Analysis	Subscales	Mean Scale Score	Standard Deviation	Internal Consistency Reliability (Alpha)
Program Attitude Scale 12 item scale that measures general attitudes towards staff and program	-2 factor solution confirmed, but 1 factor solution fits data well; accounted for 36.6% of total variance; N=363	PAS	25.39	7.24	.82
Coping Strategies Inventory 33 items that measure coping responses in relation to a stressful event	-3 factor solution confirmed; accounted for 40% of total variance; avoidance factor weakest; N=343	"Seeking Social Support" "Problem Solving" "Avoidance"	20.69 22.32 21.23	5.30 5.33 4.35	.88 .87 .74
Social Problem Solving Inventory - Adolescents 45 items that measure automatic processes used to manage or solve problems, problem orientation. and problem solving skills	-3 factor solution suggested; accounted for 45% of total variance; N=338	"Problem Solving Skills" "Problem Orientation" "Automatic Process"	1.91 2.53 2.14	.85 .69 .97	.95 .83 .82
Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory - School Form 58 items to assess self-esteem	-No model best fit the data; lack of support for a 5, 4, or 1 factor solution; poor internal reliability as well for supported subscales, but high for composite scale; N=316	SEI-Total	67.12	15.02	.84
CESD Depression Scale -unidimensional. 20 item scale	X	CESD-Total	20.26	10.97	.87
Anti-Social Attitudes Scale -unidimensional. 33 items from Jesness Inventory	X	AAS Total	14.50	4.88	.75

TABLE 5

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, JUVENILE SAMPLE

	PAS	PS	SSS	AV	PROB	ORIENT	AUTO	SEI	CESD	AAS
Program Attitudes Scale (PAS)	1.00	-0.13*	-0.15**	-0.06	-0.24**	-0.03	-0.19**	-0.13*	0.08	0.31**
CSI-Problem Solving (PS)		1.00	0.50**	0.24**	0.41**	0.11	0.36**	0.10	-0.06	-0.08
CSI-Seeking Social Support (SSS)			1.00	0.20**	0.34**	0.12*	0.28**	0.13*	-0.04	-0.18**
CSI-Avoidance (AV)				1.00	0.06	-0.41**	-0.02	-0.36**	0.43**	0.29**
SPSI-A Problem Solving (PROB)					1.00	-0.04	0.66**	0.21**	0.04	-0.05
SPSI-A Problem Orientation (ORIENT)						1.00	0.08	0.39**	-0.48**	-0.37**
SPSI-A Automatic Process (AUTO)							1.00	0.33**	-0.14*	-0.09
Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI)								1.00	-0.52**	-0.44**
CESD Depression Inventory									1.00	0.41**

*P = .05 ** P= .01

While the factorial validity was not assessed for juvenile responses on the CESD Depression scale, nor the Anti-Social Attitudes scale, both instruments did display acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability (see Table 4). In summary, all instruments administered to juveniles (with some caution regarding the factorial validity of the SEI) were found to demonstrate desirable psychometric properties.

VI. ABILITY OF SCALES TO DETECT CHANGES IN MATURE COPING SKILLS

In addition to the need to demonstrate the reliability and validity of the measures of mature coping at focus in this study, there is a need to demonstrate that the scales are sensitive enough in their measurements to detect or capture changes in subjects' levels of mature coping, whether the changes are due to program impact or some other catalyst for change. Therefore, paired t-tests were conducted of all pre-test and post-test responses within each boot camp site. This type of analysis pairs each subject's pre-test score with his post-test score and tests whether the average change for the entire site was statistically significant.

A. Paired T-Test Results for Adult Subjects

As can be seen in Table 6, all of the paired t-test results for adults were statistically significant (at the alpha=.05 level of significance). Further, the pre-to-post-test changes were quite large as indicated by mean difference values. Because the results for separate pre-to-post-test differences within each site (i.e., Site 1 and Site 2) produced such similar results, they will be summarized simultaneously.

The similar results observed for the two adult boot camp sites suggested favorable intermediate program impacts with regards to mature coping abilities. Generally, favorable mature coping skills increased, and undesirable coping styles decreased upon completion of the boot camp experience, regardless of boot camp site. In particular, adult participants exhibited increased problem solving abilities, heightened self-esteem, lower depression, reduced antisocial attitudes, improved program attitudes, and strengthened coping skills.

The reader should keep in mind, however, that a more sophisticated research design is required before changes in these mature coping measures can be attributed to program impact. Again, the point of presenting the results from conducting within-site paired t-tests is simply to demonstrate that the mature coping measures at focus in this study do appear to be sensitive enough to detect changes on the various dimensions. The determination of whether the boot camp experience actually caused the observed changes in mature coping skills is outside the purview of this current research effort.

B. Paired T-Test Results for Juvenile Subjects

As can be seen in Table 7 (which presents data only for those variables exhibiting statistically significant results from the paired t-test analyses), many more significant intermediate program effects were detected for Site 1 than was the case for Site 2. The general

pattern detected from these statistically significant results was for an average increase to occur in positive mature coping skill levels upon completion of the boot camp program.

Thus, when the pre-test and post-test scores of subjects from Site 1 were analyzed for significant pre-to-post-test changes, the findings were generally positive. Subjects tended to indicate decreases in undesirable coping styles and increases in mature coping skills. In particular, Site 1 subjects exhibited fewer antisocial attitudes, less depression, less negative attitudes toward the boot camp program, improved ability at seeking social support, enhanced problem solving abilities, and greater self-esteem levels after completing the program.

In contrast to the findings observed for Site 1, juveniles completing the Site 2 program displayed few positive intermediate program effects. This finding was not surprising since this particular boot camp site was included in the study because of the fact that it had many negative characteristics which would be consistent with this lack of observed positive change in Site 2 subjects.

In fact, a statistically significant finding was obtained for only one of the four measures of undesirable coping skills. Site 2 subjects displayed a very large increase in scores (21.9 to 26.4) on the negatively-scaled Program Attitudes Scale during the pre- to post-test period. This was particularly interesting due to the fact that Site 2 subjects had significantly lower Program Attitude Scale scores than did Site 1 subjects at the time of pre-testing. This indicates that even though Site 2 subjects entered the boot camp with fairly positive expectations regarding their experiences, the negative features of this particular program resulted in much more negative attitudes about the boot camp upon program completion.

However, even though Site 2 subjects left the boot camp program with relatively negative feelings regarding their boot camp experiences, a few positive intermediate outcomes were observed at Site 2. Specifically, Site 2 subjects witnessed significant decreases in depression and significant increases in self-esteem and problem solving as measured by the SPSI-A between pre- and post-testing. While attrition within Site 2 compels one to exercise caution in interpreting the results, these data suggest that not placing youth in the Site 2 boot camp program may have had greater benefits for the youth in terms of developing their mature coping skills than the making of such a placement.

TABLE 6

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT PAIRED T-TEST RESULTS FOR ADULT SUBJECTS BY SITE

Variable	Group	N of Pairs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean of Paired Difference	T-value	D.F.	p-value
SPSI Constructive Problem Solving	Site 1, pre	65	52.54	17.52	6.02	3.16	64	.002
	Site 1, post		58.55	6.43				
	Site 2, pre	102	54.74	16.85	7.91	3.36	101	.001
	Site 2, post		62.65	22.11				
SPSI Dysfunctional Problem Solving	Site 1, pre	65	48.12	20.64	-10.31	-4.34	64	.000
	Site 1, post		37.82	7.58				
	Site 2, pre	102	33.84	19.53	-6.58	-3.45	101	.001
	Site 2, post		27.26	19.56				
SPSI Total Problem Solving	Site 1, pre	65	112.41	29.81	-16.32	-4.66	64	.000
	Site 1, post		128.74	24.40				
	Site 2, pre	102	128.89	28.84	-14.49	-4.60	101	.000
	Site 2, post		143.38	31.25				
Coopersmith Self-Esteem	Site 1, pre	64	64.75	17.77	9.87	5.35	63	.000
	Site 1, post		74.62	15.96				
	Site 2, pre	104	72.19	17.09	8.61	5.28	103	.000
	Site 2, post		80.81	14.90				
CESD Depression	Site 1, pre	67	22.75	10.97	3.93	2.72	66	.008
	Site 1, post		18.82	9.62				
	Site 2, pre	104	15.86	10.17	3.14	3.14	103	.002
	Site 2, post		12.72	9.26				

TABLE 6, continued

Variable	Group	N of Pairs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean of Paired Difference	T-value	D.F.	p-value
Antisocial Attitudes	Site 1, pre	66	14.61	4.85	2.18	3.90	65	.000
	Site 1, post		12.42	4.64				
	Site 2, pre	107	10.84	4.57	1.95	4.57	106	.000
	Site 2, post		8.89	5.17				
Program Attitudes	Site 1, pre	69	22.20	7.66	2.48	2.69	68	.009
	Site 1, post		19.72	6.84				
	Site 2, pre	107	23.49	6.40	3.13	4.61	106	.000
	Site 2, post		20.36	7.10				
CSI Problem Solving	Site 1, pre	67	23.60	5.55	1.57	1.99	66	.050
	Site 1, post		25.16	5.37				
	Site 2, pre	102	24.72	4.71	1.91	3.35	101	.001
	Site 2, post		26.63	5.09				
CSI Avoidance	Site 1, pre	67	21.69	4.04	1.49	2.71	66	.009
	Site 1, post		20.19	4.22				
	Site 2, pre	102	20.81	4.39	1.67	3.07	101	.003
	Site 2, post		19.13	5.22				

TABLE 7

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT PAIRED T-TEST RESULTS FOR JUVENILE SUBJECTS BY SITE

Variable	Group	N of Pairs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean of Paired Difference	T-value	D.F.	p-value
Antisocial Attitudes	Site 1, pre Site 1, post	111	13.66 11.06	4.95 4.60	2.59	5.85	110	.000
CESD Depression	Site 1, pre Site 1, post Site 2, pre Site 2, post	115 24	21.24 17.22 28.17 22.38	11.76 10.85 9.30 12.60	4.03 5.79	3.56 2.47	114 23	.001 .021
Program Attitudes	Site 1, pre Site 1, post Site 2, pre Site 2, post	127 54	28.14 19.46 21.91 26.42	6.30 5.32 6.68 8.17	8.67 -4.52	14.74 -3.25	126 53	.000 .002
CSI Seeking Social Support	Site 1, pre Site 1, post	114	19.77 22.86	5.67 6.26	-3.09	-5.16	113	.000
CSI Problem Solving	Site 1, pre Site 1, post	114	21.03 24.69	5.74 5.77	-3.67	-6.54	113	.000
SPSI-A Automatic Process	Site 1, pre Site 1, post	112	1.82 2.30	1.01 .82	-0.38	-4.07	111	.000
SPSI-A Problem Solving	Site 1, pre Site 1, post Site 2, pre Site 2, post	112 22	1.65 2.19 1.89 2.41	.79 .84 .78 .77	-0.54 -0.52	-6.13 -2.53	111 21	.000 .020
Coopersmith Self-Esteem	Site 1, pre Site 1, post Site 2, pre Site 2, post	112 21	66.96 74.23 61.43 69.81	15.66 15.67 13.13 9.25	-7.27 -8.38	-5.18 -3.46	111 20	.000 .002

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This analysis revealed that the psychometric properties of each utilized measure of "mature coping" are well within acceptable ranges and that, generally, the measures do appear to measure what they were intended to measure. Furthermore, the indices demonstrated that they were sensitive enough in their measurements to be able to detect changes on the various "mature coping" dimensions over the pre-to-post-test period.

More specifically, the Coping Strategy Indicator was found to be a very robust instrument with a strong theoretical base and promising application potential. The results indicated that the intended factor structure of this inventory was confirmed, and that strong evidence of its internal consistency reliability and construct validity were demonstrated for use with both adult and juvenile populations.

The results for the Social Problem-Solving Inventory were not as promising. The adult version of the instrument (SPSI-R) indicated an underlying theoretical model which could not be confirmed through factor analysis. Our own observations regarding the administration of the instrument suggested that the sub-scales were over-identified and that the instrument was too long. Subjects appeared to tire of the redundancy of the items and seemed to rush to complete the inventory. The data support a re-conceptualization of the scale to a simpler two-factor structure, where many items could be deleted without impairing the overall utility of the scale. This re-conceptualization is certainly more intuitively appealing, in addition to having practical implications for scale administration.

The adolescent version of the Social Problem Solving Inventory (SPSI-A) demonstrated similar issues. Once again, the underlying theoretical structure of the inventory could not be supported through factor analysis, since only three of the nine intended sub-scales of the instrument could be identified. Unfortunately, the three sub-scales of the instrument lead to rather ambiguous interpretations of whether or not social problem solving has actually improved as a result of program impact. The SPSI-A is also too long and has even less intuitive appeal than the adult version. We suggest that this instrument be simplified with an attempt to measure "weak" vs. "strong" social problem-solving. In fact, a new adolescent version of the adult instrument (SPSI-R) is now available and should be examined closely as a possible replacement for the SPSI-A.

The Anti-Social Attitudes Scale was not examined for its factorial validity since this psychometric property had already been well established in the literature. However, the results of this current study demonstrated that the instrument did display acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability and construct validity for both the adult and juvenile samples. Thus, this scale is recommended as a useful measure of antisocial attitudes with respect to societal norms and values.

While the intended two-factor structure of the Program Attitudes Scale could be confirmed, the psychometric results suggested that a one-factor interpretation was more

appropriate for both adult and juvenile samples. We recommend that this scale be used as a parsimonious composite measure of "expected personal change" as a result of program intervention.

The adult version of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory has a unidimensional factor structure which has been well-validated in the literature and thus was not a focus of the factorial validity analyses performed for this current study. However, this composite measure of self-esteem was found to exhibit desirable levels of internal consistency reliability and construct validity for the adult sample. Thus, the limited psychometric evidence generated by this current study suggests that the adult version of this measure can be used to assess the self-esteem levels of adult offenders.

In contrast to the adult version of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, the factorial validity was investigated for the adolescent version (i.e., School Form) of this instrument. The theoretical underlying structure of this inventory could not be confirmed in this current study. Furthermore, the 50-item instrument was unnecessarily long and redundant. We recommend that another instrument be used to assess the self-esteem levels of juvenile offenders.

The final measure of "mature coping," the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Inventory, was not investigated in terms of factorial validity since the instrument has been well-validated in other studies. The results of the psychometric analyses which were performed for the adult and juvenile samples indicated that strong evidence exists to support the internal consistency reliability and construct validity of the inventory. Therefore, we recommend this measure of depression for use with both juvenile and adult populations.

In conclusion, this research presents significant implications for evaluations of programs that attempt to promote the "mature coping" of program participants. A number of simple, self-administered pencil and paper instruments appear capable of efficiently measuring a variety of attributes, skills, and states often associated with the display of mature coping behaviors. Of course, some caution should be exercised in the use of the Social Problem-Solving Inventory (both adult and juvenile versions), and we recommend that a different measure of self-esteem be used for juveniles than the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. However, all of the other measures of "mature coping" can be usefully applied to various populations and settings to discover whether key intermediate outcomes are being generated by particular program interventions. Researchers need to continue to explore the psychometric properties of these instruments with a variety of special populations and intervention programs. It is only through continued validation research, as undertaken in this current study, that we can feel confident in the application and interpretation of personality inventories.

CHAPTER 5

IMPACT EVALUATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of a variety of impact evaluations for a limited number of sites. As suggested in Chapter 1, only a few of the original sites were able to complete some type of impact assessment. For these sites, efforts were made to determine if the boot camp had an impact on either recidivism or costs -- the core outcome goals for most boot camps.

The first site reported on is the rather large Illinois prison boot camp program. The Illinois program is a rather comprehensive overview of recidivism and cost benefits based upon a matched comparison group. Immediately following that study is a review of the Cook County (Chicago) boot camp program -- one of the few remaining county level programs. It is noteworthy in that program seems to have reduced the number of inmates that could be placed in the Illinois boot camp program by diverting them into the county level system.

Finally, In an effort to understand the varied dynamics associated with boot camps, selected impact findings are also presented for three additional programs (Indiana's Camp Summit boot camp for juveniles, Washington State's boot camp, and Oregon's SUMMIT boot camp).

II THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS BOOT CAMP

A. Introduction

Despite the numerous problems encountered in attempting to conduct a national assessment of these various boot camp programs, it was possible to complete a fairly comprehensive study of the Illinois adult program. This was in large part to the IDOC's commitment to reviewing the progress of the IIP on a periodic basis, subject to internal and external evaluations. This commitment is primarily driven by two factors; first, according to statute, the IDOC must report annually to the state General Assembly, describing program participants and development.[8] During 1992, a Task Force on Crime and Corrections appointed by the governor was charged with determining factors attributed to prison population growth, while providing recommendations based on a review of successful programs that reduced offending and were instrumental in positive community reintegration. As cited in the Task Force's final report, preliminary findings regarding recidivism and cost savings as described in

[8] Illinois is one of only two states operating correctional boot camps (New York being the other) required to do so.

the IIP annual reports provided impetus for modifying the statutory eligibility criteria mentioned above to expand the IIP-eligible pool.

In the IIP annual reports, the IDOC consistently has found lower new-offense recidivism rates at 12-month, 24-month, and 36-month intervals for IIP graduates versus a comparison group of traditional releasees with similar offense and criminal history characteristics. However, the IIP graduates are more likely to return to prison for technical revocations to the point that the total recidivism rate (new offenses and technical revocations) parallels that of the comparison group. No controls have been employed to control for the policy change regarding the intensive supervision period or the modified statutory eligibility criteria. Also, the IIP annual reports have documented continued cost savings due to a reduction in length of stay for IIP graduates versus a comparison group.

Second, the IDOC received a $250,000 grant award through the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Program to assist with the development of the IIP. A second $200,000 federal award was granted the following year. These monies were used to support the program services component. Also, the IDOC was one of eight states required to participate in an NIJ-sponsored study of correctional boot camps. Recidivism findings in the multi-site study were similar to those reported by the IDOC regarding the new offense, technical revocation, and aggregate return to prison rates. The two above-mentioned factors have contributed to program exposure and publicity. Further, evaluations have been conducted by the National Institute of Corrections in a case review of three correctional boot camps and by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority in a recidivism analysis of Illinois' correctional drug treatment programs. Additionally, NIJ and the American Correctional Association have included IIP-specific chapters within published documents.

B. Impact Evaluation Design

Completing an outcome analysis of the IIP required a quasi-experimental retrospective design. One treatment (IIP graduates) and two comparison groups (traditional releasees and IIP failures) were selected. Three subgroups were drawn from each of the primary study groups controlling for enactment of the modified statutory eligibility criteria and change in supervision intensity. For example, the following subgroups exist within the IIP graduate study group: Subgroup 1 includes offenders admitted per the *original* statutory eligibility criteria and released under the *original* supervision intensity; Subgroup 2 encompasses offenders admitted per the *original* statutory eligibility criteria and released under the *revised* supervision intensity; and, Subgroup 3 consists of offenders admitted per the *modified* statutory eligibility criteria and released under the *revised* supervision intensity.

Only inmates released from the IDOC prior to June 30, 1995 were included in the analysis. This allowed for a three-year follow-up period for each case, with observations ending June 30, 1998.

C. Study Groups

The treatment group included all 4,070 IIP graduates from program inception through June 30, 1995 (see Table 8). The majority of these inmates were placed at the IIP subsequent to the statutory eligibility criteria modification and the change in supervision intensity.

The comparison group of traditional releasees was comprised of offenders eligible for the IIP according to the statutory eligibility criteria. A key element to the traditional releasee group selection was to discount eligible offenders denied IIP participation by the IDOC, to remove IIP failures from consideration, and to exclude inmates who had previously graduated from the IIP (control for the second-time felony incarceration provision). According to the statute, an inmate cannot be admitted to the IIP after previously having participated. Further, selection of inmates in the traditional releasee study group required a two-pronged effort to ensure that selected offenders were admitted according to the same time period as the treatment group. First, offenders sentenced to the IDOC between August 20, 1990 and August 11, 1993 (and released prior to June 30, 1995) were included based upon their satisfying the *original* statutory eligibility criteria. No controls were utilized to assess the physical and mental health of the traditional releasees, or to ascertain whether offenders would have volunteered to participate in the IIP given the opportunity. However, it was possible to limit the traditional releasee pool by reviewing safety and security indicators for escape risk, security level designation, and internal supervision level indicators as identified at intake.[9] Finally, as noted in the IIP annual reports, less than two percent of the IIP graduates had a sentence length less than three years. Cases in the traditional releasee group with sentence lengths less than three years were excluded to enhance similarities with the treatment group.

Second, inmates sentenced after August 11, 1993 (and released prior to June 30, 1995) were included, based on their satisfying the *modified* statutory eligibility criteria. The statutory eligibility criteria modification allowed for inclusion of older offenders, offenders serving longer sentences, and offenders incarcerated with a second adult felony sentence. Technical revocations did not exclude offenders under this last provision. For example, an offender could have three prior incarcerations and still be eligible for the IIP if two of those prior incarcerations resulted from a technical revocation, as opposed to a conviction for a new offense. Additionally, an intensive review was conducted to discount cases where a prior incarceration was for any of the serious "exclusion" offenses identified by statute. After the safety and security indicators and the sentence length consideration described above were controlled, the traditional releasee study group totaled 5,723 offenders.

---

[9] Only inmates with a 'low' escape risk and 'minimum' security level designation were included. For internal supervision level, inmates with values of 'limited', 'intermediate', or 'external' were included, while those with 'close' or 'staff escort' were excluded. After June 30, 1994, the internal supervision level designation was removed from the database, in large part, because the escape risk and security level designations were deemed substantive indicators of behavior. Due to the timing of admission and release dates for study inclusion, and the continued use of the escape risk and security level designation indicators, this would have a minimum impact on subject selection. Finally cases with a 'missing' or 'pending' value on any of the three safety and security indicators were excluded.

TABLE 8

IIP STUDY GROUPS

Group	N	%
IIP Graduates		
Subgroup 1 (original criteria; original supervision level)	983	24.2%
Subgroup 2 (original criteria; revised supervision level)	1,002	24.6%
Subgroup 3 (revised criteria; revised supervision level)	2,085	51.2%
Total	4,070	100.0%
Traditional Releases		
Subgroup 1 (original criteria; original supervision level)	1,302	22.8%
Subgroup 2 (original criteria; revised supervision level)	2,300	40.2%
Subgroup 3 (revised criteria; revised supervision level)	2,121	37.1%
Total	5,723	100.0%
IIP Failures		
Subgroup 1 (original criteria; original supervision level)	323	29.0%
Subgroup 2 (original criteria; revised supervision level)	540	48.5%
Subgroup 3 (revised criteria; revised supervision level)	250	22.5%
Total	1,113	100.0%

The second comparison group included offenders who were admitted to the IIP, but failed to complete the program. These offenders then were placed in traditional IDOC facilities to serve the remainder of their sentence. Through June 30, 1995, 1,113 IIP failures were released to regular supervision.

D. Study Variables

All recidivism and offender characteristic data employed for this analysis were gathered from the Offender Tracking System (OTS), which is the official database of the IDOC. OTS contains security, clinical, and background data attributed to each inmate and releasee in IDOC custody. Study variables representing demographic, social, and offense characteristics included gender, race, marital status, age at prison admission, committing crime type, self-reported

alcohol abuse, self-reported drug abuse, education level at prison admission, committing county,[10] prior IDOC commitment, and sentence length.[11]

E. Group Characteristics

Table 9 presents demographic, social, and offense characteristics for each of the study groups. The major differences between these three study groups can be summarized as follows:

- A substantially larger percentage of IIP failures were Black, as compared to IIP graduates and traditional releases, and a higher percentage of the IIP graduate and traditional releasee study groups were Whites and Hispanics.
- A greater proportion of IIP failures have never been married.
- The traditional releasee study group had a slightly older population (24.3 years) as compared to 22.3 and 21.9 years of age for IIP graduates and IIP failures, respectively.
- A greater percentage of those in the IIP graduate and traditional releasee study groups had received at least a high school diploma/GED, 36.3% and 36.1%, respectively, than their IIP failure counterparts (28.0%).
- More than one-quarter of the IIP graduates (28.4%) and traditional releasees (36.1%) were from non-Cook areas within Illinois, as compared to 23.2% of the IIP failures.
- A greater percentage of offenders who were traditional releasees (8.4%) had served a previous sentence within the IDOC, as compared to 2.2% of IIP graduates and 1.4% of IIP failures.
- A greater percentage of IIP graduates were sentenced with property and drug offenses as opposed to those in the comparison groups.
- A substantially lower percentage of inmates in the IIP graduates group self-reported drug or alcohol abuse.

---

[10] Committing county is comprised of three attributes: inmates from Cook County (Chicago and the near suburbs), collar counties (the five counties adjacent to Cook County), and else (remaining counties).

[11] Data regarding a number of potentially important criminal history and socioeconomic variables (e.g., age at first arrest, number of prior arrests or convictions, employment status/stability, etc.) were unavailable. The researchers acknowledge this limitation to the study.

- Finally, IIP graduates had the longest average sentence length at 4.2 years, as compared to 3.6 years for both comparison groups.

- It appears that the longer the sentence length, the greater the likelihood the inmate will successfully complete the program. Further, an even greater percentage of the traditional releases (54.7%) received 3-year sentences, even though sentence length was controlled during group selection.

TABLE 9

IIP GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

	IIP Graduates N=4,070	IIP Failures N=1,113	IIP Graduates and Failures N=5,183	Traditional Releases N=5,723
Gender				
Male	97.5	97.3	97.5	97.0
Race				
Hispanic	7.7	5.9	7.3	7.4
White	25.6	20.5	24.5	24.2
Black/African Am.	66.2	73.4	67.7	68.1
Other	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.3
Marital Status				
Never Married	82.9	89.1	84.2	80.6
Married	8.8	5.8	8.2	11.6
Other	8.3	5.0	7.6	7.8
Age at Prison Admission				
Mean	22.3	21.9	22.2	24.3
Committing Crime Type				
Violent	12.4	16.0	13.2	20.9
Property	33.1	40.4	35.7	41.4
Drug	54.1	43.3	51.8	37.4
Other	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4
Self-reported Alcohol Abuse				
Yes	14.8	23.6	16.7	29.7
Education Level at Prison Admission				
9th grade or under	7.4	14.0	8.8	11.2
10th	14.1	18.7	15.1	15.4
11th	34.8	37.2	35.3	31.7
12th	28.9	23.2	27.7	29.3
College	7.4	4.8	6.8	6.8
Missing	7.4	2.2	6.3	5.6
Committing County				
Cook County	71.6	76.8	72.7	63.8
"Collar" Counties	8.4	5.4	7.8	10.6
Other	20.0	17.8	19.5	25.5
Prior IDOC Commitment				
Yes	2.2	1.4	2.0	8.4
Sentence Length (in years)				
Mean	4.2 years	3.6 years	4.1 years	3.6 years

Note: Totals over or under 100% are due to rounding.

Traditionally, recidivists are more likely to be younger, less educated, property or drug offenders, from urban areas, with extensive criminal histories. Across each of the study groups variations exist with respect to recidivism-type characteristics. As such, attempts were made to rule out the effects of these variables when analyzing the relationship of study group identification and recidivism.

F. Recidivism Analysis

For purposes of this study recidivism was defined as re-incarceration to the IDOC for a technical revocation or new offense within three years after release. As shown in Table 10, the overall recidivism rates for all of the various study groups ranged from 35-48 percent with most of the "failures" representing a re-incarceration for a new offense. Consistent with earlier studies, there is no difference between the boot camp participants and the comparison group (38% versus 39%). Not unexpectedly, the boot camp failures had a higher overall re-incarceration rate due entirely to a much higher re-incarceration rate(45% versus 25%). The traditional releases also have a higher rate of new offenses versus technical violations for the boot camp participants. The higher technical violation rate for the IIP graduates may well be a function of the fact that IIP graduates receive more intensive supervision at release.

Further analysis was conducted to identify whether group differences existed in the recidivism rates at one, two, and three year intervals. The data were disaggregated by recidivism event. In general, the majority of offenders recidivated within two years after release. The greatest percentage of new offense recidivist events occurred during the second year of release, while the majority of technical revocations occurred during the first year (Table 11). Similarly, of the offenders who were returned to the IDOC because of a technical revocation, over 55% of each study group did so during Year 1. Overall, given the time required to process a case through the court system and the intensive supervision afforded IIP graduates immediately following release, these findings are expected.

Additional analyses were conducted to identify whether the statutory eligibility criteria modification and the change in supervision intensity impacted the recidivism rates of IIP graduates. Given the information provided in Table 8, it was expected that the criteria modification would result in increased new offense recidivism rates for IIP graduates. That is, traditional releasees had higher *new offense* recidivism rates and the criteria modification allowed for more traditional releasees to become IIP-eligible. In a similar vein, it was believed that if the change in supervision intensity impacted IIP graduate recidivism rates, the incidence of *technical revocations* would decrease.

Table 12 presents the subgroup three-year recidivism rates by type of re-incarceration. Here one can see a lowering of the recidivism rate for only the IIP graduates, principally by a lowering of the technical violation rate. There is little change over time for the other groups. This might indicate that while IIP graduates were released to a less intensive supervision component, inmates released to the IDOC's regular supervision were watched more closely.[12]

---

[12] In July 1991, the IDOC implemented a community supervision component, termed PreStart, in which surveillance and supervision functions of parole for most offenders were de-emphasized, while referrals to social services that might assist society integration were emphasized. Increasingly, the IDOC was criticized as negative publicity surrounding isolated incidents made media headlines. Perhaps as a

TABLE 10

IIP THREE YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES–IIP GRADUATES, TRADITIONAL RELEASES, AND IIP FAILURES

IIP Three Year Recidivism Rates	IIP Graduates		IIP Failures		IIP Graduates and Failures		Traditional Releases	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total 3-Year Recidivism Rates	1,433	35.2	533	47.9	1,966	37.9	2,215	38.7
New Offense	1,028	25.3	501	45.0	1,529	29.5	2,078	36.3
Technical Revocation	405	10.0	32	2.9	437	8.0	137	2.4

TABLE 11

IIP RECIDIVISM RATES BY GROUP BY YEAR AND TYPE OF REINCARCERATION

	IIP Graduates (N=4,070)		IIP Failures (N=1,113)		IIP Graduates and Failures (N=5,183)		Traditional Releasees (N=5,723)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total								
Year 1	609	15.0	188	16.9	797	15.4	772	13.5
Year 2	493	12.1	220	19.8	713	13.8	892	15.6
Year 3	331	8.1	125	11.2	456	8.8	551	9.6
New Offense								
Year 1	250	6.1	170	15.3	420	8.1	673	11.8
Year 2	455	11.2	208	18.7	663	12.8	857	15.0
Year 3	323	7.9	123	11.1	446	8.6	548	9.6
Technical Revocation								
Year 1	359	8.8	18	1.6	377	7.3	99	1.7
Year 2	38	0.9	12	1.1	50	1.0	35	0.6
Year 3	8	0.2	2	0.2	10	0.1	3	0.1

result of these criticisms, the IDOC informally began reemphasizing surveillance and supervision strategies for most inmates released to PreStart.

TABLE 12

IIP THREE YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES BY SUBGROUP BY TYPE OF REINCARCERATION

	Total		New Offense		Technical Revocation	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IIP Graduates						
Subgroup 1 (n=983)	383	39.0	231	23.5	152	15.5
Subgroup 2 (n=1,002)	351	35.0	265	26.4	86	8.6
Subgroup 3 (n=2,085)	699	33.5	532	25.5	167	8.0
IIP Failures						
Subgroup 1 (n=323)	144	44.6	137	42.4	7	2.2
Subgroup 2 (n=540)	266	49.3	253	46.9	13	2.4
Subgroup 3 (n=250)	123	49.2	111	44.4	12	4.8
IIP Graduates and Failures						
Subgroup 1 (1,306)	527	40.4	368	28.2	159	12.2
Subgroup 2 (1,542)	617	40.0	518	33.6	99	6.4
Subgroup 3 (2,335)	822	35.2	643	27.5	179	7.7
Traditional Releasees						
Subgroup 1 (n=1,302)	510	39.2	481	36.9	29	2.2
Subgroup 2 (n=2,300)	860	37.4	812	35.3	48	2.1
Subgroup 3 (n=2,121)	845	39.8	785	37.0	60	2.8

TABLE 13

IIP TOTAL RECIDIVISM RATES CONTROLLING FOR STUDY VARIABLES

	IIP Graduates	Traditional Releasees	IIP Failures	Significance
	% Recidivated	% Recidivated	% Recidivated	
Race				
White	25.9	25.6	34.2	$p < .05$
Black	39.4	43.9	52.4	$p < .01$
Other	30.1	34.2	39.7	NS
Marital Status				
Married	23.2	32.7	32.3	$p < .01$
Age at Prison Admission				
17-20	38.9	44.8	52.2	$p < .01$
21-24	21-24	39.3	41.1	$p < .01$
25-28	30.4	33.3	48.8	$p < .01$
29-32	31.9	34.8	34.6	NS
33-35	26.9	36.6	36.8	NS
Committing Crime Type				
Violent	30.2	40.6	37.6	$p < .01$
Property	39.2	40.9	48.9	$p < .01$
Drug	33.8	35.4	50.8	$p < .01$
Other	50.0	31.8	33.3	NS
Self-reported Alcohol Abuse				
Yes	35.6	38.5	41.8	NS
No	35.1	38.8	49.8	$p < .01$
Self-reported Drug Abuse				
Yes	38.6	42.9	49.6	$p < .01$
No	34.3	35.5	47.1	$p < .01$
Education Level at Prison Admission				
= < 8th grade	42.2	38.4	59.3	$p < .05$
Some H.S.	39.9	41.9	51.8	$p < .01$
H.S. graduate	29.2	35.3	39.1	$p < .01$
> 12th grade	19.1	28.5	30.2	$p < .05$
Committing County				
Cook	37.0	42.3	50.3	$p < .01$
Collar	28.8	32.5	33.3	NS
Else	31.4	32.4	41.9	$p < .05$
Prior IDOC Commitment				
Yes	41.8	51.9	61.1	NS
No	35.1	37.5	47.7	$p < .01$
Sentence Length (in years)				
1-3 years	37.6	40.8	48.0	$p < .01$
4-5 years	35.4	36.2	47.7	$p < .01$
6-8 years	28.3	33.3	100.0[1]	NS

[1] Cell count equals 1.

Based on these findings, it appears that the change in supervision intensity has decreased the IIP graduate technical revocation rate without having a significant impact on the new offense rate. This pattern negates the claim by some that technical violations serve to suppress new offense rates by "catching" them before they commit more serious crimes.

In terms of items associated with re-incarceration, the usual variables emerge. Across the three study groups, marital status, age at prison admission, committing crime type, self-reported alcohol abuse, self-reported drug abuse, committing county, prior IDOC commitment, and sentence length are associated with recidivism. To illustrate, Black offenders and inmates with above an 8th grade education returned to prison at rates lower than those in the comparison groups. Conversely, IIP graduates with "white" as a race attribute and IIP graduates with an 8th grade education or less had higher recidivism rates than traditional releasees, but lower recidivism rates than IIP failures.

G. Cost Analysis

A primary reason for developing the IIP was to reduce the length of stay largely for nonviolent offenders who possess limited criminal histories. To that extent the length of stay reduction should result in lower incarceration costs for these offenders. However, averted imprisonment costs can be offset by the impact of IIP failures because these inmates were expected to graduate from the IIP. Additionally, the IDOC has continually emphasized both the residential and aftercare components of the IIP. Due to the intensive supervision element of the IIP aftercare component, additional post-release community supervision costs have the potential to neutralize the cost savings of reduced residential length of stay. Further, as evidenced by the recidivism findings reported above, technical revocations occurring within a short period after release, during the intensive supervision phase, may counterbalance IIP residential cost savings.

What is required is a comparative analysis of the average length of stay (ALOS) for the boot camp participants and the comparison group of traditional releasees. Table 14 lists average length of stay data (in months) for the three study groups and the subgroups according to program alterations previously described. As expected, the average length of stay for the IIP graduates is shorter than for inmates in the comparison groups. In fact, the length of stay for IIP failures (13.5 months) is more than twice that for IIP graduates (6.2 months).

The average length of stay for IIP graduates consistently has been six months, two months longer than the statutory requirement of 120 days of active participation. Although this may be partly explained by delay factors, such as extended medical review or clarification of court records, the primary reason is time awaiting transfer to an IIP site.

The estimated average prison population averted by the overall reduction of 3.4 months per IIP admission (includes graduates and failures) is shown in Table 14. This is done by simply multiplying the annual number of IIP admissions by the average number of months of incarcerated (3.4 months) which amounts to a reduced inmate population of 541. This figure is

quite small (about one percent of the entire prison population) given that the entire prison population during this time was well over 40,000. This number is not even sufficient to avert the construction of a single prison. Consequently, only marginal costs should be applied to the analysis. Marginal costs include food, clothing, medical, and other expenses that vary directly with the number of inmates in a facility but exclude construction and staffing expenses if a new prison were built. During the period of study, marginal costs were approximately $3,000 to $4,000, while per capita costs ranged from $15,000 to $19,000.

The average annual marginal cost was determined for the IIP ($3,327) and traditional prison ($3,048). Further, the average monthly marginal costs were controlled for time served in the boot camp and traditional prison. IIP graduates were estimated to serve four months in the boot camp, while prior IDOC statistics revealed that the average time served in boot camp for IIP failures is one month. The time awaiting transfer to the boot camp becomes a factor here because 2.2 months of traditional incarceration costs must be included for each IIP graduate. Reducing the IIP graduate average length of stay to include only R&C processing and the 120 days of active participation would eliminate 1.7 months (or $432 in marginal costs) of time served.[13] The computations resulted in estimated marginal costs based on average length of stay to be $1,668 for IIP graduates, $2,845 for traditional releasees, and $3,452 for IIP failures.

H. Summary

Generally, the Illinois boot camp program has been built on modeling positive behavior for eligible inmates while reducing their length of stay within a correctional environment. As such, public safety and program costs are two policy issues that must be considered by those responsible for designing, operating, and evaluating these programs. Since inception on October 15, 1990, more than 13,000 inmates have been admitted to the program. The boot camp was designed to promote lawful behavior via a structured, specialized program that develops responsibility, self-esteem, and a positive self-concept. Additionally, the IIP attempts to address the underlying issues that often lead to criminal behavior and substance abuse, and promotes public safety through risk management in the selection of participants.

Since program implementation, two changes related to the "cost versus safety" issue have occurred, both primarily the result of preliminary positive findings regarding the recidivism rate of IIP graduates. These changes included an increase in the number of IIP-eligible inmates by allowing older offenders, those with longer sentences, and those with one prior adult felony incarceration to participate. The 90-day restrictive intensive supervision element that followed the 90-day electronic monitoring element also was abolished. In both of these changes, the IDOC believed that program cost could be lessened with minimal impact on public safety.

---

[13] Multiplying $432 of marginal costs against 4,070 IIP graduates computes to $1,758,240 for time awaiting transfer.

Consistent with previous studies, IIP admissions have the same recidivism rates as traditional measures and are only slightly less expensive to house. While it is true that IIP graduates return to prison less often, the level and expense of boot camp failures diminishes these more positive trends.

TABLE 14

ESTIMATED BED SAVINGS

	N	Avg. LOS In Months	Annualized ADP
IIP Graduates	4,070	6.2	701
IIP Failures	1,113	13.5	417
Total IIP	5,183	7.8	1,123
Traditional Releases	5,723	11.2	1,780
Annualized IIP Admissions	1,908	3.4	541

III. COOK COUNTY BOOT CAMP

A. Introduction

The Cook County program offers an interesting contrast to the Illinois state prison program. As noted earlier in the report, the Cook County program is unique because it provides a model of cooperation between state and local government. In many ways it represents the best opportunity for a county operated boot camp program to have an impact on the criminal justice system. This is due to how inmates are selected for the program. Unlike most county operated boot camps, inmates eligible for the Cook County program must reflect offenders who have a strong probability of being incarcerated within the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC). This is accomplished by delaying the screening process until the inmate has been in custody for a sufficient period of the time to ensure he or she would not be released on a variety of pretrial release mechanisms. Based on the data provided to the evaluators, the average period of time in custody until the inmate is admitted to the program is 86 days.

In order for the boot camp program to operate, special legislation had to be created that allowed the court to sentence offenders to the county operated boot camp program as opposed to probation or state prison (ILCS 5/5-8-1.2). It was passed strictly for the benefit of County as it was restricted to only counties "with more than three million inhabitants." One of the legal issues that the legislation resolved was the need to have an aftercare component which was

administered by the Sheriff as opposed to probation or the state department of corrections. There are no other county boot camp programs in Illinois.

As of April 1, 2000, a total of 1,573 offenders have been sentenced to participate in Cook County's boot camp program. Of the total 1,573 participants, complete data is available for 1, 543 participants. Table 15 displays the characteristics of all boot camp participants. What follows are the major attributes of these referrals:

- Most of the participants are male (at 97%) under the age of 21 (67%) with an average age of 20 years;
- African Americans account for the largest racial group at 79%, while Latino's follow at nearly 11 percent, and whites account for nine percent of the population.
- Nearly all of those sentenced to boot camp were convicted of a felony (99%), and drug offenses were the most commonly reported offense at nearly 50%, while crimes against persons and property crimes followed at 18% and 15%respectively.
- The average length of time between when an offender is booked and the start of boot camp is about 86 days. Thus most offenders spend almost three months in jail before being committed to the boot camp program.
- More than 60% of the offenders admitted into boot camp were assigned a medium security classification level, 26 percent received a maximum security classification level, and 12% received a minimum security classification level.
- Reflective of the low percentage of those classified at a minimum custody level, nearly 35% of all admittance had an "excessive bail" which precludes them from being assigned to minium custody.
- Forty-eight percent of the boot camp participants had been arrested as a juvenile, and close to 12% have had a prior felony conviction.
- A sizable percentage of those admitted into the program were diagnosed with a substance abuse problem at 34%.
- While the majority of offenders admitted into the program were not members of or affiliated with a gang, nearly 31% of all the offenders did have some affiliation with a gang.
- Thirty-one percent of all offenders admitted to Cook County's boot camp had a medical problem, but none that could hinder their full participation in the program.

TABLE 15
COOK COUNTY BOOT CAMP ADMISSIONS
March 1997 - March 2000

Background Attributes	N	%	Background Attributes	N	%
Total	1,543	100%	Total	1,543	100%
Gender			**Offense**		
Male	1,494	97%	Person	274	18%
Female	52	3%	Property	226	15%
Race			Drug	763	49%
Black	1,222	79%	Other	36	14%
Latino	175	11%	Unknown	59	4%
White	140	9%	**Juvenile Arrest**	744	48%
Age			**Average Time in Jail before Boot Camp**		86 days
Under 21	1038	67%	**History of Alcohol/Drug Abuse**	960	62%
22-25	262	17%	**Prior Felony Offense**		
26-30	160	10%	None	775	50%
31-39	83	5%	One	587	38%
Average Age		20	Two or more	180	12%
Excessive Bail	534	35%	**Serious Offense History**		
Charge Type			None or low	781	51%
Felony			Moderate	357	23%
Misdemeanor			High	394	26%
Traffic			Highest	10	<1%
Classification Scoring Items			**Special Management Concerns**		
Classification Level			Known Gang Affiliation	476	31%
Minimum	179	12%	Escape Threat	2	<1%
Medium	956	62%	Serious Violence Threat	13	<1%
Maximum	403	26%	Substance Abuse Problems	527	34%
Missing	5	<1%	Known Management Problem	33	2%
Severity of Current Charge			Psychological Impairment	27	2%
Low	35	2%	Suicide Risk	17	1%
Moderate	605	39%	Medical Problems	490	32%
High	859	56%	Physical Impairment	3	<1%
Highest	43	3%	Mental Deficiency	7	1%

Collectively, these data suggest that the program has done a good job in targeting inmates who absent the boot camp program would have been sentenced to state prison. The most telling statistics is the length of time until they are admitted to program, the felony level charge which includes some crimes against the person, and their street gang affiliation. It is a well-known fact that the longer inmates remain in pretrial custody, the longer they are likely to receive a state prison term. Inmates received at the Illinois Department of Corrections serve approximately 3-5 months in pre-trial detention before being shipped to the state prison system. Although it may be that these inmates would receive a suspended prison term and placed on probation, these inmates are not "lightweight" misdemeanant type offenders.

B. Inmate Perceptions of the Boot Camp Program

In order to gain an additional understanding of the total Boot Camp experience, interviews were conducted with inmates at the Cook County Sheriff's Boot Camp during the week of September 7, 1999. Nineteen inmates were randomly selected to answer questions based on their experience at the Boot Camp thus far. The interview form consisted of four general areas of consideration: (1) background questions, (2) criminal history questions, (3) boot camp questions, and (4) the future.

The purpose of the interviews was to gain insight into the inmate's total experience taking the above areas into consideration. Observations and general likes and dislikes on the part of the inmate were addressed. In addition, an attempt to discern prior criminal history, social status, and any future plans played an important role in the interview process. All information received was self-reported.

Background Questions - Personal History

All inmates interviewed were male. Majority of the interviewees were single between the age of 18 to 34, with the average age being 22. Most of the inmates interviewed were African-American, while the others were white and Hispanic. In addition, almost half of the inmates interviewed were employed at the time of their arrest on the instant offense. Less than half of all the inmates completed a high school education, either by graduating with a diploma or by obtaining a GED, while the others had not completed high school. None of the inmates interviewed had any college education.

Criminal History

In the area of criminal history, questions were broken down into juvenile and adult arrests. More than half of all the inmates had at least one prior juvenile arrest, and an adult arrest. It should be noted that these answers were self-reported and often the inmate gave what he felt was his best estimate based on memory. Majority of the inmates indicated that they were represented by a Public Defender at the time of their court hearing.

Gang Affiliations

When asked whether or not they had ever belonged to a gang, a majority of the inmates answered yes to this question. It is interesting to note that every inmate stated that they had renounced their gang affiliation either years earlier, or upon entering the Boot Camp. Numerous inmates still had gang tatoos. When asked whether it would be a problem remaining outside of the gang upon their release, each inmate felt confident that they could do so without any fear of reprisal. Those that had left their gangs in previous years stated that it had never been a problem for them to quit.

Boot Camp Experience

Most inmates interviewed appeared very dedicated to the Boot Camp. All were pleased to have been placed in the program and the majority felt that they would have been sentenced to state prison if they had not accepted the offer to attend Boot Camp. The inmates either received the Boot Camp sentence directly from the Judge or were offered this alternative by the prosecutor. In some instances, their attorney's requested the Boot Camp as part of a plea bargain. Most of the inmates felt that the majority of other inmates in the program would be sentenced to state prison if they had not been accepted. Moreover, all inmates interviewed stated that the Boot Camp was much safer than prison noting that there was no fear of being "shanked," no fear of fighting or other types of violence typically associated with state prisons.

Program Experience

All of the inmates interviewed had high praise for the computer education program. Many voiced a desire to join the computer workforce upon their release or to continue their computer education. For those who did not already have a high school diploma or GED, there was a strong desire to complete this course of study. They all seemed to realize that without an education, their habits could quickly fall back to their previous lifestyles. The drug and alcohol treatment program also received high praise from the inmates. Many, however, stated that they were not addicted and sold drugs solely for money. These individuals did not attend the drug counseling sessions. All expressed a clear desire to remain drug-free once released.

Inmates who were assigned work details stated that they actually enjoyed the work. They appreciated the cleanliness of the camp and worked hard to maintain their environment. They also commented on the food quality as far superior to anything they had previously experienced. There were only two areas were inmates voiced dissent. No one liked the fact that they were awake each day at 5:30 a.m.; all would prefer longer sleeping hours. And, while they did admit that it was a necessary evil, most interviewees did not like the fact that the entire platoon received punishment for the misstep of one member. Otherwise, the inmates expressed a great appreciation for the discipline and the "Drills" (Drill Sergeants).

The Future

Each inmate stated that they had no intention of coming back into the criminal justice system. For repeat offenders, they seemed to believe that this time would be different. They believed that the Boot Camp instilled in them the discipline they previously lacked. They felt that they would not have any problems dissociating themselves with the peer groups that they had previously been accustomed to engaging in criminal activity with. Most had a strong family support system waiting for them upon their release. They all had a place to live, usually with family members, upon their release. However, very few had job prospects waiting for them. Almost all of the interviewees were counting on the Boot Camp to secure employment for them upon completion of the program.

Most individuals who were involved in drug or alcohol treatment in the Boot Camp planned on continuing the same upon release. However, there was no continued treatment structured for their release. Their only plan was to continue attending Alcoholics or Narcotics Anonymous meetings on the outside and finding a mentor to help them through the most difficult times. Some of the inmates had additional one year probation sentences to serve upon completion of all phases of the Boot Camp.

In all, the inmates we spoke to were quite impressed with the entire experience. We spoke to inmates at all different levels of entry. Each had their own unique take on the Boot Camp experience, but there was a unanimous support for the program and a resounding approval for the staff and its rules and regulations. When asked their likes and dislikes about the program, numerous inmates stated that they genuinely did not have any negative comments.

C. Outcome Analysis of Cook County's Boot Camp

As a means to assess the efficacy of Cook County's Boot Camp programing efforts, an external outcome evaluation was conducted. This evaluation examines and compares the demographic characteristics, offense characteristics, and recidivism rates of a sample of boot camp participants and traditional releases.

Completing an outcome analysis of Cook County's Boot Camp program required a quasi-experimental retrospective design. One treatment group (Cook County boot camp participants) and one comparison group was selected, with the treatment group divided into two groups, those that completed the residential phase of the boot camp and those that did not complete the residential phase of the program. Data was collected for offenders associated with Cook County Department of Corrections between the dates of March 1997 and March 2000 as well as a comparison group of similarly situated offenders who were sentenced to the IDOC.

Sixty-one percent of offenders who enter Cook County's boot camp successfully complete the residential and aftercare phase of the program; among those that failed the program,

12% were removed from the camp, 18% were re-sentenced, and 8% went AWOL during the post supervision phase of the program (see Table 16).

Review of Table 17 shows that there are few differences between those that completed the residential and aftercare phase of the program, and those that did not complete both phases of the program. It should be noted that this section of the report refers to the terms "complete" and "not complete" differently than subsequent sections. Complete is defined as when a boot camp participant finishes both the boot camp phase and the aftercare phase of the program, and did not complete is defined as when a boot camp participant does not complete all phases of the program.

Majority of the offenders that succeeded in completing both phases of the program and those that did not were African American males. More than 60% of the offenders in both groups were under the age of 21; the average age of those who completed the program was 20 compared to the age of 19 for those that did not complete the program.

TABLE 16

ADMISSION STATUS AND BOOT CAMP TERMINATION STATUS AS OF APRIL 14, 2000

Status	N	%
Total Admission	1,543	100%
Still in Program	547	35%
Residential	213	14%
Aftercare	334	22%
Admission with a Termination	996	100%
Completed Successfully	607	61%
Unsuccessful Completions	389	39%
Residential Phase	304	31%
Disciplinary Removals	119	12%
Re-sentenced	185	19%
After Care Phase	85	9%
AWOL	85	9%

TABLE 17
SUCCESS AND FAILURE CHARACTERISTICS OF BOOT CAMP PARTICIPANTS

Characteristics	Completed Phase 1 and 2		Did Not Complete		Characteristics	Completed Phase 1 and 2		Failures	
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%
Total	607	100%	389	100%	**Total**	608	100%	391	100%
Gender					**Severity of Current Chg**				
Male	579	95%	379	97%	Low	19	3%	5	1%
Female	28	5%	10	3%	Moderate	206	34%	173	45%
Race					High	360	59%	204	52%
White	60	10%	27	7%	Highest	21	3%	7	2%
Black	466	77%	334	86%	**Prior Felony Offense**				
Latino	80	13%	27	7%	None	299	49%	158	41%
Asian	1	<1%	1	<1%	One	234	39%	177	45%
Charge Type					Two or more	73	12%	54	14%
Felony	601	99%	387	99%	**Serious Offense History**				
Misdemeanor	6	1%	4	1%	None or low	297	49%	151	39%
Age					Moderate	142	23%	110	28%
Under 21	379	62%	290	75%	High	161	26%	125	32%
22-25	106	17%	55	14%	Highest	6	1%	3	<1%
26-30	85	14%	29	7%	**History Alcohol/Drug Abuse**	330	54%	223	57%
31-39	37	6%	14	4%	**Juvenile Arrest**	285	53%	205	53%
Average Age	20 years old		19 years old		**Special Management Concerns**				
Offense					Known Gang Affiliation	206	34%	150	39%
Person	110	18%	78	20%	Escape Threat	0	0%	2	.5%
Property	70	11%	60	15%	Serious Violence Threat	7	1%	3	.8%
Drug	298	49%	210	54%	Substance Abuse Problems	217	36%	129	33%
Other	92	15%	34	9%	Known Management Problem	15	2.5%	12	3%
Unknown	37	6%	6	1.5%	Excessive Bail	226	37	133	34%
Classification Scores					Suicide Risk	9	1.5%	4	1%
Classification Level					Medical Problems	149	24%	97	25%
Minimum	51	8%	44	11%	Psychological Impairment	8	1%	7	2%
Medium	380	63%	232	59%	Mental Deficiency	4	<1%	1	<1
Maximum	174	29%	113	29%					

Majority of the participants who completed the program and those that did not complete the program were charged with a felony, and most committed a drug offense; the second most common offense was crimes against persons for both groups. A greater percentage of those who failed to complete the program, had a serious offense history than those who completed the program, and slightly more of those that did not complete the program also had a history of alcohol and drug abuse than those who succeeded in completing the entire program.

D. Comparison Groups

As previously mentioned, in order to conduct an evaluation of the boot camp program, three study groups were selected -- those that completed the residential phase; those that did not complete the residential phase; and a group of inmates who were not admitted to the boot camp program but who were similar to the first two groups but were sentenced to the IDOC. Excluded form the analysis were the 547 inmates who are still participating in the residential phase (39%) or the post boot camp phase (61%) of the program at the time in which data was collected (see Table 16).

As indicated above, there were 607 who had completed both phases of the program and 389 who failed to complete either Phase 1 or Phase 2. The IDOC comparison group was drawn from 6,320 offenders who based on their level of classification, current charge, and history of offense could have been potential boot camp participants, but were sentenced to Cook County State Correctional facility. (See Appendix A for a more detailed discussion of how the treatment groups and comparison study group populations were selected.) This statistic itself is quite significant as it reflects the number of offenders sentenced to prison who could have been placed in the Cook County boot camp program had it had sufficient bed space. Even more interesting is that fact that the average length of stay for these Cook County boot camp eligibles is only 3.5 months.

Table 18 displays the demographic and offense characteristics for each of the study groups. Not surprisingly, most of the individuals in both the Cook County /treatment and IDOC comparison groups are male, with less than six percent of both the residential failure and the residential success treatment groups population being less than six percent female; the comparison group had a higher percentage of females in its population at 10%. Few group differences were observed when examining the racial breakdowns of the groups, with all of the groups having a predominate African American population at or over 80% for all three groups. Latinos and whites followed at a close second and third in the racial make-up of the offender populations (with equal percentages or less than a two percent difference).

Slight differences are observed when examining the age differences of the two treatment groups, majority of both groups populations were under the age of 21, and those who successfully completed the residential phase of the boot camp were only faintly older (with an average age of 20) than those who did not complete the residential phase of the boot camp (with an average age of 19). In contrast the IDOC population was considerably older with a more

TABLE 18
COMPARISON GROUP CHARACTERISTICS
March 1997 to March 2000

Background Attributes	Boot Camp Graduates	Residential Phase Failures	IDOC Comparison Group	Background Attributes	Boot Camp Graduates	Residential Phase Failures	IDOC Comparison Group
	N=692	N=304	N=6,336		N=692	N=304	N=6,336
Gender				**Prior Felony Offense**			
Male	95%	98%	90%	None	48%	41%	48%
Female	5%	2%	10%	One	40%	44%	37%
Race				Two or more	12%	15%	15%
White	10%	5%	10%	**Severity of Current Charge**			
Black	77%	88%	79%	Low	3%	45%	3%
Latino	12%	4%	10%	Moderate	35%	52%	62%
Asian	<1%	<1%	1%	High	59%	2%	35%
Age				Highest	3%	2%	---
Under 21	64%	75%	64%	**Serious Offense History**			
22-25	18%	13%	18%	None or low	48%	38%	50%
26-30	13%	8%	13%	Moderate	24%	29%	34%
31-39	6%	4%	6%	High	27%	33%	15%
Average Age				Highest	1%	1%	
Classification Level				**Special Management Concerns**			
Minimum	8%	13%	14%	Known Gang Affiliation	35%	39%	20%
Medium	64%	58%	85%	Escape Threat	99.7%	99%	--
Maximum	29%	29%		Serious Violence Threat	<1%	1%	0%
Missing	--	<1%	4%	Substance Abuse Problems	36%	33%	31%
Offense				Known Management Problem	3%	3%	--
Person	18.5%	19%	13%	Suspected Drug Trafficker	99.7%	100%	4%
Property	12%	12%	24%	Excessive Bail	38%	33%	34%
Drug	49.1%	48%	51%	Medical Problems	24%	25%	43%
Other	15%	19%	11%				
Unknown	6%	2%	2%				

Over 50% of all three study groups had prior felony convictions (52% for both the boot camp graduate population and the comparison group population, and 59% of the non-graduates), and 50% or more had a serious offense history (52% of the graduate group, 63% of those that did not graduate, and 50% of the IDOC group). In relation to the severity of the arresting charge, most of those who completed the residential phase of the program had a high ranking (59%) or a moderate ranking (35%). Among those that did not complete the residential phase of the program, the most common ranking of their charges were moderate (52%) or low (45%); the reverse was true for the comparison group, with most of their charges being ranked moderate (62%) or high (35%).

The most common arresting criminal offense was drug related for all three study groups (49% of the boot camp graduates, 48% of the non-graduates, and 51% of the comparison group). The second most common arresting offense for the boot camp graduate group and its counterpart – the group that did not complete the residential phase – was crimes against persons (19%) while the second most common offense for the comparison group was property offenses at 24%.

In regard to special management concerns, over 34% of both had a gang affiliation, compared to only 20% of the comparison group. Over 30% of the two treatment group populations as well as the comparison group populations had reported substance abuse problems.

While slight differences were observed among the three study group characteristics, the groups are more similar than different. There were two major differences found in the populations. A higher percentage of the offender population in the two treatment groups were younger than those in the comparison group. It should also be noted that a higher percentage of the offenders in the two treatment groups had a reported substance abuse problem. In spite of this, all three study groups are comparable.

E. Recidivism Analysis

In order to compute a standardized recidivist rate among the study groups, only inmates who were discharged from either the boot camp/county jail or the IDOC before April 1, 1999 were selected. The date of April 1, 1999 was used to ensure that all offenders were in the community for a period of at least 12 months Out of 996 individuals who were discharged from boot camp either successfully or unsuccessfully, 373 were discharged before April 1, 1999. Among these offenders 60 (or 16%) were admitted to the IDOC -- primarily for a new sentence for a new crime or for violating the terms of their probation (Table 6). Not surprisingly, those that failed the residential phase of the program had a much higher IDOC admission rate that those who completed the program (32% verus 5%).

For the IDOC comparison group, a random sample of 328 inmates was drawn. These inmates were similar to the Cook County boot camp inmates but had been sentenced to state prison. Since these inmates were released between January 1 and April 1, 1999, it was necessary to do a further refinement of the boot camp releases to ensure they had been released during this

same window. As shown in Table 19, this analysis shows that inmates who complete the boot camp program have a very low re-admission rate (7%) as compared to the program failures (20%) and the IDOC comparison group (9%). Given the limits of this analysis, it's clear that the boot camp program is successful in graduating inmates who have a very low probability of being returned or re-sentenced to state prison. However, it is also clear that a large number of inmates now being sentenced to state prison, who are similar to the IMPACT inmates have, an equally low recidivism rate and can be retained at the local level.

TABLE 19

COOK COUNTY BOOT CAMP VERSUS IDOC BOOT CAMP ELIGIBLES RE-ADMISSION TO IDOC RATES

Population	Discharges	Recidivist	Percentage
Released Prior to April 1, 1999			
Total Boot Camp Participants	373	60	16%
Residential Phase Graduates	218	11	5%
Residential Phase Failures	155	49	32%
Released Between January 1 and April 1, 1999			
Total Boot Camp Participants	121	15	12%
Residential Phase Graduates	70	5	7%
Residential Phase Failures	51	10	20%
IDOC Boot Camp Eligibles Released Between January 1 and April 1, 1999	328	28	9%

F. Cost Analysis

In terms if costs, the FY 2000 appropriation for the program is $7.8 million. With approximately 550 inmates in the program on any given day (220 in the residential phase and 330 in the post-release phase), the overall daily cost is approximately $40 per day. It's difficult to separate the residential phase from the after care costs but one would have to assume that most of the budget is allocated to the residential phase. By comparison, the average cost of a typical Cook County inmate and IDOC inmate is $50 which reflects true incarceration costs. Assuming that 75% of the Impact budget is associated with the residential phase, those costs would be $70-$75 per day. The higher cost is expected given the higher staffing level (both security and programmatic).

The program, if expanded, would be cost-beneficial to the IDOC. It appears that the Cook County program is diverting several hundred inmates from the IDOC. For example, as shown in Table 20, there has been a decrease in the number if cases being recommended by the courts in Cook County for the IDOC boot camp program which mirrors the number being admitted to the Cook County boot camp (400-500). However, these low risk inmates are spending only an average of 3-4 months in state prison before they are release. Given that approximately 16,000 inmates are admitted to the IDOC from Cook County per year, a diversion of 400-500 short-term prison bound inmates per year who will spend an average of 3-4 months in state prison would only have a marginal impact on the IDOC budget.

G. Summary

The Cook County Boot Camp is a well-administered program that provides a safe environment for staff and inmates. Inmates, staff, and the criminal courts staff have high praise for the program. While in the program, the inmates who complete it improve their education and life skills capabilities. The program also has a well-structured aftercare component. Although the program is more expensive to operate than a traditional jail setting, it is succeeding in retaining offenders in the community who otherwise would have been incarcerated at the IDOC without jeopardizing public safety. It has been recommended to the agency that efforts be made to expand the number of low risk offenders who are being unnecessarily sentenced to state prison into other less expensive alternatives to incarceration.

TABLE 20
ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
JUDICIAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPACT INCARCERATION PROGRAM

Fiscal Year	Statewide	Cook County	% Cook County
1994	2,567	1,923	74.9%
1995	3,122	2,301	73.7%
1996	3,048	2,209	72.5%
1997	3,214	2,251	70.0%
1998	2,871	1,970	68.6%
1999	2,807	1,773	63.2%
2000*	2,002	1,177	58.8%

IV WASHINGTON STATE

The Washington state WEC program was part of the BJA/NIJ-funded Corrections Options Demonstration program that was evaluated by the National Council on Crime and

Delinquency (NCCD). The NCCD targeted WEC as one of its primary evaluation sites due to its positive process evaluation results. Namely, that it was a well-administered boot camp program that placed more emphasis on treatment services and less on the military style regime.

Once the an inmate is approved for WEC, she/he must serve the remainder of his/her sentence at the WEC and then enter the community under an intense supervision program (Community Custody Inmate Status). Thus, WEC is a vehicle for early release. Generally speaking, two years of confinement are reduced to two months in prison awaiting a screening decision at the DOC reception center and then another four months at the WEC facility or a total LOS of six months before being released to the community supervision program.

Table 21 summarizes the attributes of the inmates who were admitted to the program. As shown here, the program participants were predominantly male (70%), youthful (24 years), white (53%) and Black (37%), unemployed at arrest (37%), without any college education (16%), and convicted of a drug-related (70%) crime (see Table 21).

In terms of prior criminal record, the vast majority of cases had no prior prison terms (86 percent) but a large proportion had prior felony arrests (43%) and convictions (40%). The majority of the prior convictions were for nonviolent crimes. Relative to drug use, a significant number had prior drug treatment (42%) and were poly-drug users (principally alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine)

A quasi-experimental design was implemented that successfully matched the WEC participants on a number of key demographic and criminal history attributes. A 12-month follow-up was conducted on both groups. There was a total of 159 offenders in the experimental group, and 127 offenders in the comparison group. There were no major differences on the key attributes of gender, race, ethnicity, age and committing offense.

As shown in this table, the WEC participants had a higher overall recidivism rates than the comparison group. Similar to the other sites, the technical violation rates reflect most of the recidivism with relatively low rates for the offenders returned to prisons with new sentences. The WEC participants actually had a lower new conviction rate although these rates are quite small for both groups. The higher technical violation rate was ascribed to the intensive supervision component that was required by the WEC program.

TABLE 21

ATTRIBUTES OF THE WEC PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
(N=449)

Attribute	%	Attribute	%
Sex		Prior Criminal Arrest	42.7%
Male	70.0%	Prior Criminal Conviction	40.1%
Female	30.0%	Violent	1.7%
Race		Property	21.9%
White	53.0%	Drug	24.2%
Black	37.0%	Prior Prison Term	13.9%
Asian	2.0%	Prior Primary Drug Abuse	
Other	8.0%	Alcohol	18.2%
Education Level		Marijuana	23.3%
No High School Degree	41.0%	Cocaine	13.2%
High School or GED	42.0%	Other	13.4%
Some College or Higher	16.0%	Prior Drug Treatment?	41.6%
		Drug Treatment History?	
Most Serious Crime Convicted		Currently in AA/NA	21.2%
Violent	8.0%	Ever in AA/NA	30.3%
Property	20.7%	Enrolled in AA/NA for 6 Months	10.6%
Drugs	69.5%	Unemployed at Arrest	36.8%
Other	1.8%	Average Age	23.7 years

TABLE 22

12 MONTH RETURN TO PRISON RATES FOR WEC AND COMPARISON GROUPS

Out-Come Measure	WEC	Comparison
12 Month Outcome Measure	159	127
Return to Prison – Technical Violation	25.2	13.4
Technical Violation - New Conviction	2.5	5.5
Total Return to Prison Rates	**27.7**	**18.9**

With respect to costs, the possible averted costs produced by WEC would be caused by reducing the projected length of stay. As noted earlier, two years of confinement are reduced to six months. The comparison group, which consisted of inmates who in general were eligible for the WEC at a time prior to the WEC's implementation, were evaluated to determine their actual LOS. Based upon the most recent data at the time of the evaluation, 439 inmates had been released from the program in 1996. WEC cases spent six months incarcerated while the controls were imprisoned for 16 months or a savings of 10 months. On an annualized basis, this program is reducing the projected population by approximately 366 inmates. The annualized operating cost of WEC is $5,254,830 based on a daily rate of $65.58 as compared to $10,156,704 for the control group which is assumed to be a minimum custody population with a daily cost of $57.80. The net annual savings would be $4.9 million.

However, these rates assume that the WEC program has been sufficiently large enough to avoid the construction of a new facility or housing unit. The numbers presented here suggest that the bed savings may not be sufficient to avoid prison construction as was the case for many other boot camps. If so, it would be more appropriate to use marginal savings rates which would approximate 20 percent of the $4.9 million, or about $1 million per year.

It is noteworthy that the size of the WEC program has diminished significantly over the past few years. As of 2000, the program now only houses a handful of inmates and will likely close due to a lack of referrals.

TABLE 23

COST COMPARISONS FOR WEC AND CONTROL CASES

Cost Factor	WEC	Controls
Graduates per Year	439	439
LOS	6 months	16 months
Cost per Month	$1,995	$1,446
Total Costs	**$5,254,830**	**$10,156,704**

Source: Washington Department of Corrections

V. OREGON SUMMIT PROGRAM

The Oregon boot camp Summit program was evaluated by the Department of Correction's research unit. The Oregon researchers attempted to match known attributes of the boot camp graduates with the inmates who were not selected for the program. What is more important, inmates who failed to complete the program were not included in the impact analysis. A total of 1,663 individuals have been admitted to the program but only 56% have completed the institutional phase and 48% completed both the institutional and transitional leave (aftercare) phases. This high drop out rate makes the decision to exclude dropouts from the recidivism analysis even more problematic

Table 24 presents the demographic, social, and offense characteristics of the boot camp graduates and the comparison group. At first blush, the two groups appear too similar. Both groups are predominantly male (91% and 87%, respectively), white (over 70% for both groups) and relatively young with mean ages of 28 and 29 years. There were some differences between the two groups with respect to the type of crime the inmates had been sentenced to prison for with a higher percentage of (34% versus 26%) of the boot camp graduates who had been convicted of a violent crime.

Recidivism rates, based on re-incarceration within 12 months of release from prison shows the boot camp graduates have lower recidivism rates, as measured by a subsequent felony conviction at 12, 24 and 36 month intervals. However, it must again be noted that the Summit rates exclude the large number of boot camp participants who did not complete the program. Most of the individuals in both the groups who did recidivate committed either a drug or property offense.

TABLE 24

SUMMIT GROUP AND TRADITIONAL RELEASES CHARACTERISTICS

	Camp Summit Graduates N=1,663	Traditional Releases N=671
Gender		
Male	90.9%	87.0
Race		
Hispanic	5.6%	4.6%
White	77.9%	77.2%
African American	14.4%	13.7%
Native American	1.4%	3.4%
Other	0.7%	1.0%
Age at Prison Admission		
Mean	28 years	29 years
Committing Crime		
Violent	33.8%	26.2%
Property	27.9%	26.2%
Drug	25.4%	29.1%
Other	12.9%	18.5%
Re-Conviction Rates		
12 Months	8.0%	16.8%
24 Months	17.3%	29.3%
36 Months	22.7%	37.6%

Note: Totals over or under 100% are due to rounding.

VI. INDIANA'S CAMP SUMMIT BOOT CAMP

The Indiana juvenile Camp Summit Boot Camp utilized an experimental design with random assignment. The random assignment was done as follows. The Indiana Department of Corrections (IDOC) identified eligible cases. As part of the regular assessment process, IDOC classification committee identified 28 young males each month from counties with aftercare programs. Three hundred youths were in the study by December 1997. Each month for one calendar year (12 months) youth were assigned to participate in the boot camp program – they became the experimental group; youths not selected for the program became the randomized control group and were assigned to regular programming at satellite and contract facilities.

Table 25 presents the demographic, social, and offense characteristics of the experimental and control groups. There was a total of 107 individuals in the experimental group and 98 in the control group. African Americans accounted for the majority of the population of both the experimental and the control groups, with whites accounting for the second largest percentage of both groups. The mean age of both study groups was 15 years of age. Forty-nine percent of the youth in the experimental group were in custody as a result of a property crime, 20 percent for violent crime, four percent for drugs, and the remainder for another type (or unknown type) of crime. Similar to the experimental group, most of the juveniles in the control group were in custody for a property offense (at 32%), 13% committed a violent offense, 10% committed a drug offense, and the remaining percent committed another type of crime or an unknown offense. The majority of the youth in both groups had a drug problem, at 86% for the experimental group and 91% for the control group. In summary the random assignment appears to have succeeded in creating two equivalent groups.

Recidivism analysis entailed examining the differences between individuals who graduated from Camp Summit and those that were in the control group, released from traditional juvenile correctional facilities. The recidivism rate for individuals charged as juveniles in both the experimental group and the control group was relatively the same, at 35 percent for the experimental group and 36 percent for the control group.

Review of Indiana's Summit boot camp program revealed that overall the program has had little impact on the reduction of juvenile incarceration rates. The reincarceration rates for the graduates of the Summit program are only one percentage less than that of the control group. Therefore, although the average length of stay for the Summit participants is half that of the traditional releases, because the juveniles re-offend at approximately the same rate, the benefits associated with cost reduction are diminished.

TABLE 25

CAMP SUMMIT EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

	Camp Summit Graduates N=107	Traditional Releases N=98
Gender		
Male	100%	100%
Race		
White	36%	32%
Black/African American	64%	68%
Age at Prison Admission		
Mean	15.6 years	15.4 years
Committing Crime Type		
Violent	20%	13%
Property	49%	32%
Drug	4%	10%
Other	28%	45%
Self-reported Drug Abuse		
Yes	86%	91%
Recidivism Rate	**35%**	**36%**
Length of Stay	**57 days**	**108 days**

Note: Totals over or under 100% are due to rounding.

CHAPTER 6

THE DECLINING FUTURE OF BOOT CAMPS

The results show that boot camp programs are not having the impact on offenders or corrections as originally envisioned. This is not due to poor administration or program "integrity". Many of the programs reviewed here are well administered by highly dedicated staff who strongly believe in the ability of treatment to work. And there are many individual cases studies that suggest individual lives were turned around by the program. Furthermore, these programs are very popular with public officials and public offering the hope that such programs can become alternatives to what many view as a wasteful and ineffective prison system. But the reality is that they are not demonstrating a significant impact on recidivism, prison or jail crowding, or costs -- the three core goals of boot camps.

The lack of success in reducing recidivism is likely tied to the fact that many boot camp participants are low risk by definition of the selection criteria employed by correctional agencies and the courts for determining who is eligible for admission to these programs. Too often boot camps target those who require little if any intervention to succeed in the future.

Another factor that diminishes the programs recidivism effect is tied to the lack of treatment "dosage." Although it's clear that many boot camp participants improve their education levels and develop "pro social values," these levels of improvement are not sufficient or sustained for substantial period of time to overcome the more powerful social and economic forces that facilitated their involvement in criminal activities. It is truly naive to assume that participation in a 3-6 month program can some how negate the lifelong effects of poverty, child abuse, substandard education, medical care, and the traumatic effects of violence and death -- even with the promise of "aftercare services"adds much to the lack of treatment effects.

With regard to averted cost savings, these programs are simply too small in terms of capturing a sufficient "market share" of the prison or jail population to have an impact on population growth and the associated operating and construction costs. Furthermore, boot camps tend to be more staff and program service intensive than traditional correctional facilities.

For all of these reasons, the future of boot camps is not promising. It is unlikely that we will see more boot camps implemented. As reported hear, many have creased to exist or have dropped in terms of their numbers. However, it also true they will completely disappear from the correctional scene any time soon. As long as they offer a setting where low risk offenders can be exposed to a more intense level of services in a safe correctional environment without being overly expensive to operate, the need for them to exist will continue -- regardless of their limited therapeutic and cost benefits.

REFERENCES

Adair, F. (1984) "Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventories." In Keyser, Daniel J. and Richard C. Speetlant (eds.), *Test Critiques*, Vol. 1. Pp. 226-232. Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America (subsidiary of Westport Publishers).

Ahmed, S.M.S., P.M. Valliant, and D. Swindle (1985) "Psychometric Properties of Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory." *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 61: 1235-1241.

Allen, M. (1997) "Boot Camps Fail to Pass Muster" *Governing.* 11: 2, Pp. 40-41.

Amirkhan, J.H. (1990) "A Factor Analytically Derived Measure of Coping: the Coping Strategy Indicator." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59(5): 1066-1074.

Andrews, D.A. and J. Bonta. (1994) *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct.* Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

Austin, James, M. Jones and M. Bolyard. (1993) *Growing Use of Jail Boot Camps: The Current State of the Art.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Barnes, G.E., and H. Prosen (1984) "Depression in Canadian General Practice Attenders." *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 4: 561-571.

Beck, A.T., C.H. Ward, M. Mendelson, J. Mock, and J. Erbaugh. (1961) "An Inventory for Measuring Depression." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 4: 561-571.

Bottcher, J. and T. Isorena (1994) "LEAD: A Boot Camp and Intensive Parole Program: An Implementation and Process Evaluation of the First Year." Washington, DC: California Youth Authority and U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 150513.

Camps, P. (1996) "Shock Incarceration in New York." In *Juvenile and Adult Boot Camps,* Pp. 23-38, Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association and U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ 165592.

Castellano, T.C., and S.M. Plant (1996) "Boot Camp Aftercare Programming: Current Limits and Suggested Remedies." In *Juvenile and Adult Boot Camps,* Pp. 233-255, Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association and U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ 165592.

Castellano, T.C. and I.R. Soderstrom (1997) "Self-Esteem, Depression and Anxiety Evidenced by a Prison Inmate Sample: Interrelationships and Consequences for Prison Programming." *Prison Journal* 77(3): 259-280.

Clark, K. K., C.A. Bormann, R.S. Cropanzano, and K. James (1995) "Validation Evidence for Three Coping Measures." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 65(3): 434-455.

Clark, C.L., D.W. Aziz and D.L. MacKenzie (1994) *Shock Incarceration in New York: Focus on Treatment.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Clemmer, D. (1940) *The Prison Community.* Boston, MA: Christopher Publishing.

Coopersmith, S. (1981) *Self-Esteem Inventories.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Cowan R., H. Altmann and F. Pysh (1978) "A Validity Study of Selected Self-concept Instruments." *Measurements and Evaluation in Guidance.* 10, 211-221.

Cowles, E.L. and T.C. Castellano (1995) "Boot Camp Drug Treatment and Aftercare Intervention: An Evaluation Review." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Cronin, R. (1993) "Evaluation of the National Demonstration of Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders." American Institutes for Research (presented at the Fourth Annual Conference on Evaluating Crime and Drug Control Initiatives, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Donaldson, T.S. (1974) *Affective Testing in the Alum Rock Voucher Schools.* RAND Corporation, February.

D'Zurilla, T.J. and E.C. Chang (1995) "The Relations between Social Problem Solving and Coping." *Cognitive Therapy and Research* 19(5): 547-562.

D'Zurilla, T.J. and A. Nezu. (1990) "Development and Preliminary Evaluation of the Social Problem-Solving Inventory." *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 2(2): 156-163.

D'Zurilla, T.J., A. Nezu and A. Maydeu-Olivares (1995) "Manual for the Social Problem-Solving Inventory-Revised." Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York at Stoney Brook.

Empey, L. (1982) "Implications & A Game with No Winners." In A.J. Manocchio and J. Dunn (eds.), *The Time Game: Two Views of a Prison.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. 241-52.

Flowers, G.T., T. S. Carr and R. B. Ruback (1991) "Special Alternative Incarceration Evaluation." Washington DC: Georgia Department of Corrections and U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ 132851

Frauenknecht, M., and D.R. Black (1995) "Social Problem-Solving Inventory for Adolescents (SPSI-A): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Evaluation." *Journal of Personality* Assessment 64(3): 522-539.

Gardner, E.A. (1968) "Development of a Symptom Checklist for the Measurement of Depression in a Population." Unpublished manuscript.

Gendreau, P. (1996) "The Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders." In A. Harland (ed.) *Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*. Pp. 117-182. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gransky, L.A., T.C. Castellano and E.L. Cowles (1995). "Is There a "Second Generation"of Shock Incarceration Facilities?" In J.O. Smykla and W.C. Selka (eds.), *Intermediate Sanctions: Sentencing in the 1990's*. Pp. 89-111. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Gransky, L.A. and R.J. Jones, R.J. (1995) "*Evaluation of the Post-release Status of Substance Abuse Program Participants*." Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Heppner, P.P., and C.H. Peterson (1982) "The Development and Implications of a Personal Problem Solving Inventory." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 29: 66-75.

Hunter, R.J., V.S. Burton, J.W. Marquart, and S.J. Cuvelier (1992) "Measuring Attitudinal Change of Boot Camp Participants." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 8(4): 283-298.

Illinois Compiled Statutes. Chapter 730, ILCS, 5/5-8-1.1, 1998.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning and Budget. (1991). *Impact Incarceration Program Status Report*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning and Budget. (1991). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1991 Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning, and Budget. (1992). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1992 Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning, and Budget. (1994). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1993 Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning, and Budget. (1995). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1995 Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning, and Budget. (1996). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1996 Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning, and Budget. (1997). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1997 Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Department of Corrections, Planning, and Budget. (1998). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1998 Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Illinois Revised Statutes. Chapter 38, paragraph 1005-8-1.1, 1991.

Illinois Task Force on Crime and Corrections. (1993) *Final Report*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Police.

Jesness, C. (1983) *The Jesness Inventory*. Palo, Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Jesness, C. and R. Sedge (1985) "Jesness Inventory Classification System." Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Johnson, R. (1996) *Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison* (2nd edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Jones, R.J. (1996). "Illinois' Impact Incarceration Program: Evaluation and Implementation Issues." In American Correctional Association (ed.). *Juvenile and Adult Boot Camps* (pp. 327-351). Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association and U.S. Department of Justice.

Karr, S.P. & Jones, R.J. (1996). "The Development and Implementation of Illinois' Impact Incarceration Program." In D.L. MacKenzie and E.E. Hebert (eds.), *Correctional Boot Camps: A Tough Intermediate Sanction* (pp. 69-92). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Kimball, O.M. (1972) "Development of Norms for the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory: Grades Four through Eight." Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 34: Pp. 1131-1132.

Kokenes, B. (1978) "A Factor Analytic Study of the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory." *Adolescence* 13: 149-155.

MacKenzie, D.L. (1989) "The Parole Performance of Offenders Released from Shock Incarceration (Boot Camp Prisons): A Survival Time Analysis." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

MacKenzie, D. L. and J.W. Shaw (1990) "Inmate Adjustment and Change During Shock Incarceration: The Impact of Correctional Boot Camp Programs." *Justice Quarterly* 7: 125-150.

MacKenzie, D.L., L.A. Gould, L.M. Riechers, and J.W. Shaw. (1990) "Shock Incarceration: Rehabilitation or Retribution?" *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation* 14(2):25- 40.

MacKenzie, D.L., and J.W. Shaw. (1990) "Inmate Adjustment and Change During Shock Incarceration: The Impact of Correctional Boot Camp Programs." *Justice Quarterly* 7:125-150.

MacKenzie, D.L., and C. Souryal. (1991). "Boot Camp Survey: Rehabilitation, Recidivism Reduction Outrank Punishment as Main Goals." *Corrections Today* 53(6):90-92, 94-96.

MacKenzie, D.L., and C. Souryal (1992). "Inmate Attitude Change During Incarceration: A Comparison of Boot Camp and Traditional Prison." Part II, *Final Report to the National Institute of Justice*, University of Maryland.

MacKenzie, D.L. (1993) "Boot Camp Prisons in 1993." *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 227: 21-28, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

MacKenzie, D. L. (1993) "The Impact of Shock Incarceration on Technical Violations and New Criminal Activities," *Justice Quarterly* 10:463-87.

MacKenzie, D. L. (1994) "Boot Camps: A National Assessment," *Overcrowded Times* 5(4): 14-18.

MacKenzie, D.L. and A. Piquero (1994) "Impact of Shock Incarceration Programs on Prison Crowding" *Crime and Delinquency* 40: 2, Pp. 222- 249.

Mackenzie, D.L., and C. Souryal (1994) *Multi-Site Evaluation of Shock Incarceration.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

MacKenzie, D.L. and C. Souryal, (1994) "Multi-Site Evaluation of Shock Incarceration, Report to the National Institute of Justice." College Park, MD: University of Maryland, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice.

MacKenzie, D.L., R. Brame, D. McDowall, and C. Souryal (1995) "Boot Camp Prisons and Recidivism in Eight States." *Criminology*, 33(3), 327-357.

Mackenzie, D.L., and R. Brame (1995) "Shock Incarceration and Positive Adjustment during Community Supervision." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11(2), 111-142.

MacKenzie, D.L. and E.E. Hebert, eds. (1996) *Correctional Boot Camps: A Tough Intermediate Sanction.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

MacKenzie, D.L. (1997) "Criminal Justice and Crime Prevention." In *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, (eds. L.W. Sherman, D. Gottfredson, D. MacKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter, and S. Bushway), report to the U.S. Congress. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

McCorkle, R.C. (1995) "Correctional Boot Camps and Change in Attitude: Is All the Shooting Necessary?" *Justice Quarterly* 12(2): 365-375.

Morash, M. and L. Rucker (1990) "Critical Look at the Idea of Boot Camp as a Correctional Reform." *Crime and Delinquency* 36: 2, Pp. 204-222.

Orme, J.G., Reis, and E.J. Herz, (1986) "Factorial and Discriminate Validity of the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression (CES-D) Scale." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 42(1), 28-33.

Parent, D. (1989) "Shock Incarceration: An Overview of Existing Programs" Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Parent, D. (1990) "Day Reporting Centers for Criminal Offenders: A Descriptive Analysis of Existing Programs." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Parent, D., V. Leiter, S. Kennedy, L. Livens, D. Wentworth, and S. Wilcox (1993) "Conditions of Confinement: A Study to Evaluate the Conditions in Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities." *Final Report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Parent, D. (1994) "Boot Camps Failing To Achieve Goals," *Overcrowded Times* 5(4):8-11.

Parent, D., J. Byrne, V. Tsarfaty, L. Valade, and J. Esselman (1995) "Day Reporting Centers." *Issues and Practices*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Peters, M.., D. Thomas, and C. Zamberlan (1997) "Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders." *Program Summary*. In Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Series. Washington DC: Series: U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ 164258.

Radloff, L.S. (1977) "The CES-D Scale: A Self-Report Depression Scale for Research in the General Population." *Applied Psychological Measurement* 1: 385-401.

Reiter, H.H., and D. Costanzo (1986) "Relation between Personality Variables and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory." *Mankind Quarterly* 27(2): 161-165.

Sadowski, C., L.A. Moore and M.L. Kelley (1994) "Psychometric Properties of the Social Problem Solving Inventory (SPSI) with Normal and Emotionally Disturbed Adolescents." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 22(4): 487-499.

Sechrest, D.K. (1989) "Prison 'Boot Camps' Do Not Measure Up." *Federal Probation* 53: 3 Pp. 15-20 .

Spielberger, C.D. (1981) *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Form Y)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Sykes, G. S. and S.L. Messinger (1960) "The Inmate Social System." In R.A. Cloward, D.R. Cressey, G.H. Grosser et al. (eds.), *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*. Pp 5-20. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Toch, H. (1977) *Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival*. New York: Free Press.

U.S. General Accounting Office (1993), "Prison Boot Camps: Short-Term Prison Costs Reduced, but Long-Term Impact Uncertain." *Report to the Chairman*, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, GAO/GGD-93-69.

Zamble, E. and F. Proporino (1990) "Coping, Imprisonment, and Rehabilitation: Some Data and their Implications." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 178: 53-70.

Zhang, S.C. (1998). "In Search of Hopeful Glimpses: A Critique of Research Strategies in Current Boot Camp Evaluations." *Crime and Delinquency*, 22(2), 314-334.