

# **Overview of Substance Abuse Treatment Programs in Correctional Settings**

**August 1989**

**Prepared by L.I.S.I.  
under Contract 89K06-DP-5 with the  
U.S. Department of Justice,  
National Institute of Corrections**

## Table of Contents

Introduction . . . . .	1
Section 1: Surveys . . . . .	1
Comprehensive State Agency Survey . . . . .	1
Survey of Probation and Parole Agencies . . . . .	3
Survey of U.S. Jails . . . . .	4
Additional Survey Projects . . . . .	5
Section 2: Summary of Major Substance Abuse Treatment Programs . . . . .	6
Institutional Programs-Project Reform . . . . .	6
Other State Projects . . . . .	7
Substance Abuse Programs in Community Corrections . . . . .	6
Substance Abuse Programs in Jails . . . . .	9
Appendix A: Components of Comprehensive State Department of Corrections Treatment Strategy in Six States . . . . .	11
Appendix 6: List of Contacts . . . . .	12

# **Overview of Substance Abuse Treatment Programs in Correctional Settings**

## **Introduction**

This report highlights corrections agencies' efforts to address the supervision and treatment of offenders with substance abuse problems. The information provided is based on the resources at the NIC information Center. Most projects described below have been funded by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Section 1 summarizes national surveys on the topic; Section 2 describes treatment programs in the range of correctional settings.

## **Section 1: Surveys**

### **Comprehensive State Agency Survey**

#### **State Survey of Treatment Opinions for Drug-Dependent Offenders.**

This is the most comprehensive national survey undertaken on the subject, and it should have a broad impact on the choices and funding for treatment of drugdependent offenders. The National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA), in cooperation with the National Governors' Association, is involved in this BJA-funded project to "identify effective and workable approaches to treatment of drug-dependent offenders and to help guide criminal justice officials in selecting, implementing, and assessing the effectiveness of various treatment approaches."

**Method**

The first stage of the project included a survey of all states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. In each case, NCJA sought out, as principal survey respondents, "state agency officials most knowledgeable about state and local governments' policy and practice relating to the operations, financing, and use of treatment programs for drug-dependent offenders and about state and local 'programs available to drug-dependent offenders." In many states more than one agency or department completed a survey form. The total number of survey responses received was 147.

**Description**

The survey consisted of five sections: administration, finance, intervention strategies, research and evaluation, and issues and attitudes. It included both dose-ended questions requiring a yes/no response and open-ended questions that solicited a narrative response or sought a respondent's opinion. A preliminary analysis of the first type of question has been completed. Responses to the open-ended questions are being analyzed.

**Preliminary Results**

Preliminary results indicate that although budgets for drug treatment services have increased over the past five to ten years, total resources available for these services are insufficient. Because treatment services budgets are vulnerable to shifts in state funding priorities, federal funds are the source of significant proportions of total treatment funds.

Survey respondents indicated that the intervention strategy used most frequently in treating drug-dependent offenders, either alone or with other treatment approaches, was counseling and therapy. Treatment of drug-dependent offenders was most often described as "short-term" and most often delivered in institutional settings.

Survey respondents cited several non-economic policy decisions as affecting treatment programs. These included philosophical debates over the relative importance of punishment and treatment in dealing with offenders, and public resistance to the establishment of community-based treatment programs.

# Survey of Probation and Parole Agencies

## **The National Narcotics Intervention Training Program**

This project, sponsored by WA, is being conducted by the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) and the National Association of Parole Executives (NAPE). In addition to the survey described below, the project compiled "strategy briefs" describing "model" community-based programs and conducted a series of week-long training programs, based on needs identified through the survey and on successful program models. These project components are also discussed on page 8. The project is being continued through 1990.

*Method* A survey questionnaire was mailed to 231 probation and parole administrators and managers nationwide. Although project directors did not survey every local probation department in states with county or regional probation, an attempt was made to obtain information from every state. Members of the APPA Board of Directors, the entire NAPE membership, and members of APPA affiliate organizations were included in the survey. Ninety-seven forms were returned, representing a response rate of 42 percent.

*Description* The survey had three purposes: 1) to identify current practices with respect to drug abusing offenders; 2) to identify model programs from which the training curriculum could be based; and (3) to assess training needs that the program should address. The survey was divided into the following sections: Identifying Information, Program Philosophy, Client Assessment/Referral Supervision/Monitoring Practices, Program Resources/Services, and Program Evaluation.

*Results* The typical community corrections program model for drug offenders consists of participating in a specialized caseload or intensive supervision, with referral to either residential or non-residential treatment. Forty-seven (47) percent indicated that the primary emphasis of their program was risk control; 40 percent cited a primary emphasis on treatment.

Forty-two (42) percent of responding agencies assess a fee to the client for participation; 25 percent receive some federal funding. Elements identified as essential to successful drug programs were, in descending order of importance: 1) the availability of treatment resources; 2) drug screening; 3) qualified and/or dedicated staff;

4) intensive supervision methods; **and** 5) sanctions for non-compliance with program decisions.

Only 20 percent indicated that they have conducted or are planning to conduct studies of recidivism to assess program success.

## **Survey of U.S. Jails**

### **Drug Treatment In the Jail Setting: National Demonstration Project**

As the first stage of this BJA-funded project, the American Jail Association surveyed 8,300 jails nationwide. The purposes of the survey were: 1) to identify exemplary drug treatment programs in jails that could serve as demonstration models to be replicated; and 2) to collect information to be used in an AJA clearinghouse on the topic.

*Method*                    The survey has been conducted by mail; AJA is attempting to attain a 100 percent response rate. As of August 1, 1989, responses had been received from 98 percent of the- 104 jails with inmate populations over 500. Although these jails are the most likely to have drug treatment programs, AJA is following up on all other survey recipients.

*Description*            The survey requested the following information: the number and types treatment programs provided, their cost, the number of inmates served, and the existence of any program constraints. Targeted programs are those which are focused on treatment rather than awareness and programs which are not run by volunteers.

*Results*                    Results so far indicate that at least 80 percent of jails do not provide in-house drug treatment services. Most programs provided in jails are volunteer programs such as Narcotics Anonymous, rather than "treatment programs" in the sense that AJA intended. Referral services provided by jails range from the presence of a pamphlet describing community resources to an active encouragement of Inmates' participation in such programs.

Funding for jail treatment programs comes principally from county support, although some facilities have received funds from state block grants.

## **Additional survey projects:**

Additional surveys relevant to an examination of corrections' actions in dealing with drug use include the following:

- **NIC Information Center Survey of Institutional Drug Programs -**  
In 1988, Information Center staff conducted a preliminary survey of correctional agency personnel in each state who were identified by state directors of corrections as appropriate to contact for information about institutional substance abuse programs. Although results proved too inconclusive for a major analysis, a review of the data warrants some general observations: 1) Only a small percentage of inmates identified as having substance abuse problems receive any treatment within the institution. 2) Nearly all states provide some form of treatment for inmates; at most, this treatment consists of self-help or education programs-. 3) Many substance abuse programs are combined with other rehabilitation efforts, which address such issues as sexual deviancy, criminal thinking, social skills training, or mental health counseling. 4) In states that appear to have successful, long-standing programs, respondents reported a cooperative working relationship with other state agencies, mental health agencies, or other human service agencies in the state.
- **Drug Use Forecasting Program Survey -** The escalating connection between drugs and crime - and the consequent pressure on corrections - has been substantiated through the WA-sponsored Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) Program, whose data for 1988 indicate that across 21 cities, 50 to 90 percent of inmate arrestees tested positive for an illegal drug.
- **1988 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities -**This survey, also sponsored by WA, gives another indication of the severity of drug use. Among inmates interviewed, 43 percent said that in the month prior to their current offense they were using drugs on a daily or near-daily basis. Thirty-five (35) percent reported that they were under the influence of drugs and the time they committed their current offense.
- **Survey on Drug Use Among Corrections Personnel -** A study conducted by the Institute for Economic and Policy Research and sponsored by the National Institute of Justice surveyed 48 states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons on employee drug-testing policies in prison systems. Results indicated that only 19 states and the Bureau test either employees or job applicants for drugs. Most agencies are more likely to identify drug problems after hiring.

## Section 2: Summary of Major Substance Abuse Treatment Programs

### Institutional Programs

#### Comprehensive State Department of Corrections Treatment Strategy for Drug Abuse - "Project REFORM"

Conducted with WA funding. Coordinated by Narcotics and Drug Research, Inc.

#### *Purpose*

The major aim of Project REFORM is to assist state departments of corrections develop comprehensive institutional drug treatment and related rehabilitation components as part of a statewide correctional strategy for dealing with drug offenders.

The Project aims "to develop a range of model state drug treatment activities including drug education, drug resource centers, self-help groups, and therapeutic communities that can be integrated into existing and proposed institutions and programs." (FY 1988 Report on Drug Control, WA, p. 89)

#### *Participation*

Ten states are participating in the project: Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, and Washington. California also is receiving technical assistance. All have completed Phase I of the project, in which a comprehensive state plan for correctional substance treatment is developed.

Six states - Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, New Mexico, and New York - have entered Phase II, an 18-month phase in which states implement their plans and test the efficacy of their ideas. Appendix A, taken from BJA's FY 1988 Report on Drug Control, indicates the range of activities being undertaken by the states currently in the implementation phase.

Once states have satisfactorily completed the two phases of Project REFORM, they will be designated "model states" with the intention of using them for technical assistance, training, and as observation sites.



## *Evaluation*

**Evaluation** is an important component of these projects, and the states are in varying stages of evaluating their programs. Sample programs that have been evaluated include the following:

- Stay n' Out (New York) is a therapeutic community program that has operated in two New York State prisons for eleven years, and has been evaluated for more than a decade. Evaluators from Narcotic and Drug Research inc., concluded that "prison-based therapeutic community treatment can produce significant reductions in recidivism rates."
- The Cornerstone Program (Oregon) is a modified therapeutic community, located on the grounds of Oregon State Hospital in Salem. An evaluation of the 220 program discharges from January 1, 1983, through December 31, 1985, indicated that "the order of success as measured by no arrests, convictions, or prison incarceration . . . consistently favors time in treatment. Program graduates consistently do much better than the nongraduate groups, even though many graduates continue to have some contact with the criminal justice system."
- The Substance Abuse Treatment Program of the Washington Department of Corrections provides a variety of services to inmates. Services include assessments, individual counseling, skills training, family counseling, group work, and substance abuse education. In a 1988 study of program outcomes evaluators found that the frequency of infractions was less after treatment than before. In addition, compared to a control group, the program participants returned to prisons at a reduced level."

## **Other. state projects**

At the state level, a number of projects are taking place in addition to the comprehensive statewide planning and implementation program. WA has funded innovative pilot projects in single facilities in Iowa, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio and Wisconsin to test a variety of drug treatment approaches in correctional settings. Also, through both BJA block grants and state funds, a number of states are supporting other education and treatment efforts.

## Substance Abuse Programs in Community Corrections

### National Narcotics Intervention Training Program

Probation and parole staff around the country are being trained in drug testing and drug supervision under the National Narcotics Intervention Training Program, funded by BJA and conducted by the American Probation and Parole Association and the National Association of Probation Executives.

- In a July 1989 evaluation, 41 of 72 respondents indicated that they had introduced or changed a program since participating in the training. of 48 who indicated that they had not initiated changes, 37 said that change was planned for the near future.
- Another component of the program is a set of strategy briefs highlighting 19 drug-related community corrections programs. A copy of these strategy briefs may be obtained by contacting the NIC Information Center.

### Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)

The Bureau of Justice Assistance provides training and technical assistance to participants in this program through the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors (NASADAD).

TASC's goal is to interrupt the persistent drug-using behavior of offenders by linking the sanctions of the criminal justice system to the therapeutic processes of drug treatment programs. initiated in 1972, "TASC identifies, assesses, and refers appropriate drug- and/or alcohol dependent offenders accused or convicted of non-violent crimes to community-based substance abuse treatment as an alternative or supplement to existing justice system sanctions and procedures." (**TASC** Program Brief, 1988, page 3).

By 1988, twenty-three states had adopted or were considering adopting the TASC program model.

In a survey, collecting data on over 30,000 clients served by 60 TASC programs in 14 states, the Bureau of Justice Assistance found "there are substantial variations among programs regarding follow-up, sources of funding, host organization and service component emphasis." (FY88 Report on Drug Control, page 81). The project also "pointed to the need for improved management, client tracking and follow-up, and assessment and evaluation in many TASC Programs," which WA is assisting through development of a management information system.

## **Intensive Supervision Probation/Parole Demonstration Program**

In another project supported by WA, five demonstration sites have been established to test the effectiveness of intensive supervision among drug offenders. The five sites (New Mexico Corrections Department, Washington Department of Corrections, Georgia [with three locations], Iowa Department of Corrections, and Front Royal, Virginia) targeting this population are part of a larger program testing intensive supervision effectiveness in general. The RAND Corporation is conducting an independent evaluation of this program for BJA.

## **NIC Efforts**

- NIC will conduct public hearings on substance abuse programs in community corrections September 27 - 28, 1989, in Washington, D.C. Opinions expressed by those invited to the hearing will be used to formulate future NIC drug-related initiatives.
- The National Academy of Corrections will offer two Special Issue Seminars on the topic: **Substance Abuse Programming In Custodial Institutions**, to be offered on **October 15 - 20**, 1989, and **Substance Abuse Programming In Community Corrections** on March 18 - 23, 1990.

## **Substance Abuse Programs in Jails**

### **Drug Treatment In the Jail Setting: National Demonstration Program**

As reported in the preliminary results of the survey performed by AJA (page 4), few jails are active in substance abuse treatment programming. **AJA** is addressing the situation in a project funded under a WA grant. In addition to the survey, objectives of the project are:

- To establish two model drug treatment programs (a third site was later established).
- To transfer components from the model projects to other jails.
- To conduct preliminary research on the success of reducing drug abuse and recidivism rates through a combination of instructional and community treatment.

The three model sites selected are Pima County, Arizona, Hillsborough County, Florida, and Cook County, Illinois. Linkage to community-based treatment on release is a component of all the programs.

- In Arizona, an intensive therapeutic community for sentenced inmates has been developed in a wing of the Pima County Jail. Treatment is provided by Amity, Inc., which also continues programming after release.
- In Hillsborough County, (Tampa, Florida), both sentenced and pre-trial inmates are being treated by inhouse staff.
- In Cook County, Cermack Health Services and the Gateway Foundation are providing treatment for pre-trial inmates.

The American Jail Association is transferring what is learned from these demonstration programs by supporting site visits, training programs, and other activities.

**COMPONENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE STATE DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS TREATMENT STRATEGY FOR DRUG ABUSE IN SIX STATES**

**ALABAMA**

**Operational**

Inmate drug screening, addiction assessment and treatment referral

Database for tracking inmate **treatment**

Inmate drug education

Interim treatment prior to intensive treatment (12 step structured self-help program)

**Intensive 8-week** residential treatment

Therapeutic community 6-12 months

Prerelease transitional services

Urinalysis in prison, probation and parole

Evaluation research

**CONNECTICUT**

**Operational**

Pretrial diversion of substance abusers

Institutional treatment drug screening, addiction assessment, treatment referral, NA/AA, AIDS intervention

**Community-based treatment: Individual and group counseling, urinalysis, job referrals, vocational and educational counseling, financial referrals, NA/AA**

Community half-way houses and residential drug-free programs

Supervision, referral, monitoring for addicted probationers

**Planned**

*Therapeutic community*

*Information system*

Training for corrections staff

**DELAWARE**

**Operational**

Inmate drug screening, addiction assessment and treatment referral

Substance abuse training for corrections

Interim treatment prior to intensive treatment prison work program, counseling, substance abuse treatment

Therapeutic community: 9-15 months

Planned

Community residential drug-free programs: work release, progressing to supervised custody and parole supervision

**FLORIDA**

**Operational**

Inmate drug screening, addiction assessment and treatment referral

Training of corrections staff to improve treatment programs and unify treatment efforts

Tier I: Inmate drug education: 35-40 hours of literature distribution, Short-term counseling, group discussion education program

**Tier II:** Intensive 8-week residential - treatment individual and group counseling

**Tier III:** Therapeutic community: 6-12 months

**Tier IV:** Community-based treatment: 10-week program consisting of counseling, NA/AA, education groups

**NEW MEXICO**

**Operational**

**Substance abuse training for corrections staff**

**Drug information resource center and satellite center**

**Inmate drug education: graded training modules for inmates and peer counselors**

**Therapeutic community: 6-12 months**

**Modified therapeutic community: less intensive treatment/counseling program**

Evaluation research

**NEW YORK**

**Operational**

substance abuse training for corrections **staff**

Therapeutic communities training

Interim treatment prior to intensive treatment

Therapeutic community 9-12 months

**Planned**

**Expanded drug screening, assessment, treatment referral**

Treatment database

Drug information resource center

Expanded transitional services: employment, housing, family counseling, substance abuse services, education

Community-based treatment programs

Evaluation research

## Appendix B List of Contacts

### U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections

**Central Office:** 320 First Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC. 20534

Contact: Laura Schmidt

**National Academy of Corrections:** 1790 30th Street, Suite 430  
Boulder, Colorado 80301

Contact: Roger Smith

**National Institute of Corrections  
Information Center:** 1790 30th Street, Suite 130  
Boulder, Colorado 80301

Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.  
New York, New York  
Douglas S. Lipton, Ph.D.  
Harry K. Wexler, Ph.D.  
George DeLeon, Ph.D.

James Inciardi, Ph.D.  
Director, Division of Criminal Justice  
University of Delaware

Eric D. Wish, Ph.D.  
National Institute of Justice  
Washington, D.C.

Timothy H. Matthews  
Council of State Governments  
Lexington, Kentucky

Lloyd Rupp, Ph.D.  
Corrections Research Institute  
Kansas City, Missouri

Doug Holien  
National Council on Crime and  
Delinquency, Midwest Office  
Madison, **Wisconsin**

Todd Clear, Ph.D.  
School of Criminal Justice  
Rutgers University  
Newark, NJ

Beth Weinman  
Technical Assistance and Training  
Coordinator  
National Association of State Alcohol  
and Drug Abuse Directors  
Washington, D.C.

Gary Field, Ph.D.  
Director, Drug Treatment in Corrections Project  
Salem, Oregon

Mary Toborg, Ph.D.  
Toborg Associates  
Landover, Maryland

Joan Petersilia  
Director, Criminal Justice Programs  
The RAND Corporation  
Santa Monica California

Rod Mullen, **MA.**  
Amity, Inc.  
Tucson, Arizona