

**The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:**

**Document Title:            Boot Camp Planning Grants: An Analysis of Correctional Program Planning, Final Report**

**Author(s):                    R. Alan Lewis ; Michael A. Jones ; Susan M. Plant**

**Document No.:              192009**

**Date Received:              January 17, 2002**

**Award Number:              96-SC-LX-0004**

**This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.**

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.**

192009

# NATIONAL MULTI-SITE PROCESS EVALUATION OF

# BOOT CAMP PLANNING GRANTS: AN ANALYSIS OF CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM PLANNING

FINAL REPORT

PROPERTY OF

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

Prepared by

R. Alan Lewis  
Michael A. Jones  
Susan M. Plant

FINAL REPORT

Approved By: [Signature]

Date: 8/1/01

Submitted to

the National Institute of Justice

This project was supported by grant number 96-SC-LX-0004 from the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated 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.

*NCCD*

## NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Headquarters Office 685 Market Street, Suite 620 • San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 896-6223 • Fax (415) 896-5109

Midwest Office 426 South Yellowstone Drive, Suite 250 • Madison, WI 53719  
(608) 831-8882 • Fax (608) 831-6446

Washington DC Office 1325 G Street, NW, Suite 770 • Washington DC 20005  
(202) 638-0556 • Fax (202) 638-0723

New York Office 9 East 47<sup>th</sup> Street, 5<sup>th</sup> floor • New York, NY 10017  
(212) 371-9150 • Fax (212) 371-9104



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	iii
Acknowledgments .....	iv
Executive Summary .....	v
Chapter I	
Introduction .....	1
A. Project Overview .....	1
B. Report Organization .....	2
Chapter II	
Current Trends in Correctional Boot Camps .....	5
A. The Context of the Boot Camp Movement .....	5
B. Research on Boot Camps .....	7
C. Summary .....	13
Chapter III	
Methodology .....	16
A. Research Design .....	16
B. Research Method .....	17
C. Research Questions .....	19
D. Research Method Concerns .....	19
E. Summary .....	20
Chapter IV	
Program Documentation Results .....	21
A. Introduction .....	21
B. Background .....	21
C. Context .....	22
D. Missions, Goals and Objectives .....	23
E. Characteristics and Components .....	24
F. Attributes and Costs .....	26
G. Placement & Selection Criteria .....	26
H. Reasons for Termination .....	27
I. Security Staff Selection and Requirements .....	28
J. Aftercare Supervision and Services .....	28
K. Potential Performance Measures .....	28
L. Summary .....	28

Chapter V	
Survey Results	30
A. Background	30
B. Implementation	32
C. Operations	33
Chapter VI	
Structured Telephone Interview Results	35
A. Introduction	35
B. The Process	36
C. Perceptions	37
D. Implementation	39
E. Summary	41
Chapter VII	
Lessons Learned	42
A. Introduction	42
B. Factors Facilitating Boot Camp Planning	43
C. Barriers to Boot Camp Planning	44
Chapter VIII	
Conclusions and Policy Recommendations	45
A. Conclusions	45
B. Policy Recommendations	46
C. Reducing Recidivism, Crowding and Costs	47
D. Summary	48

Tables

References

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Correctional Populations in the United States, 1996 .....	50
Table 2:	Incarceration Rates for the United States, 1990-1996 .....	50
Table 3:	Selected Impact Evaluation Findings .....	51
Table 4:	Boot Camps — Background .....	52
Table 5:	Boot Camps — Context .....	53
Table 6:	Boot Camps — Mission, Goals and Objectives .....	56
Table 7:	Boot Camps — Characteristics, Components and Keys .....	60
Table 8:	Boot Camps — Attributes .....	69
Table 9:	Boot Camps — Costs .....	70
Table 10:	Boot Camps — Placement Authority and Selection Criteria .....	71
Table 11:	Boot Camps — Program Limitations .....	72
Table 12:	Boot Camps — Reasons for Termination .....	73
Table 13:	Boot Camps — Security Staff Selection .....	74
Table 14:	Boot Camps — Security Staff Requirements .....	75
Table 15:	Boot Camps — Aftercare Supervision .....	76
Table 16:	Boot Camps — Aftercare Services .....	77
Table 17:	Boot Camps — Potential Outcome Measures .....	78
Table 18:	Boot Camps — Advanced Outcome Measures .....	79
Table 19:	Planning Activities, Benchmarks and Research .....	80
Table 20:	Aftercare, Stakeholders and Partnerships .....	81

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to formally express their appreciation to persons who provided guidance, assistance, and information in completing this evaluation project. Voncile Gowdy was the NIJ project manager and Arnold Hopkins represented OJP in providing regular advice on all aspects of the process evaluation. Thomas Castellano provided technical assistance and editorial services. We are also grateful to the grant recipients who were willing to have their boot camp program planning efforts evaluated.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1995, the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), awarded 25 boot camp planning grants as part of the Corrections Boot Camp Initiative. This initiative implements the discretionary grant component of the Violent Offender Incarceration Grant Program authorized by Section 20101 of Subtitle A, Title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. Section 13701-13709, and implemented by 28 CFR Part 91). Administered by the Corrections Program Office, this funding provided program guidelines and awarded correctional boot camp planning grants.

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) awarded a grant to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to conduct a national multi-site process evaluation of the aforementioned boot camp planning grants. Goals of the evaluation include providing both Congress and corrections practitioners with valuable and timely information on factors that influence the boot camp planning process. Specifically, this research is designed to determine the usefulness of planning in facilitating the development or expansion of boot camp programs.

This report summarizes findings of the NCCD process evaluation. Findings demonstrate that under certain conditions, collaborative boot camp planning partnerships can be formed involving federal, state and local governments. These planning alliances have the potential to increase corrections options while addressing community concerns about public safety. Findings also describe various boot camp planning processes and resulting program plans. Planning experiences are documented and program characteristics are compared across sites. Finally, these findings reveal the need for continued corrections planning and the protracted utilization of research in the development and implementation of creative alternatives to long-term incarceration. This report

concludes that the correctional boot camp planning experience is a process that must be modified over time to solve complex problems and improve upon existing program plans. Important lessons learned during the boot camp planning process and imperative policy recommendations for future boot camp initiatives are also presented.

In summary, the current fiscal climate in many jurisdictions challenges correctional policymakers to manage increased demands for incarceration and declining resources. The need for tough intermediate sanctions that place an increased emphasis on community corrections and substance-abuse treatment is apparent. The current process evaluation examines whether, and under what circumstances, boot camp planning contributes to the development of viable alternatives to long-term incarceration. Results show that specific conditions must be met for “successful” boot camp planning. This report discusses these conditions.



# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### A. Project Overview

In fiscal year 1995, Office of Justice Programs (OJP) funding was awarded for the development, construction and expansion of adult and juvenile correctional boot camp facilities for nonviolent offenders. The idea was to free conventional prison, jail and juvenile corrections space for the confinement of violent offenders. This funding included grants for organizations interested in developing or expanding a boot camp program to engage in the planning and development necessary to implement a successful program. An important requirement of planning grant recipients was the incorporation of intensive aftercare services for program participants. In summary, planning funds could be used to: (1) sponsor statewide meetings, workshops and focus groups; (2) employ planners and develop innovative program strategies, and (3) promote informed decision-making and program improvements.

A portion of funds under the OJP program was allocated to the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to implement a national evaluation strategy. The strategy was intended to assess the process of boot camp planning and identify key elements of programs to be implemented. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) was awarded a competitive grant to conduct a detailed evaluation of boot camp planning for 25 sites that were awarded planning grants. NCCD's process evaluation involved program documentation to develop descriptions of the progress made by grant recipients. The analysis also involved the in-depth study of more advanced program plans. Included in the evaluation are adult and juvenile boot camp planning initiatives, serving males and females, with a wide-range of program characteristics and components.

The current research provides corrections policymakers with valuable information on factors that facilitate or impede the boot camp planning process. This research also documents the development of planning partnerships to solve problems related to both general and site-specific boot camp program planning initiatives. In addition, this study places specific emphasis on the future of correctional boot camps in the context of their emergence, expansion and evolution.

## **B. Report Organization**

The scope of this report is limited to summarizing results of the national multi-site process evaluation of boot camp planning grants. Beginning with historical trends, this report discusses developments leading to the emergence of boot camp programs. Chapter Two describes the growth in the number of boot camps across the United States from 1983 to the present, and reports on the evolutionary development of state, county and privately operated boot camps. The boot camp experience is discussed in terms of the exponential expansion of shock incarceration programs from adult prisons to local jails and juvenile populations. This report also discusses the recent evolution of boot camps toward models that place increased emphasis on education, treatment and therapy.

Chapter Two provides a basic literature review on what we know about boot camps and their effectiveness. A critical review of the empirical literature leads to a recognition of how limited our knowledge is and the need for stronger outcome measures, more theory driven evaluation and research-based planning. These advances may disentangle the effects of differing program components, especially aftercare. While many contend that boot camp programs deter and/ or rehabilitate offenders, little to no empirical evidence in support of this proposition has been reported in the literature. Research results reviewed for this study find little evidence to support the conclusion that the boot camp experience changes behavior in a manner that reduces crime.

Chapter Three describes the current research methodology and discusses the potential of

process evaluation to guide boot camp planners. The strategy involves program documentation, conducting a survey and in-depth telephone interviews.

Chapters Four through Six present process evaluation results and constitute the body of this report. Chapter Four presents program documentation findings including brief boot camp planning program descriptions detailing program missions, goals and objectives. In addition, major in-custody and aftercare program characteristics and components are compared across sites. Chapter Five summarizes results of the boot camp planning survey. The three-tiered survey was administered to grant recipients and designed to gather background, implementation and operational data on the overall planning process. Survey results describe the nature, extent and progress of planning activities. Chapter Six reports results of structured telephone interviews. These findings are characterized in the context of a three-step boot camp planning process. This process involves initial, intermediate and implementation phases of program development or expansion.

Chapters Seven through Nine present our summary and conclusions. These chapters discuss important lessons learned in the context of barriers to boot camp planning and factors that facilitate the planning process. In addition, policy recommendations are suggested to guide the development of future boot camp plans. Reported results: (1) contribute to our understanding of the importance of planning in program development; (2) advance the current body of knowledge on the emergence, expansion, and evolution of boot camps plans; (3) identify progressive boot camp program components and characteristics; (4) determine intended program outcomes and potential measures of “success,” and (5) assist policy makers in determining what works, what doesn’t work and what’s promising.

Attached to this report is a fairly in depth description of a prototype boot camp planning grant initiative in Pennsylvania. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania determined the feasibility of a boot

camp and developed a comprehensive plan for statewide implementation. Results include a detailed description of a residential- and community-based treatment program serving adult male and female offenders.

## CHAPTER II

### CURRENT TRENDS IN CORRECTIONAL BOOT CAMPS

#### A. The Context of the Boot Camp Movement

Prior to discussing boot camp planning, the correctional boot camps movement must be considered in the context of current trends in corrections. Perhaps the most pervasive problem challenging modern corrections is the nexus of overburdened corrections systems and rising confinement costs. Prison and jail populations are increasing rapidly and this growth is paralleled by rising operational and capital costs. In 1997, more than 1.7 million inmates were held in the nation's prisons and local jails. More than 1.1 million offenders were incarcerated in state and federal prisons and almost 567,079 were housed in local jails at midyear 1997. Recent estimates also show that there were more than 3 million offenders on probation and over 700,000 on parole in 1996 (Tables 1 and 2). In addition, more than 35 states as well as many of the major jail systems were overcrowded or under court orders to control crowding that year.

There are now approximately 5.6 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 local jails, juvenile and female populations (Toby and Pearson, 1992; Austin, Jones and Boylard, 1993). Today, estimates indicate that there are as many as 70 adult state and federal correctional boot camps in more than 33 states and over 30 juvenile boot camps in operation (Sherman et. al., 1997).

Boot camps have been viewed as a means for reducing the high rate of recidivism among offenders and for reducing prison crowding. Often categorized as an intermediate sanction, boot camps were created to confine 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 length of stay incarcerated and reduce recidivism (Parent, 1989). In doing so, the costs of confinement 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 et. al., 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 boot camps. Indeed, there is culminating empirical evidence suggesting that, in many instances, they simply don't work as intended (MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994; Parent, 1996).

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 lead by a mean and dogfaced 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, they view boot camps as being 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 et. al., 1990).

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 (Peters et. al., 1997). Whether and what impact these changes will have on the ability of boot camps to reduce recidivism, crowding and costs remains to be seen.

#### **B. Research 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, 1996). 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, 1994; Cowles and Castellano, 1996). 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 towards 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).

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 1996).

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 and Aziz; 1996; 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.

Some observers of correctional boot camps suggest that "Third Generation" programs are now emerging (Parent, 1996). 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 reenter 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. While a body of evaluative research on boot camps has been derived from studies of "first" and "second" generation boot camps (e.g., MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994), we currently know very little about the impacts of "third generation" programs on desired correctional outcomes. Thus, much of our knowledge base is already dated.

### ***Reducing 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- and back-end. Because boot camps share this potential, many jurisdictions have enthusiastically embraced these programs as alternatives to incarcerations. 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.

### ***Impact While In The Boot Camp Program***

Some evaluations have examined the impact of boot camps on offender adjustments while institutionalized (e.g., MacKenzie and Shaw, 1990; 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 prosocial 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. 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.

## ***Offender Recidivism***

### **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 generally found that boot camps do not appear to be reducing offender recidivism rates. It was found that the boot camp experience did not result in a reduction in recidivism in five states. In three states, boot camp participants who successfully completed the programs had lower recidivism rates than comparable inmates who served longer prison terms in conventional prisons on at least one measure of recidivism. The three state boot camp programs that appear somewhat successful in

positively impacting offender recidivism rates had some common characteristics. First, post-release intensive supervision of boot campers is a program component in all three states, while prison releasees from those states are not generally as intensively supervised upon release from prison (see e.g., Karr and Jones, 1996). Second, the institutional phase of these programs tended 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 on probation (see MacKenzie et. al. 1993; MacKenzie and Shaw 1993). 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 releasees had marginally lower recidivism rates than comparison groups on some measures of recidivism. Among these promising program characteristics are therapeutic activities including counseling and drug treatment, and follow-up for offenders upon residential program completion (Sherman et. al.,1997).

### **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 among 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, these findings conclude that the boot camp experience does not appear to impact re-offending among juveniles releases. Specifically, field experiments utilizing both experimental and quasi-experimental to evaluate the effect of boot camp programming on recidivism found no statistical difference between treatment and comparison in terms of future repeat offending. The results of these and other studies are discussed in further detail in the next section of this chapter.

### **Selected Impact Evaluation Findings**

Selected impact evaluation findings are presented in Table 3. Results of field experiments utilizing both experimental and quasi-experimental designs show little evidence in support of boot camps as a viable corrections option in terms of crime prevention. These findings show little or no difference between the offenders who participated in boot camp programs and those who did not. Moreover, these findings are consistent across methodologically sound studies with varying levels of scientific rigor.

For the purpose of this discussion, degrees of research rigor are classified as low, medium or high. Studies with relatively low research rigor fail to use statistical controls to adjust for differences between boot camp releases and comparison groups. Studies with medium scientific rigor use statistical controls when examining differences between experimental and control groups.

Finally, studies with high scientific rigor use random assignment to treatment and control groups to examine boot camps participant performance in the community.

In summary, there are a reasonable number of evaluations demonstrating that boot camps do not have an impact on the recidivism rates of offenders. Some evidence that suggests the need for planning the evaluation of programs with therapeutic residential environs and intensive community aftercare. While these boot camp programs may offer some promise, the available evidence must be examined under rigorous experimental conditions with random assignment to treatment and control groups.

### **C. Summary**

Adult and juvenile boot camps do not appear to be viable corrections 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, however, methodological factors that should be considered in interpreting some of these findings. Among these factors are relatively 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 plan and implement alternatives 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, Merry, and Rucker,

1990; Sechrest, 1989; Dickey, 1993). 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 a 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.
- Boot camps often have resulted in the revitalization of correctional staff.

The actual source of these benefits are uncertain at this point. It does seem, however, that having inmates engaged in 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 some 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 current research does indicate that boot camp planning goals are more likely to be achieved if programs exhibit certain components and characteristics.

Experience with boot camps suggests that proactive offender management, involving the frequent and direct supervision of offenders by staff who also serve 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 impact of boot camps remains unproven and must be the subject of more empirical scrutiny.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### A. Research Design

The current research design involves the use of process evaluation to describe how well programs are planned, implemented and modified over time. Process evaluation provides a mechanism to document barriers to program planning and factors that facilitate the planning process. This documentation is of particular value to corrections planners and policy makers in search of prototypes for program implementation. Prior to the expenditure of additional resources to develop or expand boot camp programs, process evaluation is an invaluable research tool essential to setting the stage for outcome evaluation.

The research methodology utilized a case study approach involving a three-tiered data collection strategy. This approach involved: (1) analysis of program documentation; (2) written survey administration, and (3) in-depth telephone interviews. The process evaluation initiated with the program documentation phase. This first level of analysis involved gathering and reviewing written information from planning sites including correspondence, proposals and final reports. Available documentation was used to identify major program characteristics, components and expectations about how individual program plans were intended to work. These materials were used to develop program descriptions and determine planning progress over time. In addition, these items were used to assess whether there were changes in program plans, why these changes occurred, and how these changes might impact program outcomes. The program documentation phase required regular follow-up focused on the collection of missing data. In general, grant recipients failed to adequately document boot camp planning grant activities.

The second level of analysis involved conducting a survey of planning grant recipients. The



survey questionnaire was separated into three sections to gather background, implementation and operations information. The background query targeted general areas of inquiry including the identification of boot camp missions, goals and objectives. In contrast, the implementation query focused on specific types of planning activities, expenditures, and the status and / or feasibility of the boot camp program plan. The survey concludes with an operations query designed to direct attention toward the provision of program treatment and services, and the role of constituents in the planning process. In addition, the survey includes a section for respondents to summarize the boot camp planning experience in terms of achievements and challenges. While planning grant recipients were responsive to the survey, repeated follow-up was necessary to increase response rates and add clarity to responses.

The third level of analysis involved the use of structured telephone interviews with sites selected on the basis of planning grant type, geographic location, and the status of program development. In-depth telephone interviews were conducted with boot camp planners and / or key stakeholders at twelve selected sites. These interviews centered around the process of boot camp planning. The telephone interviews provided an opportunity to clarify program missions, goals and objectives, and to more accurately identify the intent of major program characteristics and components. Specifically, structured telephone interviews identified successful strategies and tactics to build planning partnerships and gain community consensus; barriers to boot camp planning and factors that facilitate the planning process, and “lessons-learned” in order to fine-tune and fund correctional boot camp plans. In general, interviews with key stakeholders at each site yielded valuable process evaluation information.

## **B. Research Method**

The current research method utilized process evaluation to answer questions about how

planned boot camp programs are intended to operate. This approach documents activities undertaken during the planning process in an effort to identify problems faced in developing boot camp program plans and strategies for overcoming these problems. This research method also serves as a guide to gauging boot camp planning progress in terms of program context, characteristics, and components.

Boot camp context includes the set of conditions and assumptions that define the program concept and describe logical linkages. Theoretical perspectives that guide the selection of target populations and intervention strategies are included in this framework. The context of boot camp planning initiatives include the development of program missions, goals and objectives. This context is used to add clarity to the planning process in terms of program interventions and expected outcomes.

Boot camp characteristics describe the distinctive features that define the program plan. Modern correctional boot camps are most often distinguished by their emphasis on military- or therapeutic-style environs. Among the primary program characteristics of military-style boot camps are discipline, drill and physical fitness. Characteristics of therapeutic-style boot camps include counseling, education and treatment services. While there is an array of military and nonmilitary models to borrow from in planning the most appropriate boot camp model, the current research utilized these characteristics to compare and contrast program attributes across sites. Boot camp characteristics are also used to determine whether planners demonstrate a commitment to combining both military- and therapeutic-styles to potentially enhance the effect of program benefits.

Boot camp components include program phases that involve the full range of activities, interventions, and services provided to participants. These phases commonly include residential and aftercare program components. Residential program components which include intensive training

are the signature of the boot camp concept. These components routinely concentrate on traditional boot camp methods of behavior modification including cognitive re-engineering, education, military regimentation, physical training, and work ethic. Aftercare program components are designed to continue the process of community reintegration and promote public safety. Aftercare programs may include many the aforementioned services combined with counseling and therapeutic services, drug screening and testing, and intensive and other forms of community supervision. Because community reintegration is the measure of overall boot camp success, the current research uses these components to determine whether continuity between program phases contributes to the success of developing a planning initiative to restore youths to the community.

#### **C. Research Questions**

While individual program plans are unique, the current research design and method determines how program plans are intended to operate by addressing specific questions. These research questions are related to how best to plan future adult and juvenile boot camps. Among these questions are: (1) who are the intended program participants in terms of demographic, criminal, and other risk characteristics; (2) what types of therapeutic and treatment services are provided program participants in terms of dosage and duration; (3) when do program participants begin the boot camp and how long are program phases; (4) where do program operations occur in terms of location and how many participants are admitted to the program, and (5) what levels of supervision are required during residential and aftercare phases of the program?

#### **D. Research Method Concerns**

In general, major methodological concerns involve the finding that there were considerable difficulties experienced by most of the sites in developing viable boot camp plans. This finding suggests that planners had insufficient time to achieve planning goals. More than 75 percent of

grantees requested no-cost extensions of the original funding period. The primary reasons for the requests were the need for additional time to plan and delays in distributing planning grant funds. Extended grant periods ranged from 6 to 12 months and some of the planning initiatives are ongoing. While the majority of grantees received no-cost extensions, many of these sites still failed to deliver program plans. Moreover, the aforementioned difficulties resulted in low response rates that limited findings during program documentation and survey questionnaire phases of the process evaluation.

#### **E. Summary**

In summary, process evaluation provides a systematic approach to assessing boot camp planning. This approach offers the opportunity to evaluate the merits of a wide-variety of program plans and presents the occasion to monitor modifications in program design. Results show that program changes made during the planning process were intended to overcome deficiencies in previous boot camp plans. In most instances, these changes were related to the development of more intensive aftercare components. The increased emphasis on aftercare via intensive community supervision is expected to enhance the ability of boot camp programs to reduce recidivism and crime, the *sine quo non* of desirable correctional interventions.

## CHAPTER IV

### PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION RESULTS

#### A. Introduction

Much of the program documentation was provided by grant recipients during the planning process, and included formal proposals, progress reports, correspondence and final reports. Program documentation provided much needed insight into the process of boot camp planning. Findings demonstrate wide variance in planning grant purposes, target populations, missions, goals and objectives. These findings also abstract major boot camp characteristics, components and keys to successful planning. In addition, program documentation findings compare boot camp attributes, selection criteria, and expected costs across sites.

Other program documentation results parallel boot camp placement authority, participation limitations and termination requirements. Security staff selection and training qualifications are also compared. In addition, these results include cross-site comparisons of types of aftercare supervision, community support services and potential performance measures. While space limitations prohibit the inclusion of entire boot camp plans, program planners are encouraged to refer to individual site reports to gain a more detailed perspective of planning initiatives.

#### B. Background

Background information on boot camp planning grant recipients is presented in Table 4. Results show that more than \$1.1 million in federal funds was distributed to 25 sites in 16 states and 3 U.S. territories. State and county corrections agencies constitute more than 90 percent of the grantees. Among other grantees were agencies involved in the provision of court, public safety and social services. While 52 percent of the grantees planned adult boot camp programs, 48 percent of the grantees planned programs targeting juvenile offenders.

### C. Context

The primary purpose of boot camp planning grants are presented in Table 5. While there is wide variance across program plans, there appears to be some consistency among grant purposes. The majority of grantees utilized funds for the purpose of developing, expanding, or determining the feasibility of a comprehensive boot camp program plan. In general, these plans were intended to provide alternatives to incarceration and reduce recidivism, reserve bed space for violent offender incarceration and reduce crowding, and preserve public safety while reducing confinement costs. Plans to reduce recidivism involved the use of boot camp programs as a tough intermediate sanction while plans to reduce crowding emphasized the diversion of certain nonviolent criminals from correctional facilities, and plans to reduce costs utilized boot camps to attenuate average lengths of stay. In most instances, planning grant recipients combined these purposes to create comprehensive, highly structured and intensive boot camp programs. The majority of programs were intended to hold offenders accountable for their actions, positively change behaviors, and enhance the reintegration of offenders.

#### *Target Populations*

Selected target populations are also shown in Table 5. Nearly all of the boot camp planning grant programs targeted nonviolent and male offenders who were otherwise institution-bound. In some circumstances, boot camp program plans focused attention on at-risk youthful offenders adjudicated for the first-time. Other program plans specifically targeted those youth with minor criminal histories serving sentences in overburdened detention facilities.

Most of the program plans for focused attention on property and drug offenders while some program plans specifically targeted those offenders sentenced to overcrowded county jails or prisons for 1 to 5 years. In addition, both juvenile and adult boot camp plans routinely targeted probation

and parole violators for boot camp program participation.

#### **D. Missions, Goals and Objectives**

##### ***Missions***

A summary of program missions are presented in Table 6. In general, boot camp missions challenge corrections planners to balance the public's need for punishment; the offender's need for reintegration, and the victim's need for restoration. Among the primary missions of boot camp planners is the establishment of correctional environs that encourage positive behavioral change and respect for the law. Stated missions also include the protection of individual dignity and the preservation of public safety. In addition, boot camp missions are committed to the reintegration of offenders, as well as the restoration of victims, families and communities. Specifically, boot camp missions promote positive values including discipline, education, physical fitness and work. Other missions involve the creation of corrections options that expand alternatives to incarceration and reduce recidivism, crowding and costs. Still other stated missions are concerned with the development of communication, employment and life skills.

##### ***Goals***

Commonly expressed boot camp planning grant goals are also presented in Table 6. The most basic boot camp goals involve the provision of an institution- and community-based continuum of care to successfully reintegrate offenders and, in general, these goals promote positive behavioral change for the preservation of public safety. Specifically, these goals include deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation and punishment. Other stated goals involve enhancing alternatives to secure confinement to reduce recidivism, crowding and cost. Achieving these goals requires the support of key stakeholders representing residents, community service and treatment providers.

## *Objectives*

The primary objectives of boot camp programs are also presented in Table 6. In general, these objectives involve the reintegration of offenders and the restoration of victims. While there is some variance among program objectives, stated objectives are usually intended to promote productive, law-abiding and self-reliant lifestyles by advancing accountability, discipline and self-esteem. Other program objectives involve expanding the range of sentencing options and / or the diversion of nonviolent offenders from traditional incarceration. These rather functional objectives are intended to reserve bed space for violent offenders while reducing recidivism, crowding and costs.

## **E. Characteristics and Components**

### *Characteristics*

Boot camp planning grant program characteristics are shown in Table 7. Characteristics describe the distinctive features that define the boot camp program. These crosscutting characteristics are most often distinguished by their emphasis on military- or therapeutic-style environs. Military-style boot camp characteristics involve structured programs with military-style drill, ceremony and titles. Program participants are typically grouped in platoons and required to adhere to regimented daily schedules that include mental challenge, physical training and work activities. These characteristics are intended to build character, discipline and leadership skills.

In contrast, therapeutic-style boot camp characteristics involve the provision of counseling, education and treatment services, and an overwhelming majority of program plans made counseling services available to individuals, groups and families. Among these services were conflict resolution, problem solving and substance abuse resistance instruction. Educational services were also provided program participants to facilitate the reintegration of offenders into communities. These services oftentimes included GED preparation and vocational skills development. In addition,



some program plans provided alcohol and drug abuse treatment programs to prevent substance abuse.

### *Components*

Planning grant program components are also shown in Table 7. Boot camp components specify program phases that include all activities, interventions and services provided to participants, and commonly include residential and aftercare program phases. The residential component refers to the initial phase of the program that typically involved intensive institutional programming and training in areas including counseling, education, military drill, physical fitness, skills development and work. While most residential programs lasted 6 months, program lengths range from 2 to 6 months.

The aftercare component refers to the final phase of the boot camp program. This period typically involved the continued provision of residential program services and treatment combined with some form of community supervision. While types and levels of community supervision varied, most programs utilized probation and/ or parole for periods ranging from 6 to 12 months.

While military- and therapeutic-style boot camps are distinctive, the majority of plans combined characteristics of both paradigms in residential and aftercare program components. In some instances, a transitional component was also included to promote the passage of the boot camp participant from confinement to community. This fusion demonstrates an attempt on the part of grantees to develop comprehensive boot camp programs to enhance the effects previous interventions.

### *Keys to Planning*

Reported keys to successful planning are also included in Table 7. Among the key elements in effective boot camp planning is the establishment of partnerships. These alliances were usually

led by advisory committees consisting of community stakeholders, constituent groups and policymakers. Planning partnerships proved valuable during both initial and intermediate stages of program development. Other key elements involve the use of needs assessment to determine the number of eligible boot camp participants, and include the use of population projections to estimate expected numbers of offenders and bed-space needs. In addition, the use of outside experts to assist with planning activities was a key to success in several sites. While the nature and extent of activities varied, consultants typically contributed to conducting feasibility studies, facilitating site plans and the production of planning reports.

#### **F. Attributes and Costs**

Boot camp program attributes are presented in Table 8. Across program plans, results show that the overall average daily population of the operational programs was 100 and bed capacities ranged from 12 to 400. Annual admissions ranged from 60 to 600 offenders, and program length ranged from 5 to 18 months. The average length of stay (ALOS) across all programs was 12 months. Other findings show that the number of security and total staff varied with the size of the boot camp program.

Table 9 displays reported boot camp construction and operational costs at the sites. While the majority of plans failed to achieve this level of analysis and estimates vary with the size of the program, available data suggest that construction costs ranged from \$2.7 million - \$15 million, and annual operating costs ranged from \$450,000 to \$5.3 million. In addition, inmate costs per day ranged from \$31 to \$117 and averaged \$75 per day.

#### **G. Placement Authority and Selection Criteria**

Boot camp placement authority and selection criteria are shown in Table 10. The majority of programs specified that the courts exercise boot camp placement authority. In some instances,

however, placement authority was also accorded to corrections and other social service agencies. Other findings suggest that offender selection criteria severely limited boot camp program participation. These criteria involve demographic, offense and other program prohibitions. Demographic restrictions include age and gender parameters that largely limit boot camp participation to male and juvenile offenders. In some instances, other restrictions limited program participation of those convicted of violent and/ or sex crimes along with certain other felonies and misdemeanors. In addition, offenders identified as either an escape risk or drug dependent were oftentimes precluded.

Other boot camp program limitations are shown in Table 11. These limitations are based on correctional agency status, sentence length, individual impairments and consent. While most boot camp programs permitted the participation of probationers, most planners were reluctant to admit parolees. Maximum and minimum sentence limits also precluded the participation offenders in some programs. In these instances, boot camps routinely required a prerequisite 6 to 12 month sentence remaining to be served. In addition, an overwhelming majority of programs limited the participation of offenders with physical and/ or mental impairments. This finding is related to inherent liability issues associated with the aforementioned characteristics of nearly all boot camp programs. Finally, the majority of programs required the voluntary consent of program participants.

#### **H. Reasons for Termination**

Boot camp program reasons for termination are presented in Table 12. Results show that boot camp planners included 6 major reasons to terminate an offender from program participation. Among these reasons were: (1) an offender fails to meet program requirements; (2) an offenders institutional behavior is in violation of program rules; (3) an offender volunteers to be terminated from the program; (4) an offender tests positive for drugs; (5) an offender violates probation or

parole, and (6) an offender is arrested or convicted of a new offense.

#### **I. Security Staff Selection and Requirements**

Boot camp program security staff selection limitations are fairly typical (Table 13) and among persons ineligible for employment were those with a history of violence, abuse or neglect, alcohol or drug abuse, or repeatedly reporting misconduct. Other limitations involved restricting persons with current or serious personal problems, and those with physical or mental impairments that would impede the performance of job duties. In addition, security staff requirements routinely required some college, a high school diploma and state certification (Table 14).

#### **J. Aftercare Supervision and Services**

Aftercare supervision commonly involved probation, parole and other oversight activities, where associated levels of community supervision range from moderate to intensive (Table 15). Reported aftercare program services are shown in Table 16. These services include an assortment of assistance programs including community service, counseling, drug testing and treatment, education, employment training and placement, life skills development and physical training.

#### **K. Potential Performance Measures**

Potential boot camp program outcome measures are shown in Tables 17 and 18. Among these measures are reductions in recidivism, drop out and commitment rates. Advanced outcome measures involve improvements in program completion rates, education, life skills development, job placement, community reintegration and cost-effectiveness.

#### **L. Summary**

Many of the most successful grantees utilized planning partnerships as a mechanism to gain consensus. These alliances consisted of corrections policymakers, community stakeholders and consultants. In general, these partnerships facilitated the development of comprehensive plans.

Specifically, these alliances expedited the process of: (1) determining whether sufficient numbers of boot camp eligible offenders were available to warrant a program; (2) developing program, treatment and service models, and (3) designing facilities and site plans. Moreover, planning partnerships ensured that the majority of boot camps combined promising program characteristics to create a comprehensive continuum of care.

## CHAPTER V

### SURVEY RESULTS

This chapter summarizes results of the boot camp planning survey administered to grant recipients, and designed to gather background, implementation and operational data on the planning process. Survey results describe the nature, extent and progress of planning activities designed to achieve viable boot camp plans. Grant recipients returned 18 of the 25 completed surveys, representing a 72 percent response rate during the extended data collection period.

#### **A. Background**

Background survey results involve general information on boot camp planning grant initiatives. Results show that the majority of grant recipients initiated the planning process through the use of an advisory committee. While the role of advisory committees and their level of planning participation varied across sites, these groups generally consisted of community members, constituent groups and corrections policymakers. Other results show that the most of grantees conducted a population projection of some type to assess the need for a boot camp and determine bed capacity. Program capacities averaged 200 annual participants and the mean program length was 12 months. In general, boot camp plans included a structured, 3-month residential program followed by 6 to 9 months of community aftercare. While 53 percent of survey respondents report plans for adult facilities, 47 percent planned juvenile facilities. Survey findings also reveal that 50 percent of respondents planned coed programs and 25 percent planned male programs. In addition, more than 75 percent of boot camp programs were to be administered by state or county governments, and the others were to be operated by private contractors.

The majority of boot camp planners established restrictive selection criteria for program participation. Survey results show that 49 percent of planners report having developed a process to

review and select program participants. Similarly, 41 percent of planners had developed formal, written policies or statutes that described the selection process and criteria. In general, selection for boot camp participation was governed by: (1) restrictive legislative requirements that mandated eligible offenses and offenders; (2) court-ordered or correctional agency review, and (3) prohibitions against violent and other offenders serving specified sentences. While the age of program participants ranged from 12 to 28 years, nearly all of the survey respondents report targeting youthful offenders. In addition, other selection criteria involved geographical (14%), medical (48%) and voluntary consent (33%) restrictions.

The primary purpose of the planning grants was the development of a boot camp program, and nearly 70 percent of survey respondents utilized the grants for this purpose. Among other uses of grant funds was the expansion of an existing boot camp and/ or the enlargement of a boot camp in a new or present location. Survey results also show that program goals remained stable during the planning process, and approximately 60 percent of respondents report no change in original planning goals. Other results show that program characteristics also remained constant as boot camp plans developed. More than 50 percent of respondents report the inclusion of military drill, protocol and discipline as major program characteristics. Among other boot camp characteristics were physical labor (70%) and recreational activities (50%).

Perhaps the most significant survey finding is that an overwhelming majority of boot camp planners committed their programs to educational, therapeutic and treatment services. More than 75 percent of plans included these services as a major part of institutional and aftercare programming. These findings also show that a similar portion of plans committed programs to the development of life skills and the provision of job/vocational skills training.

Background survey results conclude that 30 percent of respondents report having made the

decision to continue the development of a boot camp program plan; 20 percent report having made the decision to discontinue plans, and the future plans of 50 percent of the boot camp initiatives were undecided at the time of the survey. In the event that the decision was made not to continue planning, respondents were asked to answer survey questions as they relate to the activities that occurred prior to that decision. In addition, survey results show that only two planning grant recipients report having initiated program implementation.

## **B. Implementation**

Implementation survey results involve boot camp planning events, milestones and research activities and respondents were requested to identify planning activities that required the utilization of grant funds. The percentage of respondents that report the completion of varied boot camp planning activities are shown in Table 19. Results show that these planning activities include: attending or convening statewide meetings (59%); participation in OJP workshops (53%); conducting focus groups (36%); site visits to facilities (53%), and attending training sessions (18%).

Survey respondents were also asked to identify planning benchmarks that were completed or in progress. The purpose of this query was to determine the status of the planning initiative and the feasibility of boot camp program implementation. The percentage of respondents that achieved planning benchmarks are also shown in Table 19. Results show that these planning benchmarks include developing: clear and measurable program goals (65%); mission statements (65%); target populations (76%); criteria for program admission (53%); criteria for program dismissal (47%); population or capacity projections (41%); treatment and service requirements (65%); planning/advisory committees (65%); comprehensive aftercare components (53%); administrative and management mechanisms (35%); evaluation plans (35%); strategies to obtain funding (18%); state and local partnerships (24%), and program expansion plans (6%).



Finally, implementation survey respondents were asked to identify specific research activities conducted during the planning process. This query was designed to determine the utilization of research in boot camp planning. The percentage of respondents that conducted research activities are shown in Table 19. Results show that these research activities include: developing aftercare program components (59%); conducting needs assessments (71%); utilizing population projections (71%); assessing facility space needs (53%); designing program services (65%); analyzing housing needs (47%); determining staff requirements (47%), and performing pilot studies (12%).

### **C. Operations**

Operational survey results involve the process of developing aftercare program components, the role of key stakeholders and creating community partnership mechanisms. Survey results show that 35 percent of respondents report definite plans to construct or expand a boot camp. Other results show that boot camp plans were perceived as: (1) most likely in 30 percent of the sites; (2) not likely in 30 percent of the sites (although no formal decision had been made), and (3) not feasible in 6 percent of the sites (a formal decision had been made not to continue planning). Major factors contributing to the more than 33 percent of respondents that decided to discontinue planning initiatives include legislative restrictions on eligible boot camp program participant populations, and the lack of program, operational and construction funding. Specifically, 41 percent of sites surveyed report that knowledge of the lack of construction grant funds impacted the decision whether or not to continue planning the development or expansion of a boot camp.

The majority of survey respondents report having devoted specific planning activities to the enhancement of aftercare programs (Table 20). Results suggest that these planned components include: case management services (71%); individual case planning (71%); intensive surveillance (59%); comprehensive services (67%); incentives (59%); sanctions (68%); service brokerage with

community resources (53%); management information (47%), and evaluation (59%).

Survey respondents also report that in most instances, residents of the community and social service providers were included among key stakeholders and contributed to the planning process. The percentage of respondents that report the utilization of these persons in important roles is also shown in Table 20. Results show that these roles include: gathering and processing information (65%); decision making (65%); committee meetings or presentations (88%); brokering of services (12%), and other key stakeholder roles (94%). In addition, survey results presented in Table 20 show that mechanisms used to inform the community of boot camp planning activities include newspaper press releases (29%), community forums and presentations (29%), informal meetings and gatherings (24%), television interviews (12%) and other mechanisms (71%).

Finally, operational survey results show that several grant recipients contracted with outside experts to assist in planning activities. While the nature and extent of these activities varied, the role of the outside consultants included services that involve data collection and analysis, feasibility studies, planning facilitation and report preparation. Among the products and services provided by outside experts were onsite technical assistance, presentations to planning committees and staff and final reports.

## CHAPTER VI

### STRUCTURED TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESULTS

#### A. Introduction

Telephone interviews were conducted with representatives from the sites of Juneau (AK), Gila River Indian Community (AZ), Pima County (AZ); Alameda County (CA), San Diego (CA), Baltimore and Harford Counties (MD), Lansing (MI); Jackson (MS), Lincoln (NE), Sac and Fox Nation (OK), Philadelphia (PA), and Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Racine Counties (WI). On average, three stakeholders involved in the day-to-day planning activities were interviewed in twelve selected sites. Among the key stakeholders interviewed via telephone were a cross section of planning grant participants including community members, criminal justice professionals and social service providers. This core group of boot camp planners referenced others who contributed to the planning initiative including representatives of community organizations, local businesses and state legislatures.

These sites were selected on the basis of planning grant type, geographic location and the status of program development. While most of the sites focused on developing programs for youthful/juvenile male offenders convicted of property and drug offenses, some boot camp plans targeted nonviolent adult and female offenders. Across the nation, selected telephone interview sites ranged from urban to rural settings. These sites included Native American communities that embraced cultural elements to reintroduce traditional values and practices. Other sites developed distinctive plans targeting specific inmate populations. For example, the Philadelphia boot camp curricula is specifically designed to meet the needs of incarcerated women and prevent repeat victimization.

## **B. The Process**

Results show that the majority of planning grants produced boot camp plans that combined traditional military-styled components with progressive therapeutic-oriented components to advance the boot camp concept. This nexus resulted in residential and community based components intended to provide a continuum of care. While most planners report that program development lasted for one year, other stakeholders report that the planning process lasted nearly two years.

Structured telephone interview results demonstrate that boot camp planning can be characterized in the context of a three-phase process involving initial, intermediate and implementation phases of program development. First, initial planning phase activities include determining the need for a boot camp program, selecting a target population and defining selection criteria. These activities also involve strategies to garner community, legislative and political support to build collaborative planning partnerships. Second, intermediate planning phase activities involve the development of actual boot camp programs, and focus on the creation of conceptual frameworks and program philosophies. Program missions, goals and objectives are also formalized during this period. In addition, this phase involves categorizing boot camp service components in residential and aftercare programs. Residential program components which include intensive training are the signature of the boot camp concept. These components routinely concentrate on traditional boot camp methods of behavior modification including cognitive re-engineering, education, military regimentation, physical training and work ethics. Aftercare program components are designed to continue the process of community reintegration and promote public safety. Aftercare programs may include many the aforementioned services combined with drug treatment and testing. This program component also involved intensive and other forms of community supervision such as day reporting, electronic monitoring and home detention. Third, implementation phase activities involve advanced issues concerning facilities planning, management and operations.

This advanced level of program development also relates to activities involving staff selection, training, security and construction.

### **C. Perceptions**

The majority of the stakeholders interviewed support the boot camp planning process. Among the most common perceptions was that the process brought together key decision makers with a wide range of experience to participate in a collaborative planning effort to produce viable programs. Planners also report that in some instances the process developed a network of professionals who had begun working toward the development of other programs. In addition, stakeholders report that research findings and the boot camp planning experiences of other jurisdictions were instrumental in guiding the program development process.

Other results reveal that the national training conference contributed much to the development of program plans. Among the most common perceptions was that the conference presented an opportunity for planners to explore a wide variety of boot camp programs. In addition, stakeholders report that the conference presented an occasion to share concerns and draw upon the technical expertise of consultants who would prove invaluable to the planning process.

#### ***Planning Partnerships***

An overwhelming majority of planners perceived partnerships as essential to achieving planning grant purposes. These public/private partnerships consisted of corrections policymakers, community stakeholders, and representatives of other agencies and organizations. Most stakeholders formed planning committees that combined the limited resources of government agencies and community organizations to develop boot camp programs, operating budgets, and facility plans.

### *Goals*

The majority of planners perceive that program goals remained generally stable throughout the process, and while boot camp goals adhered to federal guidelines, they were custom tailored to fit state and local policy and practice. In Alaska, for example, the original target population was expanded to include young adult males age 26 and under to increase the number of boot camp eligibles. Stakeholders in Gila River report modifying program goals to focus attention on rehabilitating at-risk juveniles. Similarly, boot camp goals were changed to emphasize work program attributes and expand target populations in Nebraska. In most instances, program goals were developed by group consensus and evolved to reflect therapeutic- rather than military-style models. While correctional administrators determined boot camp goals in some instances, goals were also dictated by the State and county governments.

### *Selection Criteria*

Nearly all of the planners perceive that selection criteria were subject to considerable debate during the planning process. Across sites, the most common selection criteria were first-time, non-violent offenders with no serious mental or physical disabilities. Age and gender restrictions also prohibited program participation in many instances. Most stakeholders also report efforts to pretest eligibility criteria to determine whether sufficient numbers of boot camp eligibles existed.

In Alaska, pretest results prompted the planning committee to conclude that the selected target population could not sustain a boot camp program. Similarly, there were early indications that the number of boot camp eligibles might not be sufficient in Alameda County. The matter was further complicated by a mandate that the planned coed program maintain a certain ratio of females to males. While the Alameda County boot camp was implemented, it became increasingly difficult to enroll females and the program was closed.

Results of stakeholder interviews also reveal the shared concern that selection criteria requiring first-time and non-violent offenders was too restrictive. Some planners perceive that these and other grant restrictions were based on the characteristics of outside programs that fail to consider the priorities of local jurisdictions. It was suggested that future planners be afforded the opportunity to develop site-specific selection criteria.

### *Aftercare*

The majority of the planners perceive that the development of aftercare programs was perhaps the most important part of the boot camp plan. In many instances, however, stakeholders report that the community aftercare program component was minimized. In general, boot camp planning aftercare services involved community restitution, counseling, health education, graduated sanctions, intensive supervision, job placement, substance abuse treatment and vocational training.

### *Evaluation*

All of the planners perceived that the evaluation of boot camp programs is essential to determining program success or failure. The majority of stakeholders were familiar with the results of previous research and planned for process and impact evaluation to be conducted by independent organizations a year after program implementation. In addition, most planners indicated that evaluation of the effectiveness of boot camp programs would be largely based on measures of recidivism including rearrest and re-incarceration, and in some sites plans included the development of a computerized system to track boot camp participants and provide automated information on offender recidivism.

## **D. Implementation**

Structured telephone interview results reveal that only two of the twelve sites implemented boot camp plans. In Mississippi, the State mandated the opening of two additional boot camps after

a pilot program was implemented in 1985. The current planning grant assisted in achieving this endeavor in 1996. In California, the State awarded an operational grant to Alameda County in 1996. While the boot camp was successfully implemented, the program is no longer operating due to insufficient numbers of eligible offenders.

Michigan and Nebraska have passed legislation in support of the implementation of boot camp programs. As a result of this legislation, the State of Michigan is scheduled to open a boot camp in August, 1998. In Nebraska, the current plan was proposed to the State legislature resulting in the passage of a bill to implement a boot camp no later than 2005.

During the planning process, Alaska and Wisconsin reached a decision to discontinue boot camp planning. While the State legislature in Alaska supported program implementation, research results revealed that the number of boot camp eligibles was insufficient to sustain a boot camp program. In Wisconsin, respondents stated that the decision not to implement boot camp plans was the result of a lack of federal, state and local funding.

Planners from San Diego and Pima Counties also report that funding limitations impacted boot camp program implementation. In San Diego, the planning committee originally submitted a pre-architectural proposal for a 200 bed facility and was not successful in securing funding. An effort is currently underway to determine whether a site is available to accommodate a 100 beds facility. In Pima County, stakeholders also indicated that the decision to implement the boot camp is pending due to the lack of resources.

Maryland, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania experienced external factors that impacted the implementation of boot camp plans. In Maryland, transitions in staff and changes in county electoral leadership delayed plans to submit the proposal for boot camp implementation. Similarly, high turnover and changes in the administration also influenced planning in Oklahoma.



## **E. Summary**

In general, planning processes began with establishing the intended purpose of programs and defining target populations. Most sites analyzed available data to determine whether the development of a boot camp was viable. Population projections were utilized to determine whether sufficient numbers of boot camp eligibles exist to sustain a program. Cost analyses were also conducted to determine the fiscal feasibility of programs. In addition, policy analysis was used to determine whether existing policies and practices could support and sustain a boot camp program. Much of the aforementioned research was conducted by consultants and findings facilitated the early development of program plans.

Planning grant interviews also added clarity to program missions, goals and objectives. Results show a general commitment on the part of stakeholders to establish correctional environments that promote public safety, encourage positive behavioral change and protect individual dignity. Moreover, the use of public/private planning partnerships were seen as providing a forum for developing and refining boot camp program elements.

Other areas where telephone interviews provided illumination involve the development of program characteristics and components. Crosscutting boot camp characteristics confirm the commitment of stakeholders to combine military- and therapeutic-style models. Planners merged these philosophies in residential and aftercare program components to provide a continuum of services, treatment and supervision. Interview results also specified strategies and tactics to gain consensus and build planning partnerships, and identified barriers to boot camp planning and factors that facilitate the planning process. Finally, telephone interviews provided an opportunity for planners to share important lessons learned during the boot camp planning process. These findings are discussed in more detail in the remaining chapters of this report.

## CHAPTER VII

### LESSONS LEARNED

#### A. Introduction

Among the primary lessons learned is that process evaluation can provide a systematic approach to assessing planning that offers the opportunity to evaluate the merits of a wide-variety of programs. This approach also presents the occasion to monitor modifications in program designs during the planning process. Across sites, changes in boot camp plans were often made to overcome deficiencies in previous plans. These adjustments resulted in the development of more therapeutic residential programs and more intensive aftercare programs to enhance the overall potential of boot camp to reduce recidivism.

Other important lessons learned are related to the funding of correctional boot camp facilities. Prior to developing a new program or expanding an existing effort, planners must consider options to combine limited federal, state and local resources, and efforts must also be made to garner legislative and community support for facilities planning. Because physical design has tremendous potential to impact program effectiveness, facilities must be planned in accordance with program purposes and within fiscal constraints. While the majority of boot camp plans placed emphasis on therapeutic and rehabilitative environs, most of the planned facilities were based on traditional military-styled designs rather than progressive program philosophies

Still other valuable lessons learned involve the use of trend analyses, population projections and bed space needs assessments. These tools provided invaluable assistance to program planners in the identification of suitable target populations. In most instances, boot camp plans targeted nonviolent, confinement-bound offenders who would have otherwise been incarcerated. It is imperative to ensure that the average length of stay for the target population be significantly longer

than that of typical offenders. Selecting such a target population increases available incentives for boot camp program participation by shortening the average length of stay and potentially reducing crowding and costs.

Perhaps the most valuable lesson learned during the boot camp planning process evaluation is the need to gain consensus among corrections planners, policymakers and community members. Collaborative planning partnerships committed to increasing corrections options and addressing community concerns about public safety were used to build consensus and create program plans. While the most frequently reported factor which facilitated planning was consensus building among decision makers, the most routinely reported barrier to boot camp planning was the lack of construction funding. These and other factors that influenced planning outcomes are separated into categories that include: (1) facilitators of boot camp planning, and (2) barriers to boot camp planning.

## **B. Facilitators**

- Gaining consensus during the early stages of the planning process with specific regard to the boot camp purpose, target population, and program mission, goals and objectives.
- Collaborative planning partnerships involving federal, state and local governments.
- Planning alliances committed to increasing corrections options while addressing community concerns about public safety.
- Establishing strategic planning partnerships to create comprehensive boot camp plans.
- The use of population projections to estimate expected numbers of eligible program participants and future bed space needs.
- The use of outside experts to assist with planning activities.
- Targeting nonviolent, youthful and confinement-bound offenders convicted of property and drug offenses.
- Mission and goals statements that include reducing recidivism, crowding and costs.
- Mission and goals statements that also include deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation and punishment.
- Mission and goals statements that expand alternatives to incarceration while emphasizing the preservation of public safety.
- Residential and aftercare program services that include counseling, discipline, drug treatment, education, life skills, physical fitness, vocational training and work assignments.

- Combining characteristics of both military- and therapeutic-styled models for the delivery of a wide array of program services.
- An evolution progressing away from the military type regime toward an increased emphasis on education, therapeutic and treatment services and community aftercare.
- Treatment services that involve families in therapeutic and rehabilitative environs.
- Viewing planning as a process that must be modified over time to improve upon existing program plans.
- Program changes made during the planning process intended to overcome deficiencies in previous plans.
- The development of more intensive aftercare components including enhanced treatment and intensive community supervision services.
- Planning measures of success that include reducing rearrest and reincarceration, and improving education and job skills.
- Utilizing process evaluation as a systematic approach to assessing boot camp planning that offers the opportunity to evaluate the merits of a wide-variety of program plans and presents the occasion to monitor modifications in program design.
- Continued corrections planning utilizing research in the development and implementation of creative alternatives to long-term incarceration.

**C. Barriers**

- Prohibitive construction and operational costs.
- Legislative restrictions that result in longer lengths of stay and substantial reductions in the boot camp eligible population.
- Paradigms implementing more punitive sentences in the absence of demonstrable positive results.
- Increasing demand for tough intermediate sanctions that place emphasis on community corrections and substance abuse treatment.
- Increasing empirical evidence that does not support the efficacy of correctional boot camps in terms of crime control and delinquency prevention.
- Increasing empirical evidence that does not support the efficacy of correctional boot camps in terms of the reduction of corrections crowding and confinement costs.
- Fiscal climates where corrections policymakers are challenged to manage increased demands for incarceration and declining resources caused by the nexus of overburdened corrections systems and rising confinement costs.

## CHAPTER VIII

### CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

#### A. Conclusions

The national process evaluation of boot camp planning grants concludes that the majority of grant recipients had some success in achieving their intended goals. These findings demonstrate that while there was wide variance across planned programs and settings, correctional boot camp planning activities consistently contributed to the development of viable alternatives to long-term incarceration. Specific conditions, however, must be met for successful boot camp planning. These prerequisite conditions involve gaining consensus and establishing partnerships among boot camp planners and constituents. First, gaining consensus among corrections planners, policymakers and community members is essential to ensuring the success of program plans. Second, the development of strategic planning partnerships is necessary to combine limited resources in support of program plans.

Other conclusions involve cross-site comparisons of boot camp planning grant initiatives. Grant recipients shared similar planning experiences and developed comparable program plans. First, the majority of plans shared parallel purposes and target populations involving the development of boot camp plans targeting nonviolent, confinement-bound offenders. Second, most of the plans shared similar missions, goals and objectives. Among these were intentions to preserve public safety and expand corrections options while reducing recidivism, crowding and costs. Third, nearly all of the plans shared complementary residential and aftercare program components. These components combined military- and therapeutic-styled characteristics in an effort to enhance overall boot camp program effects.

Final conclusions involve crosscutting correctional boot camp planning issues and concerns.

Among these issues and concerns are shared difficulties across sites in achieving planning goals and the apparent need for additional time to plan. These findings conclude that there is an apparent need for: (1) continued corrections planning; (2) the utilization of research in the development of creative alternatives to long-term incarceration; and (3) tough intermediate sanctions that place increased emphasis on community corrections and substance-abuse treatment. Addressing these needs requires that boot camp planning be viewed as a collaborative process to be modified over time to solve complex and changing problems.

## **B. Policy Recommendations**

Rather than the continued reliance upon correctional boot camps in the absence of empirical support, the conclusions of this report strongly support the concept of research-based planning. This approach advances the use of exploratory research with strong methodology to provide much needed information about the effects of boot camp programs as compared to the alternatives. Research-based planning demands the development of programs that evidence the enhancement of public safety via reductions in recidivism; the reduction of correctional crowding and costs; and the provision of therapeutic-style treatment services.

Specifically, research-based planning is recommended to assist in determining whether the popular perception of boot camps as a tough intermediate sanction for certain first-time and non-violent criminal offenders relieves crowded conditions in correctional facilities. This approach can also aid in the determination of whether the diversion of offenders from more traditional sentences reduces confinement costs. Moreover, planning guided by research has the potential to establish whether boot camps reduce recidivism, the *sine quo non* of desirable correctional interventions.

While boot camps programs differ with regard to the amount of time participants spend in therapeutic activity and in the aftercare they are provided, there appears to be some evidence that

suggest that these programs have progressed toward placing increased emphasis on enhanced therapeutic programming and community aftercare. Research-based planning can examine whether and under what conditions these changes may reduce recidivism, crowding and costs. This approach may also afford the occasion to assess the therapeutic integrity of progressive boot camp program components involving residential and aftercare program phases. In addition, research-based planning recognizes that while the conventional concept of a boot camp may be consistent across sites, planners must customize program characteristics and components to accomplish specific and varying missions, goals and objectives.

### **C. Reducing Recidivism, Crowding and Costs**

The following briefly summarizes policy recommendations suggested by program planners during the boot camp planning experience. The purpose of the recommendations is to guide future planners toward developing successful boot camp programs. Policy recommendations are categorized into two groups including: (1) those intended to reduce recidivism; and (2) those intended to reduce crowding and costs:

#### ***Reducing Recidivism***

- Develop programs that emphasize program elements designed to reduce recidivism.
- Develop programs with intensive aftercare supervision and services.
- Develop programs to increase participants reading and math levels by 1-2 grades.
- Develop programs for participants to obtain their high school diploma or GED.
- Develop programs to increase participants cognitive and behavioral skill levels.
- Develop programs to reduce participants use of drugs and alcohol.
- Develop programs to enhance employability.
- Develop programs that increase enrollment in community programs aimed at aiding reintegration to the community after release.

#### ***Reducing Crowding and Costs***

- Develop programs that target populations with a high probability of otherwise being confined for longer periods of time than average offenders.
- Develop programs that ensure that the pool of potentially eligible offenders is sufficient.
- Develop programs that have large program capacities.

- ● Develop programs that shorten the average length of stay as compared to the length of stay in traditional confinement.
- Develop programs that maintain significant portions of the average daily population
- Develop programs that increase incarceration bed day savings.

#### **D. Summary**

While additional research in the form of impact evaluation is required to determine whether, and under what circumstances, planning impacts the success of correctional boot camp programs, NIJ's investment in the current process evaluation of boot camp planning grants has yielded returns that: (1) contribute to our understanding of the importance of planning in program development; (2) advance the current body of knowledge on the emergence, expansion and evolution of boot camps; (3) identify progressive boot camp models and essential program components; (4) determine intended outcomes and potential measures of "success"; (5) address barriers to boot camp planning and factors that facilitate the planning process; (6) bridge the gap between correctional ideology, practice and research; and (7) assist policymakers and planners in determining what works, what doesn't work, and what's promising.



## **TABLES**

**TABLE 1**  
**CORRECTIONAL POPULATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1996**

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	1,126,293	507,044	679,421	3,077,861	5,390,619
1996	1,182,169	518,492	704,709	3,180,363	5,585,733
<b>Percent Change 1990-1996</b>	<b>52.8%</b>	<b>27.9%</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>

*Notes:* Prisoner counts are for December 31 of each year and include all prisoners under jurisdiction of State and Federal correctional authorities; Jail counts are for June 30 of each year; A small number of individuals may have multiple correctional statuses, so the total number of persons under correctional supervision is an overestimate.

*Sources:* Probation and Parole, 1996; Prisoners in 1996; and Prison and Jail Inmates, 1995.

*Prepared by:* National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

**TABLE 2**  
**INCARCERATION RATES FOR THE UNITED STATES, 1990-1996**

Year	Total Inmates in Custody	Incarceration Rate
1990	1,148,702	461
1991	1,219,014	483
1992	1,295,150	508
1993	1,369,185	531
1994	1,476,621	567
1995	1,585,589	601
1996	1,630,940	615
<b>Percent Change 1990-1996</b>	<b>42.0%</b>	<b>33.4%</b>

*Note:* Incarceration rate is total of persons in custody of State, Federal, or local jurisdictions per 100,000 U.S. residents; Jail counts are for June 30 of each year, Prison counts are for December 31 of each year.

*Source:* Prisoners in 1996.

*Prepared by:* National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

**TABLE 3**

**SELECTED IMPACT EVALUATION FINDINGS**

<b>Study</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Rigor</b>	<b>Major Findings</b>
Flowers and Ruback (1991)	Adult	Low	No significant differences in recidivism comparing those sentenced to: boot camp, serve a longer period of time in prison; or serve sentence on probation. Reincarceration rates were higher for boot camp graduates when compared to where compared with groups most similar.
MacKenzie (1991)	Adult	Low	Boot camp graduates had fewer arrests and reconvictions for new crimes when compared to samples of parolees and probationers but more arrests for technical violations. Those dismissed from the program had fewer arrests than graduates but were the same in reconviction rates.
MacKenzie et al (1995)	Adult	Medium	Compared to probationers, mixed results in regard to rearrest and revocations. Commonality among programs where the boot camp releaseses had lower recidivism rates than comparison groups on some measures of recidivism including: more time committed to therapeutic activities; follow-up for offenders in the community; volunteer for the program participation In programs where a substantial number of offenders were dismissed from the boot camp prior to completion, the recidivism rates for those who completed the program were significantly lower than the rates for those who were dismissed.
Peters et al. (1996)	Juvenile	High	No significant differences in recidivism between the boot camp youth and the control groups. In Cleveland, more boot camp youths (72%) recidivated than control group (50%).
Peters et al. (1996)	Juvenile	High	No significant differences in recidivism between the boot camp youth and the control groups. While more boot camp youths (38.8%) recidivated than control group youths (35.5%), the Denver findings were not statistically significant.
Peters et al. (1996)	Juvenile	High	No significant differences in recidivism between the boot camp youth and the control groups. While fewer boot camp youths (28.1%) recidivated than control group youths (31%), the Mobile findings were not statistically significant. Mobile
Botcher et al. (1996)	Juvenile	High	More of the boot camp youth were reincarcerated than the control youth. While more boot camp youths (77.7%) were rearrested than control group youths (77.1%), preliminary California Youth Authority findings were not statistically significant.

Source: Sherman et al. (1997); Peters et al. (1997); MacKenzie and Hebert (1996)  
Prepared by: National Council on Crime and Delinquency

**TABLE 4  
BOOT CAMPS — BACKGROUND**

Site	Grantee	Title	Type	Amount
Alaska, Juneau	Department of Corrections	Male Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$50,000
American Samoa, Pago Pago	Department of Public Safety	Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$37,140
Arizona, Gila River Indian Community	Governor's Office for Children	Native American Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$43,701
Arizona, Pima County	Department of Youth Treatment and Rehabilitation	Pima County Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$37,500
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	California Youth and Adult Correctional Agency	Alameda/Contra Costa Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$50,000
California, Orange County	California Youth and Adult Correctional Agency	Orange County Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$30,098
California, San Diego County	California Youth and Adult Correctional Agency	San Diego County Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$32,362
California, Santa Clara County	California Youth and Adult Correctional Agency	Adult Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$49,995
Guam, Barrigada	Guam Department of Youth Affairs	Guam Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$46,875
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	Kane County Illinois Court Services	Juvenile Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$46,265
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services	Feasibility Study for an Adult Boot Camp Facility	Adult	\$50,000
Massachusetts, Boston	Executive Office of Public Safety	Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$50,000
Michigan, Lansing	Department of Social Services	Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$37,500
Mississippi, Jackson	Department of Human Services	Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$50,000
Mississippi, Jackson	Department of Corrections	Adult Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$37,063
Missouri, Jefferson	Department of Corrections	Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$37,500
Nebraska, Lincoln	Department of Correctional Services	Adult Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$45,000
New Mexico, Santa Fe	Department of Corrections	Adult Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$50,000
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	Division of Criminal Justice	Boot Camp Planning Grant	Juvenile	\$50,000
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	Department of Corrections	Adult Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$50,000
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia	Department of Corrections	Female Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$50,000
South Carolina, Spartanburg County	Department of Corrections	Adult Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$50,000
U.S. Virgin Islands	USVI Department of Justice	Boot Camp Planning Initiative	Adult	\$50,000
West Virginia	Department of Corrections	Adult Boot Camp Planning Project	Adult	\$33,665
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	State of Wisconsin Department of Corrections	Tri-County Boot Camp Planning Project	Juvenile	\$44,395

**TABLE 5**  
**BOOT CAMPS — CONTEXT**

Site	Primary Purpose	Target Population
Alaska, Juneau	The Alaska Department of Corrections developed a preliminary conceptual framework for an adult male boot camp program. Among the primary purposes of the planing grant was to determine whether sufficient numbers of offenders were available to warrant the construction of a correctional boot camp. The planning process revealed that neither the number of eligible offenders nor the availability of construction funding were sufficient to support a boot camp program. The preliminary boot camp plan was intended to reduce crowding and costs while preserving public safety. This plan was based on a two-stage military prototype with residential and aftercare phases. These phases planned to combine therapeutic and treatment services.	Nonviolent male and young adult offenders
Arizona, Pima County	The Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections and the Prevention Resource Center created a planning partnership to develop the Pima County Leadership Academy. The primary purpose of the program was to develop an alternative to incarceration in an effort to reduce institution populations while providing a continuum of care for youth in its custody. The two-phased boot camp plan proposes a 3-month institution phase followed by a 9-month aftercare phase. While the planning process was based upon existing guidelines approved for the Phoenix boot camp, the Pima County approach places specific emphasis on community participation in the development of a comprehensive boot camp program.	Nonviolent adjudicated male juveniles age 15-17 years who were otherwise institution-bound
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	Alameda and Contra Costa counties planned the development and evaluation of a regional boot camp targeting nonviolent male and female juvenile offenders. The primary purpose of the grant was to develop a program to divert youths adjudicated for first-time property, drug, and gang-related offenses from long-term incarceration. The Camp Chabot R.E.A.D.Y. program focuses on accountability, discipline, education, and rehabilitation. The plan provides a highly structured, intensive, short-term alternative to detention that promotes the successful participation of youths in both families and communities.	Nonviolent male and female juvenile offenders age 14-18 years adjudicated for first-time
California, Orange County	The Orange County Probation Department boot camp plan is modeled after the Sgt. Henry Johnson Youth Leadership Academy in New York. The purpose of this grant is to develop a highly structured and intensive program. This military training approach consists of rigorous physical conditioning, formal classroom education, and experiential training. The program also offers individual and group counseling, life skills development, and recreation. In addition, major emphasis is placed on values, morals, and the development of personal potential.	Nonviolent male juvenile age 16 years and above with at least 7 months remaining to be served
California, San Diego County	The County of San Diego, Department of Probation, developed an innovative boot camp program that combines traditional military-styled components with progressive therapeutic-oriented components. The impetus for the boot camp initiative was escalating violence involving juveniles coupled with crowding in county and State confinement facilities. The purpose of this grant is to develop a plan to offer alternative sentences via detention in a proposed 296 bed facility serving nonviolent juvenile offenders with a history of property and drug offenses. The two-phased model features a regimented 4-month institutional program followed a rehabilitative 8-month aftercare program.	Nonviolent male and female juvenile wards of the court age 15-19 years
California, Santa Clara County	In response to increasing numbers of felony bookings, convictions, and persons held in county custody, the Santa Clara County Regimented Corrections Program accords alternative sanctions to inmates who would have otherwise been incarcerated for longer lengths of stay. The two-phase program provides a continuum of in-custody and aftercare services and treatment for drug and other nonviolent felony offenders. The primary purpose of this grant is to provide corrections options for countywide use.	Nonviolent adult male felony drug offenders and pretrial in-custody detainees

**TABLE 5  
CONTINUED**

Site	Primary Purpose	Target Population
Guam, Barrigada	The purpose of this grant was to develop the Guam Youth Challenge Program. This program provides: an alternative to traditional incarceration for nonviolent youthful offenders; an intervention for at risk youth under the supervision of the court; and, a voluntary educational experience for dropouts. The program plan is intended to change the behavior through the use of a military-style, highly structured program that includes a daily routine of physical fitness, hard work, education, counseling, and community service. The three-phased 17 month program and facility are designed to provide safe and humane environs for youth-based treatment and rehabilitative services.	Nonviolent males age 16-17 years at-risk of delinquency, drug abuse, and dropping out of school
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	The Kane County Court Services planned a residential training program that serves three counties. The plan promotes positive behavioral change and instills respect for societal values and mores while preserving individual dignity. The two-phase program provides a safe and disciplined residential environment followed by post completion community monitoring and support. The primary purpose of this grant is to develop alternatives to sentencing youths to secure detention. Program goals include reducing recidivism, crowding, and enhancing the successful reintegration of youths from the juvenile justice system to the community.	Nonviolent male youthful offenders including first-timers and probation violators
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	The purpose of this grant was to determine the feasibility of constructing an adult boot camp facility serving two counties. The Maryland Bureau of Corrections developed a plan for a regional boot camp to reduce crowding and reserve bed space for violent offender incarceration. The proposed facility targets offenders who would have otherwise been confined in county detention facilities for more than six months including: (1) nonviolent male and female adults; (2) male and female juveniles; (3) county probation and parole violators for technical and eligible offenses; and (4) other consenting offenders in the metropolitan area.	Nonviolent male and female adult and juvenile offenders others who would have been incarcerated for longer lengths of stay
Michigan, Lansing	In response to the need to expand the continuum of services delivered to youths in custody, the Michigan Department of Social Services developed a boot camp program targeting nonviolent juvenile offenders. The planning initiative was prompted by a series of task force studies documenting the overuse of state residential facilities by 36 percent. This problem was exacerbated by the nexus of increased numbers of institution commitments and longer lengths of stay. In addition, a policy raising of the upper age limit of youth that may be retained in the department from 18 to 21 years contributed much to the crowding problem. The primary purpose of this planning effort was to develop a comprehensive residential and community-based treatment program.	Nonviolent male juvenile offenders age 15-17 years serving 90 or more days
Mississippi, Jackson	The Mississippi Department of Human Services, Division of Youth Services, planned and developed the Emerge into the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century program for youths. The purpose of this planning initiative was to develop an integrative boot camp plan involving military, academic, vocational, and therapeutic program models designs. Goals of the program include reducing recidivism, crowding, and costs.	Nonviolent male and female youthful offenders
Mississippi, Jackson	Sentencing reforms including the abolition of parole and the emergence of truth in sentencing laws have increased the number of new commitments and the average length of stay in Mississippi Department of Corrections (DOC) facilities. In response to the crisis, the DOC is currently considering alternatives to traditional incarceration including the expansion of the Regimented Inmate Discipline (RID) adult boot camp program. The primary purposes of this planning initiative are to: (1) examine the feasibility of expanding prison alternative programs to divert prison-bound offenders that would have otherwise been incarcerated to the RID program; (2) determine whether sufficient numbers of eligible offenders exist in the State's inmate population to justify the expansion of the program; and (3) estimate the reasonable capacity of an expanded boot camp program	Nonviolent male and female adult prison-bound offenders under DOC supervision

**TABLE 5  
CONTINUED**

Site	Primary Purpose	Target Population
Nebraska, Lincoln	The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services developed a comprehensive boot camp plan in response to increasing prison populations and costs that have persisted for more than a decade. The Incarceration Work Camp program provides a tough intermediate sanction in response to these problems. The primary purpose of this planning initiative is to develop a program that holds offenders accountable for their actions while providing skills which will aid in every-day life. The program is intended to reduce the potential for future criminal activity while maintaining public safety. The plan increases correctional options through the provision of a highly structured, military-styled, continuum of control for selected nonviolent and first time offenders.	Nonviolent male and female first time offenders sentenced to prison for less than 3 years
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	The Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Justice and the Sac and Fox Nation developed a comprehensive boot camp plan to target nonviolent juvenile offenders. This planning initiative is cast in the context of a reorganized tribal justice system and activities involve key stakeholders representing tribal, state, and Federal agencies. The primary purposes of this planning initiative include: (1) data collection in support of a needs assessment; (2) identifying the number of eligible adjudicated juveniles; (3) site visits to established boot camp programs; (4) the review of literature on institution-based and aftercare services; and (5) the design of the overall boot camp program, operating budget, and facility site plan.	Nonviolent male and female Native American juvenile offenders age 10-18 years
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania developed a comprehensive boot camp plan for statewide utilization. An advisory committee consisting of state and county officials guided the planning process with the assistance of consultants. The primary purpose of this grant was to determine the feasibility of a boot camp program as an alternative to incarceration in county prisons and jails. Results of the analysis show that sufficient numbers of nonviolent male and female offenders exist to warrant the continued planning boot camp program. The planned program is expected to preserve public safety by reserving bed space for violent offenders. Other program expectations include the potential to reduce prison and jail construction costs.	Nonviolent males and females serving 1 to 5 years in county prison of jail and probation and parole violators
U.S. Virgin Islands	The purpose of this planning initiative is to develop a comprehensive boot camp program as an alternative to jail detention and prison incarceration. The U.S. Virgin Islands, Department of Justice, planned the Living in a Free Environment (LIFE) Camp to reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs. The three-phase program includes residential, reintegration, and aftercare components designed to preserve public safety and provide treatment services.	Nonviolent adult male offenders housed in overburdened prisons and jails
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	The purpose of the Tri-County boot camp plan is to provide viable corrections options to policymakers faced with the challenge of relieving crowded conditions in county correctional facilities. The program targets nonviolent youth at risk of re-offending, gang involvement, substance abuse, and probation violation. This multi-faceted military model is designed to build self esteem and promote public safety via deterrence and rehabilitation. Goals of the program include reducing recidivism, crowding, and costs.	Nonviolent male youths at risk of re-offending, gang involvement, substance abuse, and probation violation

TABLE 6

BOOT CAMPS — MISSIONS, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Site	Mission	Goals	Objectives
Alaska, Juneau	To develop a comprehensive boot camp program for male and female offenders	To promote positive behavioral change To preserve public safety To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs	To divert offenders from traditional incarceration To preserve limited bed space for violent offenders To enhance counseling and treatment services
Arizona, Pima County	To promote and enhance positive youth development via a Leadership Academy program that balances the public's need for punishment, the victim's need for restoration, and the offender's need for reintegration	To create a continuum of institution- and community-based care To enhance alternatives to secure care To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs	To provide culturally competent treatment To restore juvenile offenders to productive, law-abiding, and self-reliant lifestyles To eliminate arbitrary and excessive punishment To consider community needs in corrections planning
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	To provide an intensive, highly structured, short term alternative to detention that supports the successful reintegration of youths into families and the community.	To expand corrections options to meet cadet, family and community needs To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs	To reintegrate youthful offenders To rehabilitate and educate youths To promote accountability and discipline among youths
California, Orange County	To develop the endless potential of juvenile offenders in a correctional boot camp setting for reintegration to the Orange County community as positive members of society	To create positive behavioral change To expand corrections options to meet cadet and community needs To enhance institutional effectiveness and efficiency To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs	To instill self-discipline, esteem, and worth To support and development families To identify alternatives to counter productive peer groups To improve education, communication, and vocational skills To promote health and physical fitness
California, San Diego County	To develop a highly structured program which emphasizes youth development, education, leadership, and responsibility	To promote positive behavioral change in the interest of public safety To advance alternative sentences To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs	To provide positive role models To plan a non-punitive environment To improve parental involvement To reserve bed space for violent offenders



**TABLE 6  
CONTINUED**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Mission</b>	<b>Goals</b>	<b>Objectives</b>
California, Santa Clara County	To establish a safe, secure, and humane alternative to longer-term incarceration for adult nonviolent felons and drug offenders in a growing local jail population	<p>To expand range of sentencing options</p> <p>To promote productive members of society</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p> <p>To limit pretrial and in-custody length of stay</p>	To divert adult drug and other felony offenders from county jail populations
Guam, Barrigada	To establish an environment in which youth can learn the values of community service, discipline, education, empathy, hard work, leadership, physical fitness, and respect for law	<p>To promote positive behavioral change and law abiding citizenship</p> <p>To preserve public safety and reduce recidivism</p> <p>To address academic failure and school drop outs</p> <p>To reduce crowding and costs</p> <p>To rehabilitate youths</p>	<p>To divert youth from detention</p> <p>To reserve limited bed space for violent offenders</p> <p>To enhance community and family involvement</p> <p>To expand the range of sentencing options</p> <p>To extend program and treatment services</p>
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	To develop a residential training program that promotes positive behavioral change and instills respect for societal values and mores, and provide community monitoring and support	<p>To provide alternatives to secure detention</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p> <p>To enhance the community reintegration</p>	<p>To design an intensive residential training program</p> <p>To design a comprehensive community supervision program</p> <p>To preserve individual dignity through a safe, disciplined environment</p>
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	To protect public safety and promote positive behavioral change through learning in a highly-structured correctional program.	<p>To provide alternatives to county detention</p> <p>To reduce length of stay</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p> <p>To make reparations to victims and communities</p> <p>To Promote prosocial values, morals, greater empathy, and reintegration</p>	<p>To reserve limited bed space for violent offenders</p> <p>To expand range of sentencing options</p> <p>To extend program and treatment services to aftercare</p> <p>To enhanced interagency collaboration with families</p> <p>To raise victim awareness and reconciliation</p>

**TABLE 6  
CONTINUED**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Mission</b>	<b>Goals</b>	<b>Objectives</b>
Michigan, Lansing	To develop an innovative, non-traditional boot camp program to protect public safety through a highly-structured, safe and secure out-of-home placement	<p>To promote behavioral change and prosocial values</p> <p>To enhance sentencing options for juvenile offenders</p> <p>To reduce length of stay</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p> <p>To reintegrate youths</p>	<p>To redirect youth from traditional training school and the juvenile justice system</p> <p>To make reparations to victims and communities</p> <p>To demonstrate measured improvement in academic, social, and emotional competencies of youth and families</p>
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	To create legitimate, alternative pathways to adulthood through equal access to services that are intensive, culturally sensitive, and consistent with the highest professional standards	<p>To provide leadership for change in youths, families, and communities</p> <p>To treat all students with dignity and respect</p> <p>To enhance corrections options</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p>	<p>To maintain long-term accountability and self-discipline</p> <p>To increase social, moral, ethical, and legal sensitivity</p> <p>To develop empathy for victim and community</p> <p>To promote responsibility as a productive citizen</p> <p>To unlock educational, vocational, social and developmental skills</p>
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	To expand prison alternative programs to divert offenders that would have otherwise been incarcerated	<p>To expand alternatives to traditional long-term incarceration</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p> <p>To reduce length of stay</p> <p>To reserve prison space for violent offenders</p>	<p>To conduct a feasibility study</p> <p>To determine whether sufficient numbers exist to justify program expansion</p> <p>To determine the reasonable capacity of an expanded program</p> <p>To conduct an assessment of current and expected inmate populations</p> <p>To determine whether existing policies and practices support program expansion</p>
Nebraska, Lincoln	To provide a residential and community continuum of control via the development of a highly structured, regimented and disciplined work program for certain non-violent criminal offenders	<p>To reduce recidivism and maintain public safety</p> <p>To enhance correctional options</p> <p>To reduce crowding and costs</p>	<p>To provide programs that assist offenders in every-day life</p> <p>To hold the offenders accountable for their actions</p> <p>To provide a tough intermediate sanction that reserves prison space for violent offenders</p>

**TABLE 6  
CONTINUED**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Mission</b>	<b>Goals</b>	<b>Objectives</b>
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	To develop a comprehensive boot camp program targeting nonviolent Native American youthful offenders ages 10 to 14 under the tribal statutes of the sac and Fox Nation	<p>To create positive behavioral change via the integration of Native American philosophy and culture</p> <p>To plan a boot camp program in the context of a tribal justice system</p> <p>To involve key stakeholders representing tribal, state, and federal agencies</p> <p>To plan the construction of a boot camp facility that supplements current plans for a juvenile justice facility</p>	<p>To conduct a needs assessment</p> <p>To determine the number of eligible youths</p> <p>To develop a comprehensive boot camp plan</p> <p>To design a facility site plan</p>
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	To develop a boot camp plan for statewide utilization targeting nonviolent males and females serving 1 to 5 years in county prison or jail including probation and parole violators	<p>To determine the feasibility of a boot camp program</p> <p>To create alternatives to incarceration in county prisons and jails</p> <p>To restore victims of crime, families, and communities</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p>	<p>To preserve public safety</p> <p>To reserve bed space for violent offenders</p> <p>To reintegrate offenders</p>
U.S. Virgin Islands	To develop a comprehensive boot camp program as an alternative to long-term secure confinement in an effort to relieve crowded conditions in overburdened prisons and jails located in the U.S. Virgin Islands	<p>To preserve public safety</p> <p>To enhance treatment services</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs</p>	<p>To develop a boot camp plan with residential, reintegration, and aftercare program components.</p> <p>To reserve limited bed space for violent and repeat offenders</p>
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	To develop a comprehensive juvenile boot camp model including a program, facilities and an implementation plan capable of completion	<p>To enhance corrections options to reduce reliance upon traditional incarceration</p> <p>To assist youthful offenders to become law-abiding citizens and productive members of the community</p> <p>To promote public safety</p> <p>To reduce recidivism, crowding and costs</p>	<p>To divert youth and reserve limited bed space for violent offenders</p> <p>To enhance community supervision and aftercare services</p> <p>To develop youths and families</p> <p>To expand range of sentencing options to rehabilitate youths</p>

TABLE 7

BOOT CAMPS — CHARACTERISTICS, COMPONENTS, AND KEYS

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
Alaska, Juneau	<u>Adult Male Boot Camp</u> Accountability Community service Counseling Discipline Military style drill and ceremony Physical labor Regimented daily schedule Substance abuse counseling	<u>Residential (6 months)</u> Alcohol abuse counseling Alcohol abuse treatment Discipline Drug abuse counseling Drug abuse treatment Education Group counseling Individual counseling Life skills development Military drill Physical fitness and exercise Physical labor Therapeutic community	<u>Aftercare (6 months)</u> Community service Community supervision Counseling	Utilizing planning to determine whether the targeted population is adequate
Arizona, Pima County	<u>Leadership Academy</u> Academic education Cognitive reprogramming Community service Discipline Education Efficacy model General counseling Highly structured Life skills training Military drill and ceremony Physical training Regimented daily schedule Substance abuse services Therapeutic model Treatment Work assignments	<u>Residential (3 months)</u> Academic education (GED) Anger management Decision-making skills Dispute resolution Drug/alcohol counseling Drug/alcohol treatment English as a second language Gang involvement education Health education Inner-vision training Mental health services Parenting education Physical fitness and exercise Religious services School drop-out reduction Special Education Stress reduction Transition preparation Vocational training	<u>Aftercare (9 months)</u> Community support systems Continuation of services Counseling Education Employment services Family oriented Monitoring and testing Personal responsibility Vocational training	Collaborative planning partnerships Evaluation planning Involvement of key decision-makers Needs assessment Planning committee consisting of juvenile justice practitioners, citizens and local government officials Program design that complements existing community initiatives

**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
<b>California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties</b>	<u>Camp Chabot READY Program</u>  Accountability Discipline Individual and group counseling Military-style ceremony and drill Physical training Pre-release training Regimented daily schedule Reintegration Rehabilitation Treatment services Work assignments	<u>Residence (6 months)</u>  Counseling Discipline Goal setting Highly structured Leadership Life plan Life skills Military drill Mutual respect Physical training Regimented daily schedule Self-esteem Specialized education Teamwork Treatment services Work assignments  <u>Transitional (2 months)</u>  Pre-release training	<u>Aftercare (12 months)</u>  Education Employability services Gang avoidance counseling Intensive supervision Parenting skills education Regular supervision Structured recreation Substance abuse counseling Supplemental supervision Tattoo removal	Consultants  East Bay Corridor Juvenile Justice Committee  Evaluation strategy.  Planning partnership among key stakeholders in two counties
<b>California, Orange County</b>	<u>Youth Leadership Academy</u>  Communication Discipline Education Family support Leadership skills Military ceremony and drill Physical and mental challenge Positive affiliation Regimented daily schedule Self discipline, esteem and worth Vocational skills Work ethics	<u>In-Custody (90 days)</u>  Adventure challenge Basic challenge Cognitive restructuring Counseling Education Goal setting Job skills Leadership America Prg. Life skills "Magic Within" Prg. Moral perspectives Physical training and health Substance abuse services	<u>Post-Release (unspecified)</u>  Community challenge Community service Education Employment services Evenings and weekends Live at home Regional occupational Program Respite care Social skills training	Study to determine number of boot camp eligibles  Support of key stakeholders

**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
California, San Diego County	<u>Boot Camp Planning Project</u> Counseling Character building Education and literacy Highly structured Leadership Military drill and protocol Physical fitness Positive values Pro-social skills Responsibility Role models and mentors Self control and discipline Substance abuse prevention Therapeutic environs Treatment services Work ethic	<u>Motivational (2-4 months)</u> Individual responsibility Group responsibility Leadership Mentoring Military drill and protocol Peer group counseling Physical fitness Recreation Vocational skills  <u>Developmental (2-4 months)</u> Emancipation skills Job training and placement Family counseling Parental involvement Reintegration	<u>Aftercare (2-4 months)</u> Community service Counseling Drug testing Family counseling Intensive probation Job training and placement Rehabilitation Victim restitution	Consultants  Formal linkages with county service agencies, county juvenile justice officials, and private service  Partnership to involve key stakeholders in the decision making process  Planning an evaluation strategy  Production of a site architectural plan
California, Santa Clara County	<u>Regimented Corrections Program</u> Accountability Discipline Education Highly structured Individual accountability Individual case plan Leadership skills development Life skills development Nutrition and health Regimented daily schedule Self discipline and respect Separate in-custody programs Special housing (M/F) Substance abuse education Substance abuse counseling Substance abuse treatment	<u>In-Custody (2 months)</u> Anger management training Counseling Dispute resolution Domestic violence education Drug/alcohol counseling Drug/alcohol treatment Drug testing Family counseling (GED/ESL) Health and sex education Individual program plan Job services Life skills development Nutrition Parent training Physical training Pre-release preparation Stress reduction	<u>Post-Release (3 months)</u> Community programming Continued program services Counseling Day reporting Drug testing Education Employment services Intensive supervision Job training Probation Team meetings	Planning subcommittees  Planning task force  Support of key stakeholders  Task Force involving DOC, probation, classification, security and county officials

**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
<b>Guam, Barrigada</b>	<u>Youth Challenge Program</u> Barracks-style housing Discipline Group rewards and punishments Individual accountability Individual case plan Leadership skills development Military ceremony and drill Public graduation ceremony Regimented daily schedule Self discipline Summary punishment Victim awareness and empathy Wilderness Program Work details Youth development	<u>Residential (2 months)</u> Academic education (GED) Anger/stress reduction Challenge and adventure Cognitive decision making Counseling Dispute resolution Drug/alcohol counseling Drug/alcohol treatment Family counseling Health and sex education Individual program plan Land Navigation Military drill Parenting education Peer group counseling Personal time for meditation Physical fitness and exercise Physical labor Platoon meetings Rational behavior training Religious services Repelling Team building and pride	<u>Day Reporting (3-4 months)</u> Community programming Community service Community supervision Day reporting Employment referrals Individual dignity Job services Life skills development Mentoring Pre-release programming Progressive community Reintegration Rehabilitation Therapeutic community Vocational training Volunteerism  <u>Aftercare (12 or more months)</u> Continued services Supervision Random drug testing	Advisory Committee including Department of Youth Services, public safety and human service agency representatives  Consultants  Planning partnership among key community stakeholders
<b>Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, &amp; Kendall Counties</b>	<u>Juvenile Boot Camp</u> Behavior modification Community service Counseling Education Life skills Mental health services Military style, drill. Ceremony Regimented daily schedule Physical training and fitness Self discipline Substance abuse services Vocational training	<u>Regimented (4 months)</u> Assessment/orientation Basic skills development Classroom learning Daily routine Family counseling Fitness Challenge Goal setting Interpersonal skills Parenting skills Personal hygiene Platoon/group responsibility Recreation Reflection Remediation	<u>Community (9 months)</u> Community Reintegration Community service Community resources Family/home reintegration School planning Substance abuse treatment	Consultants  Site visits  Study to determine number of boot camp eligibles  Planning partnership among key stakeholders in three counties  Planning subcommittees

**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
<b>Maryland, Baltimore &amp; Harford Counties</b>	<u>County Correctional Center</u> Cognitive restructuring Day reporting Education Employment Preparation Health/Mental Health Leadership skills Physical strength & endurance Regimented daily schedule Substance Abuse Prevention Substance Abuse Treatment Vocational Education Work details	<u>Residential (4 months)</u> Academic education (GED) Anger/stress reduction Child support payments Cognitive decision making Communication skills Counseling Dispute resolution Drug/alcohol counseling Drug/alcohol treatment Family involvement Health and sex education Job skills development Life skills development Mentoring Motivational encouragement Problem solving Prosocial values and morals Self discipline and reliance, Social and emotional skills Vocational training Work ethic	<u>Reintegration (8 months)</u> Community programming Community restoration Community service Community supervision Day reporting Education Family counseling Job placement Job training Mentoring Social services Victim restitution	Advisory committee of police, courts, corrections, education, social service, religious, other county stakeholders  Consultants  Detailed evaluation design  Detailed facilities plan  Population projection of male and female bed space needs  Study to determine number of boot camp eligibles  Support of constituent groups



**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
Michigan, Lansing	<u>Michigan Juvenile Boot Camp</u>  Community service Education Highly-structured Problem-solving Prosocial behavior Self discipline and control Skills development Substance abuse treatment Values/moral reasoning Vocational education Work ethic	<u>Comprehensive (6 months)</u>  Academic education Cognitive behavioral prg. Community service Competency skills Employment preparation Focus groups Group meetings Leadership training Physical fitness Regimented discipline Substance abuse education Substance abuse treatment System of behavior mgt. Transition planning Treatment groups Victim awareness training Work assignments	<u>Reintegration (6 months)</u>  Academic education Cognitive behavioral Community service Continuum of care Emotional well-being Employment preparation Family support services Leadership Monitoring Substance abuse treatment Supervision Work assignments	Boot Camp Advisory Committee comprised of state juvenile justice practitioners, local elected officials and service agency representative.  Consultants  Evaluation plan  Facility location  Needs Assessment  Planning partnership among key stakeholders in three counties  Planning subcommittees  Population/ bed space projection and /trend analysis  Series of task force studies to determine number of boot camp eligibles
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	<u>Emerge into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</u>  Citizenship Discipline Education Integrity Leadership Mental health Military-style, drill and ceremony Vocational marketability Pride Spiritual awareness Students as creators	<u>Military Training (unknown)</u>  Behavior change Education GED Emotional counseling First aid Individual counseling Group counseling Oral communications Life skills Personal responsibility Problem solving Religious and counseling Remedial/tutorial services Special Education Vocational education	<u>Alternative Schools (-)</u>  Continuum of care Counseling College enrolment assistance General Education Job Corps Life skills	Site visits

**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
<b>Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)</b>	<u>Regimented Inmate Discipline</u>  Discipline Group rewards and punishments Grouping in platoons Highly structured Individual accountability Leadership skills development Military style ceremony and drill Regimented daily schedule Respect for authority Self esteem and discipline Small groups Work details	<u>Residential (6 months)</u>  I. Discipline Therapy Academic education (GED) Bible/Discipleship Study Military drill Physical fitness and exercise Physical labor  II. Psychological Counseling Anger/stress reduction Counseling Dispute resolution and Family counseling Peer group counseling  III. Alcohol/Drug Abuse Counseling Education Treatment  IV. Pre-Release Counseling Life skills development Pre-release programming Therapeutic community	<u>Aftercare (12 months)</u>  Community service Continuum of services Drug/alcohol counseling Drug/alcohol treatment Drug testing Employment services	Consultants  Population projection and trend analysis
<b>Nebraska, Lincoln</b>	<u>Incarceration Work Program</u>  Cognitive Thinking Restructuring Community Volunteers Counseling Military model Physical fitness Regimented daily activity Therapeutic environs Treatment services Work assignments	<u>Residential (6 months)</u>  Alcohol and drug counseling Anger management Community service Daily exercise Domestic accountability Education Family counseling Financial planning programs Individual counseling Non-paid work programs Pre-vocational programs Parent programs Security volunteer service Specific substance abuse treatment	<u>Aftercare (12 months)</u>  Comprehensive Aftercare Continuum of services Employment assistance Judicial discretion Intensive supervision Local treatment providers Moderate supervision Rehabilitation Probation officers	Advisory Council  Consultants  Detailed facility plan  Needs Assessment  Population projection  Statewide Planning Committee comprised of corrections practitioners and community members

**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
<b>Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation</b>	<u>Sac and Fox Nation Boot camp</u>  <u>"Fire"</u> Diagnostic/Evaluation Phase Dormitory style Good citizenship Individual and group activities Multi-cultural curricula Native American culture Native American philosophy Respect for others Responsibility Self respect, and discipline Self esteem and worth Summary punishment Work ethic	<u>"Water" (2 months)</u>  Alcohol/drug counseling Animal husbandry Arts and crafts Challenge course activities Cultural awareness Daily living skills Education Facility maintenance Goal setting Group responsibility Health care Individual and group counseling Marching Mobile boot camp Physical fitness, Therapeutic environs Recreation Resident assessment  <u>"Earth" (1 month)</u>  Job skill development Community reintegration Community resources Community service	<u>"Wind" (8 months)</u>  Alcohol/drug counseling Community service Continuum of services Counseling Hiring and retention skills Job services Mandatory school attendance	Consultants  Detailed facilities plan  Expansion of existing facility  Institution-based and aftercare services  Native American oriented planning context  Needs assessment of tribal and statewide necessities  Planning partnership with key stakeholders
<b>Pennsylvania, Camp Hill</b>	<u>Commonwealth Boot Camp</u>  Accountability Behavioral change Discipline Family-oriented Highly-structured Learning environment Offender reintegration Substance abuse treatment Victim restoration	<u>Residential (6 mos)</u>  Community service Competency skills Counseling Education Family support groups Group meetings Job readiness training Job placement Physical fitness Pre-release planning Regimented daily schedule Substance abuse treatment Victim awareness training Vocational training Work assignments	<u>Reintegration (6 mos)</u>  Citizen mentors / sponsors Community service Competency skills Education Family support Job development Parole supervision Structured Treatment groups Victim restitution Vocational training	Consultants  County and State Partnership  Statewide Strategy

**TABLE 7  
CONTINUED**

Site	Characteristics	Components		Keys to Planning
		Residential	Aftercare	
U.S. Virgin Islands	<u>LIFE Camp</u> Education Counseling services Life skills training Military-styled drill and protocol Physical fitness Regimented daily schedule Substance abuse services Vocational training Work assignments	<u>Residential (6 months)</u> Assessment and orientation Counseling Education Life skills training Military drill and protocol Physical fitness Substance abuse treatment Substance abuse education Vocational training Work assignments  <u>Reintegration (2 months)</u> Community resources Counseling services Education Employment training Employment planning Family reintegration skills Job placement Job skills development Military drill and protocol Physical fitness Substance abuse services Work assignments	<u>Aftercare (4 months)</u> Community service Continued treatment Counseling Drug testing Victim Restitution	Consensus among correctional authorities, constituent groups, and community stakeholders  Consultants  Planning partnership involving key decision-makers in the U.S. Virgin Islands
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	<u>Tri-County Program</u> Discipline Highly structured Grouping in platoons Individual accountability Military style ceremony and drill Regimented daily schedule Self discipline Victim awareness and empathy Work details	<u>Programming (5 months)</u> Academic education Counseling Drug/alcohol counseling Drug/alcohol treatment Education Health and sex education Military drill Parenting education Peer group counseling Physical fitness and exercise Physical labor Religious services Team building and pride  <u>Transition (1 month)</u> Community programming Job skills development Life skills development Pre-release programming Vocational training Work assignments	<u>Aftercare (6 months)</u> Community service Community supervision Continuum of services Drug testing	Consultants  Planning Partnership involving three jurisdictions  Planning management team of stakeholders  Steering Committee consisting of DOC, consultants, and county officials

TABLE 8

## BOOT CAMPS — ATTRIBUTES

Site	Bed Capacity	ADP	Annual Admissions	Program Length (months)	ALOS (months)	Number Security Staff	Number Staff Total
Alaska, Juneau	400	-	400	-	-	-	-
Arizona, Pima County	24	24	100	12	12	-	-
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	45	45	90	18	18	-	-
California, Orange County	30	30	60	18	18	10	27
California, San Diego County	200	200	600	8	8	-	-
California, Santa Clara County	75	75	450	5	5	-	-
Guam, Barrigada	20	20	100	18	18	7 to 10	12 to 14
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	30 to 45	30	90	13	13	10	27
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	200	200	600	12	12	17	114
Michigan, Lansing	73	73	146	12	12	-	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	-	-	-	-	-	-	272
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	397	310	500	18	18	39	78
Nebraska, Lincoln	100	100	200	18	12	17	46
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	12	12	72	11 to 12	11	10.5	33
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.S. Virgin Islands	150	150	300	12	12	-	-
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	60	60	120	12	12	15	37.5

**TABLE 9**  
**BOOT CAMPS — COSTS**

Site	Inmate Cost Per Day	Estimated Construction Cost	Construction Funding Sources	Annual Operational Costs
Alaska, Juneau	-	-	-	-
Arizona, Pima County	-	-	-	-
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	-	-	-	-
California, Orange County	-	-	None	\$2.5M
California, San Diego County	-	\$15M	Public/Private	-
California, Santa Clara County	-	-	Public	-
Guam, Barrigada	\$74 to \$83	-	Public/Private	\$400K to \$450K
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	\$117	-	-	\$2.3M
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	\$61	\$2.76M	Public/Private	\$5.3M
Michigan, Lansing	-	-	-	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	-	-	-	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	-	-	-	-
Nebraska, Lincoln	\$31.5	\$5.22M	-	-
New Mexico, Santa Fe	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	-	-	Public/Private	\$1.25M
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	-	-	-	-
U.S. Virgin Islands	-	-	Public/Private	-
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	\$82.30	-	-	\$1.8M

TABLE 10

BOOT CAMPS — PLACEMENT AUTHORITY & SELECTION CRITERIA

Site	Placement Authority	Selection Criteria					
		Age	Sex	Non-violent or -sex offenders	Non-escape risk	First-time confined	Non-drug dependent
Alaska, Juneau	Court/ Corrections	15-24+	M/F	Public/private	Yes	Yes	-
Arizona, Pima County	Court/ Corrections	15-17	M	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	Court/ Corrections	14-17	M/F	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
California, Orange County	Court/ Corrections	16-17	M	Yes	Yes	-	-
California, San Diego County	Court	15-19	M/F	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
California, Santa Clara County	Court	18+	M/F	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guam, Barrigada	Court	16-17	M	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	Court	13-17	M	Yes	Yes	No	No
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	Court/ Corrections	> 16	M/F	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Michigan, Lansing	Court/Department of Social Services	15-17	M/F	Yes	No	No	No
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	Court/Department of Human Services	< 17	M/F	-	-	-	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	Court	18+	M/F	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Nebraska, Lincoln	Court	17-35	M/F	Yes	Yes	No	No
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	Court	14-16	M/F	Yes	Yes	No	No
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	Court	18+	M/F	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
U.S. Virgin Islands	Court/ Corrections	17-35	M	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	Court/ Corrections	14-16	M	Yes	Yes	-	Yes

TABLE 11

## BOOT CAMPS — PROGRAM LIMITATIONS

Site	Limitations				
	Probationers	Parolees	Sentence limits	Non-physical or mental impairment	Voluntary Consent
Alaska, Juneau	No	No	-	Yes	Yes
Arizona, Pima County	Yes	No	-	Yes	Yes
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	No	No	-	Yes	No
California, Orange County	Yes	-	> 7 months	Yes	No
California, San Diego County	No	No	-	Yes	No
California, Santa Clara County	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
Guam, Barrigada	Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	No	No	>13 months	Yes	No
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	Yes	Yes	> 6 months	Yes	Yes
Michigan, Lansing	No	No	-	-	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	-	-	-	Yes	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	Yes	-	death penalty life sentence mandatory sentence	Yes	Yes
Nebraska, Lincoln	Yes	No	< 10 years	Yes	No
New Mexico, Santa Fe	-	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	No	No	-	Yes	No
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	Yes	Yes	1 to 5 years	Yes	-
U.S. Virgin Islands	No	No	< 5 years	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha & Racine Counties	Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes



TABLE 12

BOOT CAMPS — REASONS FOR TERMINATION

Site	Failed Program Requirements	Institutional Behavior	Voluntary Termination	Positive Drug Test(s)	Probation/ Parole Violation	New Arrest / Conviction
Alaska, Juneau	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓
Arizona, Pima County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	✓	✓	-	-	-	-
California, Orange County	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-
California, San Diego County	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓
California, Santa Clara County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Guam, Barrigada	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	✓	✓	-	-	-	-
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Michigan, Lansing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	✓	✓	-	-	✓	✓
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska, Lincoln	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	✓	✓	-	-	✓	✓
U.S. Virgin Islands	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

TABLE 13

BOOT CAMPS — SECURITY STAFF SELECTION

Site	Limitations					
	History of violence	History of abuse of Neglect	History of alcohol/ drug abuse	History of repeatedly reporting misconduct	Current serious personal problem	Physical or Mental Impairment
Alaska, Juneau	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Arizona, Pima County	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	-	-	-	-	-	-
California, Orange County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, San Diego County	-	-	-	-	-	-
California, Santa Clara County	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guam, Barrigada	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Michigan, Lansing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Nebraska, Lincoln	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.S. Virgin Islands	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE 14

## BOOT CAMPS — SECURITY STAFF REQUIREMENTS

Site	Requirements		
	Some College Education	High School Diploma	State Certification
Alaska, Juneau	-	✓	✓
Arizona, Pima County	-	✓	✓
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	-	✓	✓
California, Orange County	-	✓	✓
California, San Diego County	-	✓	✓
California, Santa Clara County	-	✓	✓
Guam, Barrigada	-	✓	✓
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	-	✓	✓
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	-	✓	✓
Michigan, Lansing	-	✓	✓
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	-	✓	✓
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	-	✓	✓
Nebraska, Lincoln	-	✓	✓
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	-	✓	✓
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	-	✓	✓
U.S. Virgin Islands	-	✓	✓
West Virginia	-	✓	✓
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	-	✓	✓

TABLE 15

## BOOT CAMPS — AFTERCARE SUPERVISION

Site	Supervision			Type
	Probation	Parole	Other	
Alaska, Juneau	✓	✓	✓	Moderate//Intensive
Arizona, Pima County	✓	-	-	Moderate
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	✓	-	-	Moderate//Intensive
California, Orange County	✓	-	-	Intensive
California, San Diego County	✓	-	-	Intensive
California, Santa Clara County	✓	-	-	Moderate//Intensive
Guam, Barrigada	✓	-	-	Moderate//Intensive
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	✓	-	-	Moderate/Intensive
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	✓	✓	✓	Moderate/Intensive
Michigan, Lansing	✓	-	✓	Moderate
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	-	-	✓	Moderate
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	✓	-	-	Moderate/Intensive
Nebraska, Lincoln	✓	-	-	Moderate/Intensive
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	✓	-	✓	Moderate
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	✓	✓	-	Intensive
U.S. Virgin Islands	✓	✓	✓	Moderate/Intensive
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	✓	-	-	Moderate

TABLE 16

BOOT CAMPS — AFTERCARE SERVICES

Site	Services							
	General counseling	Drug/ alcohol counseling	Drug/ alcohol testing	Community Service	Job readiness/ placement	General education	Life skills	Physical training and drill
Alaska, Juneau	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Arizona, Pima County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	✓	✓	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Orange County	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, San Diego County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
California, Santa Clara County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Guam, Barrigada	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Michigan, Lansing								
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-
Nebraska, Lincoln	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill								
U.S. Virgin Islands	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-

TABLE 17

## BOOT CAMPS — POTENTIAL OUTCOME MEASURES

Site	Recidivism Rate	Dropout Rate	Completion Rate	Reduction in Commitments
Alaska, Juneau	✓	✓	✓	✓
Arizona, Pima County	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Orange County	✓	✓	-	✓
California, San Diego County	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Santa Clara County	✓	✓	✓	✓
Guam, Barrigada	✓	✓	✓	✓
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan, Lansing	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	✓	✓	-	
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska, Lincoln	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	✓	✓	✓	✓
U.S. Virgin Islands	✓	✓	✓	✓
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	✓	-	✓	✓

TABLE 18

BOOT CAMPS — ADVANCED OUTCOME MEASURES

Site	Education Improvement	Job Skills Development	Job Placement	Community Reintegration	Cost Effectiveness
Alaska, Juneau	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Arizona, Pima County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Orange County	-	✓	-	✓	✓
California, San Diego County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
California, Santa Clara County	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Guam, Barrigada	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Illinois, Kane, Dekalb, & Kendall Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maryland, Baltimore & Harford Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan, Lansing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mississippi, Jackson (DHS)	-	✓	✓		
Mississippi, Jackson (DOC)	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
Nebraska, Lincoln	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma, Sac and Fox Nation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania, Camp Hill	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
U.S. Virgin Islands	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Kenosha, & Racine Counties	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

**TABLE 19**

**PLANNING ACTIVITIES, BENCHMARKS, AND RESEARCH**

<b>Planning Activities</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% In Progress</b>
Statewide Meetings	58.8	17.6	23.5
OJP Workshops	52.9	11.8	35.3
Focus Groups	35.5	11.8	52.9
Site Visits	52.9	11.8	35.3
Training	17.6	23.5	58.8
<b>Planning Benchmarks</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% In Progress</b>
Developed clear and measurable program goals	64.7	5.9	5.9
Developed a boot camp mission statement	64.7	11.8	-
Defined boot camp target population	76.5	-	-
Developed criteria for program admission	52.9	11.8	11.8
Developed criteria for program dismissal	47.1	23.5	5.9
Conducted boot camp capacity projections	41.2	29.4	5.9
Defined boot camp services	64.7	-	11.8
Developed a boot camp planning committee	64.7	17.6	-
Developed a comprehensive aftercare component	52.9	11.8	17.6
Developed administrative and management mechanisms to oversee the implementation of the boot camp	35.3	17.6	29.4
Developed a boot camp evaluation plan	35.3	23.5	23.5
Developed strategies to obtain funding for sustaining the boot camp	17.6	35.3	29.4
Developed state and local partnerships for boot camp development and operation	23.5	29.4	23.5
Developed boot camp program expansion plan	5.9	70.6	5.9
<b>Research Activities</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>	<b>% In Progress</b>
Aftercare program development	58.8	11.8	11.8
Needs assessment for boot camp development or expansion	70.6	11.8	5.9
Offender capacity projections	70.6	11.8	11.8
Facility space needs assessment	52.9	23.5	11.8
Boot camp programs and services	64.7	11.8	5.9
Housing needs	47.1	23.5	5.9
Staff projections	47.1	23.5	11.8
Pilot studies	11.8	47.1	41.2



**TABLE 20**

**AFTERCARE, STAKEHOLDERS, AND PARTNERSHIPS**

<b>Planned Aftercare Components</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
Case management services	70.6	11.8
Individual case planning	70.6	11.8
Intensive surveillance	58.8	11.8
Comprehensive service array	67.4	11.8
Incentives	58.8	23.5
Sanctions	68.4	11.8
Service brokerage with community resources	52.9	23.5
Management information	47.1	29.4
Evaluation	58.8	23.5
<b>Key Stakeholder Roles</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
Gathering and processing information	64.7	23.5
Decision making	64.7	29.4
Committee meetings or presentations	88.2	5.9
Brokering of services	11.8	82.4
Planning some or other key stakeholder role	94.1	-
<b>Community Partnership Mechanisms</b>	<b>% Yes</b>	<b>% No</b>
Newspaper press releases	29.4	64.7
Community forums and presentations	29.4	64.7
Informal meetings and gatherings	23.5	70.6
Television interviews	11.8	82.4
Other mechanisms	70.6	23.5

PROPERTY OF  
 National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
 Box 6000  
 Rockville, MD 20849-6000