

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

117999



M-1

National Institute of Justice

Issues and
Practices

In-Prison Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders

117999

1999

15 1999

CONSTITUTIONS

About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice is a research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Institute's mission is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes and control. Priority is given to policy-relevant research that can yield approaches and information that State and local agencies can use in preventing and reducing crime. The decisions made by criminal justice practitioners and policymakers affect millions of citizens, and crime affects almost all our public institutions and the private sector as well. Targeting resources, assuring their effective allocation, and developing new means of cooperation between the public and private sector are some of the emerging issues in law enforcement and criminal justice that research can help illuminate.

Carrying out the mandate assigned by Congress in the Justice Assistance Act of 1984, the National Institute of Justice:

- Sponsors research and development to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and related civil justice aspects, with a balanced program of basic and applied research.
- Evaluates the effectiveness of justice improvement programs and identifies programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- Tests and demonstrates new and improved approaches to strengthen the justice system, and recommends actions that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments and private organizations and individuals to achieve this goal.
- Disseminates information from research, demonstrations, evaluations, and special programs to Federal, State, and local governments, and serves as an international clearinghouse of justice information.
- Trains criminal justice practitioners in research and evaluation findings, and assists practitioners and researchers through fellowships and special seminars.

The Director of the Institute is appointed by the President of the United States, and upon confirmation by the Senate, serves at the President's pleasure. The Director establishes the research and development objectives of the Institute. The Director has final authority to approve grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements, and maintains responsibility for fiscal operations of the Institute. In establishing its research agenda, the Institute is guided by the priorities of the Attorney General and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of police, courts, and corrections practitioners as well as the private sector to identify the most critical problems and to plan research that can help resolve them.

James K. Stewart

Director

National Institute of Justice

James K. Stewart

Director

117999

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. 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 National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/OJP/NIJ
U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

Program Monitor

Jonathan Budd

National Institute of Justice

Washington, D.C.

The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program Offices and Bureaus: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime.

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice
Office of Communication and Research Utilization

In-Prison Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders

by

Marcia R. Chaiken, Ph.D.

July 1989

RECEIVED

SEP 15 1989

ACQUISITIONS

Issues and Practices in Criminal Justice is a publication of the National Institute of Justice. Designed for the criminal justice professional, each *Issues and Practices* report presents the program options and management issues in a topic area, based on a review of research and evaluation findings, operational experience, and expert opinion in the subject. The intent is to provide criminal justice managers and administrators with the information to make informed choices in planning, implementing and improving programs and practice.

Prepared for the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, by Abt Associates Inc., under contract #OJP-86-C-002. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dealing with drug-involved offenders can be a discouraging, thankless task with little discretionary time to devote to the demands of researchers. However, in preparation of this report, many practitioners graciously provided time to discuss their programs for prisoners, shared their experiences, and arranged for visits to observe the programs. I would like to thank them for their generous cooperation and applaud them for the high level of commitment they maintain for their work.

A wealth of information and many hours of cooperation were provided by the supervisors, directors, staff, and associates of the Cornerstone Program in Oregon, the Lantana Program in Florida, the Simon Fraser University Prison Education Program in British Columbia, and the Stay'n Out Program in New York. In particular, I would like to thank the following people for their help and advice.

British Columbia: Stephen Duguid, Director, Prison Education Programs, Continuing Studies, Simon Fraser University and the PEP faculty members, especially, Henry Hoekema, Programs Coordinator; Shiela Roberts, Administrative Assistant to the Dean of Arts, Simon Fraser University; Evan Alderson, Associate Dean of Arts, Simon Fraser University; Jo Lynne Hoegg, Dean of Continuing Studies, Simon Fraser University; Peter Marrett, Assistant Warden, Matsqui Institution; Charles McGinnis, Regional Director of Programs, Pacific Regional Headquarters, Correctional Service; Warden J. Stonoski, Matsqui Institution; David McLaren, Assistant Warden, Mountain Institution.

Florida: John Shaw, Superintendent, Lantana Correctional Institution; Michael Thompson, Supervisor, Counseling and Social Services, Lantana Correctional Institution and the counselors in his department; also at Lantana Correctional Institution, Robert N. Bohler, Assistant Superintendent; Edward Pfiester, Education Supervisor; Robert J. Rohr, Business Manager; Robert Miller, Classification Supervisor; Lucy Colucci, Personnel Director; Major R.D. Payton, Security; Dr. Cecilia Liangco and Florence Bryant R.N., Medical Services.

New York: Ronald Williams, Executive Director, Stay'n Out, New York Therapeutic Communities, Inc. and the members of his staff, especially, Sonja Paige, Senior Unit Director, Stay'n Out; Hazel Smith, Deputy Superintendent, Arthur Kill Correctional Facility; Anthony Luvera, Alcohol and Substance Abuse Treatment Programs, Program Services, Department of Correctional Services; Paul Samuels, Executive Vice-President, Legal Action Center; Dr. Harry Wexler, Narcotics and Drug Research, Inc.

Oregon: Dr. Gary Field, Director, Cornerstone Program and the Cornerstone counselors; Mr. Dale Weinstein, Director, Correctional Treatment Programs, Oregon; Tom Masters, Assistant Director, CTP, Oregon State Hospital; Mr. Steve Gassner, Assistant Superintendent, Oregon State Penitentiary; also at OSP, Carl Beals, Social/Support Services Manager,

and Jim Muranaka, Social Services Manager; Lee Anders, Parole Supervisor, Department of Corrections; Stan Mazur-Hart, Acting Director, Oregon State Hospital; Tom Lester, Correctional Institutional Services, Oregon State Hospital; Larry King, Adult Parole and Probation Officer, Community Corrections, Salem.

For the follow-up of the now defunct NARA program, valuable information was supplied by Dr. Jeanne Hetzel, Chief of Psychology Services, and Warden R.H. Rison, Federal Correctional Institution, Terminal Island, California.

Our project advisors provided thoughtful suggestions about issues to be addressed and reviewed earlier drafts of this report. They are Douglas Lipton, Division of Substance Abuse Services, New York State, and Narcotics and Drug Research, Inc.; Beth Weinman, TASC Project Director, National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors; and Chase Riveland, Secretary, Department of Corrections, Washington. Their reviews and the suggestions of three anonymous reviewers were used to prepare this report.

The cooperation of the staff in the Departments of Corrections in the states participating in our survey made possible our estimation of the current availability of prison programs for drug-involved offenders. The participating states are listed in Appendix B.

Virginia Baldau and Jonathan Budd, National Institute of Justice, initiated the preparation of this report, monitored its progress, and provided insightful comments. Dr. Bernard Gropper, Director of the Institute's Program on Drugs and Crime, reviewed several earlier drafts of this report; his suggestions and comments have been incorporated and are much appreciated. At Abt Associates Inc., Karen Tallman carried out the survey of state prison programs, and under the direct supervision of Jan Chaiken, analyzed the data; Joan Mullen, reviewed all drafts; her suggestions are also incorporated in this report.

Finally, I would like to thank the inmate program participants who perceptively discussed the benefits and barriers to participating in the programs.

Contents

Acknowledgments iii

Executive Summary vii

Chapter 1

Overview 1

Chapter 2

The Four Programs: Common Elements 13

Chapter 3

Barriers to Successful Program Implementation and Practical Solutions 41

Chapter 4

Organizing Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders 65

Epilogue 75

References 77

Appendix A 81

Program Resources

Appendix B 85

Survey of Prison Programs: Sample and Methods

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is written for practitioners who deal with the many drug-involved offenders repeatedly cycling through our prisons. In particular, it is intended for those who make decisions on the funds to be spent for drug treatment or on the type of programs to be mounted, and for those charged with designing, planning, and implementing drug-treatment approaches. Growing understanding of the relationship of drug abuse and crime has led to growing recognition of the need for in-prison drug abuse programs. To assist in the program development, NIJ commissioned a survey of state departments of corrections to determine the current status of such programs. The Institute also commissioned a review of evaluations of past and current programs to see whether any programs showed promise in terms of post-release performance, particularly recidivism. Several programs surfaced; four were still in operation and provide the primary basis for this report. However, the history of the disbanded programs was also informative.

The report begins with an overview of reasons for providing in-prison programs for drug-involved offenders and their multiple benefits for correctional administrators. Common practices found in the four programs are described. Barriers to providing such programs and ways of overcoming these obstacles are presented. The report concludes with answers to common questions about increasing the availability and viability of drug-treatment programs for imprisoned offenders.

Reasons for Providing Programs for Drug-Involved Prisoners

The numbers of drug-involved prison inmates have greatly increased over the past decade. In 1979, approximately 100,000 inmates had used heroin, illicit methadone, cocaine, LSD or PCP once a week or more for at least a month before their last arrest. By 1986, estimates indicate that close to 140,000 inmates had used these drugs regularly before their last arrest. About the same number were under the influence of drugs when they committed the crime for which they were incarcerated. Additionally, about a quarter of a million inmates in prison in 1986 reported having used other types of drugs regularly. Corrections administrators have responded to the large numbers of drug-involved offenders with whom they must deal by increasing enrollments of inmates in prison drug-treatment programs. In 1979, an estimated 4.4 percent of inmates were enrolled; in 1987, our survey indicated 11.1 percent.

However, over 50 percent of all inmates in prisons were regularly involved in using drugs before their last arrest but were receiving no programmatic help while incarcerated. When released from prison without effective treatment, many of these offenders commit crimes frequently, including robbery, assault, burglary, and distributing drugs.

Reducing the number of crimes committed by such offenders is an impor-

tant reason for providing drug-treatment programs. Perhaps equally important are the managerial and administrative benefits that may accrue, specifically:

- Good security,
- Improved working conditions for correctional staff,
- Positive publicity,
- Reduced staff stereotypes and conflict,
- A resource for crisis intervention,
- A reference for ACA accreditation.

Common Program Features

The four programs described in this report are the Cornerstone Program in Oregon, the Lantana Program in Florida,¹ the Simon Fraser University Prison Education Program in British Columbia, and the Stay'n Out Program in New York. They were selected because, unlike the vast majority of prison programs, they collected information about later behavior of inmates and reported relatively low rates of recidivism among program participants—rates as low as 16 percent.

Rehabilitation effects are difficult to measure and these findings have been debated among researchers. Some researchers who formerly were very pessimistic about rehabilitation have been encouraged by these evaluation results. Others are still skeptical. However, though it is not clear whether the reported low rates mean that the programs changed the behavior of the participants, the findings appeared to warrant further exploration of each program's organization and services. When examined in greater detail, an interesting finding emerged. Although the programs were developed in quite different settings by quite different people, the four share the following characteristics:

- The program participants typically were heavily involved in drug use and committed many serious crimes before incarceration.
- The programs differ from other drug-treatment programs in prisons in the comprehensive approach they use and the range of activities they provide; in these respects, they are more typical of free-standing residential programs. They also differ from other drug-treatment programs in terms of their housing and fiscal arrangements.
- The program providers are also atypical of correctional personnel; they are often drawn from other professions. Yet program staff are sensitive to and able to work within the regulations needed for preserving security. They are also realistic about goals for program participants.
- In carrying out the program activities, the inmate participants learn a range of practical life skills and come to feel as if they "own" the program.

-
- The programs formally or informally provide follow up and aftercare for inmate participants.

Barriers to Successful Implementation

These common elements, by themselves, are not sufficient to ensure continued program viability. Barriers to continued successful implementation constantly arise and require day-to-day and long-term flexibility and innovative practices. Most generally, the barriers fall into four categories:

- Changes in priorities for specific types of programs,
- Constraints on resources,
- Staff resistance,
- Inmate resistance.

The methods successfully used to resolve these problems typically involve the following three steps:

- Negotiation with all involved parties to determine their concerns and needs,
- Development of a new program component to meet these concerns and needs,
- Implementation of the new program components in a manner that complements the other program activities rather than detracts from them.

Organizing Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders

Practitioners and other decision makers who are involved with increasing the availability of programs for drug-involved offenders commonly have a number of questions about the feasibility of funding and implementation. Answers to frequently-asked questions are summarized below. The answers are based on a number of practices that appear to have increased the availability and viability of the four programs described in this report. In addition, practices that seem to decrease program viability were discovered in the survey of state departments of corrections and during discussions with administrators involved with disbanded programs formerly reporting reduced recidivism. These practices provide the bases for the caveats.

Funding

Question: Our budget for corrections is already allocated for essential services; how can new programs be funded?

Answer: Innovative sources of state funds may be available for legislative allocation to provide in-prison programs for drug-involved offenders. Legislatively earmarking specific, appropriate sources of income for particular prison programs can help ensure the viability of programs, increase public awareness, and promote

systematic and programmatic accountability.

Question: What about federal funds?

Answer: Funds available through federal agencies are best used for one-time initial program costs—not for routine ongoing program costs. Even the most effective programs, that depend exclusively on federal rather than state funds, are likely to be dropped when federal funding is withdrawn. Among prison programs no longer operating, 70 percent were eliminated because they were dependent on federal funds no longer available.

Selecting Programs to Implement

Question: What is the newest and most popular approach for prison drug-abuse programs that we can try?

Answer: There are several new and untested programs that are popular. However, before deciding to implement new programs, a review of ongoing programs can help prevent the costly and wasteful process of “re-inventing the wheel”. Programs already in place in your state may be more effective than new programs proposed by out-of-state experts. Programs that are already providing administrative benefits need to be replicated under conditions that will permit careful tests of their effectiveness in reducing recidivism.

Question: Our correctional system is different than those of Florida, New York, Oregon, and British Columbia; does it make sense to use their programs?

Answer: Persistent, drug-involved offenders who commit many serious crimes are very much alike no matter where they live. They typically have many of the same complex social/psychological, educational, and vocational needs. Therefore, there is no reason to assume that the programs described in this report could not be replicated effectively in other settings.

Question: Where can we find trained program directors?

Answer: Program directors who are outside of corrections but who have long-term experience in working to change participants' lifestyles often have the essential training and skills to design and implement effective in-prison programs. More specifically, the search for program directors can be brought to the attention of local universities and colleges, private and public community drug-treatment centers, private and public mental health agencies, comprehensive health care agencies, and agencies that deal with arrestees diverted from the criminal justice system.

Housing Programs

Question: Our system is already overcrowded; how can we house new programs?

Answer: While prisons in many states are overcrowded, and therefore inappropriate for starting new programs or expanding ongoing programs, other, potentially suitable, state residential institutions may be underutilized. Units in facilities such as mental hospitals have been found to require little or no renovation for providing medium or minimum security for drug-involved offenders.

In states in which prison overcrowding is not a problem, the status of state institutions still might be reviewed and facilities selected for housing programs that meet the following criteria:

- Inclusion in or close to a secure correctional facility to facilitate immediate transfer of inmate participants who are disruptive;
- Availability of units within the facility with limited and controlled physical and visual access;
- For programs targeted on inmates nearing release, proximity to a nearby community with available job opportunities and low-cost housing to facilitate gradual release of inmates and accessibility of parolees to program staff after release.

Initial Implementation (or Replication) of Programs

Question: When introducing new programs, can we avoid turf battles between agencies and staff?

Answer: Probably not. However, the following steps can be taken to minimize conflict.

Interagency conflict can be minimized if state-level executive staff in all agencies involved in providing the programs take part in the program planning process from the earliest stages.

Effective programs require cooperation among diverse sets of agencies. All agencies need to realize benefits from the program. For successful program implementation, initial coordination and cooperation among involved agencies need to be negotiated at the state-level.

At a minimum, prison administrators, parole supervisors, local law enforcement officials and community representatives need to be briefed and brought on board for launching programs.

Conflict can also be minimized if a plenary committee produces a contract, cooperative agreement, or other document that explicitly details division of responsibility for provision of services and materials.

Traditionally, the department of corrections assumes responsibility for providing virtually all services and materials needed by prisoners. In planning program implementation, responsibility for such tasks and materials can be reallocated and divided between the department of corrections, the department housing the program, and the program providers. Significant saving of resources can result from reallocation—for example, program staff providing total supervision of inmates in the program area.

Additionally, responsibility needs to be assigned for carrying out tasks and providing materials that are integral parts of program implementation, including:

- Selecting program participants,
- Expelling a participant from the program for disciplinary reasons,
- Taking disciplinary action (less serious than expulsion) for minor infractions,
- Awarding privileges to inmate/participants for achieving goals,
- Structuring activities for discretionary time.

Training sessions held for program staff, correctional officers, and other institutional staff in contact with program participants can benefit all involved.

Potential conflict between program staff and correctional staff can be minimized by a shared understanding of each others' goals, objectives, responsibilities, and activities.

An institutional coordinating/negotiating committee, composed of a representative from all departments involved with the program, can be established and should plan to meet frequently.

As day-to-day disagreements about the use of resources or operational procedures arise, they can be resolved quickly and satisfactorily by a committee specifically formed for this purpose. Additionally, as the committee becomes familiar with common sources of complaints, problems can be anticipated and resolved before they occur.

The program initially can be implemented with the *minimum* number of staff and inmates needed to be cost effective.

Beginning with a relatively small program decreases barriers to implementation due to resource constraints, staff resistance, and inmate resistance, and allows for easier resolution of day-to-day problems.

Selecting Inmate Participants

Question: Should participation be voluntary or mandatory?

Answer: There is growing evidence that offenders who enter treatment programs because of legal coercion are just as likely as other participants to respond positively. However, in practice, all those who entered treatment under legal coercion chose to do so as an alternative to other forms of correctional supervision. For example, they chose drug treatment instead of jail.

Legal coercion cannot be equated with mandatory participation. Experienced program administrators report that forced participation simply does not work. Inmates assigned to programs against their will are frequently extremely disruptive.

Rather than involuntary conscription, the programs can provide perquisites such as desired recreational activities, that make the program more attractive than serving a regular prison sentence.

Question: What type of inmates should be involved in the program?

Answer: Effective programs that recruit the most serious, persistent offenders are more likely to gain the respect of other inmates and have the largest impact on recidivism. Most offenders do not commit a lot of crimes. Although many are persistent criminals who cycle through institutions, when they are released they get by on odd jobs, living with relatives, and an occasional theft or burglary that lands them back in jail or prison.

A small proportion of offenders are extremely active criminals; when released, they hit the streets running—committing hundreds of crimes each year as long as they are free to do so and haven't learned to lead a less criminal life. Recruiting the latter type of offender for treatment is more likely to improve everyone's quality of life—the offender, the members of his or her family and community, and potential victims.

Question: How can we screen inmates at intake for admission to the program?

Answer: The vast majority of prisoners have been drug-involved; almost all persistent offenders who committed crimes at an early age also used drugs. Therefore, screening for drug use may not be cost effective. Administrators in the four programs suggested that, if demand does not exceed available resources, inmates who are not security risks and who indicate that they can profit from

the program should be allowed to participate. Since the most effective programs deal with complex multiple needs, not just drug use, virtually all mentally competent offenders could profit from the programs. Mentally retarded prisoners generally require alternative programs. However, poor reading skills, often characteristic of serious offenders, need not preclude participation; basic literacy classes can be incorporated as a program component.

Ongoing Practices

Question: How can we increase the chances of keeping a good program?

Answer: The following procedures have been found to increase program viability.

Ongoing monitoring of the program facilitated by program directors

Program directors continually have provided documentation of program activities and impact to state legislators, gubernatorial staff, corrections department administrators, and other concerned agencies and staff.

Providing briefs about the program to new administrators

Program directors have presented briefs to new administrators about the program, the benefits for the new administrators' office, and the sources of external support. At the same time, the program directors determined the priorities of the new administrators and planned to meet these priorities without compromising the integrity of the program.

Assigning staff in the facilities housing the programs to positions requiring coordination with the programs only if they are knowledgeable about and sympathetic to program goals

Staff assignments to the program areas have been voluntary and have followed at least one orientation session providing information about program goals, activities, and procedures.

Opening to participation by facility staff appropriate program activities

When made available to staff, attendance in classes, seminars, group counseling sessions, and other program events by facility personnel has increased the value of the program for everyone involved.

Encouraging state legislators to periodically visit prison programs

On-site inspection of the programs by legislators has benefited all persons concerned. Such visits increase the positive view of the correctional administration and staff, raise the morale of the program staff, enhance the prestige of the program among inmates, and provide excellent publicity for the visitors and hosts.

Evaluation

Question: How can we tell whether a program actually reduces recidivism?

Answer: Evaluation of the programs can be carried out periodically by neutral researchers. The primary questions that should be addressed by researchers involve both program process and impact. More specifically, program evaluation should provide answers to the following questions:

- Who are the program participants? Is the program reaching the most serious offenders or offenders who have a low probability of being recidivists?
- What is the length of time participants are involved in the program? Is this length of time optimal for reducing recidivism?
- What are the program activities? And, as compared to inmates not involved in the program, specifically what activities are carried out by program participants?
- Who are the staff members involved in the program? As compared to staff supervising other inmates with the same classification, what is the ratio of staff to inmates, and what is the background and training of staff members?
- As compared to similar offenders who have not participated in the program, do the program participants commit fewer crimes after release? Are they more socially stable? Are they less involved with drugs?

Note

1. Lantana was converted to a facility for women offenders in January, 1989.

Chapter 1: OVERVIEW

Ron was an inmate in Comstock prison. When paroled, he had no intention of returning—nor using heroin again. He had some money saved from the work he did in prison. And since he was a medic in the army, he found a job in a private hospital caring for elderly terminally ill patients. Working the graveyard shift and living by himself, he was lonely and isolated. His only friends were the people with whom he used to share dope. It wasn't long before he was once again doing dope with them.

He told himself it was o.k. As long as he was working, there was nothing wrong with shooting drugs. He needed more money to pay for heroin, and started “middling” drugs. He got caught. And although he beat the charge on a technicality, he was returned to prison for violation of parole. Released a year and a half later, he began the process all over again.

Ron is one of hundreds of thousands of drug-involved offenders who have been cycling through our correctional institutions. This report is written for practitioners who deal with them. In particular, it is intended for those who make decisions on the funds to be spent for drug treatment, on the type of programs to be mounted, and for those charged with designing, planning, and implementing drug treatment approaches. Information is provided for initiating and maintaining drug treatment programs for prisoners.

Growing understanding of the relationship of drug abuse and crime has led to growing recognition of the need for in-prison drug abuse programs. To assist in the program development, NIJ commissioned a survey of state departments of corrections to determine the current status of such programs. The institute also commissioned a review of evaluations of past and current programs to see whether any programs showed promise in terms of post-release performance, particularly recidivism. Several programs surfaced; four were still in operation and, although the history of the disbanded programs was also informative, a study of these four programs provides the primary basis for this report. Interestingly, while developed in quite different settings by quite different people, the four have a number of common characteristics, including long histories of dealing with serious offenders. They are the Cornerstone Program in Oregon, the Lantana Program in Florida, the Simon Fraser University Prison Education Program in British Columbia, and the Stay'n Out Program in New York.

The Prospects for Rehabilitation

Prison wardens and superintendents are all too familiar with inmates like Ron who repeatedly cycle through their overcrowded facilities. In 1986, 62 percent of inmates in our prisons had used drugs regularly prior to incarceration.¹ And although the proportion of people in the United States who use drugs is dropping, the proportion of serious offenders who are

regular drug users is still increasing.²

Although our prisons are supposed to be correctional institutions, professionals in charge of running them frequently express despair over their actual function—warehousing persistent drug-involved offenders. Rehabilitation, although still an ideal concept, has largely fallen into disrepute as an operational goal.

Many of the inmates involved in the programs reviewed in this report are offenders who grew up on the streets of inner-city neighborhoods. Frequently they are school dropouts, who never had or expected to have steady employment or stable relationships with other people. As one of the inmate participants commented, “I got by minding my own business. I did my own time inside [juvenile facilities and prisons] and I did my own time on the streets. I never thought about what I did hurting someone else. It’s something I never thought about.”

“It’s senseless to talk about rehabilitation,” one of the program directors commented, “when the people you’re talking about have never been rehabilitated.”

Ten Years Ago Many Researchers Were Pessimistic About Rehabilitation

In the past decade, many researchers have also been very pessimistic about changing the behavior of drug-involved offenders. The widely cited study by Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks,³ helped promulgate the negative perception of rehabilitation—“nothing works.” And in 1979, the National Academy of Sciences reexamined their research results and reported rather poor prospects for rehabilitation. Although the panel suggested that the “literature does afford occasional hints of interventions that may have promise,” it strongly advised against widespread implementation.⁴

The panel called for a major research and development effort to determine what rehabilitation efforts should be used. Ten years later the “Herculean” effort envisioned by the panel still has not been implemented. Practitioners and the research community still do not have a comprehensive study on which to base recommendations for more effective ways of dealing with the drug-involved offenders flooding the criminal system.

Recently, More Researchers Are Optimistic About Certain Approaches

Fortunately, although a large-scale definitive study of rehabilitation efforts for drug-involved offenders has not been carried out, over the past ten years a small number of practitioners and researchers persisted in their efforts to develop and evaluate programs designed to reduce the criminal behavior of drug-involved offenders.

Based on a review of this literature,⁵ the following program characteristics

appear to be key:

- The rules of the program are made clear and the consequences for breaking the rules are made clear and quickly enforced.
- The program staff are concerned about the welfare and future of the inmates, and make their concern known.
- The program staff are regarded by the inmates as people worth imitating; in turn, the imitation is rewarded by the staff and other inmates.
- The program process includes preparing the inmate to deal with problems which increase the likelihood of their committing crimes.
- The programs utilize community resources.

Indeed, some of the same researchers and practitioners who formerly presented evidence of program failure have expressed cautious optimism about the effectiveness of some correctional programs for drug-involved offenders, specifically those who were heroin addicts.⁶ Based on research evidence and practical experience, the authors of another National Institute of Justice Issues and Practices report ("A Criminal Justice System Strategy for Treating Cocaine-Heroin Abusing Offenders in Custody")⁷ emphasize the importance of:

- Identifying drug-involved offenders through urinalysis,
- Intensely supervising convicted drug-involved offenders on probation or parole, and ensuring that they are in treatment,
- Involving drug-involved prisoners in drug treatment nine months to a year before release and continued treatment in the community as a condition of their parole.

This report focuses primarily on specific operational issues and practices for providing programs for drug-involved prisoners. It describes four programs with long histories of successfully managing prisoners involved in persistent drug use and crime. Based on observations of these programs and interviews with correctional department administrators and staff, program directors and staff, and inmate participants, the programs are described in day-to-day operational terms. Common practices found in these programs are described. Also described are ongoing problems that threaten the viability of programs. These problems are presented, not to demean the programs, but rather to describe the real issues with which program directors and staff must deal, and to suggest what can be done to overcome these obstacles. Finally, answers to common questions about practices for implementing programs for drug-involved offenders are provided. Before turning to the analysis of key elements and common barriers, the remainder of this chapter focuses on documenting the reasons for providing programs for drug-involved offenders, including the administrative benefits that can be realized from implementing such programs.

Reasons for Providing Programs for Drug-Involved Prisoners

The Numbers of Drug-Involved Prisoners Are Increasing

Many of the former inmates who participated in the programs described in this report provide vivid examples of correctional success. However, for each programmatic success story, there are thousands of examples of other drug-involved offenders in America who are incarcerated, receive no help, and fail. The number of drug-involved prison inmates has greatly increased over the past decade. There is both a growing number of offenders imprisoned in the U.S. and a growing proportion of inmates who have been regular users of opiates or hallucinogens. A 1979 census revealed that 304,844 people were serving time in state prison facilities.⁸ Thirty-three percent of these prisoners reported having used major drugs regularly, that is, once a week or more for at least a month.⁹ Estimates based on these surveys indicate that in 1979 approximately 100,000 inmates had used heroin, illicit methadone, cocaine, LSD, or PCP regularly before their last arrest.

By 1986, the number of prisoners in state facilities had grown to 465,383.¹⁰ More than 35 percent of these prisoners reported having been regular users of major drugs;¹¹ estimates indicate that close to 140,000 inmates had used heroin, illicit methadone, cocaine, LSD, or PCP once a week or more for at least a month before their last arrest. About the same number were under the influence of drugs when they committed the crime for which they were incarcerated. Additionally, about a quarter of a million inmates in prison in 1986 reported having used illicit methadone, cocaine, LSD, or PCP regularly.

Although the percentage of people in the United States who use drugs appears to be decreasing,¹² there is no evidence to suggest that the numbers of drug-involved offenders, with whom corrections administrators and staff must deal, will decline in the years ahead. On the contrary, the estimates presented above are based on self-reports of inmates; since drug-involved offenders commonly deny use,¹³ the numbers of inmates who are regular users may be significantly higher and increasing more rapidly than self-report surveys indicate.

Without Effective Prison Programs, Released Drug-Involved Inmates Typically Commit Many Crimes

Many drug-involved inmates have been cycling through detention facilities since they were adolescents. They began using drugs and committing crimes as youngsters. A small proportion of them were violent drug-involved offenders before they were sixteen; they are likely to commit hundreds of crimes including robberies and burglaries each year they are free.¹⁴ Other high-rate, dangerous, drug-involved inmates committed crimes for many years before getting caught and sent to prison for the first time.¹⁵

Releasing these types of drug-involved offenders from prisons without changing their patterns of behavior is clearly offensive to the public in-

terest. They are entrenched in a lifestyle that includes drugs and crime. When released, many hit the streets running, robbing and assaulting vulnerable victims, breaking into homes, and distributing drugs. Parole doesn't necessarily deter them, as research suggests that the highest-rate, most dangerous, drug-involved offenders typically escape supervision.¹⁶

More Inmates Are Enrolled in Prison Programs for Drug-Involved Offenders

To determine how corrections administrators have responded to the large numbers of drug-involved offenders with whom they must deal, we carried out a telephone survey of directors of programs in state prisons. When we compared the results with a similar survey carried out by NIDA in 1979, we found that administrators have responded by increasing enrollments of inmates in prison programs. According to the NIDA Survey,¹⁷ 3.9 percent of inmates in the fifty state corrections systems were found to be enrolled in drug treatment programs; (adjusting for the absence of Texas in the NIDA data, our estimate for 1979 is 4.4%. See Table 1). Our estimate for 1987, based on the telephone survey sample (see Appendix B), is that 11.1 percent of inmates in the fifty states were enrolled, an increase of over 150 percent. In 1987, approximately 51,500 inmates were enrolled in prison drug treatment programs nationwide, compared to 10,500 in 1979.

Table 1:

Change in Enrollment in Drug Treatment Programs: 1979 to 1987

Percent of Inmates Enrolled	1979 ^a	1987 ^b	Percent Change 1979-87
All states	3.9%	11.1%	174%
Number of inmates			
Large	3.3	10.5	267
Excluding Texas	3.3	7.9	139
Medium	6.4	8.4	131
Small	8.0	13.8	72

Source: For 1979, NIDA survey "Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons." For 1987, Abt Associates telephone survey of a sample of corrections agencies.

^a The NIDA survey reports no data for Texas inmates enrolled in drug abuse treatment programs in 1979; but Texas (with zero inmates enrolled) is included in the total 3.9 percent. Excluding the missing Texas data, the corrected 1979 figure is 4.4 percent enrolled.

^b States were divided into three groups: top third, middle third, and lowest third, according to their census of inmates in 1984.

States with large prison systems had a small fraction (3.3%) enrolled in 1979 and increased over 10 percent between 1979 and 1987. States with small systems had 8 percent of their inmates enrolled in 1979. By 1987, they still had a comparatively high percentage enrolled (14%) but they increased proportionately less than did medium- or large-sized prison systems. Overall, increases in treatment programs were concentrated in states that had proportionately few inmates in treatment in 1979. Among states with the smallest enrollment percentages (2.5% or fewer inmates enrolled in treatment in 1979), enrollment increased from an average 1.6 percent in 1979 to 6.4 percent in 1987.

The most common types of substance-abuse programs are group therapy and general drug education, similar to 1979. Decreases occurred in the amount of individual counseling and, especially, vocational and family counseling. Large proportions (over 60%) of states currently offered programs based on the Alcoholics Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous (AA/NA) 12-step recovery model implemented by recovering alcoholics and addicts from local communities. There was no mention of these programs in the 1979 NIDA survey.

In 90 percent of states, prison program staff, parole officers, or volunteers offer some kind of arrangement for continued drug treatment after release. The most common arrangement (58% of states) is affiliation with a self-help organization such as AA or NA in the community. Thirty-seven percent of state corrections agencies coordinate an aftercare program through parole services. All other types of aftercare programs were uncommon (under 7% of states).

Thirty-five percent of states had their funding for drug abuse programs cut at some time during the past ten years. Of these, 70 percent had previously been funded by the federal government, and the program was abandoned for budgetary reasons. The states that experienced program cuts were not significantly different from other states in terms of the numbers and types of programs currently in operation.

Most Drug-Involved Prisoners Are Not Enrolled in Drug Abuse Programs

In comparison to a decade ago, many more inmates are enrolled in prison programs for drug-involved offenders. However, while 62 percent of inmates reported using drugs regularly before incarceration, and 35 percent used major drugs regularly, only 11 percent of inmates were estimated to be enrolled in drug-abuse programs. Over 50 percent of all inmates in prisons were regularly involved in using drugs but were receiving no programmatic help while incarcerated.

Additionally, although enrollments in prison programs are increasing, there have been major cuts in important components of programs such as vocational and family counseling. Drug education, one of the most common types of programs available to prisoners, has not been found by itself to significantly reduce drug use.¹⁸ Very few programs appeared to offer a comprehensive multi-modal approach to the drug-involved prisoner.

Potential Administrative Benefits of the Programs

In addition to their potential for reducing the numbers of crimes participants commit after release, the programs described in this report may also enhance institutional operations. Importantly, wardens and superintendents have found that the programs described in this report provide managerial and administrative benefits. Several administrators suggested that they would be in favor of continuing the programs to gain the following benefits even if the programs did not affect inmates' behavior after they are released.

The Programs Can Help Provide Good Security

Several of the processes and practices that have been developed to increase program effectiveness serve to increase the control staff have over inmates behavior. The programs generally are highly structured and occupy all the hours the inmates are not involved in other basic institutional activities such as eating, sleeping, and carrying out work assignments. Because the programs are so intensive, while they are carrying out their primary functions, the program staff also provide "intensive supervision;" they are very likely to learn about contraband, and, to preserve the reputation of the program, to react quickly to discipline involved inmates. Cornerstone utilizes and pays for breathalyzer and urinalysis tests. Additionally, because the inmate/participants have a vested interest in the program, they also provide indigenous security.

June 2, 1981 a riot broke out at the Matsqui Institution in British Columbia. Throughout the night, hundreds of inmates on a rampage, burned and destroyed half of the facilities including the residence buildings. Royal Canadian Mounted Police quelled the riot the next morning and the prisoners surrendered. However, the devastation could not be quickly repaired.

The prisoners were housed in tents in a field inside the gates. Within a couple of days, heavy rains had turned the area into a churning mass of mud. Cold, wet, and miserable, 200 inmates were assigned to sleep in one of the few buildings that had sustained no damage—the academic center housing the Simon Fraser University program.

The inmate grapevine passed a brief message from some of the "heavy" inmate-students. There was to be absolutely no damage done to the center. Not one table scratched—not a book page torn.

The large group of inmates filled the small building over night. Every inch of space was taken. The library and classrooms became dormitories. The next morning, the inmates filed out. Other than mud that had been tracked in from the field, there was no evidence that the building had been converted into a residential hall for hundreds.

The Programs Can Help Provide Good Working Conditions for Correctional Staff

Several correctional administrators associated with the programs suggested that the programs improved the working environment of the rank and file institutional officers involved with the program. They feel safer and day-to-day interaction with the inmates/participants is generally less abrasive than in ordinary prison settings. Therefore, correctional staff tends to turn over less frequently and absenteeism is reduced.

Additionally, correctional staff involved with the programs typically have an "upbeat" attitude toward their function. Rather than viewing their role as simply keeping institutional order, they pride themselves on providing a supportive environment in which the program providers and inmates can carry on meaningful activities. They see themselves as part of a correctional team rather than as a group of guards. They are more likely, or just as likely, as program providers to refer to the low recidivism rates among former inmates. Although superintendents and wardens are more skeptical about the long-range behavioral changes produced by the programs, the short-term changes are an appreciated source of cooperative management.

The Programs Can Provide Good Publicity

The programs frequently provide a showcase for the media, visiting dignitaries, concerned citizen groups, students from local colleges, and researchers. Numerous newspaper articles have been written about the programs, program staff, and participants that enhance the image of the correctional institutions and, by association, the administrative staff in the institutions. Human interest stories about inmates who were "transformed" from robbers or perpetrators of other violence into law abiding citizens abound and add to a positive public perception of corrections. And pictures of prison administrators with top state officials at program ceremonies indicate that the programs provide positive professional publicity for wardens and superintendents.

The Programs Can Help Break Down Staff Stereotypes and Conflict

Common sources of management problems in correctional institutions are negative stereotypes staff in some departments have formed about staff in other departments. Correctional staff may be viewed by treatment staff as head-bashing neanderthals, while correctional staff regard treatment staff as bleeding hearts, manipulated by inmates. Contractual service providers who are on the staff of outside organizations may be treated by correctional staff as interlopers, insensitive to security needs. Conversely, correctional staff may be viewed by outside contractors as belligerent ignoramuses. The constant bickering that goes on between groups holding such stereotypes, and the rumors that frequently result from a lack of communication between the groups, present a day-to-day nuisance for mid- and top-level managers.

Although such stereotypes can never be eliminated entirely, in institutions in which the programs have been operating for a relatively long time, these divisive comparisons have been reduced to a barely audible level. Mid-level program and correctional staff, for the most part, resolve any staff conflict that does arise without resorting to top-level arbitration. And inmates, who commonly seize conflicts between staff and use rumors for achieving their own goals, are less likely to have such opportunities.

The Programs Can Provide a Resource for Crisis Intervention

Although superintendents and wardens strive to maintain safe stable environments with routinized activities, given the violence-prone nature of inmate populations, frequently potentially explosive situations arise that require immediate reaction to quell incipient danger to staff or inmates. Because the program staff have day-to-day contact with some of the most influential inmates and because they are comfortable and have practice with working with inmates on a one-to-one basis, at one time or another they have provided a resource for resolving dangerous situations involving inmates both in and out of the program.

At various times, program staff have dealt with suicidal inmates, identified psychotic inmates who slipped through the screening measures at intake, reasoned with riot leaders, counselled AIDS victims, and provided crisis intervention after stabbings or other violence in the general population. When crises arise because of strikes or other management problems with the custodial staff in host institutions, program staff have been called on to provide interim custodial functions. Program staff have also fulfilled a stopgap function by finding homes for inmates who lose their community residence as they are about to be released.

The Programs Can Provide a Reference for ACA Accreditation

For institutions undergoing review for ACA accreditation, many of the programs' practices demonstrate compliance with the organization's standards for corrections. More specifically, the programs commonly help demonstrate acceptable conditions for confinement, compliance with standards on offender education and training, provision of programs for offenders with special needs, involvement of the private sector in corrections, development of a professional correctional staff, and cooperation with research and evaluation.

Notes

1. Innes, Christopher A., 1988. *Profile of State Prison Inmates, 1986*. Special Report. Washington, D.C., Bureau of Justice Statistics.
2. Johnston, Lloyd D., Patrick O'Malley, and Jerald G. Bachman, 1985. *Use of Illicit Drugs by America's High School Students, 1975-1985*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Johnston, Lloyd D., Patrick M. O'Malley, and Jerald G. Bachman, 1986. *Drug Use Among American High School Students and Other Young Adults, National Trends Through 1985*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

NIDA Capsules, 1986. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Innes, *op. cit.*
3. Lipton, D., R. Martinson, and J. Wilks, 1975. *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies*. New York, Praeger Publishers.
4. Sechrest, Lee, Susan O. White, and Elizabeth D. Brown, eds., 1979. *The Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders: Problems and Prospects*. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences.
5. Cullen, Frank and Paul Gendreau, 1988. "The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation," in L. Goodstein and D.L. MacKenzie, eds., *The American Prison: Issues in Research Policy*. New York, Plenum.
6. Wexler, Harry K., Douglas S. Lipton, and Kenneth Foster, 1985. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment: Preliminary Results." Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting, San Diego. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.
7. Wexler, Harry K., Douglas S. Lipton, and Bruce Johnson, 1988. *A Criminal Justice Strategy for Treating Drug Offenders in Custody*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.
8. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1980. *Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31, 1980*. National Prisoner Bulletin. Washington, D.C.
9. Innes, *op. cit.*
10. American Correctional Association, 1987. *Juvenile and Adult Correctional Department, Institutions, Agencies and Paroling Authorities, 1987*. College Park, Maryland.
11. Innes, *op. cit.*
12. Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, 1985, 1986, *op. cit.*

NIDA, op. cit.
13. Wish, Eric D., Mary A. Toborg, and John Bellassai, 1988. *Identifying Drug Users and Monitoring Them During Conditional Release*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
14. Chaiken, Jan M. and Marcia R. Chaiken, 1982. *Varieties of Criminal Behavior*. Santa Monica, Rand Corporation.

Chaiken, Marcia R., and Jan M. Chaiken, 1985. *Who Gets Caught Doing Crime?* Bureau of Justice Statistics Discussion Paper. Washington, D.C.

Chaiken, Marcia R. and Bruce D. Johnson, 1988. *Characteristics of Different Types of Drug-Involved Offenders*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.

-
- Nurco, David N., Thomas E. Hanlon, Timothy W. Kinlock, and Karen R. Dvzynski, 1988. "Differential Criminal Patterns of Narcotic Addicts Over an Addiction Career," *Criminology* 26:3 pp. 407-423.
15. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985, *op. cit.*
 16. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985, *op. cit.*

Chaiken, Marcia R. and Jan M. Chaiken, 1989 (forthcoming). *Redefining the Career Criminal: Priority Prosecution of the High-Rate Dangerous Offender.* Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.
 17. NIDA, *op. cit.*
 18. Fergasen, Patricia, Thomas Lennox and Dan J. Lettieri, eds., 1974. *Drugs and Attitude Change*, "Non-medical Drug Use: Attitudes and Attitude Change." Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Chapter 2: THE FOUR PROGRAMS: COMMON ELEMENTS

The four programs described in this report were selected because, unlike the vast majority of prison programs, they collected information about later behavior of inmates and reported relatively low rates of recidivism among program participants—rates as low as 16 percent. Most states have implemented some type of prison program for drug-involved inmates, however, a literature search revealed that very few programs have had a published outcome evaluation. About half of the few that have been evaluated have used changes in inmates' attitudes rather than behavior as a measure of impact. And among the few programs evaluated using behavioral measures, the results of only five evaluations reported that participants appeared less likely to recidivate than groups of similar offenders who had not completed the program. However, only four programs were still operating.

Rehabilitation effects are difficult to evaluate,¹ and these findings have been debated among researchers. Some researchers who formerly were very pessimistic about rehabilitation have been encouraged by these evaluation results—others are still skeptical. However, though it is not clear whether the reported low rates mean that the programs changed the behavior of the participants, the findings appeared to warrant further exploration of each program's organization and services. When examined in greater detail, an interesting finding emerged. Although the programs were developed in quite different settings by quite different people, the four share common characteristics.

In this chapter, the following common characteristics of the programs are described in detail.

- The programs are atypical of other drug-treatment programs in prisons in the comprehensive approach they use and the range of activities they provide; in these respects, they are more typical of free-standing residential programs. They are also atypical of other drug-treatment programs in terms of their housing and fiscal arrangements.
- The program providers are also atypical of correctional personnel; they are often drawn from other professions. Yet program staff are sensitive to and able to work within the regulations needed for preserving security. They are also realistic about goals for program participants.
- The program participants typically were heavily involved in drug use and committed many serious crimes before incarceration.
- In carrying out the program activities, the inmate participants learn a range of practical life skills and come to feel as if they "own" the program.
- The programs' staff members formally or informally maintain contact with inmate participants after release and provide care.

-
- The behavior of the inmates who completed the program was studied after release and in three programs compared with the behavior of other released inmates. Although less than rigorous methods were used to study the impact of the program, the results indicated that the programs were worthy of further study.

The Programs in the Context of Other Drug-Treatment Programs

Most drug treatment programs (in or out of prisons) can be classified into four modal categories: detoxification, methadone maintenance, outpatient drug-free, and residential.² Detoxification programs provide medical and psychological services for substance abusers undergoing staged withdrawal from physical dependency on drugs. Methadone maintenance programs provide addicts with chemical substitutes for heroin in a legally and medically controlled environment; individual or group counseling is almost always provided along with methadone maintenance.³ Outpatient drug-free programs provide counseling and other services in settings including store front clinics, mental health clinics, and hospitals. Residential programs provide counseling and other services in hospitals, free-standing facilities, and correctional facilities. The programs described in this report are obviously a subset of residential programs.

The types of drug abusers served by the different modes of treatment programs range from those who committed no other crimes apart from their possession, to those who were very criminally active before entering treatment. Clients in outpatient drug-free programs are the least likely to be serious criminals, methadone clients are more criminally active, and drug abusers who enter residential treatment are involved in the greatest criminal activity before treatment. On an average, each day before they entered treatment, the crimes committed by drug abusers in residential programs cost their victims over \$43 in terms of lost property, medical expenses resulting from injuries, and lost work time.⁴ Drug-involved offenders who wind up in residential treatment in prison are the most criminally active of all offenders.⁵ And the programs described in this report involve inmates who are among the highest-rate and most dangerous offenders in the prisons.

Although drug programs in prisons typically serve the most criminally active offenders in residential treatment, traditionally the prison programs provide fewer services than other residential units. Although other departments in the institutions may provide these services, prison drug treatment programs are much less likely than outside residential programs to include job counseling, vocational rehabilitation, and education. Over 80 percent of other residential programs incorporate family therapy or counseling, but only 41 percent of prison programs have provided this service. And while the vast majority of outside residential program staff provide referral to treatment services and aftercare follow-up, fewer than 65 percent of prison program staff provide referral and fewer than 27 percent maintain contact after release.⁶

In terms of their approach and the services they provide, the programs described in this report are less like typical prison programs and more like other residential programs. Two programs have essentially reconstructed in prisoners' dormitories one of the most common forms of free-standing residential programs—the therapeutic community. One program has implemented a modified form of a therapeutic community for prisoners in a unit of a nearby mental hospital. And one program has created university buildings within the confines of prison walls. The approach of all four programs is comprehensive; they each provide a span of activities planned to intervene in and change almost every behavioral aspect of participants' lives: social, psychological, economic, and recreational.

All four programs regard participants' histories of drug use as only one element of their criminal lifestyle. The programs focus on enabling participants to review all elements of their entire style of life—including destructive interactions with family members, friends, and employers; participation in criminal activities; and use of drugs. Rather than merely attempting to persuade participants to give up drugs, program staff provide opportunities for learning and practicing more constructive and responsible patterns of behavior.

Organizational Context of the Programs

High on a hill in suburban Vancouver, on a campus overlooking breathtaking views of lakes and heavily forested mountains, a group of **Simon Fraser University (SFU)** faculty members and administrators have gathered to discuss typical university topics: curriculum development, interdepartmental coordination of courses, projected numbers of students for specific courses, and evaluation of instructors. Although the general concerns are integral to all universities, because of the location of the students and the population from which they have been recruited, the specific problems to be resolved are not typical. The students are located in prisons in areas remote from the campus; most are long-term drug-involved offenders committed for very serious crimes.

On a West Side, midtown Manhattan street teeming with people, including pimps, prostitutes, and sellers of drugs and other illicit merchandise, in a windowless, oppressively hot and steamy conference room, the ex-addict director of the **Stay'n Out** therapeutic communities tells the story of how he became involved in the residential program that helped him beat his habit. While his story is not unusual for an ex-addict, the location and the residents of the therapeutic programs he directs are not typical. The community programs are located inside correctional facilities in the city; the residents are drug-involved offenders who are within a year of being released.

On the extensive metropolitan grounds of the Oregon State Mental Hospital, in a red brick gothic building featured in the film, "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest," several administrators pore over figures detailing the institution's population, projected expenditures, and prioritized needs. Although fiscal planning is a necessary management activity in all mental

institutions, the hospital population on whom funds are to be expended are not typical mental patients. They are drug-involved offenders committed for serious crimes. Most are located in Oregon prisons; others have been transferred to the **Cornerstone** unit on the hospital grounds.

Across the country in Florida, in the conference room of a **Lantana** hospital that resembles a large pink ship, administrators, medical directors, program personnel, and security staff gather to discuss work schedules and noteworthy problems. Unlike most medical facilities, access to the conference room requires clearance through two sets of heavy, electronically-controlled doors. The doors were specially added to control the movement of the resident population—youthful drug-involved offenders who have been sentenced to prison.

Obviously, these scenarios taking place in diverse locations and contexts have a common purpose—providing programs for drug-involved offenders committed to prison. However, a more important commonality also exists. Contrary to the pervasive disillusionment with treatment and rehabilitation, these programs are providing a basis for optimism among criminal justice practitioners and researchers, and are evoking enthusiastic participation among the program providers, affiliated correctional personnel, and the inmate participants.

Organizationally, the programs are very different (see Table 2). The Simon Fraser University program is provided under contract with Her Majesty and administered by the Prison Education Program in the Department of Continuing Education. The Stay'n Out Program holds a contract with the State of New York and is under the supervision of New York Therapeutic Communities Inc. The Cornerstone Program is part of the Oregon Department of Human Resources and a joint project of the Corrections Division and the Mental Health Division. And the Lantana program is provided and administered by the Florida Department of Corrections.

The programs also vary by size. The Cornerstone Program is the smallest involving a maximum of 30 residents at any given time. Stay'n Out currently operates three 35-bed units in a prison for males.* The SFU program, operating in four institutions, cumulatively enrolls approximately 200 inmates. The Lantana program also involves approximately 200 inmates, however, all inmates are housed in the same institution.

Recidivism Among Program Participants

The **Simon Fraser University Prison Education Program** reported by far the lowest recidivism rates. In a 1980 evaluation of the program sixty-five former students/inmates were compared with sixty-five non-student former inmates matched for time of release. Both groups had the same average

* Stay'n Out also operates a unit in a facility for women. However, at the time of this study, the women's program did not appear to be functioning smoothly. Therefore, this report focuses primarily on the program in the correctional facility for men.

age. The students were more likely to be convicted for drug-related offenses; the comparison group for burglary. The average lengths of sentences served were slightly longer for the students, and the students were more likely to have histories of addiction to opiates; 56 percent of the students were former addicts compared to 21 percent of the non-students. On the average, students had more education before being imprisoned than the non-students (10.27 years compared to 8.45 years); however, 65 percent of the students had not completed high school. There was no significant difference between the groups in terms of their Base Expectancy Scales or Recidivism Prediction Scores.⁷ The follow-up study reported that while 50 percent of the non-students returned to prison within three years after release, only 16 percent of the students returned.⁸

Cornerstone graduates' reported recidivism rates were higher than the students', but low compared to the rates of other drug-involved offenders. The Cornerstone evaluation compared 144 former inmates who graduated from the program between 1976 and 1979 with three comparison groups: inmates who dropped out of the program within thirty days during the same years, all Oregon parolees with a history of alcohol or drug abuse who were released in 1974, and a similar population released in Michigan during the same time. The Cornerstone dropouts had the highest rates of recidivism, with 74 percent returning to prison within three years after release. The Michigan group had between 45 and 50 percent who returned, and the Oregon parolees, 37 percent. The Cornerstone graduates had the lowest rate of recidivism with 29 percent returning to prison within three years.⁹

In an initial study, **Stay'n Out** measured outcome in terms of arrest on parole. Stay'n Out graduates appeared to have significantly lower recidivism when compared to inmates who applied to participate in Stay'n Out, but for administrative reasons could not participate. Among inmates who applied but did not participate, 41 percent were arrested during parole; among graduates of Stay'n Out, 27 percent were arrested during parole. Stay'n Out graduates also appeared to have lower rates of arrest than inmates who had undergone milieu treatment (35% arrested) and counseling treatment (40% arrested).¹⁰ A more recent study of Stay'n Out showed that 44 percent of Stay'n Out participants were eventually reincarcerated after leaving prison. However, only 30 percent of participants who remained in the program for nine months to a year were reincarcerated.¹¹

The follow-up evaluation of **Lantana** graduates did not include a comparison group. However, in 1983 the reported estimated recidivism rate among all inmates paroled after 1977 was 18 percent.¹²

Obviously, none of the program evaluations used designs incorporating random assignment of inmate volunteers to experimental (program) and control (nonprogram) groups. The evaluations also did not incorporate the most state-of-the-art analyses such as recent techniques for studying recidivism.¹³ And more rigorous evaluations of the programs certainly need to be carried out. However, it is remarkable that the effort was made to follow the behavior of participants. It is noteworthy that the programs

Table 2:

Comparison of Four Programs for Imprisoned Drug-involved Offenders

	Program			
	Cornerstone	Lantana	Stay'n Out	Simon Fraser
Primary approach of program	Comprehensive social/psychological. Stress on individual responsibility. Individual needs assessment and development of basic social and psychological skills to live responsibly. Includes therapeutic community organization for inmates before release and aftercare	"Therapeutic Communities" (Lantana and Stay'n Out)		University education
		"Tough love" method of teaching individual responsibility, mutual trust, self-discipline. Inmates progress through several stages of increasing responsibility and privileges such as more desirable rooms		Moral development through humanistic liberal arts education; recognizing alternative decisions
Program activities	Group and individual counseling dealing with comprehensive social/psychological and interpersonal problems. Life skills group sessions. Encounter groups. Seminars. Inmates divided into two families of 16 who as a group assign jobs for keeping unit clean and perform other "family functions" such as deciding TV schedule	Drug counseling; encounter groups, other types of group sessions; vocational training; recreation; community service. A private sector industry was recently added	Participation with same group of 10 inmates in encounter groups, group counseling. Attending seminars on various topics. Hierarchical job assignments such as keeping housing unit clean and orderly	Virtually all on-campus activities at liberal arts colleges: attending lectures and seminars; library research; writing papers, essays, poetry; informal discussions of literature, current events, families, publications

Table 2:

Comparison of Four Programs for Imprisoned Drug-involved Offenders
(continued)

	Program			
	Cornerstone	Lantana	Stay'n Out	Simon Fraser
Type of program setting	Residential unit on hospital grounds including bedrooms, day-rooms, kitchen, recreational areas	Medium security correctional security facility on hospital grounds	Three dormitory units in medium security correctional institution including day rooms*	Separate academic buildings including classrooms, offices, library, study area
Hours inmates are in program area each day	Initially 24— gradually decreases as jobs and other community activities are approved	8 - 12 hours curriculum. 24 hours in institution (except for community work)	All hours not involved in other prison events such as meals and work	7.5 hours weekdays excluding lunch time
Daytime activities outside program area	Gradual participation in community, includes AA/NA meetings, jobs, volunteer work, recreation such as hikes, picnics, films. Aftercare—supervised living and continued group counseling	Community service in beaches and parks; CIVITAS projects such as a weekly car wash	Meals, work assignments; virtually same as other inmates	Meals, appointments outside program area with medical, psychological, area social-welfare staff
Number of full time program staff	18	8 (counselors)	15*	7** staff

Table 2:

Comparison of Four Programs for Imprisoned Drug-involved Offenders
(continued)

	Program			
	Cornerstone	Lantana	Stay'n Out	Simon Fraser
Background requirements for program staff	Professional degrees in psychology/mental health; psychological counseling experience	Masters degree/experienced counselors	Directors - TC experience, Masters degree; counselors - ex-addicts/experienced - TC "grads"	University faculty (academic credentials such as Ph.Ds, publications)
Primary program staff functions	Case management; individual counseling; group counseling; oversight of all inmate activities before and after release Staff also provide range of services for other mental hospital and prison units	Oversight of group activities (see above); individual counseling; running group sessions; drug education		Teaching university courses (including Certificate program in literacy instruction) Oversight of extracurricular activities Advising individual students Curriculum development Coordination with main campus
Program staff security tasks	Total supervision	Cooperation with security staff	Cooperation with security staff	Total supervision in program area

Table 2:

Comparison of Four Programs for Imprisoned Drug-involved Offenders
(continued)

	Program			
	Cornerstone	Lantana	Stay'n Out	Simon Fraser
Number of security guards assigned to each program area during each shift	0	Total staff for all shifts 22 supervisory; 44 correctional officers	1/unit	0
Hours program staff formally on site	24 hours/everyday	Security: 24 hours/everyday Counselors: 8 am - 9 pm, Mon-Thurs 8 am - 5 pm, Friday 8 am - 4 pm, Sunday	40 hours/week 8:30 am - 4:30 pm	37.5 hours/week
Materials supplied by program	All materials except major medical (meals by hospital)	All materials	Drug education, administrative materials	Textbooks and teaching supplies
Agency Providing Program	Oregon Mental Health Department	Florida DOC	Therapeutic Communities of New York, Inc. (private)	Simon Fraser University

Table 2:

Comparison of Four Programs for Imprisoned Drug-involved Offenders
(continued)

	Program			
	Cornerstone	Lantana	Stay'n Out	Simon Fraser
Form of agreement with Department of Corrections	Cooperative Agreement	—	Contractual	Contractual
Number of program sites (institutions)	1	1	2*	4
Number of total program "slots"	32	(Designed) 187	(35/unit) 105	(Approx.) 200
Criteria for selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary application • Referral from drug counselor in prison • Not primarily a sex offender • Not likely to become psychotic under stress • No history of escapes • Eligible for minimum security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-report of drug use • Male • (other formal criteria not in effect such as age 16-25) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for treatment • Within 2 years of parole board appearance • Positive participation in other programs for 6 months • History of substance abuse/involvement in drug culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open admission

Table 2:

Comparison of Four Programs for Imprisoned Drug-involved Offenders
(continued)

	Program			
	Cornerstone	Lantana	Stay'n Out	Simon Fraser
Criteria for selection (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 6 - 18 months of release • Intent to reside in Oregon after release (Cornerstone is the only co-ed program) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No violent institutional infractions within 8 months • No history of sex crimes, severe mental illness or escapes 	
Urinalysis/breathalyzer monitoring	Yes	No	No	No
Participation duration				
Minimum	6 months	3 months	6 months	1 semester (13 weeks)
Maximum time in program	18 months	36 months	36 months	Unlimited
Time in supervised aftercare	6 months	0	0	Regular student status

Table 2:

Comparison of Four Programs for Imprisoned Drug-involved Offenders
(continued)

	Program			
	Cornerstone	Lantana	Stay'n Out	Simon Fraser
Program costs	Total costs 1987-1988: \$530,000; Approximately \$48/inmate daily	Total cost 1986: Approximately \$2.4 M; \$35.20/inmate daily	Total cost for 1986-1987*: \$700,154; Approximately \$14/inmate daily	Total cost for 1988: \$417,000 (Canadian); (Approximately \$1,200 annually per full time student)
Fees charged to inmate/participants	Yes — parole fees	No	No	Yes — tuition fees

* Stay'n Out has a program for 40 women (an additional staff of 5) in a Manhattan facility; only the program in the men's facility on Staten Island is discussed in this report. Program costs for 1986 - 1987 include the womens' program and two units for the men. The third unit for the men was added while this study was in progress. The total cost in 1987-1988 for the three men's units and the women's unit was \$776,407.

** Additionally other full time faculty members teach one or two courses a semester at the prison location.

targeted persistent "heavy" drug-involved offenders; for example, the SFU students followed up in the evaluation had an average of six periods of incarceration as adults, an average of three incarcerations as juveniles, and an average age of fifteen at first conviction. Based on prior histories the prognosis for post-release adjustment among the program participants was poor. For example, 56 percent of SFU students were rated as less than good on the Recidivism Prediction Scale. Yet arrest rates and reincarceration among these groups of offenders were low.

Similarly, Cornerstone participants' average age was thirty-one and they first started abusing substances at an average age of 12.5 years. The average age at first arrest was 13.6, and the average number of adult arrests was 13.7; they had an average of 6.9 adult felony convictions and had spent an average of over seven years incarcerated as adults.¹⁴

Elliott Quinones is a typical Stay'n Out participant.

Quinones first shot heroin when he was fifteen years old. At fifteen he was also arrested for the first time; for petty larceny with a pistol. During the next fifteen years he used heroin and cocaine, beginning as a seller, then a user. He was arrested twenty-seven times, had fifteen convictions, and spent nine years in jail.

His last arrest was at the end of 1974 on a drug charge.¹⁵

Robbery was the modal charge for which Stay'n Out participants were incarcerated (43%); over 17 percent of other participants were incarcerated for burglary. Participants averaged 8.8 prior arrests, four prior adult convictions, and previously served an average of four years in jail or prison. They abused drugs for an average of ten years before entering Stay'n Out, and three months before their incarceration were most likely to be using heroin or cocaine.¹⁶

Although Lantana participants are primarily too young to have accumulated an adult criminal record, according to the accounts of program staff and self-reports, they typically have been involved in using drugs and committing crimes persistently since early adolescence.

Although they vary in size and organization, several elements of program delivery are remarkably similar. Common factors appear to enhance effectiveness and, in part, explain their longevity. In the following section we discuss these commonalities.

The Programs Function Operationally as "Guests" in Previously Established "Host" Facilities

Although the programs are innovative in terms of their approaches for dealing with inmates, they are all located in institutions that have had long-term experience in housing and providing essential services for incarcerated populations. Both the Simon Fraser University Program and the Stay'n Out program operate within prison facilities in areas dedicated to program use. The Lantana and Cornerstone programs are both housed in exclusive

areas in hospitals run by state departments other than corrections.

Operating as "guests" in a host institution has definite drawbacks. As discussed in the section on barriers, the programs are not entirely welcome guests and must frequently justify using space. However, the advantages appear to offset the problems. A primary advantage is the reduction of operational costs. Facility repair, food services, and other mundane costs are often prohibitively high for independent programs with small numbers of residents. For large institutions hosting small programs, the costs of housing and providing essential services for program participants are marginal. Therefore, "guest" status allows the programs to provide intensive services to a small group of residents at relatively low average cost per program participant. For example, the Cornerstone program only involves thirty residents and provides treatment on a 24-hour basis; however, because it operates as an adjunct of the State Hospital, the average daily cost per participant is lower than those for inmates in the Oregon Women's Correctional Center which houses a population of eighty female offenders (see Table 2 for program costs).

Similarly, the Stay'n Out Therapeutic Communities operate as units of the Arthur Kill Correctional Facility on Staten Island in New York. The medium-security facility, located in one of the few remaining areas of marsh lands and woods in the city, has a total population of approximately 800. The population of inmates assigned to the Stay'n Out units constitutes less than 15 percent of the total population. Other medium security correctional facilities in New York State with total populations about the same size as the Stay'n Out population (100 or fewer inmates) have costs that are approximately twice as high per inmate as the costs at Arthur Kill. Therefore, if Stay 'n Out were to be housed in its own independent facility, costs would double.

The SFU Program operates in bungalows or trailers on the grounds of both maximum and medium security institutions, typically housing populations of 250 to 350 inmates. During each academic semester, SFU courses enroll approximately 15 to 20 percent of the inmates incarcerated in the institutions they serve. The Lantana program shares the hospital facility with state patients requiring long-term care. Obviously, because of economies of scale, the costs of feeding, clothing, housing, and providing other essential services for the participants in all programs are lower than if they functioned independently.

In addition to the fiscal advantages, the guest relationship allows the program staff to focus on activities integral to program approach rather than being burdened with the oversight of many day-to-day operational activities. The extent to which the staff is free to pursue purely programmatic goals rather than institutional objectives depends on the contractual structure of the guest/host relationship. These relationships vary among the programs from formal guest services provided during specific hours on specific days to essentially a common-law marriage.

Among the four programs, Stay'n Out and SFU contractually provide the most limited services. Although the program staff must be cognizant of

and adhere to the daily operations of their host institution, the staff concentrates primarily on providing program activities. More specifically, the Stay'n Out staff contractually provides treatment to program participants and partial supervision during weekday, daytime hours. All other essential services are provided by the New York Department of Correctional Services staff at the facility. By contract, the SFU staff provides classes for enrolled inmates and total supervision while the inmates are in the academic area, typically from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm weekdays except for meals. All other services are provided by the Department of Correctional Services staff at the four prison facilities.

Cornerstone and Lantana are responsible for providing services on a twenty-four-hour-a-day basis, and the program staff are more involved in day-to-day facility operations. The Cornerstone program operates in a wing of a building that is part of the Oregon State Hospital. As part of the interagency agreement, the treatment staff provides total supervision of residents on a twenty-four-hour-a-day, seven-day-week basis, in addition to all counseling, treatment, and case management. A parole officer provides additional supervision for program participants who, shortly before official release, spend increasing amounts of time in the community. All other essential services, except for medical and dental services, are provided by cooperative agreement with the hospital staff employed by the Department of Mental Health. Medical and dental services are provided by the Corrections Division at the neighboring Oregon Penitentiary.

Lantana also operates in a state hospital facility. However, the Lantana personnel assume many more facility operational duties than the Cornerstone staff. The treatment staff constitute only a fraction of the personnel needed to conduct the non-treatment components of the program. For example, the Lantana security staff supervise Lantana inmates who operate the laundry facilities shared by both the hospital and the treatment facility. The population in the hospital has been declining, and as the hospital staff has been reduced, the treatment facility staff have taken over more responsibility for grounds and plant maintenance. Food preparation is carried out by the hospital staff but served in a dining room within the treatment facility confines. And expendable materials used by the treatment program are warehoused by the hospital but ordered and paid for by the Lantana staff. Rather than a contractual division of duties, the major divisions are agreed on by the Florida State secretaries and operational responsibilities are agreed on by the on-site supervisory staff of the hospital and the Lantana program.

Consonant with Their Innovative Operational Arrangements with Host Institutions, the Programs Have Nontraditional Sources of Fiscal Support and Creative Forms of Fiscal Administration

Most traditional prison programs operate as an integral part of correctional institutions, are provided by employees of the department of corrections, and are funded directly out of the department's budget. When funds are scarce and programs have lower priority for correctional administrators

than security and basic operational needs, the budget for the programs may be the first line to be cut. Additionally, although many correctional administrators value programs and protect them at all costs, changes in administration may lead to reduced budgets for formerly valued programs. The longevity of the programs described in this report is in part explained by the special sources of funds that are earmarked for the use of the program and administered separately from other correctional services. Lantana, which has been in operation since 1974, is funded through monies allocated for "youthful offender" programs.

Since its inception in 1977, Stay'n Out was administered by New York Therapeutic Communities under contract with the Division of Substance Abuse services. The funds for the Stay'n Out program currently are legislatively approved as contractual monies for New York Therapeutic Communities Inc. designated in the New York State Executive Budget.

Established in 1976, Cornerstone is administered by the Department of Mental Health through a cooperative agreement with the Department of Corrections. The funds for the program are legislatively allocated to the Department of Corrections and derived from the beer and wine tax which is collected by the State Office of Alcohol and Drug Programs. In turn, Cornerstone pays rent to the State Hospital, but is technically separate from the hospital since it cannot meet the standards of the Joint Commission of Accreditation of Hospitals. (Cornerstone is licensed by the Department of Mental Health as a residential treatment program.) Although the funds are allocated to the program through the Department of Corrections, the department does not have the discretion to use the funds for other purposes.

Similarly, part of the funds used by the 16-year old SFU program have been nationally legislated and designated for the specific purpose of increasing literacy. The legislation could have shifted funds from the university program to more basic education. However, the director of the SFU program responded with a concept that enhanced both the university program and the attempt to combat illiteracy, a university course in teaching literacy. SFU holds a contract utilizing the funds to provide courses for inmates who are trained and certified as reading instructors. In turn, the inmate/tutors provide many more hours of instruction for illiterate inmates than could be provided by teachers who are on staff at the institutions; and since correctional services administrators must account for the funds designated for reducing illiteracy, the monies cannot be used for other operational needs.

All Programs Have Formal or Informal Ongoing Interactions with Legislators or Senior State Administrators Who Are Committed to Preserving the Program

Commitment to the program by legislators and administrators provides additional assurance of continued funding. In general, the legislators and administrators who are advocates of the programs are so because they have a sustained interest in changing conditions that foster criminal behavior, and

early in the history of the program, they were presented with evidence that the program presented minimal risk to the community. In Stay'n Out and Lantana, the evidence was first based primarily on the personal experiences of people who later advanced to executive positions. For Cornerstone and the SFU program, the evidence was based on more formal data collection efforts.

To foster and maintain this early commitment, the program directors provide their champions with ample, detailed information about program activities and results. Tours of program facilities with visiting dignitaries are encouraged. And ceremonial occasions create opportunities for the program advocates to be presented positively in the media along with program staff and inmate participants. For example, Stay'n Out graduation ceremonies are gala affairs attended by many dignitaries.

In addition to highly publicized events, the directors and program staff also encourage interactions between inmates, legislators, and top-level administrators, that provide opportunities for mutual education that is frequently eye-opening for all participants. For example, inmate students in the SFU program have invited government officials to give guest lectures and attend seminars. The very fact that such people agree to participate in program activities is frequently amazing to the inmates who, for the most part, have long felt alienated from and hostile to government agencies. In turn, the government officials are impressed by the articulateness and thoughtful concerns of inmate students, many of whom are drawn from the least educated and most deviant populations in the province.

The Program Providers Are Drawn From Outside the Field of Corrections or Are Considered to Be Atypical Corrections Personnel

Just as the funds for the programs are allocated outside the general correctional budget, the program providers are generally drawn from outside the general pool of correctional staff.

The Simon Fraser program staff most clearly have no ties to the field of corrections. They are drawn from those on the university faculty who have previously developed and demonstrated heuristic skills in classrooms outside the prison context. Prior to their involvement with the prison program, most have had no contact with inmates or correctional personnel.

Most of the Cornerstone staff are also drawn from outside the correctional field, primarily from clinical psychology. Although they may have had experience dealing with substance abusers, most of their clients were not inmates. The parole officer assigned to the program volunteered for the job when the position was first created—at that time he was the only officer interested in working with the program. Although formally he is an employee of the corrections division, he functions more as an integral part of the Cornerstone program than the parole agency.

The Stay'n Out staff is composed primarily of ex-addicts, many of whom were formerly inmates. Most of the corrections officers assigned to the

Stay'n Out units have held the post for many years and appear to be entirely comfortable with the high involvement of inmates in organizing and supervising activities. Major responsibility for program operations has been assumed by a former corrections officer who was hired by the Stay'n Out executive director when she decided to leave the DOCS.

The Lantana staff are persons drawn from within the Department of Corrections and a variety of outside fields, primarily psychology. However, the staff drawn from corrections perceive themselves as nontraditional, both in their own eyes and the eyes of corrections officers and administrators outside the program. They reported that, at regional meetings, correctional staff from outside Lantana refer to them as the "kiddy" program, because of the assignment to deal with youthful offenders. Moreover, the administrators made it clear that they look for particular attributes in hiring security staff. For example, one administrator pointed out that "You need to select a correctional officer who can be flexible and isn't afraid of change; a person who's program oriented and sensitive to the needs of the inmates. You need a more professional staff for this kind of a program—a person who can get along with the [staff in] other departments. Someone with more patience than most officers; one that's willing to give the program a chance."

A relatively high number of staff members in all programs indicated that their involvement was not limited to their professional position. Rather, they saw their work as instrumental to a higher purpose. Many staff members spoke about their commitment to the program in terms of fundamental philosophical values including religious philosophy and humanitarianism. Although there was an undercurrent of missionary zeal in the programs, it was far from fanatical and generally balanced with a keen sense of humility and humor.

Although the Staff Was For the Most Part Drawn From Outside Corrections, Senior Persons in all Programs had Developed a Long-Term, Ongoing Cooperative Relationship With Senior Staff Members Within the Coordinating Prisons

Initially, when the programs were introduced, almost all correctional staff were hostile to the program staff and extremely skeptical about program concepts and activities. Gradually, senior program staff members developed strong personal cooperative relationships with senior correctional staff members. The programs that appeared to be functioning with little or no friction between correctional and program staff had developed multiple formal and informal alliances. For example, the Oregon Corrections Division has formalized the alliance by deputizing the director of treatment services, and recruiting a staff member who has long-term experience and allegiance to both corrections and drug treatment; he works hand in hand with both the prison programs coordinator and the Cornerstone director. Additionally, one of the senior Cornerstone counselors functions essentially in partnership with a parole officer who has been assigned exclusively to handle Cornerstone residents during temporary release and after parole.

Although hostility of more traditional correctional officers was still evident in some facilities in which the programs take place, at least one senior program staff member and one correctional staff member formally or informally had assumed a joint ombudsman role for resolving conflicts that arise between program and correctional staff. Typically, the people who have forged this key alliance are a member of the program staff with major responsibilities for day-to-day operations of the programs and the correctional staff member in charge of coordinating other prison programs such as prison industry and basic education.

The correctional program directors who assumed the ombudsman role generally took proprietary interest in the program. Like the directors of the programs, they were experienced practitioners with a healthy skepticism about the extent of behavior change that could be produced by prison programs. Yet they were enthusiastic about the incremental changes the program in their particular facility appeared to produce. And they saw program successes as an integral part of the goals of their overall correctional agenda.

The Program Providers Are Committed to Realistic, Limited, Incremental Goals

According to the highest principles of corrections administrators, the goals of programs for offenders are to “. . . enhance self-worth, community integration, and economic status . . . to support individuals in their efforts to become self-sufficient and law-abiding.”¹⁷ Although the personal philosophies of many of the program providers are broader than these principles, their professional programmatic goals are more limited and, in many ways, more realistic. They are aware of the difficulties of changing human thought processes and behavior and focus on incremental changes over time. In fact, rapid major changes in behavior are regarded with suspicion. “Our brightest stars are the ones most likely to fall,” one director noted.

In part, their realism is based on an acute awareness of the backgrounds of the people with whom they are dealing. As previously noted, many inmates involved in the programs are school dropouts, who never had or expected to have steady employment or stable relationships with other people.

The personal experience of some staff members also adds to the limits on the goals they set. A relatively high proportion of the staff in three of the programs are themselves former substance abusers. Although Stay'n Out is the only program that explicitly hires ex-addicts for program staff, a number of staff members in the Lantana program and the Cornerstone program are recovering alcoholics/drug users. Through their own experience they know that it is a lot easier to express a desire to stop using drugs than to actually do so. Several of them cycled through programs several times before giving up their addictions. And they are very wary of “instant” recovery among program participants.

Additionally, goals are also limited by the constant realization that the program participants are not only substance abusers, but also criminal, many highly active predators. Many of the staff members commented that they

never forgot that they were dealing with people who had robbed, assaulted, or in other ways hurt people. They pointed out that they weren't dealing with sick people or mentally ill people. They were dealing with inmates who had to be able to think in extraordinary ways to commit the crimes for which they were incarcerated.

The Programs Involve Offenders Who Mentally Are Capable of Learning New Concepts

The inmates who are involved in the programs are drawn from a spectrum of ethnic groups, racial backgrounds, geographical areas, and age groups, but most appear to have at least one common trait—they are bright. Typically, they learned more on city streets than in school, but their lack of formal education does not appear to be indicative of lack of intelligence. On the contrary, when they believe lessons to have practical benefit, they learn quickly. And although their knowledge of grammar and vocabularies initially may be limited, when projecting their own beliefs and needs, many are articulate.

Since all programs involve group sessions for decision making and verbally grappling with motives for behavior, inmates who are mentally or intellectually handicapped have difficulties in participating. Functional illiteracy too may present a problem in participating in many activities that require reading and writing skills; however, often program participants who are illiterate because they were absent from school rapidly improve their reading and writing skills in order to be able to participate.

Although institutional security regulations require screening inmates for institutional violence or prior escapes (see Table 2), the only requirements that appear to be necessary for program participation are mental stability, a normal or above intelligence, and a desire to participate.

The Programs Embody Multiple and Eclectic Approaches Toward Dealing with Offenders

Rather than assuming that drug use or any other factor is the sole or primary cause of past criminal behavior, the directors and primary personnel demonstrated an understanding of the multiple factors that increase the chance of an offender taking drugs and committing another crime. They were concerned about individual, family, cultural, and environmental factors. Additionally, all rejected simple or single approaches to changing behavior. Instead they concentrated on processes known to lead an individual to refine his or her self concept and to reinterpret the meaning of his or her own actions and others' behavior. All displayed a commitment to building an effective program of integrated activities rather than to proving a set theory or single approach. "We throw everything at them—including the kitchen sink," said one director in summary.

Many Important Skills Are Developed by the Program Participants by Carrying Out Activities That Are Not Necessarily Formally Defined as Part of the Program

Each program provides a core set of primary activities that are formally mandated. For example, SFU provides a minimum number of hours of classroom instruction, Cornerstone and Lantana provide a set number of sessions administered by professional staff, and Stay'n Out specifically provides group sessions run by ex-addicts.

However, probably just as important or more important in reducing recidivism, are secondary activities that provide an opportunity to learn and practice skills essential for maintaining "normal" lives after release. Most generally, the programs provide the opportunity to learn and refine organizational and management skills, effective interpersonal communication skills—especially negotiation rather than confrontation—and perhaps most important, alternative, meaningful, personally gratifying ways of spending leisure time. (These activities are summarized in Table 2 and described in more detail throughout the following sections; program staff who may be contacted for program materials are listed in Appendix A.)

Each Program Incorporates Written Documentation of the Progress of the Inmate Participants that is Produced Collaboratively by the Inmates and the Program Staff

Cornerstone, Stay'n Out, and Lantana all maintain documents, written by the inmates and staff, that record each participant's status, objectives, allowed activities, and goals as he or she progresses through the program. For example, for Lantana inmates to become eligible for more advanced stages of the program (and more desirable rooms), they must prepare an essay stating what they have learned and why they think they should be allowed to progress.

Written documentation of the inmates in the Simon Fraser University program is essentially the same as the written materials produced by university programs around the world. Exams, papers, essays, dissertations, and research reports document the student's learning progress. Critical reviews and grades document the interaction with the faculty.

The contents of these documents frequently are unlike those of most university materials. Anger, crime, and the despair of confinement are constant motifs. Yet the progressive development from bare literacy to professional quality is captured in the inmates' work.

The documents produced by the other programs are more prosaic and, generally, less literate, but no less illuminating in reflecting the inmates' introspection and development from initial participation in the program to senior status.

are protected by the rules of the Oregon Department of Mental Health and are not available to correctional personnel. The records are not used for parole decisions. Neutral reports are given to the Department of Corrections if an inmate is returned to the prison. And if there is any difficulty with a resident, procedures have been established that allow his or her immediate removal from the unit and return to the general prison population.

Under security procedures, Cornerstone residents are considered to be inmates—not mental health patients. The Director of Correctional Treatment Programs has a joint position in the Department of Mental Health and Department of Corrections. Formally, Cornerstone residents are inmates temporarily released in his custody. If there is any basis for believing that a resident poses an immediate danger, the director has the responsibility of insuring that the staff follow the security guidelines.

The Cornerstone program has three absolute taboos:

- No drug use (or alcohol use),
- No violence or threats of violence,
- No sexual activity.

Any infractions of these rules are immediate grounds for the Director of Correctional Treatment Program to transfer the violator back to a Department of Corrections facility. Since the facilities are only a few blocks apart, immediate transfer at any time of day or night is logistically practical.

Informally, the Director of Correctional Treatment Programs defers to the Director of the Cornerstone Program since the latter has far more contact with the inmates and is in a better position to spot a security threat. When he is on the unit, the director constantly monitors program activities to be sure no taboos are violated and all activities are being carried out according to protocol. For example, watching one of the clients in animated conversation with a woman student who had participated in a college class visit, he quickly positioned himself to observe whether the resident was “trying to use the visit as a dating service”.

To assure compliance with the ban on drug use, Cornerstone uses urine tests conducted by the drug testing unit at the hospital. The costs of the tests are not trivial; however, the use of the tests allows for maximum security without the even higher cost of security personnel. All inmates returning to the Cornerstone unit from the outside community are given a breathalyzer test (for alcohol) as they come through the unit door.

Searches of residents' rooms are conducted by the staff. Since these searches are likely to be considered by the residents as an intrusive action based on suspicion rather than trust, usually only one search a year is conducted and presented to the residents as an accountability requirement imposed by outside agencies.

The compliance with the ban on sexual activity and violence is visually monitored by the treatment staff twenty-four hours a day. Women are

assigned rooms nearest to the staff desk in the corridor to provide them with greater security.

Additional security is provided by highly structured schedules for residents' daily activities and requiring adherence to the schedules. When activities involve leaving the program premises, residents fill out a log book, describing the time they leave, their destination, the purpose of their trip, the time it will take them to travel to the destination, to carry out activities at the destination, and to return to the program site, and the time they actually return.

Although the Need for Security Demands That the Program Staff Maintain Minute-to-Minute Control Over the Participants, the Participants Feel That They "Own" the Program

Several common programmatic structures and processes appear to foster the pride of ownership. In addition to the staff carrying out security functions, the inmate participants in all programs take responsibility for preserving discipline and order. Inmates in all programs seemed delighted to point out that other inmates in the general population misconstrued these activities and characterized them as "snitching" or "ratting." The program participants viewed their ability to assume these functions as a dividing line between ordinary prison life, in which the inmates had to struggle for safety and control, and, an extraordinary program life in which they were provided with safety and granted limited control.

Sometimes the correctional staff believe that at times inmates abuse their monitoring privileges. However, long-term staff members involved with the programs have found that, in most cases, careful supervision and quick responses to problems can solve the majority of difficulties without resorting to formal disciplinary actions.

"You need to discuss this with the inmates—caution them about their demeanor and try to smooth out the situation—iron out the difficulty. You always have to make a judgment call; whether you write up an inmate, or discuss [the problem] with the counselors, or take no action. But minor infractions are given back to the house [other program inmate/leaders]."

All programs have an inmate organization that deals with day-to-day management of program activities—including assigning inmates specific tasks to carry out, immediately reporting other inmates who violate security rules to program staff, and dealing with inmates who violate program (but not security) rules.

- SFU has a student council that handles all social activities and the general running of the program, including internal disciplinary problems such as cutting classes and sleeping instead of coming to class.

-
- Cornerstone is divided into two "family" groups of sixteen inmates. "Families" meet and democratically decide what activities they want to pursue. Leaders elected by the inmates follow set procedures for presenting decisions to staff and getting permission for carrying out activities.
 - Stay'n Out and Lantana both have a hierarchic inmate organization that assumes responsibility for assigning, carrying out, and monitoring the completion of many program activities, including housekeeping tasks and recreational activities. Inmates who are newly assigned to the program are given the most menial tasks. As inmate residents progress through the program, they assume the responsibility for tasks requiring coordination and oversight.

Many of the same activities are routinely carried out by both inmates in the general population and inmates in the programs. Moreover, the space assigned to the program participants for carrying out these familiar activities is not necessarily newer, better, or very different from typical prison surroundings. However, program inmates come to regard routine activities as important, rather than onerous tasks imposed by authorities, or at best, just ways to do time. And their program area is seen as a better place than the rest of the institution.

Stay'n Out participants perform many menial activities such as cleaning toilets, sinks, bathroom floors, making beds, painting, and refinishing floors. They also assume responsibility for administrative tasks such as keeping records and filing. Such activities are of course performed by inmates in all prisons. However, Stay'n Out residents talk about the activities as program activities that they are cooperatively carrying out as residents. They express great pride in the results of carrying out the activities more rigorously than inmates in the general population. The residents point out that their units are cleaner, more attractive, more orderly, and better maintained than the living units housing general population inmates.

Similarly, most prisoners can take classes, have libraries and books accessible, and may spend leisure time reading. For SFU students, a quiet place to read and access to books becomes a paramount concern. Unlike the squeaky clean feeling of the Stay'n Out units, some of the SFU academic areas look more typical of areas inhabited by students—papers in progress cluttering tables, stacks of books, and newspapers on couches. However, to the students, the area was far more desirable than any other place within the prison walls. Several inmates remarked that being in the academic building was like being on an island far removed from the prison.

Several programs have developed an oral history of extraordinary measures taken by program participants to preserve the program. The historical events generally illustrate the great value the participants place on the program and how only actions taken by participants could save the program. These histories are fostered by the staff and administration and passed on from participant to participant.

All Programs Have Some Formal or Informal Processes of Support for Inmates After Release

Cornerstone and SFU programs both have a formal process for continued affiliation with the program after release. SFU inmate students are encouraged to finish their degrees at the Burnaby Campus. Scholarships and loans are made available and inmates who wish to continue are provided help in finding nearby affordable housing.

Cornerstone staff coordinates services with a parole officer who is assigned only inmates from the program. This officer also is assigned as a temporary leave officer and becomes involved in the supervision of the inmates when they are issued leave to work in the community three months before they are paroled. During the months immediately before release, the inmates are gradually given leaves of longer duration and the officer assumes greater responsibility for their supervision.

The officer works shoulder to shoulder with a Cornerstone staff member who also becomes involved with the inmates in the months immediately before release and who also is assigned only Cornerstone participants who have been or are nearing return to the community. This two-person team works with inmates in planning for their future needs and preparing a parole plan several weeks before they are released. As a condition of parole, inmates are expected to sign a six-month contract with Cornerstone in which they agree to continue to attend a Cornerstone graduates group once a week, to meet with a Cornerstone counselor once a week, to attend an AA or NA meeting once a week, and to be monitored for substance abuse by urinalysis and breathalyzer tests approximately three times a week. In turn, Cornerstone agrees to provide counseling whenever needed, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

The Cornerstone staff member takes primary responsibility for overseeing the parolee's ongoing involvement in therapy; the parole officer, for overseeing the legal requirements of parole. However, operationally, both members of the team and the counselor work as a triad in working with the parolees, ensuring that the provisions of parole are being met, providing counseling, and reviewing and modifying the steps individual parolees are taking to become integrated into the community. Additionally, they coordinate efforts with community volunteers who provide assistance in finding employment, housing, and resources for other needs.

Participants who successfully complete parole are given lifetime privileges including:

- Crisis intervention and support,
- Short-term counseling,
- Access to program as visitors,
- Day treatment,
- Ongoing participation in graduates' groups.

Although SFU and Cornerstone are the only programs that have formalized mechanisms for aftercare, Stay'n Out, Lantana, and SFU have several staff members who, on their own initiative, provide assistance to inmates after release. They keep in touch with former program participants, provide practical advice and counselling, track down former inmates who suddenly disappear to determine whether they need help, and persuade former participants to return to work with inmates as professionals in Stay'n Out or as volunteers in Lantana.

Almost Everyone Connected with Each Program Derives Benefits

Each program brought a set of ongoing problems for the correctional staff, the program providers, and the inmates; the problems and solutions are discussed in the next chapter. However, each set of actors felt that the problems presented by the program were more than offset by the benefits they were deriving. Most generally, the correctional staff found the programs to be excellent inmate "management tools," the program providers have access to a literally captive audience from which to recruit, and the inmates found the physical comforts provided by the program much preferable to the standard of living in the prison areas occupied by the general population.

The Program Staff Are Realistic About Barriers to Successful Implementation

This section of the report has described the common characteristics of the programs that appear to promote their ability to function successfully. However, as described in the following chapter, these common elements, by themselves, are not sufficient to insure continued program viability. Barriers to continued successful implementation constantly arise and require day-to-day and long-term processes of negotiation among all concerned individuals.

Notes

1. Sechrest, White, and Brown, *op. cit.*
2. National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1983. *Main Findings for Drug Abuse Treatment Units, September 1982*. Data from the National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Utilization Survey (NDATUS) Series F, Number 10. Rockville, Maryland, Department of Health and Human Services.
3. NIDA, *op. cit.*
4. Collins, James J., Henrick J. Harwood, Mary Ellen Marsden, Robert L. Hubbard, Susan L. Bailey, J. Valley Rachal, and Elizabeth R. Cavanaugh, 1987. *Crime Control and Economic Benefits of Drug Abuse Treatment*. Draft summary report submitted to the National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.
5. Chaiken, Jan M., and Marcia R. Chaiken, 1982. *Varieties of Criminal Behavior*. Santa Monica, Rand Corporation.
Chaiken, Marcia R. and Bruce D. Johnson, 1988. *Characteristics of Different Types of Drug-Involved Offenders*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.
6. NIDA, *op. cit.*
7. Ayers, Douglas, Stephen Duguid, Catherine Montague, and Sonia Wobwidnyk, 1980. *Effects of University of Victoria Program: A Post Release Study*. Ottawa, Canada, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.
8. Duguid, Stephen, 1987. *University Prison Education in British Columbia*. British Columbia, Canada, Simon Fraser University.
9. Field, Gary, 1985. "The Cornerstone Program: A Client Outcome Study" in *Federal Probation*: 50-55 (June). Washington, D.C., Administrative Office of the United States. Courts in Cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice.
10. Wexler, Harry K. and Ronald Williams, 1986. "The Stay'n Out Therapeutic Community: Prison Treatment for Substance Abusers." *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 18, 3:221-238.
11. Wexler, Harry K., Gregory P. Falkin, Douglas S. Lipton, Andrew B. Rosenblum, and Linda P. Goodloe, 1988. *A Model for Prison Based Drug Treatment: An Evaluation of the Stay'n Out Therapeutic Community: A Final Report to the National Institute on Drug Abuse*. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.
12. Wainwright, Lovie L., 1983. *Drug Treatment Program, Lantana Correctional Institution*. Florida Department of Corrections.
13. Maltz, Michael D., 1984. *Recidivism*. Orlando, Florida, Academic Press.
14. Field, *op. cit.*
15. Anonymous, *New York Therapeutic Communities, Inc.* (undated).
16. Wexler, et al., *op. cit.*
17. ACA, 1986.
18. Emmonds, David, 1987. "Solitary Confinement" in *Prison Journal No. 6*: 25 (January). Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada, Simon Fraser University.

Chapter 3: BARRIERS TO SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS

Successful implementation of drug-treatment programs for prisoners requires recognition of the barriers which frequently arise and preparation to overcome these barriers through flexibility and innovative practices. In this chapter, common impediments to program implementation are discussed and methods used to resolve these difficulties are described.

In general, the barriers discussed in this chapter fall into four categories:

- Shifts in program priorities,
- Constraints on resources,
- Staff resistance,
- Inmate resistance.

The methods successfully used to resolve these problems typically involve the following three steps:

- Negotiation with all involved parties to determine their concerns and needs,
- Development of a new program component to meet these concerns and needs, and
- Implementation of the new program component in a manner that complements other program activities.

Shifts in Program Priorities

Shifts in program priorities can occur at any time and be initiated from many different sources, including new administrators inside or outside the institution, volunteers who offer beneficial services such as tutoring or leading self-help groups, businesses who are willing to train inmates in exchange for establishing a lucrative prison industry, or even the inmates themselves. Although new program priorities may be beneficial for inmates, they can disrupt the smooth functioning of well-established programs. Program staff need to be flexible enough to meet the new priorities.

An Example Problem. According to several staff members at Lantana, the program is no longer as effective as it was before the high priority for educational programs was shifted to vocational programs. Initially, the educational component played a vital role in the program. The educational component was carried on eight hours a day and incorporated drug counseling.

Three hundred inmates with long-term sentences were being served by the facility. The staff was very committed and everyone had the feeling that the program was doing a lot of good. There was an effort to modify the inmates behavior through a team effort involving both the teachers and the counselors. Each inmate's progress was reviewed frequently. Classification staff, teachers, and counselors were all involved in decisions made about actions to take in regard to individual inmates. For example, if an inmate was becoming a disciplinary problem there was a team decision to reduce his "gain time." Or, if an inmate was having difficulty understanding the discussions in drug education classes, the needed vocabulary was introduced as part of the reading skills classwork he was doing.

Vocational training was coordinated with more basic academic training and a vocational guidance counselor coordinated with job placement services at release. There was also a life skills course. For the inmates who already had high school degrees, courses taught by local college staff were available at night.

Although the program appeared to be effective, administrators outside Lantana decided to focus on vocational training rather than education. The funds for the education program were cut and the number of teachers was reduced. Several classes, including the life skills class, were dropped and the position of vocational guidance counselor was eliminated. There was still some attempt to provide the means for inmates to get a GED, but not as many did.

The night classes taught by local college faculty members continued for several years, but eventually were dropped because of the high turnover rate among student inmates and because of lack of consensus about which courses should be offered.

The educational classes were never reintroduced and the integration of education into the overall program actually continued to go downhill when the decision was made to focus on vocational training.

However, one of the staff members indicated that because of the lack of academic skills among the inmates, many are not able to complete vocational training. Additionally, the lack of basic academic skills affects inmates' ability to participate in the drug education discussions and the program components that require literacy.

Today, according to one of the staff, rather than working as part of a team, the functions of the staff are prioritized with security first, housing and operations second, drugs third, and educational/vocational training a very low fourth. Rather than functioning as an important component in a holistic therapeutic community, at the time of this study, education was a peripheral activity.

An Example Solution. The Simon Fraser University program was also threatened by a similar shift in priorities. Just as the decision was made in Florida to shift priority from educational programs to vocational training, a decision was made in Canada to use the education funds for increasing

literacy rather than higher forms of education. Unlike the Lantana program where one component was threatened, the entire SFU program was in jeopardy.

Rather than fighting this new emphasis on literacy, the SFU staff involved in the prison programs turned it into an advantage for the program. Negotiating with both the university faculty and correctional services, they successfully convinced both sets of actors to provide, as part of the university curriculum, classes for preparing inmate/students to teach literacy.

As a result, the funds for the university program have been increased. Additionally, the inmate/students who are trained to teach literacy receive university credit and certificates, the inmates in need of literacy teaching receive instruction from people who they trust, and the correctional services administration has been able to accomplish one worthwhile priority without sacrificing another.

Resource Constraints

The most obvious resource constraint that can affect the viability and effectiveness of a program is a lack of or minimal availability of **funding**. Other less obvious but important resource constraints are restrictions on **space** and **competition for inmates' time**.

Funding. As previously discussed, the four programs described in this report had developed sources of funds that were allocated independently from general funds for correctional services. This form of allocation prevented cutbacks in specific program services when general fund budgets had to be reduced. For example, in the Lantana facility, fiscal restraints led to severe cutbacks in the educational staff and programs; however, counseling staff and programs were preserved because the funds for the counselors were not interchangeable.

Although special allocations help preserve funds for specific program components during periods of severe fiscal limitation, the effectiveness of the program, or even its very existence, can be threatened by unanticipated increases in program costs due to actions beyond the control of the program staff. Programs are more or less vulnerable to increases in operating costs depending on the organizational and fiscal arrangements negotiated at the time the program is established. The more general the services provided by programs, the more vulnerable they are to increases in costs.

An Example Problem. At the time of the study, the business manager at Lantana was struggling with increases in expenditures due to a more transient population than in the past. Because of overcrowding in the state facilities as a whole, the movement of the inmate population through the Lantana facility was more rapid than in the past. Given the rapid turnover in inmates, the annual costs of one-time services or items provided to inmates increased. According to the business manager, the line items that had increased most because of the more transient populations were:

-
- New clothing: "I tell them [Florida DOC administrators] maybe they can use the same pants two or even three times [for different inmates], but they can't do that with underwear. I won't use underwear twice."
 - Physical exams/eye exams.
 - Eyeglasses: "About nine-tenths of them [new inmates] need glasses. I never see them wear them; but all have them. Even if they come from another institution, they're suppose to get them there but they never do. And I suppose if they go to another one from here they get another pair."
 - Dental care: "They need a lot of dental care—they have a right to dental care. Some of them have never seen a dentist in their life until they get here. So we fix them up, and then they leave, and the next one coming in probably has never seen a dentist."

In addition to the increased costs caused by rapid turnover of inmates, Lantana was also experiencing increased medical costs due to a new court ruling which mandated inmates' rights to twenty-four-hour-a-day medical services.

Example Solutions. Many of the fiscal problems experienced by the business manager at Lantana were avoided by the other programs because of their organizational and fiscal arrangements. Fiscally, Lantana operates as a Department of Corrections facility rather than as a program. As a facility, the Lantana staff was responsible for providing for all the needs of the inmates and had little control over the selection of or length of stay of the inmates who were assigned to the program. The other programs operate as units within the organizations housing them, are responsible for a discrete set of services (not including those listed above), and have control over the selection of the inmates who are sent to the program.

Additionally, expenditures are reduced in other programs by making the inmate participants aware of, and in part responsible for, programmatic costs. For one example, Cornerstone residents planning recreational or other activities must present the staff with a proposal, including the resources needed to carry out the activities, the cost implications, and the source of fiscal support. If the staff believes the proposal to be flawed for any reason, including material costs or staff supervision costs, they reject the proposal and provide the reasons for rejection. If the residents still want to carry out the activities, it is up to them to devise a more workable plan.

For another example, as part of their prison work assignment, SFU inmate students carry out many clerical functions for the program. Through these activities they become aware of the budget for and costs of materials such as books, writing materials, and computer supplies. One inmate student and part-time lecturer holds the key to the university area supply cabinet and doles out educational materials on request. Although both the staff and other inmates sarcastically kid him about his stinginess, they also express pleasure over his good management.

A group of SFU inmate students also took the initiative to construct

several operative computers using components from units that had been abandoned. Knowing full well that requests for new units would not be met because of budgetary constraints, they asked for inoperative PCs closeted in the facility, and under the direction of a knowledgeable inmate student, spent their recreational time reconstructing computers. These units have been set up in one room in the university area and the inmate students share them for preparing papers for university courses.

Space. Ongoing negotiation over the allocation of space for program activities occupied a substantial portion of all program directors' time. In many institutions such negotiation may be needed because of actual space limitations and overcrowding. However, the struggle over space may be exacerbated by symbolic issues, based on power struggles between program staff and other administrative staff or other concerned parties. Each program has its own set of issues but the essential issue is: who is in control?

An Example Problem. Lantana had two sets of issues. Objections to using hospital space for housing inmates were raised by members of the community, mainly young couples in first homes and retired senior citizens. Although the superintendent and other key staff thought the program could function more economically with more inmates, they knew that enlarging the program would upset the truce they had negotiated with the community.

An Example Solution. Negotiations with various citizen groups enabled the program to function without continual community resistance. Lantana administrators agreed to preserve the exterior appearance of the hospital building so that it was not obvious that the building housed prisoners. They also agreed to provide closely supervised inmates for ongoing community service projects such as cleaning the parks and beaches. The former concession was a bane to the security personnel since they could not replace a low wire fence with a more traditional prison perimeter. However, virtually all people involved with community service projects were pleased by the addition of this program component. The inmates thought it was a real perk to be able to spend a few hours a week at the beach, the counselors thought that it was a good way to introduce inmates to social responsibility, the security staff appeared to enjoy the supervisory assignment, and the administrators were pleased with the positive way in which the community responded to the inmates' efforts.

An Example Problem. The space issue that presented a more serious threat to the Lantana program was preserving the use of the facility for inmates who qualified for the program. Originally, the Lantana staff was integrally involved in selecting inmates for the program, and only inmates who (informally) requested the program and then qualified were sent to the facility. Recently, in part due to the overcrowding in other Florida facilities, Lantana is being used to house inmates who neither qualify for the program nor want to be there. By refusing to participate in program activities and to follow program rules, these inmates are demoralizing both staff and those inmates who have greater interest in the program. They are essentially creating a situation in which more time must be devoted to security and

less to the rehabilitative components of the program. At the time of the study, this issue had not been resolved in Lantana.

An Example Solution. Oregon also is experiencing overcrowding of facilities, and additionally, needs to find ways of providing special services for inmates who have been classified as "dangerous offenders." Cornerstone has experienced considerable pressure to use their space for these inmates. Although the director has complied with this request, the staff does not passively receive inmates who are not appropriate or who do not want to participate in the program. Rather, they stay in close contact with personnel in the prisons, and through ongoing discussions with counselors and classification staff, they are able to select residents who are both typical of the street-wise active drug-involved offenders in Cornerstone and classified as "dangerous offenders." Additionally, since inmates must formally request to participate, only inmates who want to be there are selected. Since Cornerstone has had a long track record of working with drug-involved inmates who thoroughly deserved the "dangerous" appellation, the program activities required no modification (other than dealing with unjustifiable pride among inmates so designated).

The Problem. Although Cornerstone was able to resolve the most serious issue about space, the director must deal with ongoing symbolic challenges about the use of shared space. So must the other programs. Whether the issue is the use of specific areas for recreational activities, or the use of specific rooms for group sessions or family visits, virtually every day brings its share of minor complaints from staff not connected with the program.

An Example Solution. Resolving symbolic issues concerning space requires a good deal of patience, soothing words, informal assistance, and everyday negotiation on the part of senior program staff. Keeping the symbolic space issue to a minimum requires keeping staff resistance to a minimum. It also requires literally gaining ground incrementally rather than trying for an immediate take over.

For example, the Stay'n Out program began with one dormitory unit in the Arthur Kill facility. The reputation of the program, the confidence of the correctional staff, and the interest of the inmates has grown slowly. And the space the program has occupied has kept pace with these less tangible factors. Recently, the program prepared to occupy a third unit. Program participants provided all labor for converting the unit into the squeaky-clean environment characteristic of the Stay'n Out program. But even though it had taken years before the program was assigned new space, rather than pushing out the inmates already housed in the area, residency was offered to any who wanted to join the program. Those who didn't want to join, but who also didn't want to move, were slowly surrounded.

Competition for Inmates' Time. Successful implementation of effective programs obviously requires assigning drug-involved offenders to the program while they are in prison, keeping them involved in the program on a routine basis, and keeping them in the program for the duration needed to complete the entire curriculum.

Three barriers to successful implementation that commonly occur involve the following types of competition for inmates time:

- Competition for inmates' long-term participation in other prison programs,
- Competition for inmates' day-to-day participation in other prison activities,
- Competition for inmates' participation in other correctional settings.

Competition for Inmates' Long-Term Participation in Other Prison Programs

An Example Problem. Almost all inmates are less interested in improving themselves while incarcerated than in finding the best way to do time. Prison programs that provide pay or privileges are preferable to programs that do not. Several of the programs are finding fewer participants because other seemingly more desirable programs have become available. For example, the Lantana administrators said that inmates who ordinarily would have asked their attorney to request a Lantana sentence, were instead bargaining for the new (relatively short sentence) quasi-military "boot camp" programs highly touted by the press. In another state, the introduction of a private enterprise work project essentially dissipated the demand for a program for drug-involved offenders;* most of the program participants opted for the eight-hour, relatively well-paid work project and simply had no time or were too tired to carry out the drug program activities.

An Example Solution. Like any other business competing for "clients," programs must have a successful market strategy. Almost all inmate/participants interviewed said that they were originally attracted to the program because of the immediate perquisites rather than the long-term implications. Although program directors and staff tried to select inmates who they thought sincerely wanted to change their behavior, they were aware of the factors that attracted the inmates and encouraged this attractive image.

Lantana inmates heard from their defense attorneys and from inmates in the classification facility that Lantana was safer than the other Florida facilities; there was less of a chance of getting raped, or stabbed, or having shoes stolen. Stay'n Out inmates heard from correctional staff and inmates that they had a better chance of making parole if they participated in the program. Cornerstone inmates were attracted by the physical features of the unit, such as individual showers, the food, and the opportunity to wear their own clothes. And SFU participants regarded the program area as "an island" that seemed remote from the prison and far away from the ordinary hassles of prison life.

*This program was a potential study site; given the problems it had encountered, it was not visited but is referenced in this chapter to illustrate potential problems.

Competition for Inmates' Day-to-Day Participation in Other Prison Activities

The Problem. Although each program had definite hours scheduled for specific activities, conflicts in schedules for other activities were constant sources of disruption. Obvious sources of disruption in any prison setting are security measures such as general lock-downs that must be carried out whenever inmates' conduct requires extraordinary precautions. Although the inmate/participants grumbled about such disruptions due to other inmates' behavior, the program staff recognized that security had first priority. When planning program activities, they knew that they needed the flexibility to postpone those activities when required by security needs.

However, inmates and program staff alike complained about individual participants being called out of scheduled program activities for other reasons such as medical appointments, dental appointments, appointments with psychiatrists, psychologists, caseworkers, clerical personnel in charge of records, and a variety of personnel in other prison departments. The comings and goings not only interrupted the participation of the individuals called away, but also the groups with which they were working.

An Example Solution. Several program directors were negotiating with the facility administration to set aside blocks of time, not in conflict with program activities, for appointments with other personnel. However, only Cornerstone was able to systematically regulate inmates interactions with other correctional staff. Because of its separate location and because the staff took over many of the correctional personnel functions, including case management, non-emergency health care, and psychological counseling, the Cornerstone staff had a virtual day-to-day monopoly on the inmates' time. Additionally, because of its separate location, Cornerstone also did not have to deal with interruptions due to security measures. The Cornerstone inmates are so closely supervised that if one inmate becomes a disciplinary problem, the inmate is promptly removed from the Cornerstone unit and sent back to the nearby prison, before the behavior is imitated by other residents.

Inmates' Transfers to Other Correctional Settings

The Problem. In order to complete treatment, inmates must remain in the physical area where the program is being implemented. Based on post-release performance data, programs like Stay'n Out and Lantana prefer that participating inmates remain in the setting a minimum of nine months and a maximum of twelve months; however, it is difficult to coordinate the most effective schedule of the program with the time the inmate will be released on parole. And few inmates would sacrifice their release date to complete the program.

Similarly, SFU operates on a standard university semester program. However, the Correctional Services structures inmates' time according to a cascading plan in which inmates are transferred to facilities with lower

security classifications as they approach release time. The schedule of transfers often does not coincide with the end of the university semesters.

Example solutions. Because inmates in the Cornerstone program continue to participate in the program after they are paroled, except for the few inmates who leave the Salem area, the problem of the program competing with parole has been resolved. Similarly, some SFU inmates can continue their studies by transferring to a facility that also has a university program. Once released, they can continue at the main campus in Burnaby (Vancouver).

In the absence of an aftercare component, the problem has been partially resolved in two ways. Inmate/participants are not selected unless there is a good chance that they can actually complete the program before release (and unless there is a good chance that they will be released shortly after they complete the program). And for the rare inmate who wishes to stay to complete the program, compliance for extended stays has been given by the correctional administrators in the facilities which house Stay'n Out and SFU.

Staff Resistance

The implementation of any new innovative program in a large bureaucracy frequently results in considerable opposition from staff members. Programs for drug-involved offenders are not exceptions; quite the contrary. Such programs commonly involve **more than one bureaucratic organization**. For examples, SFU involves both the University and Correctional Services; Stay'n Out, the New York Department of Corrections Services and the Therapeutic Communities of New York, Inc.; Cornerstone, the Department of Mental Health and the Division of Corrections; and Lantana, the Department of Corrections and the Department of Health. And since administrators and personnel from more than one bureaucracy are involved in each program, the problem of staff resistance is compounded.

The most critical stages of staff resistance occur at the time the program is first introduced and during periods when there is a change in those members of the correctional administration who coordinate activities with or supervise the program. Additionally, it is common to have ongoing resistance on the part of the lowest ranking professional staff who must deal with the inmates on a daily basis.

The most general solution to staff resistance once again consists of negotiation to determine the concerns of the resistant persons, development of a program component to meet these concerns, and implementation of the component in a manner that complements the other program activities. As the director of the SFU summarized the process, "Everyone has their own agenda. Everyone needs to feel they are getting something out of the program."

Staff Resistance When the Program Is Introduced

The Problem. According to the directors and staff who had been involved with the programs since their inception, most of the correctional personnel who were in any way involved with introducing the programs were at best skeptical about the idea. Many were extremely hostile. Correctional staff who had day-to-day contact with the program staff and inmate participants were the most hostile. Departmental regulations were used to justify harassment of program staff. For example, program personnel were made to wait for hours before being cleared for entry into the prisons, strip searched before being allowed to enter, and their program materials totally disorganized when they were inspected.

Example Solutions. The most important first steps toward alleviating staff resistance in all the programs were actions taken by the program founders to develop interest and solid support at the highest levels of the administration of the organizations involved. Administrators in the non-correctional agencies were interested in supporting the efforts for at least two reasons: the programs validate the social importance of their organizations' activities, and the programs were good business. For example, administrators in post-secondary educational organizations enthusiastically supported the prison university program since it provided demonstrable proof of the role of higher education in moral development. Given collegial interest, the program enhanced the image of the university responsible for its development and implementation. Additionally, program implementation increased the income of the university, the number of courses the university could provide, and the number of faculty members it was able to support.

The program founders also developed active support from key legislators or administrators at the State/Province by stating the objectives and achievements of the program in **quantitative** terms. High-level administrators especially were less interested in program process than impact and outcome. For example, after describing the activities that are involved in a therapeutic community, the founder/executive director of Stay'n Out was challenged by the director of the division of parole to specify what percent of inmates who completed the program could be expected to successfully complete parole. Similarly, within two years of initiating prison university the founder of the SFU/University of Victoria program* won the regard of the district director of parole for the numbers of inmate students who had gone on to take college courses and finish degrees after release.

The interest and concern of legislators and high-level administrators helped set the stage for gaining the support of institutional administrators. Since their direct supervisors were interested in seeing the program implemented, superintendents and wardens at least were not adamantly opposed to program implementation. However, they were very concerned about upsetting the uneasy equilibrium that is often characteristic of prison environments.

*The SFU program started as a research project in 1972 at the University of Victoria; the "UVic" program was expanded over the following decade. After a heated political battle in 1983, precipitated by the Solicitor General's decision to cancel the program, the contract for providing the program was awarded to SFU.

One act of violence that could have been attributed to the program would no doubt have led the superintendent and wardens to remove the programs from their facilities. The program directors and the staff were watched very carefully in the earliest days of the program to see how they handled themselves and the inmates.

Knowing that they were being tested, the program founders chose their staff very cautiously. The people they selected all had proven themselves to be excellent program providers outside the prison setting, yet had no illusions about the difficulties they might encounter inside. The program directors impressed (and continue to impress) on their staff members the fact that program participants are convicted criminal offenders—not the same type of people with whom they were used to dealing in the community. Potential staff members who were too timid about dealing with inmates either were weeded out when they displayed nervousness about entering the prison, weeded themselves out when they simply could not enter the facility door, or remained very uncomfortable once they did. On the other hand, potential staff members were (and continue to be) rejected if they appear to be overconfident about dealing with inmates. As the personnel director in Lantana commented, "...we screen out the ones with the attitude of 'I can take care of them' [inmates]."

The superintendents and wardens slowly gained confidence in the program directors as the directors demonstrated that their management of the inmates led to fewer incidents requiring correctional attention rather than more. Typically, the superintendents, wardens, their deputies, and assistants came to regard the programs as excellent management tools. For example, one commented:

"The problems are minuscule compared to other institutions; there's never been a staff member assaulted here. Compare that to eighteen assaults each month in [another institution in the same state]."

When incidents did occur, program directors responded rapidly to rectify the situation. For example, Stay'n Out hired one staff member who smuggled drugs into the facility. Rather than trying to cover up the incident, the offender was immediately turned over to the proper authorities. This incident actually appeared to increase the confidence of the administrators. Similarly, when a staff member in one of the other programs did not immediately come to the aid of a corrections officer struggling with an inmate, the officer accused the staff member of taking the side of the inmate. Although the staff member said he froze for a couple of minutes and then called for help, he was removed from the facility by the director to prevent further difficulty.

The institutional administrators' commitment to the programs was also increased by the favorable reaction to the programs from outsiders and visiting dignitaries. For example, Stay'n Out and SFU have graduation ceremonies which involve various dignitaries. Not only do the superintendents and wardens and their assistants have a chance to meet and

greet the distinguished visitors, but more often than not the media cover the events with praises for the program, the institution, and the correctional staff.

As previously discussed, one pivotal type of alliance forged in the programs was between the on-site program coordinator and the administrative correctional staff member who had day-to-day responsibility for overseeing the program. It was in the context of this relationship that most friction between correctional staff and program staff became resolved. The formation of this alliance was formally encouraged in several of the programs by organizing a committee composed of both correctional and program personnel who meet frequently to discuss and resolve staff concerns about security or other matters having to do with the program. Although the committees met often during the first years of the programs, more recently there were very few problems of resistance among institutional administrators and mid-level staff. Most problems of staff resistance involved new administrators or the line correctional officers.

Staff Resistance Among New Administrators

The Problem. New administrators typically prefer to review organizational processes and procedures and recommend changes. Since programs, such as those discussed in this report, are relatively innovative, they often do not fit new administrators' assumptions about the "proper" use of resources. The most effective programs are in danger of being swept out the door by "new brooms."

For example, a new administrator in a host institution housing one of the programs strongly suggested that the use of institutional resources for dealing with drug-involved offenders was wasteful and inappropriate. He argued that such offenders were "characterologically flawed" rather than mentally disturbed and that treatment resources should be reserved for mentally-ill people more in need of services. He made it clear that he would prefer to relocate the program to another institution.

Similarly, the university program was nearly disbanded after a change in Canada's administration in 1980. A couple of years later, the Canadian Association for Adult Education accused the Solicitor General of "undervaluation of education...in penitentiaries." In 1983, to reduce the budget for correctional services, the Solicitor General decided to end federal funding of post-secondary education in the prisons.

Example Solutions. Program directors have avoided most head-on collisions with new administrators by delivering a presentation on the secondary benefits of the program for the administrators' office soon after they assume their new position. Additionally, after determining the priorities and concerns of the new administrators, program directors are often in a position to cooperate in developing practices that meet these priorities and concerns without jeopardizing the integrity of the program. For example, the new administrator who was concerned about delivering more services to the

mentally ill was in part mollified when the drug-program staff agreed to provide crisis intervention for people in the institution not in the program.

When, however, administrators have not been reassured by briefing and negotiations, programs provided by organizations **outside** the correctional agencies have been able to withstand attempted assaults by drawing on the support of those with whom the program directors had established congenial relations over past years: other administrators, legislators, program participants, or the media. However, in addition, the program directors have had to be flexible enough to compromise on elements most irksome to the contentious administrator.

For example, over the years before the change of administration in 1980, the university program had invited politicians for highly visible tours of the programs and graduation ceremonies. The media were given access to the programs and frequently wrote human interest success stories about particular inmates; additionally, reporters were invited to program events such as graduations and theatrical plays by the inmates. The program director always made sure that the wardens were given due credit for the programs in the press. Educators and academics were supplied with sufficient information about the programs at professional meetings and in publications to point with pride to the program as an example of the value of education.

When the survival of the university program was in jeopardy, these investments paid off. Supportive politicians brought the issue to parliamentary debate; the media gave high visibility to the debate and ran editorials in favor of keeping the programs; wardens expressed concern over losing the program; educational associations, individual academics, and educators were very vocal in their displeasure.¹ A compromise was reached. The programs were maintained but the students had to pay fees for their courses. The compromise was largely symbolic since the students are paid for the work they do to maintain the university area in the prison—and the fees are taken from these funds.

Staff Resistance Among Correctional Officers

The Problem. Many correctional officers who have worked in more traditional prison settings are very uncomfortable with programs in which the inmates appear to be in charge of activities or fraternizing with the staff or otherwise "out of control."

As one of the superintendents suggested, the primary concern of correctional officers in most correctional settings is survival. In most prisons, out of the ordinary behavior by inmates immediately evokes suspicion and disciplinary action in order to curtail violence and assure order and control. Since many program activities are unusual, some correctional officers initially have a heightened sense of anxiety.

Additionally, some correctional officers tend to resent the continuous presence of the program staff, their perceived attitude toward security, and their relatively high educational level. Another source of contention is

manipulative behavior on the part of the inmates. One staff member suggested that, "Inmates try to play one off against the other [counselors and correctional officers] all the time."

Correctional staff who resent the program can essentially undermine the program by overzealously applying institutional regulations. Basically, all movements of inmates or staff become hindered, and all program activities become curtailed by the actions of officers who claim they are just carrying out their duties. For examples, program staff are delayed at the front gate while the officers slowly search through all program materials; inmates who are walking through the institution on program business are stopped, questioned, sent back to the program area, and if they protest, are "written up"; program materials are confiscated; confidential records are opened; constant complaints about program staff are filed; and verbal hostility to the program staff and inmates is common. These day-to-day problems create an environment that is unrewarding for the program staff, inmates, and correctional administrators.

Example Solutions. Once again, Cornerstone has solved such site problems with correctional staff by assigning responsibility for security to the program counselors. However, since Cornerstone must coordinate efforts with the prison correctional staff, they, as all programs, follow the general practice that appears to keep correctional staff resistance to a minimum—*providing maximum information about the program to the correctional staff*. Cornerstone has an open-house policy for prison personnel and encourages correctional officers to visit the unit, to spend time observing the activities and talking to the inmates and staff.

Since the other programs must deal with correctional officers on a day-to-day basis, they have instituted the following practices to ameliorate resistance and to curtail hostile practices:

- *Opening program activities to participation by correctional staff.* SFU encourages correctional staff to sign up for courses taught in their facilities. Although few have actually taken advantage of this offer, the availability has reduced hostility. Cornerstone and Lantana have offered counseling services with similar results.
- *Providing structured informational meetings.* Lantana and Stay'n Out have held sessions involving both program staff and correctional staff. Using techniques such as role playing, both sets of actors come away with a better understanding of each others' responsibilities and problems.
- *Assigning correctional personnel who are sympathetic to the program to institutional areas with maximum exposure to the program.* Correctional officers who know about the program and volunteer for such posts are generally the most sympathetic. For example, assignments to the Stay'n Out units, as most assignments to posts in New York prisons, are fixed long-term positions; the correctional officers assigned to the Stay'n Out program have chosen to be there for many years and are in

accord with the program staff and procedures. When new positions open, Lantana tries to select correctional officers for the program “who can be flexible and who aren’t afraid of change; a person who’s program oriented and sensitive to the needs of the inmates.”

- *Training inmates to negotiate with, rather than confront, correctional officers.* Integral to all the programs is the concept that hostile confrontation with persons in positions of authority seldom results in long-term positive rewards; informed negotiation is much more likely to result in desirable outcomes. Program participants are taught to carry on negotiations with the program staff, with each other, and, when necessary, with correctional staff. The correctional staff respond to lowered hostility on the part of program participants with lowered hostility on their own part.

“It’s the easiest job I’ve ever had. The only problem is boredom.”

— Correctional officer assigned to program

- *Providing orientation for newly-assigned correctional staff.* New officers who are warned by their supervisors about program activities that are departures from usual institutional behavior, and told the purpose of the activities, are much less likely to become hostile and anxious than new staff members who enter the situation cold. For example, according to one of the correctional supervisors, “. . .without orientation, if a new staff member saw an encounter group for the first time—it would look like the beginning of a riot. So new staff must be told—this is not a riot, this is what they do in the program. Also, they have to be warned that inmates have limited authority over other inmates, that it’s ok, that it’s a part of the program.”
- *Establishing an ombudsman committee or liaison staff members* who are knowledgeable about and sympathetic to both programmatic goals and security priorities. As noted, some programs have formal committees that can listen to the complaints of correctional officers and program staff and work out an acceptable resolution. Virtually all the programs, as previously discussed, had developed a liaison between a supervisory program staff member and supervisory correctional staff member. With this arrangement, problems can be ameliorated as they arise without resorting to formal arbitration.

For example, one day after the families of SFU inmate students had visited the university area, the inmates were angry and the program staff dismayed because correctional officers had cleared

the library and locked it. The correctional officers were angry because of "forbidden sexual activity" occurring in the library and were threatening to refuse further family visits in the area. In a few minutes of discussion between the key program and correctional coordinators, the decision was made to warn the inmates and program staff about "too much cuddling" during family visits and to pacify the correctional staff by agreeing to closer supervision by the program staff and the inmate student council during the next family visit.

- *Physically shielding program activities* most likely to cause anxiety among correctional staff from all staff except those assigned to the program. The physical separation of the program from the rest of the institution allows the staff and inmates to carry out new activities without having to explain, train, and negotiate with the entire rank and file correctional officers.

For example, since the academic areas are in separate buildings within the prisons, most of the correctional officers rarely view university activities.

During the summer session, student inmates in the SFU program decided to read and study in the cooler outside area adjacent to the classrooms. The officers assigned to posts in view of this outside area perceived these activities as "laying around being lazy when the inmates were suppose to be doing college work." Shortly after the complaints were registered, a portion of the outside area was screened and the students were able to continue their studies outside without further resistance from correctional staff.

Physical separation between the program and the rest of the institution, however, can promote rumors about program activities. Programs set off from the rest of the institution must be sure to provide enough visits and information for correctional officers to prevent rumors.

Inmate Resistance

Drug-involved prisoners typically are more persistent and more serious offenders than other prisoners. They also are more resistant to change. Successful implementation of effective programs for serious, persistent offenders requires overcoming three types of inmate resistance: **cultural resistance** to the program, **individual resistance to initial participation in the program**, and **individual resistance to following program activities** once they are enrolled.

Cultural Resistance to the Program

The Problem. The ideology of the programs and many of the practices of

the programs run counter to the culture of many persistent serious offenders—both the culture on the streets and in prison. For example, the same practices that foster inmate/participant's feeling of program ownership, such as disciplinary decisions made by student councils or house committees, run counter to the streets/prison code of doing your own time. Voluntary participation in activities involving intellectual pursuits or housekeeping chores are considered unmanly. And willing compliance with the rules made by persons in authority, including program personnel, is considered to be uncourageous. Inmates in male facilities who have reputations for being unmanly, uncourageous, and "snitches" or "rats," are more likely than other inmates to be raped, assaulted, or otherwise victimized.²

Example Solutions. Recognizing that the programs were antithetical to the inmate culture, the directors initially invested time in involving the inmates who have a reputation for being "heavys" and natural leaders. The fact that the correctional staff initially was suspicious of and hostile to the program staff appears to have enhanced the efforts of the program staff to interest these "hard-core" inmates in participating in the program. Additionally the "marketing strategies" formerly discussed helped to gain initial participation by such inmates. Once the program became known as an "elite" activity, ongoing staff attempts to reach out for the most persistent, serious offenders were facilitated.

Tom, a Native American Cornerstone resident who towered over most of the staff and who had the girth to match his height, was striding through the corridor, his long black hair tied back with a piece of pink string.

"I like your little pink ribbon, Tom" one of the program staff called out. The other residents in the area froze as Tom turned to the counselor.

"I like it too," Tom growled, "and I'm big enough to wear it."

"You sure are," agreed the grinning counselor. The other residents nodded.

Inmate Resistance to Participating in Program

The Problem. Since programs are operated in areas not usually visited by prisoners in the general population, negative rumors about the program practices are often rampant. These rumors have been reinforced and elaborated by former participants. Misinformation is most likely to come from inmate participants who are dismissed from the program because they violated security or program rules.

Common negative information about the programs include: it was a "snitch" program or "they tried to rake me." More fanciful objections have included misinformation about (male) inmates being required to wear skirts or dresses and participants being required to wear diapers. Even former participants who are less negative and who eventually reapply for participa-

tion in the program commonly report that the programs are tough and hard. The negative information about the programs can discourage participation of inmates whose counselors suggested they apply.

Example Solutions. To counteract negative impressions of the program formed through rumor or through program "failures," program staff have increased the visibility of the attractive practices of the program; they have also relied on outreach by more successful program graduates and by experienced substance abuse counselors.

For an example of the former tactic, the university program has incorporated a drama course in its curriculum. As part of the course, the inmate students stage and perform a play each semester. The plays have received critical acclaim in the newspapers. Not only are they performed for the other prisoners, but as is known to other inmates, the plays are taken on the road to community theatres. Additionally, female roles are commonly played by coeds from outside the prison.

Outreach by successful program participants is integral to the Stay'n Out program since ex-addict therapeutic community graduates are part of the staff. Staff members travel around the state to prisons to tell the inmates about the program. They make it very clear to the inmates that the program staff come off the same streets as the inmates and out of the same cells. They also contend that there is virtually no excuse used for not participating in the program that hadn't been used previously by a member of the staff. And they can provide reassurance that some of the rumors about the program are ridiculous and others distorted versions of actual activities.

SFU, through its literacy program, is accomplishing very much the same function. While tutoring other students, inmate students can also make it clear that the university activities are purposely geared for people who are bright but not necessarily formerly good students. By debunking misinformation about eligibility requirements, they encourage inmates who were embarrassed by past failure to finish GEDs and to take university courses.

Cornerstone relies on experienced counselors in each institution to provide accurate information about the program and to squelch rumors. Since the unit is small, there is less pressure than in the other programs to continually recruit relatively large numbers of participants. However, program staff stay in close touch with the institutional counselors to ensure a waiting list of potential participants as beds become available.

In all programs, the ethnic background of the staff appears to be a strong factor in determining which inmates want to participate. Programs with black and Hispanic staff members were much more likely to attract inmates with similar characteristics. Conversely, the lack of specific minority group staff members in the programs was reflected in a lack of participants from the same groups.

Individual Resistance to Following Program Activities

The Problem. Since most inmates initially participate in the program for "the wrong reasons," it is not uncommon for new participants to try to derive the short-term benefits without adhering to the less desirable program rules and requirements. Unless new participants quickly become committed to carrying out program activities, they actively or passively become disruptive, and make it difficult for staff and more involved inmates to accomplish their goals.

Inmates who lack at least a rudimentary knowledge of program requirements and activities, and the capacity or initial desire to carry out the activities, are likely to be extremely disruptive. For example, the inmates sent to Lantana to alleviate overcrowding in other facilities did not know, for the most part, what a therapeutic community was and had no desire to participate in the community's activities. Many refused to carry out routine procedures such as participating in group sessions and accepting assignments from more senior inmates. When disciplined by silence, they talked; when ordered to rooms to contemplate the implications of their behavior, they read magazines or rapped with other inmates also under discipline. Both staff members and more involved inmates found dealing with these behaviors discouraging.

General Solutions. In general, three practices appear to be instrumental in increasing inmate involvement and avoiding disruption:

- Voluntary participation coupled with realistic selection,
- Immediate action in response to disruptive behavior,
- Activities regarded by participants as "real" rather than work created to punish them or to keep them under control.

Voluntary participation coupled with realistic selection. There is some evidence that offenders legally coerced into community drug-rehabilitation programs may have as low recidivism rates as people who voluntarily participate.³ However, legal coercion always involves a choice, for example, jail or treatment. The Lantana experience suggests that **mandatory** commitment of inmates to prison programs can cause serious problems for the staff and voluntary participants. The programs that reached out to serious, persistent offenders and convinced them to volunteer for the programs had far fewer problems.

Additionally, although the program must be sold to the inmates, both the staff and the participants did not think that all inmates who were sold on the program should be accepted. The staff were generally more inclusive than the inmate participants. Other than ruling out psychotic inmates or those with a history of uncontrollable assaultive behavior (and in the SFU program, functional illiteracy), the staff generally assumed that almost all inmates could succeed if they were sincerely motivated. The inmate/participants tended to be more exclusive, and discouraged the participation of other inmates they thought would not eventually contribute to the program. The primary concern of the inmates in all the programs was intelligence.

They suggested that inmates with relatively low I.Qs. were bound to get into trouble because they could not grasp the basic concepts of the program. The inmates also were concerned about undiagnosed psychotic tendencies.

In programs in which the inmate/participants come from the same institution that houses the program, the staff can afford to be more inclusive since the inmate/participants can informally or formally take action to discourage disruptive inmates from applying for or participating in the program. For example, an inmate in one of the British Columbia institutions applied for the SFU program; although formally he met all criteria for the program, the inmate/students warned the staff that he was crazy. The staff explained that they could not reject potential students based merely on opinions of other students. However, it became clear to the staff after a few days that the objectionable inmate was a walking time bomb. The other students kept a careful eye on all his actions, and as soon as he violated the program rules, the student council called a session and formally recommended immediate expulsion on justifiable grounds.

In programs in which inmate/participants do not come from the same institution that houses the program, the staff needs to exercise more selectivity. Informal discussions with program staff who know potential participants at other institutions are frequently carried on by Cornerstone staff, Stay'n Out staff, and formerly, by Lantana staff. These discussions provide a rich source of preliminary assessments of whether inmates will be extremely disruptive in the program context and steps that need to be taken to prevent such behavior . . . including referral to a different program.

For example, because of cultural differences, some of the Native American participants have had a difficult time adjusting to the Cornerstone program. Although Cornerstone does not exclude Native Americans, another program has been designed specifically for Native American substance abusers. The staff decides which program is more appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, drug-involved inmates who are "low functioning" because they are mentally retarded are assigned to another residential program.

Immediate action in response to disruptive behavior was theoretically integral to all programs. As previously discussed, the inmates take primary responsibility for minor infractions of program rules; the program staff, in cooperation with correctional staff, take responsibility for more serious infractions. Examples of the types of infractions with which inmates deal include: cutting lines for meals, taking more of the programs' supplies than allocated for individuals, leaving a program area dirtier than the acceptable standard of cleanliness (ranging from a speck of dirt in Stay'n Out to visible muck in one of the SFU areas), talking in areas set aside for quiet work, and skipping a group meeting.

Examples of penalties which inmates may apply include: assignment to a "hot seat" and open group discussion of the violation and motivation; a one-way "dummy" in which the offender may not talk to anyone for a specific period; a two-way "dummy" in which the offender may not talk

nor be addressed for a specific period of time; confinement to the offender's room or another room set aside as a penalty box; exclusion from specific program areas or recreational activities; and requirements to provide written documentation of the actual motives for the infraction, the (negative) effects it had on the program participants, and actions that could be taken to remedy these negative effects.

The program staff has, at its disposal, penalties for more serious program infractions that range from losses of status and specific privileges in the program to physically removing the violator from program participation and the program area. However, *unless removal from the program premises can be accomplished immediately after a serious violation of security, the whole system of immediate reactions to disruptive behavior is undermined.* If the ultimate threat turns out to be an empty threat, the viability of the intermediate penalties is greatly diminished.

Cornerstone appears to have one of the most responsive systems; Lantana one of the least responsive. Based on a comparison of the two programs, the following factors appear to increase the ability of a program to respond immediately to disruptive behavior.

- Proximity to facilities to which disruptive inmates can be transferred.
- Minimum paperwork necessary for transfer.
- Twenty-four-hour-a-day capability for physically transferring disruptive inmates.
- A firm agreement between the program staff and the correctional staff that decisions made by the program staff to expel a program participant will be backed up immediately by the correctional staff.

Activities regarded by participants as "real" rather than work created to punish them or to keep them under control. Inmates who were highly committed to the programs characterized the programs as "hard" or "tough" but "worth it." They characterized the program staff as caring and concerned, and attributed the toughness of the program's activities to the determination of the staff to teach the inmates what they needed to know. They saw the program activities as providing a learning process that led to rewards in the following pragmatic terms.

- *The program helps you stay alive in prison.* Although the relative physical safety of the programs was considered an initial benefit, the challenging intellectual or thought-provoking components of the program were regarded as an antidote to institutionalization. The inmates explained that in the general prison population, "everything seems to slow down." At the same time, the inmates in the general prison population experience a good deal of mental stress but have no way to deal with the stress. The programs' emphasis on reading and challenging discussions kept the participants mentally sound and intellectually alive.

-
- *The program gives you work habits you need to survive on the outside.* Although each program involved different types of work, from scrubbing bathroom floors in Stay'n Out to preparing research papers in SFU, the inmates commonly said they had never worked as hard as they had in the program. And they realized they were working so hard because, often for the first time in their lives, they liked getting a job done.
 - *The program teaches you how to care about people—about your family outside.* Inmates commonly mentioned how impressed they were with the concern and care of their staff. They also commonly saw the role the staff played in their lives in prison as examples of the role they could play in the lives of their families after release. As one of the inmates said, "I want to give back to my kids what I got in here."

Staff members in all programs expressed deep concerns about the effects of the families of program participants on participants' behavior after leaving the program. All directors and many staff members indicated that family interactions could significantly increase or decrease the probability of participants' involvement with drug use and criminal behavior.

Given the level of detail known about individual participant families, staff members in all programs obviously paid a lot of attention to these issues. Staff members in all programs appear to monitor major and minor family crises and to work with program participants on reacting to the crises in constructive ways. All programs incorporated some activities that focussed on family interactions. SFU frequently invites families for weekend events such as cook outs or picnics. It is not unusual for the family members of the faculty to attend these events. The student inmates have a chance to see how the caring nature of the staff translates into interactions with his or her own family. Additionally, the attendance of the faculty families transforms the event from visiting day at the prison to a "real" university event.

Cornerstone has regular visiting hours for family members. Regular family visiting hours are allowed three hours on Saturdays or Sundays. Additionally, family members or "significant others" are encouraged to come to group sessions on Thursday nights to talk about fears, or progress, or other concerns. And counselling for individual couples is available through the program.

Cornerstone has a visible supply of toys and games for children of residents. Program participants frequently plan events involving activities, with the specific purpose of creating positive ties between parents and children. For example, before Halloween, a party was planned that involved refreshments and pumpkin carving. During the planning session, suggestions for activities were becoming increasingly grandiose and complex. Finally, the resident inmate leading the plenary meeting reminded others that the purpose was not to have a party but to allow the residents with kids to do something nice with them.

“I mean it’s no big deal—no big deal—it’s not like a big deal party—it’s so the family members (program participants) that have kids can carve a pumpkin with them or something nice like that....”

- *The program teaches you how to accept responsibility—that you can trust people and they can trust you.* Typically, the inmates pointed out that the programs fostered a cooperative relationship between inmates, and between inmates and staff, based on the assumption of responsibility and trust. As one student inmate described the situation:

“We experience give and take—not a polarized relationship. Our status is assumed, not ascribed, and it is assumed with rights and obligations.”

Other, less articulate inmates pointed out that such relationships were activated through the day-to-day procedures needed to keep the programs running, including coordinating schedules, tracking budgets, resolving personnel conflicts, purchasing equipment and program materials, planning social activities, responding to inquiries from outsiders, maintaining facilities and equipment, and dealing with individuals who do not complete allocated tasks.

- *The program makes me feel good about myself.* The most compelling reward for many of the inmates was the self-esteem they gained through the program. They felt that their participation in the program placed them in an elite group. These feelings were enhanced by the involvement of outside community members.

For example, Civitas, a community organization, involves Lantana inmates in several fund raising endeavors. Inmates raise funds for community betterment projects by taking pictures on visiting days, selling greeting cards to other inmates, and conducting a car wash every Friday. One of the inmates described his reaction to his participation, “It’s important. It’s doing something for others . . . it makes me feel good.”

Notes

1. Duguid, Stephen and Hendrik Hoekema, 1986. *University Education in Prison: A Documentary Record of the Experience in British Columbia, 1974-1986*. British Columbia, Canada, Simon Fraser University.
2. Toch, Hans, 1977. *Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival*. New York, The Free Press.
3. Anglin, M. Douglas, 1988. "The Efficacy of Civil Commitment in Treating Narcotics Addiction" in NIDA Research Monograph No. 86, *Compulsory Treatment of Drug Abuse: Research and Clinical Practice*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Drug Abuse, ADM-88-1578, pp. 8-34.

Chapter 4: ORGANIZING PROGRAMS FOR DRUG-INVOLVED OFFENDERS

As Chapter One has indicated, the vast majority of offenders incarcerated in our prisons have used drugs; a substantial proportion are regular users of major drugs. These regular users typically are recidivists who, without effective intervention, continuously cycle through the criminal justice system and back out on the streets where they commit many serious crimes.¹ The vast majority of such offenders are not enrolled in programs for drug abusers while they are in prison.

Practitioners and other decision makers who are involved with increasing the availability of programs for drug-involved offenders commonly have a number of questions about the feasibility of funding and implementation. Answers to frequently-asked questions are given below. The answers are based on a number of practices that appear to have increased the availability and viability of the four programs described in this report. In addition, practices that seem to decrease program viability were discovered in the survey of state departments of corrections and during discussions with administrators involved with disbanded programs formerly reporting reduced recidivism. These practices provide the bases for the caveats.

Funding

Question: Our budget for corrections is already allocated for essential services; how can new programs be funded?

Answer: Innovative sources of state funds may be available for legislative allocation to provide in-prison programs for drug-involved offenders. Legislatively earmarking specific appropriate sources of income for particular prison programs, as in Oregon, can help ensure the viability of programs, increase public awareness of programs, and help demonstrate systematic and programmatic accountability. Appropriate sources of funds that have been allocated include beer and wine taxes, parole fees used to offset aftercare costs, and inmate fees collected from income from work performed in prison. Other potential sources are taxes on other alcoholic beverages, taxes paid by legitimate pharmaceutical manufacturers or distributors, and assets seized from illegitimate drug manufacturers or distributors.

Question: What about federal funds?

Answer: Funds available through federal agencies such as the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the National Institute of Corrections are best used for one-time initial program costs (such as modifying preexisting institutions for program use or technical assistance for implementing programs) or for supplementary program activities

such as hiring outside researchers to evaluate program outcomes; they should not be used to support ongoing program costs. Even the most effective programs that depend exclusively on federal rather than state funds are likely to be dropped when federal funding is no longer available. In the telephone survey we conducted for this report, we found that among those programs that were no longer operating, 70 percent had been eliminated because they were dependent on federal funds no longer available.

Selecting Programs to Implement

Question: What is the newest and most popular approach for prison drug-abuse programs that we can try?

Answer: There are several new and untested programs that are popular. However, before deciding to implement new programs, a review of ongoing programs can help prevent the costly and wasteful process of "re-inventing the wheel." Programs already in place in your state may be more effective than new programs proposed by out-of-state experts. Programs that are already providing administrative benefits need to be replicated under conditions that will permit careful tests of their effectiveness.

Evaluations are needed to monitor whether or not the programs are reaching the intended focal group and whether or not they are actually having an impact on participants' behavior after release. At the very least, ongoing programs should be required to supply documentation of the numbers of inmates who have participated, their background characteristics including extent of involvement in crime and drugs before incarceration, and their progress while in the program in terms of improvement in skills needed for leading a noncriminal life after release. If possible, state-of-the-art evaluations of program impact on behavior after release should be carried out by neutral researchers.

Question: Our correctional system is different than those of Florida, New York, Oregon, and British Columbia; does it make sense to use their programs?

Answer: Persistent, drug-involved offenders who commit many serious crimes are very much alike no matter where they live.² They typically have many of the same complex social/psychological, educational, and vocational needs. Therefore, there is no reason to assume that the programs described in this report could not be replicated effectively in other settings. Of course, sensitivity to cultural differences must be taken into account when replicating programs; however, such differences require care in staff selection and innovation in specific activities of the program, rather than changes in the general structure or integral components of the program.

Question: Where can we find trained program directors?

Answer: Program directors who are outside of corrections but who have long-term experience in working to change participants' lifestyles often have the essential training and skills to design and implement effective in-prison programs. More specifically, the search for program directors can be brought to the attention of local universities and colleges, private and public community drug-treatment centers, private and public mental health agencies, comprehensive health care agencies, and agencies that deal with arrestees diverted from the criminal justice system.

Since such agencies focus primarily on providing services that promote constructive lifestyles, administrators and staff members may have developed skills capable of having a greater effect on prisoners' behavior after release than more traditional correctional skills focused primarily on supervision.

Question: We are considering contracting with an outside agency for providing programs for our inmates; how should we rank proposals?

Answer: Outside agencies that can demonstrate the following characteristics in their proposals are likely to provide excellent programs.

- Institutional capability and flexibility to handle complex fiscal arrangements, including financial tracking of highly mobile participants.
- Institutional capability for attracting highly-qualified staff and intent to utilize this staff for the prison program.
- Adequacy of intended procedures for providing security in the program area.
- Program goals that are realistic and incremental.
- Program approaches that recognize the multiple needs of participants.
- Program manuals that clearly define rules and procedures for participation, penalties for violations, and rewards for successful completion of activities.
- Program format that is based on active participation of inmates as opposed to passive instruction.
- Program activities that provide many opportunities for learning organizational, management, and interpersonal communication skills, and for developing constructive ways of spending leisure time. Activities that foster stronger family ties also should be planned.

-
- Programmatic opportunities to carry out projects valued by outside groups and organizations (as opposed to projects designed to keep inmates busy and in addition to those necessary to operate the facility).
 - Ongoing, frequent documentation of inmates' progress combined with procedures for protecting privacy of sensitive records.
 - Methods for providing continued contact with participants after release.

Housing Programs

Question: Our system is already overcrowded; how can we house new programs?

Answer: While prisons in many states are overcrowded, and therefore inappropriate for starting new programs or expanding ongoing programs, other potentially suitable residential institutions may be underutilized. Units in facilities such as mental hospitals have been found to require little or no renovation for providing medium or minimum security for drug-involved offenders.

In states in which prison overcrowding is not a problem, the status of state institutions still might be reviewed and facilities selected for housing programs that meet the following criteria:

- Inclusion in or close proximity to a secure correctional facility to facilitate immediate transfer of inmate participants who are disruptive,
- Availability of units within the facility with limited and controlled physical and visual access,
- For programs targeted on inmates nearing release, proximity to a nearby community with available job opportunities and low-cost housing to facilitate gradual release of inmates and accessibility of parolees to program staff after release, and
- Administration by chief executive officers who are sympathetic to (or at least not hostile to) the implementation of the program.

Unless the superintendent of the facility is at least willing to negotiate program plans that are mutually beneficial, the probability of successful implementation is extremely low.

Initial Implementation (or Replication) of Programs

Question: When introducing new programs, can we avoid turf battles between agencies and staff?

Answer: Probably not. However, the following steps can be taken to minimize conflict.

Interagency conflict can be minimized if state-level executive staff in all agencies involved in providing the programs take part in the program planning process from the earliest stages.

Effective programs require cooperation among diverse sets of agencies. All agencies need to realize benefits from the program. For successful program implementation, initial coordination and cooperation among involved agencies should be negotiated at the state level. State Criminal Justice Coordinating Committees, state-level agencies with analogous functions, or ad hoc state committees representing involved agencies are needed to spearhead this cooperative planning effort.

Since they encompass institutional and community activities for inmates and an aftercare component for parolees, at a minimum, prison administrators, parole supervisors, local law enforcement officials, and community representatives need to be briefed and brought on board for launching programs. Program evaluation requires dealing with state employed researchers or independent researchers. Obtaining state funds for the programs requires the cooperation of legislators; obtaining additional federal money requires competing for grants from U.S. Department of Justice. Programs housed in facilities that belong to other agencies, require coordination between the Department of Corrections and the agency supplying the facility.

Conflict can also be minimized if a plenary committee produces a contract, cooperative agreement, or other document that explicitly details division of responsibility for provision of services and materials.

Traditionally, the Department of Corrections assumes responsibility for providing virtually all services and materials needed by prisoners, including classification, security, medical care, dental care, education, psychological services, social services, clothing, meals, recreational materials, and transportation. In planning program implementation, responsibility for such tasks and materials can be reallocated and divided between the department of corrections, the department housing the program, and the program providers. Significant saving of resources can result from reallocation—for example, program staff providing total supervision of inmates in the program area.

Additionally, responsibility needs to be assigned for carrying out tasks and providing materials that are integral parts of program implementation. In addition to carrying out specific program activities, these include:

-
- Selecting program participants,
 - Expelling a participant from the program for disciplinary reasons,
 - Taking disciplinary action (less serious than expulsion) for minor infractions,
 - Awarding privileges to inmate/participants for achieving goals, and
 - Structuring activities for discretionary time.

The criteria for taking these actions and procedures need to be drafted cooperatively; however, day-to-day responsibility for decisions leading to these actions is best assigned to the program staff. For example, infractions that will result in immediate dismissal from the program need to be explicit and made known to all concerned parties including the participants; procedures for correctional officers immediately transferring an expelled inmate from the program area should be spelled out. As staff who are most likely to be aware of serious violations, program directors and staff function best if given the responsibility for immediately expelling violators. Taking this responsibility out of their hands compromises their control of inmates' behavior and the viability of the program.

Training sessions held for program staff, correctional officers, and other institutional staff in contact with program participants can benefit all involved.

Potential conflict between program staff and correctional staff can be minimized by a shared understanding of each others' goals, objectives, responsibilities, and activities. Role playing has been found to reduce tension and resentment (correctional staff and program staff take each others' parts in acting out common scenes in dealing with inmates). Training in team coordination for problem solving also helps promote cooperation.

Disagreements can be resolved by regular meetings of an institutional coordinating/negotiating committee composed of a representative from all departments involved with the program.

As day-to-day disagreements about the use of resources or operational procedures arise, they can be resolved quickly and satisfactorily by a committee specifically formed for this purpose. Additionally, as the committee becomes familiar with common sources of complaints, problems can be anticipated and resolved before they occur. For example, if program staff know in advance that inmates will be called out frequently for eye exams on specific days, they can plan their activities accordingly.

The program initially can be implemented with the *minimum* number of staff and inmates needed to be cost effective.

Beginning with a relatively small program decreases barriers to implementation due to resource constraints, staff resistance, and inmate resistance and allows for easier resolution of day-to-day problems.

Selecting Inmate Participants

Question: Should participation be voluntary or mandatory?

Answer: There is growing evidence that offenders who enter treatment programs because of legal coercion are just as likely as other participants to respond positively. However, in practice all those who entered treatment under legal coercion chose to do so as an alternative to other forms of correctional supervision. For example, they chose drug treatment instead of jail.³

Legal coercion is not the same as mandatory forced participation. Forced participation does not appear to work. Inmates assigned to programs against their will frequently are extremely disruptive.

Rather than involuntary conscription, the programs need to provide prerequisites, such as desired recreational activities, that make the program more attractive than serving a regular prison sentence.

Question: What types of inmates should be involved in the program?

Answer: Effective programs that recruit the most serious, persistent offenders are more likely to gain the respect of other inmates and have the largest impact on recidivism. Most offenders do not commit a lot of crimes. Although many are persistent criminals who cycle through institutions, when they are released they get by on odd jobs, living with relatives, and an occasional theft or burglary that lands them back in prison. A small proportion of offenders are extremely active criminals; when released, they hit the streets running—committing hundreds of crimes each year, as long as they are free to do so and haven't learned to lead a less criminal life. Recruiting the latter type of offender is more likely to improve everyone's quality of life—the offender, the members of his or her family and community, and potential victims.

Unless the most serious offenders are recruited, the program will get a reputation for handling lightweights and increase the chances that participants will be harassed by other inmates.

Question: How can we screen inmates at intake for admission to the program?

Answer: The vast majority of prisoners have been drug-involved; almost all persistent offenders who committed crimes at an early age also used drugs. Therefore, screening for drug use may not be cost effective. Administrators in the four programs suggested

that, if demand does not exceed available resources, inmates who are not security risks and who indicate that they can profit from the program should be allowed to participate. Since the most effective programs deal with complex multiple needs, not just drug use, virtually all mentally competent offenders could profit from the programs. Mentally retarded prisoners generally require alternative programs. However, poor reading skills, often characteristic of serious offenders, need not preclude participation; basic literacy classes can be incorporated as a program component.

To the extent that demand exceeds available resources, efforts will need to be made to involve the most seriously drug-involved offenders. However, demand may also be met by enlarging the program.

Ongoing Practices

Question: How can we increase the chances of keeping a good program?

Answer: The following procedures have been found to increase program viability.

Ongoing monitoring of the program facilitated by program directors

Program directors have continually provided documentation of program activities and impact to state legislators, gubernatorial staff, corrections department administrators, and other concerned agencies and staff. Additionally, after conferring with institutional administrators, invitations to graduation ceremonies or other program events periodically have been extended to such persons and to media reporters.

Providing briefs about the program to new administrators

To avoid being swept out by new brooms, program directors have presented briefs to new administrators about the program, the benefits for the new administrators' office, and the sources of external support. At the same time, the program directors have found out about the priorities of the new administrator and planned to meet these priorities without compromising the integrity of the program. For example, when an administrator planned to institute activities that inmates regarded favorably, the program director negotiated participation as a reward for inmates who were progressing in the program.

Assigning staff in the facilities housing the programs to positions requiring coordination with the programs only if they are knowledgeable about and sympathetic to program goals

Staff assignments to the program areas have been voluntary and have followed at least one orientation session providing information about program goals, activities, and procedures.

Opening appropriate program activities to participation by facility staff

When made available to staff, attendance in classes, seminars, group counseling sessions, and other program events by facility personnel has increased the value of the program for everyone involved.

Encouraging state legislators to visit prison programs

On-site inspection of the programs by legislators has benefited all persons concerned. Such visits increase the positive view of the correctional administration and staff, raise the morale of the program staff, enhance the prestige of the program among inmates, and provide excellent publicity for the visitors and hosts.

Evaluation

Question: How can we tell whether a program actually reduces recidivism?

Answer: Evaluation of the programs can be carried out periodically by neutral researchers. The primary questions that should be addressed by researchers involve both program process and impact. More specifically, program evaluation should provide answers to the following questions:

- Who are the program participants? Is the program reaching the most serious offenders or offenders who have a low probability of being recidivists?
- What is the length of time participants are involved in the program? Is this length of time optimal for reducing recidivism?
- What are the program activities? And, as compared to inmates not involved in the program, specifically what activities are carried out by program participants?
- Who are the staff members involved in the program? As compared to staff supervising other inmates with the same classification, what is the ratio of staff to inmates, and what is the background and training of staff members?
- As compared to similar offenders who have not participated in the program, do the program participants commit fewer crimes after release? Are they more socially stable? Are they less involved with drugs?

Notes

1. Chaiken, Marcia R., and Bruce D. Johnson, 1988. *Characteristics of Different Types of Drug-Involved Offenders*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.
2. Chaiken, Jan M., and Marcia R. Chaiken, 1982. *Varieties of Criminal Behavior*. Santa Monica, Rand Corporation.

Chaiken, Marcia R., and Jan M. Chaiken, 1985. *Who Gets Caught Doing Crime?* Bureau of Justice Statistics Discussion Paper. Washington, D.C.

Chaiken, Marcia R., and Jan M. Chaiken, 1989 (forthcoming). *Redefining the "Career Criminal" for Priority Prosecution of High-Rate Dangerous Offenders*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.

Chaiken and Johnson, *op. cit.*
3. Anglin, M. Douglas, 1988. "The Efficacy of Civil Commitment in Treating Narcotics Addiction," in NIDA Research Monograph No. 86, *Compulsory Treatment of Drug Abuse: Research and Clinical Practice*. Washington, D.C., National Institute on Drug Abuse, ADM-88-1518, pp. 8-34.
4. Chaiken and Johnson, *op. cit.*

EPILOGUE

This report began with a description of Ron, one of hundreds of thousands of drug-involved offenders who have been cycling through our correctional institutions. Ron got lucky. When he was once again incarcerated, he was offered the chance to participate in a new type of program—a program that made clear that he had a choice: grow up and clean up his act or continue to become increasingly enmeshed in a life of drugs, crime, and prison time.

After he was released, together with a small group of other drug-involved offenders who had participated in the program, Ron founded a residential community of recovering addicts. Surrounded by practicing addicts who taunted them and shot dope on their door step, Ron and the others in the TC supported each other financially, physically, and morally. They stayed clean and created a refuge for other addicts who also wanted to give up drugs. The program they created, Phoenix House, provided a model for the Stay'n Out prison program. Today, Ron is the executive director of Stay'n Out.

REFERENCES

- American Correctional Association, 1986. *Public Policy for Corrections: A Handbook for Decision-Makers*. College Park, Maryland.
- American Correctional Association, 1987. *Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies and Paroling Authorities*, 1987. College Park, Maryland.
- Anglin, M. Douglas, 1988. "The Efficacy of Civil Commitment in Treating Narcotics Addiction" in NIDA Research Monograph No. 86, *Compulsory Treatment of Drug Abuse: Research and Clinical Practice*. Washington, D.C., National Institute on Drug Abuse, ADM-88-1518, pp. 8-34.
- Ayers, Douglas, Stephen Duguid, Catherine Montague, and Sonia Wolowidnyk, 1980. *Effects of the University of Victoria Program: A Post-Release Study*. Ottawa, Canada, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1980. *Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31, 1980*. National Prisoner Bulletin. Washington, D.C.
- Chaiken, Jan M., and Marcia R. Chaiken, 1982. *Varieties of Criminal Behavior*. Santa Monica, Rand Corporation.
- Chaiken, Marcia R., and Jan M. Chaiken, 1985. *Who Gets Caught Doing Crime?* Bureau of Justice Statistics Discussion Paper. Washington, D.C.
- Chaiken, Marcia R., and Jan M. Chaiken, 1987. *Selecting "Career Criminals" for Priority Prosecution*. Submitted to the National Institute of Justice. Waltham, Massachusetts, Brandeis University.
- Chaiken, Marcia R. and Bruce D. Johnson, 1988. *Characteristics of Different Types of Drug-Involved Offenders*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.
- Chaiken, Marcia R. and Jan M. Chaiken, 1989 (forthcoming). *Redefining the Career Criminal: Priority Prosecution of High-Rate Dangerous Offenders*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.
- Collins, James J., Henrick J. Harwood, Mary Ellen Marsden, Robert L. Hubbard, Susan L. Bailey, J. Valley Rachal, and Elizabeth R. Cavanaugh, 1987. *Crime Control and Economic Benefits of Drug Abuse Treatment*. Draft Summary Report submitted to the National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.
- Consad Research Corporation, 1974. *Bureau of Prisons Addict Commitment Client Outcome Evaluation and NARA I/II/III Comparisons*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Cullen, Frank, and Paul Gendreau, 1988. "The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation," in L. Goodstein and D.L. MacKenzie, eds., *The American Prison: Issues in Research Policy*. New York, Plenum.
- Duguid, Stephen, 1987. *University Prison Education in British Columbia*. British Columbia, Canada, Simon Fraser University.
- Duguid, Stephen, and Hendrik Hoekema, 1986. *University Education in Prison: A Documentary Record of the Experience in British Columbia, 1974-1986*. British Columbia, Canada, Simon Fraser University.
- Emmonds, David, 1987. "Solitary Confinement" in *Prison Journal* No. 6: 25 (January). Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada, Simon Fraser University.
- Federal Prison System, 1987. *Chemical Abuse Programs Directory*. Washington, D.C., Department of Justice.

Ferguson, Patricia, Thomas Lennox, and Dan J. Lettieri, 1974. *Drugs and Attitude Change—Nonmedical Drug Use: Attitudes and Attitude Change*. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Field, Gary, 1985. "The Cornerstone Program: A Client Outcome Study" in *Federal Probation: 50-55* (June). Washington, D.C., Administrative Office of the United States Courts in cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice.

Flanagan, Timothy J., and Maureen McLeod, eds., 1983. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1982*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 553.

Flanagan, Timothy J., and Edmund F. McGarrell, eds., 1986. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1985*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 545-546.

Gottfredson, Michael R., Michael J. Hindelang, and Nicolette Parisi, eds., 1978. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1977*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 668.

Hindelang, Michael J., Christon S. Dunn, Allison L. Aumick, and L. Paul Sutton, eds., 1974. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1973*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 356.

Hindelang, Michael J., Christon S. Dunn, Allison L. Aumick, and L. Paul Sutton, eds., 1975. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1974*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 457-458.

Hubbard, Robert L., J. Valley Rachal, S. Gail Craddock, and Elizabeth R. Cavanaugh, 1984. "Treatment Outcome Prospective" Study (TOPS): Client Characteristics and Behaviors Before, During, and After Treatment in Frank M. Tims, Ph.D. and Jacqueline P. Ludford (editors),

Drug Abuse Treatment Evaluation: Strategies, Progress, and Prospects, NIDA Research Monograph 51, A RAUS Review Report. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Innes, Christopher A., 1988. *Profile of State Prison Inmates, 1986*. Special Report. Washington, D.C., Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Jamieson, Katherine M., and Timothy J. Flanagan, eds., 1980. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1979*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 651.

Jamieson, Katherine M. and Timothy J. Flanagan, eds., 1984. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1983*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 587.

Jamieson, Katherine M., and Timothy J. Flanagan, eds., 1987. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1986*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 416-417.

Johnston, Lloyd D., Patrick M. O'Malley, and Jerald G. Bachman, 1985. *Use of Licit and Illicit Drugs by America's High School Students, 1975-1984*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Johnston, Lloyd D., Patrick M. O'Malley, and Jerald G. Bachman, 1986. *Drug Use Among American High School Students, and Other Young Adults, National Trends Through 1985*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Lipton, D., R. Martinson, and J. Wilks, 1975. *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies*. New York, Praeger Publishers.

Maltz, Michael D., 1984. *Recidivism*. Orlando, Florida, Academic Press.

McGarrell, Edmund F., and Timothy J. Flanagan, eds., 1985. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics—1984*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C., USGPO. p. 665.

National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1981. *Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons*. Treatment Research Report. Rockville, Maryland, Department of Health and Human Services.

National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1983. *Main Findings for Drug Abuse Treatment Units, September 1982*. Data from the National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Utilization Survey (NDATUS) Series F, Number 10. Rockville, Maryland, Department of Health and Human Services.

NIDA Capsules, 1986. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Nurco, David N., Thomas E. Hanlon, Timothy W. Kinlock, and Karen R. Duszynski, 1988. "Differential Criminal Patterns of Narcotic Addicts Over an Addiction Career," *Criminology*, 26:3, pp. 407-423.

Peck, Michael L., and David J. Klugman, 1973. "Rehabilitation of Drug Dependent Offenders: An Alternative Approach" in *Federal Probation*: 18-23. Washington, D.C., Administrative Office of the United States Courts in cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice.

Platt, Jerome J., 1986. *Heroin Addiction: Theory, Research, and Treatment, second edition*. Malabar, Florida, Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.

Rhodes, William, 1984. *Federal Offenses and Offenders: Bank Robbery*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. Washington, D.C.

Sechrest, Lee, Susan O. White, and Elizabeth D. Brown, eds., 1979. *The Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders: Problems and Prospects*. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences.

Terminal Island Memo 53305.3, 1982.

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

Wainwright, Louie L., 1983. *Drug Treatment Program, Lantana Correctional Institution*. Florida Department of Corrections.

Wexler, Harry K., Gregory P. Falkin, Douglas S. Lipton, Andrew B. Rosenblum, and Linda P. Goodloe, 1988. *A Model for Prison-Based Drug Treatment: An Evaluation of the Stay'n Out Therapeutic Community: A Final Report to the National Institute on Drug Abuse*. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Wexler, Harry K., Douglas S. Lipton, and Kenneth Foster, 1985. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment: Preliminary Results." Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting, San Diego. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Wexler, Harry K., Douglas S. Lipton, and Bruce Johnson, 1988. *A Criminal Justice Strategy for Treating Drug Offenders in Custody*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.

Wexler, Harry K., and Ronald Williams, 1986. "The Stay'n Out Therapeutic Community: Prison Treatment for Substance Abusers." *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 18: 3, 221-230.

Wish, Eric D., Mary A. Toborg, and John Bellasai, 1988. *Identifying Drug Users and Monitoring During Conditional Release*. National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX A
PROGRAM RESOURCES

Professor Evan Alderson
Associate Dean of Arts
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia
V5A 1S6
CANADA

Mr. Lee Anders
Department of Corrections
3050 Center Street, N.E.
Salem, OR 97031

Carl Beals
Social/Support Services
Manager
Oregon State Penitentiary
1605 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Robert N. Bohler
Assistant Superintendent
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Florence Bryant, R.N.
Medical Services
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Lucy Colucci
Personnel Director
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Dr. Stephen Duguid
Director
Prison Education Programs,
Continuing Studies
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia
V5A 1S6
CANADA

Dr. Gary Field
Director
Cornerstone Program
Oregon State Hospital
2600 Center Street, N.E.
Salem, OR 97310

Mr. Steve Gassner
Assistant Superintendent
Oregon State Penitentiary
1605 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Dean Jo Lynne Hoegg
Continuing Studies
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia
V5A 1S6
CANADA

Dr. Henry Hoekema
Programs Coordinator
Prison Education Programs,
Continuing Studies
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia
V5A 1S6
CANADA

Larry King
Adult Parole and Probation
Officer
Community Corrections
220 High Street, N.E.
Salem, OR 97031

Dr. Cecilia Liangco
Medical Services
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Peter Marrett
Assistant Warden
Matsqui Institution
P.O. Box 2500
Abbotsford, British Columbia
V2S 4P3
CANADA

Mr. Tom Masters
Assistant Director, CTP
Oregon State Hospital
2600 Center Street, N.E.
Salem, OR 97310

Mr. Charles McGinnis
Regional Director of Programs
Pacific Regional Headquarters
P.O. Box 1200
Agassiz, British Columbia
V0M 1A0
CANADA

Mr. David McLaren
Assistant Warden
Mountain Institution
P.O. Box 2500
Abbotsford, British Columbia
V2S 4P3
CANADA

Robert Miller
Classification Supervisor
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Jim Muranaka
Social Services Manager
Oregon State Penitentiary
1605 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Sonjia Paige, MHS
Senior Unit Director
Stay'n Out
Arthur Kill Correctional Facility
2911 Arthur Kill Road
Staten Island, NY 10309

Major R. D. Payton
Security
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Edward Pfister
Education Supervisor
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Sheila Roberts
Administrative Assistant to the
Dean of Arts
Simon Fraser University

Burnaby, British Columbia
V5A 1S6
CANADA

Robert J. Rohr
Business Manager
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

John Shaw
Superintendent
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Hazel Smith
Deputy Superintendent
Arthur Kill Correctional Facility
2911 Arthur Kill Road
Staten Island, NY 10309

Warden J. Stonoski
Matsqui Institution
P.O. Box 2500
Abbotsford, British Columbia
V2S 4P3
CANADA

Michael Thompson
Supervisor Counseling and
Social Services
Lantana Correctional Institution
1199 E. Lantana Road
Lantana, FL 33462

Mr. Dale Weinstein
Director
Correctional Treatment
Programs
Oregon State Hospital
2600 Center Street, N.E.
Salem, OR 97310

Ronald Williams
Executive Director
New York Therapeutic
Communities, Inc.
500 Eighth Avenue, 8th Floor
New York NY 10018

APPENDIX B

**SURVEY OF PRISON PROGRAMS:
SAMPLE AND METHODS**

A telephone survey was carried out in a stratified sample of twenty-seven state corrections agencies. The sample design contained two strata: the first stratum included the largest twelve state corrections agencies, according to their 1986 inmate populations as recorded in the American Corrections Association directory; they were selected with certainty. The sampling frame for the second stratum was the remaining thirty-eight state agencies; thirteen of them were selected randomly to be in the sample. See Table B-1 for a list of the sampled agencies and their inmate populations. The sample is representative of agencies of all sizes, and also of the entire range from low to high in terms of the proportion of their inmates enrolled in drug-treatment programs in 1979, according to the NIDA survey "Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons."

Our survey was conducted during September and October, 1987. In each sampled state, the corrections agency's director of substance abuse services was contacted personally by telephone, or, in states without a specific office for drug-treatment programs, the director of health or medical services was contacted. The response rate was 100 percent. The respondent was asked ten questions concerning the number of state prison facilities offering drug-treatment programs, the types of programs offered, the number of inmates participating in programs, and the total number of inmates in the prison system.

Table B-1

States sampled for telephone survey
in order by 1986 inmate population

State	Inmate Population
Stratum 1	
California	55238
Texas	37214
New York	36078
Florida	29712
Ohio	21922
Illinois	19184
North Carolina	17764
Michigan	17451
Georgia	17088
Pennsylvania	15055
Maryland	13161
New Jersey	11448
Stratum 2	
Alabama	11415
South Carolina	10090
Indiana	10079
Connecticut	6250
Wisconsin	5507
Kentucky	4675
Iowa	2864
Minnesota	2432
Delaware	2419
New Mexico	2400
Utah	1779
Montana	1160
New Hampshire	675
Vermont	665
North Dakota	438