



**CRIMINAL
DISPOSITION
COMMISSION**



SI Newhouse
Center for Law and Justice
15 Washington Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

BRIEFING REPORT

Don M. Gottfredson
Chairman

March 1990

Stephanie R. Bush
Vice Chairman

Lela M. Keels
Coordinator
(201) 648-3187



BOOT CAMP PRISONS

Criminal Disposition Commission
Alternatives to Incarceration Committee

PREPARED BY:

Edward J. Coyle
Research Analyst

3-25-92
MPI

133080

133080

**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
**New Jersey Criminal
Disposition Commission**

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

CRIMINAL DISPOSITION COMMISSION



SI Newhouse
Center for Law and Justice
15 Washington Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

BRIEFING REPORT

March 1990

BOOT CAMP PRISONS: A SURVEY OF EARLY PROGRAMS AND SOME PRELIMINARY EVALUATION EVIDENCE

Prepared By:

Edward J. Coyle
Research Analyst

INTRODUCTION

Frustration with crime and recidivism often leads to the development of innovative correctional strategies. Today, that frustration is exacerbated by growing prison populations and the costs of traditional confinement. For example, the New York Times reports that the prison population in the United States increased in the first half of 1989 more than any other increase since the Federal Government began collecting data 64 years ago. As of September 10, 1989, 673,565 people in the United States were serving a prison sentence. The Times reports that this figure reflects a need for 1,800 new prison beds each week (Associated Press, 1989). The American Correctional Association projects that, by 1993, 771,388 persons (300.76 per 100,000 population) will be incarcerated in prisons throughout the United

States (1989, p. 41). The cost of incarceration is equally staggering. In 1987, states paid between \$21.00 and \$71.83 per day per inmate to operate their prisons (Camp and Camp, 1988, p. 28-29) only to see a large group of offenders return to the prison system.

One strategy which attempts to prevent recidivism and reduce prison populations is shock incarceration (Boot Camps). Shock programs are not new to criminal justice and they appear to be experiencing a resurgence in popularity in the form of Boot Camp programs. Boot Camps have been an issue, most notably, among politicians like Ronald Lauder in the New York Mayoral campaign, in Star Ledger reports covering the New Jersey Gubernatorial race, and on ABC-TV's Nightline where Alabama DOC Commissioner Morris L. Thigpen and Jerome Miller of the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives debated the effec-

tiveness and utility of these types of shock incarceration programs. In New Jersey, two bills have been introduced in the State Assembly that establish Boot Camp programs. Bill No. A 2346, sponsored by Assemblymen Franks and Kelly creates a three year youthful offender pilot program in Essex County for first time non-violent youthful offenders which mandates a "stringent, regimented, and punitive 90 day military style experience coupled with closely supervised probation for first time young and impressionable criminal offenders." A second bill (No. A 1521), sponsored by Assemblywoman Crecco and Assemblymen Stuhltrager, Roma, Kyrillos, Kelly, Martin, and Franks, establishes "a special six month program of shock incarceration, stressing a highly structured routine of discipline, intensive regimentation, exercise and work therapy, together with substance abuse workshops, education, pre-release counseling and self-improvement counseling" within the Department of Corrections for certain young inmates between 18 and 24 years of age.

Shock Incarceration (SI) programs are perceived to benefit the criminal justice system in several ways. First, they allow policy makers an opportunity to improve correctional resource management by providing a less costly alternative to traditional prison incarceration. Although boot camps cost more or as much per day per inmate as traditional incarceration, the shorter period of imprisonment leads to greater savings. However, two critical issues become apparent and

deserve serious evaluation attention: (1) Are boot camp inmates more likely to return to prison as repeat offenders than those released after serving a prison sentence thus increasing prison populations? and (2) Are individuals who would have been sentenced to community supervision being sentenced to boot camp prisons simply because the programs are available? An affirmative answer to these two questions may create more costs for a corrections system already experiencing serious fiscal constraints. Second, the appeal of enhanced discipline is also cited as a system benefit by Parent (1989). Here, he suggests that increased discipline assures safer and more orderly institutions. Finally, boot camp programs are an intuitively appealing strategy to rehabilitate young offenders and deter future criminal activity thus reducing the need for additional correctional resources (See Parent, 1989, p. 2-3).

Parent (1989) notes that shock incarceration programs can generate broad political appeal because, "[it] is a program that can be - at least in perception - all things to all people" (p. xi). He states, "in many states a political constituency for SI has developed, spawned, in part, by extensive favorable media coverage. SI makes "good copy" conveying powerful visual images well suited for the electronic media. Above all, SI evokes themes which are clearly in tune with (and some critics say cater to) popular desires for a quick fix to crime through harsh punishment, discipline, and deterrence" (Parent, 1989, p. 1). It appears to be time to

stop and take a look at where shock programs have been and where they are going. It is important to seriously consider the utility of these programs using reliable and valid research data rather than political fervor and intuitive appeal.

REVIEW OF EARLY SHOCK PROGRAMS

States have experimented with shock incarceration programs (i.e. Ohio) as well as programs like Scared Straight in New Jersey and Juvenile Offenders Learn (JOLT) in Michigan attempting to deter young, impressionable, "crime prone" individuals from beginning or continuing a life of crime. Shock programs began in California and Ohio during the 1960's where judges would combine a probation sentence with a short jail term to give offenders a "taste of the bars" (Parisi, 1981). This sentencing technique was considered a "compromise between immediate release and a regular prison sentence" (Potter, 1977, p. 49). As Angelino, et.al., point out, "shock probation is purported to give felons sufficient experience with prison to deter them from crimes without risking 'prisonization' and its accompanying effects" (p. iii).

Today, shock incarceration programs have taken a new twist. Rather than stress the uncertainty of release from the general prison population where offenders were subsequently given a second chance in the early programs, current shock programs emphasize the certainty and severity of punishment as

the driving deterrent force. Based upon a military "boot camp" design, young offenders earn a second chance by participating in, and successfully completing, an intensive program of physical training, hard labor, and exposure to the realities of traditional state prison incarceration. Parent stresses that current SI (boot camp) programs are different from traditional shock probation and programs like Scared Straight in three ways: (1) boot camp inmates are segregated from the general prison population thus preventing the "impressionable" offender from learning negative values and attitudes common in traditional prison settings; (2) boot camps may heighten the participant's fear of imprisonment by keeping it an unknown; and (3) boot camp inmates are exposed to a prolonged, yet distant, experience with incarceration unlike the "one-shot" presentation Scared Straight and JOLT participants are likely to dismiss as "theater" (1988a, p. 20).

BOOT CAMP

All the boot camp programs currently operating in the United States are basically similar in design and structure although some differ in the length of confinement as well as in the availability of education and rehabilitative counseling services. The similarities and differences reflect jurisdiction - specific philosophies and goals and warrant serious consideration by policy makers considering the expansion or development of "boot camp"

programs as correctional strategies. Interested readers are directed to the specific program descriptions provided in the last section of this report.

In all jurisdictions boot camp participation is voluntary. Offenders must agree to participate in an intense program of physical training, hard labor, and military drill and discipline. All states employing the boot camp strategy, with the exception of New York, have a relatively low refusal rate (Parent, 1989). Most offenders agree to participate because of the impending long term incarceration and due to fear of the unknown. This becomes most evident when analyzing the New York refusal rate - the majority of program eligible New York offenders served a considerable amount of time at Rikers Island prior to being transferred to a state facility thus making the deterrent effect of the unknown prison experience negligible at best (Parent, 1989). Some programs provide educational, substance abuse, and vocational counseling on a limited basis and the provision of these services are strictly limited by the time frame and philosophy of each program.

BOOT CAMPS: ARE THEY WORKING?

Prior to developing a program or conducting an evaluation, program goals must be clearly defined. Parent suggests that boot camp programs pursue both sentencing goals (i.e. deterrence, rehabilitation, punishment, and incapacitation) as well as management

goals (i.e. reduce prison overcrowding and enhance organizational credibility) in their respective programs (1988a, p. 3). Apart from media accounts of the great successes of the boot camp strategy (for example, see Berke, 1987; Mitchell, 1988; and Sterling, 1989), little systematic evaluation research has examined this correctional initiative. Therefore, it is too early to tell, with any degree of certainty, if boot camps are achieving their stated goals of reducing prison crowding and costs or if they reduce the likelihood of recidivism (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1988; N.J. Juvenile Disposition Commission, 1989). However, there have been some preliminary investigations at the state level as well as a National Institute of Justice (NIJ) sponsored survey of boot camp programs that examine how well boot camp programs are achieving their goals.

Sentencing Goal: Rehabilitation and Deterrence

Parent (1988) identified rehabilitation of offenders as one of the primary goals of boot camp programs surveyed in the NIJ project. Recidivism can be considered a good indicator of rehabilitation and specific deterrence. The preliminary analyses conducted by the authors below permit an assessment of the effectiveness of the boot camp strategy in achieving this goal.

MacKenzie, et.al., studied the recidivism rate of boot camp graduates in Oklahoma in 1984 and found that 15.7% of that group were reincarcerated within

one year compared to 23.4% of those sentenced to other diversionary programs, 18.8% of those sentenced to ISP, and 7.5% of regular prison releases (1988, p.3).

Parent found that 38.5% of Georgia Shock Incarceration graduates were subsequently reincarcerated within the three year follow-up period (1989, p.4). However, these results are only descriptive since no comparable control groups were examined in the survey. Parent also examined Oklahoma's success rate, this time using a comparison group of similar non-violent offenders sentenced to the Department of Corrections in a 29 month Survival Analysis. He found that 50% of the Boot Camp graduates, compared to 29% of the control group, returned to prison (1989, p. 4). Similarly, New York State (1988) reports that boot camp graduates' community success rate was not significantly different from the success rate of any of the six comparable control groups in its study. It is important to remember that boot camp strategies in many jurisdictions are relatively new and thus it may be too early to tell whether or not they have any effect upon recidivism. Further research in this area is warranted, however, as Parent notes, "evaluations of these programs give little cause for optimism - at best offenders exposed to them failed at rates similar to comparison groups. At worst, they failed at significantly higher rates" (1989, p. xii).

The rehabilitative impact measured by recidivism statistics is questionable at best but

there are some data that supports the contention that the boot camp experience, in and of itself, is beneficial to the participants. MacKenzie and Shaw (1988) compared prison adjustment, expectations, and attitudes of SI participants, SI Dropouts, and a group of regular prison inmates in Louisiana. They found that, after 81 days of SI participation, offenders who voluntarily continued in the program perceived more positive changes in themselves and had more prosocial attitudes than the regular prison or dropout groups. MacKenzie and Shaw conclude that "the results of these analyses strongly suggest that the experience of those in the SI program is different from the experience of those serving their sentence in regular prison" (1988, p. 24). SI was seen as a "constructive experience" where the emphasis on discipline and the segregation from the general population acted as a catalyst to accelerate positive change. Boot Camp participants were more positive about their prison experience and their ability to change their lives. Given these preliminary findings, boot camp may provide the atmosphere for a certain group of "select" offenders to pursue treatment and counseling. A note of caution is warranted, however, in that no follow-up of graduates was completed by MacKenzie and Shaw thus making inferences about lasting prosocial changes impossible. This area is in need of particular research attention since, to date, there is no research that systematically examines whether institutional treatment programs are more effective when provided in highly structured programs

like Boot Camp (Parent, 1988, p. 26).

Management Goal: Reducing Prison Crowding

Reducing the prison population was also identified as a primary goal of boot camp programs in the Parent survey. It should be noted, however, that boot camp programs can have a negligible or opposite effect on prison population reduction. For example, New York State (1988) reports that its Shock Incarceration program saved between 90 and 300 days of cell space when compared to the amount of state time served by the control groups. This cell saving can be easily translated into cost savings. However, due to the relatively small size of current boot camp programs (i.e. maximum program capacity ranges from 348 to 1,000 participants), shock incarceration is likely to have a minimal impact on the overall prison populations (Parent, 1989, p. 4). For example, states responding to the Parent survey indicated that boot camps, operating at full capacity, can only divert between 1.1% (Florida) to 11.6% (Mississippi) of its general prison population (1989, p. 5, Table 1-3).

Prison populations can be adversely affected by boot camp programs if states experience high rates of (1) Dropouts; (2) Washouts; and (3) Violators. Each of these groups eventually return to the general population thus quickly eroding saved cell space. Data on the latter group (i.e. Violators or recidivists) are presented above and Parent (1988) suggests that

states using the boot camp strategy should make every effort to also control expulsion rates by making it difficult to voluntarily withdraw (Dropouts) and by finding other methods to address unsatisfactory performance while in the camp (Washouts). Some states (i.e. Oklahoma and New York) have taken steps to prevent washouts and dropouts, and thus subsequent returns to the general population, however, no research is available indicating whether or not they have been successful.

The selection process also has an impact upon the ability of boot camps to reduce prison crowding. In order for SI to be an effective prison population reduction strategy, offenders sentenced to SI must be offenders who would ordinarily receive prison sentences rather than noncustodial terms. Also, offenders must be sentenced to shorter terms than they would receive in a traditional sentencing scheme. Parent (1988) notes that when judges control the decision to place an offender in SI, like in Mississippi and Georgia, often these offenders would have been given straight probation had SI not existed. On the other hand, when the Department of Corrections control, or substantially influence, the placement of offenders into the Boot Camp program, like New York, offenders are diverted from the prison population thus reducing crowding and preventing "widening the net of custodial control."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While the evaluation evidence on boot camp is, at best, tentative, some general conclusions and recommendations can be offered for policy makers considering the expansion of these types of programs in their jurisdictions.

RECOMMENDATION I: IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT PROGRAM GOALS BE DIRECTLY LINKED TO PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND TASKS (Parent, 1989). If states are developing boot camp programs to reduce prison crowding, policy makers must restrict the selection process to allow only those offenders who would ordinarily be sent to prison to participate in the program. Excluding offenders who would have received a straight probation sentence if not for the existence of boot camp from the program is essential to avoid increasing the "net of custodial control" and exacerbating an already fiscally strained corrections system. Policy makers must develop stringent eligibility criteria and accept offenders who are "too risky" for regular community supervision but not deserving traditional imprisonment. It is strongly suggested that jurisdictions develop and adopt risk assessment instruments for the decision making process.

If states are pursuing rehabilitative goals, boot camp programs must devote resources toward that end to provide counseling and treatment services. These rehabilitative programs should be the primary

focus in the boot camp experience since chemical dependency is unlikely to be eradicated through drill and discipline without treatment. Boot camps that aim to rehabilitate offenders must require at least six months participation and provide for "intensive" supervision and aftercare upon release to allow for continuity in the reintegration experience.

RECOMMENDATION II: BOOT CAMP PROGRAMS MUST ALSO MAKE EVERY ATTEMPT TO CONTROL ITS DROPOUT AND WASHOUT RATES. HIGH PROGRAM FAILURE RATES INCREASE PRISON POPULATIONS SINCE OFFENDERS ARE RETURNING TO THE GENERAL POPULATION THUS WASTING THE RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO BOOT CAMP PROGRAMS. THE NEW YORK AND OKLAHOMA PROGRAMS OFFER GOOD MODELS OF DEVELOPING STRATEGIES TO CONTROL WASHOUTS AND DROPOUTS FROM THEIR PROGRAMS.

RECOMMENDATION III: IF BOOT CAMPS ARE TO BE TRULY REHABILITATIVE, SPECIFIC EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING, AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNSELING SERVICES MUST BE PROVIDED IN ADDITION TO PHYSICAL TRAINING AND STRICT DISCIPLINE. MacKenzie and Shaw (1988) have noted that SI programs may act as a catalyst for prosocial change and the development of positive attitudes in a disciplined environment conducive to treatment programs. Treatment, however, must be voluntary rather than coerced and it must last longer than the usual boot camp stay (i.e. 90 days). New York's program offers a good example of a Shock Incarceration program pursuing rehabilitative goals (i.e. 6 month program of extensive counseling and GED preparation) and policy makers

should consider this program a model.

RECOMMENDATION IV: POLICY MAKERS SHOULD DEVELOP MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION IN THE SELECTION AND PARTICIPATION OF PARTICIPANTS AND OFFER OTHER COMPARABLE PROGRAMS FOR THOSE DEEMED INELIGIBLE BECAUSE OF AGE, MENTAL OR PHYSICAL HEALTH STATUS, OR SEXUAL ORIENTATION.

These safeguards will assure equal protection under the law and protect the Constitutional rights of the offenders since participants are permitted early release from confinement upon successful completion of the program. Also, administrators must make every effort to monitor program staff for abuses of authority and power and limit the imposition of summary punishments. A rigid, structured environment like a boot camp facility can easily become conducive for the abuse of offenders by staff unless specific procedures are developed, staff are carefully recruited and trained, compliance carefully monitored, and violations quickly sanctioned.

RECOMMENDATION V: THOSE WISHING TO IMPLEMENT BOOT CAMPS SHOULD DEVELOP INNOVATIVE EVALUATION TECHNIQUES BASED UPON SOUND RESEARCH METHODS (I.E. CONTROLLED EXPERIMENTS, RANDOM ASSIGNMENT OF OFFENDERS) SO THAT TRUE PROGRAM EFFECTS CAN BE MEASURED IN RELATION TO ESTABLISHED PROGRAM GOALS.

Policy makers must also be willing to abandon the boot camp program or make the necessary changes in the program processes should the information collected in the evaluation effort indicate such an approach.

CONCLUSION: It is important to note that boot camp can not be all things to all people. In an era of frustration about crime, recidivism, and the rising cost of corrections, there tends to be a need to "do something" and often proposed solutions are merely an exercise in futility (See Finckenauer, 1982). Policy makers need to realize that boot camp is not a panacea that will reduce crime. However, boot camp may provide an innovative alternative setting where young offenders can structure their lives and participate in needed counseling and educational programs. It may very well offer an alternative to traditional incarceration which is often characterized by idle time, sporadic program participation, and frequent association and identification with a more "hardened" offender. To be effective, however, policy makers must develop programs based upon a model that best fits the goals and philosophies of the jurisdiction and the needs of the offender. Also an extensive community supervision and support network (i.e. ISP) is essential for successful "aftercare."

While it is too early to judge the effectiveness of boot camp programs with any degree of certainty, the empirical evidence presented above suggests that policy makers approach the development or expansion of these types of programs with caution and realize their inherent limits. The information provided in this report as well as in the literature makes it quite apparent that boot camp programs warrant additional research attention and careful

consideration as a correctional intervention.

REFERENCES

- Associated Press. (1989). U.S. prison population sets record for a year, in six months, New York Times, (9/11/89), p. A18
- American Correctional Association. (1989). Vital Statistics in Corrections. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Angelino, H.R. et. al. (1975). Ohio: A longitudinal study of the effects of shock probation. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- Camp, G. M., and Camp, C.M. (1988) Corrections Yearbook, 1988. South Salem, NY: criminal Justice Institute.
- Crabtree, L., and Douglas, P. (1985). Military discipline: Young offenders learn accountability, Corrections Today, 47, (DEC): 38-39.
- Finckenauer, J.O. (1982). Scared Straight and the Panacea Phenomenon. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice - Hall.
- Lewis, R.V. (1983). Scared straight - California style: Evaluation of the San Quentin Squires program, Criminal Justice and Behavior, 10, (2): 209-226.
- McConville, S. (1989). Britain's boot camp detention hasn't worked, New York Times, June 5, 1989.
- MacKenzie, D.L., and Barlow, D.W. (1989). Shock incarceration programs in state correctional jurisdictions - An update, NIJ Reports, May/June, (214): 9-10.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Goodstein, L.I., and Blouin, D.C. (1987). Prisoner control and personal adjustment: An empirical test of a proposed model, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 24, (1): 49-68.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Gould, L.A., Reichers, L.M., and Shaw, J.W. (1988). Evaluating Shock Incarceration in Louisiana: A Review of the First Year. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Gould, L.A., Reichers, L.M., and Shaw, J.W. (1988). Shock incarceration: Rehabilitation or retribution. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences meeting, San Francisco, CA, 1988.
- MacKenzie, D.L., and Shaw, J.W. (1988). Inmate adjustment and change during shock incarceration: The impact of correctional boot camp programs. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology meeting, Chicago, IL, 1988.
- Mitchell, B. (1988). Colorado's Shape-Up program gives youths a taste of the inside, Corrections Today, (AUG): 76.
- New Jersey. (1989). Boot camps for juveniles: Good idea or Bad? Trenton, NJ: Juvenile Disposition Commission.

New York State. (1988). Preliminary Assessment of the First Six Shock Incarceration Platoons. Albany, NY: Division of Parole.

Parent, D.G. (1988). Overview: Shock incarceration programs, American Probation and Parole Association, (FALL): 9-15.

Parent, D.G. (1988). Shock incarceration and the attainment of sentencing and correctional goals. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology meeting, Chicago, IL, 1988.

Parent, D.G., Chaiken, M., and Logan, W. (1989). Shock Incarceration: An Overview of Existing Programs. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Parisi, N. (1981). A taste of the bars, Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 72, (3): 1109-1123.

Parisi, N. (1980). Combining incarceration and probation, Federal Probation, 44, (2): 3-12.

Sterling, G. (1989). Essex lawmen urge "boot camp" for young thugs, The Star Ledger, May 12, 1989.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1988). Prison Boot Camps: Too Early to Measure Effectiveness. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vito, G.F. (1978). Shock probation in Ohio: A comparison of attributes and outcome. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International (Dissertation: The Ohio State University).

Vito, G.F. (1978). Shock probation in Ohio: A reexamination of factors influencing the use of an early release program, Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 3, (2): 123-132.

Vito, G.F. (1985). Developments in shock probation, Federal Probation, 48, (2): 22-27.

Vito, G.F., and Allen, H.E. (1981). Shock probation in Ohio: A comparison of outcomes, International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 25, (1): 71-76.

Vito, G.F., Holmes, R.M., and Wilson, D.G. (1985). The effect of shock and regular probation upon recidivism: A comparative analysis, American Journal of Criminal Justice, 9, (2): 152-162.

Waldron, J.A., and Angelino, H.R. (1977). Shock probation: A natural experiment on the effect of a short period of incarceration, Prison Journal, 57, (1): 45-52.

BOOT CAMP PROGRAM MODELS

The descriptions provided below are based upon information supplied by the respective programs. A letter was sent to each contact person requesting handbooks, mission statements, legislation, and preliminary evaluation data as well as their own personal assessments of the current status of program operations and the perceived likelihood of future success. The information provided by these individuals was complete, timely, and informative thus reasonably assuring that the descriptions provided below represent an accurate account of the state of boot camp prisons currently operating in the United States. These program descriptions are important because as MacKenzie, et.al., note, "shock incarceration programs differ so widely at this point in time that any evaluation of them must begin with a description of the specific components of the program" (1988, p. 6).

Georgia

Georgia's Special Alternative Incarceration (SAI) program began in 1983 with two 100 bed facilities housed in, but separate from, an existing correctional institution. The program is designed to impress upon the offender the realities of long term incarceration. The SAI program admits male felony offenders who are between the ages of 17 and 25 sentenced to at least one year probation. To be considered for SAI, offenders can not have any prior experience in adult correctional

facilities, communicable or contagious diseases, or any physical or mental handicap that would prevent full participation in strenuous physical labor and activity.

The probation officer preparing the PreSentence Investigation (PSI) report determines eligibility and makes a recommendation to the sentencing court. The judge can sentence an offender to SAI. This option is considered to be a middle ground punishment for a selected

group of offenders. Once sentenced to SAI, the offender participates in an intensive program of physical labor with extremely limited idle, discretionary time. The program is designed to stress the importance of personal freedom and the subsequent loss of that freedom if the participant persists in criminal activity. The SAI participants provide manual labor for state farms, highways and land clearing projects. Rehabilitation or treatment services in the Georgia program are conducted in the evening hours and are limited to basic life skills training and drug and alcohol awareness programs. The offender who successfully completes this program is transferred to regular probation supervision to serve the remainder of his court imposed sentence in the community.

Alabama

The Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit program began in 1988 and currently enrolls 25 participants at an existing correctional facility. This program is intended to make the offender aware of the prison environment and the subsequent loss of freedom that results from involvement in criminal activity. Offenders who are considered unsuitable for regular probation supervision or other diversions can be sentenced by the court to participate in the program for 90 days as a condition of probation. The judge imposes a split sentence after the recommendation of the PSI investigator and clearance from the Department of Corrections which determines space availability. Those not

convicted of a violent crime or sex offense are considered for the program if they do not have: (1) any previous exposure to adult facilities; (2) any communicable or contagious diseases; and (3) any physical or mental limitations that would prohibit participation in work or physical exercise.

Program components like physical training, strict discipline, military drill, hard labor on state projects, basic life skills, and drug and alcohol awareness programs are intended to the offender so that he will avoid reinvolvement in criminal activity. Those who successfully complete the 90 day program are then returned to the court for resentencing to regular probation supervision.

Florida

Florida's Basic Training Program, or Boot Camp Program, began in 1987 with a 100 bed unit housed at Sumter Correctional Facility. The Boot Camp is separated from the main compound by a fence thus assuring segregation from the general population yet providing some exposure to the nuances of long term prison life. The Florida program was created to return the offender to the community better equipped to deal with the complexities of modern life without returning to crime.

Offenders, under 24 years of age, sentenced to a custodial term of not more than 10 years and who have not been previously incarcerated at a state or federal correctional facility can be considered for program participation. The Department

of Corrections Youthful Offender Program Office notifies the court of an offender's eligibility for participation in Boot Camp based upon his "amenability" to the regimented training and the rehabilitative "benefits" of shock incarceration as well as space availability. With the approval of the sentencing court, the offender is placed in the program. Those offenders not approved by the sentencing court are required to serve their respective terms in regular correctional settings.

Participants are required to adhere to strict military style discipline, courtesy, and drill with compliance reports submitted to the sentencing court every 60 days. Offenders are also required to participate in daily group counseling sessions based upon the Rational Emotive Therapy method which focuses on the individual's ability to understand his own behavior as well as his conscious ability to change his pattern of living. Boot Camp inmates must also attend a substance abuse workshop and complete a prerelease training program. Some individual counseling and educational services are provided but there is no formal education component due to the relatively short period of time participants remain at the facility. The program does allow some time for self directed study and provides some resources (i.e. some text books are provided in dorms). Individuals successfully completing the 90 - 120 day program return to the sentencing court for a reconsideration of sentence at which time graduates are usually sentenced to regular probation

supervision.

Mississippi

The Regimented Inmate Discipline program is an intensive treatment program located at the State Penitentiary in Parchman, Mississippi. Created in 1985, the program attempts to expand the shock incarceration statute by combining boot camp discipline with psychological correctional treatment interventions. The program accepts non-violent first offenders who do not have a history of psychological disorders, mental retardation, or extensive juvenile court histories. Offenders convicted of sex offenses, crimes involving firearms, and those serving sentences with mandatory minimum terms are excluded from the program.

Inmates selected for program participation are sentenced to the custody of the Mississippi Department of Corrections to serve at least 30, but not more than 180, days. Participants must first complete a 60 - 120 initial training period (Phase I) that employs boot camp training and discipline strategies. Inmates who successfully complete Phase I are then assigned to the Corrective Work Center (Phase II) to develop work habits and participate in vocational training. Once the RID inmate completes these two stages, and with the recommendation of the DOC, the offender is resentenced to "Earned Probation" to begin aftercare under intensive probation supervision. Mississippi corrections officials believe that this multifaceted treatment regimen allows an offender an opportunity to

learn self discipline, correct irrational thinking patterns, develop a work ethic and constructive problem solving techniques. The RID program considers education a valuable rehabilitative tool and thus supplements vocational training with GED classes.

Texas

The Special Alternative Incarceration (SAI) program was created in January, 1989, at the Goree Unit of the State Prison at Huntsville, Texas. Defendants eligible for probation, age 17-26, who do not have any previous exposure to felony incarceration nor any physical or mental handicap precluding strenuous physical activity can be considered for the program. The 90 day program is intended to shock young offenders into realizing the consequences they ultimately face if they continue to violate the law.

The SAI program is based upon the military training model of regimentation and strict discipline to enhance self control and create a "teamwork" atmosphere. Offenders participate in strenuous labor projects (agriculture, land clearing) which officials believe teaches the "work ethic" and basic life skills to become a productive member of the community. Drug and alcohol counseling services, as well as interview strategies and resume preparation, are also provided by RID staff.

Once a participant successfully completes the 75 - 90 day RID program, he is returned to the sentencing court at which time the judge ordinarily sus-

pends the remainder of the custodial sentence and places the offender on probation.

South Carolina

Created in 1987, South Carolina's Shock Probation program accepts non-violent first offenders between 17 and 24 years old who are exposed to a custodial term of more than five years for the instant offense or convicted of violating probation. The program is intended to provide an alternative to long term confinement by providing a highly structured atmosphere to develop meaningful employment skills. Offenders are sentenced to Shock Probation as a condition of probation upon the recommendation of the South Carolina Department of Parole and Community Corrections and must complete the 90 day program to receive the suspended custodial sentence.

Shock Probation depends upon strict disciplinary control, hard labor, and strenuous physical activity to provide the deterrent effect of incarceration and to create an atmosphere conducive to rehabilitation. Education programs play an important role in South Carolina's Shock Probation and GED classes are provided two hours each evening following the seven hour work day. Drug and alcohol counseling is also provided by the Shock Probation program staff.

Michigan

The Special Alternative Incarceration (SAI) program in Michigan was created at Camp Sauble in March, 1988. The pro-

gram attempts to develop self esteem, individual responsibility, and a solid work ethic in young male offenders considered to be inappropriate candidates for regular probation supervision. The probation officer preparing the PSI for sentencing screens eligible defendants and makes a recommendation to the SAI intake staff based upon the following criteria: (1) no prior prison exposure; (2) no physical or mental impediment to participation; (3) no prior violent offense convictions; and (4) a Michigan Felony Sentencing Guidelines score greater than 12 or a VOP, or a statement by the Court that a prison term would have been imposed if not for SAI for offenders scoring less than 12 on the guidelines. If the SAI intake staff recommends the offender for participation, the judge may sentence the defendant to probation with the special condition to complete the SAI program. Those who successfully complete the program normally serve at least one year on intensive probation supervision.

The SAI program is designed to maximize exposure to the corrections system and provide an atmosphere of strict discipline, hard labor, physical training, and drill similar to military models. The program also provides some substance abuse counseling, GED preparation courses, and "other programming."

Louisiana

The Intensive Motivational Program of Alternative Correctional Treatment (IMPACT) was created in Louisiana in 1986 to reduce crowded conditions in

traditional prisons and to promote a positive image of corrections and improve public relations. It was also intended to provide offenders with the basic life skills necessary for a crime free lifestyle outside the corrections setting.

To be eligible for IMPACT, an offender must be a first offender in which the sentence imposed by the court permits parole eligibility. Also, potential participants must be "particularly likely to respond affirmatively to participation" which is determined by certain indicators that include: (1) no pending charges; (2) no conviction for a sex or DWI offense; (3) no health problems that would prohibit full participation; (4) not having reached age 40 at the time of consideration; (5) no assaultive behavior patterns or an assaultive escape within 5 years; (6) no overt homosexual tendencies; and (7) potential residence prospects in Louisiana for IPS supervision. Offenders who are committed to the Department of Corrections for a term not greater than 7 years can volunteer for IMPACT if they receive a recommendation from the Division of Probation and Parole, the sentencing court, and the Department of Corrections. The inmate must complete the 90 - 180 day program in which the first 30 days are devoted solely to physical training, and military drill and courtesy for 17 hours each day. Once a participant graduates from the "Beginner's Squad," he begins a regimented program of work and intensive treatment that includes ventilation therapy, reeducative therapy, substance abuse counseling, and

prerelease preparation where concepts of self control, basic life skills, and chemical dependency awareness are emphasized in sessions that meet regularly throughout the inmate's 12 - 14 weeks in the program. Those who do not satisfy all the requirements of the program after 180 days are returned to the general prison population to serve the remainder of their sentence. Those who do complete the program can be placed on Intensive Parole Supervision any time after 90 days of successful program participation.

Arizona

Arizona's Shock Incarceration program, housed at the medium security prison at Florence, was created for 150 participants in order to provide a preview of prison life for offenders, save scarce prison beds, and reduce the risk of "institutionalizing" young offenders. For 4 months (120 days), offenders must participate in strenuous labor, exercise, and military protocol designed to intimidate young offenders and deter them from continued criminal activity and subsequent reincarceration. The program targets those defendants who would have normally received a prison term for their offenses. To be eligible for Shock Incarceration, an offender must (1) be a first offender, (2) less than 25 years old, (3) have no prior experience in adult institutions, (4) have no known communicable or contagious disease, (5) not be convicted of a felony involving a serious injury or weapon, and (6) not have any physical or mental

impairments that would prevent physical activity. The sentencing court can impose Shock Incarceration as a condition of probation if the defendant satisfies the above criteria. If the participant successfully completes the 120 day program, the court will likely issue an order resentencing the offender to regular probation supervision for aftercare for the remainder of his sentence.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma's Regimented Inmate Discipline (RID) located at the Lexington Correctional Center began in 1984 to "enforce the notion of offender accountability for criminal behavior and to improve chances for post-release success" (Crabtree and Douglas, 1985, p. 38). Emphasizing strict discipline, physical training, intensive programming, and extremely limited idle time, offenders under 22 years of age participate in the 90 - 120 program while their Specialized Offender Accountability Program (SOAP) plans are being developed. SOAP plans are developed to permit the sentencing court an opportunity to fashion a sentence, based upon rehabilitation and punishment, that is perceived by the defendant as well as others to be fair and just. After completing the RID program, an offender is subsequently held accountable for his actions in form of restitution, community service, participation in substance abuse counseling programs, as well as education, employment, and residence requirements all monitored through a program of intensive supervision.

New York

Perhaps the most comprehensive Boot Camp program to date was developed in 1987 at Camp Monterey, a 250 bed facility in upstate New York. This 6 month Shock Incarceration program was created to "protect public safety by combining the surety of imprisonment with opportunities for the timely release of inmates who have demonstrated their readiness to return to society" (New York Boot Camp Program Handbook).

The Department of Correctional Services reception center classifies eligible offenders who are sentenced to state prison by the criminal courts. Those offenders who meet the following criteria are referred to the Division of Classification and Movement in Albany for final review and approval: (1) age 26 and under; (2) eligible for parole within 3 years; (3) no conviction for a violent or serious (Class A-1) felony; (4) no conviction for Manslaughter or Criminally Negligent Homicide; (5) no sex offense conviction; (6) no prior escape or absconding conviction; and (7) physical and psychological clearance to participate.

The program is designed to supplement rigorous physical activity, work, intensive regimentation, discipline, military courtesy, drill, and physical training with a wide array of treatment and educational programs. Rehabilitation appears to be a major component of the program in that a considerable amount of time is spent in these activities. For example, inmates must participate one full

day each week in GED and remedial education as well as 3 - 5 hours a week in alcohol and drug abuse treatment and an additional 2 hours each week in prerelease counseling attempting to ready the participant with basic life skills needed upon his upcoming release. Throughout the 6 month program, the "Network Program" approach emphasizing community living, socialization skills, and rational decision making is employed to practice self control and discipline so that they can seek realistic goals through honest effort rather than antisocial behavior. This technique is similar to the Therapeutic Community approach used in many other correctional settings. The participants enter as a group (i.e. platoon) and live as units for the duration of the program.

Those who successfully complete the six month program are transferred to Shock Parole Supervision where their activities are closely structured and monitored until the expiration of their term.