

154113

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance

CORRECTIONAL BOOT CAMPS AND REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS

NCJRS

MAY 25 1995

A Report on Issues and Options

ACQUISITIONS

154113

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/BJA

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.

Criminal Justice Associates
March 9, 1994

This project is supported by Grant No. 93-DD-CX-K006 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs U.S. Department of Justice. The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program offices and bureaus: Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Institute of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office of Victims of Crime. Points of view in this document are those of Criminal Justice Associates and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	Page 1
INTRODUCTION	Page 2
OVERVIEW OF THE MEETING	Page 3
SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS	Page 4
APPENDIX	Page 10
• Meeting Agenda	Page 11
• List of Participants	Page 14
• Attorney General Reno's Remarks	Page 22
• Results of Small Group Discussions	Page 24

ABSTRACT

On February 24, 1994 a group of senior criminal justice decision makers met in Washington, DC, under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, to assist the Bureau in the design of its Fiscal Year 1995 program plan for correctional boot camps and related community reintegration programs. The group's discussion centered around three topics; (1) the outcomes that boot camps should be designed to achieve, (2) the best means to achieve the desired outcomes, and (3) the role that BJA should play in the development and implementation of comprehensive boot camp programs.

The group identified a wide range of individual and systemic outcomes that boot camps should be expected to achieve and endorsed the basic tenet that inter-agency, inter-governmental, and public/private partnerships should be employed to provide a continuous, integrated network of institutional and community-based services that will enhance the offender's ability to lead a law abiding, productive life in the community.

Participants at the meeting strongly encouraged BJA to use a combination of planning and demonstration grants to support jurisdictions that experiment with different boot camp models which emphasize delivery of services in both the institutional and community-based phases of the program. The following pages contain a more detailed description of the discussions that took place at the meeting.

INTRODUCTION

On Thursday, February 24th, 1994, a group of forty correctional administrators, criminal justice researchers, military personnel, private sector service providers, and officials of the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Labor met in Washington, DC to discuss correctional boot camps and related community reintegration programs.¹ The meeting was sponsored by the Corrections Branch of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, under the Correctional Options Grant Program (COGP), as part of the Bureau's on-going effort to solicit input from the criminal justice community regarding programs which BJA administers.² The meeting was planned and facilitated by Criminal Justice Associates (CJA), the COGP technical assistance contractor. The specific purpose of the February 24th meeting was to obtain input to the Bureau's Fiscal Year 1995 program plan for correctional boot camps and related community reintegration programs.

This report, written by CJA, describes the issues, challenges, and options discussed at the meeting.

¹ The appendix to this report contains the agenda for the meeting and a list of participants.

² The Correctional Options Grant Program (COGP), administered by BJA, supports the development and implementation of cost effective interventions between probation, prison, and parole that reduce reliance on incarceration while enhancing the reintegration of offenders into the community. Specific interventions supported by the COGP include boot camps, drug courts, day-reporting centers, intensive supervision programs, and other community-based sanctions.

OVERVIEW OF THE MEETING

Assistant Attorney General Laurie Robinson, the Director of the Office of Justice Programs, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants and thanking them for their willingness to assist BJA in the formulation of its 1995 program plan. Thomas Albrecht, the Chief of BJA's Corrections Branch, reviewed the specific purpose of the meeting and briefed the participants on the status of the crime bill and the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Program. After the opening remarks, the participants separated into three groups and spent the balance of the morning discussing issues related to the questions outlined below. Each small group, reflecting the make-up of the overall group, contained a correctional administrator, a criminal justice researcher, a military officer (active duty or retired), a private sector service provider, and a representative of the U.S. Department of Justice. The small groups were facilitated by CJA staff. The discussions in each group centered around three questions:

- What outcomes should a boot camp graduate attain as a result of completing a comprehensive boot camp program?
- How can desired outcomes be best achieved?
- How should BJA use its resources to support the achievement of the desired outcomes?

After lunch, the key points discussed by each small group were reported to the participants. Following the reports, Thomas Castellano, Ph.D., of the University of Southern Illinois's Crime

Studies Center, facilitated a plenary discussion of the issues and options that BJA should focus on in designing its Fiscal Year 1995 program plan for correctional boot camps and related community reintegration programs. After the plenary discussion Attorney General Janet Reno joined the meeting and exchanged views with the participants on a number of current topics related to crime, social justice, and criminal justice administration.³ The meeting adjourned shortly after the Attorney General completed her remarks.

The following section provides a synopsis of the key points discussed at the meeting.⁴

SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

What outcomes should boot camps achieve?

Each participant was asked to list the outcomes that an offender should attain as a result of completing a boot camp program.⁵ The range of desired outcomes generated by the groups can be divided into two broad categories; those pertaining to changes in attitude and behavior, and those pertaining to the acquisition of specific skills and/or competencies. Examples of

³ A synopsis of the Attorney General's remarks is provided in the appendix.

⁴ A detailed description of the points discussed by each of the small groups is contained in the appendix.

⁵ Participants were encouraged to include both institutional and community-based activities in their conceptualization of a comprehensive boot camp program.

desired changes in attitude and behavior listed by the participants ranged from the specific expectation that offenders emerge from the boot camp program addiction-free to the more general, but equally important, expectation that boot camp graduates act less impulsively, accept responsibility for the consequences of their actions, and have a sense of direction. They should understand and accept that they are part of a larger community to which they can make positive contributions.

Each of the three discussion groups listed a job, or at a minimum, the acquisition of employment related competencies such as the knowledge of how to find a job, as an example of a specific skill that offenders should attain as a result of completing a boot camp program. Several participants also discussed outcomes that boot camps, as components of an overall correctional system, should be expected to achieve. Reducing the length of incarceration, with concomitant cost reductions, diminishing the harmful affects of institutionalization, and reducing recidivism were three expectations commonly listed by those participants who also focused on systemic outcomes for boot camps.

The group acknowledged that achievement of the type of individual and system outcomes discussed at the meeting on any significant scale would require an ambitious, and in all likelihood costly, social experiment that would have implications for criminal justice as a whole. The group expressed tentative support for the notion that boot camps have the potential to

change the nature of imprisonment and may be a key component in an integrated approach to reducing criminality. However, the group also noted that the cost of such a large scale social experiment is unknown at this time and may, upon closer inspection, prove to be quite daunting.

How can desired outcomes be achieved?

Having developed a list of desired outcomes, each group was asked to discuss the best means to achieve the outcomes. Toward that end, the participants were asked to talk about the resources required to support the achievement of individual and system goals, the best approaches to achieve the desired outcomes, and the service delivery structures that must be in place to facilitate goal achievement.

In general, participants indicated that correctional agencies need to enlist the active support and participation of a wide range of service providers to achieve the type of individual and system outcomes generated by the group. The types of inter-agency, inter-governmental, and public/private partnerships endorsed by the group require leadership on the part of the correctional agency that promotes and maintains a team approach to service delivery. There was a good deal of discussion among the participants about the merits of the prevailing approach adopted by most correctional agencies to date -- the military model. While the basic tenets of the military approach, particularly its emphasis on the development of self-discipline and group cohesion, received positive endorsement, there was also

strong support for experimentation with other approaches, such as Outward Bound or approaches derived from sports, that hold the potential for achieving the same outcomes. Whatever the approach, there was widespread sentiment that the boot camp experience be tailored to fit the needs of individual offenders, that offenders themselves be actively involved in developing their specific service plans, and that mechanisms such as case management classification be employed to assure the relevance and quality of the programs and services in which offenders participate.

There was widespread recognition of the important, but limited, positive behavioral changes that can be accomplished during the institutional phase of a boot camp program. Most participants contended that the ultimate success of such programs rests on: (1) the continuation of service delivery during the community reintegration phase; and, (2) the ability of the correctional agency to integrate the institutional and community-based components into a seamless service delivery network that uses the institutional experience as a platform for reinforcing and enhancing an offender's continuing behavioral change and skill acquisition in the community. Again, the group endorsed the theme of experimentation when approaching the community risk reduction and skill acquisition components of the boot camp program. Community-based experiences which leverage the positive aspect of group cohesiveness developed during the institutional phase, while simultaneously providing meaningful public service

opportunities (such as land, stream, and forest reclamation, and work-readiness training and neighborhood housing rehabilitation in conjunction with groups like Habitat-for-Humanity) were referenced by participants as examples of community-based approaches that deserve further examination by correctional administrators.

What should BJA do with its resources?

The final question was intended to provide an opportunity for the participants to recommend how BJA should use its resources in the upcoming fiscal years to support the development and implementation of comprehensive boot camp programs. The group indicated that BJA should consider the following recommendations:

- require applicants for boot camp funds to develop and implement core program components, such as competency based world-of-work training, that support the achievement of the individual and systemic outcomes generated by the group;
- encourage applicants to experiment with various programmatic approaches, in addition to or other than the military approach, that will support the achievement of desired outcomes;
- encourage applicants to develop and implement integrated institutional / community-based programs that use the institutional phase as a staging ground or platform for continuous community-based service delivery;
- encourage applicants to develop, implement, and maintain inter-agency, inter-governmental, and/or public/private partnerships as part of their service delivery strategy;
- award a combination of planning and demonstration grants to support qualitative experimentation with different boot camp models;
- require independent, rigorous outcome-based evaluations of programs;

- support staff development and training;
- limit the amount of funds available for construction; and
- assist jurisdictions as they develop their applications for boot camp funds.

The materials in the appendix contain a more detailed description of the discussions that took place in each of the small groups.

APPENDIX

U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Assistance

CORRECTIONAL BOOT CAMPS AND AFTERCARE PROGRAMS

A Meeting to Explore Issues and Options

Great Hall
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

February 24th, 1994

BOOT CAMP AND AFTERCARE MEETING

AGENDA

Great Hall
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Thursday, February 24th, 1994

8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Welcoming Remarks and Review of the Schedule
9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	Implications of the Crime Bill
9:30 a.m. - Noon	Small Group Discussions
Noon - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Reports from Small Groups
1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Plenary Discussion
3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.	Next Steps and Closing Remarks

(a detailed agenda is provided on the following pages)

WELCOMING REMARKS AND REVIEW OF THE SCHEDULE
8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Welcoming Remarks

Thomas Albrecht
Bureau of Justice Assistance

Review of the Schedule

George Sexton
Criminal Justice Associates

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CRIME BILL
9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.

Facilitator

George Sexton

The current version of the crime bill being considered by the Congress establishes parameters on target populations, programs purposes, and other important areas that could have significant implications for state and local correctional administrators who seek federal subsidies for boot camps.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS
9:30 a.m. - Noon

Facilitators

Barbara J. Auerbach
Criminal Justice Associates

Franklin C. Farrow, Ph.D.
Criminal Justice Associates

George E. Sexton

Participants will convene in three small groups to discuss the military and non-military elements of boot camps, aftercare components of comprehensive boot camp programs, the best use(s) of the Bureau of Justice Assistance's resources, and other boot camp related issues which emerge during the discussion. A break will be scheduled during the small group discussion.

LUNCH
Noon - 1:00 p.m.

REPORTS FROM SMALL GROUPS TO PLENARY
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.

Reporters

Lawrence H. Albert, Ed.D.
Criminal Justice Associates

Robert H. Lawson
Criminal Justice Associates

Katherine A. Lewis
Criminal Justice Associates

CJA staff will provide an overview of the findings, observations, and recommendations made by each of the three small discussion groups.

PLENARY DISCUSSION OF BOOT CAMP AND AFTERCARE ISSUES
1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Facilitator

Thomas Castellano, Ph.D.
Crime Studies Center
University of Southern Illinois

Participants will discuss key points related to boot camp and aftercare programs and the future use of BJA's resources in a plenary forum. Areas in which any of the three small discussion groups agreed will be confirmed and, if possible, areas in which there is disagreement will be resolved.

NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING REMARKS
3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Presenter

Thomas F. Albrecht

Participants

James Austin, Ph.D.
Executive Vice President
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
685 Market Street
Suite 620
San Francisco, California 94105

(415) 896-6223
(Fax) 896-5109

Captain Robert A. Bradley
9108 Pershing Avenue
Orangevale, California 95662

(916) 262-1533

Robert F. Boruch, Ph.D.
Professor
Center for Research and Evaluation in Social Policy
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6216

(215) 898-0409
(Fax) 898-0532

Scarlett Carp
President
Scarlett Carp Associates
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 360
Washington, DC 20001

(202) 289-2200

Thomas Castellano, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Crime Studies Center
4244 Saner Hall
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

(618) 453-6362
(Fax) 453-3253

Thomas A. Coughlin III
Commissioner
Department of Correctional Services
State Office Building Campus
Building Number Two
Albany, New York 12226

(518) 457-8134
(Fax) 457-7252

Colonel Jack Davis
Director
Drug Demand Reduction Taskforce
3033 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 208
Clarendon Square Building
Arlington, Virginia 22201

(703) 696-1159
(Fax) 696-2065

Daniel Donohue
Chief of Public Affairs for the National Guard Bureau
Room 2D
386 2500 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-2500

(703) 695-0421
(Fax) 693-3841

Michael Gatling
Executive Assistant / Office of the Executive Director
American Correctional Association
8025 Laurel Lakes Court
Laurel, Maryland 20707

(301) 206-5098

Colonel William Holmberg, U.S.M.C. (ret'd.)
American Biofuels Association
1925 North Lynn Street
Suite 1000
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

(703) 522-3392

Susan Hunter
Director / Prisons Division
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street NW
Washington, DC 20531

Joseph D. Lehman
Commissioner
Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 598
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17001-0598

(717) 975-4860

Doris Layton MacKenzie, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology
Room 2220 / Lefrak Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742-8235

(301) 405-3008
(Fax) 405-4733

Colonel Eugene Nervo, U.S.M.C. (ret'd.)
President
Wilderness Adventure at Eagle Landing
Post Office Box 460
New Castle, Virginia 24127

(800) 782-0779
(Fax) 703-389-9866

Dale Parent
Senior Social Scientist
Abt Associates, Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138-1168

(617) 349-2738
(Fax) 492-5219

Howard A. Peters III
Director
Department of Corrections
1301 Concordia Court
Post Office Box 19277
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9277

(217) 522-2666
(Fax) 522-5089

Ronald Powell, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Criminal Justice
Taylor University
1025 Rudisill Boulevard
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46807

(219) 456-2111 [ext-2282]

Denise Quarles
Regional Prison Administrator
Department of Corrections
Grandview Plaza Building
Post Office Box 3003
Lansing, Michigan 48909

(517) 373-0287
(Fax) 373-3882

Chase Riveland
Secretary
Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 41101
Olympia, Washington 98504-1101

(206) 753-2500

Dalton A. Roberson, Sr.
Executive Chief Judge
Third Judicial Circuit
Frank Murphy Hall of Justice
Court Room 801
1441 St. Antoine
Detroit, Michigan 48226

(313) 224-2444
(Fax) 224-2786

Carol Shapiro
Assistant Commissioner
Alternatives to Incarceration Unit
New York City Department of Corrections
60 Hudson Street
6th Floor
New York, New York 10013

(212) 266-1438

Alan M. Schuman
President
American Probation and Parole Association
1701 Briar Ridge Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

(703) 241-3910

Andrew L. Sonner
State's Attorney for Montgomery County
50 Courthouse Square
Post Office Box 151
Rockville, Maryland 20849-4151

(301) 217-7333
(Fax) 217-7441

Christopher Stone
Deputy Director
Vera Institute of Justice
377 Broadway
11th Floor
New York, New York 10013

(212) 334-1800
(Fax) 941-9407

Sponsors

Thomas F. Albrecht
Chief / Corrections Branch
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Room 600 B
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531-0001

(202) 514-6236
(Fax) 616-2421

David Hayeslip, Ph.D.
Program Manager
Evaluation Division
National Institute of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531-0001

(202) 307-1355
(Fax) 307-6394

Richard Sutton, Ph.D.
Program Manager / Corrections Branch
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Room 600 A
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531-0001

(202) 616-3214
(Fax) 616-2421

Facilitators

Barbara J. Auerbach
Franklin C. Farrow, Ph.D.
Katherine A. Lewis
George E. Sexton
Criminal Justice Associates
9 E. Moreland Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19118

(215) 247-1390
(Fax) 247-2330

Lawrence H. Albert, Ed.D.
Criminal Justice Associates
17 Bidwell Parkway
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002

(203) 243-1266
(Fax) 232-6007

Robert H. Lawson
Criminal Justice Associates
4221 East Lane
Sacramento, California 95864-1604

(916) 482-9725
(Fax) 487-3849

ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO'S REMARKS
TO BOOT CAMP MEETING ON 2/24/94

The Attorney General, Janet Reno began her address to the Boot Camp Meeting by referencing a homicide study done by the Center for Disease Control between 1988 and 1991. She cited the study explaining that with most homicides: the perpetrator was usually between 13 to 24; the incident usually began with an argument; the killing was done by a family member or friend; the victim and the perpetrator were usually the same sex and same race (African American male); the perpetrator usually had no prior felonies; and in most cases alcohol and firearms were involved.

The Attorney General stated that the New York Boot Camp and Aftershock Program, which she had visited prior to the meeting, including the program for female inmates and their children, offers an alternative life-style for youthful offenders caught in a life of crime. She spoke of the importance of gaining platoon identification in the boot camp, to replace gang identification in the community and to improve self esteem. She said that it is very important to maintain flexibility and to experiment with programs. In this regard, Attorney General Reno discussed the concept of a national service corps for offenders and ex-offenders as a mechanism for restitution to society and work

place readiness training. She referred to the environmental education program in her home state of Florida, YES - Youth Environmental Service, as an example of an approach that gets young people out of their destructive environments and rebuilds positive attitudes.

Attorney General Reno also discussed the concept of establishing area desks within the Department of Justice which, with the aid of electronic technology, would be responsible for coordinating all of the Department's programs in a given location. Such coordination would enhance federal, state, and local funding efforts by eliminating duplication, thus facilitating proper resource allocation.

The Attorney General then heard comments from the group, thanked the attendees for their input and departed.

RESULTS OF INDIVIDUAL GROUP EXERCISES

Conference attendees were divided into three sub-groups and asked to address three questions designed to assist BJA in formulating its agenda for boot camp development over the course of the next few year. Question #1 asked the groups to list desired individual outcomes of the boot camp experience (both the incarceration and aftercare phases); Question #2 required the groups to develop means for achieving the outcomes they had generated; and Question #3 asked the groups to engage in a simulation in which they were to advise the Attorney General how to spend \$2 billion on boot camps over a three-year period. What follows are the responses of each of the three groups to these questions.

GROUP A

GROUP A Members: Colonel Jack Davis
 Susan Hunter
 Doris MacKenzie, Ph.D.
 Howard Peters
 Alan Shuman
 Christopher Stone

QUESTION #1: WHAT OUTCOMES SHOULD BOOT CAMPS ACHIEVE?

Group A's responses can be divided into two broad categories: those pertaining to changes in attitudes and behavior, and those pertaining to the acquisition of skills and competencies. Examples of changes in attitudes and behavior include increased self esteem and confidence, desire to conform,

willingness to take supervision, belief in the ability to control the direction of one's life, and reduction or elimination of drug use. Examples of skills and competencies to be acquired include ability to weigh consequences, ability to set personal goals and develop a "game plan" to realize them, and specific life, vocational, and job skills. The group also identified a system outcome: shorter incarceration.

QUESTION #2: MEANS BY WHICH TO ACHIEVE DESIRED OUTCOMES

Group A identified several distinct issue areas: group cohesion and socialization, aftercare, employment and education, staff training and selection, and target populations and cost effectiveness.

Group cohesion and socialization were of prime interest to the group. There was considerable discussion of how the military takes individuals having radically different backgrounds and, in a relatively short time, produces a homogeneous group having a common set of attitudes and skills - this being similar to what is expected of a correctional boot camp. It was agreed that group cohesion and the socialization it leads to are key to this outcome. The military produces group cohesion by stripping individuals of their identity--taking them down to some common level of "aliveness"--and then rebuilding them to the desired end. Identical haircuts and clothing, rigid schedules of drills and exercise, and building a strong sense of mutual dependence are means the military uses to accomplish

this. The same means could be used in correctional boot camps, although other means might be used as well. At this point, a caution was raised: a danger in producing cohesion is that after boot camp what one may have is simply a more cohesive set of criminals--a more effective gang. In regard to that concern, the group emphasized the importance of providing boot camp participants with the skills and resources necessary to avoid a return to a life of crime.

Aftercare⁶ was also discussed at length. The group noted that if cohesion is key, then cohesion must be maintained after completion of the boot camp phase. This might be accomplished through maintenance of the platoon in the aftercare phase (the platoon would continue to meet regularly for exercise or treatment programs, for example) but also, and more easily, might be accomplished by encouraging regular telephone contacts among the platoon members. Thus, for example, if a platoon member is in trouble he should have the telephone number of a comrade he can call at any time for support.

Employment and education were seen as key. The group indicated that an important boot camp outcome should be a job. There was considerable discussion of the Vera Institute's

⁶The group believed that the term "aftercare" is inappropriate. It implies that what occurs after boot camp is relatively minor when, in fact, just the opposite is true: what occurs after boot camp is probably more significant than what occurs during the camp itself.

role in securing urban public service jobs for graduates of New York State's boot camp program. The difficulty and effort required in securing such jobs was described, one of the problems being union opposition. A sincere commitment by top public officials to the effort and its success is critical. Also discussed was the role of education in boot camps. It was pointed out that for many boot camp participants, restarting the education process is critical. After restarting the process, the eventual goal should, at a minimum, be attainment of the GED. The six month maximum boot camp period (as specified in the Crime Bill) was deemed by the group to be sufficient. However, this should not preclude an individual's spending more than six months in the boot camp by recycling the individual through the boot camp if he is not meeting standards.

Staff selection and training were discussed next. The group emphasized the importance of quality supervisory staff to the success of the boot camp experience. Critical here are both staff selection and staff training--initial and ongoing. Prior military supervisory experience should not be a selection criterion. However, it was noted that DOD money may be available to retrain current military personnel for jobs in correctional boot camps.

Target population and cost effectiveness. It was noted that boot camps will not be embraced by jurisdictions unless they have an incentive to do so. Toward that end, system outcomes such as

shorter incarceration and reducing the costs of incarceration are important, and target populations that lead to net-widening should be avoided. The group understood that the Crime Bill focuses on a non-violent target population, but believed that this would not necessarily have to lead to net-widening, citing as an example the large number of non-violent offenders incarcerated for drug offenses in some jurisdictions. The group indicated that a boot camp's program should not be viewed as fixed. Rather, the boot camp's performance should be reviewed periodically and its program reoriented as necessary.

QUESTION #3: WHAT SHOULD BJA DO WITH ITS RESOURCES?

The awarding of planning grants was immediately suggested and endorsed. Such grants would enable BJA to winnow out weak proposals and focus resources on a few quality sites. It was recommended that planning grant money be used to enable applicants to visit model operating programs and, with such visits in mind, it was suggested that an applicant not be allowed to incorporate a program element in a boot camp proposal unless the applicant could cite a successful operating example of that element.

It was recommended that only comprehensive programs having a solid evaluation component be funded. However, the money need not be used solely to fund new programs; there should be the flexibility to fund programs at any stage of planning or implementation and to fund programs that have been planned or

implemented independent of BJA resources. Funding should be available (and its expenditure encouraged) to enable the applicant to better select and train personnel to operate the boot camp.

The group recommended that the "hoops" an applicant has to pass through to secure funding be minimized. Indeed, it was suggested that BJA provide training to applicants on how to prepare an effective application, thereby placing unsophisticated applicants on an equal footing with those who have had considerable experience writing grants. The group noted how costly it is to develop and operate effective jobs, education, and treatment programs and to undertake meaningful outcome evaluations. In that light, the group did not find it unreasonable to expect that funds of the magnitude proposed by the Crime Bill could be spent on a limited number of comprehensive boot camps that would be rigorously evaluated.

GROUP B

GROUP B Members: Denise Quarles
Colonel William Holmberg
Captain Robert Bradley
Judge Dalton Roberson
Carol Shapiro
Chase Riveland
Ronald Powell, Ph.D.

QUESTION #1: WHAT OUTCOMES SHOULD BOOT CAMPS ACHIEVE?

In Group B the list of individual outcomes centered around

several different categories. The first outcome expressed by the group was an improved attitude, a desire that the boot camp change the offender into a law abiding citizen. This idea of improved attitude, improved self-discipline, and improved self-esteem was stated several times by different members of the group. In accord with these ideas, another member of the team expressed a desire to see the offenders learn to embrace positive character traits and to strengthen social skills. Several members related a concern that offenders learn sound decision making and conflict resolution skills. That they should think about consequences of behavior prior to acting, and that they should accept responsibility for their actions both fell under this category of improved attitude.

Substance abuse treatment, education, and relapse prevention strategies were highlighted by the group as mandatory outcomes. There was little discourse around the merits of this category; all agreed that it was necessary.

Employment related needs were a frequently mentioned category. Several members of the group wanted offenders to have access to a job or hope of one, while others noted the importance of having a transferable skill acquired in the boot camp which then could be used back in the community. Others wanted to instill the work ethic in offenders. Still others wanted them to learn how to get and keep a job. All felt this was a vital outcome for an offender.

Other outcomes that were mentioned were: the need for safe and decent housing in the community and the need for the offender to understand that he/she is part of something bigger and that he/she can positively affect the world. Another point that arose was the need that certain offenders have for parenting skills and for access to a mentor. Mentioned too was the need to learn how to eat well and to maintain physical health.

QUESTION #2: MEANS BY WHICH TO ACHIEVE DESIRED OUTCOMES

There were several distinct issues with which the group contended, including continuity in service delivery, strategies for service delivery, interagency teams, and staff selection and training.

Continuity in service delivery was of prime importance to the group. It was established that boot camps are treatment programs which provide military discipline. Because of this, leadership must begin to acknowledge long-run factors such as the need for a continuum of service delivery and the time limitations associated with those deliveries.

Strategies for service delivery were also discussed by the group. The need for alternative boot camp models which utilize the basic tenet of the present day boot camp--discipline--but present the tenet differently (for example, tai-chi, sports, yoga, and outward bound programs) was endorsed by the group. The notion of promoting interagency resource allocation appealed to the group as well. By promoting an interagency "team," services

could be more efficiently allocated which would also result in increased cost effectiveness. This interagency coalition might also include private service providers such as the Habitat for Humanity. Offenders need to receive a tailored approach to service delivery. They should be involved in case management and contracting to empower themselves and find a sense of direction.

Staff selection and training were also important to the group. Staff must be trained and screened by content experts to highlight their awareness of potential abuse. The group felt that this training should lead to certification. New grievance procedures should also be created, as appropriate.

QUESTION #3: WHAT SHOULD BJA DO WITH ITS RESOURCES?

The group was once again fairly united on the issues that should be covered in any BJA boot camp solicitation. Program components such as the outcomes previously listed should be mandatory. Additional non-mandatory components would facilitate experimentation, a notion which the group encouraged. The structural foundations to facilitate the program outcomes would be established by a multi-agency, intergovernmental, private sector partnership. These agencies would work together to reduce overlapping programs, fulfilling each other's needs in a cost efficient way. Successful service delivery would mean continuous service delivery from the institutional phase to the aftercare phase. Within this continuum of service delivery, a mandatory deliverable is a job. The group defined "job" to include either

continued education, world-of-work programs, skills training, or an actual job.

GROUP C

GROUP C Members: Colonel Eugene Nervo
Robert Boruch, Ph.D.
Thomas Coughlin
Scarlett Carp
Andrew Sonner
Michael Gatling
James Austin, Ph.D.

QUESTION #1: WHAT OUTCOMES SHOULD BOOT CAMPS ACHIEVE?

In spite of the directive to the group to focus on individual outcomes resulting from the boot camp experience, some of Group C's attention was given over to system outcomes. The three categories which captured the majority of the group's attention, however, were all focused on the individual. First, various elements of increased self-esteem and self-respect were most frequently mentioned by the group. The need to develop a new respect for one's self as well as for others, to improve self-discipline, and to strengthen social skills in general, all fell under this category. Tangentially, the need to improve physical and mental health were noted.

Employment related needs were the next most frequently mentioned. Several group members noted the importance of increasing skills in understanding and assessing employment opportunities, including the existence of jobs in other jurisdictions as well as the local market. Improvements in

literacy and vocational skills were referenced as well. The transition from boot camp to the community also captured a major share of this group's attention. Members noted the critical importance of transferring skills and attitudes acquired in the boot camp back to normal community life. A smooth transition as a law abiding citizen from camp to community was seen as key by several members of the group.

Substance abuse treatment and education--whether all boot camp inmates should have it or just those who are in fact addicted, and whether it should be tailored to individual circumstances--was an issue which engaged the group as well. Finally, two important individual outcomes emerged from the group: that the inmate understand punishment had occurred and that the inmate be given an opportunity to restore his or her victim.

As to system-related outcomes, the need to insure that incarceration in a boot camp involve a shorter period than would be the case in a traditional prison was also viewed as essential, both from the point of view of cost savings (seen as critical if boot camps are to be "sold" to the public) and from the point of insuring that the detrimental effects of traditional incarceration be avoided. Reduced recidivism was also seen as an important individual and system outcome.

QUESTION #2: MEANS BY WHICH TO ACHIEVE DESIRED OUTCOMES

Group C addressed this question not strictly from the point

of view of the specific outcomes it recommended as a result of Question #1, but rather as a general challenge to recommend to BJA a strong design approach. Several distinct issues were of interest to the group: target populations, costs, after care, the role of the military, evaluation, and BJA's relationship to other federal agencies.

Target population. In addition to the discussion noted above as to whether boot camp inmates need necessarily have a drug or alcohol addiction, the group wrestled with the larger issue as to whether first time, "front end," non-violent offenders were the only appropriate target population for boot camps. If additional target populations were to be considered, changes in approach should also be considered. For example, there was some discussion that the boot camp experience might be thought of as a therapeutic community with the addition of military drill and ceremony; the therapeutic community aspects, at a minimum, could appropriately be made available to longer term, "back door" inmates who might be offered early release in conjunction with these services in some settings. Another suggestion was to explore a sports model, rather than the current military model. The group wrestled with the notion of including violent offenders, noting that at a minimum by removing non-violent offenders from traditional prisons, more attention could be devoted to the violent offender. As to whether participation in the boot camp need be voluntary, there was general consensus

that it was the preferred approach, but some willingness to experiment with the non-voluntary approach as well.

Cost effectiveness was given a great deal of attention by the group. The tension between the desire to provide a multitude of services (both during the incarceration phase and after release) and the need to demonstrate to the public that boot camps are less expensive than traditional forms of incarceration was examined in some depth. It was noted that short-term cost effectiveness would not necessarily lead to long-term cost savings. That is, by avoiding the provision of services such as literacy and vocational training, drug rehabilitation, housing, etc. in the short run, the risk increases that an individual will recidivate ultimately, resulting in cost increases to society overall.

Aftercare interested the group as well. There was no debate as to the merits of aftercare (though it was pointed out we have no data as to the effectiveness of significant aftercare since none has ever been provided and thoroughly evaluated); the group agreed that the typical 90 to 120 day stay in the boot camp was not sufficient to effect permanent skill or attitude change. Suggestions were made as to how aftercare might be improved, generally centering on the need for stronger continuity between the incarceration and the community phases of the boot camp experience. Toward that end, it was suggested that a platoon amp drill instructor might move with and stay with the platoon in the

community. It was further suggested that the ACA should explore the possibility of developing aftercare standards, both to insure quality service delivery and to insure that meaningful evaluation could eventually take place. The notion of a significantly longer period of involvement following boot camp incarceration, in a form mimicking the Civilian Conservation Corps camps of the 1930s, was suggested. The group encouraged experimentation of this sort, with the caveat that it take both rural and urban forms.

The role of the military in boot camps was discussed as well. The group's military representative expressed a strong opinion that the military approach was not appropriate for short-term incarceration with no parallels to technical training and long-term employment.

Evaluation was seen as critical by the group, as the logical offshoot of its recognition that the nation is about to become engaged in a major social experiment. The notion that we must seize the opportunity to measure the results of various approaches was strongly held. The group felt that experimentation should be encouraged at all costs and an outside evaluation team should be engaged so as to ensure a standardized approach.

BJA's interaction with other federal agencies was to be encouraged, to provide additional resources to participants, to increase the coordination among agency efforts, and to take

advantage of knowledge already developed by such organizations as HHS, the Department of Labor, the Department of Education, and HUD. The group also felt that coordination among discrete agency efforts at the grantee level should be encouraged.

Finally, there was some discussion about the fact that the discontinuation of the military draft had removed an avenue of escape from poverty and crime-ridden neighborhoods for a large segment of the nation's youth, very probably contributing to the rise in criminal activity among this population and, thus, indirectly to the need for correctional boot camps. The group pondered the potential of correctional boot camps to supply some of those lost opportunities as a significant program goal.

QUESTION #3: WHAT SHOULD BJA DO WITH ITS RESOURCES?

As an overall approach, the group strongly favored experimentation in as many forms as possible. Planning grants (for six months) and demonstration grants (for up to 3 years, if possible) were both recommended; support for multiple models was encouraged; and partnerships with other federal and state agencies, as well as with the private sector, were endorsed.

It was suggested that multi-site saturation would be valuable, putting a significant amount of money into a relatively small number of sites. Under this approach, sites with boot camps already in place, some of which could experiment with new approaches and some of which could continue existing approaches,

as well as new sites, would be funded. Multi-state and multi-locality sites were also of interest to the group, including the notion of a regional boot camp. There was strong feeling that money for construction should be limited, perhaps through a high match requirement in BJA's solicitation. Applicants might also be required to prove that any surplus federal properties in their jurisdictions had been considered prior to a request for construction monies.

Evaluation was seen as key to BJA's ability to have any impact on the future of boot camps. A standardized, external, outcome focussed evaluation was identified as essential and it was suggested that positive incentives to cooperate should be provided to the sites, if necessary.

Provision for aftercare (including both urban and rural approaches, as appropriate) and adequate monies devoted to transition were both identified as essential elements of a winning proposal.

As to appropriate target populations, proof of cost-effectiveness (through a reduction in the length of incarceration and/or the selection for participation in this alternative to incarceration of groups which would otherwise have been incarcerated) was also noted as a requirement. In an unusual twist, it was also suggested that BJA's normal prohibition against "supplanting" (the use of federal funds to support state or local functions otherwise funded by state or local monies) be

dropped so that resources freed up by the boot camp could be devoted to improved treatment of the system's existing violent offenders, thus potentially demonstrating an additional positive impact of the boot camp. Positive outcomes initiated as a result of this legitimate form of supplanting would then be included as "successful" aspects of the boot camp experiment.