

STATE CRIME COMMISSION

CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS AND GOALS STUDY

Study Group: Corrections

Date: October 28, 1975

Position Paper Title: Institutional Treatment  
Programs, CR 2-1

Issue Statement

How can the current approach to institutional treatment in Georgia be made more effective?

Conclusion

The Department of Corrections and Offender Rehabilitation (DCOR) should, in January, 1976, establish the Performance Earned Release Model (PERM) in a pilot project in at least two institutions to test the efficacy of the rehabilitation model that is based upon the offender taking responsibility for his own behavioral change. The pilot project should last for at least three years with a three-year follow-up on all offenders who participate in the pilot project. Since the PERM model is based upon a contractual agreement with the offender, project participants should be those sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act and the Adult Offender Act, with the Board of Pardons and Paroles acting as a third party to the contract. This pilot project should be funded through a discretionary grant from LEAA.

Furthermore, DCOR should insure that the two institutions chosen to participate in the pilot project have, in place, all of the rehabilitative programs necessary to adequately test the PERM model.

Research Findings

Problem Identification

That Georgia's correctional institutions are faced with a crisis of unprecedented proportions is undisputed. Georgia has the highest per capita ratio of incarcerated offenders of any state: over 200 offenders per 100,000 population.<sup>1</sup> These prisoners, numbering 10,984,<sup>2</sup> are crowded into 15 State and 38 County Correctional Institutions (CCIs) which were designed to house only 9,137 incarcerants.<sup>3</sup> And if present trends continue, the Department of Corrections and Offender Rehabilitation projects that by mid-1978, 16,442 persons will be committed to State and County prisons,<sup>4</sup> each of whom presently costs the State \$3,317 per year.<sup>5</sup>

In addition, institutional efforts to prevent these prisoners from returning to lives of crime so far have failed to demonstrate effectiveness. Georgia has a recidivism rate of 53%, meaning that 53 out of every 100 prisoners released from Georgia institutions will be

59/60

re-arrested and later convicted, or have their paroles revoked, within three years of their release date.<sup>6</sup>

Institutional programs designed to rehabilitate prisoners are numerous and varied, although plagued by serious staffing and facility limitations. These programs include sophisticated diagnosis and classification capability, counseling, educational and vocational services, recreational programs, alcohol and drug treatment facilities, religious services, correctional industries, and others.<sup>7</sup> That these services are extremely limited in scope, however, can be seen from the fact that only one part-time psychiatrist<sup>8</sup> and 72 counselors<sup>9</sup> are expected to serve all 10,984 offenders.

In addition to the fact that rehabilitation programs are simply inaccessible to large numbers of offenders, the research which has tested the effectiveness of such programs nationwide has consistently failed to show that they have any significant effect in reducing recidivism rates.<sup>10</sup>

Thus DCOR is faced with a burgeoning and expensive prison population, a very high recidivism rate, and a body of research which so far fails to show that rehabilitation efforts work to reduce recidivism.

#### Other States' and Federal Experience

In the traditional "medical model" of corrections, the prisoner is viewed as an unhealthy member of society who may be amenable to recovery if provided with the correct mode of treatment. This treatment usually consists of the types of specialized services mentioned above: counseling, educational and vocational opportunities, drug treatment, good-time provisions, and others. In addition to these services, humanitarian efforts have been made over the years to upgrade prison conditions by improving living space, sanitation, medical care, and providing religious and recreational activities. Such improvements are hoped to have a positive effect on prisoners and to at least provide conditions where rehabilitation can take place.

The following is a description of some programs which have been tried in other States and/or the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

##### (A) - Diagnosis and Classification

The Federal Bureau of Prisons and many State correctional systems have diagnostic and classification capabilities by which offenders are tested, interviewed and observed for the purposes of designing treatment programs which will meet their individualized needs. In some cases the diagnostic capability is not fully developed because the system lacks sufficient institutional staff to implement the treatment plans designed.<sup>11</sup>

##### (B) - Counseling

The prison systems of the Federal Government and every State surveyed attempt to provide counseling services to inmates. However, the number of counselors available is usually so limited that the scope of services is severely curtailed.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons' goal, which has not yet been reached, is to assign one counselor to every twenty-five offenders. The Bureau employs sixty-nine psychologists, fifteen trainees, and four-hundred case managers, in addition to twenty psychiatrists, to perform counseling services. The ratio of counselors to offenders varies among the institutions. In some of the larger institutions, the population has been divided into Functional Units of 100 offenders each. These units make possible more intensive supervision, improved staff communication, and increased participation by the offender in the institution's decision-making process.<sup>12</sup>

While every State surveyed provided some type of counseling to offenders, the types of treatment vary. Reality therapy, transactional analysis, and behavior modification, in both individual and group settings, are among the modalities utilized.<sup>13</sup>

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections is using the innovative concept of "support teams". Each offender has a support team composed of his counselor, work supervisor, cellblock officer and educational advisor. The team works together in making key decisions relative to the offender's status, program and conduct. Although the support team concept is working well, it is inhibited by lack of sufficient manpower.<sup>14</sup>

#### (C) - Drug Treatment

Of the 23,604 offenders incarcerated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, approximately 4,000 have problems related to drug abuse.<sup>15</sup> For these prisoners, the Bureau operates two kinds of drug treatment programs.

The first program is for offenders who have been committed under the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act (NARA). NARA offenders may not have been committed for a violent crime and may not have had two prior convictions. They are treated in any of eight intensive therapeutic community treatment centers. The program's success rate, based on the adjustment of the NARA offenders after two years in the community, is calculated to be 46 percent.<sup>16</sup>

The second program is a new one which is similar to NARA but which contains several significant differences. In this model, up to 100 offenders are housed in nine facilities throughout the country. Since the counselor-to-offender ratio is smaller than in the general institutional population, more intensive treatment can be given. To date, however, there are no statistics available on the success of this approach.<sup>17</sup>

#### Educational and Vocational Services:

The Federal Bureau of Prisons devotes considerable attention to educational and vocational programs, employing 453 staff to operate them. Of the 23,604 Federal prisoners, 4,083 are enrolled in Adult Basic Education, 4,914 in the General Equivalency Diploma Program, 5,794 in college courses, and 8,027 in vocational training.<sup>18</sup>

Six States have established "Special Purposes School District," which allow the correctional systems to operate their educational programs similarly to any other school district.<sup>19</sup> For example, in Ohio, the Department of Corrections operates seven branch campuses of its special school district in accordance with established educational standards. Because the district is chartered by the State Department of Education, the offenders who complete the program may be awarded high school diplomas, credit toward diplomas, or GED's. The chartered status also makes the district eligible for Federal educational funds and technical assistance from the State Department of Education.<sup>20</sup>

The Texas Department of Corrections has operated a special school district since 1961.<sup>21</sup> During FY 1974, 4,820 offenders received GED certificates through the program.<sup>22</sup> The Department also operates one of the largest and most comprehensive college correctional programs in the country.<sup>23</sup> During FY 1974, 1,764 offenders were enrolled in college courses,<sup>24</sup> and 207 earned degrees.<sup>25</sup>

In New Jersey, the Garden State School District, created in 1972, serves not only the Division of Correction and Parole, but also the Divisions of Mental Health and Hospitals, Mental Retardation, Youth and Family Services, and the Commission for the Blind.<sup>26</sup> The New Jersey program has a strong vocational component with courses in 37 vocational areas offered.<sup>27</sup> State law sets the ratio of educational staff to socially maladjusted offenders at 1 to 12.<sup>28</sup>

Connecticut's correctional educational program is coordinated with the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. Through the College Level Examination Program, inmates are able to receive college credit for knowledge they have obtained not only through formal study but also through private reading, employment experience or other non-traditional ways. The Connecticut Department of Correction also has an Artist-in-Residence Program at two institutions wherein painting, sculpturing, and engraving are taught.<sup>29</sup>

In Pennsylvania, offenders can be trained through post-secondary education as para-teachers. These offenders, some of whom are serving life sentences, then serve as teachers' aides or as tutors to other inmates.<sup>30</sup>

The District of Columbia is utilizing the innovative approach of "contract parole." In cooperation with the General Motors School, the Washington Board of Trade, and the District of Columbia Automotive Dealers Association, a class of twenty offenders can take a 13-to-20 month course in auto body repair. When an offender completes the course, he is granted parole and guaranteed a job in a Washington auto body shop.<sup>31</sup>

#### Correctional Industries:

Many prison systems have industries in which offenders work and may in some instances learn a marketable skill through on-the-job training.

The Federal Prison Industries (FPI) has been a self-sustaining Governmental Corporation for over forty years, after an initial capital outlay of \$4,146,000.<sup>32</sup> The FPI Board of Directors is required to provide

employment to all physically fit Federal incarcerants.<sup>33</sup> The offenders may earn "extra good-time" for their work.<sup>34</sup> The goods produced by the Industries may be used in the Bureau of Prisons or sold to other Federal agencies, but they may not be sold to the public in competition with private enterprise.<sup>35</sup>

Minnesota, which has had a Correctional Industries Program since 1887, has no laws forbidding the sale of the prisoner-manufactured goods to the public. Moreover, the offenders may receive up to \$2.50 per day for their work, and in some cases, even share in any profits realized by their factories. Offenders with good work records receive bonuses when the retail value of their goods exceeds the cost of manufacturing them in any given month.<sup>36</sup> Minnesota is now exploring the possibility of introducing private industry to the prisons. Two corporations, Control Data and 3-M, are interested and have agreed to pay offenders at the same rate as their regular employees.<sup>37</sup>

The Texas Prisons Industries, which operates 22 industrial plants, is totally coordinated with the Department's vocational and educational programs. The offender receives classroom and some on-the-job training before he begins work.<sup>38</sup>

In New York, the correctional industries division has just completed a two-year contract with the EDO Corporation for a pilot project at one institution. This was the first attempt in the country to bring private industry directly into a correctional program. Training and production were combined in the fields of electronics and fiber glass, and the products were sold to New York State agencies.<sup>39</sup>

The Bridge Rehabilitation Project at the Washington State Penitentiary is a non-profit corporation managed by the offenders with supervision from the correctional officers. Funded with a Federal grant in 1972,<sup>40</sup> the program has failed to reach its goal of complete self-sufficiency because the profits were not large enough to pay the salaries of the correctional officers.<sup>41</sup>

#### Religious Services:

Traditionally, correctional religious programs consist of part-time chaplains who conduct regular religious services for inmates. The Federal Bureau of Prisons, however, is currently evaluating the traditional roles of its thirty full-time chaplains and twenty-one priests. The Bureau is considering broadening the responsibilities of the chaplains to include not only conducting religious services, but also involving the community in the correctional religious programs and involving the chaplains in public relations work.<sup>42</sup>

#### Recreation:

In the Federal system, one recreation specialist is employed in each institution to supervise the wide range of sports and other leisure time activities available to the inmates. The Bureau does not, however, have any centralized staff to oversee recreational programs for the entire system.<sup>43</sup>

The States surveyed offered a wide range of traditional recreational opportunities. The most outstanding State institutional recreational program is probably that of the Kentucky Department of Corrections.<sup>44</sup> The Department's Recreation Leader, Mr. John Pike, has won national recognition for his program, which is credited with reducing the number of escapes from 300 to 400 a year to only forty in FY 1974. Over 1,000 intramural and varsity sports are scheduled each year for Kentucky's 3,024 inmates. The program includes weight-lifting, ping-pong, pool, basketball, softball, volleyball, flag football, trampoline and tennis.<sup>45</sup>

In New York, the Street Theatre, founded in 1970 by Gray Smith, offers both theatre training workshops and touring company performances to eight prisons. This Federally-funded program is the first in the nation to respond on a statewide basis to the cultural needs of offenders.<sup>46</sup>

#### Good-time Provisions:

"Good-time" refers to the amount of time by which an offender can reduce his sentence. In some jurisdictions, it is computed automatically from the day the sentence commences, in others it must be earned, and still other jurisdictions use a combination of both types.<sup>47</sup>

Under the Federal system, "statutory good-time" is granted to all offenders incarcerated for definite terms other than life sentences.<sup>48</sup> It is computed, from the first day of each sentence, as a deduction from the length of the sentence.<sup>49</sup> "Extra good-time" may also be granted to an offender who provides exceptionally meritorious service or who performs duties of outstanding importance to institutional operations.<sup>50</sup>

Arkansas has operated an earned good-time program since 1969. An offender is placed in one of three classifications based upon his performance. The amount of earned good-time varies with each classification. In Classification III, the offender can receive a maximum of eight additional good-time days per month; in Classification II, he can earn a maximum of twenty additional days; and in Classification I, he is eligible for up to thirty days per month. While the earned good-time program has proven to be an effective measure for inmate incentive and control, it is weakened by the fact that the Arkansas Parole Board can refuse to grant parole to an offender even though he has earned sufficient good-time for release.<sup>51</sup>

The Texas law governing good-time is one of the most liberal in the nation. It, too, is based on the notion that good-time is not a right but must be earned by the offender as evidenced by his conduct and work record. An offender can receive a maximum of thirty days good-time for each thirty days he serves, and the good-time he receives is applicable to his parole eligibility and discharge dates. In addition, offenders are rewarded for good work and behavior by being promoted to more desirable jobs within the institution.<sup>52</sup>

#### Current Georgia Experience

Georgia has instituted many of the same types of correctional programs that have been tried in other States and in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The conditions and rehabilitation programs found in Georgia's

prisons are described below. Limited funds, especially when coupled with rising prison populations and spiraling costs, inhibit the scope of these programs.

Prison Conditions:

A. Living Space

Georgia's correctional institutions are seriously overcrowded to the detriment of rehabilitation efforts. The 8,385 persons incarcerated in fifteen State prisons are housed in facilities designed for only 6,866 bed spaces.<sup>53</sup> In the thirty-eight County Correctional Institutions (CCI's), 2,599 offenders are crowded into buildings built to hold only 2,271.<sup>54</sup> Although DCOR has adopted the National Advisory Commission optimal standard of allowing eighty square feet of living space per offender, in thirteen of the fifteen State institutions, and in twenty-two of the thirty-eight CCI's, prisons are allotted fewer than even the minimal standard of 56 square feet each.<sup>55</sup>

The space that is available ranges from poor to average in all institutions. Most of the bed space has to be arranged in dormitory fashion to accommodate all the prisoners. In the twelve older State facilities, no consideration was given to including space for treatment programs in the building design. Only in the newer institutions, the Diagnostic and Classification Center, the Walker and Montgomery Correctional Institutions, and the Rehabilitation Center for Women, has space been allotted for the conducting of rehabilitation programs.<sup>56</sup>

B. Medical Services

DCOR's medical program is severely understaffed. In 1973, then Commissioner Ellis MacDougal of DCOR appointed a "blue ribbon" committee of medical experts to survey Georgia's institutional health care. The Committee's report found "an understaffed, highly fragmented health care system which was incapable of delivering adequate health care to Georgia's incarcerated offenders."<sup>57</sup> There are only six full-time licensed physicians assigned to three institutions. Those facilities which are not assigned physicians each have one medical assistant on twenty-four hour call. Although the Talmadge Hospital in Augusta provides some emergency treatment, it allots only ten beds to serve all of the State's 10,984 prisoners. In addition, the hospital's location in the far eastern section of the State makes it virtually inaccessible to many institutions. The women's facility in Milledgeville is in desperate need of a physician.<sup>58</sup>

In addition, although prescriptions are issued only by licensed physicians, the dispensing of medication is not always supervised by a registered pharmacist but is often handled by physicians' assistants and medical technicians.<sup>59</sup>

On the positive side, despite the insufficient number of physicians, each offender is given a prompt medical and dental examination upon his commitment to an institution.<sup>60</sup> Also, the Department has been granted \$400,000 in LEAA funds to begin implementing expanded medical programs.<sup>61</sup>

### Treatment Programs:

In addition to lack of space, DCOR's treatment programs suffer from an insufficient number of qualified staff to operate them. For example, while an effort is made to provide the inmates with counseling services, only seventy-two counselors are available to work with the 10,984 offenders. Moreover, only approximately 36 percent of a counselor's time is spent in actual counseling activities, the remaining time being devoted to administrative tasks. While every State and most of the County institutions have at least one full-time counselor, it can readily be seen from the offender/counselor ratio of 153 to 1, and the administrative demands on the counselors' time, that any meaningful counseling program is precluded.<sup>62</sup> Under current conditions, if every offender were to receive counseling, the maximum time he could receive would be 29.4 minutes per year.<sup>63</sup>

### Educational and Vocational Services

#### A. Education

Georgia's correctional educational program is operated by the State Department of Education, with the majority of the funds appropriated by the General Assembly. Some Federal funding, including educational funds for young, adult Basic Education and Department of Labor funds for vocational training, are also available through the Department of Education. Funds are funnelled through this department to the CCI's to staff the County programs.<sup>64</sup>

In State institutions, about 1,274 offenders are enrolled in education programs, while in the CCI's, about 400 are enrolled. These offenders represent approximately 14 percent of the total number incarcerated. Approximately 19 percent of the offenders population are estimated to need educational services. In all but four State institutions, the basic education curriculum has been individualized to meet the needs of the offender.<sup>65</sup>

The State Merit System requires that teachers in the correctional system meet normal State certification requirements for teachers. Although they are not required to do so, a number of teachers have received master's degrees in educational counseling under a work/study program funded by LEAA.<sup>66</sup>

Legislation was drafted in 1974 to create a special school district within DCOR, similar to that in several other States and to Georgia's Schools for the Blind and for the Deaf. The legislation could not be presented to the General Assembly, however, because a constitutional amendment would be required to add another school system to the 188 already in existence.<sup>67</sup>

There are currently 256 offenders enrolled in college programs.<sup>68</sup> Twenty offenders attended college through the Educational Release Program which allows the inmates to attend classes off the institutional ground.<sup>69</sup> DCOR subcontracts with South Georgia College to provide a program for the inmates of Georgia State Prison, while State Grants-In-Aid to private



colleges fund programs at Truett-McConnell College, Mercer University and Brewton Parker College to serve the offenders in three other State prisons.<sup>70</sup>

#### B. Vocational Training

Georgia's vocational programs have been developed with the objective of providing the offenders with skills which will enable them to enter the labor market at the entry levels of numerous trades. The trades which are offered were selected on the basis of Department of Labor and Department of Education statistics about job opportunities. There has not been, however, any follow-up on the offenders' assimilation into the labor market.<sup>71</sup>

Eight institutions provide vocational shop training.<sup>72</sup> Approximately 750 offenders, or about 7 percent of the total population, were enrolled in training in 1974. It is estimated that 10 percent of the offenders require vocational services.<sup>73</sup>

An in-service training program conducted for the vocational instructors in January, 1974, indicated that they are in serious need of additional training themselves.<sup>74</sup> One other drawback to the program is that it is not closely correlated with the basic education program.

#### Correctional Industries:

The Georgia Correctional Industries Program is a non-profit organization which was chartered by the State Legislature in 1960.<sup>75</sup> As it is intended to be self-sustaining, it does not receive any portion of DCOR's appropriated funds.<sup>76</sup>

The majority of incarcerated offenders are from the lower socio-economic classes and lack marketable job skills. In fact, there is a significant and positive correlation between unemployment rates and Georgia's prison population.<sup>77</sup> Correctional Industries, in conjunction with the vocational training program, has the potential to provide these offenders with salable skills. However, only 450 offenders, working in nine plants located at six institutions, currently participate in the program.<sup>78</sup>

In addition to training these offenders for work, the Correctional Industries Program attempts to simulate actual work environments to the degree possible. For example, the offender may be required to fill out a job application, submit to an interview, compete for promotions and be subjected to performance evaluations on the job.<sup>79</sup>

Although Georgia law<sup>80</sup> authorizes paying inmates for industry work and for services performed at the institutions, there are insufficient funds to pay all offenders who would be eligible for the \$25 per month maximum compensation. Therefore, to avoid inequities which some feel could trigger riots, no offenders are paid for any services rendered.<sup>81</sup>

The Correctional Industries Program is prohibited from selling its products on the open market.<sup>82</sup> Although there is a law requiring State agencies to obtain goods and services from the program if they have been certified, this law is not presently enforced.<sup>83</sup>

The principal source of income for the Industries from 1965 to 1971 was the manufacture of license plates. The program operated at a deficit until 1975 when it realized a profit of \$437,172.00, also attributed to producing tags.<sup>84</sup> Recent legislation makes it possible for a particular institution to receive credit toward its operating budget for up to 20 percent of any surplus earnings realized by its industries.<sup>85</sup>

Correctional Industries could be improved by being expanded, diversified and permitted to operate by free market criteria in order to become self-sustaining. In addition, the now fragmented services offered to the offender, including diagnosis, vocational training, industries work, work release and parole, should be coordinated to meet the needs of the individual incarcerated.<sup>86</sup>

The Committee on Correctional Facilities of the State Bar has received a grant to devise ways to strengthen the present correctional industries program. The objective is to have all offenders paid salaries for their work, with appropriate deductions for taxes, social security, room and board, support for dependents, victim restitution and savings. The Committee also hopes to develop two alternative models for the industries:

- 1) Offender enterprises to be organized and operated by the inmates.
- 2) A coalition of private and public resources, combining both prisoner and private labor, and functioning under all regular labor laws with appropriate deductions from wages.<sup>87</sup>

By making participation in Correctional Industries voluntary, by paying prevailing wage rates, and by bringing the Industries under Federal and State labor laws, exploitation of the offenders would be avoided.<sup>88</sup>

#### Religious Services:

The present religious program is not meeting the spiritual needs of the offenders because there are insufficient numbers of religious personnel.

For example, only four State institutions have full-time chaplains; the remaining eleven have access to only the part-time services of otherwise-employed ministers. The full-time chaplains that are available have no opportunities for further training or for sabbaticals, thereby tending to become "institutionalized" themselves.<sup>89</sup>

In general, the religious program consists of offering the services of the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths. Some additional religious counseling may be available on occasion for other sects as well, including the Muslim faith. No effort is made to provide offenders with special diets for religious purposes.<sup>90</sup>

#### Recreation:

One full-time recreation leader is funded at each DCOR institution. He may be assisted by volunteers, other institutional staff, and summer interns. A wide variety of recreational activities are offered, with an

estimated 95 percent of the institutional population participating. The program is hampered, however, by lack of space. Only one State facility has a gymnasium, and none of the County prisons have one.<sup>91</sup>

Coordinated Services:

An effort to coordinate the services available to an offender, and to tailor them to his individual needs, has been made through the Youthful Offender Act.<sup>92</sup> This Act, which went into effect on July 1, 1972, allows judges to commit offenders between the ages of 17 and 25 to indeterminate sentences not to exceed six years. The length of a particular offender's incarceration is determined by a contract made between him and DCOR. The contract includes:

- A) an agreement by the offender to complete certain programs successfully;
- B) the conditions of his incarceration, and
- C) an agreement from the Youthful Offender Board to consider his conditional release on a specified date.

The programs in which the offender agrees to participate can include vocational training, academic instruction, personal growth groups, institutional work assignments, and work or educational release. After release from the institution, the offender is supervised by a parole officer for at least one year.<sup>93</sup>

Through the contract technique, the responsibility for length of incarceration and for rehabilitation is placed on the offender. As of July 1, 1975, 1,207 offenders had been committed under the Youthful Offender Act. Of these, 690 had been incarcerated, and 651 of them already released. The average length of incarceration was only one year. Only thirty-four of the offenders, or 5 percent of the total, have been returned to the institution after their release for either parole revocation or conviction of another crime. This represents the lowest rate of return for any program in Georgia's correctional system.<sup>94</sup>

On July 1, 1976, a similar law, the Special Adult Offender Act, will go into effect. This Act, which will serve offenders over age 25, will allow for indeterminate sentences not to exceed five years.<sup>95</sup>

It should be noted that despite contracts for conditional release upon completion of an individualized program, under the Georgia Constitution, only the Parole Board has final authority over the release of offenders from incarceration before they have served out their sentences.

In an effort to advance the concept of mutual contract release agreements, DCOR initially proposed a modification of the existing powers of the Parole Board--one that would essentially limit the release authority of the Board to capital offense cases only. Since the powers of the Board are established by the Georgia Constitution, a referendum leading to an amendment would be necessary to effect such a modification. Also, the Board has chosen to defend its definition and prerogatives, and thus a climate of controversy prevails at the time of this writing.

Authoritative Opinions

Traditional Rehabilitation Model

Traditional correctional theory revolves around the medical model described above. The convicted criminal was viewed as sick, and the correctional system was charged with curing or rehabilitating him. The types of services described previously were recommended in order to provide the offender with the psychological, physical, social, spiritual and vocational resources which he needed in order to become a productive member of society.

Numerous standards have been designed for the purpose of delineating either the ideal, or in some cases at least the minimally acceptable, correctional system based on the rehabilitation model. For example, the American Correctional Association (ACA), in its Manual of Correctional Standards, lists eight essential elements of a successful offender rehabilitation program:

- (1) Discipline should be maintained primarily through counseling. Psychiatrists and clinical psychologists should serve as the core counseling staff, supplemented by trained counselors in various specialties.
- (2) Individualized academic, vocational and social services should be available.
- (3) Offender-oriented groups should be conducted so that the offenders can discuss matters of general welfare.
- (4) Leisure time activities should be offered, including adequate staff and facilities for a variety of recreational activities.
- (5) An adequate medical program should provide both preventive and corrective services.
- (6) Adequate and qualified personnel should manage the institution.
- (7) The institution should be located reasonably close to community resources.
- (8) Community relations should be cultivated.<sup>96</sup>

The National Advisory Commission (NAC) recognizes the rights of every person in custody to "a healthful place in which to live" and to "medical care... comparable in quality and availability to that obtained by the general public."<sup>97</sup> These rights are also supported by the American Civil Liberties Union.<sup>98</sup>

Counseling programs are traditionally viewed as essential to motivating behavioral changes in offenders. The NAC proposes that "each institution should begin immediately to develop planned, organized, ongoing counseling programs..." at three levels: individual, small group and large group.<sup>99</sup> The ACA Manual of Correctional Standards states that counseling, case work and clinical services are an indispensable part of the correctional system.<sup>100</sup> The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice supports the use of group counseling to regulate standards of inmate behavior and to allow for more extensive communication among offenders.<sup>101</sup>

The importance of educational and vocational programs is recognized by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, which recommends that such programs be upgraded and extended to all offenders who can profit from them.<sup>102</sup> The NAC suggests that educational and training programs should be individualized and geared directly toward reintegrating the offender into the community.<sup>103</sup>

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice also supports correctional industries programs. The report emphasizes that both the public and the government should realize that it is extremely undesirable for offenders to be idle. It also recommends that laws prohibiting the sale of prison-made goods on the free market be reduced if not eliminated.<sup>104</sup> The NAC supports the diversification of industrial programs to meet offenders' needs. It recommends that all work be part of a training program which includes involving the offender in decisions about his assignment, providing him with opportunity to achieve in a productive job in order to increase his self-confidence, assisting him in developing skills in a number of areas, and instilling good work habits by providing incentives. The NAC further recommends that inmates be compensated for their work that is of economic benefit, and that by 1978 they be compensated at prevailing wage rates.<sup>105</sup>

The availability of religious services within correctional institutions is also endorsed by several authorities. It is recommended by the American Bar Association that religious activities be made available to each prisoner. It is noted, however, that no prisoner should be compelled to participate in such activities.<sup>106</sup> The ACA echoes this stand by strongly favoring the availability of institutional religious programs, but recognizing the inmate's right to refuse to see a religious representative.<sup>107</sup> The NAC states that prisons should develop a full range of religious programs, with the chaplain playing a key role. To prevent the chaplain's "institutionalization", he should be required and funded to take sabbaticals. The report further recommends that community representatives should be included in the programs, and as many sects as possible should be accommodated.<sup>108</sup>

Dr. Karl Meninger, of the Menninger Clinic in Kansas, sees recreation and play as corrective and preventive measures in terms of mental health.<sup>109</sup> The American Bar Association suggests that every prisoner who does not work outdoors is entitled to at least one hour of daily exercise, with adequate space and equipment for physical and recreational training provided.<sup>110</sup> The NAC views recreational activities as "an important resource for changing behavior patterns of offenders."

It recommends that every institution have a full-time qualified recreation director, that a broad range of activities be available, and that the recreational program provide for ongoing interaction with the community.<sup>111</sup>

#### "Rehabilitation is a Myth" Viewpoint

Recently, several correctional authorities have raised serious doubts about the validity of the rehabilitation or medical model of corrections. It is interesting to note, however, that as far back as 1841, John Augustus, who was the father of American probation, referred to the "folly of attempting to force a man into a reformation."<sup>112</sup> After prison riots in 1952 and 1953, John Barttow Martin wrote that rehabilitation was an unrealistic and unattainable ideal,<sup>113</sup> and Ben Bagdikian made the same observation after Attica.<sup>114</sup>

This viewpoint has been gaining wider acceptance in recent months. Robert Martinson, a sociologist from the City College of New York, reviewed 231 studies of correctional treatment conducted since 1945 and concluded, in 1973, that current rehabilitation programs do not affect recidivism rates.<sup>115</sup> William Nagel stated in 1973 that after years of experimenting with advanced treatment techniques, "we did not appreciably change the recidivist rate."<sup>116</sup> In 1975, Norman Carlson, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, came to the same conclusion and "instructed his staff to remove the term 'rehabilitation' from their lexicon."<sup>117</sup>

Goldfarb and Singer, who published a detailed analysis of the present corrections system, consider their book as supporting "a massive indictment of our corrective system." They argue that reform could take two routes. The first would be to "clean up the system" by hiring additional personnel and other similar methods.<sup>118</sup> The authors regard this approach as "superficial and cosmetic" and recommend the second route of "more profound changes."<sup>119</sup> They support Martinson's insistence that "the myth of correctional treatment is the main obstacle to progress... (it) prevents the sound use of resources to balance public protection and inmates' rights..."<sup>120</sup> Dr. C. Ray Jeffery, a criminologist working to apply environmental design to the control of criminal behavior, also supports Martinson. He views the persistent attempts to reform offenders as based on a mistaken assumption that we know how to rehabilitate them.<sup>121</sup>

In a recent survey of 31 administrators of adult prison systems conducted by Corrections Magazine, 19 of them stated that in their opinion institutional treatment programs have not worked.<sup>122</sup>

#### New Directions

One reaction to the wave of discouraging research results has been the suggestion to abandon the rehabilitative model altogether.

For example, in Illinois a legislative commission is studying the basic reworking of the State's correctional system. Components of the new

system would include the following:

- (1) Fixed, determinate sentences to replace the current indeterminate sentences such as "one to twenty years."
- (2) An end to parole.
- (3) An end to using subjective rehabilitation factors in determining release.
- (4) An end to mandatory offender participation in rehabilitation programs.
- (5) One day reduction in sentence for each day of good behavior in the prison.
- (6) Life sentences would receive no "good-time", but the Parole Board could reduce the sentences.<sup>123</sup>

However, although the research results on treatment efforts have been discouraging, they do not necessarily mean that the programs should be totally discarded. Such programs may be effective if they are viewed as resources which the offender can use in his efforts to rehabilitate himself. If the offender becomes responsible for his own behavior and growth, and the system becomes responsible only for providing him with the necessary resources to become a productive member of society, rehabilitation may be successful.<sup>124</sup>

Dr. Allen Ault, Commissioner of DCOR, has adopted this philosophy in his "New Direction" program. The goal of New Direction is to make the offender responsible for earning, through appropriate behavior, his release from the institution. The offender progresses through several stages of "PERM", the "Performance Earned Release Model", in which he must consistently meet established performance criteria for work, vocational training and/or education. Movement through the stages is based on an individual plan which is drawn up by the offender and his counselor to meet his particular needs. At each successive stage, the offender earns additional time off from his sentence in the institution. The model follows through with intensive community supervision after the offender is released from prison.<sup>125</sup>

There are arguments against such a contract system. One authority feels that the contract method would simply "formalize the 'game' that some prisoners play--enrolling in various programs to make points toward parole."<sup>126</sup> However, this criticism fails to take into account that the same game is played under the current system and that the players are almost invariably paroled or "maxed-out" with no supervision whatsoever.<sup>127</sup> In addition, there is some evidence that by concentrating on objective, measurable behaviors that relate to the offender's positive behavioral changes, a reduction in game-playing, or dissimulation (concealing facts and feelings under a false appearance) can be achieved.<sup>128</sup>

It should be noted that participation in such a system would be strictly voluntary. While there have been no landmark court decisions addressing the offender's right either to be treated or to refuse treatment, in the mental health field, these rights have been clearly established and even extended to the criminally insane. 129

Alternatives

1. Make no changes in the current approach to institutional treatment and release from prison.

Advantages:

- A. Would not require legislation.
- B. Would not entail additional financial cost.
- C. Would keep intact the present responsibilities and authority of DCOR and the Board of Pardons and Paroles.
- D. Would not incur resistance from traditionally-oriented corrections personnel.
- E. Would not necessitate an additional complex computerized system of accounting for inmate programs.

Disadvantages:

- A. The present approach to institutional treatment, which has apparently fallen into some degree of national disrepute, would be perpetuated.
- B. Corrections personnel would continue to be expected to rehabilitate offenders with methods that have not been successfully demonstrated.
- C. The responsibility for rehabilitation would remain with correctional authorities rather than with the offenders themselves.

2. Concede that nothing works, discontinue all treatment programs except those that are obviously necessary, e.g. medical services, and adopt a punitive philosophy toward corrections.

Advantages:

- A. Would not require legislation.
- B. Would reduce the existing costs of treatment programs.
- C. Would keep intact the basic responsibilities and authority of DCOR and the Board of Pardons and Paroles.



- D. Would probably be applauded by what seems to be a growing public attitude against the "coddling" of offenders.
- E. Would simplify the existing system of accounting for inmate progress.
- F. Would reduce the present classification process to a basic consideration of custody level.
- G. Would routinize parole considerations for eligibility based upon existing statutes and release consideration based upon acceptable behavior in prison.
- H. Would reduce the current cost of research, planning and the evaluation of treatment programs.

Disadvantages:

- A. Would eliminate treatment programs for inmates who not only need them but actually desire them.
- B. Would probably result in an increased rate of recidivism.
- C. Could lead to the introduction of flat sentencing practices and the abolishment of parole altogether, in which case additional legislation and an amendment to the Constitution would be required.

3. DCOR should establish the institutional component of the PERM model as a pilot project in at least two locations. The Board of Pardons and Paroles should act as a third party to the treatment-release contracts between DCOR and offenders and the Board should retain its position as the final release authority. The pilot project should be conducted for six years, which would allow for a period of three years to initially test operations and for an additional three years of follow-up on persons released under the program. (Please refer to Position Paper CR 2-5 on the post-release components of PERM).

Advantages:

- A. Would shift responsibility for the consequences of behavior from corrections personnel to the offender.
- B. Would test the effectiveness of more measurable and objective criteria for release.
- C. Would represent a departure from a current system that has failed to demonstrate effectiveness.
- D. Would permit an assessment of this new approach before attempting to introduce new legislation or amend the Constitution.

- E. Would test effectiveness before attempting statewide changes and investing large sums of money.

Disadvantages:

- A. Would involve additional cost.
- B. Would necessitate the implementation of a computerized system for keeping an accurate account of individual inmate progress.
- C. Would require special training for personnel engaged in performance rating.
- D. Objective criteria for measuring performance through observable behavior would have to be established.

Recommendation

Alternative 3 is recommended. This recommendation is based upon the belief that DCOR and the Board of Pardons and Paroles will reconcile their differences and reach a cooperative agreement in the very near future. Once that has been accomplished, the PERM model should be tested on inmates sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act and the Adult Offender Act of 1975. If this course is followed, no additional legislation will be required for a pilot effort.

DCOR should establish the institutional component of the PERM model as a pilot project in at least two locations. The Board of Pardons and Paroles should act as a third party to the treatment-release contracts between DCOR and offenders and the Board should retain its position as the final release authority. The pilot project should be conducted for six years, which would allow for a period of three years to initially test operations and for an additional three years or follow-up on persons released under the program.

Implementation

The operational concept of PERM has already been designed in detail although some ramifications have not yet been finalized. Basically, only two things are needed to make PERM a reality on a pilot basis: (1) a cooperating agreement between DCOR and the Board of Pardons and Paroles, and (2) financial considerations.

DCOR should seek financial support through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) discretionary grant program. An application for these funds should be completed by November 1, 1975. If the grant is awarded, the pilot project should be able to start-up shortly after the first of calendar Year 1976 (refer to Position Paper CR 2-5 for the post-release components).

In addition, DCOR should insure that all of the rehabilitation programs necessary to test the efficacy of the PERM model are in place, and fully staffed, before the pilot projects begin at both of the institutions chosen for testing the model.

Financial Impact

It is estimated that the institutional component of PERM will require \$900,000 in LEAA funds for a two year period. This will necessitate State match in the amount of \$100,000 or \$50,000 per year.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. "National Incarcerant Population Trends: (1-141);" by Melinda Benekar, Research Assistant, Department of Offender Rehabilitation, November, 1974. (Note: The District of Columbia, with 447 inmates per 100,000 population in 1974, was the highest reported).
2. Department of Corrections and Offender Rehabilitation (DCOR), State Institution Monthly Population Report, August 19, 1975; hereafter, DCOR Population Report.
3. Interview with Bob Houghton, Assistant Commissioner, Facilities Engineer, DCOR, June 5, 1975; hereafter, Bob Houghton.
4. State Crime Commission, 1976 Georgia State Crime Commission Comprehensive Plan for Criminal Justice; hereafter, Comprehensive Plan.
5. Interview with Bill Baughman, Director of Planning and Evaluation, DCOR, July 15, 1975. The cost of incarcerating one offender per year is estimated at \$17,678. Research to arrive at this figure is based on a population of 6,122 offenders. A breakdown of the cost is as follows: \$3,317 for institutional costs to maintain one offender per year; \$12,450 for potential generated income loss per offender per year (based on using an economic multiplier of \$3.00); \$650 for family welfare costs per offender per year; and \$275 for tax loss per offender per year.
6. Research and Development Division, DCOR, "Recidivism Rate of Georgia Prisoners is 53 Percent," (May 1, 1975). According to the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (NAC), recidivism consists of (1) criminal acts that resulted in conviction by a court, when committed by individuals who are under correctional supervision or who have been released from correctional supervision within a specific tracking period, and by (2) technical violations of probation or parole in which a sentencing authority took action that resulted in an adverse change in the offender's legal status.

Georgia calculated its recidivism rate according to NAC's definition. The Georgia figure is based on computer analysis of records of 262 offenders who were released during the fourth quarter of 1971. During their first year after release, 56 had been arrested; another 59 were arrested in their second year, and another 24 in their third--a total of 139, or 53 percent. Only arrests leading to conviction or revocation were counted.
7. Comprehensive Plan
8. Interview with Dr. Omar Perez, Physician, Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Center, DCOR, June 23, 1975.

9. Jack Caldwell, Deputy Commissioner for Institutions, DCOR, "Institutional Treatment Programs Questionnaire," June 11, 1975; hereafter, Jack Caldwell.
10. Robert Martinson, The Treatment Evaluation Survey. State of New York (1973).
11. Interview with Dr. Levinson, Administrator of Inmate Program Services, Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBP), July 11, 1975; hereafter, Dr. Levinson. The statistical information is extracted from FBP reports dated June 29, 1975.
12. Dr. Levinson
13. R. Farrow, Governor's Intern, Institutional Treatment Program Survey, June 11, 1975; hereafter, Randy Farrow.
14. A. Astrachan, Corrections Magazine, "Profile/Pennsylvania," p. 50, (1975); hereafter, A. Astrachan.
15. Dr. Levinson
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Interview with Shelby Johnson, Assistant Administrator of the Education Branch, FBP, July 11, 1975; hereafter, Shelby Johnson. The statistical information is extracted from FY 1974 FBP reports.
19. Interview with Tony Trivisano, Executive Director, American Correctional Association, (ACA), July 10, 1975; The six states are: Arkansas, Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and Texas.
20. State of Ohio, Department of Corrections, "Report of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction," p. 17, May 1974.
21. State of Texas, Department of Corrections, "Annual Report," p. 27 (1974); hereafter, Texas Annual Report.
22. Interview with John Rathke, Principal, Windham School District, Texas Department of Corrections, July 14, 1975.
23. Texas Annual Report, p. 27.
24. D. Kirpatrick, Assistant Director of Treatment, Texas Department of Corrections, "Institutional Treatment Program Questionnaire," June 20, 1975;
25. Texas Annual Report, supra at 27.

Currently participating in the Associate degree program are Alvin Junior College, Lee College, Braxport Junior College, and Hender County Junior College.

In 1974, there were 96 offenders enrolled in 14 courses being taught in cooperation with the University of Houston at Clear Lake City, Sam Houston State University, and Stephen F. Austin University. Bachelor degrees

may be earned by offenders upon completion of curricula requirements which are consistent with each college's catalog since all credits earned are residence credits. It is anticipated that the first degree will be awarded in the 1976-1977 school year.

26. Interview with Ann Marlow, Assistant Superintendent for Administration, New Jersey Department of Corrections, August 4, 1975.
27. Ibid.
28. New Jersey Stat. Ann., § 18A96-13 (1973).
29. State of Connecticut, Department of Correction, "Program Notes," pp. 2,4 (1974).
30. A. Astrachan, column 2
31. M. Serrill, Corrections Magazine, "Profile/District of Columbia," col 2, p. 42, (1975).
32. United States Department of Justice, Federal Prison Industries, Inc. (FPI), pp. 3-4, (1973-1974). FPI offers the following: (1) employment producing over 40 different types of products through a diversified program of industrial operations, (2) marketable skills, and (3) financial compensation.  
The Atlanta Federal Penitentiary is a self-maintaining institution. The industrial plants employ more than 1,000 offenders in the textile factory, mattress factory, sign factory, basket factory, and canvas specialty factory. The yearly output is between 15 and 18 million dollars. Offenders receive financial compensation ranging from \$60.00 to \$173.00 per month. Profits from correctional industries are used to pay operating expenses, meritorious compensation for offenders, to finance vocational training programs, and to provide employment-placement services for offenders being released. See United States Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C., pp. 22-23 (undated).
33. Ibid.
34. 18 U.S. C.A. § 4162.
35. 18 U.S. C.A. § 4122.
36. M. Settill, Corrections Magazine, "Profile/Minnesota," cols. 2,8 (1975).
37. Ibid., at cols. 1,9
38. Texas Annual Report
39. Interview with Wilson Dean, Assistant Director of Correctional Industries, New York Department of Corrections, July 11, 1975.
40. Interview with Mr. Don Johns, Assistant Superintendent of Planning, State of Washington, Department of Corrections, July 20, 1975.

41. Interview with Mr. Freeman, Associate Superintendent of Treatment, State of Washington, Department of Corrections, July 20, 1975.
42. Dr. Levinson
43. Shelby Johnson
44. M. Serrill, Corrections Magazine, "Profile Kentucky," cols. 1, 17 (1975).
45. Ibid., at cols. 1, 22.
46. State of New York, Administrative Office, "The Street Theatre," (undated).
47. Georgia Law provides for two distinct methods of providing a prisoner with "good-time." See Georgia Code Ann. § 77-320 (1973); Georgia Board of Corrections Rules 125-2-2-.04 (1975).
48. 18 U.S. C.A. § 4161.
49. Ibid., "Good-time" is computed as follows: Six days for each month if the sentence is more than one year and less than three years; six days for each month, if the sentence is more than one year and less than three years; seven days for each month, if the sentence is not less than three years and less than five years; eight days for each month, if the sentence is not less than five years and less than ten years; ten days for each month, if the sentence is ten years or more.
50. 18 U.S. C.A. § 4162.
51. Interview with James Mabry, Arkansas Department of Corrections, June 24, 1975.
52. Vernon's Ann. Tex. State., Art. 6184L.
53. DCOR, Population Report.
54. Ibid.
55. DCOR Report of Living Area by Square Footage, September 30, 1974.
56. Bob Houghton.
57. The Report of the Medical Advisory Committee to the Department of Offender Rehabilitation, January, 1974.
  - A summary of the committee's findings is as follows:
    - (1) Charts and records are inadequate and incomplete in all areas of health care.
    - (2) There is no Health Services Director to coordinate and administrate health care within the system.
    - (3) Institution physicians are underpaid and overworked.

58. Interview with Hugh Hendrix, Administrator of Medical Services, DCOR, June 19, 1975; hereafter Hugh Hendrix. The GDCC has the most adequate number of medical staff of the institutions, consisting of two licensed physicians, one physician's assistant, six medical technicians, one part-time pharmacist, and a psychiatrist who works one day a week. There is a need for one more full-time psychiatrist, two clinical chaplains, and two psychologists to serve the 824 offenders.
59. Jack Caldwell
60. Hugh Hendrix
61. Ibid.
62. Jack Caldwell
63. The figure was calculated as follows: 2080 manhours per counselor per year x 72 counselors = 14,976 hours available. 14,976 x .36 = 5,391 hours actually available for counseling. 5,391 hours ÷ 10,984 inmates = 29.4 minutes per offender per year.
64. Interview with Ann Delatte, Director of Education Services, DCOR, August 6, 1975; hereafter, Ann Delatte.
65. Anne Delatte
66. DCOR Summary of NAC Standard 11.4, Education and Vocation Training, at 5.
67. Interview with Joe Edwards, Deputy Superintendent, State Department of Education, August 12, 1975.
68. Jack Caldwell
69. DCOR Summary of NAC Standard 11.4, Education and Vocation Training
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.
72. Ann Delatte;
  - (1) Georgia Industrial Institutue offers Auto Body and Fender Repair, Auto Mechanics I and II, Air Conditioning and Heating, Barbering, Electrical Repair, Food Service Training, Masonry, Plumbing, Small Engine Repair, Upholstry, Welding, Woodworking, and Food Services.
  - (2) Georgia Rehabilitation Center for Women offers Cosmetology and Office Practice.
  - (3) Georgia State Prison offers Auto Body and Fender Repair, Auto Mechanics, Masonry, Building Maintenance, and Small Engine Repair.
  - (4) Georgia Training and Development Center offers Auto Mechanics, Building Maintenance, Drafting and Graphic Arts, Bricklaying, Barbering, Welding, Small Gas Engine and Motorcycle Repair.



(5) Lee Correctional Institution offers Auto Mechanics, Plumbing, and Barbering.

(6) Lowndes Correctional Institution offers Auto Mechanics and Digital Business Machine Repair and Heating and Air Conditioning.

(7) Wayne Correctional Institution offers Building Maintenance, Cooking, and Baking.

(8) Georgia Industrial Institute and Stone Mountain Correctional Institute offer certified on-the-job training programs.

(9) Walker Correctional Institute offers Brick Masonry, Welding and Machine Repair.

73. Comprehensive Plan

74. DCOR Summary of NAC Standard 11.4, Education and Vocation Training, supra.

75. Georgia Code Ann. § 77-902 (1973).

76. Georgia Bar Association, "Report on the Correctional Facilities and Services Committee of the State Bar of Georgia to the Board of Governors of the State Bar of Georgia," p. 11 (1975).

77. DCOR Bulletin of Research and Development Division, "Unemployment is a major cause of Population Increase;" The number of unemployed Georgians for each month between January, 1967 and December, 1974 was obtained from the State Department of Labor. The number of State Offenders incarcerated in Georgia institutions was collected for the same seven year period. A statistical analysis of these monthly figures revealed a strong relationship between unemployment and institution population exists in this State. ( $r=.651$ ,  $p=.00001$ ) The strength of this finding can be summarized by stating that 42% of the incarcerants can be explained by the number of unemployed workers. The chances of this finding occurring by chance are less than one in ten thousand.

78. Mike McGuinn, Special Assistant to the Commissioner assigned to Corrections Industries; The location of each industry is as follows: (1) Stone Mountain Correctional Institute (SMCI), printing plant; (2) Lee County Correctional Institution (LCC), tire recapping plant; (3) Lowndes County Correctional Institution, screen sign plant; (4) Montgomery County Correctional Institution, wood products plant; (6) Georgia State Prison (GSP), license tag plant; textile products plant, concrete products plant, upholstery/ refinishing plant, and the metal products plant; hereafter, Mike McGuinn.

79. Ibid.

80. Georgia Code Ann. § 77-318

81. Mike McGuinn

82. Georgia Code Ann. § 77-318

83. Mike McGuinn
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid.
87. Interview with Frances Furlow, State Bar of Georgia, Project Director, Committee on Correctional Facilities and Services, July 3, 1975.
88. Ibid.
89. Interview with Bill Goins, Director of Religious Therapy Programs, DCOR, June 7, 1975.
90. Ibid.
91. Interview with Bob Martin, June 7, 1975.
92. Georgia Law 1975, 1312.
93. Annual Report, DCOR, (1974).
94. Ibid.
95. Georgia Law 1975, 900.
96. American Correctional Association (ACA), A Manual of Correctional Standards (Washington, D. C., 1971). Hereafter, ACA Correctional Standards.
97. Corrections, National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (Washington, 1973), p. 35, Standard 2.5.
98. American Civil Liberties Union, "The Rights of Prisoners," 86 (1973). The Association of State Correctional Administrator's position is that upon admission to any correctional facility, the admitting officer should determine whether the offender being admitted should receive immediate medical attention. Any individual who is suspected of being ill, physically injured, emotionally disturbed, or under the influence of alcohol or narcotics should receive immediate medical treatment. Offenders confined in any correctional facility for as long as seven days should be examined by appropriate health services personnel within that period, and treatment should be provided. Association of State Correctional Administrators, "Uniform Correctional Policies and Procedures," 17-20 (1972).
99. Corrections, p. 385, Standard 11.9.
100. ACA Correctional Standards, Chapter 25.

101. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (1967), pp. 48-53; hereafter Task Force Report: Corrections.
102. Ibid; The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, p. 175.
103. Corrections, p. 368, Standard 11.4.
104. Task Force Report: Corrections, pp. 54-56.
105. Corrections, p. 387, Standard 11.10.
106. American Bar Association, Council of State Governments, Compendium of Model Correctional Legislation and Standards (1972), p. IV-12.
107. ACA Correctional Standards, Chapter 29.
108. Corrections, p. 381, Standard 11.7.
109. Karl Menninger, The Crime of Punishment, 72 (1968).
110. Model Penal Code, p. IV-10.
111. Corrections, p. 383, Standard 11.8.
112. R. Goldfarb and L. Singer, After Conviction, 206 (1973).
113. Ibid.
114. Ibid.
115. Martinson, The Treatment Evaluation Survey.
116. William C. Nagel, The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison, 138 (1973).
117. Atlanta Constitution, April 10, 1975.
118. Goldfarb, 675.
119. Ibid.
120. Robert Martinson, "The Paradox of Prison Reform," New Republic, 23 (April 23, 1972).
121. C. Ray Jeffery, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, 1971.
122. Corrections Magazine, 1975.
123. News Release, Office of Governor of Illinois, Feb. 8, 1975.

124. American Correctional Association, Mutual Agreement Program: A Planned Change in Correctional Service Delivery, 6 (November, 1973).
125. A. Ault, Commissioner, DCOR, "Georgia Corrections, A New Direction," 5, April 18, 1975.
126. Maurice Siegler, Chairman, U. S. Parole Board, "Federal Probation," June, 1975.
127. Robert Martinson, "The Paradox of Prison Reform - III: The Meaning of Attica," The New Republic, April 15, 1972.
128. J. Bogan, "Client Dissimulation: A Key Problem in Correctional Treatment," Federal Probation, 20-23, March 1975.
129. O'Conner v. Donaldson, U. S., SCT, L. Ed. 2d (Case No. 74-8) (June 26, 1975). See also Wyatt v. Stickney, 325 F. Supp. 781 (M.D. Ala. 1972), aff'd sub nom., Wyatt v. Aderholt, 503 F. 2d 1305 (5th Cir., 1974), Davis v. Watkins, 384 F. Supp. 1196 (N.D. Ohio, 1974), and U. S. v. Moore, 486 F 2d 1139 at 1246 (D.C.C.A., 1973) (Wright, J. dissenting).

**END**