

Approved: 2/4/94
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Jerry Moran at 10:00 a.m. on January 21, 1994 in Room 514-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senator Harris (excused)
Senator Rock (excused)

Committee staff present: Mike Heim, Legislative Research Department
Gordon Self, Revisor of Statutes
Jerry Donaldson, Legislative Research Department
Darlene Thomas, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Steve Phillips, Probation Facilities, Georgia Department of Corrections
Thomas S. White, LMSW, Ph.D., representing the National Association of Social Workers

Others attending: See attached list

Thomas S. White, LMSW, Ph.D., representing the National Association of Social Workers, spoke to the Committee as an opponent of boot camps (Attachment No. 1) and answered questions from the Committee.

Paul Shelby, Assistant Judicial Administrator, was not among the scheduled conferees, however, the Committee addressed questions to him. The Committee expressed concern that the judges are not using the boot camp facilities. It was requested that judges who are using the boot camps as well as those not using it be asked to testify before the Committee.

Senator Brady said he had received a copy of the "Assessment of the Labette Conservation Camp Referral Process" prepared by James Austin, Ph.D. of the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. and suggested the Committee be provided with this information (Attachment No. 2).

Steve Phillips, Probation Facilities, Georgia Department of Corrections provided information about the Georgia boot camp and answered questions from the Committee by telephone conference call. He stated boot camps are among three types of residential programs Georgia offered as alternatives to incarceration. They have a detention center program, with no age restriction, which is similar to their boot camp program and a diversion center program where the participants leave during the day to go to work and return at night. All participants are under a sentence of probation in these programs. They have two kinds of boot camps. One is the probation boot camp program and the other is the inmate boot camp program. The inmate boot camp program is designed for adult offenders who have been sentenced to prison. They go through a screening process to determine if they meet the criteria before they are given the opportunity to participate in the inmate boot camp. The probation boot camp has been in operation since the 1980's. They have 475 in their three stand alone probation boot camps throughout the state of Georgia. The boot camp participants have a highly structured day to include: physical training, work detail, comprehensive programs in education, substance abuse, etc. Boot camp participation is from 90 to 120 days. Age restrictions are 17 to 30 at the time of sentencing. A 1991 report gives the following return rate of graduates from boot camps: 6 months-10%, 12 months-22%, 24 months-35%, 36 months-40%. The return rate of those going to prison were: 6 months-11%, 12 months-26%, 24 months-44%, 36 months-53%.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, Room 514-S Statehouse, at 10:00 a.m.
on January 21, 1994.

A motion was made by Senator Petty and seconded by Senator Vancrum to approve the minutes of the January 19, 1994. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 25, 1994.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: Senate Judiciary Committee

DATE: 1-21-94

[illegible]

TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO "BOOT CAMPS" FOR JUVENILES

Given by Thomas S. White, LMSW, Ph.D.

January 21, 1994

Representing the National Association of Social Workers

I. Kansas juveniles may not under federal and state constitutions and statutes be placed in "boot camps" under the direction of the Department of Corrections, because:

- A. Reasonable efforts must be made to maintain children in their own homes before they can be removed therefrom.
- B. Children must be treated or otherwise served in the least restrictive environment consistent with their interests and the protection of the community. "Boot Camp" confinement and rigid discipline simply do not meet the "least restrictive" criteria.
- C. In order for any juvenile to be placed in a "boot camp" under the legal and physical custody of the Secretary of Corrections or of any department or agency other than SRS, such juvenile would have to be charged, certified, tried and sentenced as an adult felony offender. The cost of this including court appointed counsel and jury trials would be prohibitive. Attempts of the State to circumvent these requirements would provoke next-of-friend and/or other class action challenges.

II. The Legislature can best help juveniles by

- A. Concentrating on the economic development of the state: More and better jobs constitute the rising tide which raises all ships, including those of self-esteem, perceived fairness and equality of opportunity, and in general physical and mental health and family eufunction as opposed to family dysfunction.
- B. The Legislature and SRS, the legal establishment and the courts, educational and religious and all other social and cultural "institutions", and the business/commercial sector should do everything possible to re-empower families, with particular reference to enabling and encouraging parents to exercise reasonable and necessary authority and control over their children without fear of being "hot lined" for verbally admonishing children within the bounds of prudent restraint, denying or withholding privileges and/or allowances, and otherwise helping children learn and identify with acceptable social behavior; to achieve as highly as possible within the limits of their abilities, and especially to "choose and own their own behavior".. to appreciate and accept responsibility for their behavior and its consequences.

Truste Judiciary
1-21-94
Attachment #1-1

C. The Legislature can most effectively and efficiently reduce family dysfunction and juvenile crime by pursuing economic development initiatives as mentioned above, and by an immediate expansion of family preservation programs. The two basic elements of achieving such expansion are:

1. Providing funding for employing and training more SRS family preservation social workers, and expanding family preservation services state-wide through a combination of SRS direct services, and contract arrangements with other providers of such services.
2. The recommendation I am going to make here is an absolutely critical one. Family preservation social workers need ready access to cash funds for discretionary use in assisting families in crisis or chronic need through temporary provision of necessities, and in enabling and empowering families to achieve autonomy and independence through case management services. Such services should be available by any family in need by referral or upon direct application, and should be offered on a purely volunteer basis, without stigma of any kind. Successful models for such programs and services are available for adaptation to Kansas. Funding (for monies used by the social workers, as opposed to the salaries of the workers) can be provided by a "Family Preservation Trust Fund" to be authorized by the Legislature, and to be located administratively within, and managed by, the Corporation for Change.

The Trust can be funded without any legislative appropriation, any new taxes, or any increases in present taxes. Urgent solicitations by public officials and community leaders for contributions will be met with immediate and generous response. The Legislature should, however, in view of the critical need for and the promise of the Fund, provide special and even extraordinary tax incentives for contributors. The adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" sums up that which must be done, if we are to turn the juvenile delinquency and crime problem around, and improve family and community life.

Thank you for your kind attention. I have intentionally avoided citations of statutes and specific references to the literature. If I can be of service with respect to references or in any other way, please let me know.

Tom White

Tom White
PO Box 89
El Dorado 67042

Phone (316) 321-5458

ASSESSMENT OF THE LABETTE CONSERVATION CAMP
REFERRAL PROCESS

NIC TA No. 92S1006

Prepared by

James Austin, Ph.D.

National Institute of Corrections
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20534

October 5, 1992

Senate Judiciary
1-21-94
attachment 2-1



U.S. Department of Justice

National Institute of Corrections

Washington, D.C. 20534

Ref: NIC TA No. 92S1006

This technical assistance activity was funded by the Prisons Division of the National Institute of Corrections. The Institute is a Federal agency established to provide assistance to strengthen state and local correctional agencies by creating more effective, humane, safe and just correctional services.

The resource person who provided the on-site technical assistance did so on a contractual basis, at the request of the Kansas Department of Corrections, and through the coordination of the National Institute of Corrections. The direct on-site assistance and the subsequent report are intended to assist the Kansas Department of Corrections in addressing issues outlined in the original request and in efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the agency.

The contents of this document reflect the views of Jim Austin. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the National Institute of Corrections.

INTRODUCTION

The Kansas Department of Corrections, like 26 other state prison systems, presently operates a boot camp program for adult offenders. Since the Spring of 1991, the DOC has provided funding for the operation of a locally administered boot camp program located in Oswego, Kansas. Known as the Labette Correctional Conservation Camp (LCCC), this 104 bed, co-ed program is unique from other boot camp programs in that it is actually managed by a private provider (Correctional Services Group or CSG), which receives an annual funding appropriation of approximately \$1.2 million from the DOC.

Since the program began operations, it has been unable to reach its full capacity. During the first year of operations, the average daily population (ADP) averaged less than 50 inmates. Since March, 1992, the ADP has increased to approximately 70-75 inmates but remains well below its design bed capacity.

Concerned with these low ADP numbers, the DOC contacted the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Prison Division for purposes of receiving a short-term technical assistance grant. The TA assignment was designed to have a consultant review the selection and referral process to determine whether adjustments could be made which in turn would increase the number of program referrals.

A list of potential consultants were provided to the DOC and they subsequently chose Dr. James Austin to complete the TA assignment. Dr. Austin was contacted by the DOC's Division of

Community and Field Services, which monitors the LCCC, to arrange for a three day on-site visit by Dr. Austin which began on September 23 and was completed on September 25.

What follows is a description of the consultant's on-site activities and major findings. Recommendations are then listed for modifying the programs's current operations which would help increase the program referrals and the ADP.

ON-SITE ACTIVITIES

The first day was spent interviewing DOC Community and Field Services staff located at the DOC's administrative offices in Topeka. An initial interview was first conducted with Deputy Secretary Elizabeth Gillespie, Community and Field Services, and Terry Reiling, Parole Services, to gain an overview of the program's history and current operations. Mr. Reiling has been monitoring the program since its inception in 1991.

During this meeting statistics on the program's operations to date were provided along with written documents summarizing the program's referral process and operations. A second meeting was held with Gary Stotts, DOC Secretary, to advise him of the NIC assignment and to learn of those issues he would like to have addressed via the NIC report. All parties were advised by Dr. Austin that his report would be submitted to the DOC within two weeks and would narrowly focus on those factors which are restricting the program's ADP.

Based on these initial meetings, a list of key persons who are associated with the program and to be contacted by Dr. Austin was formulated. These individual were then contacted and arrangements made for interviews over the next two days.

Finally, a request was made by Dr. Austin to the DOC to prepare a list inmates currently in the DOC who met the eligibility criteria for LCCC and who were sentenced from the four major counties of Johnson, Sedgwick, Shawnee and Wyandotte. The printout, which listed each inmates and his/her criminal and demographic attributes, was provided that same day. The remainder of the day was spent travelling to Oswego where the LCCC is located.

The second day was spent visiting the LCCC and interviewing staff. During the morning session, interviews were conducted with Walter N. Wharton, Administrator, Judge Charles J. Sell, Labette District Court Judge, and Mayor George Hubert who is a member of the LCCC Administrative Advisory Board. During this meeting a number of issues were explored regarding the program's current operations and suggestions for increasing program referrals. A brief tour was then taken of the facility. The remainder of the day was spent in transit from Oswego to Kansas City for the next day's interviews with Johnson County Court Services and DOC Community Corrections staff.

The third day was spent interviewing Mr. Bruce Rider from the Johnson County Community Corrections and Ms. Donna Hoene from the Johnson County Court Services Office. The focus of these

interviews was to understand those factors which might be limiting referrals to the LCCC and how they might be resolved.

Telephone interviews were also conducted with Vicki Minor, Labette County Court Services, Mary Kadel, Montgomery County Court Services and Doug Irwin, Sedgwick County Court Services. These three counties have used the program far more frequently than Johnson County and, thus, provide a differing perspective on the program's potential benefits to the referring counties.

LCCC PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In theory, offenders can be referred to the conservation camp program by the courts or by the DOC. Kansas's sentencing statute (21-4603) states that offenders can be sentenced for a period up to 180 days and can be so sentenced in combination with a prison, jail, probation, a fine, community corrections or house arrest disposition. The court can also require that the offender attend and complete an alcohol, drug education, or training program. The legislation is silent on whether participation in the LCCC should be voluntary.

In practice, all of the program referrals to date have been made by the District Courts. Offenders are screened by either the county Court Services Office or DOC Community Corrections staff prior to sentencing. Assuming the offender meets the program's selection eligibility criteria and agrees to volunteer, the case is then presented before the court with a recommendation for admission

to the LCCC. Presently, the official general selection criteria is as follows:

1. First or second time felony conviction.
2. Age 18-25.
3. Determined by the sentencing court to be physically and mentally able to participate in strenuous physical activity under conditions that are highly structured and subject to strict discipline.
4. No record of violent crimes ,
5. No previous incarcerations in an adult penal institution.
6. Determined by the Sentencing Court to be free of contagious or communicable diseases and determined by the court to be not pregnant.

If the court concurs with the LCCC recommendation, the offender is sentenced to the custody of the DOC with the court suspending the sentence pending successful participation in the LCCC. The offender is then transported, at the sentencing county's expense, to the LCCC.

The program itself requires the inmate to progress through four successive levels of programming. Appendix A contains a brief description of each program level and the associated time frames for completing each level. Each level requires the inmate to participate in various programs, work assignments, and community service programs along with a rigorous physical training and challenge activities as shown in Appendix B.

Should the inmate fail to complete a particular program level, he/she will remain in that level until the inmate's behavior warrants progression to the next phase. If the inmate's behavior does not improve, he/she can remain in that level until the 180

time period has passed. Should the inmate become involved in repeated serious disciplinary problems, escapes, or a new crime, he/she will be returned to the sentencing court for re-sentencing. Counties are notified of the decision to remove the inmate with a request that they pick up the inmate within a specific time frame (usually 48 hours).

For those inmates who successfully complete the 180 day period without being removed from the program, they are returned to the sentencing judge who then usually imposes a period of probation supervision - often intensive supervision if available.

RESULTS TO DATE

As indicated above, the major issue related to the LCCC to date has been its low ADP. As shown in Table 1, prior to March 1992, the ADP was averaging only 40-45 inmates. Shortly thereafter, the population began to increase but only to the 70-75 level. It should also be noted that the program's female component has had no more than 2 participants in the program in any given month. In order for the program to remain as a cost-effective sanction for the state, it must develop new methods for increasing its referrals, which in turn will increase the ADP.

There are two factors which are causing the ADP to be so low. The first factor is the most obvious - lack of referrals. Through 1992, the monthly number of admissions has averaged 16. Two of the largest counties (Johnson and Wyandotte) have thus far referred a total of 10 cases. The DOC itself has not referred any cases to

TABLE 1
LCCC MONTHLY ADMISSIONS, RELEASES, ADP
1992

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	AVE
Admissions									
Male	6	10	24	14	22	15	21	11	15
Female	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total	6	12	24	14	23	15	21	11	16
ADP	40	45	56	63	67	69	73	76	61
Releases									
Graduates	5	3	4	5	5	12	5	16	7
Behavioral	0	2	1	7	3	8	3	1	3
Medical	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
Escape	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Abscond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Total	5	6	5	14	8	21	11	19	11

Source: LCCC Monthly Reports

the LCCC. Reasons for the lack are referrals are discussed in the following section of the report.

The second factor affecting the ADP is successful program completion rates. If a boot camp program terminates a large number of referrals prior to completion it will have a shorter length of stay which in turn will lower the ADP.

As shown in Table 2, of the 368 referrals to the program since 1991, 87 (or 24 percent of all referrals) have successfully completed the program. Nearly a quarter (23 percent) have been denied acceptance into the program by LCCC staff. Surprisingly, another 43 of the referrals did not show up meaning that there was last second change in the offender's or county's willingness to participate in the program. And finally, another 68 (or 18 percent) of all referrals were removed from the program, largely for disciplinary reasons.

These high non-graduation rates are also impacting the ADP problem. To illustrate the importance of success rates, one can estimate the rate of successful terminations required to keep the program at full capacity given the current rate of referrals. Assuming that admissions continue at 16 per month level, 75 percent of them will need to successfully terminate from the program in 6 months while another 25 percent could fail within an average time of 30 days. These rates produce a 108 ADP which is slightly above the current bed capacity. However, even assuming that all of the 87 inmates in the LCCC as of September 8, 1992 will successfully complete the program, the current LCCC success rate will be about

TABLE 2

STATISTICAL INFORMATION BY COUNTY
MARCH 25, 1991 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 8, 1992

	N	%
Referrals	368	100.0
Accepted into program	283	76.9
Denied acceptance into program	85	23.1
Inmate Population	85	23.1
Accepted/No show for program	43	11.7
Removed from LCCC program	68	18.4
Graduated from LCCC program	87	23.6
Removals:		
Behavior	51	75.0
Medical	13	19.1
Escape	4	5.9
Denials:		
Crimes against persons	56	65.9
Medical/Psychological	26	30.6
Excessive Felonies	1	1.2
Prior Incarceration	1	1.2
Age	1	1.2
Waivers: *		
Crimes against persons	68	71.6
Excessive felonies	23	24.2
Age	23	24.2
Prior Incarceration	1	1.1
Medical	3	3.2
Total number of persons	95	

* Some individuals may have more than one waiver

61 percent, which is well below the required 75 percent rate. Either the success rate must increase or the number of referrals must increase substantially.

The disciplinary removals are problematic to the referring county's for several other reasons. First, counties have indicated that they have received little information on the nature of the exact violation. Consequently, they are ill-suited to make a recommendation to the court to either have the prison sentence reinstated or recommend that another intermediate sanction be attempted. Second, cases being returned to the county causes further bureaucratic and time consuming court actions that may not have occurred had the offender received a more traditional sentence. In effect, a high failure rate can cause the program to become expensive to the referring county given that they have to pay for picking-up the program violator within 48 hours and then "reprocess" the case before the court. Successful terminations do not remove the pick-up charge but do eliminate all of the paperwork and court activity surrounding an unsuccessful termination.

This is not to say that the program should ignore disruptive behavior which is harmful to the program's objectives and goals. It only suggests that the program must carefully monitor its termination decision-making policies and recognize the consequences of a high failure rate in terms of making the program attractive or, "user friendly" from the county's perspective.

FACTORS RESTRICTING PROGRAM REFERRALS

What follows is a review of the major factors that seem to be restricting referrals to the LCCC. These are the primary issues the LCCC must address to increase the District Court and DOC referrals.

1. General resistance from selected counties

Its clear that the LCCC has received mixed reactions from the various District Courts. Several have embraced the program and are using it on a regular basis. This level of acceptance tends to occur where the judges are supportive of the program. Where such judicial support is absent, referrals are low or non-existent. What follows are some of the major factors cited by most counties which are making the program less attractive to them.

2. Selection Criteria Is Too Strict

Virtually all of the persons interviewed expressed the desire to have the program's eligibility criteria expanded. This is desirable for two reasons. First, there is a unknown but potentially large offender pool which is not being considered simply because the county has been told that such individuals will not be accepted. There are offenders who do fall outside the eligibility criteria which Court Service Office, Public Defenders,

and Community Corrections staff should be considered. Although waivers to these criteria can be made, some county's do not even attempt to have such waivers accepted by the LCCC.

Second, large number of referrals accepted by the program do not meet the official program eligibility criteria, but are admitted via the waiver process. Unfortunately, the waiver process is a separate administrative process which requires more information and time to process. If the eligibility criteria were expanded, the number of waiver requests would diminish and it would be easier for counties to refer more cases directly to the program.

3. Application Process Is Too Cumbersome And Expensive

Related somewhat to the above point, there is the overall reality that the LCCC referral process is unique and requires actions above the normal activities for the Court Service Officer, Community Corrections, or the DOC. Again, this is not a criticism per se but a reality the LCCC must deal with and try to overcome. Perhaps over time, the application process will seem less onerous to the courts. But as presently constructed, an LCCC application requires a special effort by the County. Indeed, the LCCC has implemented many policies to make the referral process and response to referrals as quickly

as possible. Decision are to made within 24-36 hours upon receipt of a referral packet. But despite these efforts, the perception persists that the LCCC referral process is more difficult than any other community based sanction.

Listed below are the unique hurdles one must go through to have a case reviewed for program acceptance:

- Medical Exam

As part of the application, the county must have the applicant undergo a medical exam. The official referral instructions indicates that this can be done by a health professional but counties seem to have interpreted this as requiring an exam by a physician. The exam is done at the county's expense (cost estimated at \$25-\$40) and may have to be done either at the holding jail or in the community if the offender has been released from custody. No other community-based sanction has such a requirement.

- Optional Psychological Exam

There may be a requirement to have a psychological exam or clearance completed. This does not happen often but apparent occurs with enough frequency so that two county's cited it as a problem. Again, arranging the interview and determining who will pay for it negatively effect the county's decision to refer a case.

- Criminal Record Check

Referring counties are responsible for conducting a criminal record check. In most cases, this has been done as part of the pre-sentence investigation by the court services office. However, the LCCC requires a further verification of the offender's prior record which is then forwarded to the LCCC for its own internal review. Again, this requirement is unique for the LCCC. One suggestion is to equip the LCCC with its own access to NCIC or the state criminal history records (KBI) which would allow the LCCC to conduct its own criminal record assessment.

4. Confusion Among The Judges On How To Sentence People To The Program

Two of the counties interviewed expressed confusion on how the LCCC cases are to be sentenced under the current penal code. In particular, are the offenders to be sentenced to the care of the Secretary of Corrections with the provision that upon successful completion of the program that the sentence will be modified, or, are they to be sentenced to probation with the provision that the first 180 days be spent in the conservation camp? Although this is not a big issue, it would be advantageous for the state to review the penal code and clarify this issue.

5. Large Number of Program Failures

This issue has been discussed earlier.

6. Access to External/Community Based Rehabilitation Services is Limited

The geographic location of the LCCC hinders its ability to offer rehabilitative and treatment services from existing county, state, and private agencies. In particular, access to existing drug treatment programs, community service opportunities and vocational training programs are in short supply in the Labette area. The absence, or perception, of limited treatment and rehabilitative programs associated with the program

translates into counties believing that they can provide more opportunities to cases they might otherwise refer to the LCCC. This factor was especially emphasized by Johnson County which already offers the court and offenders placed in the community with a wide array of programs and drug treatment opportunities.

7. Program Is Too Long For Some Offenders

Concern was expressed that the program made been too long for some offenders. Counties have offenders who they might otherwise refer if the program duration was in the neighborhood of 90-120 days instead of the current six month schedule. It is not clear from a county's perspective why there could not be alternative program schedules requiring less time while still keeping the 180 day schedule for those who believe that such lengthy period was needed.

8. Overall Purpose of the Program and How It Fits Within the Current Continuum of Criminal Justice Sanctions

Finally, it is not clear to all counties how the LCCC is filling a specific gap in the current range of criminal justice sanctions. In other words, what is unique about the LCCC aside from the military training component, and how does this program fill an existing gap in the current range of sentencing options now available to the court? Again, there is a perception of some counties that the

LCCC does not fill any specific gap and therefore is not needed. Whether or not this perception can be altered is another matter.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations which should be considered to help increase LCCC referrals. Some of the recommendations can be implemented immediately with no further implications for program costs or operations. Others will require a longer implementation plan, changes in program operations and the current operating budget.

All of these recommendations are intended to make the program more user friendly to the counties. The over-riding assumption is that the program has potential value to the criminal justice system. The over-riding issue is how to better utilize these resources and make the program more cost-effective. If demand for the program increases this year, then there is justification for it to continue and perhaps be expanded or replicated elsewhere.

1. Expand Program Eligibility Criteria

The program's official eligibility criteria is unnecessarily eliminating offenders who could be benefiting from the program and creating an excessive use of the more cumbersome waiver system. The consultant suggests the following changes be made to the existing eligibility criteria.

- Expand upward age limitation from 25 to 30
- Increase the limit on prior felony offenses from two to four
- Modify the limitation on violent crimes to exclude simply battery crimes.
- Modify the limitation for prior DOC incarcerations to exclude prior DOC incarcerations which occurred more than 5 years ago.
- Allow persons convicted of Class C drug cases to be admitted to the program.

2. Terminate The Female Program Component

There simply is insufficient demand for a female only program component at this time. Termination of the program at this time would free up space in the existing facility to launch a "staging area" which is discussed in detail below.

3. Establish An Experimental Staging Area Within The Existing LCCC Facility

The most dramatic change in the program's current operations would be to establish a short-term staging area where inmates accepted into the program would be housed until a full squad has formed and can enter the program's level 1. Creating housing area would have the following advantages:

- a. It would allow counties to could send offenders at their convenience to the program rather than waiting up to 21 days for a new squad to form. Since most referrals are in the jail's custody until they are transferred to the LCCC, this policy

would allow the counties to empty that bed sooner than would occur otherwise.

- b. It would allow the county to better coordinate its transportation of the LCCC offender with other transportation assignments which need to be completed during the same time period. In other words, if the county is planning to ship or pick-up another offender from Labette County or in the vicinity in the next few days, a county could coordinate this existing transportation assignment with the transfer of the LCCC offender.
- c. Ability to quickly transfer of LCCC bound inmates from the county's jail to the staging area might also reduce the number of no-shows. It may be that a delay in transfer may be contributing to the rate of no-shows of offenders who have been accepted into the program. By executing the transfer more quickly, fewer no-shows might occur.
- d. Finally, the establishment of a staging housing area would definitely increase the ADP and bring the program up to full capacity. Almost all boot camp programs maintain a staging area. Because the LCCC is not appended to an existing correctional facility or system, it does not have such a capacity to stage newly recruited inmates. In this author's opinion, a staging area is a necessary part of any boot camp program which requires the sequential ordering of recruits into squads which are formed every 2-3 weeks.

4. Have DOC refer cases via the 120 day program

The DOC needs to review its own policies which have resulted in no referrals to date. In particular, it would seem that cases assigned by the court to the 120 day assessment program would be appropriate candidates for the LCCC. Shortly after admission to the 120 program, offenders could be assessed as to whether they would benefit from the LCCC. The DOC is an excellent position to conduct the prior record and medical

screening required by LCCC. Those candidates who are deemed eligible, would then be transferred to the LCCC. Upon completion of the program, the DOC would re-submit the case to the court for modification of sentence. Those that fail the program would be return to the court with the recommendation that the prison sentence be imposed.

5. Modify the Physical Exam Requirement

The complaint about physical exams was universal from all persons interviewed. Recognizing that some type of physical assessment is needed for all LCCC admittees, two alternative methods are proposed which would reduce the county's burden.

- a. Explore whether an exam conducted by a nurse could be substituted for an exam conducted by a physician. Many boot camps do not require a complete physical exam by a physician. Many simply rely upon a basic exam which can be adequately performed by the nurse. Most jails require such an exam at the time of admission. Could not the results of the jail exam be relied upon as well?
- b. Have an exam completed by the LCCC nurse while offenders are housed in the proposed staging area. The county, of course, would still be responsible for the costs of pick up of those who fail this exam. This "penalty" would encourage counties to be responsible in referring cases where no obvious medical problem exists.

6. Develop A Shorter Program Duration Curriculum

A recent survey of county administered boot camp programs by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD), found that most boot camps had a program duration of 90-120 days. A shorter time period might increase the attractiveness of the program and increase referrals. The consultant recognizes that LCCC staff may be firmly opposed to this recommendation but still believes it has merit. Put differently, the program must have a sound and empirical basis for strictly adhering to the 180 day requirement.

SUMMARY

All of the above recommendations should be carefully discussed with the various LCCC advisory committees, DOC, LCCC, and CSG agencies. Should any or all of these changes be adopted, they should be clearly and widely communicated to all counties to ensure that all District Courts are well informed of the modifications.

One final note. Some type of evaluation should be conducted by the DOC to determine how effective the program is in reducing costs and/or recidivism. Boot camps should be viewed with caution since there have not been any evaluations conducted to date which prove their overall effectiveness. The correctional landscape is covered with "great ideas" which often fail to achieve to formally stated objectives and goals. With respect to the LCCC, there will soon be enough LCCC graduates to conduct a meaningful follow-up

study assuming that an appropriate comparison group can be located. Such a study should be launched and completed over the next year to better inform policymakers on the impact of LCCC.

APPENDIX A
LCCC PROGRAM LEVELS

* Level I - Orientation

This orientation level will serve to familiarize inmates with the rules, expectations, and philosophy of the program. Individualized evaluations and case plans will be completed during this two-week period.

* Level II - Challenge Activities

This level consists of a minimum of eight weeks of challenge activities. Physical conditioning, daily work activities, military drills, outdoor functions, grooming, and regular inspections will complement the evening treatment and academic program.

* Level III - Work Program

The concentration within this level is on community service. Inmates will continue an abbreviated schedule of physical conditioning, daily work assignments, education, and counseling to maintain and improve on the foundation of discipline and skills which were developed at Level II. They will also work eight hours a day at a community service project or nonprofit agency. Level III is anticipated to require fourteen weeks for completion.

* Level IV - Reintegration Program

This two-week level is designed to prepare the inmate for return to the community. Classes and practical exercises in such areas as obtaining/maintaining employment, finding a residence, networking with community support programs, and management of personal/family finances will be the curriculum. During this level, inmates may be permitted short, unescorted visits home.

* Auxiliary Services.

Ongoing throughout the program auxiliary services will include; assessment, educational programs, drug abuse programs, non-denominational religious programs, life skills training, and others.

A significant feature of the program is the system of on-going progress reviews provided to inmates relative to their accomplishments, behaviors, and completion of previously established goals. During the progress reviews, inmates will be considered for promotion to another level or return to the referral source for unsatisfactory behavior.

The Labette Correctional Conservation Camp will provide the judicial system of Kansas with a confinement option or intermediate sanction that is an alternative to prison for young, minimum

APPENDIX B
LCCC PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

LABETTE CORRECTIONAL CONSERVATION CAMP
EVENING PROGRAM OFFERINGS

Program Title: General Education Development (GED)

Scheduled: Tuesday - Thursday 1900-2100 hours.

Facilitated By: Labette Community College Staff

Course Description: Individualized self paced program giving individualized instruction covering all five of the testable modules of the GED examination.

Goals and Objectives: To provide the individual inmate with the skills necessary to successfully pass all modules of the GED test and be awarded a GED Diploma.

Program Title: Adult Basic Education (ABE)

Schedule: Mondays 1900-2100 hours.

Facilitated By: Labette Community College Staff

Course Description: Self paced individualized instruction covering the skills needed to function in society. Reading and writing skills are the basis of the course.

Goals and Objectives: To insure that each inmate graduating from the facility has the ability to read and write.

Program Title: Bible Study

Schedule: Monday/Tuesday and Thursday-Saturday 1900-2100 hours.

Facilitated By: Volunteer Clergy and Lay Leaders

Course Description: Bible and Religious exploration in both open and competency based formats. Each evening covers various teachings of the Bible from a historical and social prospective.

Goals and Objectives: To provide the inmate with a religious based educational program with the opportunity to learn the relationship between man and God.

Program Title: Alcohol and Narcotics Anonymous (AA/NA)

Schedule: Tuesdays and Saturdays 1900-2100 hours.

Facilitated By: Volunteers from Parsons Chapters of AA and NA

Course Description: A self help program covering the principles of self help for the chemical dependent individual. It is patterned after the national organizations "12 Step Program" and the 12 steps to be successful as a recovering alcoholic or addict.

Goals and Objectives: To give the inmate the information and support to maintain a chemical free lifestyle.

Program Title: Substance Abuse Awareness Education

Schedule: Mondays and Wednesdays 1900-2100 hours.

Facilitated By: LCCC Counseling Staff

Course Description: A basic course of instruction in the chemicals of abuse. Topics include identification, accepted and street terminology, clinical and illegal uses, physical effects and side effects of usage. Also included are the sociological and psychological pressures associated with substances of abuse.

Goals and Objectives: To increase the awareness of the inmate on the dangers of substance abuse both as an individual and as a society resulting in the inmates disassociation with substance of abuse.

Program Title: Public Speaking and Creative Writing

Schedule: Thursdays 1900-2100 hours

Facilitate By: Volunteer Workers

Program Description: A noncredit college level course in public speaking and creative writing. The inmate learns to make oral presentations in front of an audience and to express themselves in writing.

Goals and Objectives: To provide the inmate with the knowledge to be able to prepare and deliver an oral presentation to an audience and to be able to effectively express themselves in written communications.

Program Title: Psychology of Achievement

Schedule: Monday - Saturday

1900-2100 hours.

Facilitated By: Audio Based Program

Course Description: A self paced audio program designed to help develop self confidence, self esteem, self concept, and developing a program for success.

Goals and Objectives: To help the inmate develop a positive self concept and the self confidence to return to the community as a successful and productive member of society.

Schedule of Calls

Weekdays

	Level I	Level IIA P.M. KP	Level IIB A.M. KP	Level III	Level IV
0450	-----First Call (Lights On)-----				
0500	-----Last Call (Everyone Out of Bunk)-----				
0515	-----Physical Training-----				
0515	-----Showers-----				
0545	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Breakfast/Medication Laundry Call	Clean-Up
0715	Breakfast/Medication Laundry Call	Breakfast/Medication Laundry Call	Breakfast/Medication Laundry Call	Drill	Breakfast/Medication Laundry Call
0730	-----Sick Call-----				
0745	Prep/Insp.	Prep/Insp.	Prep/Insp.		Prep/Insp.
0800	Drill	Drill	Work Call	Work Call	Drill
0915	Inspection	Inspection	"	"	Inspection
1000	Conf. Course	Conf. Course	"	"	Conf. Course
1030	***** P.M. KP's Go on Recreation until 1130 then shower and work at 1200 *****				
1045	Drill	Drill	"	"	Drill
1145	Recall	Recall	"	"	Recall
1200	Lunch/Medication Laundry	Lunch/Medication Laundry	"	"	Lunch/Medication Laundry
1215	"	"	Recall	Recall	"
1230	Formation	Formation	Lunch/Medication	Lunch	Classroom
1255	"	"	AM Cooks Barracks Break	"	
1300	Drill	Work Call	Drill	Work Call	"
1400	Physical Tng	Physical Tng	Physical Tng	"	"
1500	Recreation	Recreation	Recreation	"	"
1600	Showers	Showers	Showers	Arrival/Search	"
1630	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	"	Dinner
1700	Set Up Classrooms	Set Up Classrooms	Set Up Classrooms	Dinner/Laundry	Recreation
1730	Road March	Road March	Road March	Recreation	"

2-31

1830	Prepare For Class Medication	Prepare For Class Medication	Prepare For Class Medication	Showers Medication	Showers Medication
1900	Class	Class	Class	Class	Class
19100	Personal Time	Personal Time	Personal Time	Personal Time	Personal Time
	Medication	Medication	Medication	Medication	Medication

19200 -----Lights Out-----

Schedule of Calls

Saturday

	Level I	Level IIA P.M. KP	Level IIB P.M. KP	Level III	Level IV
0550	-----First Call (Lights On)-----				
0600	-----Last Call (Everyone Out of Bunk)-----				
0615	-----Physical Training-----				
0630	-----Showers-----				
0700	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Breakfast Medication/Laundry	Clean-Up
0730	Breakfast Medication/Laundry	Breakfast Medication/Laundry	Breakfast Medication/Laundry	Clean-Up	Breakfast Medication/Laundry
0800	Prep/Insp.	Prep/Insp.	Prep/Insp.	Prep/Insp.	Prep/Insp.
0815	Stand-By Inspection	Stand-By Inspection	Stand-By Inspection	Stand-By Inspection	Stand-By Inspection
0915	Drill	Drill	Drill	Honor Platoon/Drill	Drill
1000	Conf. Course	Conf. Course	Conf. Course	Recreation	Recreation
1030	***** P.M. KP's Go on Recreation until 1130 then shower and work at 1200 *****				
1100	-----Confidence Course Challenge-----				
1145	Recall	Recall	Recall	Recall	Recall
1200	Lunch Medication/Laundry	Lunch Medication/Laundry	Lunch Medication/Laundry	Barracks Break	Lunch Medication/Laundry
1230	Barracks Break	Barracks Break	Barracks Break	Lunch/Medication	Barracks Break
1300	Road March	Road March	Road March	Road March	Road March
1430	Physical Training	Physical Training	Physical Training	Work Call	
1500	Recreation	Recreation	Recreation		
1600	Showers	Showers	Showers		
1630	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	Recall	Dinner
1700	Set Up Classrooms	Set Up Classrooms	Set Up Classrooms	Dinner/Laundry	Recreation
1730	Drill	Drill	Drill	Recreation	Recreation
1830	Prepare For Class Medication	Prepare For Class Medication	Prepare For Class Medication	Showers Medication	Showers Medication
1900	Class	Class	Class	Class	Class
2100	Personal Time Medication	Personal Time Medication	Personal Time Medication	Personal Time Medication	Personal Time Medication

Schedule of Calls Sunday

	Level I	Level IIA	Level IIB	Level III	Level IV
550	-----First Call (Lights On)-----				
600	-----Last Call (Everyone Out of Bunk)-----				
615	-----Physical Training-----				
630	-----Showers-----				
700	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Breakfast	Clean-Up
730	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Clean-Up	Breakfast
800	-----Prepare For Walk Through Inspection-----				
815	-----Walk Through Inspection-----				
830	-----Church Call/Drill-----				
930	-----Work Call-----				
145	-----Recall-----				
200	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Barracks Break	Lunch
230	Barracks Break	Barracks Break	Barracks Break	Lunch	Barracks Break
300	-----Movie/MTV/Dayroom Recreation-----				
500	Confidence Course	Confidence Course	Confidence Course	Track Time	Track Time
545	Track Time	Track Time	Track Time	Confidence Course	Confidence Course
630	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	Clean-Up	Dinner
700	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Clean-Up	Dinner	Clean-Up
730	-----Recreation-----				
830	-----Showers-----				
900	-----Movie Call/Dayroom Rec-----				
100	-----Personal Time-----				
200	-----Lights Out-----				