RODERICK'S NEW CHAPTER

Roderick listened as Dr. Hanser began to wrap up the session. He glanced around at the rest of the men sitting in the circle and noticed that all of them seemed to also be intent upon the final words that summed up the session.

“In essence, gentlemen, it is up to you to create an entirely new lifestyle. Just quitting the drugs and alcohol is not enough. You have to quit the entire criminal lifestyle,” Hanser said, meeting the gaze of each man in the group. “Look, the deal is that you need to make a shift from going around talking about what you are not going to do and instead spend more time being concerned about what you need to be doing.”

Roderick raised his hand, and Hanser nodded at him to speak.

“So you mean that we should make out a schedule of activities that we should be doing and focus more on what things we need to complete than on the people, places, and things that should not be in our lives, right?”

Hanser replied, “Yep, that’s exactly right. . . . The more time you spend worrying about what needs to get done, the less time you have to think about relapse.”

The group ended, and Hanser began to walk toward his office. As he did so, Roderick followed and said, “Excuse me, Dr. Hanser, but can I speak with you for a minute?”

“Sure, Roderick, come on in.”

They sat down in the office, which held a strange mix of items from different areas of the world. A number of volumes on life change and self-improvement were on the bookshelves.

Roderick began. “I’m kind of concerned. As you know, a lot of my family use drugs and stuff, and I am not sure what to do. I mean, New Orleans is all that I know . . . but if I go back, I know it’s probably just a matter of time until . . . ”

Hanser watched him trail off and then said, “Roderick, you know that we’ve talked about this before. We both know perfectly well that if you go back to that area, you put all of your hard work at risk.”

“Yeah, I know, but you remember that my brothers are not helping my mom out much, right?”

“Yes, I do. But these types of decisions are what make recovery and make life difficult. Roderick, you have to get yourself stable before you can put the welfare of someone else on your plate. You have to get out of the toxic environment. I know that, emotionally, you want to help your mom, but, really, at this point, it is my guess that she would rather you get your life together first. If you don’t, then all you’re going to do is go home and, within a few weeks or months, end up back here. If that happens, then you will not be able to help your mom at all, and I’m sure it will break her heart as well.”

Hanser paused for a moment to let Roderick absorb his last few words, then continued. “If you finish the program, take the job with the reentry house, and extend your therapy in the community program that I suggested, you’ll be away from those influences and be able to continue your programming and use the job skills you learned in here. Plus, we can help you get aid at the community college. There is nothing to say that you cannot stay in touch with your mother and even visit her.”

Roderick sighed. “Yeah, you’re right. So when I finish this program here, the one on the outside is similar?”

“They are designed to augment one another. And your job training here in the joint will be consistent with the job at the factory on the outside.”

Roderick considered. “Can I make a call? I want to let my folks know that I’ve changed my mind and want to make sure that my Ma knows why.”

Hanser said, “Sure, just give me the number, and I will dial you out.”

Hanser dialed the number and handed Roderick the phone. Roderick hesitated. “I’m doing the best thing, right?”

“Yeah, man, I think that you’re doing the best thing for everyone involved.” Hanser heard a distant voice say “Hello.”

“Hey, Mom. . . . ”

No one said that change was easy, Hanser thought to himself as he watched Roderick lay the groundwork for a new chapter in his life.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter will focus on the various prison programs and services that are typical to any facility, including basic services as well as educational, work, therapeutic, recreational, and religious programming. These types of programming typically go beyond the basics of subsistence and housing. Rather, they tend to be very important in managing offenders’ behavior and in improving the outcomes of inmates once they are released from prison. With this noted, it is important to understand that there are two competing views regarding prison programs for inmates. The first view is the work/education reform view, which is thought to save society untold millions due to the lack of recidivism of inmates who have obtained employment and/or education through prison programming. The second view is the minimal services view, which contends that inmates are entitled to no more than the bare minimum that is required by law. While this second view is certainly true, it is unrealistic and, in all honesty, simply ensures that recidivism will be a continual problem in the United States.

MEDICAL CARE

Outside of prison, citizens must find a way to afford their own health care, and, if they are not able to do so, they will usually have to gain minimal health coverage from public government service. Regardless, free-world persons have at least some say over the types of services that they will receive. For inmates, this is not the case, and because prison health care is not always satisfactory, this has been the basis of many legal actions taken against prison systems.

History of Prison Health Care

During the early days of jails and prisons, the public generally did not believe inmates had the right to health care. Indeed, the general consensus was that the lack of health care was perhaps deserved as a result of being sent to prison. This state of affairs lasted for hundreds of years. In the United States, this attitude began to change in 1971 due to a prison riot that took place at the Attica Correctional Facility in the state of New York. Inmates at Attica protested the unsanitary conditions that existed at the prison as well as inhumane practices that prevented them from obtaining appropriate medical services. In many cases, personnel working in the medical sector were unqualified and could not legally practice medicine in outside society.

Deliberate Indifference Revisited

During the 1970s, following the Attica riot, medical care began to draw more attention from correctional officials and the public. This period also saw the Supreme Court hand down decisions in a series of cases regarding health services in prisons. In particular, Estelle v. Gamble (1976) ushered in an era where medical services for inmates were normalized and states were required to provide more than just marginal care in prisons.

The Estelle decision established a test to determine whether treatment given by prison officials was so insufficient as to constitute cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment. According to the Court, it must be proven that prison officials knew of an inmate’s serious need of medical services but were deliberately indifferent to that need and denied services to that inmate, almost as an extension of his or her punishment. Some examples of deliberate indifference include denial or delay in providing treatment, providing inadequate treatment, or failing to have qualified medical staff. Incidentally, prison systems cannot evade liability by citing inadequate funding as a reason for failing to provide medical services.

The Lifestyle of Offenders Inside and Outside

The inmate population tends to cycle in and out of prison. This has been discussed in prior chapters but is again important in the current discussion. When inmates enter prison, they may bring with them conditions and illnesses acquired on the streets due to their unhealthy lifestyles. Likewise, when inmates leave prison and go back to their communities, they bring any illnesses they may have acquired while incarcerated.

The use of drugs and participation in risky life choices deteriorate the health of offenders, and any negative effects from this are exacerbated by the prison environment. Thus, all individuals...
(including both inmates and correctional staff) within the prison should be educated on communicable diseases and take precautions to avoid contracting germ-based illnesses.

**Clinics, Sick Call, and Standards of Care**

In many prison facilities, sick call often requires that inmates fill out a form to request a visit to the unit infirmary. Inmates should be apprised of the procedures used to obtain medical services since, unlike in the free world, they cannot simply decide to see a doctor whenever they wish. Perhaps the best time to ensure that inmates are informed of these procedures is during orientation, when written materials are handed out to inmates and they are expected to ask questions.

In order to avoid the abuse of sick call and the likelihood of malingering (faking an illness), many prison facilities have instituted a modest inmate co-pay system. In essence, inmates must pay a small fee to see a medical professional, and this tends to discourage most inmates from taking trips to the prison infirmary unless the request is legitimate. Administrators must be careful that these types of programs are not seen as punitive. The key is for administrators to lend assistance to inmates who are truly ill while holding inmates partially accountable for medical services when the illness is not severe.

Some issues are unique to prisons regarding the standard of care to which inmates are afforded. First, there can sometimes be problems with confidentiality due to the close quarters and constant traffic in and out of spaces, including prison infirmaries. It is important to remember that inmates have a right to medical privacy, which means that medical personnel may not share details about an inmate's health or medical status with other correctional staff. This is particularly true if those persons are not medical staff. However, this does not prevent security staff and other personnel from gaining access to protected medical information in the process of completing work assignments or through conversations with inmates. There are several exceptions to privacy, which are delineated in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). HIPAA guidelines are well known among medical and mental health personnel, and, for the most part, this act guides professionals on matters regarding the confidentiality of medical information.

**Medical Services for Female Inmates**

Students may recall from Chapter 10 that the needs of female offenders tend to vary from those of male offenders. It would be remiss to discuss medical care of inmates without providing some commentary on the specialized medical issues common to the female inmate population. Ross and Lawrence (2002) note that female offenders as a group are increasingly immersed in the illicit drug culture as alcoholics, drug addicts, or intimate partners of alcoholics or drug addicts. They note that research on syphilis indicates that incidence follows that of cocaine use in such a manner as to suggest the increasing prevalence of a sex-for-drugs lifestyle. Ross and Lawrence (2002) further state that the medical problems of these inmates are associated with those lifestyles prior to arriving in prison.

Common medical issues of female inmates include asthma, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, hypertension, unintended pregnancy, a variety of sexually transmitted diseases, and other sundry medical problems. While many of these concerns are also common to male inmates, some, such as issues related to pregnancy, are, of course, unique to women offenders. With this in mind, we turn our attention to services for birth control and pregnancy.
Birth Control and Pregnancy
According to the BOP, female inmates should have access to medical and social services related to pregnancy, birth control, child placement, and abortion. Inmates are medically screened for pregnancy upon admission and are instructed to inform medical staff as soon as they suspect they are pregnant. If necessary, the childbirth takes place at a hospital outside the institution, and arrangements are made with outside social service agencies to aid the inmate in finding an appropriate placement for the child. Newborn children are not permitted to return to the institution with their mothers. Children can visit their mother when under the supervision and care of an adult visitor.

In addition, the BOP provides a community residential program called Mothers and Infants Nurturing Together (MINT) for women who are pregnant at the time of commitment. The MINT program is a residential reentry center–based program that promotes bonding and parenting skills for low-risk female inmates who are pregnant. Women are eligible to enter the program if they are in their last 3 months of pregnancy, have less than 5 years remaining to serve on their sentence, and are eligible for furlough. The inmate or a guardian must assume financial responsibility for the child's medical care while residing at MINT. The mother has 3 months to bond with the newborn before returning to an institution to complete her sentence. In select MINT programs, the inmate may stay for an additional period of bonding with the child. The decision to refer an inmate to the MINT program is at the discretion of the inmate's unit team.

Abortion
As per federal law, the BOP is not allowed to use government funds to facilitate the performance of an abortion. Funds are used to pay for abortion services only if the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus was carried to term or in cases of rape. In all other cases, non-BOP funds must be obtained to pay for an abortion. Inmates receive medical, religious, and social counseling regarding their decision to carry the pregnancy to term or to have an elective abortion. If an inmate decides to have an abortion, arrangements are made for these medical services to be provided in an appropriate clinic outside the institution.

FOOD SERVICE
In early prisons, it was not unusual for inmates to be required to pay or work for their own food. Porridge, bread and water, beans, stew, and bitter coffee were typical menu items. This state of affairs continued, for the most part, until the early 1970s when the Attica riot occurred. After the riot, the courts became more involved in determining prison operations, and the federal courts, in particular, were very directive. Nevertheless, there were no clear standards in place as this process unfolded.

Since that time, one body has emerged that sets standards on food service programming in the prison environment: the American Correctional Food Service Association (ACFSA). This organization promotes professionalism and sets standards of performance within this specialized area of correctional operations. It also provides for national certification of professionals working in the corrections food service industry.

Planning the Menu
The menu planning process is usually done on a 28- to 30-day rotation cycle, and the menus are typically prepared by the overall supervisor of food services or the assigned dietitian. Menus are usually planned according to standards set by the National Academy of Sciences. A variety of factors must be considered in food preparation. Connecticut's Department of Correction (2010), in its administrative directive titled Nutrition and Food Services, denotes the planning criteria of the master menu as follows:
Master Menu Planning Criteria. The Correctional Chief of Food Services shall prepare menus considering nutritional adequacy, inmate preferences, costs, physical layout, cost of equipment and staff complement, variety in method of preparation and frequency and other relevant factors to good dietary practice. Preparation shall consider food flavor, texture, temperature, appearance, and palatability. (p. 2)

According to the Connecticut prison system, common fare is a diet that meets all nutritional requirements and reasonably accommodates recognized religious dietary restrictions. This demonstrates that the planning of the menu can be somewhat complicated and that general dietary health should be considered at a minimum. Further, the inmate population can be quite diverse both ethnically and due to medical needs, and food service managers may take these issues into consideration as well when preparing their menu cycles.

Training Requirements
Training requirements for prison kitchen staff can vary, but the personnel must have a documented understanding of the planning, preparation, and serving of nutritious meals using sanitary and safe conditions. These individuals usually must have knowledge of kitchen work such that they know how to direct people who must work together in a coordinated fashion. In addition, it is important that the kitchen manager ensures that those working in the kitchen are ethical and appropriate for the job. Because inmates can be unpredictable and spiteful to one another, the kitchen manager will need to ensure that none of the inmate workers (or staff, for that matter) act in an inappropriate or unsanitary manner when serving other inmates. In addition, persons in the kitchen should not give “extra” food during meals to inmates who do not have an authorized basis for such an allocation.

The Quality of Food as Leverage for Social Control
While it is clear that prisons have a legal obligation to ensure that minimal standards for nutrition are met when feeding the inmate population, there is no requirement that they go beyond this. However, there may be incentives for correctional administrators to budget additional funds for their menu list. For instance, on a holiday, most prisons serve some type of meal that is consistent with that holiday. Wardens who are able to allocate additional funds for special meals and events will greatly improve morale among inmates.

Likewise, the type of food is served in prison may be modified due to disciplinary reasons. While it is generally not considered good correctional practice to use food allocation for punishment, prison systems do alter the way it is served to inmates who have some type of special security status or disciplinary consideration. Prison food loaf is sometimes used as a replacement meal for inmates of various disciplinary statuses. In particular, this type of meal alternative may be given to inmates who are hostile and in lockdown (i.e., solitary confinement for assaultive behavior). It is not uncommon for these inmates to throw their food or liquid beverages on correctional officers and/or to use their utensils as weapons. While this may not sound overly problematic, when hot coffee is thrown on an officer or when salt is thrown in the eyes of an officer or another inmate, this can cause injury that lasts for days. The use of products such as the prison food loaf eliminates safety and security concerns when feeding inmates with this type of behavioral history.

Prison food loaf is a food product that contains all the typical ingredients of a well-balanced meal mixed together and baked as a single loaf-like product that would be served to inmates.
not used for punishment as much as to avoid the possibility of safety problems for inmates and staff, and it is typically served to inmates who are dangerous and unpredictable. Legal issues related to this food product emerged during the 1990s, when inmates contended that being fed prison food loaf was tantamount to cruel and unusual punishment, in violation of their Eighth Amendment rights. One case in particular was *LeMaire v. Maass* (1993). Ultimately, it was determined that the Eighth Amendment only requires that food be provided that is adequate to maintain health, not that it be tasty or appealing.

**EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

Of all the prison programs available for inmates, education is perhaps the most important. Basic academics are fundamental to functioning in the day-to-day world of work. Without the ability to read, write, and do simple arithmetic, offenders will find it difficult to maintain gainful employment, and many of them have problems with literacy and/or basic mathematics. In this section, we will examine some of the history behind prison education and illustrate how this has been an integral component of the correctional field.

**Educational Programs Throughout History**

The use of education in the institutional setting can be traced all the way back to America’s first penitentiary, the Walnut Street Jail. At this time, education and religious instruction tended to be combined. The Quakers were largely behind the availability of education to inmates, and they were even the first to encourage secular education. However, there was a general fear that criminals would become even craftier if they were educated, and this resulted in minimal education being provided to those who were locked up.

After the Civil War, educational programs were identified as a preferred method for reforming offenders. Indeed, education was at the heart of the reformatory model that prevailed during this period. The origins of this system were largely rooted in the efforts of Zebulon Brockway at the Elmira Reformatory. However, some researchers, such as Schlossman and Spillane (1995), have contended that the credit given to Brockway is perhaps a bit excessive. They note that his programs were largely just replications of programs for adults that were made available to juvenile offenders at Elmira.

Work at Elmira was centered on a contract-driven, factory-based production of goods for the private sector. There tended to prevail a fundamental faith among prison administrators of the late 1800s that hard work was the touchstone of discipline and rehabilitation, regardless of the type of work that it might be. As Brockway (1912) commented in 1888, “There is not any proper education and test of character that does not include training in industry” (p. 268). Most of Brockway’s efforts concerned vocational education, which was designed to prepare inmates for the world of work. Schlossman and Spillane (1995) conducted an extensive review of the policies and practices of correctional systems in New York, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia during the 1920s and 1930s, and they found that while some advancements were made in these systems, they lagged well behind the innovations provided by Brockway. There was, however, one other noteworthy emergence in corrections during the 1930s: Austin MacCormick’s work *The Education of Adult Prisoners*.

MacCormick, a former administrator at a U.S. Navy prison, was a professor at Bowdoin College when his well-known work was completed. Earlier in his career, he had authorities in New York anonymously commit him to a prison so he could gain firsthand knowledge of the life of an inmate; only a handful of administrators in the prison knew that he was not actually a convicted offender. He had also written his own thesis on penological principles. *The Education of Adult Prisoners* was the result of efforts within the New York prison system to improve educational opportunities for inmates. New York, in tandem with the Carnegie Corporation, hired MacCormick as a consultant to conduct the most comprehensive survey ever undertaken of educational programs for adults in prison in the United States.

During the 1960s and 1970s, correctional education began to become a priority within many state systems. This was true of both academic and vocational programming (Simms, Farley, & Littlefield, 1987). A primary impetus behind this was the passage of the Adult Education Act of 1964, which provided funding for programs that serviced adults who had deficiencies in communication, basic math skills, or social skills that impaired their ability to gain or retain...
employment. The 1980s is perhaps the period when the most fervor and public attention were
given to prison-based education. There were several reasons for this, but one key factor was that
the prison population had grown considerably during this time. Another was that numerous rul-
ing from the Supreme Court during the 1960s and 1970s on prison conditions and inmate rights
tended to cite the need for better educational programs. The climate during this time was more
punitive, and less emphasis was placed on correctional treatment programming, but education
was an exception since it was not steeped in mental health jargon and was more clearly under-
stood by the general public.

The 1990s saw an intense interest in prison education programs, and these types of programs
proliferated throughout the United States. For example, the Windham School District became a
major component of prison operations in Texas, which, as students should know by now, has one of
the biggest prison systems in the United States. Another noteworthy occurrence during this period
was the 1991 creation of the Office of Correctional Education (OCE) within the Department of
Education. The OCE was created to provide national leadership on issues related to correctional
education, and it offers technical assistance to states, local schools, and correctional institutions
and shares information on correctional education. The office was authorized by the Carl D. Perkins

Despite these seeming victories for educational programming, the 1990s are also known for
one major policy change that negatively impacted the ability of inmates to obtain higher educa-
tion while in prison: the elimination of the federal Pell Grant for inmates seeking college educa-
tion. Prior to this, the federal government had allocated a very small fraction of Pell Grant dollars
to those who were incarcerated. Pell Grants are need-based federal monies set aside for persons
who pursue a college education. The use of the Pell Grant in prisons was the result of legislation in
1965, when Congress passed Title IV of the Higher Education Act, which permitted inmates to
apply for financial aid in the form of Pell Grants to attend college. Despite abundant research from
the BOP and states such as Alabama, Illinois, Ohio, New York, Texas, and Wisconsin that showed
college-level education caused a clear and consistent reduction in recidivism rates, this program
was ultimately discontinued (Karpowitz & Kenner, 2001).

During the 1990s, the effects of the War on Drugs were being felt, and there was a mass prison-
building boom throughout the nation. Politicians heralded “tough on crime” platforms that included
three-strikes initiatives, the elimination of parole, and enhanced penalties against drug offenders.
During this time, politicians introduced legislation that resulted in the passage of the Violent Crime
Control and Law Enforcement Act, which, as discussed above, eliminated the availability of the Pell
Grant for inmates and all but killed the offering of higher education in American corrections.

Since 2008, many state legislatures and even Congress have considered legislation aimed at
providing educational benefits for inmates. This demonstrates that even politicians are beginning
to see the connection between education and the reduction of future crime rates. This provides a
sense of optimism for many correctional educators and prison administrators.

Types of Education Programs
in Corrections
The federal system is the premier correctional
system and includes a wide range of services
that are also common to most state systems.
Because many states essentially follow the stan-
dards of the federal system, it is perhaps easier to
showcase the federal system and/or a handful of
eamples from among the states. The BOP has
long recognized the importance of education
both as an opportunity for inmates to improve
their knowledge and skills and as a correctional
management tool that encourages inmates to
use their time in a constructive manner.
Each federal prison has its own education
department that provides educational and rec-
reational activities to federal inmates. Of these,
literacy education receives the highest priority. With few exceptions, an inmate who does not have a General Educational Development (GED) diploma must participate in a literacy program for a minimum of 240 instructional hours or until he or she earns a GED credential. The English as a Second Language (ESL) program enables inmates with limited English proficiency to improve their English language skills. Due to legislation passed in 1990, non-English-proficient inmates must participate in an ESL program until they pass competency skills tests at the 8th-grade level.

**Celebrating Achievements**

One of the most rewarding aspects of educational programs is the sense of empowerment and achievement that is obtained. Inmates who are recognized for their efforts, whether educational, vocational, or treatment-oriented, gain positive esteem and tend to be more motivated as they approach their eventual release into society. For some inmates, this may be one of the few times that they have actually been recognized for an accomplishment. This alone can provide the offender with a new sense of self-worth. Later we will discuss the offering of life skills education and programming as a means of furthering offenders’ sense of esteem and ability to effectively cope with stressors that may make them prone to further recidivism. However, for now, students should consider that few offenders have received much—if any—positive attention in their lives. Showcasing their positive outcomes is likely to reinforce that behavior and will serve to instill prosocial norms within their psyches.

**PRISON WORK PROGRAMS**

Prison work for inmates tends to consist of two types. The first includes those jobs that maintain the functioning of the prison itself. These types of jobs might include the preparation of meals, working in the laundry, and the cleaning of various prison areas. These tasks do not usually provide inmates with a trade or a skill by which they can earn a living in the outside community. The second type of work is industrial or vocational in orientation. These jobs include production, agriculture, craftsmanship, carpentry, construction, and even clerical positions in prison offices where genuine professional skills might be learned.

**Inmate Labor Throughout History**

The origin of labor in prisons can be traced back to English jails of the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, when inmate labor paid for the costs of imprisonment as well as the salaries of the jailers and the sheriff. During the 1400s, hard labor was considered part of one’s payment for keep and was the mainstay activity in workhouses of that time. The emphasis on work continued throughout history, but the types of work usually did not compete with free labor outside of the prison walls. During the mid- to late 1700s, prison reformers such as John Howard and Cesare Beccaria considered inmate labor a key factor in the reformation of offenders.

Unlike discussions on inmate labor in prior chapters, this chapter will focus on a more modern history of inmate labor, and we will center our discussion on the federal system. The primary reason for this is that it has a defined history that is far-reaching and at its base contains all the elements of historical development that are common to most of the state systems. However, the federal system is not given to the peculiarities of history and geography that have defined various state prison systems, such as those in the southern United States that relied largely on agricultural operations.

**The History of Inmate Labor in a Model Program: UNICOR**

In June 1934, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed a law that established an organization for federal prison labor called the Federal Prison Industries Inc. (FPI). From this action emerged a full-fledged corporation owned by the U.S. government. This corporation was designed to operate various factories and to ensure that inmates were gainfully employed, when and where appropriate, during the course of their sentence. By the end of World War II, FPI was a producer of more than 70 categories of products at 25 separate shops and factories.

During the World War II era, FPI was a major contributor to the war effort. During this time, inmates worked double and even triple shifts throughout the day and night, with 95% of all products being sold to the military. Among these products were items such as bomb fins and
bomb casings, TNT cases, parachutes, welded products, aircraft sheet metal work, shipbuilding crafts, auto/aviation mechanics, and drafting and electrical products. Many people are not aware that the inmate population, at least at the federal level, has been such a strong contributor to our national defense. During the Korean War of the 1950s, federal inmates again contributed to America’s war effort. Indeed, sales by FPI exceeded $29 million, and over 3,800 inmates were employed by the corporation. Following the Korean War, FPI retooled factories and renovated outdated equipment to produce new products in response to changing markets. FPI opened shops that specialized in the refurbishment of furniture, office equipment, tires, and other government property. In addition, FPI introduced new vocational training programs that provided medical benefits for consumers by manufacturing artificial limbs and dentures, and it provided inmate labor for hospital attendant work.

During the Vietnam War, there was another growth in production levels, but this was a short-term occurrence as FPI sought to ease its inmate population out of wartime production and into more mainstream forms of industry. By the late 1960s, military sales had declined significantly and had nearly all but ceased at the close of the Vietnam War. During the late 1970s, FPI changed its name to UNICOR Inc. as a means of creating a new civilian and corporate-based identity. In an effort to increase its competitive position, UNICOR introduced new lines in stainless steel products, thermoplastics, printed circuits, modular furniture, ergonomic chairs, Kevlar-reinforced items (such as military helmets), and optics. State-of-the-art production techniques were embraced, including modern printing equipment. Such efforts led to improved product offerings, which, in turn, created new inmate work opportunities to better prepare inmates for post-release employment.

A 7-year study conducted in the 1990s, the Post-Release Employment Project (PREP), conducted by the BOP’s Office of Research and Evaluation, validated, conclusively, that UNICOR successfully achieved its mission of preparing inmates for release and therefore provided long-term benefits to society. Further, the PREP study showed that the inmates who participated in UNICOR’s industrial or educational programs were less likely to incur misconduct reprimands while incarcerated, less likely to commit crimes following release, and less likely to return to prison than inmates who did not take advantage of such programs.

During the new millennium, UNICOR embarked on a corporate-wide campaign to become a leader in eco-sensitive practices and to set the standard for government. This eco-sensitive industry, commonly known as green technology, became a primary area of industrial growth for UNICOR. To ensure that it fulfilled its commitment to green technology, a senior-level task force was formed to develop a 5-year environmental plan, complete with measurable, corporate-wide objectives. This demonstrates how UNICOR has operated as a forward-thinking operation, providing products and services that are useful to society and that also reform offenders who are subject to release in the community.

Other Prison Work Programs
In many states and especially among three of the largest state correctional systems—Texas, California, and Florida—the employment of inmates in agricultural, forestry, and roadwork services has been a traditional focus of inmate labor (again, students should refer back to Chapters 1 and 2 of this text). These were especially popular forms of labor in the southern prison systems of the United States. Typically, this work included cotton picking, cutting lumber, harvesting crops, road construction, firefighting, and the maintenance of state grounds and property. While this type of work offsets costs of prison system budgets, it does not prepare offenders for work on the outside and therefore does

PHOTO 14.3 Female inmates, incarcerated at the California Institution for Women, make firefighters’ uniforms at the prison’s textile factory.
little to decrease recidivism, particularly when compared with skilled labor experience that allows offenders to support themselves once they are released.

There are examples of state prison systems that operate both agricultural programs and industrial programs; these systems both reduce the costs of prison operations and also prepare inmates for work on the outside. We will examine the Texas industrial system as a means of exploring this point. However, some comments regarding the benefits of agricultural production should be provided.

In Texas, the prison system continues to operate under a directive to be as self-sufficient as fiscally possible while meeting all constitutional requirements. As a result, this prison system’s agricultural division grows most of the food consumed by the staff and inmates. The Texas prison agricultural system includes farms that produce millions of pounds of fresh cannery vegetables, substantial dairy products, and poultry products (including eggs). These operations are so successful that they produced surpluses during the 1990s and the early 2000s and kept food costs down to approximately $2 per inmate per day (Benestante, 1996). This is obviously beneficial to the state prison budget but also to Texas taxpayers who are free of the additional fiscal burdens that would be placed upon them if these programs did not exist. However, as noted earlier, agricultural programs do not tend to prepare inmates for work that will provide them opportunities on the outside. Thus, the answer is to allow inmates who are nearing release to train in other job sectors. This is done in Texas, and, as a result, we will briefly showcase this program in the subsections that follow.

The Texas Prison Industry—Texas Correctional Industries

Texas Correctional Industries (TCI) was established in 1963 with the passage of Senate Bill 338, the Prison Made Goods Act of Texas (see Figure 14.1 for organization of prison manufacturing and logistics in Texas). The specific charge of TCI is to provide offenders with marketable job skills to help reduce recidivism through a coordinated program of job skills training, documentation of work history, and access to resources provided by various employment services upon release.

In addition, TCI helps to reduce prison system costs by providing products and services on a for-profit basis to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) and other eligible entities and to agencies or political subdivisions of the state.

TCI manufactures goods and provides services to state and local government agencies, public educational systems, public hospitals, and political subdivisions. TCI comprises six divisions: Garment, Graphics, Furniture, Metal, Marketing and Distribution, and Offender Work and Training Programs. TCI has 37 facilities that manufacture items such as shirts, pants, coats, shoes, sheets, pillows, mattresses, signs, stickers, printed materials, janitorial supplies, soaps, detergents, license plates, stainless steel goods, park equipment, dump beds, a variety of office and institutional furniture, and modular office systems. All total, sales generated from these activities exceed $95 million annually. The work and training programs offered to offenders help reduce idleness and provide opportunities for offenders to learn marketable job skills and work ethics. On-the-job training and accredited certification programs, along with the Work Against Recidivism (WAR) program (described in more detail in the following pages), are specifically targeted to successfully reintegrate offenders into society.

The division collaborates with the Windham School District (a secondary education program in Texas prisons) and other entities to establish work and training programs directed toward the effective rehabilitation of offenders, promoting a seamless integration of training opportunities,
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such as apprenticeship programs, diversified career preparation programs, short-course programs, on-the-job programs, and college vocational courses. These programs provide offenders with opportunities to acquire workplace knowledge and skills and help offenders develop a work ethic. The division is composed of Engineering, Operational Support, Financial Operations, Planning and Monitoring, Transportation and Supply, and TCI.

In Texas, the **Prison Industry Enhancement (PIE) Certification Program** is a partnership between the TDCJ and a private company, which allows the company to employ offenders who have volunteered to be a part of the program. The offenders are paid by the private company, and deductions are taken from their wages for their taxes, room and board, dependent support, and restitution, and a contribution is made to a crime victims’ fund. This program has successfully offset correctional expenses for inmates who participate. Indeed, more than $17 million of offender earnings (room and board deductions) have been deposited in the state’s General Revenue Fund since the program’s inception. On average, for each offender employed, $5,071 is deducted for room and board, $1,431 is deducted for family support, $508 is deducted for the state’s crime victims’ compensation fund, and another $42 is deducted for restitution to victims (see Figure 14.2 for details).

The PIE Certification Program demonstrates how prison work programs can save taxpayers substantial amounts of money, but, at the same time, these programs are also able to give

---

**Figure 14.1: Organizational Structure of Manufacturing and Logistics Division of Texas Prison System**
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Thus, in addition to aiding in recidivism reduction for offenders who have useful job skills on release, the participation of those inmates while incarcerated yields benefits for the prison system, society, and victims in a direct manner that can be measured. This means that these programs are invaluable within the field of corrections, as they provide tangible benefits almost immediately after implementation.

Lastly, the Work Against Recidivism (WAR) program involves a joint effort between the Manufacturing and Logistics Division, the Texas Parole Division, the Texas Workforce Commission, and private sector enterprises, with a goal to facilitate the successful reentry of offenders upon release from the TDCJ. The WAR program tracks offenders who are provided job skills while assigned to Manufacturing and Logistics facilities. WAR is administered by the Offender Work and Training Programs Division of TCI. TCI-designated training facilities continue to provide employable skills to offenders while providing services that directly benefit customers and, less directly, society as a whole.

DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Studies have consistently shown that comprehensive drug treatment works. It not only reduces drug use but also curtails criminal behavior and recidivism. Moreover, for drug-abusing offenders, treatment facilitates successful reentry into the community.

Dr. Nora D. Volkow, director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (see Volkow, 2006)

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) estimate that 60% to 83% of inmates in the nation’s correctional population have used drugs at some point in their lives; this is twice the estimated drug use of the total U.S. population (Office of National Drug Control Policy [ONDCP], 2001). Included in this group are inmates who used an illegal drug at least weekly for a period of at least 1 month, have been imprisoned for selling or possessing drugs, were under the influence of drugs or alcohol when they committed their crime, committed their offense to get money for drugs, or have a history of alcohol abuse. As stated before, drugs are commonly linked with crime, the issue generally being not if but how they are linked.

The primary modality implemented in most jails is simple chemical detoxification. Detoxification is designed for persons dependent on narcotic drugs (e.g., heroin, opium) and is typically found in inpatient settings with programs that last for 7 to 21 days. While many detoxification programs address only the addict’s physical dependence, some provide individual or group counseling in an attempt to address the problems associated with drug abuse. Many detoxification programs use medical drugs to ease the process of overcoming the physical symptoms of dependence that make the detoxification process so painful for the addicted substance abuser. For drug offenders in jails and prisons, the mechanism of detoxification varies by the client’s major drug of addiction. For opiate users, methadone or clonidine is preferred.

In all detoxification programs, inmate success depends upon following established protocols for drug administration and withdrawal. Regardless, it is important to understand that mere detoxification from a substance is not drug abuse “treatment” and does not help people stay off drugs. This in no way ensures that relapse will not occur, and thus it is important for any program to have much more than a simple detoxification process. This should instead be viewed as nothing more than an initial step of comprehensive treatment.
Peer Support Groups
Within many prison facilities, peer support programs are integral components of alcohol or drug intervention strategies. These programs are called peer support because, in many cases, the facilitators are also prior alcohol or drug abusers. In many prisons, peer support groups are facilitated by other inmates who have progressed to an advanced or senior level of involvement in the program. Perhaps the most widely known peer support group is the 12-step program, in which individuals meet regularly to stabilize and expedite their recovery from substance abuse.

The best known of these programs is Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), in which sobriety is based on fellowship and adhering to the 12 steps of recovery (Hanson, Venturelli, & Fleckenstein, 2006; Myers & Salt, 2000). The 12 steps stress faith, confession of wrongdoing, and passivity in the hands of a “higher power” and forward group members from a statement of powerlessness over drugs and alcohol to a resolution that they will carry the message of help to others and will practice the AA principles in all affairs. In addition to AA, other popular self-help 12-step groups include Narcotics Anonymous and Cocaine Anonymous.

The success of self-help programs in general, and AA in particular, may be explained by the comprehensive network of such a program, which supports abstinence and recovery; frequent attendance at AA meetings where role modeling, confession, sharing, and support take place; and participation in the member network between meetings, which includes obtaining and relying on a senior member or sponsor. Al-Anon, a fellowship for relatives and significant others of alcoholics, was founded in 1951, although it did not take off as a movement until the 1960s. Narcotics Anonymous, the third of the three major 12-step fellowships, was founded in 1953. It was relatively small throughout the 1950s and 1960s but obtained a great deal of popularity during the 1970s and 1980s (Myers & Salt, 2000).

The Therapeutic Community
After the detoxification phase, the residential therapeutic community is the next full-service form of treatment given to substance abusers in jails, prisons, or residential treatment centers. Recovery through this form of treatment depends on positive and negative pressures to change. This pressure is brought about through a self-help process in which relationships of mutual responsibility to every resident in the program are built. In addition to individual and group counseling, this process has a system of explicit rewards that reinforce the value of earned achievement. As such, privileges are earned. In addition, therapeutic communities have their own rules and regulations that guide the behavior of residents and the management of facilities. Their purposes are to maintain the safety and health of the community and to train and teach residents through the use of discipline. There are typically numerous rules and regulations within these facilities (Hanser & Mire, 2010).

The Benefits of Substance Abuse Treatment in Corrections
Aside from education and employment, effective drug treatment is perhaps the most commonly needed form of inmate programming. Every state correctional system offers some variety of drug treatment programming, but it is the means by which these programs are carried out that tend to determine their effectiveness. The best means of reducing recidivism among nonviolent drug offenders is through drug treatment admissions rather than imprisonment.

Further, it has been shown that increased admissions to drug treatment are associated with reduced rates of violent crime (see Figure 14.3). According to the Justice Policy Institute
Part II: Correctional Practices

During the same period, violent crime fell by 31.5%.

These reduced rates of violent crime also correspond with lower incarceration rates. Indeed, of the 20 states that admit the most people to treatment per 100,000, 19 had incarceration rates below the national average. Of the 20 states that admitted the fewest people to treatment per 100,000, eight had incarceration rates above the national average (Justice Policy Institute, 2008).

Many offenders with substance abuse problems are sentenced to intensive supervision probation (ISP) if they are not sent to prison. Others, when on parole, will tend to have similarly restrictive programming. In addition, drug offenders on probation or parole may be required to submit to drug screens to ensure compliance with treatment. Court and corrections officials will generally want to know if the offender is complying with treatment and remaining abstinent from drugs. In programs in which access to treatment is limited by available space or funding, those who do not comply may be discharged from treatment. Those who do not successfully complete treatment and continue to have positive drug screens may be sent back to court for further sentencing. While drug testing appears to serve a useful purpose in monitoring offenders with substance abuse problems, this testing alone is not sufficient to keep offenders from using drugs and reoffending. The best approach may be to combine random drug testing with forms of rehabilitative drug treatment to address the addiction and minimize the likelihood that the individual will engage in future criminal behavior.

Drug offenders on probation are usually placed in outpatient treatment programs, which usually include individual and group therapy. Some programs include family therapy and relapse prevention support. Outpatient drug treatment often includes a range of protocols, from highly professional psychotherapies to informal peer discussions (ONDCP, 2001). Counseling services vary considerably and include individual, group, or family counseling; peer group support; vocational therapy; and cognitive therapy. Aftercare, considered necessary to prevent relapse, typically consists of 12-step meetings, periodic group or individual counseling, recovery training or self-help and relapse-prevention strategies, and/or vocational counseling (ONDCP, 2001).

Figure 14.3: Relationship Between Increase in Drug Treatment Admissions and Federal Spending on Drug Treatment and Decrease in Violent Crime, 1995–2005


(2008), admissions to drug treatment increased by 37.4%, and federal spending on drug treatment increased by 14.6% from 1995 to 2005. During the same period, violent crime fell by 31.5%.
RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS

Recreational activities are an important aspect of prison management and operations. Well-designed recreational programs provide constructive options for inmates to spend idle time and also can serve as incentives for good behavior. Though many people may balk at the notion that inmates are afforded recreational opportunities, it should be pointed out that access to such activities can (and does) keep the inmate population more manageable. Beyond this, many prison systems provide a set of additional rationales for their recreation programs. For example, Washington State’s Department of Corrections (2012) provides the following purposes for providing prison recreational programming:

1. Contribute to a safe and secure environment and reduce idleness by allowing offenders an opportunity to participate in supervised and structured physical and prosocial activities.
2. Help offenders take responsibility for their health and wellness by adopting positive lifestyle habits.
3. Reduce the number of disciplinary problems as well as injuries related to stress and strain.
4. Allow offenders to use recreation/wellness activities in conjunction with the offender release plan.

From the four purposes listed above, it can be seen that Washington (like many other prison systems) views effective recreational activities as producing good outcomes for the offender and for the institution.

History

In America’s early colonial jails as well as the Pennsylvania and Auburn system prisons, physical exercise was provided to inmates as part of the daily regimen. However, it was Elmira Reformatory, known for its progressive orientation toward inmate supervision and reform, that first offered a diverse array of programming options. At Elmira, inmates could participate in team sports, gymnasium activities, a variety of social clubs to build esteem and social skills, and even acting and artistic pursuits. In addition, inmates could opt to work for the inmate-run newspaper, titled The Summary, which first began in 1883. This paper was an eight-page weekly digest of world and local news. Importantly, The Summary was the first inmate-operated prison newspaper in the entire world (New York Correction History Society [NYCHS], 2008). In today’s current prison environment, nearly every prison system (if not every major prison) has an inmate-run newspaper or newsletter.

During the late 1880s, the use of prison labor for profit was banned due to opposition from private corporations and businesses. This led Zebulon Brockway, the historical figure associated with the innovations at Elmira (see Chapter 1), to look for ways to keep the inmates busy with productive activities. As one of many programs, Brockway implemented a military program; when it was in full stride, the inmates were drilling 5 to 8 hours a day. Inmates were organized into companies and regiments, with inmate officers and a brass band. Brockway also took this opportunity to shift the trade school program from evenings to days and to adapt the physical education program to the entire population. A gymnasium with marble floors, a swimming pool, and a drill hall, completed in 1890, allowed military and physical training in all weather (NYCHS, 2008).
The Addiction Severity Index—Multimedia Version (ASI-MV®) interview is the client self-administered version of the widely used Addiction Severity Index (ASI). Inflexxion, with several grants from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), developed and tested the ASI-MV, and studies have shown it to have excellent reliability and validity. Since developing the ASI-MV in the early 1990s, Inflexxion also received NIDA grant support to research and develop the Spanish language ASI-MV and the Comprehensive Health Assessment for Teens (CHAT®).

Clients self-administer these interviews on a computer with audio and video using a mouse. Since these tools do not require staff time to ask the questions or collect data, they save agencies staff time and money, while increasing the consistency of data collection. It has been found that clients are able to easily use these programs, regardless of education level, reading ability, or prior computer experience.

In addition to clinical reports, which are immediately available for treatment planning and level of care placement, the system also includes the Analytics Data Center, which enables providers to

---

**Figure 14.4: ASI-MV Graphic Profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Areas</th>
<th>A = Perception</th>
<th>B = Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>A = 0</td>
<td>B = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>A = 3</td>
<td>B = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>A = 3</td>
<td>B = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>A = 1</td>
<td>B = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>A = 3</td>
<td>B = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>A = 2</td>
<td>B = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>A = 1</td>
<td>B = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>A = 3</td>
<td>B = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 0–4

0 = Not at all 1 = Slightly 2 = Moderately 3 = Considerably 4 = Extremely

---

*Perception is a how troubled or bothered a client is by problems.

*Motivation is how important it is for the client to receive help for problems now.
FOCUS TOPIC 14.1
Drug Treatment Reduces Violent Crime and Incarceration in the State of California

Case Study: California Proposition 36

The Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA), or Proposition 36, was put into effect in California in order to reduce the use of incarceration for nonviolent offenders, reduce drug-related crime, and increase public health. It requires the use of drug treatment as an alternative to incarceration for nonviolent adult offenders convicted of drug possession for personal use. From its passage in November 2000 to December 2005, the rate of people incarcerated for drug possession in California dropped 34.3%, from 59 to 58 people per 100,000. Implementation of SACPA may not be the sole cause of this rapid decrease; there were, however, no other major public changes during this time.

According to the National Survey of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (NSSATS), this period saw a 25.9% increase in the number of drug treatment facilities in California, but a 2.83% decrease nationally when California is excluded. Along with this increase in treatment facilities, the number of substance abuse clients in California increased 34.1% from 2000 to 2004. Excluding California, the nation as a whole only had a 4% increase in the number of treatment clients during the time. As California’s violent crime rate decreased more rapidly than the nation’s, the number of California treatment facilities and clients increased.

Those opposing Proposition 36 feared that this decrease in incarceration would lead to an increase in violent crime. In fact, from 2000 to 2004 California’s violent crime rate decreased 11.2% while at the same time the national average violent crime rate fell by 8.1%.

Not only did California experience a decrease in violent crime, but the state also saved a substantial amount of money. Using the year 2000 as a baseline for drug possession prison admissions, a Justice Policy Institute (JPI) report estimated that the state saved more than $350 million from 2000 to June 2006 (the end of the initiative’s funding) by using drug treatment as an alternative to prison. (Researchers took the cost of the drug treatment programming into account in calculating savings.) Using a similar methodology, JPI found that California saved a total of $412 million on prison and jail operating costs alone over 6 1/2 years.

The University of California’s cost analysis of Proposition 36 also saw substantial cost savings. The study showed that California saved a minimum of $2.50 for every dollar spent on the treatment alternative, $4 per person who completed treatment, and a total of $173.3 million in savings to the California government in the first year alone. The cost savings from Proposition 36 are available to be spent on more cost-effective public safety policies for Californians.
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APPLIED THEORY 14.1

Social Learning and Behavior Management

Social learning theory is an integration of differential association and behavioral learning theories. In differential association theory, Edwin Sutherland posits that both criminal and law-abiding behaviors are learned in interaction with others. In American society, according to Sutherland, one is likely to associate, to varying degrees, with individuals who define law violations as favorable while also associating with individuals who define law violations as unfavorable. When exposure to people with behavioral patterns and attitudes favorable to crime exceeds exposure to people with behavioral patterns and attitudes unfavorable to crime, criminal behavior is likely to be learned. If the balance is struck in the opposite direction, law-abiding behavior is likely to be learned instead.

Because of this social learning component that can be both positive and negative, depending on the social circumstances, some treatment programs are separated from the main prison population. For example, the Successful Treatment of Addiction and Recovery (STAR) program at Richwood Correctional Center is a drug addiction program that consists of dorms that are separate from the housing units of the main compound. Inmates in this treatment program are kept separate from the general population because it is presumed that they will not be affected by negative associations with persons not in treatment. In addition, inmates in treatment together will likely be positive influences on one another and will, therefore, be likely to give messages and reinforcements conducive to treatment and recovery. Further, like many drug treatment programs, the STAR program emphasizes the people, places, and things that these inmates encounter that can affect relapse into drug use and recidivism into criminal activity. These messages demonstrate that associations with healthy people will aid in the offender’s recovery from drugs and alcohol while associations with persons who lead unhealthy lifestyles will likely lead to associations that support drug and alcohol use.

In 1966, the National Correctional Recreation Association was established. The emergence of this association served as the formal acknowledgment of prison recreational services as a legitimate and central feature in prison operations and management.

During the 1990s, prison systems experienced enormous growth, and the public fervently advocated for a “get tough on crime” approach to incarceration. As a result, many states and even the BOP limited many recreational items and activities in prisons, including in-cell television viewing, R-rated movies, pornographic materials, boxing, wrestling, judo, karate, electronic musical instruments, computers, and in-cell coffee pots and hot plates.

In 1994, weight lifting in particular came under public scrutiny, and, between this time and 1997, several states banned or limited weight lifting in prisons. One particular piece of legislation, passed by Congress in 1996, is known as the Zimmerman Amendment. This amendment restricted...
the purchase of several types of weight lifting equipment within the BOP. In recent years, the issue has moved to the back burner, but weight lifting remains banned or limited in approximately a dozen states.

From 2000 onward, a number of states have experienced budgetary problems, and this has in turn severely impacted prison budgets. As a result, cuts in prison system spending have limited the types of recreational activities available. Although recreational opportunities may exist in most prisons, they tend to be funded by the inmates themselves and are restricted to activities such as unstructured physical activity on a recreation yard, singing in prison choirs (especially for religious programming), watching films, and other no-cost programs that do not require anything more than marginal commitment on the part of prison systems.

Recreational Programming

Effective recreational programs require well-trained professionals, adequate equipment and supplies, and space for implementation. In addition, programs should include a variety of indoor and outdoor activities. For an example, we will refer to the Department of Corrections in the state of Montana and its policy document titled Recreation Programs DOC 5.5.3. This document lays out in very clear terms the expectations regarding personnel who supervise in recreational services as well as the structure of recreational programming. According to this document, each program will have a full-time recreation program administrator.

This recreation program administrator is often responsible for a number of duties, one of which is that this individual is expected to survey the recreational needs and interests of the offender population at least once each year. This is important because it provides inmates with some voice in the matter and, as we have seen from prior history, detracts from the likelihood that inmates will be so disgruntled as to be unruly or, worse yet, resort to a riot. Throughout the year, the recreation program administrator will ensure that recreational facilities are maintained and in good condition.

Recreation program administrators will also oversee recreation programs in locked facilities and be adept at crafting programs for special needs offenders. This is an important aspect of the duties of this administrator. Programming for the elderly must be appropriate for these offenders and is increasingly becoming a requirement in many prison facilities. Often, such programs not only emphasize physical fitness but also integrate wellness programming into the overall service delivery. Programming for women and juveniles also requires additional considerations. This can be true for a number of reasons ranging from the preferences of different groups to potential security or medical concerns.

Benefits for Inmates and Institutions

One of the key benefits of recreation is the tendency toward a reduction in violence and disciplinary problems. The fact that when inmates are provided constructive activities the institution will

**FOCUS TOPIC 14.2**

**The NCRA Position Statement on Weight Lifting Programs in Correctional Settings**

It is the official position of the National Correctional Recreation Association that weight lifting programs are an integral part of rehabilitation services within the spectrum of corrections. Properly administered weight lifting programs are a vital tool in the daily management of a volatile environment as well as a potentially cost-effective measure. The task of providing a safe environment of positive change is not an easy one, and our tools are few. The elimination of any of these tools would create a void that would be difficult and costly to fill. The reality is that nearly all inmates in our prisons will one day return to society. It is our responsibility to ensure that they have every opportunity to return as more productive citizens than when they came to us. Weight lifting is a vital part of correctional programming, and we strongly encourage its continued presence in America’s prisons.

likely have fewer discipline problems is simply common sense; boredom can lead to chaos much more quickly than structured activity, particularly activity that is enjoyable. The leverage that prisons can maintain over inmates who desire such activities also helps to maintain compliance that is otherwise difficult to obtain.

Another benefit related to recreational programs is that they can help to elevate the esteem of inmates serving time. Because most programs enable inmates to set their own standard for success, there is a high likelihood that they will be encouraged to participate, and this can add a sense of motivation. It is important that inmates feel motivated since this is a necessary experience if they are to participate in a positive manner in programs such as drug therapy, educational achievement, or job training. Sports such as jogging are intramural in nature and allow the inmates to compete against their own past performance and to gauge improvements in their own activity. Team sports allow inmates to practice group membership, anger control, and the ability to work with authority figures (team captains and such).

Recreational Programs as Tools for Rehabilitation

In many respects, recreational programs can be useful as tools for rehabilitation. One term used to describe rehabilitative recreational programs is therapeutic recreation. Therapeutic recreation is a type of recreational programming intended to augment treatment planning for clients so that they can achieve optimal physical and mental health. More specifically, therapeutic recreation (TR) programs are designed to meet the needs of individuals with a variety of disabilities, impairments, or illnesses by providing specific services such as recreational activities, leisure education, and skills training in the cognitive, physical, behavioral, social, and affective domains (Olson, 2004). The definition provided by Olson (2004) is connected to mental health orientations. It is this perspective that we will take for this subsection, and therefore the definition provided by Olson will be used.

Common activities used in TR programs are arts, crafts, board or card games, music, sports or physical fitness, gardening, and reading activities. Unique activities include relaxation therapy, experiential education, animal-assisted therapy, anger management, parenting groups, diet and wellness groups, martial arts, humor therapy, and current events. The more specialized programs are often conducted in partnership with a mental health professional, such as a professional counselor, social worker, or psychologist. In these cases, there is often a fusion between the therapeutic group and some type of other recreational activity.

For instance, programs related to gardening and therapeutic outcomes have been used in the past and are still used today. In the early 1900s, a prison garden project was implemented by Warden Lewis Lawes of Sing Sing Prison in Ossining, New York. At that time, Charles Chapin, an influential inmate with ties to wealthy community members, had successfully obtained support and materials to create a beautiful and well-maintained garden on prison grounds. This garden, attended by inmates (under the direction of Chapin), grew to be a major project and was purported to have resulted in numerous benefits for inmates. For example, it is likely that naturalistic settings may offer benefits in terms of stress reduction and improved mental states for offenders. In several studies conducted within U.S. correctional facilities, access to outside views and the quality of these views have been shown to have a measurable influence on the behavior and psychological outlook of inmates and staff. Lindemuth (2007) showcases work by Moore (1981) showing that an inmate’s view out from the prison cell can have a significant impact on his or her physical well-being. More specifically, Moore found that the view out from a cell (exterior or interior), the cell’s relative privacy, and the noise level within the cell are correlated with the number of sick calls to the infirmary.
Lindemuth (2007) also shows how gardening recreation programs can have therapeutic effects on inmates. One unique gardening program can be found at Rikers Island in the state of New York. In 1997, the Horticultural Society of New York (HSNY) began GreenHouse, a program providing inmates at the Rikers Island jail complex horticulture training and work experience in the design, installation, and maintenance of gardens.

The garden at Rikers Island features arbors, post and rail fences, birdhouses, a gazebo adjacent to a pond and a waterfall feature, a greenhouse, and a preexisting brick-and-cinder-block building used as an office and a classroom. Walkways are constructed of gravel and brick. Several rabbits are kept near the office, and guinea hens donated from a correctional officer's farm live near the garden. The Rikers Island garden has a strong programming component. Horticulture classes are primarily taught in the winter months when conditions become inhospitable for garden activities. During this time, the greenhouse is transformed into a carpentry shop where inmates construct birdhouses, kestrel and bat boxes, planters, and other wood features for the Rikers garden and citywide schools and parks.

As noted in earlier parts of this chapter, some of the work-related programs offered to inmates provide benefits to others in society, including youth and persons who have disabilities or financial challenges. For example, inmates involved in the GreenHouse program grow plants for schools and other public entities, including libraries in low-income neighborhoods. Vegetables grown on Rikers are donated to cooking classes offered at the Rikers jails and also to area homeless shelters. The Rikers program is a perfect example of how the volunteer work of inmates can help others in the community. For the minimal time and effort required by prison staff, it seems that these types of programs offer huge incentives to everyone involved, and that they are able to improve the prognoses of inmates who also receive mental health services.

Before closing this subsection, one other program, also in New York, should be showcased because of its uniqueness and because it specifically relates to female offenders, making it a genuine rarity that, if replicated in other facilities, could generate enormous benefits. This program is located at Bedford Hills Correctional Facility (BHCF), a maximum-security facility for women. This program includes gardening and also provides grounds for mothers to see visiting children. Like the garden at Sing Sing, the contemporary Children's Center garden and playground at BHCF had strong support from individuals both within and outside the facility. The main goal of the Children's Center is to help women preserve and strengthen relationships with their children while incarcerated.

The gardens at BHCF are maintained by the women who serve time and are created to provide a pleasant area for child visitation. The entire program is quite extensive and includes a nursery, a parenting center, a day care center, a prenatal center, and a child advocacy office. It is important to emphasize that this type of programming affects not only the inmates but their children as well. Thus, it has a direct impact upon persons in the community and, at the same time, helps to maintain the mental health of the female inmates serving time. In addition, this program demonstrates how two different types of programming (gardening and children's visitation programs) can be connected to improve the standards of confinement for inmates, reduce interpersonal problems within the institution, and reduce problems related to child maladjustment that can occur within the broader outside community. Thus, recreational programming can provide numerous benefits, including therapeutic benefits.
RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS

Religion has played a central role in American prisons since the days of the Walnut Street Jail and even before. Students may recall that the Quakers of Pennsylvania were instrumental in achieving jail and prison reform. Indeed, the term penitentiary is reflective of the word penitence, and the prison was initially meant to be a place where inmates could reflect on their wrongdoings, and where it was hoped that they would come to change their ways. While religious programming today is a key aspect of prison facility operations, the role of hired staff and volunteers who provide religious services has become quite complex. In many cases, religious programming may be infused with treatment programming for addiction recovery, the development of life skills, and even the dietary requirements of various inmates.

History of Religion in Corrections

In earlier chapters, we have discussed the history of corrections and have noted the long and extensive role of religion throughout that history. The work of Dr. Harry Dammer, set out in the Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment (Levinson, 2002), provides a very succinct and interesting historical overview of the role of religion in corrections. Because Dammer’s work is so precisely congruent with the goals of several subsections in this chapter that address religion in corrections, it will be used extensively throughout this section. With this noted, we begin with a brief account of the history of religion in corrections, borrowing from the work of Dammer (2002).

Dammer (2002) notes that the influence and practice of religion in the correctional setting is as old as the history of prisons itself. He speculates that the initial entry of religion into prison was probably carried out by religious men who themselves were imprisoned. Indeed, many notable biblical figures were themselves prisoners, such as Joseph and Jeremiah in the Old Testament, and John the Baptist, Peter, John, and Paul in the New Testament. Beginning in the days of Constantine, the early Christian Church granted asylum to criminals who would otherwise have been mutilated or killed. Although this custom was restricted in most countries by the fifteenth century, releasing prisoners during Easter and requests by church authorities to pardon or reduce sentences for offenders were continued practices for centuries.

In the nineteenth century, when daytime work was initiated by the Auburn system, solitary confinement at night was still the norm in correctional practice. This forced confinement was thought to serve the same repenting purpose as the older penitentiary. Belief in education as a tool for reducing criminal activity also assisted in the growth of religion in prison. Because of the limited budgets of correctional institutions, chaplains were often called upon to be the sole educator in many American prisons.

In the modern world of corrections, religion continues to play a very important part in prison operations. However, as we will see when discussing legal issues in correctional religion, the meaning of the term religion has broadened a bit. It now includes groups that were not even in existence during the early colonial history of America and religions that were more prevalent in areas of the world outside of Europe. The religious pluralism in prisons means that inmates will (and often do) raise questions or requests that go beyond the expertise, training, or ecclesiastical endorsement of some clergy member (Van Baalen, 2008). In such cases, these inmates may have to defer to spiritual leaders in the community. In many cases, volunteers may fill that role, or facilities may hire contract chaplains or religious experts to address inmate issues if the need seems to warrant such an expenditure.

Religious Diets and Holy Days

Inmates of various religious groups will request specialized diets that are required for their particular faith. In most instances, prison staff can and do ask inmates to document in advance that such a diet is a required part of their faith. Legitimate requests based on recognized religious tenets must be accommodated (Van Baalen, 2008). Van Baalen (2008) notes that many religious observances for even traditional faiths may require the consumption of particular foods (e.g., Jewish Passover), and some religions may require that food not be consumed at specific times during the day or night (e.g., Muslim Ramadan). Prisons around the United States routinely accommodate these dietary modifications based on religion. There are even some occasions where a religious group may require the setting of a group meal as part of a ceremony; such types of request should


Legal Issues and Religious Practices

The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects the freedom of religion as a fundamental right, and this protection extends to inmates. In essence, regardless of whether individuals are locked up, they still have a right to practice the tenets of their religious beliefs without obstruction. The right to religion in prison was not an issue identified as needing court intervention until the 1960s and 1970s. During this time, a handful of cases emerged in federal courts that directly addressed religious practice within the prison setting. Most notable among these cases were *Fulwood v. Clemmer* (1962), *Cooper v. Pate* (1964), and *Cruz v. Beto* (1972). In *Fulwood v. Clemmer* (1962), the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled that correctional officials must recognize the Muslim faith as a legitimate religion and not restrict those inmates who wish to hold services. During this period, two Supreme Court cases also addressed religion. In *Cooper v. Pate* (1964), the Court ruled that prison officials must make every effort to treat members of all religious groups equally unless they can demonstrate reasonableness to do otherwise. In the case of *Cruz v. Beto* (1972), it was ruled discriminatory and a violation of the Constitution to deny a Buddhist prisoner his right to practice his faith in a comparable way to those who practice the major religious denominations.

Later, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in *Theriault v. Carlson* (1977) that the First Amendment does not protect so-called religions that are obvious shams, that tend to mock established institutions, and whose members lack religious sincerity. Further, though inmates have protected rights to exercise their faith, prison staff have the right to regulate religious practices within prisons to ensure that the safety and security of the institution are not compromised. In the case of *O’Lone v. Estate of Shabazz* (1987), it was ruled that depriving an inmate of attending a religious service for “legitimate penological interests” was not a violation of an inmate’s First Amendment rights. This fully affirms the fact that, ultimately, the safety and security of the institution is the paramount priority in prisons.

Thirteen years later, a significant piece of legislation emerged that has weathered the tests of litigation: the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (RLUIPA). The RLUIPA has helped to refine and clarify inmates’ religious rights under the First Amendment. The primary intent of this law is to further safeguard (not restrict) the rights of inmates to practice their religious tenets in state and federal facilities. The Supreme Court issued a ruling in *Cutter v. Wilkinson* (2005) addressing the constitutionality of the RLUIPA and its application to nontraditional religions. In this case, the inmates asserted that they were adherents of “nonmainstream” religions, namely the Satanist (typically the Church of Satan, which opposes Christian churches), Wicca (nature worship that includes witchcraft), and Asatru (the name for a Nordic-based religion that reveres Odin) religions. In addition, some of the plaintiffs in this lawsuit included members of the Church of Jesus Christ Christian (CJCC), which has ties to an extremist group and criminal gang, the Aryan Nation. These inmates complained that Ohio prison officials, in violation of the RLUIPA, failed to accommodate their religious exercise in a variety of different ways, including retaliating and discriminating against them for exercising their nontraditional faiths, denying them access to religious literature, denying them the same opportunities for group worship granted to adherents of mainstream religions, forbidding them to adhere to the dress and appearance mandates of their religions, withholding religious ceremonial items substantially identical to those that the adherents of mainstream religions are permitted, and failing to provide a chaplain trained in their faith (*Cutter v. Wilkinson*, 2005, p. 713).

The Court unanimously decided in favor of the inmates and found that the state of Ohio had violated the rights of the inmates.

The Court concluded that the RLUIPA neither established nor promoted any specific religion nor interfered with religious observance, including the right to not observe a religion or belief system. Thus, the Court reasoned, the RLUIPA did not violate the Establishment or Free Exercise Clause.

**Sources:** See References section for all court cases and referencing of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (RLUIPA).

Chaplain Functions and the ACCA

According to the American Correctional Chaplains Association, correctional chaplains are professionals who provide pastoral care to those who are imprisoned as well as to correctional facility staff and their families when requested. In early U.S. prison history, chaplains held positions of relative importance, which is not surprising considering they were part of a system created by religious groups. They were responsible for visiting inmates and providing services and sermons, and they also served as teachers, librarians, and record keepers. At times the chaplain would also act to accommodate so long as appropriate notice is given to prison administrators (Van Baalen, 2008). In these cases, the chaplain or another religious expert will aid security staff in providing the accommodations to ensure that misunderstandings are minimized.

**Cutter v. Wilkinson** (2005): Held religious inmates do not have more legal rights than nonreligious inmates.
FOCUS TOPIC 14.3

Focus From the Inside With Ronald “Raúl” Drummer; Criminal Charge: Aggravated Battery and Attempted Armed Robbery

My quest for self-identification started when I realized my own failure to make rational decisions. I was constantly driven by either my environment, emotions, or a desire rooted in unrealistic expectations. As the result of years of pondering and searching, I developed the Triangular Approach to Complete Liberation in Prison (TACL). The basic tenet to this is that we function best when we have persistent stimulation in all three realms of existence, consisting of the spiritual, mental, and physical.

During this time, I had a choice to give credence to a higher power in accordance with Alcoholics Anonymous and the 12 steps. I also tried to rely on self-education and Islam, and I even studied under a cult leader named Dr. Malachiz York. I was introduced to Christianity with emphasis on the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus the Christ. I noticed that this belief system challenged me more than anything else in my life, thus far. After being in the faith for about 2 years and practicing for over 11 years, I observed two types of Christians. One used the notion that faith is all that is needed of a person (thereby remaining on the surface level of their spiritual development), whereas the other consisted of those brave souls who plunged into their commitment to the word with no reservations (there was no point of return). I wanted that sort of dedication, and it went so deep that it pierced my very heart.

However, I soon learned that the principles of the Bible would continually keep me at a crossroads. At every checkpoint I had to leave a piece of myself behind in order to advance to the next. This has made all the difference in my incarceration—total abandonment of my old way of thinking that would be inconsistent with what I now believed to be the truth. This process showed through my conduct in the prison. My disciplinary reports went down to none at all. I was once unapproachable—now people can hardly believe this is the same person they had known. In addition, prison officials liked to have me around and eventually trusted me with responsibilities. Most important of all, I had no “good time” incentives to influence my behavior based on early release. I simply was making these changes for my own good . . . and all the while I was serving “flat time” on my sentence.

With the spiritual aspect of development on the go, I eventually focused more on the mental aspects of functioning. With this, I focused on information dealing with addiction and drug rehabilitation. Although my faith was the rock, awareness of my addiction was the undergrowth. Taking classes in a therapeutic environment opened my mind to the threat of drug use to my body and mind. During this time, I delved into various philosophical readings and a series of thought-provoking tomes. Ultimately, my development of both spiritual and information-based areas gave me stability in mind and spirit, but I was still lacking in my physical development.

While my introduction to exercise was a much needed step in the right direction, I lacked motivation to maintain my regimen. I applied the same technique to physical fitness as I did to discovering God and comprehending available information about drug addiction. I started out jogging around the prison. I pushed myself until I went from 245 pounds to 178 pounds. Through access to the prison facilities, I took advantage of weight lifting. It turned out that I was well suited for this form of exercise, and, once results started coming, I felt a sense of motivation and gratification that was unparalleled in the physical world.

For the first time in my life I had found my point and purpose in the most unlikely of places. Now, I am completely liberated in every area of my life, which is the ultimate goal of the TACL. If I did not have access to these resources, I would still be mentally, spiritually, and physically impaired and unfit. Now I am able to smile without effort, laugh and not hurt, and love without restrain. My life started when I was locked up. My family is my fellow prisoners and the staff. We give each other hope. I am connected openly with my prison brothers and discreetly with the staff. Coming to prison was the best thing that happened to me. I am only sorry that the incident that led to my incarceration hurt the victim of the crime. At this point in my life, I thank my mom, dad, and family for the support throughout the years. Most of all, I thank God for giving me a willingness to change.

Mr. Drummer was incarcerated for over 19 years before being released on parole. He is now a house manager with Freed Men, Inc., a non-profit faith-based reentry organization. He also has recently become a certified fitness instructor and has worked for over a year as a fitness trainer.

Home to Europe’s biggest Muslim population and a robust counter-terrorism system, France has long kept a keen watch on Islamic radicalism. In recent years it has been spared big bombings of the kind seen in London and Madrid. But France is no stranger to attack by jihadists, and officials fear it is just a matter of time before they strike again.

The authorities are particularly worried about recruitment to militant Islam in France’s overcrowded prisons. “French prisons are a preferred recruiting ground for radical Islamists,” Michèle Alliot-Marie, the interior minister, told Le Figaro newspaper. She and her EU counterparts have been working on a joint handbook on how to counter the phenomenon, which touches many European countries, notably Britain. At the end of September, Ms. Alliot-Marie will host an EU seminar, in the heavily Muslim Paris banlieue of Saint-Denis, to discuss what to do.

Fiercely secular, France does not collect official statistics based on religion. But Farhad Khosrokhavar, a French specialist on the subject, estimates that Muslims make up well over half France’s prison population—for higher than their 8% or so share of the total population. Among these there are currently some 1,100 people behind bars in France for terrorist-related activities, according to Alain Bauer, a criminologist. Ms. Alliot-Marie said that another 55 have been detained this year.

Proselytizing among inmates is common. Security officials are worried that many radicals jailed around the time of the 1998 football World Cup, hosted by France, are starting to be released. “Radicalized Islamists become more influential in prison,” says Mr. Khosrokhavar. He reckons there are a few hundred Islamists actively recruiting behind bars in France.

It is hard to know how to counter this. Concentrating jihadists in one or two penitentiaries, as many countries do, may help them plot attacks from prison. Yet dispersing them, or regularly moving them between high-security prisons in order to disrupt networks, may spread radical ideology and increase recruitment.

Less crowded cells might help. France, whose jail population has grown by 30% since 2001, is building three new prisons to this end. Another idea is to provide more Muslim chaplains to offer a moderate spiritual outlet for Muslim inmates.

Azzedine Gaci, head of the Regional Council of the Muslim Faith in Lyon, makes such visits to the prison in Villefranche-sur-Saône, where he reckons 70% of its 700-odd inmates are Muslim. “They need a different interlocutor,” he says. In the absence of competent chaplains, extremists fill the vacuum. France currently has 1,100 chaplains accredited to visit its 63,000 inmates across 195 prisons—yet only 117 of them are Muslim.

**QUESTION 1:** How might it aid security within French jails and prisons to add more Muslim chaplains to their overall count?

**QUESTION 2:** In your opinion, how appropriate is it for French administrators to have only 117 of their 1,100 accredited chaplains be of Muslim orientation when approximately half of all the country’s inmates are Muslims by faith?

number of nontraditional religious groups have been established in prison environments. These include, but are not limited to, Hinduism, Mormonism, Native American religions, Buddhism, Rastafarianism, Hispanic religions (Curanderism, Santeria, Espiritismo), Jehovah’s Witnesses, Christian Scientists, and two of the newest faith groups to enter correctional facilities, Witchcraft and Satanism. The religious programs and practices conducted by the different faith groups differ according to the beliefs of the group, inmate interest, amount of time and space available in the prison, competence of the religious staff, and the support of the correctional authorities. It is not uncommon for a large prison to have numerous religious services on a daily basis. As one can see, the role of the chaplain in modern corrections can be quite complicated, and this is, in part, what has led to the various legal challenges noted in this chapter.

Religious Volunteers

Religious volunteers are commonplace in most prison systems. In most cases, faith-based volunteers will desire to minister to their own religious groups, and they are likely to be part of a larger church membership outside the prison within the community. The availability of volunteers to assist religious staff is a boon, but it does have its limits. Most volunteers are not necessarily trained in clinical skills to provide professional counseling, and they are usually oblivious to many of the security practices necessary to operate a prison. Volunteers should be given very specific instructions regarding security at the very beginning of their involvement within a program. The volunteer, according to ACAA standards, should be provided some type of orientation, a tour of the prison, and materials that include a handbook and/or guidelines for the prison. The list of rules and regulations for inmates should also be provided to ensure that inmates cannot manipulate the volunteer into assisting them with something that is unauthorized.

Are Inmates Really Motivated by Religion?

There is perhaps a good deal of dissent among practitioners in the field of corrections when addressing the question of whether or not inmates are truly motivated by religion. According to Dammer (2002), there is a belief among many who work in prison environments that inmates “find religion” for manipulative reasons (p. 1375). However, though this may sometimes occur, there is evidence that inmates have received positive benefits resulting from their incarceration and religious practice (Dammer, 2002). Research by Johnson, Larson, and Pitts (1997) found that participants in religious programming had significantly fewer infractions while in prison than did inmates who did not participate in such programs. Even more convincing is the finding that inmates who participated frequently in religious programming services were less likely to be arrested when examined a year after their release. Thus, it would appear that prison religious programs have both short-term and long-term positive effects.

More recent research provides continued empirical evidence indicating that religious programming reduces crime and recidivism among adult offenders (Hercik, 2007). For instance, Johnson and Larson (2003) conducted a preliminary evaluation of the InnerChange Freedom Initiative, a faith-based prisoner reform program. Results show that program graduates were 50% less likely to be rearrested and 60% less likely to be reincarcerated during a 2-year follow-up period.

Contrary to dour views held by skeptics, numerous studies seem to demonstrate the efficacy of faith-based programs, both within the prison facility itself and later when offenders are released into the community. Thus, it appears that most inmates really are motivated by religious programming. With empirical quantitative evidence of positive outcomes, it should be concluded that religious programs in corrections are just as important as other forms of programming.
CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided an extensive overview of many of the typical programs offered to inmates within the prison environment. We have discussed basic services, such as food and medical services, and various types of programming, including educational, vocational, drug treatment, recreational, and religious. Though other types of programs are available to inmates, these types tend to be universal in their implementation, and they all tend to be used by nearly every inmate who serves time in the United States. This conclusion will not address each of these programs individually but will instead point toward one key theme that has been consistently mentioned throughout this chapter.

Students have learned that each of these programs works to improve inmate conditions within the prison and that each reduces observed infractions among inmates as well as the likelihood of lawsuits and/or prison riots. Further, most of these programs have legal requirements that make them at least marginally necessary within the prison environment. Regardless of whether each program is constitutionally required, it is clear that each provides benefits to both the inmates and the prison staff. This is an important observation because it can therefore be said that these programs reduce problems in prison facilities, and, even more encouraging, they reduce recidivism when inmates are released into the community. Thus, prison programming is a smart investment that saves taxpayers more money in the long term than it costs them and enhances public safety in future years when inmates are released from prison. To overlook the importance of prison programming is to be negligent in safeguarding our community’s safety.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Provide an overview of one of the prison work programs presented in this chapter.
2. What are some distinct forms of programming that exist for female offenders?
3. What are some of the important legal issues associated with food services in corrections?
4. What are therapeutic communities? How are they utilized in prison facilities?
5. How do substance abuse treatment programs affect potential recidivism?
6. Discuss some of the concerns for administrators with different types of recreational programming (e.g., weight lifting).
7. Discuss at least two Supreme Court cases associated with religious programming in prisons. Be sure to explain why you selected those two cases for your discussion.
8. How can social learning mechanisms be both positive and negative within a prison environment? Provide an example of a treatment program that attempts to capitalize on the positive aspects and minimize the negative aspects.
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APPLIED EXERCISE 14.1

Students must conduct either a face-to-face or a phone interview with a staff person in a prison facility who works in one of the following fields: (1) inmate education, (2) job training, (3) recreational supervision, (4) substance abuse treatment, or (5) religious programming. The student should use the interview to gain the practitioner’s insight and perspective on several key questions related to work in his or her field. Students must write the practitioner’s responses, analyze those responses, and submit their draft by the deadline set by their instructor. Students should complete this application exercise as an essay that addresses each point below. The total word count should be 1,400 to 2,100 words.

When completing the interview, students should ask the following questions:

1. What are the most rewarding aspects of your job?
2. What are the most stressful aspects of your job?
3. How does your work help offenders to eventually reintegrate into society?
4. What are some challenges that you have in helping inmates?
5. Why did you choose to work in this field?
6. What type of training have you received for this line of work?
7. What would you recommend to someone who was interested in pursuing a similar career?

Students are required to provide contact information for the auxiliary staff member. While instructors will probably not need to contact him or her, it may become necessary so that they can validate the actual completion of an interview.

Name and title of correctional supervisor: ______________________
Correctional agency: ______________________________________
Practitioner’s phone number: _____________________________
Practitioner’s e-mail address: _______________________________
Name of student: ________________________________________

WHAT WOULD YOU DO?

You are a correctional officer assigned to the agricultural section of a minimum-security facility. Your facility is large, with over 2,800 inmates who live on the property, most of them in dorm-like structures. The classification of most of these inmates is either trustee or minimum security. None of them is known to be violent.

You have recently been assigned to a field squad run by several “field bosses,” who are correctional officers with experience supervising inmates who work in agricultural settings. Each field boss has his or her own horse, field radio, revolver, and rifle to ensure that security is maintained during the day. The work is hot, and the inmates work very hard.

On your fourth day of work, you notice that the ranking officer, Sergeant Gunderson, allows two inmates, Dooley and Craft, to go off into a wooded section at the edge of the clearing. They emerge a little later and talk with the sergeant and then go back to work.
You watch this same routine continue during much of the month of July. You finally ask one of the other officers about what you’ve noticed, and he says, “You know, Mack, I just tend to watch over my assigned inmates and don’t worry about too much else. So long as they ain’t escaping and as long as the sarge is happy, I just stay out of it. Maybe they gotta use the restroom or something . . . like, maybe they got bladder control problems or something.”

You ponder this, and after 2 more days, you decide to speak to Sergeant Gunderson himself about the situation.

Sergeant Gunderson eyes you for a moment, pushing his straw-rimmed Stetson hat back a bit on his forehead before speaking. “I wouldn’t be worried about them. They’re old trustees who never hurt nobody and will likely be here forever. They just wanna ride their time out, and I really don’t see the need to rock the boat. Besides, you need to know that they have a long history with one of the assistant wardens here. Believe it or not, those two like to work this detail, but anytime that they want they can pick another detail at the dorm or elsewhere, and they’ll get the job switch within 48 hours. They have their reasons, and I have mine, for why things work as they do. You understand?”

You nod. “Yeah, I get it,” you say, and leave the issue alone.

However, later that day, you happen to observe the two inmates load a couple of watermelons into the back of a wagon holding work tools and sundry items. They also have several potatoes stacked on the wagon. They cover the produce with a tarp as you ride up and shoot each other worried looks. You ask them what they are doing.

Dooley responds, “We were just gonna see if there were any more work hoes available, but there aren’t. Why? What’s wrong, boss?”

You stare at him for a beat. “Nuthin’. Just thought I would see what was going on—you guys get back to work.” You watch them turn and go toward the main group.

The next day, you wait until Sergeant Gunderson is preoccupied explaining the details of some work assignment to another officer. You quickly guide your horse to the edge of the woods where you have spotted Dooley and Craft disappear so often. You see a faint trail, and when your crane your neck, you spy at its end a small clearing containing a watermelon patch and several potato plants.

Knowing what you know about inmates and the prison subculture, you recognize these two items as being prime ingredients for making homemade alcohol. In fact, some officers who work the dorms have noted that some inmates have appeared drunk on recent occasions.

You look around for Sergeant Gunderson and see that Dooley and Craft have their backs to you, nearly 50 yards away. You gently pull the reins on your grey gelding so as not to turn him too quickly or too obviously. You ride slowly back to a post that provides a full field of vision over the inmates you are supervising. You count them and find that all are accounted for.

You turn over what you have just discovered in your mind. You think, Those two inmates are growing products to make alcohol, and Gunderson is allowing it. You wonder how long this has been going on and who else might know about it.

Squinting up at the hot sun, you mutter to yourself, What would you do?