

8-2014

Paws in Prison: A Second Chance

Tiffany King

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), [Journalism Studies Commons](#), and the [Place and Environment Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

King, Tiffany, "Paws in Prison: A Second Chance" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2190.
<https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/2190>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact ccmiddle@uark.edu.

Paws in Prison:
A Second Chance

Paws in Prison:
A Second Chance

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts in Journalism

by

Tiffany King
University of Missouri
Bachelor of Journalism, 1998

August 2014
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Professor Larry Foley
Thesis Director

Professor Dale Carpenter
Committee Member

Dr. Thomas Rosteck
Committee Member

Abstract

The documentary film *Paws in Prison: A Second Chance* takes an in-depth look at a program that has been incorporated in seven Arkansas prisons since 2011. Select inmates housed in these prisons are chosen to learn how to become dog trainers during their sentences. They spend 24 hours a day with dogs that were rescued from shelters where they may have been euthanized. This project incorporates interviews with inmates in the Paws in Prison program, wardens at the Maximum Security Unit and the Tucker Unit, and volunteers who spend time teaching inmates how to train and socialize their dogs. The film includes footage I shot inside two Arkansas prisons. This 23-minute film, submitted as a supplemental file to this paper, tells the story of one inmate, who is new to the program, and the first dog he is assigned to train, and another inmate who is scheduled to be released on parole in August. The documentary explores the impact the Paws in Prison program is having on incarcerated individuals and institutions. It illustrates both positive and potential negatives aspects of programs such as these in the prison system. The goal of this film is to answer questions about how these programs work, how the community perceives the programs and what, if anything, have the inmates learned from being a part of Paws in Prison. The target audience for this film includes anyone interested in the Arkansas penal system and the ways in which prisoners are rehabilitated while incarcerated. I believe viewers who are interested in saving animals would also be included in the target audience.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Research.....	2
A.	Initial Research.....	2
B.	Interviewee Research.....	11
III.	Production Narrative.....	12
A.	The Production Process.....	12
B.	Conclusion.....	16
IV.	Film Script.....	18
V.	Works Cited.....	27
VI.	Appendix.....	28

I. Introduction

Although prison programs allowing inmates to train animals have been around since the 1900s, they have become more widespread in correctional facilities over the past 25 years (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 79). In 2011, Renie Rule, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences executive director of development, approached the Arkansas prison system with an idea to help save unwanted dogs that were slated to be euthanized, and help rehabilitate inmates serving prison sentences. Her goal was to illustrate how programs, such as Paws in Prison, help inmates find a sense of purpose.

ADC Paws in Prison partners animal shelters and correctional facilities, pairing select inmates with shelter dogs. Professional dog trainers visit the prison once a week to show inmates how to teach dogs basic obedience skills and how to properly socialize the animals. After eight to 10 weeks, the animals are available for adoption or used as service dogs.

The program is funded exclusively through donations. No taxpayer money is allocated to help feed, transport or take care of the Paws in Prison animals.

I met Ms. Rule in January 2013. She described Paws in Prison and offered to escort me to the Maximum Security Unit in Tucker, Arkansas so I could meet with the prisoners and learn more about the program. I was drawn to this project because I had never been inside a federal correctional facility and wondered how adding animals to a prison population could work. I was given access to these prisoners and was able to understand what life is like behind bars. The prisoners opened up to me about their pasts and allowed me, with my camera, to follow them and capture their daily lives.

This film is meant to illustrate how the Paws in Prison works within the Arkansas Department of Corrections, share first-hand accounts of the inmates who are participating in the program and allow prison wardens to explain the impact the program is having on the Arkansas prison system.

II. Research

A. Initial Research

There is little empirical, systematic research to validate the effectiveness of programs such as Paws in Prison, but anecdotal evidence suggests animal training programs in correctional facilities are beneficial to inmates, dogs slated to be euthanized and society (Currie, 2008). Inmates who have participated in prison-based animal programs have lower recidivism rates, learn skills that may help them gain employment after they are released and report gaining a higher level of responsibility and improved self-esteem (Deaton, 2005; Hennessy, Morris & Linden, 2005; Strimple, 2003). The Oakwood Forensic Center, located in Lima, Ohio, hosted the first successful animal therapy program in 1975. "David Lee, a psychiatric social worker, initiated a therapy program after noting improvement in some men who had cared for an injured bird" (Strimple, 2003, p. 72). The men began acting as a group and communicating positively with the prison staff. "The program grew to include over 150 small pets ranging from birds to gerbils, fish, rabbits, guinea pigs and even a deer and goats" (Hines, 1983, p. 14). Nearly one-third of the inmates were involved in the program at Lima and Mr. Lee noted that "pets help reduce loneliness, hopelessness, and boredom, lower the alienation and hostility towards other inmates and improve staff morale" (Hines, 1983, p. 14). Prison officials began a year-long study examining two wards, one with pets, and one without. Strimple (2003) reported that prisoners in the ward with pets exhibited less violent behavior, required half the amount of medication and had no suicide attempts, compared to eight suicide attempts in the other ward.

In 1981, Kathy Quinn introduced the idea of an animal training program in the Washington Correction Center for Women in Gig Harbor, Washington. She had several specific goals for the program, including helping inmates build a positive self-image, giving inmates the tools to select and achieve realizable goals, enabling inmates to learn self-control and showing inmates that others in society care about them and are willing to share knowledge and skills (Hines, 1983, p. 7). The program partnered with dog trainers from the Tacoma Community College and rescue dogs from the Tacoma-Pierce County Humane Society. Inmates signed up for 11-week classes and received college credit and lessons in dog training, dog grooming, and job-seeking skills (Furst, 2006, p. 414). The inmates

registered for these classes as part of the school program through Tacoma Community College (Hines, 1983, p. 8). Classes included both classroom instruction and hands on experience. Inmates took tests allowing instructors to assess progress (Hines, 1983, p. 8). Inmates listened to lectures about general dog care and behavior, how to train puppies, grooming procedures and employment opportunities in dog related fields (Hines, 1983, p. 8). Classes were held Mondays and Thursdays from 8-11:30 a.m. and 1-2:30 p.m. Following the lectures, inmates worked with dogs.

Inmates were grouped into novice and advanced classes. Novice trainers worked with dogs on basic obedience commands, such as sit, stay, heel, down and come. Advanced inmate trainers taught skills such as retrieving, jumping and scent work. "the grooming classes include instruction on different types of cuts, cutting nails and development of all skills required to acquire competence for future employment in this area" (Hines, 1983, p. 10). Inmates would practice grooming skills on dogs that were brought in by the public. The money made on grooming was put back into the program to build kennels to house the dogs at the prison.

As a result of the program, participating inmates said they "experienced increased self-esteem, developed a marketable skill and earned college credit" (Strimple, 2003, p. 72). For example, Sue Miller, a convicted murderer, became a successful dog trainer once released from prison (Strimple, 2003, p. 72). The community also saw benefits. Animals that would have been euthanized were instead trained to be service dogs to help people with birth defects and seizures. Administrators said the inmates learned self-control and were more cooperative. "Rather than any incidences of animal abuse being reported, as was initially feared, the inmates quickly became concerned for the animals' welfare" (Furst, 2006, p. 414).

Furst (2006) discussed a program established in Virginia that paired shelter animals with prisoners at Lorton Prison. The People, Animals and Love program (PALS) began in 1983. Forty Lorton residents were "trained, supervised and evaluated for their care and attention to a companion animal" (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 143). Inmates were trained in the Assistant Laboratory Animal Technician course. The course was designed based on the American Association of Laboratory Animal Science, or AALAS (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 143). "The AALAS educational program is used to teach entry-level people the fundamentals of laboratory animal care. It is designed to be taught for two

hours a week over a 26 week period” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 143). Although the inmates involved in the program do not received accreditation after completing the program, they receive recognition after teacher evaluations. “The men who do exceptional work in the course and are eligible for ‘work-release’ or ‘work-training’ programs at Lorton, are helped to find a job in a local laboratory, humane society or animal hospital” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 143).

In order to be accepted to the PALS program, inmates go through a screening process. Inmates are chosen if a panel of PALS members believes the candidate shows a “responsible and honest devotion to the program” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 144). Once a new member is accepted, he is placed on a 90-day probation period to determine if he illustrates traits the PALS members are looking for, “compassion, understanding, love and responsibility” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 144).

While some inmates may attempt to use the program as a “means to be viewed by others – staff, social workers, parole officers - as a changed person” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 144), many involved said they legitimately felt a positive change in behavior. One inmate, who was serving 45 years to life for murder, said, “I was illiterate, now I am taking courses. In sum, this program has shown me I have a purpose in life after all” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 144). Another inmate said, “This course is the most solid thing they have here to prepare you to return to society. They are even trying to get us jobs before we leave” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 144).

“In an evaluation conducted several years after its inception, Moneymaker and Strimple (1991) sought to quantify the treatment effects of the program by examining disciplinary records” (Furst, 2006, p. 414). They studies a group of inmates (n = 98) at Lorton who went through the training program from 1982 to 1984. “There were 10 missing cases from the sampling indicating a difficulty in determining an inmates’ status in the program; for example, how often he showed up, willingness to participate, degree of responsibility, etc.” (Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991, p. 144). Moneymaker and Strimple found 26 (29.5% of 88 valid cases) were “extremely active”, and 24 (27%) were “very active” in the PALS program. This means the inmates participated in monitoring the health and care of animals and keeping records.

Money maker and Strimple discovered that 11 participants (12%) were discharged for not following the rules. Violations included drug abuse, altercations with other inmates or staff and abusing the animals in the program (Money maker & Strimple, 1991, p. 146). Ten (11.3%) later returned to prison for having committed another offense after being released, while 87 (97%) never returned to prison (Money maker & Strimple, 1991, p. 146). "This could be attributed to the fact that they simply could not have been caught, or were not out long enough to commit new offenses" (Money maker & Strimple, 1991, p. 146). Money maker and Strimple discovered of the 67 (68%) paroled inmates involved in the PALS program, four men received jobs as "Assistant Laboratory Animal Technicians, two of whom are with SIMA Corporation which is contracted through National Institutes of Health to do research on primates, while another is employed with the Department of Medicine and Research at Georgetown and George Washington University vivariums. The last individual is working at Dr. Strimple's office in Washington, D.C." (Money maker & Strimple, 1991, p. 147).

Money maker and Strimple concluded the PALS program at Lorton allowed inmates to gain a valuable skill set. "Indeed, it seems clear from some of these preliminary findings that the program has worked to instill in its members a sense of responsibility and goal oriented achievement toward a rewarding vocation" (Money maker & Strimple, 1991, p. 150).

Furst (2006) discussed three prison-based animal programs: 1.) Service animal socialization programs allow inmates to raise puppies/dogs, teaching them basic commands and socialization skills. The animals go on to receive specialized training from a professional so they may become service animals. 2.) Vocational programs train inmates in animal grooming and handling. The participants may use these skills to gain employment after release. 3.) Community service programs allow inmates to train and care for animals which are then placed up for adoption.

Furst (2006) created a survey that was sent to each state's department of corrections. Forty-six states (92%) returned surveys. Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana and Texas didn't respond. Of the respondents, 10 states reported having no Prison-based Animal Program (PAP). Furst found six PAPs were established in the United States in the 1980s, 14 in the 1990s and 34 since 2000 (Furst, 2006, p. 420).

Furst (2006) reported the most common program prisons used was based on the community service model ($n = 24$; 33.8%), which was implemented at 59 sites (Furst, 2006, p. 417). “In this model, animals (usually dogs, $n = 19$; 79.2% of community service models) were rehabilitated and then adopted out to the community” (Furst, 2006, p. 417). Furst (2006) found the second most frequent type of PAP model used was service animal socialization programs ($n = 15$; 21.1%). At 34 sites, inmates trained puppies which were sent to more advanced training to become service animals. Most inmates ($n = 30$; 42.3%) were paired with animals 24 hours a day. Participants worked with the animal an average of 7.6 months.

Furst (2006) reported that “according to the surveys of the 67 program models in which the gender of participants was specified, males ($n = 38$; 56.7%) are more likely than females ($n = 15$; 22.4%) to be participants in PAPs” (Furst, 2006, p. 420).

Of those surveyed, the largest program reported having 300 participants, while the smallest program had only two inmates. Furst (2006) discarded the five largest and smallest programs and discovered the program size ranged from 5 participants to 70 participants. “According to this restricted mean, the average-sized program has 21.2 participants” (Furst, 2006, p. 421).

Furst (2006) reported that most PAP models ($n = 43$; 60.6%) are associated with a nonprofit organization. The organization was responsible for administering the program and giving supplies and providing training for the animals. “The organizations include animal shelters, rescue groups (e.g., Greyhound Pets of America), county humane societies, and service animal agencies (e.g., Guiding Eyes for the Blind)” (Furst, 2006, p. 421).

According to Furst (2006), the majority of inmates were interviewed prior to acceptance into a PAPs ($n = 51$; 71.8%) by program staff ($n = 36$), other prison staff or administrators ($n = 28$) and representatives of the affiliated nonprofit agencies ($n = 18$) (p. 421). Furst (2006) discussed how inmates become eligible or ineligible for PAPs and found “16 programs (22.5%) said there were no crimes that made inmates ineligible to participate; 42 program models (59.2%) make inmates ineligible based on the nature of their convictions” (Furst, 2006, p. 422). Crimes against animals ($n = 25$; 59.5%), sexual offenses ($n = 19$; 45.2%), and crimes against children ($n = 11$; 26.2%) most commonly made inmates

ineligible to participate (p. 421). Furst (2006) noted 53 (74.7%) programs had eligibility requirements, the most common being behavioral (i.e., no disciplinary infractions; $n = 29$; 54.7%). According to Furst (2006), 18 (34.0%) programs considered an inmate's work or program history before granting acceptance into the program. Fourteen (26.4%) programs looked at custody level before granting acceptance and 12 (22.6%) programs reported having educational criteria, meaning participants would have to demonstrate a specified level of education prior to entering the program. Furst (2006) reported 9 (17.0%) programs required a certain level of interest or inmate enthusiasm before program consideration (Furst, 2006, p. 422).

Furst (2006) found that most programs ($n = 49$; 70.0%) did not offer a certificate yielding component. "Of the 10 programs (14.3%) that do offer state-recognized credit, the most common type is a state vocational certificate ($n = 3$), followed by a pet care technician certificate ($n = 2$), and veterinarian assistant ($n = 2$)" (Furst, 2006, p. 422). Community college credit was offered for participants in two programs. One program awarded a certificate in dog behavior modification while another offered a dog handling certificate. Of those who responded to Furst's survey, 24 (33.8%) reported that former inmates worked with animals in the community after they were released from prison. Many former inmates worked at places such as veterinarian's offices and kennels. "Seventeen survey respondents (23.9%) indicated that the program includes a job referral or a link to a possible job in the community on release" (Furst, 2006, p. 423).

Furst also examined the ways PAPs were funded. She found 37 PAPs (52.1%) relied on donations from the community, businesses or non-profit organizations. In addition 20 programs (28.2%) reported collecting fees for things such as adoption, training or service fees. "Even if the PAP does not generate money for the facility, the animal trained in the program may earn the administering humane society, shelter, or nonprofit organization funds" (Furst, 2006, p. 423).

According to Furst (2006), 60 out of 61 prison administrators (98.4%) recommended PAPs. "Overwhelmingly, the most commonly cited benefit is the sense of responsibility instilled from caring for a dependent animal ($f = 40$) and most ($f = 42$; 60.0%) reported no negative aspects associated with the PAP" (Furst, 2006, p. 423). Common negative aspects were staff resistance to the PAP ($f = 8$; 10.1%), challenges related to the animals ($f = 7$; 8.9%), and a lack of resources ($f = 7$; 8.9%) (p. 423).

Britton and Button (2005) conducted a qualitative study at the Ellsworth Correctional Facility in Kansas. The medium security men's prison partnered with Canine Assistance Rehabilitation Education and Services (CARES) and 18 inmates were carefully selected for the program. "Puppies are assigned to inmate handlers, whose sole responsibility is training the dogs for 12-18 months, during which they learn more than sixty basic obedience commands and master an agility course" (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 83). The focus was to determine the inmates' perceptions of the program by looking at motivations for involvement, challenges participating inmates encountered while in the program, and the benefits felt by the inmates who participated in the program.

The pair conducted in-depth interviews. Inmates said the number one motivating factor to enroll was a love for dogs, followed by freedom of movement in prison and giving back to the community (Britton & Button, 2005). Inmate trainers said the dogs were therapeutic which resulted in a positive change in attitude and emotion (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 90). One program coordinator told the story of an inmate named Jackson, who was often angry and regularly in segregation (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 90). After participating in the program for six months, Jackson didn't have any disciplinary reports. He said, "[The program] helped me a whole lot. I was constantly in trouble... The impact of a pet... calms a whole lot of people down" (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 91). According to Britton and Button (2005), participants believed the dogs taught them patience, unconditional love, helped them deal with anger and made serving a prison term easier. "All of the men interviewed... cited 'giving back' as one of the primary benefits of being in the program" (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 93). Administrators saw a positive reaction by the general prison population. "The program's coordinator told us that dogs often become 'mascots,'" (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 91).

Britton and Button (2005) also noted several negative aspects of prison training programs as reported by the 18 prisoners used in their study. Prisoners said they felt more visible than the general prison population, noticed an increase in conflict with inmates not enrolled, and they had a difficult time giving the dogs up at the end of the training period (Britton & Button, 2005). Other data not included in the study suggested staff members face challenges while supervising inmate dog handlers. "[It] can present

some out-of-the-ordinary security concerns, and there may always be resistance from members of the community who oppose seeing the lives of inmates improved in any way” (Britton & Button, 2005, p. 94).

One study, conducted by Turner (2007), found seven positive themes among inmates participating in the Indiana Canine Assistance and Adolescents Program (ICAAAN). Turner (2007) conducted a qualitative study to understand the participants’ experience while enrolled in a pet training program. Turner interviewed six participants and asked each three guiding questions: 1.) What was the experience like? 2.) What benefits did the inmate gain? 3.) How did the experience affect the inmate? Turner (2007) found seven common themes among the inmates who were interviewed. Inmates said the program gave them more patience. “Although patience is a skill that was developed by working with dogs, it can be transferred to interactions with people as well” (Turner, 2007, p. 39). All of the inmates in the program had children and each said being involved helped them re-establish a connection with their own children. “Many of them explained that the program has taught them responsibility, and that lesson will carry over into their roles as fathers” (Turner, 2007, p. 40). Inmates also said they felt they were helping others while participating in the program because the dogs they trained ultimately became service animals for children with special needs. Inmates said they felt an increase in self-esteem because it was an honor to be selected, and they found it easier to relate to and work with others. Participants said the program made prison feel more like home, and the dogs brought a calming effect on the entire prison (Turner, 2007). One inmate stated, “It helps a little bit with morale. It eases stress a lot, too” (Turner, 2007, p. 42).

While PALs may offer some benefits for prisoners who participate, there are some limits to many studies analyzing these programs. Offenders who participate are carefully chosen and the program is not available for all prisoners. “Administrators of the program screened out applicants who they believe would take advantage of the additional privileges given to dog trainers” (Turner, 2007, p. 43). Opponents of such programs worry about animals being abused by the prisoners and have said prisoners shouldn’t be rewarded by being able to have a pet while they are incarcerated. “Skeptics might argue that giving prisoners puppies... sounds more like a vacation than punishment” (Deaton, 2005, p. 60). However, Turner (2007) argued most of the participants are in medium security facilities and would soon be

released. "It seems to be more cost effective to rehabilitate, rather than simply punish" (Turner, 2007, p. 42). Turner (2007) noted recidivism rates at the time of her study were approximately 60 percent nationally. "A dog training program in Wisconsin has had 68 inmates released who were dog trainers, and none of them have returned to prison (Turner, 2007, p. 42). One inmate said he felt none of the prisoners in the Indiana program would return to prison because "it has given us many opportunities and it's given us some marketable skills" (Turner, 2007, p. 42).

According to one study conducted by the Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Women Correctional Service of Canada, there are several reasons why prison-based animal programs close. "In some prisons the recent emphasis on security led to closure" ("Pet facilitated," 1998, p. 21). Other issues arise when there is a high turnover of prison and government officials. New leaders may not support prison-based pet programs.

Animal rights activists point out potential ethical concerns about having animals in correctional facilities. The study reported a potential for animal abuse and animal fatigue if the program is not monitored properly ("Pet facilitated," 1998, p. 21). "It is widely recognized that residential animals must have respite and cannot be expected to be constantly 'on duty'" ("Pet facilitated," 1998, p. 21). The study also reported the need to make sure each individual animal can cope with the stress of interacting in such programs. "Inmates need to be taught what the signs are for a tired or stressed animal and how to effectively respond to the situation" (Pet facilitated," 1998, p. 21).

B. Interviewee Research

Before beginning the filming process for this project, I visited the Maximum Security Unit located in Tucker, Arkansas to talk with Paws in Prison inmates. This informal group discussion proved to be extremely valuable and insightful. I spent three hours talking at length with all of the inmate dog trainers in the prison. It was a bit intimidating at first, but I was interested to hear how each inmate felt the program worked. I learned more about the program and how each prisoner said he was impacted by being a part of Paws in Prison. Most of the men at the Maximum Security Unit said they were surprised when they heard dogs were going to come and live in the prison with inmates. As one inmate said, "The worst of the worst (inmates) come to 'The Max'." Many of the inmates are serving life sentences for violent crimes, such as murder and rape. After the initial meeting, I was curious about the circumstances surrounding the incarceration of each prisoner. At that point, I made a decision that I was not going to focus on the crime that brought these inmates to prison, instead I was going to focus on the program itself. The judges and jurors decided the fate of these prisoners, and many of the prisoners admitted to me that they had committed crimes, made mistakes and are in the Paws in Prison program to somehow try to make amends.

I decided to structure the film around two primary inmates, one who is housed in the Maximum Security Unit who may not be getting out of prison and one who is housed in the Tucker Unit who is soon to be paroled. I was fortunate to find an inmate who was new to the program in the Maximum Security Unit. The film follows this inmate, Nimous Burrow, as he receives his first dog and attempts to train him. I was also introduced to Inmate George French at the Tucker Unit. He is getting paroled in August and I decided to follow him as he prepares for release and also prepares to say goodbye to a dog he has trained that has been adopted by a family in Canada.

III. Production Narrative

A. The Production Process

After completing initial research for this project I began my outline. I created several goals for this film during the outline process. I wanted to illustrate what life is like inside the Arkansas prison system, how the inmates may have changed as they became part of the Paws in Prison program, and how the dogs progress as they spend eight weeks living behind bars. I planned to begin with a new dog coming into the program and follow its progress to adoption. I also wanted to focus part of the film on a prisoner that would soon be released to see if he felt the program would give him skills he needed to stay out of prison once he was no longer incarcerated.

The structure of the narrative changed somewhat throughout the production process. I had thought of incorporating a segment about volunteers picking out dogs for the Paws in Prison program and even going to the home of a family that had adopted a dog from prison. After filming the prison, I decided adding more elements to the film may take away from the narrative instead of add to it. In retrospect, I believe these sequences might prove to be worthy of incorporating.

On the first day of filming, I was introduced to an inmate who was new to the program. I thought following his progress through the program would be a good element for this film. I was fortunate that on the first day of filming a new dog arrived at the Maximum Security Unit days before schedule. That dog was to be paired with the new inmate, Nimous Burrow. I was able to film the dog's arrival, document the bonding process between the inmate and dog, and capture the dog's progress in the program.

The Maximum Security Unit and the Tucker Unit are both located in Tucker, Arkansas. I traveled to the prisons on three occasions, filming multiple days while I was there. Filming lasted from six to eight hours each day. I was given access to much of the prison, including the barracks and cells in which the prisoners lived with their dogs. I had planned to utilize new cellphone camera technology and a monopod to capture footage for the film, but the picture quality proved to be less than satisfactory for the purpose of this documentary. Instead, I shot with a small JVC camera and used a wireless lavalier microphone. I understood that my personal challenge would be getting usable video and I learned a great deal about

working with the small JVC camera. I monitored my audio levels by wearing a headset while filming b-roll, but I abandoned the headset for the inmate interviews.

One of my greatest challenges was filming and interviewing inmates by myself. I am more comfortable engaging with my interview subjects while not having to constantly monitor what is going on with my camera. When talking with these inmates, one of my main goals was to be able to convey the emotions they felt while in prison and while in the program. It was difficult to make sure the inmates were comfortable in front of the camera while I was constantly checking to make sure the shot was framed correctly, but we managed. I grew more comfortable filming as the project continued.

Shooting the film was broken down into three phases. The initial session gave me an opportunity to get to know the prisoners at the Maximum Security Unit and document the arrival of a new dog. I also learned a lot about shooting during this phase. After reviewing the video I had gathered I realized I needed to focus on maintaining longer, steady shots and pay attention to matching the action that was happening in the prison. Reviewing the footage immediately after shooting became an important activity to make sure I was getting every element I needed. The review process helped me understand how to correct any shooting techniques that were not working for the documentary.

During the second phase of filming, I focused on how the volunteer dog trainers interact with the inmates and dogs. My goal was to show the viewer how diligent both volunteers and prisoners are as they work to socialize and rehabilitate the animals. I noticed how the inmates, many of whom were stoic and silent, lit up when interacting with their dogs and even other inmates. I could hear excitement in their voices and see it on their faces as the volunteer trainers spent time with them. During this phase, I noticed that the dog I was following during the process was acting skittish. I learned the inmates were worried that the dog may not be able to be socialized, and therefore unadoptable. I decided this would be a driving element in the narrative of the film.

I was surprised to find out that one of the dogs in the program was not going to a family, but instead to a nursing home to be a service dog. The Paws in Prison program is expanding to focus on training even more service dogs, which would be a good element to explore given more time for the film.

The last filming phase focused on saying goodbye to the animals the inmates have trained. I scheduled my final shoot for graduation day at the Tucker Unit. I expected a bit more pomp and circumstance at the graduation ceremony and was surprised to see a small girl in attendance, ready to pick up her new puppy. I filmed a lot of footage with the girl, her new dog and the inmate that trained him. Adding this to the narrative did not seem to flow, so I decided to leave it out of the film. I was able to also film the arrival of new dogs to the prison. Once the inmates at the Tucker Unit say goodbye to their dogs after eight weeks, they immediately receive a new dog and begin the training process again.

Scripting began after the long and arduous task of logging every minute of footage I had gathered. I spent one week logging and writing a rough draft of the film's narrative. Because I had a clear picture of the film via the outline, writing the script was one of the most enjoyable aspects of the film. I believe staying organized and focusing on a beginning, middle and end to this story helped to ensure I gathered all the elements I needed while on location and allowed the story to emerge.

Initially, I intended to use the voice of a local police officer as narrator to this film. I thought an officer, who had put many people behind bars, would lend credibility to the film and give it the overall feeling I was going for. The officer could relate to interacting with criminals and also understand what it is like to become part of the penal system. In the recording booth, I learned how difficult it is to coach a narrator to achieve a desired feel of the film. Narration is not like reading a book, it is like telling a story. I made the decision to narrate the piece myself because I felt like I had a firm grasp of the overall theme of the film and have had practice with voice over work. While I do not believe my voice was the best choice for the film, I believe it was satisfactory. I learned a lot while narrating, as well, such as how to convey emotion and vary pace and style to achieve a desired effect.

I edited my documentary on Adobe Premiere Pro. I have extensive experience with linear editing, but was challenged by the new technology associated with Premiere Pro. I was extremely intimidated by this portion of my project, but after trial and error I was able to figure out how the program worked. I learned how to blend multiple channels of audio and video and how simply video and audio clips may be manipulated on a timeline.

The biggest challenge for me was creating graphics in Premiere Pro. My goal was to use mug shots and lists of names and charges as identifying graphics for the inmates I interviewed. Layering the elements of these graphics proved to be time consuming and the finished product did not look as polished as I would have liked.

B. Conclusion

This film turned out to be as I had visualized, but I did have doubts about it along the way. My main concern during the project was the film's length. I had worried the film would not be of significant length, but by learning to allow the film to "breathe" and focusing on how music could play a role in the narrative, I ended up with a 23-minute film. I was also concerned with video quality of this documentary. My skills as a videographer are not as polished as many filmmakers and I was worried that my film would not look professional. In fact, I noticed many shaky shots, some were out of focus and the colors were not as crisp as I might have hoped. After visiting with my thesis committee member Professor Dale Carpenter, he put my mind at ease somewhat by saying that one of the most important elements to a good documentary was a good story. I believe while some of the video used in this documentary could have been better, it helped establish the grim reality of what prison life is like.

I believe one of the strengths of this film is being able to hear from a prisoner in his own words about his offense, what prison life is like and how Paws in Prison has changed his outlook while locked up. The film also illustrates how hundreds of dogs can be saved from being euthanized and go on to give joy to families or people who need service animals.

Objectively, I believe some of the film's weaknesses are in the videography. It was challenging to film action in a loud, dark prison. It was a humbling and educational experience and I have learned a lot throughout this process and appreciate the opportunity to tell this story. I believe these lessons will help me as I move along my career path in the future. I have a new respect for aspects of documentary film making that I was not as familiar with before this project began. I hope to utilize the skills I have gained in future films.

This is the first film I have created without the aid of a shooter and editor. I have learned a great deal about how to film a documentary, including how to make sure the shots are steady and the proper length, how to interview someone while also filming and the importance of double checking equipment before heading out on a shoot. I had to travel several hours to get to the prisons featured in this film and I

knew that if I had a technical issue it would be difficult to trouble shoot on location. Journalism Instructor Hayot Tuychiev worked closely with me before I began filming, making sure I understood the proper settings for the small JVC camera.

Editing was a daunting task for me. I was fortunate to work with John Cooper on a documentary film prior to this project. He was a tremendous help regarding editing technology. I turned to him numerous times when I needed assistance with graphics, audio and editing.

I also learned a great deal about the Arkansas prison system. Before each day of filming, I had to go through a lengthy security screening process before I was allowed inside the prison. My gear was thoroughly searched and I had to obtain special permission to bring a cellular phone inside. I underwent a security pat-down before each visit. Prison guards scanned my retinas and took my fingerprints prior to my first filming session. The prison warden and guards escorted me while inside the Maximum Security Unit.

Even though I have covered crime and punishment stories for a local television station, I had never had a chance to conduct one on one interviews with prisoners. I learned how to conduct myself inside a prison, how to treat prisoners with respect and how to gain the trust of prisoners in order to tell the Paws in Prison story. Most of the prisoners I encountered were very respectful to me, except when I entered the barracks of the Maximum Security Unit. Prisoners who were not involved with Paws in Prison made off color comments to me. I maintained composure and focused only on the task at hand.

Most importantly, I learned that I can create a documentary film without the help of a shooter or editor. While I would prefer to collaborate on future projects, I know I can confidently pick up a camera and gather usable audio and video. This experience will be invaluable as I work on future projects.

IV. Film Script

Paws in Prison: A Second Chance

Video	Audio
Interior Maximum Security Unit	<p>Music fades up: <i>Virtues Inherited Vices Past</i></p> <p>Narrator: In 2011, an unconventional idea was introduced to the Arkansas Department of Corrections.</p> <p>(Nats of prison)</p>
Cut to CU prisoner	Inmate Jeff Tyler SOT: I was surprised when I heard dogs are coming to the ADC, this was not something we expected.
<p>Cut to inmate teaching dog</p> <p>Cut to Carrie Kessler/Volunteer Trainer</p>	Narrator: Paws in Prison created a partnership between the ADC and volunteers (Nats of Carrie Kessler/Volunteer Trainer: Can I look at her teeth?) who scour local animal shelters with a mission to rescue dogs that may not have been given a second chance.
Cut to dog training	Inmate Jeff Tyler SOT: Every single dog we received, except two, they were strays, come from a kill shelter.
<p>Cut to dog crate</p> <p>Cut to Inmates/dog in barracks</p> <p>Cut to dog training</p> <p>Cut to dog coming out of crate meeting inmates</p>	<p>Narrator: Those dogs go from death row at the shelter, to a temporary life behind bars. For 8 weeks select inmates live with these animals, care for them, train them and rehabilitate them so they may be adopted.</p> <p>(Nats: Roll over.)</p> <p>The dogs aren't the only ones benefitting from the program...</p>
	Inmate Jeff Tyler SOT: Dogs didn't just change me, they changed my prison. Just like I hope someday I'm able to get a second chance from society, I'm glad I'm able to give a dog a second chance.
<p>Fade to Prison Bars</p> <p>Fade in title: Paws in Prison: A Second Chance</p>	Music fades down
<p>Fade to prison exteriors</p> <p>Cut to dog entering prison</p>	<p>Music fades up: <i>Grim Desert Aftermath</i></p> <p>(Nats dogs barking)</p>
<p>Cut to CU prison guard patch</p> <p>Cut to dog getting ready to meet other dogs</p>	Inmate Nimous Burrow: This is going to be my first dog I ever train. It's just like meeting someone new.
Cut to Rebel in room with dogs/inmates	Narrator: Rebel is getting ready to meet his new trainers, two prisoners sentenced to hard time at the Maximum Security Unit.

<p>Cut to Inmates Burrow and Miller Cut to CU tattoo</p>	<p>(Nats dogs meeting)</p> <p>Narrator: Like all new inmates, the first day behind bars is an adjustment.</p> <p>(Nats dogs meeting)</p> <p>Narrator: Inmate Nimous Burrow has been locked up for 13 years.</p>
<p>Cut to Burrow Interview</p> <p>Take full page graphic mug shot. Fade in name, location, charges</p> <p>Cut to Burrow interview</p>	<p>Inmate Nimous Burrow SOT: I was 18 when I came down. . I feel like I If hadn't come to the pen I'd be dead already by the way I was living, my lifestyle. I wouldn't listen to anybody I was doing it my way or no way. I guess I was in everything before I came over to the Max: gangs, acting wild, smoking weed doing drugs. I'm in here for murder, 1st degree murder change I'm in here for a reason I'm doing my time.</p>
<p>Cut to inmates with dogs behind bars</p> <p>Cut to Burrow interview</p> <p>Cut to Inmates entering barracks</p>	<p>Narrator: For much of this sentence, didn't have a lot of privileges. Visit with his family took place behind glass.</p> <p>Inmate Nimous Burrow SOT: I've changed a lot in 5 years.</p> <p>Narrator: He's had to in order to be accepted into the paws in prison program. Inmates must remain class one for a whole year before they can partner up and receive a puppy. That means no fights, no cigarettes, no drugs. In a place like the maximum security unit, towing the line can be difficult.</p> <p>(Nats of door closing)</p>
<p>Cut to Mug shot Dissolve in info about Inmate Tyler</p> <p>Cut to Inmate Tyler interview</p> <p>Cut to dogs meeting</p>	<p>Inmate Jeff Tyler SOT: When I came in here, I was 160 pounds. I felt like I had to prove something and I didn't like anybody. Prison mentality if you have an issue you solve it usually with "these," having a dog you learn to deal with it with "this"</p> <p>(Nats rowdy dogs meeting)</p>
	<p>Narrator: The dogs in the program have to learn the same lesson.</p> <p>(Nats growling)</p> <p>Narrator: Tempers flare when a new dog joins the group.</p> <p>(Nats barking)</p>
<p>Cut to dogs meeting</p> <p>Cut to Inmate Burrow with new dog</p>	<p>Narrator: Inmate Burrow is excited to get to know this yellow lab. He hopes the two will bond over the next eight weeks. Burrow is new to the program and will rely on his partner and program</p>

	veteran, Inmate Damon Miller. Together they will attempt to turn skittish “Rebel” into an adoptable dog.
Cut to Inmate Miller interview	Inmate Damon Miller SOT: He’s real hyper but most of ‘em are when they first get here. I like that he’s a lab, very smart, easy to train.
Cut to CU of prisoners	Narrator: Many of the men at the maximum security unit are in prison for rape and murder charges. Others end up here because they can’t behave in prison. Many, like Inmate Miller, will never leave.
Cut to Inmate Miller Interview Cut to mug shot Dissolve name, location, charge information	Inmate Damon Miller SOT: I’m in here for double homicide. I was just under the influence of methamphetamine. I’d been up a long time. Snapped like a light switch turned on and off. I made a horrible mistake.
Cut to dog on prisoner lap	Narrator: Miller says this program is the one thing in prison that reminds him what it’s like to be human.
Cut to Miller interview	Music fades up: <i>Fields So Green, Part 2</i> Inmate Damon Miller SOT: I remember the first night I got my dog I took him outside, it was dark, cold, stars were out. I looked up and thought for this little bit of freedom right here, it’s worth getting in the program”
Cut to shots of dogs/prisoners	Music up full
Cut to prison exteriors Cut to prisoners in training room with Kessler	(Nats of trainer entering room) Trainer Carrie Kessler: Hey guys! So we have some new dogs I haven’t met. Introduce me, please!
Cut to CU of dog Cut to Kessler making rounds	Narrator: Each week, dog trainer Carrie Kessler makes her rounds at the prison. (Nats: I’m seeing some progress and I’m anxious to see how the new dogs are doing.) Narrator: She is responsible for mentoring the inmates, showing them how to train the animals they’ve been assigned.

<p>Cut to Polo Cut to Kessler</p> <p>Cut to Polo and inmate working</p>	<p>Carrie Kessler SOT: This is this dog, truly his last chance, he had been returned from 2 different fosters. His main problem was he had no training, no manners. He would jump on people and pull them down knock them down.”</p> <p>Narrator: Kessler volunteers her time each week to meet with the inmates and check on each dog’s progress. She’s seen Polo come a long way.</p> <p>(Nats: Kessler: Let’s see polo work. Inmate Lee: Sit. Down Kessler: Good job, Mr. Lee. That is beautiful, what a vast improvement. One of the things we’ve been encouraging them to do is work as a team.</p>
<p>Cut to prisoners</p>	<p>Narrator: A skill many inmates have trouble exercising within the confines of the prison.</p>
<p>Cut to Tyler interview</p> <p>Cut to bars</p> <p>Cut to Tyler interview</p>	<p>Inmate Jeff Tyler SOT: In prison you close yourself off because it’s the safest thing to do. I was in isolation on Christmas eve 1994. My mom and dad wrote me a letter saying they wanted nothing to do with me ever again. For 22 years they haven’t spoken to me. Do you know what it’s like to not have a visit in prison or have somebody write you or tell you they love you? That’s the most depressing thing in the world.</p>
<p>Cut to prisoners training dogs</p>	<p>Narrator: Prison wardens say they can see the positive effect the program is having on the prison. In the last 3 years, they’ve seen fewer fights and a higher overall morale at the Maximum Security Unit. (Nats: laughing) Inmates may be teaching the dogs, but they are learning a thing or two as well.</p>
<p>Cut to Tyler interview</p>	<p>Inmate Jeff Tyler SOT: I’ve learned how to be a human being again, I’ve learned how to love, I’ve learned how to make friends again. I’ve learned how to trust I’ve learned how to open myself up to receive love. Twenty-two years I’ve lived in prison and love is not a main factor. But a dog, once it loves you, that’s the greatest feeling in the world.</p>

Cut to Tyler with "Moose"	Narrator: Inmate Tyler is serving five life sentences for kidnapping, rape and aggravated robbery. He says his experience with the program has helped keep him out of trouble and in line.
	Inmate Jeff Tyler SOT: I've been blessed that I was able to change my life around and if it wasn't for these dogs, I probably wouldn't have done that.
	Narrator: Tyler's last dog, moose, holds a special place in his heart. Instead of being adopted to a family, moose now lives in a nursing home. He lifts the spirits of residents there.
Cut to pictures of "Moose"	Kessler SOT: Alright a moose report! He's doing great, his tail is like a propeller, visiting people in wheelchairs. One of the women told me with tears in her eyes this was finally going to feel like a home.
Cut to Burrow and "Rebel"	Narrator: Inmates Burrow and Miller have spent the last 18 days bonding with Rebel. After getting to know his personality they decided to start calling him Rowdy.
CU "Rowdy"	Inmate Nimous Burrow SOT: we figured we'd change the name because people might take rebel as being a racist because we live in the south. Figured it would be easier to adopt him out. Music fades up: <i>The 49th Street Galleria</i>
Cut to Rowdy in a corner	Narrator: But the team faces challenges that reach beyond the dog's name. (Nats: He's a dog that's had some abuse) Narrator: Rowdy cowers in a corner when approached by strangers. Trainers believe he was previously held in a backyard, beaten with a tennis racket.
Cut to Burrow interview Cut to Rowdy	Inmate Nimous Burrow SOT: He's my buddy. Makes me sad. When you're in the penitentiary you don't get attached. I'm worried he might not get adopted because he's scary. Music fades out
Cut to Tucker Unit. "Rusty" runs down stairs with leash. Inmate George French follows	(Nats: Wanna go outside?) Narrator: Seven Arkansas prisons are now part of the paws program. Inmates at the Tucker Unit have participated for about 9 months. They have a little more freedom with their dogs.

Cut to Warden Williams interview	Warden Stephen Williams SOT: Most of these guys here are short term inmates, ready to go home for a second chance.
Cut to Inmate French with “Rusty” walking the halls of Tucker	Narrator: Like inmate George French. After serving seven years of a ten year sentence, he’s eligible for parole in august.
Cut to French Interview	Inmate George French SOT: As I’m getting closer to going home, it’s starting to come into my heart, what I’ve caused everyone else by what I did. I was living the American dream. I had a family I had a son. I write my son every week for seven years. I ain’t missed a week. I don’t get no response or nothing.
Cut to French and “Rusty” in cell	(Nats: Sit. Shake)
Cut to mug shot Dissolve name, location, charges information	Narrator: Inmate French is serving time for domestic crimes against his ex-wife. He says his prison term and the program have allowed him to take responsibility for his actions and try to make amends.
Cut to Inmate French and “Rusty” in cell	Inmate French SOT: This paws in prison program helps you become who you really are. Helps you show who you really are
Cut to Tucker Unit dogs training	Narrator: But it’s not easy. Only a select few inmates qualify for paws in prison.
CU dogs CU trainers	Inmate French SOT: In order for you to be in the program you have to be trusted
Cut to various shots of dogs and inmates	Narrator: Inmates are interviewed and brought before a classifications committee. Wardens don’t look closely at the charges inmates face, unless they have a history of violence toward animals. Once accepted, inmates must follow all the rules or they will be kicked out of the program.
Cut to inmates working with dogs	Inmate French SOT: Everything about you has to be in accordance with them or they’ll say give me that dog somebody else will get that dog. You got to be on your A-game.
Cut to inmates sitting with dogs	Narrator: Prison wardens admit they were a bit skeptical of the program at first. They worried about animal abuse and chaos in the prison.
Cut to Warden Outlaw interview	Warden Steve Outlaw SOT: First thought inmate gets a dog and train ‘em to attack officers. Carry out for potty call but someone would use it to escape. A lot of doubt at first.
Cut to Tucker Unit Wide shot dogs and inmates	Narrator: But so far, wardens at the Maximum Security Unity and Tucker say they’ve seen only a few problems with the program. Some inmates don’t like dogs, others may want to sabotage the program.

Cut to Outlaw interview	Warden Outlaw SOT: We only got rid of one handler that was accused of abusing dogs. I think he thinks he's going to get back in the program but he's not he's out for good.
Cut to Williams interview	Warden Williams SOT: I heard rumors of another inmate throwing shoes at a dog so we pulled him out and moved him to another barracks just to avoid problems.
Cut to dogs and trainers	Narrator: But they say the positive aspects greatly outweigh the possible negatives, even though there may be some backlash from the community.
	Warden Williams SOT: I have people say, why would you do this? Lock 'em up in a cell, throw away the key. You can't manage people like that. They're going to become that monster that society sees out there Music fades up: <i>The 49th Street Galleria</i>
Cut to dogs and inmates CU dogs playing CU inmates smiling MS prison guards	Inmate French SOT: You see them people that ain't said nothing in 25 years start talking. They start feeding them their food so them dogs softened them up. That tells you what this program does. I'm talking about killers, people with four or five life sentences. So that tells you how powerful this program really is
Cut to French behind bars	Warden Williams SOT: Doing time is hard. It gives them motivation to get up every day and know they are making a difference.
Shots of French and "Rusty" going outside to play	Narrator: Inmate French says he feels like a different man after being part of the program. He's getting ready to say goodbye to his latest pal. Rusty is getting out of prison and going to live with a family.
	Inmate French SOT: The people that's gonna get Rusty sent some friends to look at him and the little boy was five years old the first question he asked was does Rusty roll over
	Narrator: That request struck an emotional chord, reminding French what he has missed while being in prison, giving him a glimpse of what life used to be like outside the prison walls
Cut to French interview Cut to "Rusty" outside Dissolve to graduation day	Inmate French SOT: When I came here my son was just four years old. We had just gotten him his first dog. Before I could train that dog to do all types of things we wind up here going thru all this. It kind of hurt me when that little boy asked if he could roll over. I want to make it my business to teach that dog to roll over. Music fades out

<p>Dissolve into graduation day Cut to French and "Rusty"</p> <p>French takes Rusty through obstacle course</p> <p>Rusty rolls over</p> <p>Cut to crowd reaction</p> <p>Cut to roll over</p>	<p>Music fades in: <i>Air Hockey Saloon</i> Narrator: It's graduation day! A chance to show off, and say goodbye.</p> <p>(Nats: French with Rusty.)</p> <p>Narrator: Inmate French takes Rusty through an obstacle course.</p> <p>(Nats: obstacle course)</p> <p>Narrator: Then, it's time for one last trick.</p> <p>(Nats: roll over.... Hahaha)</p> <p>Narrator: It's an emotional end to an eight week relationship between a prisoner and his dog. Even though the young boy who will foster Rusty couldn't be at the ceremony, Inmate French made good on his promise.</p>
<p>Cut to handing Rusty off to new family</p>	<p>Inmate French SOT: Her son came to see Rusty and the first thing he asked will he roll over, so we did.</p>
<p>CU Rusty</p>	<p>Narrator: Rusty's journey is just beginning. Before he came to prison, he was likely going to be euthanized. Now, he's headed home.</p>
<p>Cut to woman picking up Rusty</p> <p>Cut to French saying goodbye</p>	<p>Woman picking up Rusty: Rusty is going to Canada! We're taking care of him for a few days he's flying to Canada on Friday.</p> <p>Inmate French SOT: He's gonna have a good life</p>
<p>Cut to inmate with dog and little girl</p>	<p>Music fades in: <i>Ascent of Sham</i> Narrator: As soon as the dogs are handed off to their new families, the inmates prepare to start the process again.</p>
<p>Cut to Dogs in crates being rolled in</p>	<p>Inmate French SOT: We are fixing to get out new dogs. They are bringing them in</p>
<p>CU crate Cut to Inmates looking at crates New dog gets out of crate</p>	<p>Narrator: Inmate French has no idea what waits inside this crate, but he knows the dog will be his responsibility, and it is a big responsibility. (Nats of dog getting out of crate. This is Sweet Pea!)</p>
<p>Cut to other dogs CU French and new dog CU Inmate Cut to working with "Sweet Pea"</p>	<p>Narrator: She's three years old. And she, like the other dogs, will have to get used to her new temporary home. (Nats: ooohh she's scared.) Narrator: Bonding begins right away. Already there's progress and potential. The next eight weeks will determine the outcome of her second chance. Music fades out</p>

Cut to Inmate Miller working with "Rowdy"	(Nats: Bow. Good boy.) Narrator: Rowdy's fate has already been determined. He no longer hides in a corner.
Cut to Burrow Interview Cut to Burrow in barracks with "Rowdy"	Inmate Nimous Burrow SOT: When he got here he was scared, no housebroken or nothing. He's come a long way. (Nats working with dog) Music fades up: <i>No End Ave.</i> Inmate Nimous Burrow SOT: I'm gonna miss him. He's become my friend.
CU Rowdy	Narrator: Soon he will travel to his new home. A family has adopted him. Now Rowdy is going to get his second chance.
Slow Motion Rowdy	Inmate Nimous Burrow SOT: Glad I got a chance to help save him. Hope to help save the next one, too.
Fade to Black	
Roll Credits	

V. Works Cited

- Benefits of animal-assisted interventions to young offenders. (2011, July 30). *Veterinary Record: Journal of the British Veterinary Association*, 169(5), 115-117.
- Britton, D. M. (2005). Prison pups: Assessing the effects of dog training programs in correctional facilities. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 9(4), 79-95.
- Burke, T. (2004). Pound puppies: The rehabilitative uses of dogs in correctional facilities. *Corrections Today*, 66(2), 74-79.
- Currie, N. S. (2009). A case study of incarcerated males participating in a canine training program. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(12-B), 7805-8029.
- Deaton, C. (2005). Humanizing prisons with animals: A closer look at "Cell Dogs" and horse programs in correctional institutions. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, 56(1), 46-62.
- Furst, G. (2006). Prison-based animal programs: A national survey. *The Prison Journal*, 86(4), 407-430.
- Hines, L. (1983). Pets in prison: A new partnership. *California Veterinarian*, 7-17.
- Jaspersen, R. (2013). An animal-assisted therapy intervention with female inmates. *Anthrozoos*, 26(1), 135-145.
- Michael B. Hennessy, A. M. (2006, August). Evaluation of the effects of socialization programs in a prison on behavior and pituitary-adrenal hormone levels of shelter dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 99(1/2), 157-171.
- Moneymaker, J. &. (1991). Animals and inmates: A sharing companionship behind bars. *The Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 16(3-4), 133-152.
- Pet facilitated therapy in correctional institutions*. (1998, April 6). Retrieved from Correctional Service of Canada: www.csc-scc.gc.ca
- Strimple, E. O. (2003). A history of prison inmate-animal interaction programs. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(1), 70-78.
- Turner, W. (2007). The experiences of offenders in a prison canine program. *Federal Probation*, 71(1), 38-43.
- Wimmer, R. &. (2011). *Mass Media Research*. Boston: Wadsworth.

VI. Appendix

IRB Protocol Approval Letter

August 13, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tiffany King
Larry Foley

FROM: Ro Windwalker
IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #: 13-07-012

Protocol Title: *Paws in Prison*

Review Type: EXEMPT EXPEDITED FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 08/12/2013 Expiration Date: 08/04/2014

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (<http://vpred.uark.edu/210.php>). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 8 participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior* to implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 210 Administration Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.