

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
SECOND ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM  
ON NEW GENERATION JAILS

National Institute of Corrections  
Jail Center  
Boulder, Colorado

May 8, 1987  
Clearwater, Florida

Edited by Richard Wener & Jay Farbstein

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Panel Summaries</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Papers</b>	
Linda L. Zupan and Ben A. Menke <b>Job Enrichment and the Direct Supervision     Correctional Officer: The Role of Management</b>	<b>8</b>
Russell M. Davis <b>Using the Principles of Direct Supervision as an     Organizational Management System</b>	17
Guy Pellicane <b>Developing a Specific Role Model for Mid-Level     Managers in Direct Supervision Jails</b>	<b>24</b>
Jeanne B. Stinchcomb and Sally Gross-Farina <b>IPC Practicum</b>	37
Ray Nelson <b>Unit Size and Inmate Management for Direct     Supervision</b>	<b>45</b>
Steven Carter <b>Management Decisions in the Correctional     Facility Design Process</b>	50
<b>Symposium Evaluation</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>List of attendees</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Symposium Program</b>	<b>--</b>

## INTRODUCTION

In 1986 the National Institute of Corrections sponsored a one day symposium as a part of the annual conference of the American Jail Association, in Seattle, Washington. The goal of the full day meeting was to bring together 'people who are working in and with "New Generation"/direct supervision jails to share experiences, problems, and solutions. The genesis of the symposium came from a sense that greater interaction among practitioners was needed - that many problems were common, but solutions were not being shared. Facilities were often "re-inventing wheels" rather than learning from the experiences of others.

This first session was by invitation only, and limited to several dozen administrators, researchers, and designers. The goal was to gain the maximum opportunity for open exchange of information, and not to re-create direct versus indirect supervision debates. A proceedings of the meeting was compiled and is available from the NIC Information Center, Boulder, Colorado.

The evaluation of the session showed overwhelming positive response. Facility administrators welcomed the opportunity to speak with their peers and learn what others were doing. Uniformly they requested a repeat of the symposium at the next AJA conference. The only criticisms were from those seeking more detailed information on substantive issues - such as staff training - and from others at the AJA conference who wanted to be able to attend.

In response, the NIC again funded this forum, **the Second Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails**, at the annual AJA conference in Clearwater, Florida, May 1987. This time the session was made open to all who wanted to attend (there were over 100 in attendance). The **goals** were, again, to bring professionals in direct supervision management together to meet and share information, with a greater emphasis this year on providing greater detail on operation issues. This proceedings is a record of that session.

## ORGANIZATION OF THIS PROCEEDINGS

The symposium consisted of four group sessions and several individual papers, as well as a series of small group "break-out" sessions which were held over lunch. In this proceedings we provide a summary of each of the sessions, a report on the

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails**

**INTRODUCTION**

session evaluation forms, five presentation papers, and a list of all those attending the symposium. For additional copies of the proceedings of this or the previous symposium, and information about future symposia, please contact:

National Institute of Corrections - Jail Center  
1790 30th Street, Suite 140  
Boulder, Colorado 80301  
(303) 497-6700

**VIDEO TAPES OF THE SESSION**

The entire day's proceedings were videotaped and professionally edited. The three tape set is available for use and may be obtained by writing Dick Ford, American Jail Association, P.O. Box 2158, Hagerstown, Md. 21742.

**PANEL SUMMARIES**

**INTRODUCTION TO SYMPOSIUM - MIKE O'TOOLE, NIC JAIL CENTER**

The NIC Advisory Board has concluded that Direct Supervision has been very successful, especially in the Federal System and, at the county level, at Contra Costa- Main Detention Facility. The NIC Jail Center has taken on the task of recommending that jurisdictions considering new facilities look into direct supervision. To support these jurisdictions, the NIC provides a variety of programs in training and technical assistance, of which this symposium is a part.

NIC has supported this symposium at AJA to:

1. Provide detailed information on important issues in Direct Supervision
2. Provide an opportunity for networking among operators of Direct Supervision facilities.
3. Provide information for those interested in exploring Direct Supervision.

**PANEL 1 STAFF SELECTION AND TRAINING**

**MODERATOR: RICHARD WENER**

**PANEL: SAM SAXTON, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MARYLAND  
DON MANNING, SPOKANE COUNTY, WASHINGTON  
BEN MENKE, WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, PULLMAN,  
WASHINGTON**

This session presented the experiences of two institutions in selecting officers for a new direct supervision facility. The issues they were responding to were: Do officers for a direct supervision facility need to be specially selected for particular skills? What are the qualities one looks for in officers for direct supervision? What kinds of selection procedures and criteria work best in selection?

Mr. Saxton's presentation described Prince Georges County's effort to review the hiring policies of a number of jurisdictions, and distill from them a set selection principles. They concluded that ideal officer candidates should have some college education; be more mature (over 19 or 20 years old); and be married. He also stressed the need to check references, and be wary of applicants who are looking for a stepping stone to the police force. An extended probationary period is critical in

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
PANEL SUMMARIES**

judging good candidates. Taking applicants on a facility tour, he noted, often weeds out those who do not really understand the nature of the job, from potential good candidates.

Don Manning and Ben Menke described their experience in designing a selection system for Spokane County jail. Mr. Manning noted that they had to more than double staff in moving to their new facility. Planning for selection began years in advance to the actual move, and made use of criminal justice researchers at the local campus of Washington State University (Ben Menke and Linda Zupan) with technical assistance funds from the NIC (see following summary and paper in proceedings). The traditional county personnel selection system has not proved effective for choosing correctional workers.

The goals of the selection project were to:

1. identify the qualities necessary for a Correctional Officer to work in Direct Supervision;
2. provide structure and training for the selection process;
3. design an evaluation system to measure employee performance and the selection/training process.

Prof. Ben Menke, from Washington State University, described the critical incident technique which was employed to do a job analysis for new generation jail correctional officers, focusing on specific job behaviors. A sample of officers and supervisors were interviewed to describe difficult situations with inmates which have occurred in the past six months, and describe behaviors which led to successful resolutions of incidents. This process revealed 7 dimensions of characteristics and 72 specific behaviors related to successful job performance (see paper in proceedings).

**PANEL SUMMARIES**

**PANEL 2 TRAINING MID LEVEL MANAGERS AND OFFICERS**

**MODERATOR: MIKE O'TOOLE**

**PANEL: SARAH HEATHERLY AND JEANNIE STINCHCOMB, DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA  
GUY PELLICANE, MIDDLESEX COUNTY, NEW JERSEY  
RUSSELL DAVIS, PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

This session focussed on programs to train staff for working in direct supervision facilities. Mr. Pellicane discussed a new NIC supported program to train mid-level managers for their special duties, while Ms. Heatherly and Stinchcomb described the training procedures for officers in Dade County, Florida. The Dade County program, called "investment in excellence", is being used to select 1000 officers for their new detention center, as well as for the 1200 additional beds under construction. The interpersonal communications training program, which is at the core of the program, involves 584 hours of training at the academy, and role playing with staff and actual inmates (see paper in proceedings).

Mr. Pellicane noted that experience has shown that getting mid-level managers to 'buy-in' to the direct supervision model can be a major problem. Major Davis also commented that as the officer develops more control under direct supervision, the supervisor loses control over day to day operation of the living area, and must undergo a major role redefinition. In some ways, these managers have the most radical shift in level and type of responsibilities. In his project for the NIC, Mr. Pellicane's group developed a detailed job description for mid-level managers in direct supervision, based on interviews with line staff, mid-level managers, and administrators. A policy a review committee of managers was formed to identify management needs, define job elements, roles, and responsibilities (see paper in proceedings).

**PAPER PRESENTATION**

**PRESENTER: BARBARA KRAUT, NIC JAIL CENTER  
DIRECT SUPERVISION JAILS: INTERVIEWS WITH  
ADMINISTRATORS**

Ms. Kraut described the results of her interviews with a eleven of wardens of direct supervision jails on the importance of maintaining the direct supervision philosophy, the need for training prior to opening, budget allocation for full time transition, the importance of communication, and problems with staff and mid-level managers. The transcripts of these interviews

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
PANEL SUMMARIES**

are compiled in a publication available from the NIC Information Center.

**PANEL 3                    UNIT SIZE, STAFF RATIOS AND DIRECT SUPERVISION**

**MODERATOR: JAY FARBSTAIN**

**PANEL: STEVE CARTER, COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA**

**RAY NELSON, BOULDER, COLORADO**

**ALAN MINISH, FORT COLLINS, COLORADO**

**TOM BARRY, NEW YORK CITY**

**SAM SAXTON, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MARYLAND**

This goal of this session was to discuss the relationships of unit size, staff-inmate ratio, and staffing levels. A key issue driving much of unit design and operational cost is the allowable population levels of a direct supervision living unit. Does a unit function differently with 48 inmates to 1 officer versus 65 inmates to 1 officer? At what levels do the principals of direct supervision break down? How can maximum efficiency of staff be achieved without sacrificing quality of operation?

The panel represented administrators from jurisdictions operating settings of various sizes - from 35 inmate units to unit with over 65 inmates, as well as planners and designers. Steve Carter discussed the process a jurisdiction needs to go through in approaching decisions on issues such as unit size. He noted the need to identify at what level basic decisions are being made (administration or vendors?), and what management goals the design must help achieve. Management goals must come first so that designs can be tested against operational scenarios (see paper in this proceedings).

Mike O'Toole commented that the number of inmates which one officer can supervise depends on other variables such as the competency of staff, classification procedures, and level of double bunking. Other presenters agreed and noted other related issues. Alan Minish and Tom Barry suggested that the degree of orientation to the institution, disciplinary procedures, and unit design (such as site lines) size of the day area, and shower locations were critical. Sam Saxton noted that the level of effort is greatly affected by the degree of medical care required. He suggested that the AIDS epidemic, and the related care needs it will generate, may overwhelm the ability of many institutions to operate.



**PANEL 4                      OVERCROWDING IN DIRECT SUPERVISION**

**MODERATOR: RICHARD WENER**

**PANEL: ROGER ROSE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

**LARRY ARD, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

Like most other jails, direct supervision facilities are often populated beyond intended capacity, at times at double original intended levels. This session was created to bring administrators from facilities experiencing significant overcrowding to discuss its impact on direct supervision. Does overcrowding inhibit the effectiveness of direct supervision? Does direct supervision respond to overcrowding better or worse than indirect models? How can administrators effectively deal with overcrowding?

Roger Rose noted that the population of the San Diego MCC has doubled, to 96 inmates per unit, although facility is functioning well. Much of the population are immigration cases, creating high turnover (100% per month) and language barriers between staff and inmates. He said that rooms with single beds have less violence than those with double bunks, although he felt violence was more related to inmate characteristics than density levels. Their largest problems from crowding comes in the areas of dealing with the levels of attorney and social visits, storage space, and maintenance. He indicated that crowding increases the importance of management visibility on the living units.

Larry Ard noted that the Contra Costs Detention Facility had also doubled in population since opening. As the unit progressively increased in population, staff complained and felt each level (48, 65, and finally 85 inmates) was the maximum possible, but in each case staff adjusted and were able to reasonable handle the population. When the population reached 85 inmates a second officer was added to the unit.

He does not feel the increase in population is without significant consequences. Noise has become a major problem, tension is increased, and mental health and disciplinary problems have increased. He suggested that in dealing with crowding administrators need to increase the amount of televisions available, offer more programs, and work harder to better classify inmates. Planners, he added, should design new institutions so that equipment, space, storage, and other facilities are scaled to possible eventual population levels.

## PAPERS

**JOB ENRICHMENT AND THE DIRECT SUPERVISION CORRECTIONAL OFFICER:  
THE ROLE OF MANAGEMENT'**

Linda L. Zupun, Department of Criminal Justice, The University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama  
and

Ben A. Menke, Criminal Justice Program,. Department of Political Science, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington

Herzberg, et al. (1959) argued that people find satisfaction in their work when it is interesting and challenging, when it provides genuine responsibility, and when it presents opportunities for achievement, personal growth, and individual advancement. The design of the job performed by correctional officers has been criticized by several scholars as incapable of providing these sources of satisfaction (Brief, et al., 1976; Toch and Grant, 1982).

The work performed by correctional officers in many traditional jail facilities is best described as fragmented, routinized, menial and, impoverished. An examination of officer activities, tasks and assignments in traditional detention facilities illustrates this point. The following tasks have been emphasized for a New York correctional officer: "checks inmate passes and records inmates' movements in and out of areas"; "watches for unusual incidents and reports any to his supervisor either verbally or in writing"; "makes periodic rounds of assigned areas checking for faulty bars, gates, etc. and checks areas for daily fire report"; "supervises bathing"; "announces sick call" (Toch and Grant, 1982:85-86). These obligations appear to be bureaucratic chores that require little or no judgment, initiative or skill on the part of correctional officers. Consequently, the nature and design of the job can frustrate fulfillment of officers' personal needs for recognition, challenge, responsibility, and achievement. The paucity of expectations helps produce workers who are dissatisfied, apathetic, unmotivated, alienated from their jobs, and uncommitted to the goals of the organization.

In his study of New York State correctional officers, Lombardo (1981) queried officers about job-related factors which were sources of dissatisfaction. Thirty-six percent of the officers mentioned boredom, and 34% pointed to the routine nature of the job. Whether correctional officers desired a more enriched job was an issue addressed by Brief, et al. (1976) in their study of officers in one midwestern state. The authors found that "correctional personnel respond more positively to a job that offers them skill variety, autonomy, task identity, and

feedback than they do a job that is perceived as dull and monotonous" (228).

The architecture and inmate management style advocated by the new generation, podular/direct supervision philosophy introduce significant change into the work life of correctional officers. In particular, the new philosophy redefines the job tasks and responsibilities of the officers. Previous analysis of the role of the direct supervision correctional officer indicate that the job has the potential to be enriched (Zupan, Menke and Lovrich, 1986). Hackman, et al. (1981) argued that people are motivated by and find satisfaction in jobs which are perceived as being meaningful, and which provide employees with responsibility for the outcome of their efforts and regular feedback about the success or failure of their performance. In accordance with the theory of job enrichment, work is redesigned to provide optimal opportunities for workers to experience these conditions. Hays and Reeves (1984:273) defined job enrichment as a type of job design which:

involves a deliberate attempt to increase the amount of responsibility and challenge in work. The job must be expanded vertically as well as horizontally. Thus responsibility and controls that formerly were reserved for management are given to the employees. This inevitably leads to greater work autonomy. Workers are granted control over such job components as resource allocation and utilization, performance measures, and problem solving. Consequently, the workers' feelings of personal responsibility and accountability are heightened. In an enriched job, the employee is given an opportunity to demonstrate what he or she can do and to apply his or her creative talents freely.

Hackman, et al. (1981), in developing a conceptual basis for measuring job enrichment, argued that the design of a job influences three critical work-related psychological states: experienced meaningfulness of work, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results. In turn, the presence or absence of these psychological states influences personal and work outcomes such as motivation, satisfaction, productivity, turnover, and absenteeism. Hackman and his fellow researchers proposed that enriched jobs possess characteristics that induce the three critical psychological states. These characteristics include: skill variety (the extent to which a job requires a number of different skills and talents); task identity (the extent to which a job requires completion of a whole, identifiable piece of work); task significance (the impact of a job on the lives and

work of others); autonomy (the extent of freedom, independence, and discretion in setting work standards); and feedback (the extent to which work activities provide direct and clear information about effective performance). It is hypothesized that optimal levels of each of these five characteristics in a job produce the critical psychological states, and they in turn promote positive personal and work outcomes.

Analysis of the direct supervision correctional officer's job indicates the presence of these enriching characteristics (Zupan, Menke, and Lovrich, 1986). The direct supervision officer role requires officers to observe, investigate, and resolve inmate problems, providing officers with the opportunity to use a variety of skills and abilities. It requires officers to resolve problems and manage difficult situations within the modules, thereby allowing them to complete a job from beginning to end. Officers in these facilities must assess the impact of their own management skills on module order, hence they experience direct feedback on their performance. Furthermore, they must make most decisions within the module single-handedly, thereby enhancing their sense of responsibility and autonomy. Finally, officers are required to both maintain order and exercise leadership within the modules largely by the use of their wits-a difficult task of evident importance to society.

However, the presence of these job characteristics do not alone ensure that employees will attain the critical work-related psychological states or that they will influence work outcomes such as motivation, satisfaction, productivity, and turnover (Hackman, et al., 1981). Management must recognize the potential for job enrichment and create strategies to capitalize on its potential. Adherence to traditional bureaucratic, hierarchical, command-obey styles of management may confound the link between the enriched job characteristics and the critical triad of: experienced meaningfulness of work; experienced responsibility; and knowledge of results. Instead, management must revise its approach to take into account at least three factors necessary for full implementation of job enrichment. These factors include developing a sense of job "ownership" among employees, vesting employees with responsibility for planning, coordinating and conducting work (vertical loading), and opening feedback channels between supervisors and line personnel.

The concept of job ownership is realized when employees are given full employee responsibility for an identifiable, meaningful and coherent body of work. Hence, job ownership implies a movement away from over-reliance on fragmented specialization and external control of employees. Job ownership,

however, has been avoided by correctional institutions in particular, and by criminal justice organizations in general. The reasons for this are many and include the following widely shared perceptions and schemes: management styles emphasize bureaucratization as the key to efficiency; quasi-military models of organization are based on a belief in the untrustworthy nature of human beings; less than adequate personnel standards and training are accepted as normative; and, a desire to protect the organization from a litigious society promotes secrecy and insularity.

The direct supervision operating principles dictate that there is “only room for one leader” in each module and that employees must maintain control over the entire module. Given the degree of control that officers wield within the module and the level of discretion they possess in task performance, territoriality and job ownership among employees are inevitable. Ownership is facilitated not only by the design of the job and the architecture of the workplace, but by managerial response to the employees. Through training, performance appraisal, and daily oversight, management can demonstrate its trust in the abilities of employees to exercise responsible discretion and thereby reinforce the employees’ sense of ownership. In the words of one of our interview subjects, “Supervisors must recognize that this is my module. When things go well, I’ll take the credit. When things go poorly, I’ll take the responsibility.”

Work in jails is generally characterized by the separation of planning and coordination functions from the actual performance of the job. While line personnel are responsible for performance, supervisors control the planning and coordination of the work. Vertical loading refers to the process of moving some measure of responsibility and control, specifically planning and coordinating functions, from management to line employees. In direct supervision facilities this process can be achieved by allowing correctional officers more discretion in deciding work methods, by using them to train less experienced officers, and, finally, by requiring them to assess the quality of their own work. In addition, correctional officers can be granted greater authority and responsibility for time management, troubleshooting and crisis management Hackman, et al., 1981:241).

Team building is another means by which vertical loading can be accomplished. The design of the direct supervision facility requires that module officers from three different shifts develop a consistent and coherent strategy among themselves for inmate management. This requires two commitments from management:

first, a demonstrable trust in the accumulated wisdom of officers; and second, a more mundane recognition that shift scheduling must be done to promote interaction between staff members. Through such strategies as overlapping shifts and meetings between module officers, administrators can facilitate the exchange of information vital to the consistent management of the module.

While management's response to matters such as changes in schedules is easily accomplished, changes in traditional management perceptions about the competence of employees are more difficult to achieve. The critical factor, however, remains the extent of management's trust in its employees' ability to wield discretion.

The final consideration for management of enriched jobs concerns the provision of a forum for open and continuous feedback to employees about job performance. There are several sources from which employees receive information about their performance; these sources include management and direct supervisors, co-workers, clients and the work itself. Traditionally, correctional officers receive feedback from clients on an irregular basis (since officers are not in direct and continuous contact with inmates in traditional facilities), from management on an occasional basis (as a regularly scheduled performance appraisal, or, oftentimes only in reaction to malperformance), and from co-workers (who tend to support subculture values rather than the formal values of the organization).

By the nature of the design of their jobs direct supervision correctional officers receive immediate feedback from inmates as to the success or failure of their management styles. This learning can be direct and immediate. It is important that the supervision of correctional officers move from command-obey and occasional performance appraisals to continuous coaching and counseling to take advantage of this feedback source. Through coaching and counseling, supervisors can assist officers in interpreting daily events and experiences in a manner consistent with the direct supervision philosophy.

Our previous analysis of the direct supervision correctional officer's job revealed several important issues which face New Generation jail officials. The analysis of the core dimensions of the correctional officer's role indicated that it requires skills (managerial and leadership) usually possessed by individual higher levels of management. This fact presents at least two dilemmas (or challenges, depending on one's point of

view).

First, most organizations promote people to positions of responsibility after extensive preparation (academic or organizational). Employees are typically promoted after they have been exposed to traditions and norms of long standing. Their understanding of the organization and its various work roles have been molded by both formal and informal experience. In contrast, the direct supervision facility recruits people with little or no experience in requisite leadership and management skills. Thus, forging consensus about the correctional officers' role becomes both crucial and problematic and requires a thorough reexamination of traditional personnel and human resource development programs.

Second, direct supervision inmate management, with its explicit link between philosophy, operations, and architectural design represents a major innovation in institutional corrections experience. There is a change in the architecture, a change in the mission of the organization, a change in the operating principles and a change in the nature of the correctional officers' job. The direct supervision style of inmate management mandates careful coordination of the physical surroundings, the orienting philosophy, and work performance. This coordination, in turn, requires reevaluation and change from traditional management orientation. More specifically, it demands a move away from an organizational culture based on bureaucratic necessities to one predicated upon mutual trust and support between management and correctional officers. In addition, it requires the reexamination of formal personnel practices.

For correctional officers in podular/direct supervision facilities to experience the benefits of job enrichment, managerial and supervisory orientations must be altered to facilitate the job redesign. There is some evidence to suggest that correctional officers in podular/direct supervision facilities perceive that the orientations of managers and supervisors have not dramatically changed in the transition from traditional to direct supervision. For example, in personnel-related surveys we administered to correctional officers in five podular/direct supervision facilities, a space was provided for officers to write open-ended comments; the comments overwhelmingly concerned complaints against supervisors and administrators. Some officers complained that they were denied authority in their modules, which made it difficult to



control inmate behavior?

C.O.s do not have authority in their pods. Inmates always want to talk to a sergeant if they are not happy with the C.O.'s decision. There have been times when a sergeant will overrule a C.O.s decision and that is not right. To the inmates it doesn't look like the CO. has much authority. C.O.s should rule the pods, not the sergeant. It's very frustrating when sergeants, lieutenants, and the major dictate how to run a pod when they have no idea what it entails. All management should work a pod first then change what's needed.

Other officers complained about the lack of communication between administration and the line officers:

The things that I have observed as one of the biggest problems is the lack of communication between administration, and I mean upper administration, and the C.O. on the decks. This is the most frustrating part of the job. Sometimes it seems that they are so out of touch with the officers doing the work. This is a job where your officers' lives are always on the line. Please do not forget this when writing S.O.P.s [standard operating procedures] concerning inmate activities, wants, and grievances.

Several other officers complained about the lack of input they had in administrative policies that directly affect them:

Employees are asked for their opinions on major changes, but management does their own way regardless, i.e., mandatory shift change. Almost nobody wanted it. But it is still enforced.

As stated by another employee:

There are constant rule changes without any regards to the working officer's direct knowledge of his/her post and continuous threats of disciplinary and or termination of officers in general whenever one, two, or maybe three officers act in bad judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Officer comments are presented as transmitted to the researchers. Orthography and grammatical constructions have not been altered.

Another complaint of officers was the lack of trust demonstrated by supervisors and administrators and the degree of control they exerted over the officers:

Your sergeants and lieutenants should be there to back the officers...Stick to important matters that concern the safety of the facility and its officers. Show the officers that they can be trusted to carry on their duties and that they are trained professionals. If you have a bad apple-counsel [counsel] them and if that doesn't work get rid of them. But the same should go for the administration and sergeants and lieutenants. If the administration is not willing to talk to its line officers and listen to what they have to say and apply it to their jobs then the administration isn't worth a flying fuck. The line officer will either make or break a facility. If you have good work relations between personnel, sergeants, lieutenants, and administration you will have a better run department. Treat your people as people. They will learn from you and you will also learn from them.

Finally, officers complained about administrative reliance on coercion rather than positive reinforcement to ensure correctional officer compliance:

When a policy or decision is made the people it concerns most have no choice. Except to quit, if they don't like it. Positive reinforcement is a must in any job and a lack of it makes for low moral[e] and hostilities. The lack of pay raises means employees tend to give less of themselves. The lack of positive rewards for term of employment means that staff turnover is greater.

And, according to another officer:

If and when your new jail opens, please make sure that your officers are treated the same as you would treat inmates. We do not believe in mass punishment for inmates, but our administration seems to believe in it for their officers. And make sure your administration are open minded enough to listen to the line staff, since they are the core of the system. And they deal with the inmates more often than not. And be willing to tell the line staff about "atta boys" just as much as you would the "the aw shits." Your morale will be a lot better and things will run a lot smoother.

In summary, managers and supervisors play a critical role in ensuring that correctional officers benefit from the enriched

work provided in podular/direct supervision facilities. Although these comments are not proof that the orientations of supervisors and administrators confound the link between job enrichment and positive work outcomes, they nevertheless suggest a direction for investigation. Future research is urgently needed to develop an appropriate managerial style to fit the needs and demands of the podular/direct supervision operations.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brief, A.P., J. Munro, and R.J. Aldag (1976) "Correctional Employees' Reaction to Job Characteristics: A Data Based Argument for Job Enrichment." Journal of Criminal Justice. 4:223-230.
- Hackman, J.R., G. Oldham, R. Janson and K. Purdy (1981) "A New Strategy for Job Enrichment." In D.E. Klingner (ed.) Public Personnel Management. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company
- Hays, S.W. and T.Z. Reeves (1984) Personnel Management in the Public Sector. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B.B. Snyderman (1959) The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley.
- Lombardo, L.X. (198 1) Guards Imprisoned: Correctional Officers at Work. New York: Elsevier.
- Toch, H. and J.D. Grant (1982) Reforming Human Services. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Zupan, L.L., B.A. Menke, and N.P. Lovrich (1986) "Podular/Direct Supervision Detention Facilities: Challenges for Human Resource Development." In J. Farbstein & R. Wener (eds.) Proceedings of the First Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails Boulder, Colorado: National Institute of Corrections.

1. The authors wish to thank Nicholas P. Lovrich, Director, Division of Governmental Studies and Services, Washington State University, and Captain Don Manning, Spokane County Detention Facility, for their assistance. This work was, in part, funded by Technical Assistance Grant #DG-9 from the National Institute of Corrections.

## **USING THE PRINCIPLES OF DIRECT SUPERVISION AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

Russell M. Davis, Pima County, Arizona

During the past several years we have seen a general proliferation of Direct Supervision Jails across the country. From the beginning of the concept in the Federal Metropolitan Corrections Centers and through the pioneering in Contra Costa County, California, as well as facilities in Multnomah County, Oregon, Clark County, Nevada, Pima County, Arizona, and Larimer County, Colorado, we have seen the concept become accepted, refined and applied in a wide variety of different environments and different styles. The foundation of the concept, however, has always been the application of the eight principles of Direct Supervision. The principles have provided both a philosophical foundation for defining a style of managing inmate behavior, as well as a framework for understanding the dynamics of human behavior in a correctional setting.

Our experience has shown that while we spend considerable time, effort and money containing inmate behavior in traditional or remote supervision facilities, we had little impact on behavioral changes. Direct supervision however, has allowed us to very effectively control inmate behavior through the enforcement of boundaries of acceptable behavior and the administration of consequences for violating the boundaries.

As we examine the direct supervision facilities in operation today, there can be no doubt that the concept is extremely successful.

As managers of these direct supervision facilities work to perfect the methods of controlling inmate behavior we must also examine the environments in which we work and our management concepts as they relate to controlling staff behavior. If the principles of direct supervision work so well to control inmate behavior, will they also work as a framework for managing the overall organization and maximizing the potential of staff?

If we look at the eight principles of direct supervision as a concept of managing an organization it is easy to define the impact of each principle on the organization and personnel as well as the interrelationships between the eight principles.

Consider the principle of COMPETENT STAFF as a starting point for developing a management concept. Every good administrator knows that competent staff are the key to success.

A building is only a shell. It may be well-designed, but without competent staff the facility will fail. We must begin by recruiting and selecting qualified, career-oriented personnel for officers, supervisors, commanders and support staff in a direct supervision facility. Candidates must possess the ability to learn, be mature, and have confidence in themselves. They must have some life experiences dealing with people and they must possess a considerable amount of common sense..

The responsibility of the training program is three-fold. First, it must provide the candidate with the knowledge and skills necessary to function as an officer. Secondly, it must provide the officers with the confidence in themselves and the organization necessary for success. Thirdly, it must provide the officer with the inspiration and motivation necessary to make success a reality.

The next principle of direct supervision is the principle of CLASSIFICATION AND ORIENTATION. When we are dealing with inmates, it is important that we classify the inmates properly so that we have a group of inmates that can function together well and then orient them properly so they understand our expectations. When we are dealing with staff, orientation becomes critical. It is very important that each employee know and understand what is expected from them and what they can expect from their supervisors, managers, and the organization. Mismatched expectations are one of the leading causes of conflict, anger, hostility, and lack of productivity in the workplace today. Management has the responsibility to administer consequences, immediately and consistently, for employee behavior. If the employees do a good job, let them know it. If they make a mistake, let them know. Take the time to review the mistake, determine the causes, identify alternative behaviors, and ensure that the employees are oriented properly on the new expectations.

Employee's behavior is motivated largely by consequences. These consequences may be both positive and negative. The consequences may be tangible items such as the paycheck, insurance, etc., or less tangible items such as a sense of belonging, personal self-fulfillment, ego gratification, etc. It is clear that in the absence of consequences there is no control. If there are no consequences for behavior then management does not have control of the employees' behavior and, consequently, does not have control of the organization.

To ensure that expectations are accurately and fully perceived and understood by both employees and supervisors the

third principle of direct supervision, EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION, must be utilized. There are numerous barriers to effective communication, many of which will be present during any particular communication. Effective communication simply means that the receiver of the communication perceives and understands exactly what the communicator is attempting to communicate. If, as a communicator, you have not achieved this goal, then you have not had an effective communication. The responsibility for effective communication is on the communicator, not necessarily on the receiver of the communication.

Once you have recruited, selected and trained your employees, developed competent staff, and oriented them properly on your expectations through the use of effective communication, you are ready to implement the fourth principle of direct supervision, EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION. Effective supervision ensures that employees are fulfilling the expectations that you have effectively communicated to them. The supervisor may use a wide variety of management and leadership techniques to ensure effective supervision, which can be divided into four categories: positioning, leadership, evaluation and feedback.

The manager must position himself within the environment to determine if the employee is meeting or exceeding expectations. This positioning may include: physical observation of the officer at work, review of reports, grievances, log entries, etc., conversation with fellow officers, performance evaluations, conversations with inmates within the officers housing unit, etc. The supervisor must use any means available to constantly test the environment, evaluate the situation, and make improvements.

The manager must exercise leadership over the employees. Leadership is best defined as the ability to get employees to do what you want them to do, willingly. An effective leader will communicate effectively to employees a vision of the way things should be, then mobilize whatever forces are necessary to make that vision reality. Ownership is a key element in successful leadership. If the leader is successful in convincing everyone that they have a stake in the success of a project and that if one wins, everyone wins, the employees will be working with and for him rather than against him.

Evaluation is essential in continuing growth and improvement. The manager must constantly evaluate the personnel and the situation, determine if changes are necessary, and make changes when appropriate. A lack of decisiveness is destructive to employee morale and to the organization.

Feedback is the element that completes the management cycle. The increased flexibility and autonomy of direct supervision facilities will require improved feedback techniques. It is essential to the morale of employees to provide both positive and negative feedback concerning performance on a regular basis.

Since the officers in a Direct Supervision Jail are isolated from supervisors and managers, it is very difficult to maintain supervision by direct observation. Because of this environment it is essential that the supervisor/ subordinate relationship be based on a firm foundation of mutual respect. For the supervisor to earn the respect of the subordinate, one of the most essential elements is a belief that the supervisor treats the employee in a fair and equitable manner. Consequently, as the supervisor administers consequences for achieving, exceeding or failing to achieve expectations, it is essential to apply the fifth principle of direct supervision, JUST AND FAIR.

The foundation of the criminal justice system as well as the foundation of American Government, the Constitution of the United States, is based on the concept of "just and fair". Justice and fairness are an expectations of virtually all citizens. Lack of a "Just and fair" system is the root cause of collective violence by inmates in correctional institutions, as well as employee dissatisfaction, labor/management disputes, and job actions by labor unions. If employees are treated fairly, they will support the organization and work together with management in a team effort. If employees are not treated fairly, they will look out for themselves, often at the expense of the organization. If the principles of "just and fair" are not strictly applied, it will be impossible, to successfully implement any of the other principles.

If we start with competent staff, orient them properly to eliminate any mismatched expectations, communicate effectively these expectations, supervise effectively to determine if expectations are being fulfilled, and administer consequences in a just and fair manner, then we achieve EFFECTIVE CONTROL, the sixth principle of direct supervision.

Effective control of the inmate population means that the inmates do what we want them to do. Effective control of employees in an organization means basically the same thing. The element of maximizing the person's inner controls works for staff just as well as it works for inmates. Management should create an environment where it is in the best interest of each employee to support the objectives of the organization and work within its boundaries, rules, and regulations. Effective control is best

accomplished by merging the needs of the individual employee with the needs of the organization.

Once we achieve effective control of the organization then we can ensure the seventh principle of direct supervision, SAFETY AND SECURITY OF STAFF AND INMATES. From an organization management perspective, the concept of safety and security may be rather vague. The primary concern to employees is an environment where employees feel secure and confident in themselves and their abilities, and safe from reprisals. If we are successful in creating a supportive environment, then we can move from a survival mode for staff to a much more creative mode of operation where employees are free, and in fact, encouraged to grow, flourish, and experiment within acceptable guidelines. It is in this type of environment that the technology of management, and certainly the technology of corrections, will progress.

Once we are successful in implementing the first seven principles of direct supervision within the management structure the result will be successful implementation of A MANAGEABLE AND COST EFFECTIVE OPERATION, the eighth principle of direct supervision.

It is important to consider what a manageable and cost effective operation really is. A manager who spends his entire time controlling and directing every aspect of the operation by making decisions, reviewing reports, and exerting control and influence is not necessarily a successful manager. The successful manager is one who surrounds himself with good people, develops their knowledge and skills, coaches them into always doing more and better, gives them room to exercise creativity, provides feedback, and reaps the rewards of his efforts.

As we encounter problems with inmate behavior in a direct supervision facility, we identify and describe the problems, examine them in light of the principles of direct supervision to determine which of the principles we have violated, and develop a plan of action for solving the problem within the framework and guidance of the principles of direct supervision. If we utilize the basic philosophical foundations of direct supervision as our organizational management concept, then we can simplify the problem solving process into a four step process.

The first step is to define the "root" problem. Managers must be careful to spend the time and effort necessary to strip away all the layers of symptoms that are obvious and find the root problem. The second step is to examine the root problem in relationship to all other aspects of the organization. The third



step is to analyze the problem in terms of the eight principles of direct supervision to determine if and how any of the principles were violated. The final step is to develop a plan of action to take advantage of the opportunity and implement a solution.

To illustrate this process in action, consider this typical example of a new Corrections Officer who successfully completed the academic training in the upper 25% of her class. She is now half way through her seven-week field training program. She is having a number of problems demonstrating her proficiency for the Field Training Officer. The evaluation of the FTO is that the employee may have satisfactorily completed the academic training, however, she is incompetent because she cannot translate the academics learned in the academy into acceptable performance in the real situation.

Do we accept the FTO's analysis or do we first ask ourselves the following questions?

1. Have we utilized the principle of effective communication to ensure that the employee perceives and understands the expectations of the FTO?
2. Have we effectively supervised the new employee to give her feedback on her performance? Did we effectively communicate this feedback?
3. Are we being just and fair with the employee considering her background, experience, training, and opportunities for learning and demonstration in the FTO program?
4. Have we fulfilled the principle of competent staff by effectively training this employee with the basic knowledge and skills necessary to perform her duties?
5. Have we created an environment where the employee has an opportunity to learn, is encouraged to experiment in a controlled setting, and is rewarded for positive behaviors while provided coaching and guidance for negative behaviors?

Only when we are sure that we have fulfilled the elements of all of these principles of direct supervision should we consider separating the employee from the organization.

One of the basic elements of human motivation is that the organization will get what it rewards. An organization must ensure that it rewards only positive behaviors and converts all negative behaviors into opportunities for improvement.

I have utilized this concept of management and problem solving in my own organization, the Pima County Sheriff's Department Corrections Bureau. In virtually every problem we have identified and examined, we have found the problem to be the result of violating one or more of the principles of direct supervision. Once we examined our actions and made the changes necessary to ensure we were operating consistently with the principles of direct supervision, the problem was eliminated.

The concept is valid and functional because it is a concept based on a thorough understanding and utilization of the principles of human behavior. It is deceptively simple but sometimes difficult to put into action. This concept of managing the behavior of staff in an organization works because it is the right thing to do.

## **DEVELOPING A SPECIFIC ROLE MODEL FOR MID-LEVEL MANAGERS IN DIRECT SUPERVISION JAILS**

Guy Pellicane, Middlesex County, New Jersey

Since 1981 when the first local direct supervision jail opened in Contra Costa, California, more than 20 jails have initiated direct supervision operations and more than 20 others are preparing to begin. It appears certain that this innovative integration of proactive management and specialized architecture will be a dominant trend in the years ahead. The National Institute of Corrections has provided strong and effective leadership in this movement. Special recognition must be given for the provision of the orientation of top policy makers, as well as the transition training for the line corrections staff who manage these 'new' living units. By developing the management training geared to the Eight Principles of Direct Supervision Jails and the Inter-Personal Communication training, NIC has paved the way for the successful implementation of direct supervision operations.

The response to direct supervision has been positive. There is clear evidence that these institutions can expect reduced construction and operation costs, as well as improved staff safety and morale. As experience with direct supervision operations has grown, however, it has become clear that some elements have not been as successful as others. The performance of the mid-managers has been one such area of unfulfilled promise. As had been reported in a previous report:

In some cases, the line officers feel that their superiors are unqualified since they never had the experience of running a direct supervision unit. They feel that their supervisors don't have relevant experience, don't understand how they work, and don't try to support them. The supervisors, on the other hand, may be uncertain or uncommitted, even worse, they may purposefully attempt to undercut the direct supervision methods in a misguided desire to return to the methods with which they had been familiar.

This experience has shown that the jails need to give the mid-managers more tangible support for the transition to direct supervision operations. These key personnel need training and guidance to accept new job roles and new managerial approaches. The NIC recognized this need, and has moved to develop the 'tools' needed by the mid-managers.

The Middlesex County Adult Correction Center opened a new building in 1985 and moved into direct supervision operations at that time. Having identified a degree of resistance among the mid-level managers since the change, Middlesex was seeking a way to get the mid-managers to 'buy-in.' Recognizing the common interest, Middlesex was requested to serve as NIC's project site for the development of a Training Program for Mid-Managers in Direct Supervision Jails. With NIC authorization, Training Associates, Inc. was hired to conduct the project. A plan was established to develop a clear role model for the mid-managers and to identify the specific managerial skills best suited for such a role. This information was then to be used to develop a training program which would guide the mid-managers to recognize their new role and learn the pertinent managerial skills. In order to assure that the project would have nationwide applicability, broad based participation was authorized by NIC.

Information concerning the stated job duties of the mid-managers was gathered from the direct supervision jails. This information was used to prepare a data gathering instrument which was specifically targeted to the three sub-groups in each facility: administrators, mid-managers, and the line corrections officers. These questionnaires were set up to measure the degree to which each of the three sub-groups felt that the mid-managers were successful in a variety of managerial tasks. It was decided that a problem would be identified in any area where less than 70% of the respondents felt the mid-managers were successful. Further, it was also decided that a problem would be identified any time there was more than a 20% difference between the responses of the sub-groups.

Analysis of the data readily demonstrated the extent of the problem with the mid-managers: virtually every element signaled a problem. First, it was clear that the administrators, the line officers and the mid-managers themselves were all unsatisfied with the job performance of the mid-managers. Perhaps even more importantly, the large discrepancies between the groups also indicated wide splits between the three staff groups.

Originally it had been thought that the data analysis might point to an appropriate role model for the mid-managers by identifying those counties where there was uniform satisfaction with the work of the mid-managers. This did not turn out to be readily available. As Mr. Sigurdson remarked, "no job description fell out of this data."

As a result, the training event was designed to develop the

desired job description based upon the national data, the experience of the participating mid-managers, a body of managerial information and, most importantly, the vision developed by these participating mid-managers as to what their work could become.

'The event was challenging. In order to work towards an appropriate job description, the participants had to share their own shortcomings. The honesty and openness which characterized the group as they confronted their task were remarkable. In his report Mr. Sigurdson specifically recognized "the risks that were taken" by the IS mid-level supervisors who joined in the effort to define the roles, responsibilities, and training requirements of mid-level managers.

The formal objectives faced by the participants during the training event were as follows:

- 1) To identify management needs from the national survey and participant insights
- 2) To describe the roles and responsibilities of mid-managers in direct supervision jails
- 3) To select management concepts (theories) relevant to needs, roles and responsibilities of managers in direct supervision jails
- 4) To develop a process for translating concepts into operational components of mid-management in direct supervision jails

A thorough account of the step-by-step process developed by the trainers and accomplished by the participants is included in the report "Mid- Management Training for Direct Supervision Jails" (Training Associates, Inc., April 1987), which is available directly from NIC. For the present purpose it can be reported that the dedicated contributions of the participants resulted in the successful formulation of a role model which specifies job elements, tasks and activities and the performance measures (see Appendix II).

In order to follow up on this accomplishment, NIC has planned to repeat this training development project in Pima County, Arizona in September. This will provide an opportunity to check the consistency of the results of the first session. Once the Pima County project is accomplished, the NIC plans to develop the findings into a structured training program. Lesson

plans, instructor manuals and student manuals will be made available to the jails.

While the importance of the ongoing contribution to the national scene speaks for itself, it is also important to document the beneficial impact the training development project has had in Middlesex County. There is a new spirit of enthusiasm and a growing sense of confidence among the participants. Some of these sergeants and lieutenants are now working on a complete review of our Policy and Procedures Manual in part to assure that this new understanding of the mid-manager's role will be directly reflected in our procedures. In another development a group of the participants developed a very promising solution to our overtime scheduling problem. The proposed solution will allow the shift commanders to save time and line staff will be able to schedule most of their overtime in advance. In yet another example of the new enthusiasm, several of the participants are now preparing a training event for the total group of 33 superior officers (9 lieutenants and 24 sergeants). This training will specifically address a new emphasis on the mid-manager's role in developing new officers in the period following their completion of our training academy. More importantly it will be used as an opportunity to familiarize the other superiors with the new sense of their potential as mid-managers in a direct supervision jail.

Middlesex has found that it is very helpful to reduce this newly identified role model and managerial philosophy to a very simple and straight forward example. Too often the mid-managers think that they are expected to play the role of the team captain - the playmaker who can make the key play and score the winning points. It is critical that this traditional image be replaced. In a direct supervision jail the supervisors can be most effective playing the role of the 'coach' - staying on the sidelines of the housing unit/ playing field; watching the officers/players to spot strengths and weaknesses; putting people in a position to best use their talents; training them to develop their abilities, and always working to develop team spirit and a commitment to good sportsmanship.

The Mid-Management Training Program has been very beneficial to Middlesex County and we are pleased to report the growth of this new sense of enthusiasm and commitment. It is our anticipation that this may turn out to be a very contagious condition.

Appendix I

Participation Jails

Bucks County, Pennsylvania  
Contra Costa County, California  
Erie County, New York  
Manhattan House of Detention, New York  
Middlesex County, New Jersey  
Multnomah County, Oregon  
Pima County, Arizona

Appendix II

Role Description for Mid-Level Managers in Direct  
Supervision Jails



Assigned tasks of unit meet schedules  
Goals and objectives of work unit are  
established and clearly defined  
Staff and resources are used economi-  
cally and efficiently within established  
time constraints  
Staff completes assigned tasks completely  
in accordance with schedules  
Plans are placed into action as required  
by schedules  
Organizes periodic meetings with staff  
Solicits information from staff  
Staff have clear understanding of their  
position and responsibility within the  
organization  
Disciplinary actions are administered in  
accordance with policies and procedures

4. Be organized
5. Goal setting
6. Planning/scheduling
7. Directing
8. Implementing
9. Conduct meetings
10. Feedback
11. Establish roles
12. Disciplinary
13. Humanitarian

Know related laws

5. Develop contacts  
Develop resources

6. Mediator/Negotiator

and evaluations

Consultants to review and audit

Ability to get along with staff and inmates

3. Solicit feedback

4. Conduct meetings

5. Attend meetings

6. Conduct research

7. Listening

Acts on appropriate feedback

Organizes periodic meetings between staff/subordinates

Brings back appropriate ideas/decisions to subordinates

Has or is able to research based on resources established and convey back to subordinates

Is active listener and responds in appropriate manner--i.e., professional manner

JOB ELEMENTS	TASKS AND ACTIVITIES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES
1. Decision Maker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify problem</li> <li>Research</li> <li>Solicit input</li> <li>Consider alternatives</li> <li>Decide</li> <li>Follow-up</li> </ul>	<p>Concise problem statement through research. Actively seeks input. Makes good decisions in a timely manner.</p>
5. Auditor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor performance</li> <li>Performance evaluation</li> <li>Inspection</li> </ul>	<p>Submits objective performance evaluations. Completes thorough inspections.</p>
6. Coordinator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheduling</li> <li>Directing and implementing</li> </ul>	<p>Effectively utilizes manpower. Directs individual efforts toward a unit goal. Measures performance in time factor.</p>

Initiator  
(Implementor)

Planner

3. Describe problem  
4. Counseling

1. Research  
2. Evaluate  
3. Communicate  
4. Listen  
5. Goals and objectives

1. Organize  
2. Communicate

Are goals and objectives being met?

Continuity of policies and procedures.

## MIDDLESEX COUNTY ADULT CORRECTION CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The purpose of the Middlesex County Adult Correction Center is to provide, in a cost effective manner, the highest degree of protection for the citizens of Middlesex County and safety for both the staff and inmates as, the institution serves as a place of incarceration for pre-trial detention and the serving of sentences. The philosophy of the Adult Correction Center is based upon the following underlying tenets:

- Society has a right to incarcerate people in order to protect our citizens and communities.
- All inmates shall be held accountable for their actions.
- Inmates shall leave the facility no worse physically, emotionally or psychologically than when they entered and as much as possible they shall be more prepared to lead responsible lives in the community.

A positive and productive atmosphere shall be created and maintained for both the staff and the inmates by the use of direct supervision management principles and through the provision of:

- A safe and secure environment
- Trained professional correctional personnel
- A variety of programs and services which provide inmates an opportunity to prepare themselves for either immediate or eventual return and successful re-integration into their communities
- A classification system which identifies special custody needs and results in appropriate security and services for the individual inmate
- Positive incentives for inmates through a classification system based on behavior
- Meaningful work and vocational programming which meets the inmates' needs and serves as a form of restitution by benefiting both the institution and the community

The staff and management of the Middlesex County Adult Correction Center are committed to the preservation of the basic human rights and dignity of the inmate population as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States and by the Administrative Code of both the State of New Jersey and the County of Middlesex. Additionally, the most beneficial community impact will be fostered through abiding by progressive correctional standards such as those promulgated by the American Correctional Association.

## **IPC PRACTICUM**

Jeanne B. Stinchcomb, Dade County, Florida  
and  
Sally Gross-Farina, Miami, Florida

### Introduction

When the Dade County Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation began to move from remote supervision of inmates to direct supervision as practiced in new generation jailing, it became apparent that a different type of “human relations” training was needed. In order to promote the acceptance and effectiveness of new generation jailing, officers needed to overcome resistance to working directly with the inmates throughout an entire shift. Traditionally, staff have been physically separated from inmates, but under new generation concepts, they are actually “confined” with the inmates in a dormitory environment. They must therefore learn to listen, observe, interpret, and react while in direct contact with the inmates--without bars, without weapons, and hopefully, without bias. In short, effective communication has become the critical component of modern correctional practices.

### IPC Training

The Interpersonal Communications (IPC) training program developed by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has proven to be an excellent tool for preparing officers to work under new generation jailing. The IPC model contains 3 essential elements:

1. Basics (sizing up the situation: positioning, posturing, observing, and listening);
2. Add-ons (communicating with inmates: responding to content, feeling, and meaning; asking questions);
3. Applications (controlling behavior: handling requests; making requests; reinforcing behavior).

IPC in this format has been incorporated into Dade County’s basic recruit training program, and is also offered frequently for in-service officers. The program is well-designed and includes demonstrations, extensive role-playing, and written self-tests. However, it did not provide a method for evaluating the students’ level of IPC skills. Initially, we prepared a paper-and-pencil test to assess comprehension of the IPC principles listed above. The test was helpful, but it soon became clear that while good “test-takers” were easily passing the written exam, they were not necessarily able to practice what



they had learned when they reached Department facilities. The solution was to develop a method of realistically evaluating the application of skills through an IPC practicum.

### The IPC Practicum Experiment

Our first attempt at providing an IPC practicum exercise was very rudimentary, designed as an experiment to determine if the concept could be implemented. Trainees were exposed to a series of 6 scenarios based on potential conflict situations which occur in correctional work. They proceeded through these exercises at the training academy, during which they were assessed by their IPC instructors. In the morning, half of the class dressed in civilian clothes and acted as role-players, doing their best to imitate inmate behavior. In the afternoon, the groups reversed. Recruits were given feedback on their strengths and weaknesses, but were not given a numerical or pass/fail score. Actually, it was more of an in-depth practice than an evaluation session.

Several factors limited the effectiveness of this first practicum, primarily because of the lack of realism:

1. Role alterations  
Whenever classmates role-play, there are subtle variances in behavior based on their prior knowledge of and relationships with each other. Some role-players seemed to purposely alter their behavior for certain classmates, either to help or hinder their performance.
2. Role familiarization  
The element of surprise was missing for the class members who had role-played all morning and became "officers" in the afternoon.
3. Reality of the roles  
Few people who are in training to become correctional officers can accurately portray the behavior, attitudes, feelings, and emotions of real inmates.
4. Reality of the setting  
In the academy setting, it was impossible to replicate the true environment of the jail. The stress factor was present, but not consistent.

This experimental practicum served to point out the above weaknesses and helped staff to recognize how the scenarios and the evaluation tool needed to be changed. Probably the primary discovery resulting from this experience was the extensive degree of organization, cooperation, and coordination needed to make the practicum work efficiently and effectively.

### The Revised IPC Practicum

Learning from the first experience generated a number of additions and changes in:

1. Practicum preparation
2. Practicum location
3. Scheduling and briefing
4. Scenario scripts
5. Role-players, evaluators, and coordinators
6. The evaluation instrument
7. Debriefing

Current practices relating to each of these components are described below.

#### Practicum Preparation

It was determined that recruits needed an opportunity to observe inmates in a correctional setting and begin to practice their IPC skills prior to being evaluated through the practicum. Therefore, approximately one week after conclusion of the classroom portion of IPC, classes are assigned to a shift at one of Dade County's facilities. The objective is to give all trainees a chance to observe, compare, and learn about officer-inmate relationships in the "real world." They are directed to look for application of IPC skills by in-service officers and are allowed to interact with inmates, trying to use IPC techniques. But they are to be treated as officers, by those working in the facilities or to be left alone with inmates at any time. Too often, recruits in facilities are expected to "fill-in" for absent employees. This was not our intention for the practicum preparation shift, and thus far, it has not occurred. Upon return to the training academy, trainees give feedback on what they learned and have an opportunity to ask questions and clarify aspects of IPC application.

#### Practicum Location

In order to enhance the setting's realism, the practicum was moved from the academy to the Dade County Training and Treatment Center, where portable units housing inmates have been set up using many of the principles of new generation jailing. Units vacated during the day by inmates on work release are used, so that the practicum now takes place in one of the settings where trainees can be expected to be assigned upon graduation. This eliminates the need to attempt to simulate the sights, sounds, smells, physical layout, tensions, etc. associated with life in an actual correctional facility.

### Scheduling and Briefing

The class is assigned to the Training and Treatment Center for an 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM shift. At the beginning of the day, a briefing is conducted. The class reviews the actual evaluation form outlining IPC skills on which they will be assessed. We have found that the stress level is quite high at this point, and therefore, some time is used for stress reduction, breathing exercises, and positive imagery.

Following the briefing, recruits are assigned to work in pairs at specific housing units. They move into the testing unit with their partner only when their team is scheduled to be evaluated. Teams are separated from each other throughout the day to avoid “contamination” of the scenarios. All recruits wear their trainee uniforms to distinguish them from in-service officers.

During the evaluation itself, trainees cycle through the scenarios in pairs. However, only one officer handles each situation. The pair alternates in “primary officer” status, so that each person has fifteen minutes between scenarios to refocus, observe, and prepare for the next station. The recruit being tested is given immediate verbal feedback after each station, but they do not see their written evaluation sheets until the next day.

### Scenario Scripts

A “scenario” is a specific set of circumstances included in ‘a role-playing exercise. Each scenario is designed to elicit the actual behaviors tested in IPC. Suggestions for realistic situations were solicited from experienced officers and grouped into 3 categories, (low, medium, or high stress/intricacy level), based on the type of situation and number of inmates involved. A few examples are listed below:

1. Low stress scenarios involve one inmate with a common type of question or difficulty (e.g., shaking down an inmate’s bed and personal possessions because information was received that he has contraband).
2. Medium stress scenarios involve two inmates in a mild confrontation, one of whom has sought officer assistance (e.g., Inmate A is monopolizing the phone and Inmate B has a call to make which is important to him; both feel they have a right to more phone time).
3. High stress scenarios involve complex interaction between 4 inmates (i.e., dispute over the TV channel between Hispanic and non-Hispanic inmates; or having to

tell an inmate to clear up a mess around his bed. He initially refuses and is encouraged by other inmates who heckle the officer, but do not become physically involved).

Out of the 12 scenarios currently being used, each student is tested on 3, with one from each level of difficulty. No scenario is designed to lead to any physical confrontations, (and in fact, none have to date). If the trainee decides that the inmate is to be removed from the area, the exercise ends and the trainee is evaluated up to that point.

Perhaps the most important point in the development of scenarios is having clearly-defined, written scripts. In order to insure consistency for all students, it is essential that role-players closely adhere to prescribed roles. Evaluators use hand signals to assist them in doing so, and no role-player improvisation is allowed.

### Role-Players

A significant improvement over the experimental practicum was the introduction of real inmates, (rather than other students), as role-players. This has resolved the problems of familiarity and role alteration mentioned earlier, and has also added a major element of realism to the exercises. Inmates selected to be role-players are chosen from the ranks of trustees volunteering for this assignment. Most often, they have little time remaining on their sentences and have been living in new generation housing units.

Scripts are reviewed with inmate role-players, and expectations are outlined to them. For example, there is no touching permitted, and they are directed to follow predetermined nonverbal signals of the evaluators during the exercises. Thus, when an inmate begins to deviate from the script, or over/underplay his role, the evaluator can signal to "escalate," "back off," "move in," etc.

. The incentives for inmates to participate are obvious: it is an opportunity to do something different for the day; there is a certain amount of prestige that goes with being a role-player; it provides an inside glimpse of training; and a special lunch is offered. Role-playing is also fun for the inmates--a chance to "push," or be "uncooperative" without penalty.

The use of inmate role-players is not without critics. Some feel it gives inmates unfair or even dangerous insights into new officers and IPC techniques. We believe, however, that the

tremendous benefit of realism, as well as the positive effect on the inmates involved, outweigh the possibility that an inmate might remember a weakness in a particular recruit. (Moreover, recruits do not graduate for 8-10 weeks after the practicum, and the inmates selected are usually those who will be released before that time). But evaluators are careful not to criticize trainees within earshot of the inmates.

An effort is also made to match inmates to certain roles. Not being real actors, they should not be placed in scenes which might provoke undue hostility or discomfort. Volunteers are screened carefully to insure that no inmates are teamed up who might have a personal agenda which could erupt. If difficulties develop, roles are reassigned between exercises as the need arises.

### Evaluators

Those selected to assess the students' skills during the practicum are certified IPC instructors who teach part-time and work full-time in new generation units. Certification means that they have completed a 40- or 80-hour general instructor techniques course, along with the 40-hour IPC program and a teaching internship. We try to avoid using as evaluators the instructors who taught the group which is being evaluated since they have a "vested interest" in good performance and may tend to overrate their students.

During the morning briefing, evaluators are reminded to tightly control their stations. With inmate role-players, it is critical that the evaluators guide the scenes and be prepared to move quickly to end any situation which could dangerously escalate. In large part because of the nonverbal directions given by the evaluators, we have not had any difficulties with the role-players. The evaluation instrument is also reviewed with assessors, although they are not given information on how the final scoring is done. Thus, the possibility of adjusting scores for any particular recruit is eliminated. The evaluator's job is simply to assess the student's performance--to determine whether each of the behaviors being rated was performed.

After reviewing the materials to be used, assessors meet with inmate role-players assigned to their station. They discuss role prescriptions and set up the scenarios (including props, etc.).

### Coordinators

At least two training staff members function as practicum

coordinators. They “float” through the stations, monitor for difficulties, keep everyone on schedule, and serve as communicators between stations, evaluators, recruits, facility staff, etc. Additionally, training officers assigned to the class at the academy are on hand to observe recruit behavior that is not assessed in the practicum (e.g., cooperation, stress management, flexibility, etc.).

### Evaluation Instrument

The form on which trainees are evaluated basically reflects the elements of IPC in outline form. (See attached). It is a checklist approach to whether the behavior was performed, not performed, or not applicable. The assessor observes trainee behavior, records it on the form, and gives initial verbal feedback. The forms used by the evaluators do not contain the scoring methodology.

Scoring and interpretation are done by an independent coordinator. Scores are assigned for each behavioral cluster or group of behaviors in a related unit. The score is assigned according to the trainee’s performance on each behavior within the cluster. A maximum of 22 points can be achieved; 16 points (75%) is the minimum needed to pass.

Most classes have few, if any, failures. At this time, failure of the practicum does not automatically result in termination from the academy. However, in-depth observations about weaknesses are made in the trainee’s file. A recommendation for remedial training is made for anyone who fails, and it is strongly suggested that they not be assigned to IPC units until satisfactory evaluation of those skills.

### Debriefing

At the conclusion of all practicum exercises, an hour is spent reviewing what has occurred. First, role-players (inmates) are asked to make general comments about trainee behavior. This feedback has not only been quite valuable to the trainees, but it has also demonstrated how seriously inmates take their role-playing responsibilities. It is certainly unique in a correctional setting to hear **an** inmate telling a new recruit class to “be careful about turning your back on me;” to “watch closer for the contraband I had;” to avoid “letting me get away with so much,” not to mention wishing them well on their future career! Being involved in the practicum gives the inmates an opportunity to see what it is like from the other side--as a correctional officer--and to develop a further appreciation for their role. Some have actually been so impressed with the

experience that they have expressed an interest in getting employed in some type of correctional work upon release.

After the inmates leave the room, evaluators make general observations about the class performance, and there is a brief period for discussion. Individual behaviors are not critiqued in this setting; that occurs the next day at the academy. The coordinators solicit comments from the class and give their overall impressions of how well they handled the challenge. Inevitably, class comments are extremely positive, citing the practicum as the best experience they have had in the training program.

### Summary

The bottom line in new generation jailing is being proactive--dealing with inmates verbally before problems escalate to physical confrontation, which is exactly what students are prepared for in IPC. The IPC model as developed by NIC is an excellent tool for training officers to work in any modern correctional environment, but particularly one in which they will be interacting directly with the inmate population on a constant basis. The one major element missing in the program is a practical evaluation tool as described herein.

Since beginning the IPC practicums, Dade County has continually refined the scenarios, scheduling, grading computations, etc., searching for ways in which the experience can be improved. This is often a time-consuming and labor-intensive effort. But we believe that the results are worth the investment. There have been benefits from IPC for everyone involved--the students, the inmates, the staff, and the Department overall. Moreover, the practicums have been implemented at no cost to the county other than personnel time. In order to further improve the practicums, Dade County staff would be most interested to hear from other trainers throughout the country who are experimenting with similar efforts. In the meantime, we believe that IPC is the key to effectively implementing new generation jailing--and that the practicum exercise is the key to effectively implementing IPC!

## UNIT SIZE AND INMATE MANAGEMENT FOR DIRECT SUPERVISION

W. Ray Nelson, Criminal Justice Consultant, 3080 Flora Place,  
Denver, Colorado

[Editors\* note: Because of time conflicts, Mr. Nelson was only able to submit an outline of his prepared presentation. We felt that his presentation was of sufficient importance to be included in this state.]

### I. Introduction

#### A. Why unit size and staff ratios are such important topics for this symposium.

##### 1. Major elements of two of the eight principles of direct supervision are impacted greatly by size and staffing ratios:

- a. Effective Control
- b. Effective Supervision

They also have significant influence on the other six principles.

- c. Competent Staff
- d. Classification and Orientation
- e. Effective Communication
- f. Safety of Staff and Inmates
- g. Manageable and Cost Effective Operations
- h. Just and Fair

##### 2. What answers should we look for in today's session and in the future?

- a. Would endorsement of an ideal or standard size be desirable?
- b. Would collective professional agreement on a maximum limit for one officer to directly supervise be useful?



- c. What are the measurable characteristics of an effective staff-to-inmate ratio for direct supervision housing units?

## II. Background

### A. General Historical References

1. Determination of effective group size to achieve a collective purpose was needed from the beginning of man's efforts to manage groups of people.
  - a. Roman Legions were organized along the decimal system with Centurions in command of 100 soldiers.
  - b. Most military organizations are organized around platoons of 12 and companies of approximately 50.

### B. Penological References

1. ACA standards - Institutions should not exceed 500. Preferably, prison dormitory should not exceed 16.
2. Conventional practice in western Europe is to limit new correctional institution size to 50.
3. Early unit management practices in California, at the Men's Colony for example, divided large institutions into units of 500.
4. Unit Management doctrine in the U.S. Bureau of Prisons sets 50 as the desirable unit size.

### C. Structural Influence on Unit Size

1. Construction economy considerations call for double decking housing units, two cells sharing a single pipe chase, one shower for eight cells.
2. These considerations normally result in housing units being designed in multiples of four or eight - 32, 36, 40, 44, 48, 52, 60, 64, etc.

### D. Direct Supervision Practice Since 1974

1. Most common size is 48 and most practitioners agree that 48 is a satisfactory span of control.
2. Texas State Jail Standard limits housing unit size to 48.
3. More effective supervision may be achieved with unit sizes less than 48.
  - a. Vancouver, Canada advocates a ratio of 1-24, referring to direct supervision as dynamic supervision, and indeed it is likely to be more dynamic than the practice in the U.S.
  - b. Great Britain's Home Office is introducing direct supervision in their prison system and they have expressed the concern that at some ratio the correctional officer becomes a "guard" rather than what is implied in the role of the correctional officer.
  - c. No doubt smaller size units such as 24 or 32 are more effective than units of 48 or 60, however, in contemporary U.S. correctional practice the standard most commonly striven for is "adequate" not "most effective".
4. Practitioner Perception of Appropriate Unit Size.
  - a. Hundreds of interviews with direct supervision practitioners in NIC audits of new generation jails revealed an almost universal response that the maximum size of a unit should not exceed the maximum size unit in the respondent's facility. The ideal size would be several beds under their maximum size unit. In view of the inconsistency of unit size among the facilities audited, the consistency of the practitioner's response only established a face validity that the maximum unit size is adequate.
  - b. Extreme jail crowding has tested the limits of unit size beyond that contemplated by facility designers. In cases where the extremes of unit size were reached in the Federal System and Contra Costa County, meaningful consistency of response appeared

to occur. The Federal Prison System reported that 90 prisoners on a unit called for a second officer because the administrative demands were too great for one officer. Contra Costa reported the same response at 85 prisoners on a unit.

5. Newer Facilities Increase Unit Size.
  - a. New Federal System facilities and the new Contra Costa facility have increased their unit size to 64.
  - b. The unit size for the new Genessee County Detention Facility in Flint, Michigan will be 62.

### III. Current Issues

- A. Size of the unit in relationship with the size of the facility.
  1. Classification and separation requirements of smaller facilities.
- B. Size of the housing unit in relationship to its function.
  1. Sentenced offenders engaged in programs during the day may function more effectively in a larger unit than pre-trial felony detainees who are on the unit all day long.
- C. Staffing impact of 64 bed units compared with 48 bed units.
  1. Using a 400 bed rated capacity facility as a hypothetical example, example A, with eight 48 bed units (plus a 16 bed medical unit) would require two posts more, or approximately 10 additional officers if the posts were staffed around the clock, than a comparable facility with six 64 bed units.
  2. While the above example applies to the facilities when they are at or around design capacity, the situation changes dramatically when the prisoner

population exceeds 140% of capacity. If the 140% of capacity is distributed evenly over the six 64 bed unit facility, there would be more than 90 inmates on a unit requiring two officers on each unit, for a total of four more posts, or approximately 20 positions, than required to supervise the same population in the eight 48 bed unit facility.

- D. There is a spatial relationship to unit size that needs to be carefully considered.
  - 1. At some point between 48 cells and 64 cells the core space of the unit becomes disproportionate and modifications are made to bring the size of the dayroom into proportions that have compromised sight lines and reduced the manageability of the unit.
  - 2. What physical distance between the officer and inmates being supervised affects the ability of the officer to effectively use his sensory capacity to supervise inmate activity?
- E. What is the relationship between effective staff training and the officer's ability to supervise larger units?

#### IV. Conclusion

While we may not need to arrive at absolute staff to inmate ratios (the military has not achieved that with regard to company or battery size in several millennium), we need to gain additional knowledge about the issued that have been raised.

## **MANAGEMENT DECISIONS IN THE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY DESIGN PROCESS**

Stephen A. Carter  
Carter Goble Associates, Inc.

By now, it is safe to assume that most correctional-administrators, architects, and a growing number of correctional line officers have been exposed to a concept of integrating facility management and design solutions that is termed Direct Supervision. While the debate over the suitability of the Direct Supervision management and design approach for all types of correctional facilities will continue for years to come, it is obvious from the construction of more than 10,000 bedspaces in the last three years and another 20,000 or more bedspaces planned during the next two years under the Direct Supervision concept that this approach has a permanent place in the history of correctional system design and operation.

Recognizing this, the focus of this presentation is upon the process of designing Direct Supervision facilities that requires posing specific management questions to a range of decision makers. This presentation first discusses the issue of who is responsible for making decisions concerning housing unit management design and then attempts to frame the discussion of the management issues that will establish design criteria for Direct Supervision housing units.

Although the entire correctional facility will be influenced by the decision to design and operate under a Direct Supervision approach, the housing unit will be the most influenced by this decision. The first issue to be addressed is who should make the housing unit management decisions and, secondly, what are the decisions to be made in defining the design response to management directives and criteria.

### **HOUSING UNIT MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKERS**

Gary Mote, the former Chief Architect to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons and considered by many to be the father of the Direct Supervision design concept, refers to the housing unit as the institution's "form giver." Indeed, the housing unit establishes the configuration of an institution that allows the general public to distinguish a correctional facility from other governmental structures. The design requirements for exterior cells establishes the unmistakable form of a correctional facility. Since, in the design of Direct Supervision facilities, the cells are also grouped around a central dayroom, the housing

unit becomes even more of the institution's "form giver." Not only does the housing unit generally establish the configuration of the institution, but it also represents the most costly single component to both construct and operate. In most new facilities, the housing unit consumes from 50 to 65 percent of the construction budget and approximately the same range of the total salary budget for a contemporary correctional facility.

Recognizing, therefore, that the housing unit provides the form for the facility; establishes most of the critical circulation patterns; and is also the most expensive component of the facility, who, then should make the decisions concerning the management objectives and design responses for the facility? A substantial list of important people, departments, and organizations are often involved in the housing unit management and design decisions including the following:

- 0 Sheriff /Department Director
- 0 Jail Administrator
- 0 Advisory Committee
- 0 Correctional Officers
- 0 Elected Officials
- 0 Architects/Engineers/Consultants
- 0 Equipment Vendors

Each of these categories of decision-makers has some stake in the **outcome** of the housing unit management and design response. Since it is well documented that decisions made by committees often lead to "camels," should a single category of individuals make the final design and management decision regarding housing units? The following summarizes the type of vested interest in the facility design that is reflected by the various categories of decision-makers.

- 0 **Sheriff/Department Director.** As an elected or appointed official, this individual has a political reputation at stake that can be very much impacted by the success or failure of the correctional facility. **While the initial capital cost is a concern, the Sheriff or Department Director must argue each year for funds to operate the facility. Management and design decisions will have a substantial impact upon the operating cost.**
- 0 **Jail Administrator.** Charged with the day-to-day responsibility of managing the correctional facility, the Jail Administrator has a substantial stake in the outcome of the facility design. A design and

management decision making process that excludes the Jail Administrator or minimizes the role will prevent the development of “ownership” that is essential to the function of the Chief Operating Officer.

- 0 **Advisory Committee.** In an open planning process, many local officials will dedicate a substantial amount of time to the facility decision making process. In many ways, the outcome of the facility will reflect a justification for the level of effort expended by these appointed officials in achieving more responsive local government.
- 0 **Correctional Officers.** These men and women hold the key to a successful correctional facility. To minimize their role in the design and management decision making process will prevent the “bonding” that is essential between a management concept and the operational achievement.
- 0 **Elected Officials.** In many ways, the effectiveness and worthiness of Elected Officials to public confidence and support will be defined by the outcome of the correctional facility design and management decisions. Elected Officials should be held accountable for their decisions and the design and construction of a correctional facility has substantial budgetary implications that impact a jurisdiction’s allocation of resources.
- 0 **Architects/Engineers/Consultants.** The ability to establish a reputation that translates to other business opportunities is substantially effected by the outcome of the facility design and operations.
- 0 **Equipment Vendors.** The ability of suppliers and vendors to sell their products in other correctional environments will be due in large measure to the success of their products in correctional facilities.

Each of these categories of individuals can play a major role in the direction that the design and management of the correctional facility takes and will be impacted in many ways by the outcome of the facility design. For some it can mean re-election or defeat; public praise or ridicule; career advancement or stagnation; and/or improved or diminished opportunities for future employment or supply opportunities.

Even though each of these seven categories of individuals has a role to play in the decision making process, not any single category of individuals should be vested with the ultimate authority to make the management decisions that impact the facility design. As complicated as the process may be, a planning approach that systematically defines the objectives of each of these categories of decision makers will generally result in a facility design that has the greatest opportunity for success by anticipating the user responses to the facility design.

### **ESSENTIAL MANAGEMENT DECISIONS THAT IMPACT DESIGN**

A comprehensive planning process leading to the construction and operation of a correctional facility involves literally hundreds of decisions by a variety of individuals over an extended timeframe. Most of the major decisions that impact the design of the facility, however, are made during the very early stages of the facility planning process. Many of the less successful institutions of today have achieved this status by a failure to ask the correct management questions during the early stages of the planning process.

In the following paragraphs a discussion of 15 management decisions that should be made prior to initiating the design process are briefly discussed. These decisions address broad areas associated with appropriate standards and building codes, policy issues, operational factors, and staffing concerns. A systematic process that presents these decisions as questions to the decision-makers previously described and defines the design implications of the decisions should result in a facility that eliminates as many of the unknowns and uncertainties as feasible.

1. **Degree of Commitment to ACA Standards and Accreditation Requirements.** The extent to which the decision makers wish to achieve accreditation of the facility by the American Corrections Association (ACA) will impact the design of the facility in numerous ways. The Standards will establish certain physical criteria while the accreditation requirements will establish an operational basis for the facility. A commitment to these standards and accreditation requirements will establish a baseline for the design of the facility.
2. **Fire/Smoke Prevention and Rescue Requirements.** Local building codes regarding life safety issues will impact many aspects of the facility design ranging from the number of cells to be grouped in an open dayroom



environment to the amount and size of glazed openings into various spaces. Corridors, stairs, and material selection will be substantially influenced by the life safety requirements of local building codes.

3. **Confidence Level Required for the Perimeter Security.** The type and configuration of the perimeter security of a correctional facility establishes a final “line of defense.” If a high degree of confidence is achieved in the perimeter of a facility, whether it is through fencing or the exterior construction of the building, will influence the design and construction choices for spaces within the correctional facility. A hard and “escape proof” perimeter can generally permit the use of less secure and less costly construction and equipment on the interior of the facility, assuming adequate supervision. Also impacting the confidence level in the perimeter will be the attitude of the general public as to the facility appearance.
4. **Amount of Direct Natural Light Desired in the Cell.** The first design decision should determine if the individual cells will have windows or if natural light will be achieved through corridors or dayroom space. Assuming windows will be located within the cells, the amount of glazed area should be defined based upon environmental and security criteria.
5. **Acceptable Amount of Double-Celling.** In these times of extensive overcrowding, it is highly unlikely that any correctional facility will not be pressured into double-celling. The percentage of cells and the duration for double-bunking should be approached as a policy decision that will substantially impact the design. If the policy is to allow a certain percentage of the cells to be double-bunked continuously, then, consideration should be given to oversizing these cells to accommodate double-bunking. While the ACA has not developed a standard regarding double-bunking of individual cells, consideration should be given to an 80 to 100 square foot cell design if the policy is to double-bunk a certain percentage of the individual cells.
6. **The Meaning of the Term “Flexibility.”** This term can mean creating the opportunities for multiple use of singular spaces as a design philosophy. However, the term can also mean the construction of housing unit

control rooms, but proposing to operate the units under a direct supervision approach and leave the control room doors open. Clarification should be achieved among the decision makers as to the meaning of the term “flexibility” relative to the management and design interface.

7. **Classification Responsibility and Approach.** The type and application of a classification approach will determine the number and type of bedspaces to be constructed according to custody categories. This can have an extensive impact upon the construction techniques, design layout, equipment, and hardware choices. The decision regarding classification responsibility and approach will have substantial capital and operational cost implications.
8. **Amount/Type of Out-of-Cell/Out-of-Dayroom Time.** The extent to which inmates will have ready access to scheduled out-of-cell and out-of-dayroom activities will impact the housing unit footprint, type of dayroom space, and staffing assignments.
9. **Extent to Which Services are Decentralized.** The decision regarding the type and quantity of spaces to be decentralized to the housing unit will impact the building footprint, staffing assignments and the use of equipment and furniture. This decision will also impact inmate movement and, therefore, the corridor configurations within a facility.
10. **Level of Continuous Versus Intermittent Supervision.** This management decision regarding the level of supervision will impact the configuration of the dayroom, organization of the cells by custody classification, and impact the role of surveillance technology in the overall facility operations plan.
11. **Level of Commitment to Preventive Maintenance.** The number of staff, budget, and quality of preventive maintenance will impact the selection of construction approaches, materials, equipment, and the reliance upon high technology surveillance and communication systems. This decision will also impact issues related to the types of wall and floor coverings, as well as dayroom and cell furniture.
12. **Number of Midnight Shift Officers.** The number of

midnight shift officers will influence design decisions regarding the distance of housing units from the central control room, proximity of housing units to each other, and the location of fixed versus roving patrol stations. This decision will also influence the relationships of housing unit dayrooms if officers are expected to cover more than one dayroom environment during the midnight shift.

13. **Role and Responsibilities of the Housing Officer.** Developing a detailed post description for the housing unit officer will influence design choices related to the means of controlled access to the housing unit; the type of station from which the housing officer works; the configuration of the dayroom; and the type of fixtures and furniture used in the cells and dayroom.
14. **Amount and Quality of Face-to-Face Communications.** The decision regarding the desired interaction between the housing unit officer and the inmates will impact choices related to selection of acoustical materials, configuration of the dayroom, and cell front design. The responsibility of the correctional officer to resolve, rather than simply report, conflicts will impact many of the design choices within the housing unit environment.
15. **Frequency and Duration of Cell Front Observation.** The extent of and time required to conduct cell front inspections to accomplish inmate counts and to resolve inmate problems will impact the design decision concerning the number of cells grouped around the dayroom environment and the length of a “run” of cells before a change in direction. Ultimately, this decision will influence the footprint of the housing unit.

Each of the management decision discussed above influences the design of the correctional facility housing unit. The most obvious design implications of these management decisions are summarized in the following points.

- 0 Size and configuration of the housing footprint
- 0 Size, layout, and security level of the cell
- 0 Type and size of the housing unit support spaces
- 0 Type of equipment, furniture, furnishings, and hardware
- 0 Capital and operating budgets

Many other management decisions impact design choices for housing units. Asking the right questions to the appropriate decision makers can assure that the design choices are based upon operational objectives rather than arbitrary design solutions.

## CONCLUSIONS

Many management decisions and design choices are made during the process of planning a correctional facility. There is no one single solution to the planning process that guarantees the success of the management or design concept for a facility. However, a process that involves a wide range of decision makers posing the type of questions discussed above will open the dialogue for more creative and management responsive design solutions to evolve. In summary, the following simple steps can be employed in the management planning and design process to assure more responsive facilities.

- 0 Know who and how management and design decisions are made.
- 0 Frame the design options in light of management decisions.
- 0 Test the design solution against operational scenarios.
- 0 Research the experience of others in the management and design process.
- 0 Develop ownership with decision-makers and operators.

If more than 520 billion are to be expended during the next decade to construct correctional facilities, then the result must be more cost-effective facilities to manage. Future design awards for correctional facilities should be based upon management, rather than monumental, successes.

## SYMPOSIUM EVALUATION

Fifty-four persons attending the symposium completed AJA session evaluation forms. All (100%) said that the content fit the title of the sessions. 98% (53) rated presenters as knowledgeable and information as useful, and said they gained information which would be helpful in their work. 83% (45) said all presenters were 'excellent', 11% (6) rated the presenters as 'good', 2% (1) rated presenters as fair) and 3 did not respond.

Of the comments provided, the best features of the symposium most frequently cited were the session on overcrowding, the ability to interact and share with direct supervision administrators, the overall quality of speakers, and the discussion of interpersonal communications training. The worst features most cited concerned the schedule (too long for some too short for others), the room (too cold, smoking and noisy), and the lack of handouts. Twelve respondents spontaneously requested a repeat of the symposium at next year's AJA conference.

The most frequently recommended changes were for adding more specific information on training, management and design, and increasing the symposium by spreading it over two days or having simultaneous sessions. Other suggestions included having video tours of selected institutions, and adding officer and inmate perspectives.

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees**

**LIST OF THOSE ATTENDING SYMPOSIUM**

Alcede, Joey  
Calcasieu Parish Jail  
P.O. Box V  
Lake Charles, Louisiana 70602

Allan, Stephen  
524 W. Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Aoams, Gary S.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Aquirre, Robert S.  
Genesee County Sheriff's  
Department  
932 Beach Street  
Flint, Michigan 48502

Ard, Larry  
Contra Costa County Sheriff's  
Department  
1000 Ward Street  
Martinez, California 94553

Arnold, Kenneth  
Sedgwick County Manager's  
Office  
525 No. Main Street  
Wichita, Kansas 67203

Atlas, Randy  
Atlas & Associates  
600 NE 36th Street  
Miami, Florida 33137

Barletta, Carl V.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Barry, Sheriff Bernard J.  
P.O. Box 1118  
Colorado Springs, Colorado  
80901

Barry, Thomas R.  
Bronx House of Detention  
653 River Avenue  
Bronx, New York 10451

Bissett, Susan  
Department of Corrections  
Bureau of Inspections  
5422 W. Bay Center Drive  
Tampa, Florida 33609

Braze, Thomas  
Lake County Sheriff's Office  
10 No. County Street  
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Brents, Robert L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1203 Orient Road  
Tampa, Florida 33569

Campanella, Tom  
Morin County Administrator's  
Office  
Suite 331  
Morin County Civic Center  
San Rafael, California 94901

Capaz, Dennis  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
County Jail West  
1512 No. Clark Avenue  
Tampa, Florida 33607

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Chap. A.A. Butner  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Connors, John  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Cooley, Jerry L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Davis, Russ  
Pima County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 910  
Tucson, Arizona 85702

DiRusso, Anthony  
N.Y.C.D.C.  
17-17 Hazen Street  
East Elmhurst, New York 11370

Divens, Jill  
Pinellas County Sheriff's  
Office  
14400 49th Street, No.  
Clearwater, Florida 33520

Donder, Kay  
Spokane County Jail  
West 1100 Mallon  
Spokane, Washington 99260

Doyle, Bob  
Morin County Sheriff's Office  
Civic Center  
Hall of Justice  
San Rafael, California 94903

Elden, T.  
West Virginia Regional Jails  
P.O. Box 3102  
Charleston, West Virginia  
25332

Felitz, Sgt. Patrick H.  
Hillsborough County Jail West  
1512 No. Clark Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Finical, Steve  
Summit County Sheriff's Office  
53 E. Center Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308

Fisher, Dep. Clyde L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Fortner, Rene L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
4102 W. Spruce Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Frazier, Bill  
Contra Costa Sheriff's  
Department  
1000 Ward Street  
Martinez, California 94553

Gardner, Deputy Bob  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Gauger, Glenn  
H.O.R.  
100 North Broadway  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees**

Geoghegan, W.  
Morse/Diesel  
15 15 Broadway  
New York, New York 10036

Goldhart, Jill D.  
Bureau of Adult Detention  
1050 Freeway Drive, No.  
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Graham, Sally  
Florida Department of  
Corrections  
13 11 Winewood Boulevard  
Tallahassee, Florida 3230 1

Graham, David  
Leon County Florida  
1758 Beechwood Circle, No.  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Griffis, Bruce I.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1203 Orient Road  
Tampa, Florida 33569

Griggs, Capt. John L.  
Alexandria Sheriff's Office  
520 King Street, Room 308  
Alexandria, Virginia 223 14

Hafernan, Sgt. Richard  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Hall, Marilyn C.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
Detention Department  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Hall, Tom  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1512 No. Clark Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Harman, Susan  
Michigan Department of  
Corrections  
Lansing, Michigan 489 13

Heatherly, Sara  
1500 NW 12th Avenue, Suite 722  
Miami, Florida 33136

Hecht, Frank R.  
Pima County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 910  
Tucson, Arizona 85702

Hennessey, Sheriff Michael  
333 City Hall  
San Francisco, California  
9 4 1 0 2

Hill, Bryan L.  
Monroe County Jail  
34 No. 7th Street  
Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania  
18360

Hill, Sgt. H. Craig  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 3360 1

Houghton, Bruce  
Ramois & Partners, Architects  
515 Bay Street  
Tampa, Florida 33629

Hughes, James P.  
Board/Criminal Justice  
Coordinator  
Genesee County  
1101 Beach Street, Room 312



**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees**

Flint, Michigan 48502  
Hunter, Mike  
Monolithic Constructors, Inc.  
3007 E. Telford Road  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401

Jacobson, Robert J.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Jarvis, Al  
Pinal County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 867  
Florence, Arizona 85232

Johnston, Robert B.  
Johnson County Sheriff  
Department  
Courthouse  
Olathe, Kansas 66061

Jordan, Ed  
Weld County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 759  
Greeley, Colorado 80632

Kalinich, Dave  
Michigan State University  
560 Baker Hall  
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Katz,. Jake  
Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
Department  
Central Jail  
441 Bauchet Street, Room 1040  
Los Angeles, California 900 12

Keller, Lt. John T.  
Travis County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767

Kerle, Ken  
American Jail Association  
P.O. Box 2158  
Hagerstown, Maryland 21742

Klopp, James  
Milwaukee County- Sheriff's  
Department  
821 West State Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Knowles, Capt. E.A.  
Travis County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767

Koerner, G.  
Morse/Diesel  
15 15 Broadway  
New York, New York 10036

LeVeglia, Warden Tony  
Brooklyn H.D.M  
275 Atlantic Avenue  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Lewis, Capt. Jerry  
Summit County Sheriff's Office  
53 E. Center Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308

Lichter, Janice  
Milwaukee County Board of  
Supervisors  
901 No. 9th Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Liebert, Dennis  
NIC Jail Center  
1790 30th Street  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Lucas, Robert M.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
4192 W. Spruce Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Machado, Sgt. J.A.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Melvin, Ross  
Pinellas County Jail  
14400 49th Street, No.  
Clearwater, Florida 33520

Menke, Ben  
Criminal Justice Program  
Washington State University  
Pullman, Washington  
99164-4880

Meradith, Stan  
Johnson Data Associates,  
Architects  
5550 W. Idlewild, Suite 122  
Tampa, Florida 33634

Minish, Allen J.  
Larimar County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 1190  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

Miranda, Capt. George  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
2008 8th Avenue  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Nederhoff, Dale A.  
Prime Design, Inc.  
3010 Azeele Street  
Tampa, Florida 33679

Neuenschwander, V.  
Oklahoma County Sheriff's  
Office  
321 Park Avenue  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

O'Donoghue, Vince  
Union County Jail  
15 Elizabethtown Plaza  
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Page, Bill  
MMRMA  
37713 Schoolcraft, Building A  
Livonia, Michigan 48150

Painter, Chief James  
Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
Department  
441 Bauchet Street  
Los Angeles, California  
90012

Parish, Col. David M  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Park, Jean  
West Virginia Regional Jail &  
Prison Authority  
Capital Complex  
307 Jefferson Street  
Charleston, West Virginia

Pato, Capt. J.W.  
Osceola County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 2428  
Kissimmee, Florida 32743

Patrick, Bill, Chief  
P.O. Box 310  
1st St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Pellicane, Guy  
Department of Correction and  
Youth Services  
P.O. Box 266  
New Brunswick, New Jersey  
08903

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Penn, Sgt. Richard E.  
Pinellas County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box- 2500  
Largo, Florida 34294-2500

Plunkett, James G.  
Plunkett Keymar Reginato,  
Architects  
6830 W. Villard Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 532 18

Price, Barbara Raffel  
John Jay College  
444 W. 56th Street  
New York, New York 10019

Pulitzer, Curtiss  
The Ehrenkrantz Group  
540 1 Palisade Avenue  
Riverdale, New York 10471

Ramsey, Lt. Michael  
Sarasota Sheriff's Department  
2020 Main Street  
Sarasota, Florida 33578

Reed, Tammy  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33603

Rich, . Peter G.  
Correctional Services Group  
410 Archibald Avenue, Suite 105  
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

Riley, Sgt. Mark  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Rivers, Robert E.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Robinson, Capt. James  
Contra Costa County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 391  
Martinez, California 94553

Rose, Robert  
MCC  
808 Union Street  
San Diego, California 92031

Ross, Lt. Rickard A.  
Yellowstone County Detention  
Facility  
P.O. Box 35017  
Billings, Montana 59 107

Rowan, Joe  
Juvenile/Criminal Justice  
International  
381 So. Owasso Boulevard  
Roseville, Minnesota 55 113

Salemme, Joseph  
Union County Administrator's  
Building  
4th Floor  
Elizabeth, New Jersey 07206

Sanborn, Chloe  
Goodwill Director Corrections  
1320 24th Avenue, No.  
St. Petersburg, Florida  
33704

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees**

Saunders, Major Steve  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Sawyer, Michael  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Schlageter, Marv - Undersheriff  
P.O. Box 1190  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80522

Sharrieff, N.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1512 No. Clark Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Sherwood, John  
Pinal County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 867  
Florence, Arizona 85232

Silva, G.R.  
Lincoln County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 611  
Wiscasset, Maine

Silverman, Charles  
771 14th Avenue  
San Francisco, California  
94118

Sindles, Edward  
Lake County Sheriff's Office  
10 No. County Street  
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Smith, Chris  
AIA  
9001 Edmonton Road  
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

Smith, Omer E.  
Flager County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Drawer 1880  
Bunnell, Florida 320 10

Spoon, Jeff  
Arapahoe County Sheriff's  
Department  
7375 So. Potomac Street  
Englewood, Colorado 80112

Sprecher, Rob  
Arapahoe County Sheriff's  
Office  
Littleton County  
7375 So. Potomac  
Englewood, Colorado 80112

Stewart, Deb  
Bureau of Adult Detention  
240 So. Parsons Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 432 15

Sullivan, Sheriff Pat J., Jr.  
Arapahoe County Sheriff's  
Department  
5686 So. Court Place  
Littleton, Colorado 80120

Tesmer, Bernie  
Milwaukee County Sheriff's  
Department  
821 West State Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Tolson, Beverly  
Compliance Officer  
Fulton County Sheriff's  
Department  
136 Pryor Street, S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Troutman, Sheriff Dave  
Summit County Sheriff  
53 E. Center Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees**

Tyler, Sgt. Andre  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Walker-Adia, H.  
Glynn County Detention Center  
1728 Newcastle Street  
Brunswick, Georgia 31520

Wallace, Capt. Steven D.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Westlake, Lt. Jim  
Washoe County Sheriff's Office  
911 Parr Boulevard  
Reno, Nevada

Zemites, John V.  
Johnson County Sheriff  
Department  
Courthouse  
Olathe, Kansas 66061

# PROGRAM

## 2nd NIC SYMPOSIUM ON NEW GENERATION JAILS

Clearwater, Florida; May 8, 1987

- 8:00-8:15 GENERAL INTRODUCTION (O'Toole, Ford, Farbstein, Wener)
- 8:15-9:15 **STAFF SELECTION AND TRAINING**  
Topics: Is there such a thing as "appropriate" staff for working in direct supervision housing units or can any properly trained corrections staff manage effectively? What methods are systems using to screen and train staff?  
Moderator: Rich Wener  
**Panelists:** Sam Saxton with Dr. Feigenbaum, Prince Georges County MD; Linda Zupan, Washington State University, Pullman WA with Don Manning, Spokane County WA.
- 9:15-9:45 'Application of Direct Supervision Principles to Management of Department of Corrections,' Russell Davis, Pima County AZ.
- 9:45-10:00 **Break**
- 10:00-11:00 **TRAINING MID-LEVEL MANAGERS**  
**Topics:** Preparing middle level managers to deal effectively with their line supervisory staff. The greater autonomy of direct supervision housing makes a problem solving and support style of management more effective than traditional, authority-based management.  
**Moderator:** Mike O'Toole  
**Paper:** Guy Pelicane, Middlesex County NJ: "Training Middle Level Supervisors."  
**Panelists:** Sara Heatherty, Dade County FL; Russell Davis, Pima County AZ.
- 11:00-1:30 **SMALL GROUP PROBLEM SOLVING SESSIONS**  
Groups of 6 to 8 participants will be formed to discuss specific problems or concerns affecting new generation jails. Topics or problems will be identified by jail systems which would like to get input, review or assistance from others at the symposium. Topics could include planning staffing, training, services, classification, budgeting, facility planning (review of designs), etc. Groups will be constituted based upon topics submitted by May 7 (at the conference) to Mike O'Toole. Each group will have a facilitator and will prepare to report back to the large group. Session will begin at 11:00 and run over lunch. Session will start with a 10 minute presentation on the results of the NICIC survey of new generation jail's problems by NICIC representative or Mike O'Toole.
- 1:30-2:00 Report Out on Small Group Sessions  
**Moderator:** Jay Farbstein
- 2:00-3:15 **UNIT SIZE, STAFF RATIOS AND DIRECT SUPERVISION**  
**Topic:** Is there an ideal or a maximum unit size or staffing ratio for new generation jails? What are thresholds in terms of staff effectiveness and efficiency? Which tasks should the officer be responsible for in addition to inmate supervision (meals, visiting, etc.)?  
**Moderator:** Jay Farbstein  
**Panelists:** Introduction: Ray Nelson, Boulder CO; Thorn Barry, NYC; Steve Carter, Columbia SC; Scott Higgins (?), Bureau of Prisons; Alan Minish, Larimer County CO; Sam Saxton, P.G. County.
- 3:15-3:30 **Break**
- 3:30-4:30 **OVERCROWDING AND NEW GENERATION JAILS**  
Topics: How do new generation jails perform when overcrowded (and their inmate to staff ratios are increased, sometimes up to 90 or 100:1)? Are principles of direct supervision sacrificed? What staffing or management changes must be made? Do new generation jails perform better than traditional jails when overcrowded?  
**Moderator:** Richard Wener  
**Panelists:** Larry Ard, Contra Costa County CA; Joseph Knowles, Chicago MCC; Roger Rose, San Diego MCC.
- 4:30-5:00 **WRAP-UP**  
Topics: What did we learn at this session? What should be plan for next year?  
**Moderators:** Mike O'Toole, NIC
- 5:00 **Adjourn**