

LARIMER COUNTY DETENTION CENTER  
A STUDY OF  
PODULAR DIRECT SUPERVISION

August 1987

Prepared under a grant from the  
National Institute of Corrections

**By**

Herbert R. Sigurdson  
Training Associates Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Preface* . . . . . *iii*

Executive Summary . . . . . v

SECTION I: Podular Direct Supervision: An Innovative Approach to Jail Management . . . . . 1

SECTION II: Study/Audit Design . . . . . 24

SECTION III: Data Analysis: From Principles to Practice . . . . . 31

SECTION IV: Podular Direct Supervision: An Innovation Whose Time Has Come . . . . . 74

Appendix

Data Interview Schedules



## Larimer County Detention Center

O = In Operation  
P = Planning Phase

### NORTHEAST REGION

Anthony Pellicane, Director, Department of Corrections,  
Middlesex County Detention Center, P.O. Box 266, New  
Brunswick, NJ, 08903 [O]

J. Patrick Gallagher, Superintendent, Erie County Correctional  
Facility, P.O. Box X, Alden, NY, 14004 [O]

Sam Saxton, Director, Prince Georges County Detention Center,  
5310 Douglas, Upper Marlboro, MD, 20772 [O]

Larry Lezza, Jail Superintendent, Lake County Jail, 10 North  
County Street, Waukegan, IL, 60085 [P]

Edgar Wheeler, Sheriff, Aroostook County Jail, P.O. Box 803,  
Houlton, ME, 04730 [P]

Gary Billy, Sheriff, Licking County Jail, 46 South 3rd Street,  
Newark, OH, 43055 [P]

Sgt. Donald Erdman, Marathon County Jail, P.O. Box 1706,  
Wausau, WI, 54401 [P]

Arthur M. Wallenstein, Director, Bucks County Prison, 1730  
South Easton Road, Daylestown, PA, 18901 [O]

Lt. Richard Cox, Milwaukee County Jail, 821 West State Street,  
Milwaukee, WI, 53223 [P]

Janice White, Director, Manhattan House of Detention, 125  
White Street, New York, NY, 10013 [O]

Director, New York Metropolitan Correctional Center, 150 Park  
Row, New York, NY, 10007 [O]

Warden O.C. Jentkins, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 71  
West Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL, 60605 [O]

James M. Ferels, Director of Inmate Services, 917 Beach  
Street, Flint, MI, 48502 [P]

Sheriff Dave Troutman, Summit County, 53 E. Center Street,  
Akron, OH, 44308 [P]

---

*List compiled from draft of Proceedings of First Annual Symposium on Direct  
Supervision Jails, conducted by the NIC Jail Center, May 1, 1986.*



---

PREFACE



Preface

This study/audit of the Larimer County Detention Center is based on the design used in previous studies of the Manhattan House of Detention, New York (1985) and the Pima County, Arizona Detention Center (1987). Thus, it provides the third analysis of direct supervision jails located in demographically and geographically divergent areas of the country. The findings of this study are comparable to the previous studies and build a strong empirical base for advocating direct supervision as a preferred option for County Commissioners, Sheriffs, Jail Administrators and others engaged in planning new institutions.

The writer is grateful for all of the creative work that went into formulating this integration of architectural and management philosophies. Without question, this has to be one of the most significant contributions to jail management over the past 200 years. The writer also appreciates the professional contributions of the NIC Jail Division staff with respect to the study design and data analysis. Michael O'Toole assembled the team including Dee Halley, Paul Katsampes and Herbert Sigurdson to conduct the data collection in February, 1987. Stuart Readio provided valuable contributions in arranging for computer frequency distributions of the raw data.

Sheriff James Black obtained technical assistance from the NIC Jail Center to conduct the study/audit. In so doing, he facilitated arrangements for the data collection team to conduct the interviews with staff and inmates at the Larimer County Detention Center. In this regard, recognition is extended to the administrators, supervisors, unit officers and inmates of the Center who gave their valuable time to complete the data collection instruments. Finally, a special thanks to Julia O'Rourke who produced this document on direct supervision as it operates in the Larimer County Detention Center.

Herbert R. Sigurdson  
August 1987



---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



# Larimer County Detention Center

## Executive Summary

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Larimer County Detention Center has been operating as a direct supervision jail since October 1983, three and one-half years. The performance of this jail has been outstanding as measured by official records which contain objective information regarding inmate behavior. The official record data is as follows:

1.	Number of Homicides	0
2.	Number of Suicides	0
3.	Number of Sexual Assaults	0
4.	Number of Aggravated Assaults	4
5.	Number of Contraband Weapons	5
	a. Two (2) broken mop handles	
	b. Three (3) small plastic utensils	
6.	Number of Disturbances	0
7.	Number of Court-Ordered Judgments	0
8.	Costs Associated With Inmate Vandalism	\$10,700
	[Note: \$6,989 of the vandalism was from broken windows]	

These findings make a dramatic statement regarding the management of this facility. However, they do not inform the reader of the management principles and dynamics which combine to produce these remarkable results. In response to this deficiency, this Executive Summary will abstract the findings from a survey/audit conducted in the Spring of 1987 regarding eight principles and dynamics of direct supervision from the perspective of "well done" and "missed opportunities."

II. "WELL DONES"

A. Effective Control

Unit officers (96%), support staff (100%) and supervisory staff (100%) report that unit officers have quite a bit or almost complete control of the living units. Of inmates, 79% believe that unit officers or other personnel are in charge of the living units, a powerful statement supporting the perception of staff. Moreover, unit officers (86%) and supervisors (91%) report that inmates seldom or almost never challenge the leadership of unit officers in an attempt to subvert their authority. When they do challenge the unit officers' authority, inmate are seldom or almost never successful. (Unit officers - 92%; supervisors - 91%.)

These findings, buttressed by additional data in this report, vigorously support the position that the Larimer County Jail is under the effective control of the facility staff. The effective control of inmates by staff is enhanced by the facility design with sound perimeter control and the capacity to classify and divide the population into manageable units. Nevertheless, these findings punctuate a direct supervision concept--facilities contain inmates: staff control them.

B. Effective Supervision

Unit officers require effective supervision in direct supervision jails to ensure consistency with respect to two management principles:

1. Effective supervision reinforces the image of the line officer as the leader in the unit, and
2. It ensures that unit operations are consistent with agency mission, policies and procedures.

This study posed a series of questions regarding the quality of supervision at the Larimer County Jail.

Unit officers (81%) and supervisors (90%) reported that unit officers receive the coaching, guidance and direction they need. In addition, when supervisors visit the units, their presence enhances or greatly enhances the image of the unit officer as the leader of the unit. (Unit officers - 84%; supervisors - 82%.) Moreover, supervisors (100%) and unit

officers (83.3%) agree that supervisors are accessible and available to unit officers.

Supervisors (82%) perceive shift-to-shift communication as being satisfactory, a finding that is unusually high in correctional facility management. And, while shift-to-shift continuity and consistency are considered somewhat deficient, the overall consistency of procedures among general living units is remarkably high as viewed by support staff (73%) and supervisors (70%). Even more dramatic is, the finding that management helps make programs and security work well by discussing differences in program content and scheduling during joint meetings with support/program staff and security staff. (Support staff - 100%; supervisors - 100%).

While some missed opportunities will be addressed later in this Executive Summary, in the overall it seems clear that the Larimer County Detention Center has effectively attended to the supervision functions of the direct supervision jail.

### C. Competent Staff

The aggravating, ever-present discrepancy between theory and practice can often be measured by the quality of the staff. Corrections as a social control mechanism has never been strong on either theory or practice. However, this has not been the case with respect to direct supervision jails. The theory has been carefully articulated and competent staff have been effective in managing the implementation process. The Larimer County Detention Center staff have demonstrated their competence as reflected in responses to a number of relevant questions in this regard.

Supervisors (81%) and unit officers (80%) feel that the training provided unit officers adequately prepares them to manage living units. Three-quarters of the unit staff reported having had follow-up in-service training. In addition, supervisors (82%) report that they provide on-the-job (coaching) training for their subordinates which is somewhat or very helpful.

Participation in planning, problem solving and decision making in one's direct area of influence contributes greatly to a sense of influence and ownership. Supervisors (92%) and unit officer (92%) strongly agree that unit officers are involved in planning, problem solving and decision making regarding inmate management.

The survey data findings are supported by personnel data which indicate that Larimer County Detention Center has, in fact, enjoyed the benefits of high-quality and reasonably-paid staff who are competent in managing the facility.

D. Safety of Staff and Inmates

Unquestionably, the greatest concern about being incarcerated or seeking employment in a detention facility centers on the issue of personal safety. The record data, interview data and observations made by the data collection team support the hypothesis that the Larimer County Jail is very safe for both staff and inmates. There have been no homicides, no suicides, no major disturbances, no sexual assaults and no court-ordered judgments since the facility opened in October, 1983.

A number of interview items were asked of staff and inmates to check out their perceptions of safety in this facility. All of the support/program staff, most of the supervisory staff (90%) and unit officers (96%) felt comfortable or very comfortable going anywhere on the units. Supervisors (82%) felt that the Larimer County Jail was safer for staff than other jails they had worked in. Inmates (90%) agreed in that they perceive the Larimer County Jail as being a better or much better living experience than other jails.

In addition, all of the inmates, all of the supervisors, most of the support staff (91%) and most of the unit officers feel that the direct supervision approach provides safe living conditions for inmate.

Inmate property is safe, conflicts seldom or almost never occur, and physical assaults are rare. And, of great significance is the finding that sexual assaults seldom or never occur (supervisors - 100%; unit officers - 100%; inmates - 95%.)

The survey findings conclude that the Larimer County Detention Center has established a highly desirable and enviable record in managing a safe and secure facility for staff and inmates alike.

E. Manageable and Cost Effective

The principle of 'manageable and cost effective' assumes increased valence since jails occupy low status in the competing program priorities of local citizens and elected officials. Direct supervision jails are cost effective since they are designed on the premise that only 10% to 15% of the inmates will require the heavy-duty institutional safeguards that characterize traditional jails and maximum security facilities. Moreover, direct supervision jails are manageable and cost effective because they are better managed with less staff by contrast with traditional/conventional jails.

This study asked a number of questions pertaining to the principle of 'manageable and cost effective.' The findings strongly endorse the notion that programs significantly contribute to the security of the facility. Larimer County has a rich and extensive array of programs which constructively occupy much of the inmates' waking hours, thus distracting them from counter-productive activities which might otherwise lead to vandalism and the associated high costs of maintenance and repairs.

In a tangential manner, many practitioners and penologists posit a high correlation between standards of sanitation and cleanliness with sound management practice. The Larimer County Jail maintains quite possibly the highest standard of sanitation and cleanliness of any jail in the country. Thus, it is likely that high standards of cleanliness, a rich array of programs and a low level of vandalism combine in the creation of a low-stress, "hassle-free", manageable and cost effective jail in Larimer County.

F. Effective Communications

Direct supervision jails are severely hampered when effective communications are abridged. This is so because virtually all direct supervision transactions occur in the public arena. Thus, when communications are impaired, inmates as well as staff are aware. And, given the opportunity, inmates will exploit to their advantage any and every break of communication they know about, whether the signals are verbal or non-verbal. This survey asked a number of questions pertaining to communication patterns in the Larimer County Jail.

Uniformly, unit officers, support staff and supervisors agree that unit officers maintain communications with all the inmates on the living units. In doing so, unit officers and supervisors agree that the officer/inmate communication process is effective as a means of obtaining useful management information. In this exchange, a significant number of inmates (70%) feel comfortable communicating with unit officers.

The survey also included questions regarding communications patterns between and among staff. In this regard, there was high agreement that staff maintain free and open channels of communication. Thus, the findings lead one to conclude that the principle of effective communications is in excellent health at the Larimer County Detention Center.

#### G. Classification and Orientation

Classification is an essential procedure used in direct supervision jails to identify inmates capable of living in general living units as opposed to those who, for their own protection or the protection of others, need higher levels of custodial care. Similarly, inmates need proper orientation in order to know the rules and regulations which will govern their behavior. A number of questions were asked about the principle of classification and orientation in this survey.

Supervisory personnel are persuaded that unit officers receive adequate classification information as well as information inmates need (court dates, bond procedures, schedules, etc.). In-addition, procedures are in place for reclassifying inmates as warranted by their adjustment/behavior on the general living units.

Regarding inmate orientation, unit officers, support staff and supervisors agree that inmates receive adequate orientation prior to being assigned to housing units. Inmates agree with this staff finding and acknowledge that unit rules and regulations are posted or distributed in an appropriate manner.

The quality of the classification and orientation system was tested by a basic survey question: "Do inmates treat you in a respectful manner?" Unit officers (96%), support staff (91%) and supervisors (100%) responded affirmatively. Conversely, almost 80% of the inmates feel they are treated respectfully by unit officers.

Cumulatively the data support the hypothesis that the Larimer County Detention Center has an effective classification and orientation procedure.

#### H. Justice and Fairness

The general public, 'while hostile or indifferent toward jails and jail inmates, nevertheless expects that inmates will be treated justly and fairly and in accordance with the provisions of law.

A review of official records indicates that effective disciplinary and administrative remedy procedures are in place. In addition, unit officers and supervisors feel they have an adequate disciplinary system that contributes positively to the unit officers' management of the units.

Moreover, supervisors and unit officers agree that inmates have a fair and impartial grievance procedure--one that is deemed to be fair by the inmate population. These perceptions were verified by inmates (81%) who reported that they were treated fairly by unit officers.

These findings lead to a strong positive assertion that the principle of justice and fairness is firmly established in practice at the Larimer County Detention Center.

### III. MISSED OPPORTUNITIES

The findings from this study/audit indicate that the Larimer County Detention Center is operating on the basis of the eight principle and dynamics of direct supervision jail. Some missed opportunities surfaced that may or may not be problems in the overall management of the jail. However, they are presented as missed opportunities simply because minor adjustments in supervision patterns may contribute to the operation of an already well-managed correctional facility.

- Unit officers (24%) report that supervisors visit the unit less than five (5) times per week. This finding (see page 38) is in contrast with 76% of the unit officers who report that supervisors visit the units more than five (5) times per week. It is possible that the 24% responding were from the graveyard

shift. But even on this shift, one would expect supervisors to check in at the beginning and the end of the shift at a bare minimum. It is suggested that the administrative staff examine this aspect of supervision to determine its accuracy and take whatever steps may be appropriate. This suggestion is made in light of the finding which reports that 25% of the unit officers do not feel that their supervisors spend sufficient time visiting the units.

- Unit officers (64%) and supervisors (55.6%) perceive that supervisors seldom or almost never make a point of roving through all sections of the living units. These findings indicate some deficiency in mid-management's responsibility for following up on important management control functions. The administration is advised to give this area of supervision further study to assess whether corrective action is needed.
- Supervisors (45.5%) report that they do not feel there is consistency of procedures from one shift to another. This is a common problem in institutional management and one that can create serious problems regarding the smooth operation of the facility. It is suggested that the administration examine this problem in greater detail and take the necessary action to correct this management discrepancy.
- Almost half of the unit officers report that management does not help make programs and security work well together. This perception is not in alignment with the perceptions of support staff (100%) and supervisors (100%) who report that this coordination function is being adequately addressed. It may help considerably, however, if a method of communication were devised to inform unit officers of management's efforts in attending to the important function of intra-system coordination.
- The data collection team observed the unit officers spending almost all of their time in the control center or vestibule adjacent to the two living units. From our observations, the unit officers appeared to be busily engaged in managing the traffic of inmates to and from the unit, answering the telephone and discussing issues with inmates who would approach the officer for information or just to ventilate. The operation appears to be running smoothly in spite of this somewhat less-than-ideal direct supervision mode

of interaction. The administration may wish to consider the use of portable telephones or some other appropriate communication device that would free unit officers from the work station and enable them to increase their direct interaction and supervision of the inmates in their units. This suggestion is made knowing from inspection that the present method appears to be working and that the living units are; for all intents and purposes, very much under the control of the unit officers (see page 32).



---

SECTION I

Podular Direct Supervision:  
An Innovative Approach to Jail Management



PODULAR DIRECT SUPERVISION:

AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO JAIL MANAGEMENT

A System Out of Service

Local jails historically have been the most neglected, component of the criminal justice system. Many have been characterized as atrocious hell-holes that differ only in the detail of their inhumane conditions. Most often, they are badly managed by untrained and underpaid staff. The best and worst that can be said for them is that they have served for 200 years as human warehouses for pretrial and sentenced detainees.

Even jails being built today are basically similar in function and design to the nation's first penitentiary--The Walnut Street Jail of Philadelphia, built in 1790. Linear-intermittent surveillance describes the architectural and management styles of these facilities. The design is generally rectilinear, with corridors leading to either single- or multiple-occupancy cells arranged at right angles to the corridors. The management of this design, is of necessity, oriented toward intermittent surveillance. Thus, when officers are in a position to observe one cell, they are unable to observe others. Consequently, when inmates are not being directly observed, they are essentially unsupervised. The critical management variables associated with linear-intermittent surveillance jails are frequency and thoroughness of the surveillance function. In these -facilities, inmates can and do use the intervals between surveillance patrols to perpetrate barbarous activities and security and safety breaches inside their living areas. These include fighting, sexual assaults, vandalism, fashioning weapons, concealing contraband and other destructive, counterproductive activities.

Change in jail management and design has been slow in coming, notwithstanding a barrage of external forces including thousands of lawsuits brought against Sheriffs, Commissioners and Jail Administrators throughout the land. But since the mid-1960s, jail administrators have joined with architects and students of the social sciences to study ways in which our traditional institutions have affected human behavior. The dynamics and principles they learned have greatly influenced the management and design philosophy of a number of new jails being built during the past decade or so.

Early in the 1970s, the Federal Prison System (FPS) initiated a grand experiment that is having a major impact

on jail management and design philosophy for the first time in over 200 years.

### Breaking With Orthodoxy

The FPS, unable to find suitable jail space in local facilities for pretrial detainees, launched an extensive planning effort to create Metropolitan Correctional Centers (Federal Jail~~s~~) in New York, Chicago and San Diego. Three of the nation's leading architectural firms were commissioned to design MCCs for the three metropolitan areas and were prohibited from consulting or communicating with each other during the design process. While each of the MCCs reflects the individuality of its architect's responses, they are all similar in that they effectively facilitated the same management philosophy. No doubt this occurred, in large measure, because they responded to the same architectural program which was heavily influenced by a functional unit management approach developed and refined by the FPS institutions during the 1960s. The functional unit concept was based on a management strategy which organized inmate housing populations into units of 50 with a unit manager, a case manager, two counselors and corrections officers. It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that all three MCC designs incorporated "manageable" housing units with inmate rooms (cells) arranged around a common, multi-purpose area. Security control centers are conspicuous by their absence, and furnishings, fixtures and finishes are noticeable for their commercial grade (as contrasted with traditional high-security institutional-grade furnishings).

The management philosophy of these podular direct supervision units is proactive in that it is organized to prevent negative inmate behavior prior to its occurrence. This approach relies on the staff's ability to supervise and manage inmates rather than on structured barriers or technological devices which are employed only to facilitate staff efforts in controlling populations. Each living unit is staffed by one officer who has direct control over up to 50 inmates. In the podular direct supervision mode, the role of the management team is to structure the operational environment such that correctional officers will be successful using a proactive management approach to inmate control.

The FPS experience with the MCCs over the past 20 years has been very positive. There has been little violence, tension or vandalism: fewer assaults have occurred than in traditional jails; and suicide and escapes have been rare. In general, managers are pleased with the performance record of the MCCs, staff requirements have not been excessive, and staff perceive the environment as safe, clean, challenging.

### Resistance to Change: A Local Prerogative

Although many features of the MCCs have been incorporated into the design of local detention facilities, the overall concept was initially rejected. The podular design was adopted by many but modified to fit the traditional practices with which most administrators were comfortable. There was an almost universal disbelief among local administrators that direct supervision facilities could be safe, secure, cost effective, free from vandalism and a desirable place to work. Thus, the customary high-security, vandal-proof fixtures, furnishings and finishes were added to the podular design where 48-cell living units were sometimes sub-divided into units of 12 or 16 cells. Supervision was achieved either remotely from a secure observation post, or intermittently, by officers patrolling adjoining corridors (podular remote supervision). Ironically, the relative success of the modified podular design, coupled with the high-security furnishings and high-security electronics, tended to mask the true potential of the podular concept. The successes in the Federal MCCs were either ignored or attributed to the idea that federal inmates are somehow different. Few realized or accepted the perspective that this new design allowed management practices that would obviate the need for most of the reactive strategies so characteristic of traditional jail management.

### Contra Costa County Jail: A Local Prototype

In the early 1970s, Contra Costa County, California instituted plans to replace a turn-of-the-century jail that was one of California's worst. The county, located north and east of the San Francisco Bay area, includes the cities of Richmond and Martinez, both of which suffered from high unemployment. During the late '70s, plans were drawn up for 'a high-rise traditional jail to hold 642 inmates. Local opposition to both the style and appearance of the proposed facility surfaced and grew in scope and intensity. In the face of strident opposition, the County Executive agreed to appoint a search committee to study alternatives. This action resulted in the formation of a broad-based citizen's group that included the most vocal opponents of the proposed jail as well as representatives from civic organizations. The group spent months debating the philosophy and purpose of the jail along with issues pertaining to its needs and functions. Committee members traveled the country to study contemporary jail designs. They were impressed by the Chicago MCC but also incorporated in their planning concepts ideas from other jails such as an "open booking" intake center patterned after the St. Louis facility. These innovations helped the committee finalize the jail philosophy, specify its purpose, functions and spatial

relationships. The Sheriff and Commissioners endorsed the program plans which architects converted to schematic designs and blueprints.

During this process, the county discarded original plans worth \$1.2 million. The option they chose was considerably smaller with room for 386 inmates. (The new facility cost \$24.7 million including court facilities and \$1 million worth of landscaping.) Since land space was not a problem, the facility is spread out, providing for larger living areas, adjacent outdoor recreation areas, and ample daylight into rooms, as well as activity areas.

Contra Costa County Jail, which opened in 1981, has become a national showcase. Thousands of official visitors have traveled across the country to tour the facility. As a consequence of these tours, the concept of podular direct supervision has acquired new confidence from local Sheriffs, Commissioners and Jail Administrators. Since Contra Costa County made a breakthrough in 1981, some two dozen local jurisdictions are building or have built small and large facilities patterned after the podular direct supervision concept (See Appendix I) and another two dozen are being planned.

#### Differences Make a Difference

Podular direct supervision jails have proven to be cost effective which, in itself, is a persuasive argument in their favor. Moreover, by contrast with traditional practice, they have turned out to be virtually hassle-free, creating an attractive environment for personnel who, after all, are the ones who "do time" in jail over the long haul. To provide some perspective on how they function, a comparison is made between some of the more prevalent problems experienced in traditional jails and a description of how these problems are managed in podular direct supervision jails.

#### 1. INMATE CONTROL

Traditional Jails. Corrections officers control the corridors, catwalks and areas external to inmate cellblocks. Inmates control their own living areas, frequently with a "barn boss" who controls showers, television, jobs, meals and sexual favors. Inmates control "the action" in the jail.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Officers are stationed in the living areas, directly controlling inmate behavior, setting standards, allocating earned privileges, and providing a leadership role 24-hours-a-day. Inmates who

challenge the officer's authority are immediately disciplined on the unit or reclassified and moved off the unit to administrative segregation.

2. TENSION AND VIOLENCE

Traditional Jails. Fights are a daily occurrence. Inmates secure weapons to protect themselves. They form gangs for similar reasons. Personal property is frequently stolen. Sexual assaults occur frequently, often as a show of power. Staff accept the inmate code of values believing they have no alternative. Trapped in this deplorable, hopeless situation, some inmates are driven to suicide.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Tension is at a low level, fights are rare and quickly broken up because officers are in direct contact with inmates. Staff and inmates feel safe and secure negating the need for weapons or gangs. Sexual assaults are unheard of. The jail is hassle-free.

3. NOISE POLLUTION

Traditional Jails. Excessive noise is often cited as a major problem. Cell doors slam. Radios and televisions blare in competition. Conversations are shouted down echoing concrete corridors. The din contributes heavily to the constant stress.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Architectural design and management practices combine to reduce noise. Solid walls and doors confine individual room noises; In open areas-, carpeting, acoustical tile and open space absorb the sound. Shouting is neither necessary nor permitted. Inmates are instructed to keep noise levels down.

4. IDLENESS

Traditional Jails. The jail may have some facilities for recreation and programs but inmates can only be taken in groups at specific hours when staff are available to escort them. Much time is spent viewing a single television set or playing cards in a dayroom. The lack of program options invites inmates to engage in counter-productive and often destructive activities in areas remote from staff or in their cellblocks.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Dayrooms are equipped with pool and/or ping pong tables. Multiple televisions are available for viewing programs of one's choice which eliminates inmate conflicts regarding channel choices. Education areas, libraries, visiting areas and law libraries are nearby and available. Universal gyms are frequently available so inmates can choose between indoor and adjacent outdoor recreation during the day and 'evening hours but always under the watchful eyes of corrections officers. Idleness is never a problem but rather an option available to the inmates. Programs which constructively occupy inmates' time are viewed by staff as an extension of security. Indeed, security staff in direct supervision jails view programs as security.

5. VANDALISM

Traditional Jails. Inmates routinely vent their frustrations on the institution. Furniture is soon in disrepair, windows are broken, the walls covered with graffiti and plugged-up toilets are common occurrences.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Cleanliness and orderliness prevail. Peer pressure keeps the living units in good repair. Porcelain basins and toilets seldom need replacement. Inmates rarely burn cigarette holes in carpets or wooden furnishings. Maintenance is low even though non-institutional fixtures, furniture and furnishings are used. Weekly contests for cleanliness add to the daily maintenance of a clean and orderly facility.

6. INCONVENIENCES

Traditional Jails. Inmate privileges are a constant source of staff harassment. Television leads to fights over which channel to watch. Inmates badger staff for phone calls which require escorts and supervision. Getting linens, blankets, towels, soap, etc. often becomes a major problem. And, rather than send laundry to the washroom, inmates wash their clothes in toilet bowls and rip up sheets for make-shift clotheslines.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. These facilities operate on the premise that service requests by inmates are legitimate and should be readily available to them. Thus, pay phones are installed and available for inmate use on an

officer-controlled/scheduled basis. More than one television eliminates fights as compatible inmates choose and watch programs of their own choice. Laundry problem disappear when inmates have access to equipment in their living units. And, with adequate controlled storage space on the unit, officers can schedule the issuing of personal supplies. In these facilities, the service needs of inmates are no longer an inconvenience but rather a management tool 'for officers to use in controlling inmate behavior. Inmates who fail to behave according to the required norms may find themselves without the benefit of those services which otherwise are readily available.

7. INMATE MOVEMENT

Traditional Jails. Every time an inmate has to leave the cell area for a visit, education, recreation, medical services, attorney consultation, etc., he/she must be accompanied by one or two officers. This requires escort staff or is unavailable. Restrictions of this kind raise tension levels and often run afoul of court orders or simple inmate rights.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Most of the programs/services are available on the living unit precluding the need for inmate movement. Thus, access to these services becomes a management tool rather than a hassle for corrections officers.

8. INMATE INFORMATION

Traditional Jails. Inmates pepper officers for information regarding court dates, bail amounts, names of attorneys, -visiting and other issues of personal concern. Officers wind up their shifts with pockets stuffed with notes, which they may or may not have time to address. Information harassment is a chronic problem which induces tension and stress.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Officers have telephones at their stations and can readily access information sources for inmates. In some jails, computer print-outs are available regarding inmate bail, next court appearance, cash reserves in the commissary, etc. Officers discover that having control over information gives them more authority over inmates.

9. INMATE DISCIPLINE

Traditional Jails. Inmates don't care if they are "written up" and sent to segregation since they stand to lose so little. Sometimes that is the only way they can get any privacy. Moreover, being sent to "the hole" becomes a macho symbol, raising one's status among inmate peers.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Being reclassified to segregation means losing a broad range of privileges that inmates soon learn to value. The normalizing atmosphere is prized over the institutionalized atmosphere of the segregation unit where all needs become privileges and only constitutionally required minima are available.

10. STAFF PROBLEMS

Traditional Jails. Morale is low, tension is high and stress-related problems abound. Sick leave is used and abused. Some officers resort to smuggling in contraband to curry inmate favor. Others resort to brutalizing inmates. Militant unions are formed, staff turnover is high and many posts remain uncovered.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails. Officers learn leadership skills that will serve them on the streets and equip them for management roles in the future. The relatively pleasant atmosphere is designed for officers as much as it is for inmates. Officers learn to mingle with inmates without fear of assaults. Since they have the authority and resources to solve problems on their own, they find the job more satisfying. Many ask to stay in the jail even beyond the time prescribed by regular tours of duty.

It is often easier to described differences that make a difference than to understand the principles which undergird the process and explain the operative human dynamics. This dilemma haunted Ray Nelson, who opened the Chicago MCC in 1975. Having built his professional career as a jail administrator prior to joining the Federal Bureau of Prisons, he simply did not believe that a jail could successfully function using the podular direct supervision philosophy which was required by the architectural design, furnishings and fixtures of the Chicago MCC. Yet, despite his worst imaginable fantasies, the concept worked and the differences did make a difference. Mr. Nelson was able to articulate the nature and scope of these differences, some

## Larimer County Detention Center

of which are reported upon in this section. But why podular direct supervision achieves such radical change with respect to positive inmate behavior demanded careful conceptual analysis Nelson was able to provide as Director of the National Institute of Corrections Jail Center. This analysis culminated first in an unpublished paper and later in an NIC publication entitled "Direct Supervision Models." The principles and dynamics of the Podular Direct Supervision Model follow.

PODULAR DIRECT SUPERVISION MODEL\*

- Principles and Dynamics -

Principle I: Effective Control

A detention facility, by definition, is a controlled environment for those charged with a crime, awaiting a disposition, or serving a short sentence. Effective control of inmates is one of the primary objectives of any jail or program.

A. Total Control

The managers of podular direct supervision jails must be in total control of their jails at all times. Control should never be shared with inmates. When inmates are even temporarily unsupervised, they are, in effect, left in control of each other.

B. Sound Perimeter Security

The physical security of the podular direct supervision facility is concentrated on the perimeter. A strong perimeter security permits greater flexibility of internal operating procedures.

C. Population Divided Into Controllable Groups

Dividing the jail population so that corrections officers will not have to deal with more than 50 inmates at any one time facilitates their ability to remain in control. The officers may very well wish to manage larger groups of inmates when it is appropriate: however, this option should be discretionary and not dictated by design.

D. Easily Surveillable Areas

The supervision officer should always be in a position to easily observe the area he/she controls.

E. Inmates' Inner Control Maximized

One of the most significant elements of the principle of effective control is to structure the inmate's environment so that his inner controls will be maximized. Most inmates have the capacity to comply with the desires of the corrections officers if doing so will serve their needs. A

\*Nelsen, W.R., O'Toole, M., Krauth, B., Whitmore, C. Direct Supervision Model.

proactive management approach is used to manipulate the inmate's environment so that his critical needs are best achieved through compliant behavior and his negative behavior consistently results in frustration.

Principle II: Effective Supervision

Direct staff supervision of inmates is requisite for the achievement of effective control. Effective supervision involves more than visual surveillance: it includes the use of all the human senses, as well as extensive personal interaction between staff and inmates.

A. Staff-To-Inmate Ratio

The military has struggled with the concept of supervision ratios for centuries. While there are still no precise figures or absolute rules, past practice indicates that a platoon of approximately 44 men is a manageable group for military purposes. The experience of the past 10 years in podular direct supervision detention facilities suggests that an officer can effectively supervise 50 inmates. As one would reasonably assume, smaller groups are easier to supervise. However, the cost effectiveness of a lesser ratio has to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, smaller institutions--e.g., under 200--may not be able to achieve the 1-to-50 ratio because of mandatory classification groupings.

B. Officer In Control Of Unit

Effective supervision depends on the officer's being in control of the unit. The unit officer should not be expected to contend with an inmate in the unit who is not agreeable to promptly obeying all lawful orders. The housing unit should always be viewed as the "officer's space", with the inmates in the role of the visitors.

C. The Officer's Leadership Role

One of the major sources of inmate violence is the struggle to assert leadership when a leadership void exists. This is a natural group response to such a situation in any segment of society. However, the struggle for leadership or the dominant role in an inmate group is usually violent and brutal. Inmate rapes, for example, are often tactics employed by inmates to exert their dominance over others. In order to avoid this

situation, an officer must fill the leadership void and protect his or her role jealously. There is only room for one leader on a unit during any one shift and that must be the officer. Management's responsibility is to structure the unit environment to ensure that the officer remains the undisputed leader. Any inmate who vies for the leadership role has to be dealt with effectively, even if that involves his removal from the group.

D. Frequent Supervision By Management

Management must actively assume the responsibility for assuring that staff are successful in fulfilling their inmate supervisory responsibilities. This is achieved principally through the high visibility of managers in the housing units. The supervisor must ensure that the officer is performing his duties correctly, is achieving the desired results, and can be fully supported by management.

E. Techniques Of Effective Supervision And Leadership

A considerable body of knowledge has been collected and verified concerning effective supervision and leadership in all forms of human endeavors. These principles are also applicable to supervision and leadership in a podular direct supervision facility. Mastery of these techniques will enable the officer to accomplish objectives skillfully and with a sense of professional competence.

Principle III: Need For Competent Staff

A. Recruitment of Qualified Staff

A candidate for podular direct supervision should have the ability to relate effectively to people, to become a leader, and to learn the skills required of this position. Qualified candidates do not have to be college graduates, but should be capable of participating beneficially in the required training. Such candidates cannot be expected to be recruited at salaries lower than their road patrol counterparts.

B. Effective Training

In addition to basic correctional officer training, the officer needs to be trained in the history, philosophy and the principles and dynamics of new podular direct supervision facilities. He/she should also receive training to develop the critical skills of effective supervision, leadership, management and interpersonal communication.

c. Effective Leadership By Management

Even trained staff can only function as effectively as their leaders. As indicated previously, management must assume the responsibility for making staff effective. They must develop their staff through constructive supervision and leadership, ensure that they receive proper training, and maintain high recruitment standards.

Principle IV: Safety of Staff and Inmates

Probably the greatest concern about being incarcerated or seeking employment in a detention facility is personal safety. Our detention facilities have gained a reputation of danger that creates justifiable fear.

A. Critical To Mission And Public Expectations

Despite the general fear of detention facilities in our society, there is a public expectation that inmates should be safe, and the staff who operate these facilities should not be exposed to undue hazards. The basic mission of a detention facility is to provide safe the secure custody of its wards until they are released.

B. Life Safety Code

Prisons and jails are often the scenes of tragic fires. During the past 15 years, there have been more than a dozen mass-fatality fires in American correctional facilities. The fatalities from these fires occurred primarily from smoke inhalation which resulted from deficient evacuation plans and key control procedures. Any facility, regardless of architectural or management style, must be responsive to these critical issues.

c. Personal Liability

Million of dollars have been paid in court-awarded damages to victims or their families as a result of personal injuries sustained in detention facilities because of preventable, unsafe conditions. It is a travesty that these public funds were not spent in the first place to correct the unsafe conditions responsible for the injuries.

D. Inmate Response To Unsafe Surroundings

How inmates will respond to unsafe conditions is predictable-- self preservation. It is one of the basic instincts of man. Inmates attempt to enhance personal safety by acquiring defensive weapons, affiliating with a kindred group for common defense, presenting themselves as tough persons not to be messed with, or by purchasing security with cash or kind. Inmates often commit violent or destructive acts in order to be placed in administrative or punitive segregation, where they perceive it to be safer than the general population. The very acts which practitioners identify as the primary inmate management problems are often normal reactions to unsafe surroundings. Inmates in a podular direct supervision facility where personal safety is ensured do not find these defensive strategies necessary or in their best interests. On the contrary, such behavior is dysfunctional. It does not fulfill their needs and serves no constructive purpose.

E. Staff Response To Unsafe Working Conditions

Staffs' response to unsafe conditions is not too different from the inmates' since self-preservation is also one of their basic instincts. Staff often affiliate with unions to achieve safer working conditions. They avoid personal contact with inmates and avoid patrolling areas perceived by them to be unsafe. Staff often avoid coming to work altogether by using an excessive amount of sick leave for stress-related disabilities and, at other times, by simply abusing the sick leave system. They are also known to occasionally carry their own personal and prohibited weapons, and some have tried to buy personal safety from inmates through the granting of special favors.

F. Fear-Hate Response

The inevitable result of an unsafe environment is the "fear-hate" response. Fear and hate are closely related emotions. We usually hate those we fear, and fear those we hate. The inmates' fear and the resultant hate of other inmates and staff lead to some hideous consequences. The combined result of all of this hatred for one another is a "cancerous" working situation which is extremely hazardous.

Principle V: Manageable And Cost  
Effective Operations

One very important consideration for any facility is that it be manageable and cost effective. The podular direct supervision facility is able to fulfill the mission of the detention facility while, at the same time, reduce costs.

A. Reduced Construction Costs

Construction costs vary according to region and unique circumstances confronting the architect and contractor. Therefore, the costs of building podular direct supervision facilities vary from one location to another. There are, however, some basic component cost characteristics which are unique to the podular direct supervision style. The absence of vandal-proof and security-style furnishings, fixtures and finishes throughout 90% of the facility is the major contributor to lower construction costs. When one considers that the cost of a china toilet bowl is about \$150 and a stainless steel, vandal-proof toilet bowl is about \$1,500, some appreciation for construction costs savings is gained. The excessive costs of gang cell door closers and locking systems are also avoided.

B. Wider Range Of Architectural Options

Since the architect does not have to select materials primarily as a reaction to the anticipated destructive behavior of inmates, he is free to select a wider range of materials. For example, if a facility wishes to utilize carpeting as a floor covering and benefit from its relative cost advantage, ease of maintenance, and sound dampening qualities, it may do so.

c. Anticipate Fundamental Needs: Incentives for Self-Control

The proactive manager uses his knowledge of how human needs affect behavior to achieve the behavioral response he is seeking. He perceives them as environmental forces that can be effectively manipulated to assist him in accomplishing his agency's mission and goals. If the inmate understands that most of his fundamental human needs can be fulfilled on a general housing unit, then he has a very important investment in remaining on the unit.

One of the most powerful forces affecting the inmate's behavior, next to the self-preservation instinct, is the need to communicate and have contact with family and significant others. The fulfillment of this need then becomes an influential dynamic in managing the general housing unit. If contact visits are available to those who conduct themselves responsibly, the motivation for responsible behavior is greatly enhanced. The potential loss of privileges that affect an inmate's relations with his loved ones is one of the most potent forces that can be applied to achieve responsible inmate behavior.

Telephone access is likewise an important priority for the inmate. Through the telephone, he is able to keep in communication with the important people in his life. Therefore, another important ingredient for the general housing unit is sufficient collect-call phones to meet the population's telephone needs. Not only does this meet the inmate's need, but it relieves the officer from the annoying and time-consuming task of processing inmate telephone calls.

Television viewing is an important part of contemporary life. Most of the inmates have been raised on it since infancy. Considering how effectively television occupies an inmate's time, it is one of the most economical devices we can obtain for this purpose. Television is by no means a panacea. As in the home, it can be the source of a great deal of strife. On a housing unit of 50 felons representing a variety of cultural backgrounds, the resulting discord over channel selection can be violent. The solution to this problem is to have sufficient television sets to be responsive to basic needs and interests of the population. Usually two to four sets are sufficient, depending on the design of the unit

and the mix of the population. Using multiple sets can keep the sound volume lower and divide the population into smaller and more compatible groups.

Inmates should be able to purchase important items from the inmate store or commissary on a regular basis. When inmates are unable to make purchases from the inmate store or commissary, they will make their purchases from other inmates with all of the negative factors associated with these transactions.

The service of meals also takes on an exaggerated importance in correctional institutions. Good food, well prepared and presented, goes a long way toward increasing the inmate's investment in the general unit.

Security of personal property is another important consideration. The lack of secure storage for the inmate's personal property contributes to a high incidence of theft, along with concomitant corrective actions attempted by the inmate.

A great many problems occur in multiple or gang showers. The installation of sufficient individual shower stalls virtually eliminates the difficulties associated with this daily activity.

Physical exercise is an effective way to release pent-up emotional tensions which accompany the stress of incarceration. The opportunity for exercise is also a condition of confinement required by the courts. When the unit is designed to meet this need, it is no longer a management problem.

Inmate idleness still remains one of the leading management problems in a detention facility. The introduction of industrial opportunities can contribute significantly to the resolution of that problem. The income earned by the inmate's involvement in this activity is a significant motivator to remain eligible for those assignments. Inmates involved in constructive activity are seldom management problems.

#### D. Sanitation and Orderliness

A very important dynamic in managing a unit in a podular direct supervision facility is the set of activities involved in maintaining a clean and orderly unit. These activities promote a healthy

interaction between staff and inmate in which the inmate becomes conditioned to responding to the officer's directives. The orderly state of the unit is also a continual reminder that the officer is exerting active control of the unit. Competition between units for a prize awarded to the cleanest unit can produce amazing results in maintaining a high standard of sanitation and orderliness.

Principle VI: Effective Communication

Effective communication is a critical element in the operational strategy of all human enterprises. Detention facilities are not exceptions, and management must be sensitive to the important impact of the various elements of this principle.

A. Frequent Inmate And Staff Communication

Frequent communication between staff and inmates should be encouraged. Inmates will often advise staff of illegal activities being planned by other inmates if they have the opportunity to do so without running the risk of being identified. The inmate's cooperation is motivated both by an expectation of favorable treatment from the administration and by a desire not to have his living conditions jeopardized by the irresponsible actions of others, particularly if he does not stand to benefit.

B. Communication Among Staff Members

Because of the assignment of individual officers to separate units, there is particular need for management to facilitate effective communication among staff members. This needs to be accomplished between shifts and between assignments. It can be achieved through shift role calls, timely and clear policy and procedure statements, post orders, and unit logs.

C. Training and Techniques Of Effective Communication

Every officer should be trained in the techniques of interpersonal communication. These skills will greatly assist him in accomplishing his objectives. Considerable knowledge has been assembled over the years by communication specialists in correctional settings and should be fully utilized to ease the officer's task..

Principle VII: Classification and Orientation

The classification and orientation of inmates must be included in the day-to-day operations of podular direct supervision facilities.

A. Knowing With Whom You Are Dealing

The officer must know with whom he is dealing and should have the benefit of as much information about the inmate as possible. While it is true that institutions receive many prisoners on whom little information exists, they also receive many repeaters whose confinement records should detail, among other things, their behavior patterns in confinement.

B. Orientation

Inmates should be told what is expected of them. A carefully structured orientation program will save a lot of time and misunderstanding and will provide a further opportunity to learn about the inmate's behavior. Facility rules and regulations should be posted or otherwise available to the inmate population.

C. Assumption Of Rational Behavior

Human behavior is amazingly responsive to expectations communicated. This has been demonstrated frequently in educational settings and also has been seen in detention facilities. When we convey to a person the kind of behavior we expect from him, either verbally or non-verbally, his tendency is to respond to these clues.

The traditional detention facility approach is to treat all newly admitted inmates as potentially dangerous until they prove otherwise. The officers' expectation of the new inmate's behavior in these situations is clearly transmitted. In a podular direct supervision facility, the reverse approach is taken. All new inmates are treated with a clear expectation that they will behave as responsible adults until they prove otherwise. Staff are equipped to deal with those who prove otherwise, but the vast majority of inmates conduct themselves responsibly even during the admission process.

D. Maximum Supervision During Initial Hours of Confinement

The first 24 to 48 hours of confinement is a critical period in the detention process. The highest rate of suicide occurs during this period, accounting for nearly half the total jail suicides. Intensive supervision at this phase of the detention process will contribute to a lower suicide rate.

Principle VIII: Justice and Fairness

To advocate that detention facilities operate in a just and fair manner sounds more like a homily than a principle of detention facility management. However, the many implications of this issue in a detention facility warrant further examination, and because of its significance to correctional facility management, it is regarded as an operational principle.

A. Critical To Mission And Public Policy

A critical part of the mission of most detention facilities is the provision of just custody. This is in recognition of the fundamental obligation to comply with constitutional standards and other applicable codes and court decisions. Despite widespread public confusion regarding the role of the correctional facility, there is public expectation that prisoners should be treated fairly and in accordance with the provisions of the law.

Unfortunately, a large segment of the public and even many corrections practitioners appear to be oblivious of the Fifth Amendment prohibition against pretrial punishment. The Supreme Court's May 1980 decision in *Bell vs. Wolfish* is explicit in its interpretation of the Fifth Amendment to prohibit the imposition of any condition of confinement on pretrial prisoners for the purpose of punishment.

There is no place for the self-appointed public avenger in a professionally run, constitutional correctional facility. Such preoccupations are counter productive to the proactive resolution of management problems. It is, therefore, not only legally correct to manage facilities in harmony with our constitutional charter, but it is also a critical element in the principles and dynamics of managing podular direct supervision facilities.

B. Consistent Root Cause Of Collective Violence

The level of violence in our society has reached such alarming proportions that there have been two Presidential Commissions appointed to study this phenomenon within the past 15 years. After examining the history of collective violence in the United States, they were able to identify a set of root causes which were present in all of the many occurrences. One consistent root cause, which is particularly relevant to the correctional setting, is that in every such event there was strong feeling by the participants that they had been treated unfairly.

When a person is in a captive state, the impact of unfair treatment is greatly magnified. This is particularly true of Americans because we have been conditioned to expect fair and just treatment by our government. As a principle of inmate management, it is not sufficient for management to be, in fact, just and fair: it is also vitally important that management's actions are perceived by the inmate population as just and fair.

c. Critical Leadership Quality

As referred to previously, the officer's role as the leader of the unit is an important dynamic in exerting positive control over the inmate population. A critical quality of any leader is a keen sense of fairness that can be consistently depended upon by subordinates. Any compromise of the officer's reputation for fairness will seriously jeopardize his operational effectiveness.

D. Formal Administrative Remedy And Disciplinary System

There will always be those cases where the inmate does not accept the officer's position. Regardless of the basis for the inmate's disagreement, a formal administrative procedure should exist in which to channel such disputes. A creditable third party review is not only a good pressure release mechanism, but it also serves as a good monitoring system to ensure consistency of equitable treatment.

These principles and dynamics of detention facility management, in combination, constitute a philosophy around which a management approach was designed. They represent the collective observations of both successful and

unsuccessful examples of the podular direct supervision type detention facilities over a period of several years and under the leadership of a succession of chief executive officers.

It is reasonable to conclude that if a management philosophy is based on these principles and dynamics, the system will achieve the same beneficial results as the successful examples. The results will be a safe, secure, humane and just facility which will be considered an appropriate place for the detention of American citizens charged with crimes and requiring detention.

---

SECTION II

Study/Audit Design



### Background and Rationale for the Study

Direct supervision jail management describes a recent innovation in jail operations that joins the power of architectural design with a proactive approach to jail management. This Federal Prison System innovation was first tested by a local jurisdiction in Contra Costa, California in 1981 with outstanding success. Since it opened, this facility has been a good example of how to design and manage a humane, safe, secure, constitutional and problem-free jail. Many other local detention facilities have adopted this concept in recent years.

The Larimer County Detention Facility joined the growing family of direct supervision jails when it opened in October, 1983. The facility, designed for podular remote supervision, has been modified to function as a direct supervision jail. The remote supervision control centers now serve as vestibules or work stations for the unit officers. The facility operates in the context of the principles and dynamics which guide the management of inmates in these innovative jails. Sheriff James Black administers the jail through Captains who are assigned to duty tours of varying lengths of time.

The National Institute of Corrections Jail Division staff have validated their respect for the Larimer County Detention Center by using the facility for "hands-on" training in the NIC facility design program, "Planning To Open A New Institution." Thus, the Larimer County Detention Center has been a showcase for hundreds of sheriffs, county commissioners and other senior policy makers engaged in the long-range planning of new local detention centers.

One might be lulled into thinking that this national recognition, in and of itself, validates "the excellence" of the Larimer County Detention Center. However, this attention was not sufficient to satisfy the administrative curiosity of Sheriff Black. He knew that the facility was operating at a high level of efficiency and effectiveness. Critical incident record data informed him in this regard on a regular, on-going basis. But the record data did not explain why "things were going so well." Thus, early in 1987 Sheriff Black requested that the NIC Jail Division conduct a study of the Larimer County Detention Facility for the purpose of auditing for the presence or absence of the eight principles and dynamics of direct supervision jails. The Jail Division of NIC approved the audit for a number of compelling reasons:

1. The Jail Center is committed to the growth and development of direct supervision jails. In this regard, they feel it is important to support their

## Larimer County Detention Center

position by providing technical assistance in evaluating the performance of operating facilities.

2. In September, 1983, the Jail Center provided technical assistance to Larimer County during their transition phase by training staff in (a) Interpersonal Communications and (b) Training for Corrections Officers in the management of direct supervision pods.. Thus, the Jail Center helped Larimer County transition into its new facility.

3. Since opening in October, 1983, the Larimer County Corrections Bureau has hosted a number of training sessions in Interpersonal Communications Training (for jail staff) and Management of Direct Supervision Jails (for sheriffs, jail administrators and county officials).

4. Sheriff Black and other command staff have assisted the Jail Center by providing technical assistance to a number of other jurisdictions involved in the development of direct supervision jail facilities. Their contribution in this regard has been invaluable.

For these persuasive reasons, the Jail Center contracted with Mr. Herbert R. Sigurdson, Ms. Dee Halley, and Mr. Paul Katsampes to serve as a data collection team for the purpose of evaluating the Larimer County Detention Center. The data collection process occurred February 9 - 12, 1987.

### Design Features

In July, 1985, the NIC Jail Division completed an audit of the Tombs in New York City entitled "The Manhattan House of Detention: A Study of Podular Direct Supervision" and in December, 1986 a comparable study of the Pima County, Arizona Detention Center was completed ("Pima County Detention Center: A Study of Podular Direct Supervision"). [These two documents are available from the NIC National Information Center, 1790 30th Street, Boulder, Colorado, 80301.]

The study design for the Manhattan House of Detention and the Pima County Detention Center was effective in testing for the presence or absence of the eight basic principles that undergird this jail management philosophy. Therefore, it seemed prudent and efficient to replicate this "audit" or study design in the Larimer County facility. The principles being tested are:

1. Positive inmate behavior is associated with effective control.

## Larimer County Detention Center

2. Positive inmate behavior is associated with effective supervision.
3. Podular direct supervision requires competent staff.
4. Podular direct supervision provides safety for staff and inmates.
5. Podular direct supervision results- in manageable and cost-effective operations.
6. Podular direct supervision requires effective communication.
7. Podular direct supervision requires inmate classification and orientation.
8. Podular direct supervision requires that inmates be treated with justice and fairness.

Positive inmate behavior is evaluated in terms of behavioral outcome indices including:

1. Number of homicides
2. Number of suicides
3. Number of sexual assaults
4. Number of aggravated assaults
5. Number of contraband weapons
6. Number of disturbances
7. Number of court-ordered judgments
8. Costs associated with inmate vandalism

### Interview Sample

The NIC Jail Division Study Team included supervisors/administrators, unit officers, and inmates in the interview sample. Samples from these populations provide an auditing perspective from management, line staff and the user population (inmates). The randomly selected sample populations also provide for cross-tabulations of the interview responses between and among the three sample populations.

The data collection team administered the questionnaire over a four-day period to interview participants who included

almost 100% of candidates in each of the classifications. Responding to the questionnaire were 10 supervisors/administrators, 25 unit officers, 11 program/support staff and 65 inmates.

DESIGN PARADIGM		
<u>INPUT</u>	<u>TRANSFORMATION</u>	<u>OUTPUT</u>
<u>Larimer County Sheriff's Department Corrections Bureau</u>	<u>Direct Supervision Principles</u>	<u>Potential Inmate Behavior Indices</u>
Larimer County Detention Center	1. Effective control	Number of homicides Number of suicides
Staff	2. Effective supervision	Number of sexual assaults
Resources	3. Competent staff	Number of aggrava- ted assaults
support Services	4. Safety of staff and inmates	Number of contra- band weapons
Inmates	5. Manageable/cost-effective operation	Number of distur- bances
	6. Effective communication	Number of escapes
	7. Classification and orienta- tion	Number of inmate grievances
	8. Justice and fairness	Vandalism

Method of Analysis

Instrument data were coded for computer analysis with cross-references being made to each of the eight principles of direct supervision jails. The computer printouts provided frequency distributions for each of the interview populations where appropriate. This raw data provided for an analysis of the internal consistency between and among interview populations. An effort has been made to interpret major discrepancies occurring in the data and, where possible to do so, inconsistencies were cross-referenced with record data taken from Larimer County Detention Facility reports.

Finally, the Jail Division data collection team collected data regarding conditions and behavior they actually observed at the facility during the data collection phase, February 9 - 12, 1987. Their observations are woven into the data analysis where appropriate.

---

SECTION III

Data Analysis: From Principles to Practice



PRINCIPLE I: EFFECTIVE CONTROL

Managers of direct supervision jails must exercise total control of their facilities at all times. Effective control in these systems begins with the unit officer who is the first-line manager of the living units. An assessment of effective control was made in the context of four conceptual areas:

1. Perimeter Security
2. Housing Unit Design
3. Facility Management, and
4. Inmate Management

Perimeter Security

Perimeter security at the Larimer County Jail is excellent. Central control regulates access to sallyports into and out of the facility as well as management inside the jail. Inside the security perimeter, inmate flow is partially controlled by housing unit officers. During the data collection phase, it was observed that housing unit doors were sometimes left ajar, giving inmates unit officer controlled access to the corridor outside the unit. However, since this corridor provides for inmate flow to and from programs, it seems perfectly logical to maintain the flexibility of an open door to this corridor. An inmate unaccounted for would soon be located in the gymnasium or one of the program areas. From an architectural design perspective, the Larimer County Jail provides solid interior control backed up by effective perimeter control. Since the facility opened in October, 1983, there have been no escapes, a record which testifies to the physical/architectural security of the jail.

Housing Design

The Larimer County Jail is a hybrid in that it was originally designed for podular remote supervision. Thus, architectural design features diminish to some extent the visual surveillance desired in direct supervision jails. The unit officer's control center or vestibule or work space represents a potential design liability in that it provides for physical separation of the unit officer from inmates occupying two units that can be observed from that location. Some officers may, by choice or circumstance, be inclined to retreat to the protected area (control center) inside the living unit.

Questions were asked to evaluate this aspect of unit officer behavior. Specifically, administrative and supervisory staff along with unit officers were asked:

Interview Item

How much time are unit officers able to spend roving through all sections of the unit?

<b>Data Table</b>		
Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
None	0.0	0.0
Very Little	12.0	9.1
Some	52.0	54.5
A Great Deal	36.0	36.4

There is high agreement between unit staff and supervisors regarding this question. Essentially the preponderance of responses indicates that unit officers are able to spend some time roving through the units. However, during the data collection phase, the NIC Jail Center consultants observed the unit officers spending almost all of their time in the control center or vestibule adjacent to the two living units. From our observations, the unit officer appeared to be busily engaged in managing the traffic of inmates to, and from the unit, answering the telephone, and discussing issues with the inmates who would approach the officer for information or just to ventilate. Supprisingly, this process seemed to get the job done. It was clear from inspecting the sleeping rooms and the dayrooms that the unit officer was maintaining high standards of cleanliness and order. Beds were made, fixtures and floors were clean, the dayroom was picked up, although it had a comfortable, lived-in appearance. From these observations, the living units were very much under the control of the unit officers.

The data collection team expected a different pattern of unit officer behavior during the afternoon and early evening when inmate movement was considerably reduced. However, during our brief time observing this shift, we found the officers to generally remain in and/or close to the work stations. In one unit most of the inmates were engaged in a television movie. It would have been obtrusive and distracting for the officer to engage in a dialogue with inmates during this period. However, observation of the intake pod (2 South) provides some concern for direct supervision, particularly in a unit which serves as a living laboratory for observing inmate behavior pertinent to the classification system. Here the Jail Center consultants observed the officer enter the living unit area several times for cursory checks and short exchanges with inmates but actually very little time was spent in the pod.

It is possible that important opportunities for officer/inmate interaction are being missed. If this is, in fact, the case, it seems clear that the structure and design of the officer's work station is one natural contributor to this phenomenon. Officers and supervisors were asked a direct question in this regard.

Interview Item

Does the design and size of living units contribute to effective supervision?

**Data Table**

	Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Yes		72%	18.2%
No		28%	81.8%

It is curious to note the almost complete inverse relationship reported by unit officers and supervisors: 82% of the supervisors reported that the design and size of the units did not contribute to effective supervision. Alternatively, 72% of the unit officers reported that it does. The data collection team's observations are consistent with that of the supervisors.

These discrepancies led to speculation that

1. The unit officers like and are comfortable with the social distance that their work post places between them and the inmates

or

2. Unit officers have learned how to use their work station effectively by judiciously mixing direct supervision with partially remote supervision.

Unit officers were asked a clarifying question in this regard.

Interview Item

Do your assignments require that you spend the majority of your time at your duty station?

Data Table		Codes	Unit Officers
		Yes	66.7%
		No	33.3%

Two-thirds of the officers responded in the affirmative. Unit officers do, in fact, spend the majority of their time at duty stations. The implications of this pattern of behavior will be examined in the following section concerned with facility and inmate management.

Facility and Inmate Management

Facilities are designed to contain inmates while staff are trained to control [manage] them. A number of questions were asked regarding the management of the Larimer County Jail.

Unit officers and supervisors were asked:

Interview Item

Do inmates perceive that the unit officers are in charge?

Data Table		Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
		Almost Always	72%	81.8%
		Often	28%	18.2%

Clearly unit officers agree that the inmates perceive them as being in charge as do a great majority of the supervisory and administrative staff.

Inmates were asked a related question:

Interview Item

Who do you believe runs this unit?

**Data Table**

	Codes	Inmates
	Inmates	21.3%
	Officers	63.9%
	Other	14.8%

A healthy two-thirds of the inmates perceive the unit officer as being the person who runs the unit. It is not surprising that 21% of the inmates perceive themselves as running the unit. This quite possibly represents that portion of the inmate population who have problems with authority figures and are sometimes given to denying their own reality.

A further question was asked of supervisors/administrators, unit officers and support staff regarding the issue of control.

Interview Item

How much control do unit officers have over the living units?

**Data Table**

Codes	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Supervisors
Almost None	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Very Little	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Quite a Bit	38.5%	40.0%	54.5%
Almost Complete	57.7%	60.0%	45.5%

The data in this table make clear the perception by unit officers, support staff and supervisors that unit officers have quite a bit or almost complete control of the living units. These responses are highly consistent with those of the previous interview item regarding "who runs the unit."

Additional questions were asked regarding officer authority.

Interview Item

Do inmates challenge the leadership of unit officers and attempt to subvert their authority?

<b>Data Table</b>		
C o d e s	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Almost Always	36.0	36.4
Often	52.0	54.5
Seldom	12.0	9.1
Almost Never	0.0	0.0

Supervisors (90.9%) perceive that inmates almost never challenge the unit officer's authority. Unit officers (88%) agree that inmates seldom or almost never challenge their authority. Most unit officers and supervisors agree, in total, that inmate challenges are almost never or seldom made. From a management perspective, it is important that procedures are in place to handle challenges when they do occur. A pertinent question was asked in this regard.

Interview Item

Are they (inmates) successful when they do challenge officer authority?

<b>Data Table</b>		
Codes	Unit Officers	Super- visors
Almost Never	80.0%	63.6%
Seldom	12.0%	27.3%
Often	4.0%	9.1%
Almost Always	4.0%	0.0%

Supervisors (91%) agree with unit officers (92%) that inmates are seldom or almost never successful when they do challenge the officer's authority.

However, when challenges are made it is essential that adequate means are available to manage the inmate who does challenge the officer's authority.

Interview Item

Are there adequate means available to effectively deal with challenges when they do occur?

Data Table			
	Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Yes		96%	81.8%
No		4%	18.2%

Unit officers (96%) and supervisors (82%) agree that adequate means are available to deal with inmate challenges.

The cumulative data strongly affirm the fact that the principle of effective control is vigorously in place at the Larimer County Detention Center.

PRINCIPLE II: EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION

Direct staff supervision of inmates is a requisite for the achievement of effective control. Direct staff supervision of inmates is achieved through effective management supervision of staff. This, by definition, includes extensive personal interaction between supervisors and unit staff. Management must actively assume responsibility for assuring that line officers are successful in carrying out their inmate supervisory responsibilities. This is best achieved when management's presence serves two major - functions:

1. It reinforces the image of the line officer as the leader in the unit, and
2. It ensures that unit operations are consistent with agency policies and procedures.

A series of questions were asked to evaluate the quality of supervision at the Larimer County Jail.

Interview Item

How often do sergeants visit the living units (times per week)?

Data Table	Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
	Less Than 5	24%	0.0%
	5 Times	16%	45.5%
	6 Or More	60%	54.5%

Supervisors (100%) perceive that sergeants visit living units 5 or more times per week. Almost half (45.5%) reported 5 visits per week. Unit officers (76%) perceive a similar visiting pattern but there is a discrepancy of 24% between supervisors and unit officers in this regard. This discrepancy is quite significant. The administration may wish to examine this management issue in greater detail. This is particularly pertinent in light of the following question.

Interview Item

Do you feel this is a sufficient number of times?

Data Table		
Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Yes	75%	90.9%
No	25%	9.1%

Fifteen percent (15%) more supervisors consider their unit visit to be sufficient than do unit officers. More specifically stated, 25% of the unit officers do not perceive the supervision visits to be sufficient. Unit officers appear to want greater support from their supervisory staff. Relevant to this discrepancy was a related question:

Interview Item

Do you feel you are able to provide (or do you receive) the coaching, guidance and direction you need?

Data Table		
Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Almost Never	7.7%	0.0%
Seldom	11.5%	10.0%
O f t e n	50.0%	50.0%
Almost Always	30.8%	40.0%

Unit officers (80.8%) and supervisors (90%) perceive that unit officers receive the coaching, guidance and direction they need. Thus it would appear that when supervisors do visit unit officers, they are providing the quality of service that the administration would expect of them.

Direct supervision is unique in that it demands that management staff enhance the image of the unit officer as a leader. This practice ensures that the inmates understand "who's in charge."

Interview Item

What impact do supervisor visits have on the image of the unit officer as leader of the unit?

**Data Table**

Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Detracts	16%	18.2%
Enhances	64%	72.7%
Greatly Enhances	20%	9.1%

Unit officers (84%) and supervisors (81.8%) perceive the impact as enhancing or greatly enhancing the image of the unit officer as leader of the unit. These perceptions bode well for a strong mid-level management system in Larimer County.

Direct supervision theory posits that management has a responsibility to inspect, audit and check out conditions in the living units. A question was asked in this regard.

Interview Item

Do supervisors make a point of roving through all sections of the unit when visiting unit officers?

**Data Table**

Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Almost Never	12.0%	0.0%
Seldom	52.0%	55.6%
Often	36.0%	44.4%
Almost Always	0.0%	0.0%

Unit officers (64%) and supervisors (55.6%) perceive that supervisors seldom or almost never make a point of roving through all sections of the living units. These findings indicate some deficiency in mid-management's responsibility for following up on important management control functions. The administration is advised to give this area of supervision further study to assess whether corrective action is indicated. The audit data is not conclusive in this regard. This is particularly true when consideration is given to a subsequent question.

Interview Item

Are supervisors accessible and available to unit officers?  
Do they move around and help out?

Data Table			
	Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Yes		83.3%	100.0%
No		16.7%	0.0%

Supervisors (100%) and unit officers (83.3%) agree that supervisors are accessible and available. They do move around and help out. From this data set, one might conclude that effective supervision is available at the Larimer County Jail.

This evaluation examined management functions related to inter-system coordination and collaboration.

Interview Item

Is shift-to-shift communication among staff satisfactory?

Data Table		
	Codes	Supervisors
Yes		81.8%
No		18.2%

A very high percentage of supervisors (81.8%) perceive shift-to-shift communication as being satisfactory. What about the implementation of policies and procedures?

Interview Item

Do you feel there is consistency of procedures from one shift to another?

Data Table		
	Codes	Supervisors
Yes		54.5%
No		45.5%

As can be seen by this data table, about half the supervisory personnel do not feel that there is consistency of procedures from one shift to another. It is significant that mid-level managers perceive the problem of inconsistency with respect to the implementation of procedures from shift to shift. A question for higher administration is, how can mid-management staff be brought to correct their own perception of operational deficiencies?' Administrative intervention is indicated in this regard.

Supervisory/administrative staff and support staff were asked to evaluate the issue of consistency among living units.

Interview Item

Do you feel there is consistency of procedures among the general living units?

Data Table			
	Codes	Support Staff	Supervisors
Yes		72.7%	70%
No		27.3%	30%

Supervisors (70%) and support staff (72.7%) perceive consistency of procedure among the general living units. These responses are somewhat confusing in light of the previous question. One must infer from the data that the Larimer County Jail tends to operate within the context of uniform policies and procedures in a general sense, but not so when one examines shift-to-shift continuity. Perhaps these data amplify the need for further examination of these issues.

Most jails throughout the country are plagued by conflict between security personnel and support services personnel. Specific questions were asked in this regard.

Interview Item

Does management help make programs and security work well together by discussing differences in program content-and scheduling during joint meetings with support/program staff and security staff?

Data Table				
	Codes	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Super- visors
	Yes	52.2%	100%	100%
	No	47.8%	0.0%	0.0%

Supervisors and support staff uniformly perceive this coordination function as occurring 100% of the time. On the other hand, only about half of the unit officers (52.2%) perceive it as occurring. That is, almost half of the unit officers (47.8%) do not perceive management as taking this important coordination role.

It could be that supervisory and support staff are more aware of the coordination and integration taking place because they are involved in the meetings--whereas unit officers are tending to the management of their respective units. Corrective action may or may not be indicated. It may help considerably, however, if a method of communication were devised to inform unit officers of management's efforts in attending the important function of intra-system coordination.

While some questions have been raised by the data, in the overall, it would appear that Larimer County Detention Center has attended to the importance of effective supervision in managing this direct supervision jail.

PRINCIPLE III: COMPETENT STAFF

The difference between theory and practice can often be measured by the quality of the staff. Corrections as a social control mechanism has never been strong on either theory or practice. However, this has not been the case with respect to direct supervision jails. Generally, policy makers have recognized the importance of recruiting, training and supervising staff. The Larimer County Corrections Center has enjoyed the benefits of high quality and reasonably paid staff. One administrator indicated that the newer staff members enthusiastically endorse direct supervision because they have no other frame of reference. Moreover, it was reported that senior staff who resisted direct supervision when the facility opened in 1983 have thinned out, if not disappeared. Thus, the Larimer County Detention Center is operating with highly qualified staff, capable of meeting the creative challenge of direct supervision jail management. A number of questions were asked in this audit regarding staff competence.

Interview Item

Overall, do you feel that training provided unit officers adequately prepares them to manage a living unit?

Data Table		
Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Yes	80%	90.9%
No	20%	9.1%

With a high level of agreement, supervisors and unit officers believe that unit officers are adequately trained to manage living units. The training received in this regard has included a high percentage of:

1. Principles and dynamics of direct supervision jails.
2. Interpersonal communication skills.
3. Supervision methods.
4. Teamwork.
5. Understanding human behavior.

Subsequent to pre-service training, unit officers were asked:

Interview Item

Have you ever had specialized in-service training since being assigned to this jail?

Data Table		Codes	Unit Officers
		Yes	76%
		No	24%

Three quarters of the unit officers reported having had follow-up in-service training. This represents a very high percentage of unit officers who, in addition, receive on-the-job training from mid-management staff.

Interview Item

Do you provide on-the-job (coaching) training for your subordinates?

Data Table		Codes	Supervisors
		Yes	82%
		No	18%

Interview Item

How helpful do you feel this on-the-job training has been to unit officers?

Data Table		Codes	Supervisors
		No Help	10%
		Little Help	10%
		Some Help	50%
		Very Helpful	30%

Mid-level managers (82%) do take responsibility for on-the-job training and 80% feel that the training provides some help or is very helpful.

Delegation of decision making authority is one potent measure of management's confidence in unit officers. Two questions were asked of unit officers and supervisors in this regard.

Interview Item

As unit officers, are you involved (or as supervisors, do you involve unit officers) in planning, problem solving and decision making regarding the management of inmates both on and off the housing units?

Data Table			
Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors	
Yes	92%	90.9%	
No	8%	9.1%	

Supervisors (90.9%) and unit officers (92%) agree that unit officers are involved in planning, problem solving and decision making regarding inmate management.

The second question regarding delegation was:

Interview Item

Do you have delegated (or do you delegate) decision making authority in the context of broad policy guidelines?

Data Table			
Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors	
Yes	68%	70%	
No	32%	30%	

Again, supervisors (70%) and unit officers (68%) agree that decision making authority is delegated down to the unit management level. The last two items reveal a management philosophy that trains staff, develops staff and delegates appropriate responsibility and authority to them.

TWO important observations were made during the data collection phase that have relevance for staff turnover and staff morale. With respect to staff turnover, the inequity in salaries between program/support staff and security staff is such that good qualified program staff will leave their

corrections careers as alternative opportunities present themselves. Adjustments should be considered to compensate for the educational qualification of program/support staff over that of the deputies. In the long run, this could be a cost beneficial approach to program staff stability.

The reference to morale building is a simple observation. The data collection team discovered that program/support and security staff engage in volleyball during their lunch break. This activity has contributed to the quality of morale in the facility without cost to the tax paying public. No doubt the volleyball also contributes to esprit de corps and teamwork among and between staff units.

PRINCIPLE IV: SAFETY OF STAFF AND INMATES

Probably the greatest concern about being incarcerated or seeking employment in a detention facility is personal safety. The recorded data, interview data and observations made by the data collection team support the hypothesis that the Larimer County Jail is a very safe facility. There have been no homicides, no suicides, no major disturbances, no sexual assaults, and no court-ordered judgments since the facility opened in October, 1983. There have been only four aggravated assaults over this same period and five contraband weapons have been retrieved by staff (two broken mop handles and three plastic utensils). This official record supports the assertion that this is a very safe facility for both staff and inmates. Records of this standard are not commonplace among comparable-sized jails in this country. Safety derives from effective control, effective supervision, competent staff and five other principles examined in this study.

A number of interview items specifically addressed the issue of safety. These are reported below.

Interview Item

How comfortable are you going any place on the units?

Data Table				
Codes	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Super- visors	
Very Comfortable	57.7%	80.0%	81.8%	
Comfortable.	38.5%	20.0%	9.1%	
Uncomfortable	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Very Uncomfortable	3.8%	0.0%	9.1%	

All of the support/program staff, most of the supervisory staff (89.9%) and almost all of the unit officers (96.2%) feel comfortable or very comfortable going any place on the units.

These same personnel groups were asked a further question to check out their level of comfort when actually working on the living units.

Interview Item

How safe do you feel when you are on the living units?

<b>Data Table</b>			
Codes	Unit Officers	support Staff	Super- visors
Very Safe	50.0%	90.9%	72.7%
Somewhat Safe	42.3%	9.1%	9.1%
Somewhat Unsafe	3.8%	0.0%	9.1%
Very Unsafe	3.8%	0.0%	9.1%

Support staff (100%), unit officers (92.3%) and supervisory staff (81.8%) feel safe when on the living units. These are exceedingly high percentages which clearly communicate that the Larimer County Jail provides a very comfortable and safe environment for personnel to work in. More support staff (40.9%) feel very safe than do unit officers. This finding may be attributed to the fact that the role of security staff is to maintain control over the inmates, whereas support staff provide services. Perhaps if these control and program functions were shared more equitably among all staff, the discrepancy would be less with respect to their level of safety felt on the living units.

Supervisory staff were asked to compare the Larimer County Jail with others they had worked in regarding the issue of safety.

Interview Item

Do you feel this jail is safer for staff than other jails you have worked in?

<b>Data Table</b>	
Codes	Supervisors
Yes	81.8%
No	9.1%
Not Applicable	9.1%

Again, using a comparison test, supervisors (81.8%) felt that the Larimer County Jail was safer for staff than other jails they had worked in.

Inmates were asked a companion question in this regard:

Interview Item

How would you compare living on this unit with your experience in other jails?

Data Table		Codes	Inmates
		Much Better	43.2%
		Better	36.2%
		The Same	10.3%
		Worse	10.3%

A very substantial 90% of inmates perceive the Larimer County Jail as being a better or much better living experience than other jails.

Staff groups and inmates were asked a question regarding the safety of the jail for inmates?

Interview Item

How safe are living conditions for inmates?

Data Table				
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Supervisors
Very Safe	46.0%	69.2%	72.7	81.8%
Somewhat Safe	54.0%	23.1%	18.2%	18.2%
Somewhat Unsafe	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%
Very Unsafe	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%

All of the inmates, all of the supervisory personnel, most of the support staff (90.9%) and most of the unit officers (92.3%) feel that the Larimer County Jail provides safe living conditions for inmates. It would appear that conditions which ensure safety for staff have an equal benefit with regard to safety for inmates.

Inmates' sense of safety is influenced by their perception regarding the safety of personal property.

Interview Item

How safe is inmate property on this unit?

<b>Data Table</b>			
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Super-visors
Very Safe	23.4%	42.3%	54.5%
Somewhat Safe	65.6%	46.2%	45.5%
Somewhat Unsafe	9.4%	7.7%	0.0%
Very Unsafe	1.6%	3.8%	0.0%

Inmates (89%), unit officers (88.5%) and supervisors (100%) perceive inmate property as being somewhat safe or very safe. As might be expected, unit officers and supervisors perceived the inmate property as being safer than did the inmates. No doubt the inmates have first-hand experience in this regard, but nevertheless, the overall picture is very positive regarding the safety of inmate property.

One's general sense of safety is influenced by levels of conflict, fighting and the presence or absence of weapons. A number of questions were asked in this regard.

Interview Item

How often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing) occur between inmates on the living units?

<b>Data Table</b>			
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Super-visors
Almost Never	23.5%	42.3%	0.0%
Seldom	60.9%	50.0%	100.0%
Often	15.6%	7.7%	0.0%
Almost Always	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Conflicts resulting in shouting, shoving, pushing are rare occurrences among inmates. Inmates (84.4%), unit officers (92.3%) and supervisors (100%) perceive these types of conflicts occurring seldom or almost never.

A similar question was asked about conflicts between inmates and unit officers.

Interview Item

How often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing) occur between inmates and staff on the units?

<b>Data Table</b>				
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Super- visors	
Almost Never	60.9%	76.9%	72.7%	
Seldom	35.9%	19.2%	27.3%	
Often	3.2%	3.8%	0.0%	
Almost Always	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

These data indicate even less conflict between inmates and unit staff. Unit officers (77%), inmates (61%) and supervisors (73%) perceive that these conflicts almost never occur between inmates and staff.

A distinction was made between conflicts and outright physical assaults. Questions with respect to physical assaults were asked of inmates, unit officers and supervisors.

Interview Item

How often do physical fights (assaults) occur between inmates on the unit?

<b>Data Table</b>				
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Super- visors	
Almost Never	42.2%	61.5%	72.7%	
Seldom	53.1%	30.8%	27.3%	
Of ten	4.7%	7.7%	0.0%	
Almost Always	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

As one would expect, physical fights were perceived as occurring even less than conflicts. Inmates (95.3%), unit officers (92.3%) and supervisors (100%) perceived physical fights occurring seldom or almost never. Unit officers

(7.7%) perceived fights occurring often. These perceptions may be influenced by behaviors observed in booking or the intake unit of the jail. The classification procedure would have eliminated the potential for fights occurring often in general housing units.

Interview Item

How often do physical fights (assaults) occur between inmates and staff on the units?

<b>Data Table</b>				
<b>Codes</b>	Inmates	Unit Officers	Super- visors	
Almost Never	84.4%	80.8%	63.6%	
Seldom	14.1%	11.5%	36.4%	
Often	1.5%	7.7%	0.0%	
Almost Always	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

Again, inmates (84.4%) and unit officers (80.8%) perceive physical fighting between inmates and staff as occurring almost never. Supervisor perceptions varied by almost 20%, with 63.6% of them perceiving inmate/officer fighting occurring almost never. It is possible that the supervisors are involved in the booking and intake areas where fights are more apt to occur. Certainly the perception of the inmates and unit officers should prevail with respect to the general housing units where they live and work, respectively.

When safety and security are threatened, inmates are inclined--if not driven--to fashion weapons of any kind in order to protect themselves. Questions were asked in this regard.

Interview Item

Do you ever feel the need to have a weapon to protect yourself on the unit?

<b>Data Table</b>		
Codes	Inmates	
Yes	93.7%	
No	6.3%	

At a very high level of confidence, one can say that inmates do not feel the need for weapons to protect themselves.

Interview Item

Do most inmates around here feel the need for a weapon to protect themselves?

Data Table	
Codes	Inmates
Yes	96.6%
No	3.4%

As can be seen by the data table, an even higher number of inmates perceive that other inmates do not feel the need for weapons.

Finally, in many ways, sexual assaults or the fear of them may represent the greatest safety and security threat to the inmate population. A specific question was asked in this regard.

Interview Item

How often do sexual assaults occur on living units?

Data Table			
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Almost Never	94.9%	100%	100%
Seldom	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Often	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Almost Always	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%

All of the supervisors and unit officers and 95% of the inmates report that sexual assaults almost never occur on the units. This high level of agreement among three diverse populations adds great credibility to the absence of sexual assaults. Indeed, the official records indicate that no sexual assaults have occurred since the facility opened in October, 1983.

Overall, the study findings must conclude that the Larimer County Jail has established an enviable record in managing a safe and secure facility for staff and inmates alike.

PRINCIPLE V: MANAGEABLE AND COST EFFECTIVE

The principle of 'manageable and cost effective' is an important one, particularly when it is known and understood that jails occupy low status in the program priorities of local citizens and elected officials. From a construction perspective as well as an operational point of view, it has been established that podular direct supervision jails provide reduced costs because it has been determined that 80% to 90% of the inmate population does not require the heavy-duty institutional safeguards that characterize traditional jails and maximum security confinement facilities.

In addition, the architectural options provide for efficient supervision of a maximum number of offenders at reduced operational costs. By comparison with many conventional jails, podular direct supervision jails are less staff-intensive. The benefits associated with this architectural/management design have been elaborated upon in Section I of this document.

Reduced vandalism, cleanliness, sanitation and orderliness are variables associated with evaluating manageable and cost-effective operations. In addition, anticipating the fundamental needs of offenders and providing a wide range of incentives for self control of the inmate population are recognized as being instrumental in achieving manageable and cost effective jails. A number of survey questions were designed to evaluate for the presence or absence of these institutional requirements and inmate needs.

Interview Item

Is the living area kept clean?

Data Table				
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Super-visors
Almost Never	1.6%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Seldom	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Often	27.0%	16.7%	36.4%	9.1%
Almost Always	68.2%	83.3%	63.6%	90.9%

All populations surveyed agree that the living areas are kept clean often or almost always. Inmates (95.2%), unit

officers (100%), support staff (100%) and supervisors (100%) support this position. In addition, the data collection team found the Larimer County jail to be one of the cleanest direct supervision facilities in the country.

Inmates were asked about cleanliness of their rooms.

Interview Item

Are you required to keep your room clean and orderly?

Data Table	
	Inmates
Yes	100%
No	0.0%

Unanimous agreement exists in the perception of inmates that they must keep their rooms clean and orderly. Again, the data collection team observed inmate rooms at all times of the day and evening. They were clean and orderly. And it was comforting to discover a magazine on the bed or table because this gave the facility a natural, "lived in" appearance.

One would expect minimal vandalism in a facility that can pride itself on cleanliness. Questions were asked in this regard.

Interview Item

How much deliberate vandalism, damage or writing on the walls happens on the units?

Data Table			
Codes	Inmates	Unit Officers	Supervisors
None At All	46.9%	16.0%	9.1%
Very Little	51.6%	52.0%	81.8%
Quite A Bit	1.5%	32.0%	9.1%
A Great Deal	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Inmates (98%) and supervisors (91%) are in high agreement that very little or no deliberate damage occurs on the units. Of unit officers (68%) are in agreement, but 32% perceive deliberate damage occurs quite a bit. It is not possible to know what they consider to be deliberate damage. However, their perception would seem to fly in the face of official records. These reveal that a total of \$10,700 has been spent on inmate vandalism over the past three and one-half years and out of this amount, \$6,989 was spent to replace broken windows. Other than window damage, the vandalism repair bill would amount to something like \$1000 per year. This would seem to be a modest amount of money for a jail of this size.

Officers and supervisors were asked about the repair of damage.

Interview Item

Are repairs made promptly and graffiti removed soon after it appears?

Data Table		
Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Yes	96.0%	100.0%
No	4.0%	0.0%

The data clearly communicate that repairs are made promptly and the facility is maintained at a very high standard of sanitation and cleanliness.

Programs and services are intended to constructively occupy inmate time. If they are not provided by the jail staff, they will be invented by the inmates at high cost to the manageable and cost effective operation of the facility. Interview questions were asked regarding programs and services.

Interview Item

How well are the following inmate needs met?

**Data Table**

Codes	<u>Very Well</u>		<u>Satisfactorily</u>		<u>Unsatisfactorily</u>		<u>Poorly</u>	
	<u>Inmates</u>	<u>Unit Officers</u>	<u>Support Staff</u>	<u>Super-visors</u>	<u>Inmates</u>	<u>Unit Officers</u>	<u>Support Staff</u>	<u>Super-visors</u>
Law Library	85.7%	100%	100%	100%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medical	75.0%	100%	100%	100%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Visiting	56.8%	100%	100%	100%	43.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Telephone	92.0%	100%	100%	100%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Food Service	72.8%	100%	92%	100%	27.2%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%
Recreation	86.9%	96%	96%	100%	13.1%	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Commissary	60.3%	100%	93%	100%	39.7%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
Mail	79.6%	100%	100%	100%	20.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Comm.W/Staff	75.0%	100%	100%	100%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Jail Counselor	83.4%	96%	90.9%	100%	11.6%	4.0%	9.1%	0.0%
Educ./Tech.	93.2%	96%	100%	100%	6.8%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Leisure Read.	95.0%	100%	100%	100%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relig./Clergy	90.3%	100%	100%	100%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Alcohol/Drug	95.0%	92%	100%	100%	5.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other Inmate Programs	94.8%	100%	100%	100%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

## Larimer County Detention Center

Larimer County Corrections Center has an outstanding reputation as a facility rich with inmate programs and services. The data in the preceding table indicate they are either very well or satisfactorily provided as perceived by support staff, unit officers and supervisory personnel.

The following Programs Annual Statistics for 1986 adds even more credibility to the perceptual data presented in the data table.

°Total number of programming hours offered:	3,303.5
°Total number of participants:	24,980
°Total number of inmates eligible for programs (estimated):	40,682
°Percentage of participants:	61%

	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Participants</u>
°Recreation	1142.5	8233
Team sports, exercise	684	6737
Weight room	309	438
Arts and crafts	94	415
Games and tournaments	55.5	643
°Library	992	8266
General	992	7661
Law	---	605
Total library circulation:	27,952	
°Education	636.5	4484
Adult basic ed/GED	398.5	2782
Other	238	1702
°Music	266	975
°Alcohol and Drug	117	534
°Religious	102	1089
°Special	47.5	1399
VCR movies shown:	32	
°Other Information:		
Total staff:	Four (4) fulltime Two (2) work study students Volunteers	
Total number of volunteer hours:	1712.75	

Advocates of inmate programs assert that programs are equivalent to security. A question was asked for the purpose of checking practitioner perceptions of this assertion.

Interview Item

Do the above programs contribute to security of the facility?

Data Table	Codes	Unit Officers	Supervisors
	<b>Yes</b>	88%	100%
	No	12%	0.0%

Supervisors (100%) and unit officers (88%) agree that programs contribute to the security of the facility.

Not only do programs contribute to security of the Larimer County Jail, but along with the high standards of sanitation and cleanliness and reduced levels of vandalism, they provide for the county's low stress, "hassle-free", manageable and cost effective jail.

PRINCIPLE VI: EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Effective communication is the basis for all constructive human interaction. Establishing effective communication is extremely important in direct supervision jails because so much of the process occurs in the public area. Thus when communications are impaired, inmates as well as staff are aware. And given the opportunity, inmates will exploit to their advantage any and every breach of communication they know about, whether the signals are verbal or non-verbal. Jails such as the Larimer County Detention Center operate best when lines of communication are open and effective between and among staff and inmates, security staff and support services staff, and up and down the hierarchical structure. A number of interview items were included to evaluate staff and inmate perceptions regarding communication patterns.

Interview Item

Do unit officers maintain communication with all the inmates on the living units?

Data Table			
Codes	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Super- visors
Almost Never	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S e l d o m	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Often	45.8%	54.5%	36.4%
Almost Always	54.2%	45.5%	63.6%

Almost uniformly, unit officers, support staff and supervisory personnel agree that unit officers maintain communication with all inmates on the unit. An important follow-on question was asked to assess at least one benefit of open communication.

Interview Item

Do officers pick up information useful in managing their units as a result of routine communication with inmates?

**Data Table**

<b>Codes</b>	Unit Officers	Supervisors
Almost Never	0.0%	0.0%
Seldom	0.0%	0.0%
Often	0.0%	54.5%
Almost Always	100%	45.5%

Unit officers and supervisors agree that the officer/inmate communication process is effective as a means of obtaining useful management information.

A further measure of inmate/officer communication was asked of inmates, support staff and supervisors.

Interview Item

Do inmates appear to feel comfortable talking to unit officers?

**Data Table**

<b>Codes</b>	Inmates	Support Staff	Super- visors
Almost Never	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Seldom	24.6%	9.1%	0.0%
Often	37.7%	54.5%	72.7%
Almost Always	32.8%	36.4%	27.3%

Supervisory. personnel (100%) and support staff (91%) agree that inmates always or often feel comfortable talking to unit officers. As might be expected, the percentage of inmates (70.5%) was not nearly as high. This is not surprising. In fact, it is a tribute to unit officers that such a high percentage of inmates are always or often comfortable speaking with them. This finding takes on even greater significance when we evaluate the inmate culture in traditional jails where talking with staff is almost a taboo--unless the inmate is engaged in "running a game" on the staff.

An interview item was included in the inmate survey instrument to further check out inmate/officer communication:

Interview Item

Do you feel comfortable approaching the unit officers for information or assistance?

**Data Table**

	Codes	Inmates
	Almost Always	38.1%
	Often	31.7%
	Seldom	25.4%
	Almost Never	4.8%

Inmate responses (69.8%) to this question are virtually the same as they were to the previous question confirming that a very high percentage of inmates feel comfortable communicating with unit officers.

Interview items were included in the survey questionnaire to check on relationships between unit officers and support staff. The assumption was made that if support services were provided and received in mutually supportive ways, then in all likelihood, the communication process between these staff units would be effective.

Interview Item

For the following support services, do the support services staff provide their resources in ways that complement the unit officers' ability -to manage inmate behavior?

**Data Table**

Codes	Always	Often	Almost Never	Seldom
	Unit Officers	Super-visors	Unit Officers	Super-visors
Law Library	96%	90%	4%	10%
Medical	100%	100%	0%	0%
Visiting	100%	90%	0%	10%
Food Service	80%	90%	20%	10%
Recreation	96%	40%	4%	60%
Commissary	84%	40%	16%	60%
Mail	96%	90%	4%	10%

## Larimer County Detention Center

A very high percentage (84% - 100%) agree that support services are provided in ways that complement the unit officers' ability to manage inmate behavior. Supervisors (60%) felt that recreation and commissary services were seldom or almost never provided in ways that support the unit officers' management of inmate behavior. This data finding appears erroneous in the light of all other data included in this study. It is possibly a misunderstanding of the question or an anomaly in the data processing system. In any event, it does bear investigation by administrative staff because if the data is accurate, corrective action would be indicated.

Basically the principle of effective communication is in excellent health at the Larimer County Detention Center.

PRINCIPLE VII: CLASSIFICATION AND ORIENTATION

Classification is an essential procedure used in direct supervision jails to identify inmates capable of living in general living units as opposed to those who, for their own protection or the protection of others, need higher levels of custodial care. The Larimer County Detention Center appears to have an effective inmate classification system. In part, this finding was verified by the NIC data collection team in that during the data collection week, inmates on living units appeared to be functioning in a reasonable, rational manner. Orientation pertains to a structured process whereby inmates are provided information regarding rules and regulations to guide their behavior when they are classified for assignment to general living units.

A number of interview questions were included in the interview survey to check for the presence or absence of classification and orientation procedures.

Interview Item

Do unit officers receive adequate classification information about inmates assigned to them?

Data Table	Codes	Supervisors
	Yes	90.9%
	No	9.1%

Supervisory personnel (90.9%) believe that unit officers receive adequate classification information about inmates.

Interview Item

Do unit officers receive adequate information that inmates need (court dates, bond procedures, schedules, etc.)?

Data Table	Codes	Supervisors
	Yes	100%
	No	0.0%

Unit officers do receive information inmates need as perceived by supervisory personnel.

Interview Item

Are there satisfactory procedures for reclassifying inmates who cannot follow the rules and regulations about the unit?

Data Table		Codes	Supervisors
		Yes	100%
		No	0.0%

Supervisors (100%) agree that an inmate reclassification system is in place and working well.

The Larimer County Detention Center's classification and reclassification procedure appears to be working in a highly satisfactory manner. Additional questions were asked regarding inmate orientation procedures.

Interview Item

Do inmates receive adequate orientation prior to being assigned to housing units?

Data Table		Codes	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Super- visors
		Yes	100%	89%	100%
		No	0%	11%	0%

Unit officers, supervisors and support staff agree that inmates receive adequate orientation prior to being assigned to general housing unit.

Inmates were asked related questions.

Interview Item

Have you been told about the rules and regulations you must follow on this unit?

**Data Table**

	Codes	Inmates
	Yes	98.4%
	No	1.6%

Inmates agree with Larimer County Jail staff that they have been told about rules and regulations.

Interview Item

Are the rules and regulations posted in this unit or distributed in some way?

**Data Table**

	Codes	Inmates
	Yes	93.8%
	No	6.3%

Adding to the orientation process, inmate rules and regulations are posted and available for review on an 'as needed' basis.

A test of the quality of the classification and orientation systems was made with the following interview item:

Interview Item

Do inmates treat you in a respectful manner?

**Data Table**

Codes	Unit Officers	Support Staff	Supervisors
Yes	96%	90.9%	100%
No	4%	9.1%	0%

Supervisors (100%), unit officers (96%) and support staff (90.9%) agree that inmates treat them in a respectful manner. This very high level of agreement adds credence to the quality and effectiveness of the classification system.

In a related item, inmates were asked about the quality of treatment they receive from unit officers.

Interview Item

Do you feel that the officers treat you in a respectful manner?

Data Table	Codes	Inmates
	Yes	78.6%
	No	21.4%

Almost 80% of the inmates feel they are treated in a respectful manner by unit officers.

The cumulative data in this study supports the hypothesis that the Larimer County Detention Center has an effective classification and orientation procedure in place and working in an efficient manner.

PRINCIPLE VIII: JUST AND FAIR

Justice and fairness for inmates held in detention is simply taken for granted by the community at large. The public, while hostile or indifferent toward jails and jail inmates, nevertheless expect that inmates will be treated justly and fairly and in accordance with provisions of law. Justice and fairness were evaluated in the context of disciplinary procedures, grievance procedures and direct questions regarding the fair treatment of inmates.

A review of official records indicates that effective and responsive disciplinary and administrative remedy procedures are in place. In addition, a reasonable monitoring system has been established to ensure equitable and consistent treatment of all cases.

Staff and inmates were asked about procedures that influence one's sense of justice and fairness.

Interview Item

Do you feel you have an adequate disciplinary system?

Data Table			
	Codes	Unit Officers	Super- visors
	Yes	88%	100%
	No	12%	0%

Supervisors (100%) and unit officers (88%) agree that an adequate disciplinary system is in place. Disciplinary systems are designed to help facilitate inmate management. A question was asked in this regard.

Interview Item

Does the disciplinary system contribute positively to the unit officers' management of the unit?

**Data Table**

Codes	Unit Officers	Super- visors
Yes	92%	100%
No	8%	0%

Supervisors and unit officers believe the disciplinary system contributes positively to the unit officers' management of the units.

Interview Item

Do inmates have a fair and impartial grievance procedure?

**Data Table**

Codes	Unit Officers	Super- visors
Yes	100%	100%
No	0%	0%

Supervisors and unit officers unanimously agree that inmates have a fair and impartial grievance procedure. But do unit-officers and supervisors think that inmates feel they have a fair hearing?

Interview Item

Do inmates feel they will have a fair hearing?

**Data Table**

Codes	Unit Officers
Yes	65.2%
No	34.8%

Unit officers are not as certain that inmates would feel they have a fair hearing. Only 65.2% think that inmates would feel this way.

Inmates were asked a direct question that is perhaps more pertinent than any other in evaluating the issue of justice and fairness:

Interview Item

Do you feel you are treated fairly by the unit officers?

Data Table	Codes	Inmates
	Yes	80.7%
	No	19.3%

Inmates surveyed responded (81%) that they believed they are treated fairly by unit officers. Since anonymity was assured when the data were collected, there appears to be no reason to doubt this strongly positive inmate response.

The findings gathered in this section of the study/audit lead to a strong positive assertion that the principle of justice and fairness is firmly established in practice at the Larimer County Detention Center.

---

SECTION IV

Podular Direct Supervision:  
An Innovation Whose Time Has Come



## Larimer County Detention Center

### PODULAR DIRECT SUPERVISION:

#### AN INNOVATION WHOSE TIME HAS COME

The innovation of direct supervision jails is found in the creative integration of podular architectural design with advanced management practice which establishes staff control of the safety, security, and services for inmates' in confinement. The architectural design was pioneered by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons during the '60s when they built Metropolitan Correctional Centers (federal jails) in New York, Chicago and San Diego. The management philosophy also came from the Bureau's unit management approach. This management philosophy was first articulated for local jails by W. Ray Nelson in his conceptualization of eight management principle and dynamics (see NIC publication, Direct Supervision Model). Now, podular direct supervision as a joint architectural/management philosophy has been tested in a number of jurisdictions throughout the country.

The experience of the Bureau of Prisons and other direct supervision jails has been both efficient and effective for staff and inmates alike. However, until the National Institute of Corrections Jail Division initiated the study/audit of the Manhattan House of Detention (The Tombs) in June, 1985 and the Pima County Detention Center in October, 1986, there was little by way of independent data to support this emerging theory of direct supervision--a systematic set of principles and concepts which help explain the reality which undergirds this management innovation. Now the Jail Division has added the Larimer County Detention Center as a direct supervision jail which has been scrutinized by the same study/audit procedures used in Manhattan and Pima County. Performance outcome measures taken from Larimer County Detention Center between October 1983 and February 1987 reinforce the Manhattan and Pima County experiences in loudly proclaiming the power of podular direct supervision as a practical emerging theory for contemporary jail management.

The Larimer County Detention Center indicators favoring this assertion include:

Number of homicides	0
Number of sexual assaults	0
Number of suicides	0

## Larimer County Detention Center

Number of assaults	4
Number of contraband weapons (2 broken mop handles; 3 small plastic utensils)	5
Number of disturbances	0
Number of court-ordered judgements	0
Costs associated with inmate vandalism	\$10,700.00

Note: \$6,989 of the vandalism costs was for broken windows.

Like Pima County and the Manhattan House of Detention, this virtually "hassle-free" jail is nothing less than a Sheriff's pride and an administrator's dream.

The study/audit design sought to test the theory of direct supervision by evaluating the degree to which the eight principles are present as the management system (theory) for this facility. Architecturally, the Larimer County Detention Center was originally designed for remote supervision. Thus, a control center, converted to an officer's work space, serves as a vantage point to observe two adjoining living units. The design also provides for hardware and furnishings designed for remote surveillance jails. These fixtures do not seem to have diminished in any way the capacity for this jail to operate as a direct supervision facility.

Some cautions concern might be registered regarding the data collection team's observation that the unit officers tend to spend a great deal of time in their work stations rather than in the living units. Yet it must be stated that they appear to function well from this vantage point--controlling the inmate movement to other areas of the facility, answering the telephone and generally managing the inmates from this work station. From our rather limited observations, they seem to manage the living units quite well from this station, somewhat remote from the living units.

Our findings regarding the eight principles and dynamics strongly imply that the Larimer County Detention Center is indeed operating in an efficient and effective manner. All

of the data support the assertion that the officers are in total control of the facility.

Effective supervision by management staff assists unit officers in performing their direct supervision function. While modifications and improvements in the supervision system are suggested in the-'missed opportunities' section of the Executive Summary of this document, overall the management system' provides excellent supervision of unit officers.-

The Center can be proud of its highly qualified and competent staff who are outstanding in their performance ensuring the safety of staff and inmates alike. The open communication between and among staff and between staff and inmates facilitates the overall management of the jail.

With regard to communication, it is revealing that mutual respect is shared by staff and inmates. This is expected in direct supervision jails and no doubt contributes to the low level of tension in the facility. For the community and policy makers, this is an important finding because, after all, the staff do more time day-by-day over the years than do any of the inmates in their care.

All of the principles contribute to good management and are highly interdependent. Not the least of these is the just and fair handling of the inmate population. Presidential Commissions studying violence in our society have surfaced in every event a strong feeling by the participants that they had been treated unfairly. The management philosophy of direct supervision-jails is structured so as to ensure justice and fairness in the handling of the inmates. The Larimer County Jail has met the standards of this principle with high regard for the rights of incarcerated inmates.

In summary, all of the principles undergirding direct supervision jails are basically intact at the Larimer County Detention Center. Where deficiencies occur, they do not seem to have substantially diminished the quality of life for staff or inmates who are "doing time" together.

For the NIC Jail Division, it is reassuring to discover that Larimer County has matched the outstanding performance discovered in the audits of the Manhattan House of Detention and the Pima County Detention Center. These comparable studies of demographically and geographically divergent jail settings should challenge County Commissioners, Sheriffs,

Jail Administrator and others planning new institutions to consider direct supervision as an innovation whose time has come and as a primary prospect for jail systems that have long been out of service.

APPENDIX I:

NEW GENERATION JAILS  
Operating and In Planning.



## Larimer County Detention Center

O = In Operation  
P - Planning Phase

### NORTHEAST REGION

Anthony Pellicane, Director, Department of Corrections,  
Middlesex County Detention Center, P.O. Box 266, New  
Brunswick, NJ, 08903 [O]

J. Patrick Gallagher, Superintendent, Erie County Correctional  
Facility, P.O. Box X, Alden, NY, 14004 [O]

Sam Saxton, Director, Prince Georges County Detention Center,  
5310 Douglas, Upper Marlboro, MD, 20772 [O]

Larry Lezza, Jail Superintendent, Lake County Jail, 10 North  
County Street, Waukegan, IL, 60085 [P]

Edgar Wheeler, Sheriff, Aroostook County Jail, P.O. Box 803,  
Houlton, ME, 04730 [P]

Gary Billy, Sheriff, Licking County Jail, 46 South 3rd Street,  
Newark, OH, 43055 [P]

Sgt. Donald Erdman, Marathon County Jail, P.O. Box 1706,  
Wausau, WI, 54401 [P]

Arthur M. Wallenstein, Director, Bucks County Prison, 1730  
South Easton Road, Daylestown, PA, 18901 [O]

Lt. Richard Cox, Milwaukee County Jail, 821 West State Street,  
Milwaukee, WI, 53223 [P]

Janice White, Director, Manhattan House of Detention, 125  
White Street, New York, NY, 10013 [O]

Director, New York Metropolitan Correctional Center, 150 Park  
Row, New York, NY, 10007 [O]

Warden O.C. Jenkins, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 71  
West Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL, 60605 [O]

James M. Ferels, Director of Inmate Services, 917 Beach  
Street, Flint, MI, 48502 [P]

Sheriff Dave Troutman, Summit County, 53 E. Center Street,  
Akron, OH, 44308 [P]

---

*List compiled from draft of Proceedings of First Annual Symposium on Direct  
Supervision Jails, conducted by the NIC Jail Center, May 1, 1986.*

## Larimer County Detention Center

### SOUTHEAST REGION

Cal. David M. Parrish, Hillsborough County Jail, 1301 Morgan, Tampa, FL, 33602 [P]

Cap. Kevin Hickey, Dade County Corrections and Rehab Department, 1500 NW 12th Avenue, Miami, FL, 33136 [P]

Major Carl Richards, Guildford County Jail, 401 W. Sycamore Street, Greensborough, NC, 27402 [P]

Sheriff Jim Dunning, Alexandria City Jail, Alexandria, VA [0]

L. R. Putnam, Warden, Metropolitan Correctional Center, Miami, FL, 33177, [0]

### NORTHWEST REGION

Cap. Joseph Golden, Multnomah County Jail, 1120 SW Third Avenue, Room 316, Portland, OR, 97204 [0]

Don Manning, Jail Administrator, Spokane County Jail, West 1100 Mallen Avenue, Spokane, WA, 99260 [0]

William B. Harper, Corrections Director, Snohomish County Jail, County Courthouse Complex, Everett, WA, 98201 [0]

Captain Allen Minish, Larimer County Jail, 200 West Oak Street, Fort Collins, CO, 80522 [0]

Phillip Briggs, Assistant Superintendent, Cook Inlet Detention Center, P.O. Box 103155, Anchorage, AK, 99510 [0]

Lr. Rickard Ross, Jail Administrator, Yellowstone County Sheriff's Detention Facility, P.O. Box 35017, Billings, MT, 59107 [P]

### SOUTHWEST REGION

Paul Bailey, Director, Bexar County Jail, 218 S. Laredo Street, San Antonio, TX, 78205, [P]

Gordan Yach, Jail Administrator, Clark County Jail, 220 South 3rd Street, Las Vegas, NV, 89155, [0]

Major Russell Davis, Pima County Detention Center, Corrections Bureau, P.O. Box 910, Tucson, AZ, 85702 [0]

Gary Henman, Warden, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 8901 S. Wilmot Road, Tucson, AZ, 85706 [0]

## Larimer County Detention Center

Larry R. Ard, Chief Deputy, Contra Costa Main Detention Facility, 1000 Ward Street, Martinez, CA, 94553, [0]

Paul McIntosh, Solano County, Capital Project Office, 621 Missouri Street, Fairfield, CA, 94553 [P]

Jim Husset, Transition Coordinator, Sonoma County Sheriff's Department, 600 Administration Drive, Santa Rosa, CA, 95401 [P]

Lt. Frank Gonthier, Santa Clara County Jail, 180 West Hedding Street, San Jose, CA, 95115-0020, [P]

Earl Hindman, Jail Director, Shaunee County Jail, 200 East 7th, Topeka, KS, 66603 [P]

Al Kanahale, Warden, San Diego Metropolitan Correctional Center, 808 Union Street, San Diego, CA, 92101 [0]

Ken Arnold, Administrator, Sedgwick County Jail, County Administrator's Office, 525 North Main, Wichita, KS, 67203, [P]

Sgt. Mike Kramer, Washoe County Detention Facility, P.O. Box 2915, Reno, NV, 89505, [P]

Steve Keeter, San Joaquin County, 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 675, Stockton, CA, 95202 [P]

Lt. Larry Justus, Yolo County Jail, P.O. Box 179, Woodland, CA, 95695 [P]

Kent, Washington Police Department Jail



APPENDIX II:

DATA INTERVIEW SCHEDULES



Larimer County Detention Center

SUPERVISORS/ADMINISTRATORS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I N S T R U C T I O N S :

Please answer all the questions from the perspective of your role as an administrator or supervisor of officers in control of housing units at this detention facility.

• Data Questions

1. How much control do you feel unit officers have over all areas in the housing unit?

Almost none                      Very                      Quite                      Almost complete  
at all \_                      little \_                      a bit \_                      control \_

2. How comfortable are you going any place on the units?

Very                                      Very  
uncomfortable \_                      Uncomfortable \_                      Comfortable \_                      comfortable \_

3. Can unit officers maintain good visual surveillance over all areas of the living units?

Yes \_                      No \_

4. If "no" to #3, what are your problem areas and how do you compensate?

5. In general, do you think the inmates perceive the unit officers as, being in charge of the living units?

Almost                                      Almost  
never \_                      Seldom-                      Often-                      always \_

6. From your observation, do you find that officers tend to spend too much of their time where they keep their records and papers, etc? In fact, is it their center of operation on the unit?

Yes \_                      No \_

Larimer County Detention Center

7. (a) Do inmates challenge the leadership of unit officers and attempt to subvert their authority?

Almost never \_ Seldom- Often \_ Almost always-

(b) Are they successful when they do so?

Almost never \_ Seldom- Often-, Almost always \_

8. Are there adequate means available for officers to deal effectively with challenges when they do occur?

Yes \_ No \_

9. If "no" to #8, please describe:

10. How often do you visit the living units?

Average number of times per week: \_\_\_\_\_

11. Do you feel this is a sufficient number of times?

Yes \_ No -

12. Do you feel you are able to provide unit staff with the coaching, guidance and direction they need?

Almost never \_ Seldom \_ Often \_ Almost always-

13. What is your perception of the impact your visits have on the image of the unit officer as a leader of the unit?

Greatly detracts- Detracts \_ Enhances- Greatly enhances-

14. How much time are unit officers able to spend roving through all sections of the unit?

None Very little \_ Some \_ A great deal \_

Larimer County Detention Center

15. If "none" or "very little", please explain:

16. When you visit corrections officers, do you make a point of roving through all sections of the unit with them?

Almost never -                      Seldom-                      Often-                      Almost always-

17. Have you received formal training in any of the following areas?. Please check where appropriate.

- a. Principles and dynamics of direct supervision jails -
- b. Interpersonal communication skills \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Supervision methodology and techniques \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Teamwork training \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Understanding human behavior \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

18. Do you provide on-the-job (coaching) training for your immediate subordinates?

Yes -                      No -

19. If "yes" to #18, please indicate how you do this and list the subject areas you typically cover.

20. How helpful do you feel this on-the-job (coaching) training has been to unit officers?

No help -                      Little help-                      Some help \_\_\_\_                      Very helpful -

21. In general, how safe do you feel when you are on the living units?

Very safe \_                      Somewhat safe \_                      Somewhat unsafe \_                      Very unsafe \_

Larimer County Detention Center

22. Do you feel this jail is safer for staff than other jails you have worked in?  
Yes \_ No \_ Never worked in another jail-
23. How safe do you feel the living conditions are for inmates?  
Very safe \_ Somewhat safe \_ Somewhat unsafe \_ V e r y unsafe \_
24. How safe is inmate property on the unit?  
Very safe - Somewhat safe - Somewhat unsafe \_ Very unsafe \_
25. How often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing, etc.) occur between inmates on the units?  
Almost never - Seldom \_ Often \_\_ Almost always \_
26. How often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing, etc.) occur between inmates and staff on the units?  
Almost never \_ Seldom \_ Often \_ Almost always \_
27. How often do physical fights. (assaults or bordering on assaults) occur between inmates on the units?  
Almost never \_ Seldom \_ Often \_ Almost always \_
28. How often do physical fights (assaults or bordering on assaults) occur between inmates and staff on the units?  
Almost never \_ Seldom - Often - Almost always \_
29. Do inmates generally treat unit officers and support staff in a respectful manner?  
Yes \_ No \_

Larimer County Detention Center

30. Do inmates generally treat you in a respectful manner?

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

31. Are you frequently asked questions by inmates that should/could have been answered by housing officers?

Yes \_ No \_

32. If "yes" to #31, please give examples.

33. Do you provide inmates with services and/or answers to their personal problems that unit officers cannot provide?

Almost never \_ Seldom- Often- Almost always \_

34. How often do inmates break major rules on the units?

Almost never \_ Seldom \_ Occasionally- Almost always \_

35. How often do sexual assaults occur on the living units?

Almost never Sometimes- Often- All the time-

36. Are weapons found during shakedowns?

Yes \_ No \_

37. If "yes" to #36, how often per year...and...what kinds of weapons?

38. How much deliberate vandalism, damage or writing on the walls happens on the units?

None at all \_ Very little- Quite a bit \_ Very much \_

Larimer County Detention Center

39. Are repairs made promptly and graffiti removed soon after it appears  
Yes \_            No -
40. Are the living areas on the units kept clean?  
Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_
41. Do your officers maintain communication with all of the inmates on the living units?  
Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often -                      Almost always -
42. Do your officers pick up information useful in managing their units as a result of routine communication with the inmates?  
Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always -
43. Please give examples of information obtained.
44. Do inmates appear to feel comfortable talking to unit officers?  
Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often -                      Almost always -
45. Overall, do you feel that training provided unit officers adequately prepares them to manage a living unit?  
Yes \_            No \_
46. Do inmates receive adequate orientation prior to being assigned to housing units?  
Yes \_            No \_

**Larimer County Detention Center**

47. How well are the following inmate needs met?

	Very well	Satisfac- torily	Unsatisfac- torily	Poorly
Law Library	—	—	—	—
Medical	—	—	—	—
Visiting	—	—	—	—
Telephone	—	—	—	—
Food Services	—	—	—	—
Recreation	—	—	—	—
Commissary	—	—	—	—
Mail	—	—	—	—
Communication with staff	—	—	—	—
Jail counselor programs	—	—	—	—
Education/teacher programs	—	—	—	—
Leisure reading library	—	—	—	—
Religious programs/clergy	—	—	—	—
Alcohol/drug programs	—	—	—	—
Other inmate programs	—	—	—	—

48. Do the above programs contribute to the security of the facility?

Yes  No

49. If "no" to #48, indicate which do not and why.

**Larimer County Detention Center**

50. For the following support services, do the support services staff provide their resources in ways that complement the unit officer's ability to manage inmate behavior?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Law library	—	—	—	—
Medical	—	—	—	—
Visiting	—	—	—	—
Telephone	—	—	—	—
Food Services	—	—	—	—
Recreation	—	—	—	—
Commissary	—	—	—	—
Mail	—	—	—	—

51. For the following programs, do the program staff provide their resources in ways that complement the unit officer's ability to manage inmate behavior?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Counseling programs	—	—	—	—
Education/teacher programs	—	—	—	—
Religious programs/clergy	—	—	—	—
Drug/alcohol programs	—	—	—	—
Leisure reading library	—	—	—	—
Other inmate programs	—	—	—	—

**Larimer County Detention Center**

52. Do unit officers facilitate the ability of support services personnel to provide the following services to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Law library	—	—	—	—
Medical	—	—	—	—
Visiting	—	—	—	—
Telephone	—	—	—	—
Food Services	—	—	—	—
Recreation	—	—	—	—
Commissary	—	—	—	—
Mail	—	—	—	—

53. Do unit officers facilitate the ability of programs personnel to provide the following services to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Counseling programs	—	—	—	—
Education/teacher programs	—	—	—	—
Religious programs/clergy	—	—	—	—
Drug/alcohol programs	—	—	—	—
Leisure reading library	—	—	—	—
Other inmate programs	—	—	—	—

54. Do unit officers receive adequate classification information about inmates assigned to them?

Yes -            No -

Larimer County Detention Center

55. Do unit officers receive adequate information that inmates need (cou dates, bond procedures program schedules, etc.)?

Yes \_ No \_

56. If "no" to #55, please explain.

57. Do you provide an adequate disciplinary system?

Yes \_ No \_

58. Does the disciplinary system contribute positively to the unit officers' management of the unit?

Yes - No -

59. If "no" to #58, why not?

60. Do inmates have a fair and impartial grievance procedure?

Yes \_ No \_

61. Are there satisfactory procedures for reclassifying inmates who cannot follow the rules and regulations about the unit?

Yes \_ No \_

62. If a fire broke out in this jail, how likely is it that smoke and/or flames could cause injury?

Very unlikely-	Somewhat unlikely-	Somewhat likely-	Very likely-
----------------	--------------------	------------------	--------------

63. Do you believe that shift-to-shift communication among staff on a living unit is satisfactory?

Yes - No -

64. If "no" to #63, please give examples.
65. Do you feel there is consistency of procedures from one shift to another?  
Yes - No-
66. If "no" to #65, what are the problems?
67. Do you feel there is consistency of procedures among the general living units?  
Yes - No -
68. If "no" to #67, what are the problems?
69. Do you involve unit officers in planning, problem solving and decision making regarding the management of inmates both on and off the housing units?  
Yes - No -
70. Do you help make programs and security work well together by discussing differences in program content and scheduling in joint meetings with program and security staff?  
Yes - No -
71. Do you delegate decision making authority in the context of broad policy guidelines?  
Yes - No -

Larimer County Detention Center

72. Are you accessible and available to corrections officers? Do you move around and help out?

Yes -        No -

73. Do you understand the benefits of progressive employee rewards and discipline as tools for managing staff growth and development?

Yes \_        No -

74. What single thing would most improve the operation in the housing units?

75. What single thing would most improve the overall operation of this direct supervision jail?

UNIT OFFICERS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I N S T R U C T I O N S :  
Please answer all the questions from the perspective of your role as a unit officer in control of housing units at this detention facility.

• Data Questions

1. As a unit Officer, how much control do you have over all areas in this housing unit?

Almost none                      Very                      Quite                      Almost complete  
at all \_                      little \_                      a bit \_                      control \_

2. How comfortable are you going any place on the units?

Very                                      Very  
uncomfortable \_                      Uncomfortable \_                      Comfortable \_                      comfortable \_

3. Can you maintain good visual surveillance over all areas of the living units?

Yes \_                      No \_

4. If "no" to #3, what are your problem areas and how do you compensate?

5. Do you think the inmates perceive the you as being in charge of the living unit?

Almost                                      Almost  
never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      always \_

6. Do your assignments require that you spend the majority of your time at your duty station?

a. Yes \_                      No \_

b. If "yes" to #6, why?

Larimer County Detention Center

7. Do inmates challenge your leadership or attempt to subvert your authority?

Almost never-                      Seldom-                      Often-                      Almost always -

8. Are they successful when they do so?

Almost' never-                      Seldom-                      Often-                      Almost always-

9. Are there adequate means available for you to deal effectively with challenges to your authority when they do occur?

Yes                           No     

Please explain

10. How often (average number of times per week) do the following persons come through your unit?

Major                           Captain                           Lieutenant-                      Sergeant-

11. Is this sufficient?

Yes                           No     

12. If "no" to #11, what would be more appropriate and why?

13. Do you feel that you get adequate coaching, guidance and direction from your supervisory staff?

Almost never-                      Seldom-                      Often-                      Almost always -

14. If "almost never" or. "seldom", describe the deficiencies.

Larimer County Detention Center

15. What impact do their visits have on your image as the leader of the unit?

Greatly detracts-      Detracts-      Enhances-      Greatly enhances-

16. How much time are you able to spend roving through all sections of the unit?

Almost None-      Very little-      Some-      A great deal-

17. If "almost none" -or 'very little", please explain why not:

18. Have you received formal training in any of the following areas? Please check where appropriate.

- a. Principles and dynamics of direct supervision jails \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Interpersonal communication skills \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Supervision methodology and techniques \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Teamwork training \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Understanding human behavior \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other (please specify) : \_\_\_\_\_

19. Have you ever had specialized in-service training since being assigned to this jail?

Yes \_      No \_

20. Overall, do you feel the training you have received has prepared you to manage a living unit in this jail?

Yes \_      N ° -

21. If "no" to #20, what subjects are missing?

Larimer County Detention Center

22. In general, how safe do you feel when you are on this unit?  
Very safe \_      Somewhat safe \_      Somewhat unsafe \_      Very unsafe-
23. How safe to you feel this unit is for inmates?  
Very safe-      Somewhat safe -      Somewhat unsafe \_      Very unsafe-
24. How safe is inmate property on the unit?  
Very safe \_      Somewhat safe \_      Somewhat unsafe \_      Very unsafe \_
25. How often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing, etc.) occur between inmates on the units?  
Almost never \_      Seldom \_      Often \_      Almost always \_
26. How often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing, etc.) occur between inmates and staff on the units?  
Almost never \_      Seldom \_      Often-      Almost always,
27. How often do physical fights (assaults or bordering on assaults) occur between inmates on the units?  
Almost never \_      Seldom \_      Often-      Almost always-
28. How often do physical fights (assaults or bordering on assaults) occur between inmates and staff on the units?  
Almost never \_      Seldom \_      Often-      Almost always-
29. Do inmates generally treat you in a respectful manner?  
Yes \_      No \_

Larimer County Detention Center

30. How often do inmates break major rules on the units?  
Almost never \_                      Seldom-                      Occasionally \_                      Almost always \_
31. How often do sexual assaults occur on the living units?  
Almost never .                      Sometimes .                      Often .                      All the time .
32. Do you uncover weapons during shakedowns?  
Yes \_                      No -
33. If "yes" to #32, what kinds of weapons?
34. How much deliberate vandalism, damage or writing on the walls happens on the units?  
None at all-                      Very little .                      Some-                      Quite a lot-
35. Are repairs made promptly and graffiti removed soon after it appears?  
Yes \_                      No -
36. Is the living area on this unit kept clean?  
Almost never-                      Seldom-                      Often-                      Almost always ,
37. Are inmates generally cooperative in keeping their rooms clean?  
Yes \_                      No -
38. Do you maintain communication with all of the inmates on the living units?  
Almost never \_                      Seldom-                      Often-                      Almost always ,

**Larimer County Detention Center**

39. Do you pick up information useful in managing your unit as a result - routine communication with the inmates?

Yes -           **No** \_\_

40. Please give examples of information obtained.

41. Do inmates receive adequate orientation prior to being assigned to housing units?

Yes -           No -

42. Do you facilitate the ability of support services personnel to provide the following services to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Law library	---	---	---	---
Medical	---	---	---	---
Visiting	---	---	---	---
Telephone	---	---	---	---
Food Services	---	---	---	---
Recreation	---	---	---	---
Commissary	---	---	---	---
Mail	---	---	---	---

**Larimer County Detention Center**

43. Do you facilitate the ability of programs personnel to provide the following services to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Counseling programs	—	—	—	—
Education/teacher programs	—	—	—	—
Religious programs/clergy	—	—	—	—
Drug/alcohol programs	—	—	—	—
Leisure reading library	—	—	—	—
Other inmate programs	—	—	—	—

44. Do you feel you have an adequate disciplinary system?

Yes \_ No \_

45. Does the disciplinary system contribute positively to your management of the unit:

Yes \_ No \_

46. Do inmates have a fair and impartial grievance procedure?

Yes \_ No \_

47. If "yes" to #45, do inmates FEEL they will have a fair hearing?

Yes \_ No \_

48. Does the grievance procedure contribute positively to your ability to manage the unit?

Yes \_ No \_

49. If "no" to #47, why not?

**Larimer County Detention Center**

50. Are there satisfactory procedures for reclassifying inmates who cannot follow the rules and regulations of the housing unit?

Yes \_ No \_

51. How well are the following inmate needs met?

	Very well	Satisfac- torily	Unsatisfac- torily	Poorly
Law Library	---	---	---	---
Medical	---	---	---	---
Visiting	---	---	---	---
Telephone	---	---	---	---
Food Services	---	---	---	---
Recreation	---	---	---	---
Commissary	---	---	---	---
Mail	---	---	---	---
Communication with staff	---	---	---	---
Jail counselor programs	---	---	---	---
Education/teacher programs	---	---	---	---
Leisure reading library	---	---	---	---
Religious programs/clergy	---	---	---	---
Alcohol/drug programs	---	---	---	---
Other inmate programs	---	---	---	---

52. Do the above programs contribute to the security of the facility?

Yes \_ No \_

53. If "no" to #51, indicate which do not and why.

**Larimer County Detention Center**

54. For the following support services, do the support services staff provide their resources in ways that complement your ability to manage inmate behavior?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Law library	—	—	—	—
Medical	—	—	—	—
Visiting	—	—	—	—
Telephone	—	—	—	—
Food Services	—	—	—	—
Recreation	—	—	—	—
Commissary	—	—	—	—
Mail	—	—	—	—

55. For the following programs, do the program staff provide their resources in ways that complement your ability to manage inmate behavior?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Counseling programs	—	—	—	—
Education/teacher programs	—	—	—	—
Religious programs/clergy	—	—	—	—
Drug/alcohol programs	—	—	—	—
Leisure reading library	—	—	—	—
Other inmate programs	—	—	—	—

**Larimer County Detention Center**

56. Do you facilitate the ability of support services personnel to provide the following services to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Law library	—	—	—	—
Medical	—	—	—	—
Visiting	—	—	—	—
Telephone	—	—	—	—
Food Services	—	—	—	—
Recreation	—	—	—	—
Commissary	—	—	—	—
Mail	—	—	—	—

57. Do you facilitate the ability of programs personnel to provide the following services to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Counseling programs	—	—	—	—
Education/teacher programs	—	—	—	—
Religious programs/clergy	—	—	—	—
Drug/alcohol programs	—	—	—	—
Leisure reading library	—	—	—	—
Other inmate programs	—	—	—	—

58. If a fire broke out in this jail, how likely is it that smoke and/or flames could cause injury?

Very unlikely _	Somewhat unlikely _	Somewhat likely _	Very likely _
--------------------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------

**Larimer County Detention Center**

59. Are you involved in planning, problem solving and decision making regarding the management of inmates both on and off the housing units?  
Yes -        No -
60. Does your supervisory staff help make programs and security work well together by discussing differences in program content and scheduling in joint meetings with program and security staff?  
Yes -        No -
61. Does your supervisory staff delegate decision making authority in the context of broad policy guidelines?  
Yes \_        No \_
62. Are your supervisory staff accessible and available to corrections officers? Do they move around and help out?  
Yes -        No -
63. Do you understand the benefits of progressive employee rewards and discipline as tools for managing staff growth and development?  
Yes \_        No \_
64. If yes to #63, please illustrate.
65. What single thing would most improve the operation in the housing units?
66. What single thing would most improve the overall operation of this direct supervision jail?



Larimer County Detention Center

SUPPORT STAFF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

[Medical, Food Service, Law Library, Recreation, Commissary, Mail]

• Data Questions

1. How much control do you feel unit officers have over all areas in the housing units?

Almost none at all \_ Very little \_ Quite a bit \_ Almost complete control \_

2. How comfortable are you going any place on the units?

Very uncomfortable \_ Uncomfortable \_ Comfortable \_ Very comfortable \_

3. Have you received formal training in any of the following areas? Please check where appropriate.

- a. Principles and dynamics of direct supervision jails -
b. Interpersonal communication skills
c. Supervision methods and techniques
d. Teamwork training
e. Understanding human behavior
f. Other (please specify):

4. In general, how safe do you feel when you are on the living units?

Very safe \_ Somewhat safe \_ Somewhat unsafe \_ Very unsafe \_

5. How safe do you feel the living conditions are for the inmates?

Very safe \_ Somewhat safe - Somewhat unsafe - Very unsafe \_

6. Do inmates generally treat you in a respectful manner?

Yes \_ No \_

7. Are you frequently asked questions by inmates that should/could have been answered by housing officers?

Yes \_ No \_

**Larimer County, Detention Center**

8. Aside from your support service area, do you provide inmates with services and/or answers to their personal problems that unit officers cannot?

Almost never -                      Seldom -                      Often -                      Almost always -

9. Are the living areas on the units kept clean?

Almost never -                      Seldom -                      Often -                      Almost always -

10. Do the officers maintain communication with all of the inmates on the living units?

Almost never -                      Seldom -                      Often -                      Almost always -

11. Do inmates appear to feel comfortable talking to unit officers?

Almost never -                      Seldom -                      Often -                      Almost always -

12. Do inmates receive adequate orientation prior to being assigned housing units?

Yes \_      No -

13. How well are the following inmate needs met?

	Very well	Satisfactorily	Unsatisfactorily	Poorly
Law Library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Medical	_____	_____	_____	_____
Visiting	_____	_____	_____	_____
Telephone	_____	_____	_____	_____
Food Services	_____	_____	_____	_____
Recreation	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commissary	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mail	_____	_____	_____	_____
Communication with staff	_____	_____	_____	_____

**Larimer County Detention Center**

	Very well	Satisfac- torily	Unsatisfac- torily	Poorly
Jail counselor programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Education/teacher programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Leisure reading library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Religious programs/clergy	_____	_____	_____	_____
Alcohol/drug programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other inmate programs	_____	_____	_____	_____

14. Do unit officers facilitate the ability of support services personnel to provide the following services to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Law library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Medical	_____	_____	_____	_____
Visiting	_____	_____	_____	_____
Telephone	_____	_____	_____	_____
Food Services	_____	_____	_____	_____
Recreation	_____	_____	_____	_____
Commissary	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mail	_____	_____	_____	_____

15. Do you believe that shift-to-shift communication among staff on a living unit is satisfactory?

Yes \_      No \_

16. Do you feel there is consistency of procedures from one shift to another?

Yes \_      No \_

Larimer County Detention Center

17. Do you feel there is consistency of procedures among the general living units?

Yes \_ No \_

18. If I "no" to #16, what are the problems?

19. Do you feel you get adequate coaching, guidance and direction from your supervisory staff?

Almost never \_ Seldom- Often- Almost always-

20. Do security supervisors mediate/negotiate conflicts when they occur between security and support staff?

Almost never \_ Seldom \_ Often- Almost always-

21. If "almost never" or "seldom", describe what problems occur.

22. What single thing would most improve the operation in the housing units?

23. What single thing would most improve the overall operation of this direct supervision jail?

Larimer County Detention Center

INMATE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

• Data Questions

1. In general, how safe do you feel in this jail?

Very. safe \_      Somewhat safe-      Somewhat unsafe-      Very unsafe-

2. How safe from theft is your personal property?

Very safe \_      Somewhat safe-      Somewhat unsafe-      Very unsafe-

3. Is this living unit kept clear?

Almost never \_      Rarely \_      Often \_      Almost always \_

4. Are you required to keep your room clean and orderly?

Yes \_      No \_

5. How much deliberate vandalism, damage or writing on the walls happens in this unit?

Almost none at all-      Very little-      Quite a bit-      A great deal-

6. How often are there threats of violence on this unit?

Almost never \_      Sometimes \_      Often-      Almost always \_

7. HOW often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing, etc.) occur between inmates on the unit?

Almost never \_      Seldom \_      Often \_      Almost always \_

8. How often do conflicts (shouting, shoving, pushing, etc.) occur between inmates and staff on the unit?

Almost never \_      Seldom \_      Often-      Almost always -

Larimer County Detention Center

9. How often do physical fights (assaults or bordering on assaults) occur between inmates on the unit?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_

10. How often do physical fights (assaults or bordering on assaults) occur between inmates and staff on the unit?

Almost never \_                      Seldom-                      Often \_                      A l m o s t always \_

11. Who do you believe runs this unit?

Inmates in general \_\_\_\_\_                      An inmate leader \_\_\_\_\_  
Unit officers \_\_\_\_\_                      Other: \_\_\_\_\_

12. Have you been told about the rules and regulations you must follow on this unit?

Yes \_                      No \_

13: Are the rules and regulations posted in this unit or distributed in some way?

Yes \_                      No \_

14. Do you feel that the officers treat you in a respectful manner?

Yes \_                      No \_

15. Do you believe you are treated fairly by the unit officers?

Yes \_                      No \_

16. Do you feel comfortable approaching the unit officers for information or assistance?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always-

**Larimer County Detention Center**

17. Do the inmates feel comfortable talking to officers around here?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_

18. Have you ever filed a grievance with the administration?

Yes \_                      No \_

19. If "yes" to #18, what was the grievance about?

20. Do most inmates generally follow the rules of this unit?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_

21. How well are the following needs met?

	Very well	Satisfactorily	Unsatisfactorily	Poorly
Law Library	—	—	—	—
Medical	—	—	—	—
Visiting	—	—	—	—
Telephone	—	—	—	—
Food Services	—	—	—	—
Recreation	—	—	—	—
Commissary	—	—	—	—
Mail	—	—	—	—
Communication with staff	—	—	—	—
Jail counselor programs	—	—	—	—
Education/teacher programs	—	—	—	—
Leisure reading library	—	—	—	—
Religious programs/clergy	—	—	—	—
Alcohol/drug programs	—	—	—	—
Other inmate programs	—	—	—	—



Larimer County. Detention Center

PROGRAMS STAFF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(Counseling, Education, Alcohol/Drug, Leisure Reading Library]

• Data Questions

1. How much control do you feel unit officers have over all areas in the housing units?

Almost none at all - Very little - Quite a bit - Almost complete control -

2. How comfortable are you going any place on the units?

Very uncomfortable - Uncomfortable - Comfortable - Very comfortable -

3. Have you received formal training in any of the following areas? Please check where appropriate.

- a. Principles and dynamics of direct supervision jails -
b. Interpersonal communication skills
c. Supervision methods and techniques
d. Teamwork training
e. Understanding human behavior
f. Other (please specify):

4. In general, how safe do you feel when you are on the living units?

Very safe- Somewhat safe- Somewhat unsafe- Very unsafe,

5. How safe do you feel the living conditions are for the inmates?

Very safe- Somewhat safe - Somewhat unsafe- Very unsafe,

6. Do inmates generally treat you in a respectful manner?

Yes \_ No \_

7. Are you frequently asked questions by inmates that should/could have been answered by housing officers?

Yes - No -

**Larimer County Detention Center**

8. Aside from your program areas, do you provide inmates with service and/or answers to their personal problems that unit officers cannot?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_

9. Are the living areas on the units kept clean?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_

10. Do the officers maintain communication with all of the inmates on the living units?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_

11. Do inmates appear to feel comfortable talking to unit officers?

Almost never \_                      Seldom \_                      Often \_                      Almost always \_

12. Do inmates receive adequate orientation prior to being assigned housing units?

Yes \_      No \_

13. How well are the following inmate needs met?

	Very well	Satisfactorily	Unsatisfactorily	Poorly
Jail counselor programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Education/teacher programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Leisure reading library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Religious programs/clergy	_____	_____	_____	_____
Alcohol/drug programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other inmate programs	_____	_____	_____	_____

**Larimer County Detention Center**

14. Do unit officers facilitate the ability of program services personnel to provide the following to inmates?

	Almost never	Seldom	Often	Almost always
Jail counselor programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Education/teacher programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Leisure reading library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Religious programs/clergy	_____	_____	_____	_____
Alcohol/drug programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other inmate programs	_____	_____	_____	_____

15. Do you believe that shift-to-shift communication among staff on a living unit is satisfactory?

Yes \_      No \_

16. Do you feel there is consistency of procedures from one shift to another?

**Yes** \_\_      **No** \_\_

17. Do you feel there is consistency of procedures among the general living units?

Yes \_      No \_

18. If "no" to #16, what are the problems?

19. Do you feel you get adequate coaching, guidance and direction from your supervisory staff?

Almost  
never-                      Seldom-                      Often-                      Almost  
always-

**Larimer County Detention Center**

20. Do security supervisors mediate/negotiate conflicts when they occur between security and program staff?

Almost  
never -

Seldom -

Often -

Almost  
always -

21. If "almost never" or "seldom", describe what problems occur.

22. What single thing would most improve the operation in the housing units?

23. What single thing would most improve the overall operation of this direct supervision jail?