

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**MEETING HIGHLIGHTS LARGE JAIL NETWORK MEETING JULY 8-10, 2001
LONGMONT, COLORADO..... 1**

**OPENING SESSION: DEFINING THE ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE TO LARGE JAIL
NETWORK MEMBERS..... 3**

Partnerships and Collaboratives..... 3

Media Access within a Secure Facility..... 3

Jail Data Sharing..... 4

Staff With Mental Health Problems..... 4

Use of Force and Mentally Ill in Jails..... 5

12 Hour Schedules..... 5

**UNDERSTANDING AND USING THE DATA AND RESOURCES OF THE BUREAU OF
JUSTICE STATISTICS 7**

DR. ALLEN BECK, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS 7

INTRODUCTION..... 7

JIM STEPHAN, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS 9

THE 1999 CENSUS OF JAILS..... 9

DR. ALLEN BECK, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS 13

NATIONAL JAIL STATISTICS: RECENT FINDINGS AND NEW DATA COLLECTIONS 13

PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG EMPLOYEES 17

WILLIAM MONTAGUE, SHELBY COUNTY (TENNESSEE) DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS..... 17

DONALD MCWILLIAMS, HARRIS COUNTY (HOUSTON, TEXAS) SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT 19

STAFF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT WITH INMATES 22

ALBERT GARDNER, RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS 22

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEETING PARTICIPANTS..... 26

EMPLOYEES WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS 28

DAVID S. OWENS, CAMDEN COUNTY (NEW JERSEY) CORRECTIONAL FACILITY..... 28

UTILIZING STAFF EFFECTIVELY: MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES 30

RALPH GREEN, HUDSON COUNTY (NEW JERSEY) CORRECTIONS CENTER..... 30

**UTILIZING STAFF EFFECTIVELY: PROMOTING WORKING RELATIONSHIPS AND
AVOIDING BARRIERS THAT HINDER TEAMWORK..... 32**

MICHAEL COSTA, SONOMA COUNTY (CALIFORNIA) SHERIFF’S OFFICE..... 32

UTILIZING STAFF EFFECTIVELY: LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE..... 34

KENNETH RAY, YAKIMA COUNTY (WASHINGTON) DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION 34

RECAP SESSION AND PLANS FOR THE NEXT MEETING 38

TOPICS FOR THE NEXT MEETING..... 38

APPENDIX 1..... 40

MEETING AGENDA	40
APPENDIX 2	44
MEETING PARTICIPANTS	44
APPENDIX 3	54
CENSUS OF JAILS, 1999	54
APPENDIX 4	60
NATIONAL JAIL STATISTICS: RECENT FINDINGS AND NEW DATA COLLECTIONS	60

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

LARGE JAIL NETWORK MEETING

JULY 8-10, 2001

LONGMONT, COLORADO

These proceedings summarize a meeting of NIC's Large Jail Network held in Longmont, Colorado, on July 8-10, 2001. Approximately 60 administrators of the nation's largest jails and jail systems attended the meeting; 14 of the attendees were first-time participants in a Large Jail Network meeting.

The meeting focused on two main topics: 1) the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), and its collection of data related to jails and 2) employee-related issues. Presentations and discussions are summarized below and presented in more detail in the Proceedings that follow.

- **Introduction to the Meeting.** The opening session of this Large Jail Network meeting gave participants the opportunity to raise issues of concern in their jurisdictions and to request assistance from other attendees. The following issues were raised and discussed at this session: partnerships and collaboratives, media access within a secure facility, data sharing on jails, staff mental health problems, use of force, mentally ill in jails, and 12-hour schedules.
- **Understanding and Using the Data & Resources of the Bureau of Justice Statistics.** Allen Beck and Jim Stephan from the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, presented recent data on jails and discussed with meeting participants some ways in which BJS could improve its collection of relevant information on jails. Among other changes, BJS is interested in gathering better data on jail admissions and releases. A working group of Large Jail Network members with an interest in improving data collection on jails was recommended; its role will be further defined in coming months.
- **Personal Relationship Between and Among Employees.** William Montague, Shelby County, Tennessee, offered some specific recommendations for addressing personal relationships between employees. Dan McWilliams, Harris County, Texas, pointed to the reluctance of administrators to intervene in employees' personal lives and led a lively discussion of the issue among meeting participants.
- **Staff Sexual Misconduct with Inmates.** Albert Gardner, Rhode Island Department of Corrections, summarized his department's history of dealing with sexual misconduct and pointed to a variety of effective remedies.

- **Employees with Mental Health Problems.** David Owens, Camden County, New Jersey, pointed to the need for jail administrators to ensure that employees receive mental health assistance when they need it and recommended some approaches to responding to employees with mental health problems.
- **Utilizing Staff Effectively.** Ralph Green, from Hudson County, New Jersey, emphasized the need for a decentralized supervision structure, especially unit management, in large jails. Michael Costa, Sonoma County, California, summarized some key points in fostering good supervisor-subordinate relationships. Ken Ray, Yakima County, Washington, presented some results of a survey on leadership that was administered to his department staff. Survey results identified the level of importance employees attached to a number of leadership traits.
- **Presentation of Future Meeting Topics.** Richard Geather, NIC Jails Division, led a discussion on potential topics for the next meeting of the Large Jail Network, to be held in January 2002. The group agreed that the overall topic will be "The Future." A futurist will be invited to provide a framework for the discussion, which will then focus on aging prisoners, females, special needs inmates, and technology. There will also be a half-day session on legal issues.

**OPENING SESSION: DEFINING THE ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE
TO
LARGE JAIL NETWORK MEMBERS**

In a departure from past Large Jail Network meetings, the opening session of this meeting did not feature an address by an expert on the general topic of the meeting. Instead, Richard Geather, NIC Jails Division Correctional Program Specialist, gave meeting participants the opportunity to ask questions or raise issues of concern in their jurisdictions and to request assistance from other meeting participants in responding to these issues. Following is a list of the issues introduced and discussed at this session.

PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIVES.

Dorothy Williams, Baltimore County, Maryland, noted the importance in her career of interacting and networking with fellow professionals. For a new job with the Baltimore County Criminal Justice Services Administration, she requested meeting participants' help in identifying partnerships and collaboratives that involve jails and jail systems. She is interested in examples of sustained collaborations rather than ad hoc coordination efforts. On the basis of what Ms. Williams learns about such collaborative efforts, she will develop a proposal to present to Baltimore County. Those with information to share may contact her at Baltimore County Police Department, 8th Floor; 700 E. Jaffa Road; Towson, MD 21286-5501; (410) 887-2212.

MEDIA ACCESS WITHIN A SECURE FACILITY

Steve Thompson, King County Department of Adult Detention, Seattle, asked meeting participants about their policies related to granting media access within a secure facility. The question was prompted by a recent event in which a person charged with assaulting Seattle's mayor was being held in the King County facility. The inmate initiated an interview with a TV station, which was authorized by the supervisor temporarily responsible for the facility. In response, other TV stations have now also requested interviews. When Thompson took over the King County facility, he limited media access to inmates only to general visiting times, but he was interested in getting a sense of the media policies of his colleagues around the country. Responses of the meeting participants were widely varied; while some have restrictive policies on media access, others believe that it is preferable to provide as much access to the media as possible. Some individual comments in response to Steve Thompson's

question follow:

- Press representatives are never allowed to interview inmates on camera.
- Each inmate is allowed only visit per week from the media. A pool system specifies a single media representative, and the media must pay for two off-duty security officers to escort the representative into the unit.
- Media representatives are encouraged to video positive activities within the facility. That is, the jail administration uses the media to tell its own story, but does not allow the media to follow individual inmates' cases.
- The more access you give the media, the less likely they are to come to the jail. Inmates sign a release that allows media access, but their own attorneys are often the ones who refuse to allow interviews with inmates.
- It is important to have a single person on staff who serves as the point person for media contacts. That person controls all media access.
- If you close the door to the press, it suggests that you have something to hide. If you are open with the media, they are more trusting.
- With high-profile cases, allow media access if they want to pay overtime charges for security. Often, they will not want to do so.
- It may make sense to have a policy that requires media representatives interested in interviewing an inmate to submit a written request that indicates how citizens would be served by the proposed story.

JAIL DATA SHARING

Bill Montague, Shelby County Division of Corrections, asked for others to provide information on: the number of inmates, number of sworn staff, the staff relief factor, the number on fixed posts, and the number on collapsible posts. The Shelby County facility is different from most jails represented at the meeting, as it holds inmates with sentences up to eight years for the state of Tennessee. Because of this difference, meeting participants suggested that a better comparison group would be state prisons.

STAFF WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS

Ken Ray, Yakima County, Washington, Department of Corrections, asked for advice in dealing with a staff member who made comments in which he threatened to kill the Director of Corrections. The question was what to do in such a circumstance. The officer was respected and had a sterling record, but he also collected, and was

somewhat obsessed with, military weapons. Sheriffs' deputies found many weapons and ammunition in his car and about 54 military weapons in his house. The officer was known to have a militia background, but such a background cannot disqualify one from a job in the state of Washington. An investigation found that he was undergoing severe stress in his life. A psychological evaluation indicated that he was not a real threat to anyone and recommended getting the officer back into a situation where the department could get him into psychological counseling. The officer is now in an unarmed post and on 18 months probation. He is also required to deal with the social impact of his remarks by meeting with the officers who heard them. Meeting participants raised a number of concerns:

- "Negligent retention in duty" may be an issue in this case and could have legal ramifications.
- In similar situations, one agency would require the officer to complete a restorative plan before returning to work.
- The signs of potential trouble with an officer are usually clear, if you look for them.

USE OF FORCE AND MENTALLY ILL IN JAILS

Greg Jolley, Las Vegas Metro Police Department, noted that his department is dealing with use of force issues and with the large number of mentally ill persons who are in jail. He asked for help from Large Jail Network members, indicating that he will later distribute a letter asking for copies of policies addressing both issues.

12 HOUR SCHEDULES

John Dantis, Bernalillo County Department of Corrections, Albuquerque, New Mexico, asked for others whose staff are on 12-hour schedules to share their insights. Bernalillo County's corrections officers are unionized; those at the rank of sergeant and above are not.

UNDERSTANDING AND USING THE DATA AND RESOURCES
OF
THE BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS

DR. ALLEN BECK, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has a mandate to collect data on all aspects of corrections, not just institutions. A series of data collection efforts are used to collect data from local jails, community corrections agencies, and state departments of corrections. BJS also gets information from automated systems. The agency publishes a series of reports and maintains a significant web site.

There has been a dramatic change in BJS's approach to collecting and communicating information in response to the availability of technology. A web-based reporting option was introduced last year to save time and money. More than 100 agencies took advantage of the option, which was designed to be user-friendly.

Art Wallenstein, a member of the Large Jail Network from Montgomery County, Maryland, recently visited BJS. Wallenstein pointed to the importance of getting better data on jails, especially the need to focus on admissions and releases. BJS and large jails have a mutual interest in improving data collection efforts on jails, and we look forward to hearing from you the directions you would like BJS to pursue.

The Census of Jails was initiated in 1983 and was done again in 1988, 1993, and 1999; the next Census of Jails will be in 2004. In other years, BJS does an annual survey of jails on June 30.

JIM STEPHAN, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS

THE 1999 CENSUS OF JAILS

1999 Forms

The 1999 Census of Jails questionnaire was reduced from 14 pages to 10 and was simplified in a variety of ways. The questionnaire consisted of several forms; each jail filled out the form that matched its own characteristics. The 1999 forms covered the following types of jails:

- Jurisdictions consisting of a single jail
- Jurisdictions with more than one jail
- Addendum: Individual facilities for jurisdictions operating multiple facilities
- Facilities operated by multiple jurisdictions
- Privately-operated jails
- Jails in Indian Country

The survey excluded police lock-ups and state-operated jail facilities in unified state systems. After mailing, faxing, and phoning reminders, BJS had virtually a 100% response rate to the 1999 Census, at least for crucial topics.

Census of Jails Topics

The 1999 Census of Jails covered the following topics:

- Inmate and community supervision counts
- Staff characteristics
- Inmate health
- Inmate deaths
- Jail programs
- Facility characteristics

Findings

Following is a summary of some findings from the 1999 Census of Jails. (*For more complete information, see Appendix 3, which provides a copy of the PowerPoint slides used in Mr. Stephan's presentation.*)

- Number of persons under jail supervision: A total of 687,973 persons were under jail supervision on June 30, 1999. Of these, 605,943 (88%) were confined

- in jail, and the remaining 82,030 were supervised outside a jail facility.
- The number of jails grew from 3,338 in 1983 to 3,365 in 1999. Because jails are generally tied to local government jurisdictions, the number of each is about the same.
 - The number of juveniles held in jails more than doubled between 1993 and 1999: from 4,300 to 9,458. Of the total number of juveniles, 8,598 were being held as adults, and 860 were being held as juveniles.
 - Relative to the U.S. population, jail populations increased 36% from 1993 to 1999—from 239 per 100,000 adults to 295 per 100,000.
 - The jail incarceration rate was highest in the South and lowest in the Midwest.
 - Inmate population growth also varied by region of the country. It grew fastest in the Midwest and slowest in the Northeast.
 - The increase in jail bedspace was sufficient to more than keep pace with the growth in inmates. In 1983, jails nationwide were at 97% of capacity; in 1999, they were at 93% of rated capacity.
 - Large jails had higher occupancy rates than small jails
 - Most inmates in the country were housed in relatively few large jails. Large jails with total inmate populations over 1000 held a larger percentage of inmates in 1999 (47.9%) than in 1993 (32.9%).
 - Race and Hispanic origin of inmates: In 1999, 41.3% of jail inmates were White; 41.5% were Black; 15.5% were Hispanic; and 1.7% were all other races.
 - Gender of inmates: 88.8% of jail inmates in 1999 were male, and 11.2% were female.
 - There were 47 privately operated jails in 1999, up from 17 in 1993. Private jails held about 2% of the total jail population in 1999.
 - Trends in local jail staff: there was little change from 1993 to 1999 in the percentage of staff who are corrections officers (71.3% in 1993, 72.1% in 1999).

For additional information, contact Jim Stephan, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics; 810 Seventh St., NW; Washington, DC 20531; (202) 616-3289; stephanj@ojp.usdoj.gov

Roundtable Discussion

Meeting participants made the following points in the discussion following Jim Stephan's presentation:

- Rated capacity is not an adequate measure because a jail can administrator can tell you anything he/she chooses about rated capacity. It is not a definitive measure.
- In counting staff, it is important to separate "administrators" from "supervisors." Supervisors are not correctional officers and do not supervise inmates. This distinction is not made in the current survey.
- Definitions must be accurate or comparisons will not be meaningful.
- Data collection should be customized for large jails.

DR. ALLEN BECK, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS
NATIONAL JAIL STATISTICS: RECENT FINDINGS AND NEW DATA
COLLECTIONS

Recent Findings

Following is a summary of some important additional findings from the 1999 Census of Jails and the Annual Survey of Jails, done in June 2000. (*For more complete information, see Appendix 4, which provides a copy of the PowerPoint slides used in Dr. Beck's presentation.*)

- Jail populations increased 2.5% in 1999, only half the annual average growth since 1990.
- Adult arrests for index crimes dropped significantly. However, there was a dramatic increase in arrests for other crimes such as drug abuse violations, assault, and fraud--all of which have an impact on jail populations. Patterns of arrest may or may not reflect underlying rates of criminal activity, but they do make clear that there is a downturn in some, but not all, kinds of crime.
- Jail admissions were up 59.5% since 1988. However, better data on jail admissions are needed.
- The mean sentence lengths for felons entering local jails declined, but the length of stay increased.
- Increasing numbers of offenders on community supervision were returned to jail in 1999.
- Increasing numbers of inmates were being held in jail for federal and state authorities.
- The largest growth in jail inmate populations was linked to violent offenders.
- Black males were 2 1/2 times more likely than Hispanic males and almost 6 times more likely than white males to be in jail in 2000.

BJS Reports on Jails and Jail Inmates

BJS publishes both annual and periodic reports on jails and jail inmates. Recent annual reports have been:

- Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2000
- Jails in Indian Country, 2000

- HIV in Prison and Jails, 1999

Following are the titles of recent periodic reports on jails and jail inmates published by BJS:

- Census of Jails, 1999
- Profile of Jail Inmates, 1996
- DWI Offenders under Correctional Supervision
- Mental Health and Treatment of Inmates and Probationers
- Incarcerated Parents and their Children
- Veterans in Prison or Jail

Survey of Inmates, 2001

The Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 2001, will be conducted from September through November of this year. The survey, a national probability sample of 7,600 inmates in 462 jails, consists of 60-minute interviews conducted by Census Bureau staff. This year's survey will include improved measures of drug and alcohol abuse and dependence and improved measures of mental disorders.

Improvements in Jail Data Collection

BJS is committed to getting better and more comprehensive data on jails. Such data are useful for operational purposes, so it is important for them to be accurate and to express what is specifically relevant to jails.

BJS' correctional data systems are much better at the state than the local level. There are only 51 state-level jurisdictions, so the collection effort is not as complex. National statistics are more highly developed at the state level, which in part reflects logistics and in part reporting. Large jails are also very different from small jails.

Jail administrators can have an impact on how they are perceived by the public and policymakers by helping design the data elements that will be used. There is an enormous stake in having the business of jails portrayed accurately. BJS is interested in reaching out and developing an ongoing mechanism for getting input from large jail administrators.

It would be most useful to have a subcommittee of people involved in the Large Jail Network who have a real interest in this issue. That group could pursue ideas and propose possibilities for the future direction of BJS data collection efforts.

Deficiencies in Current National Jail Statistics

- A one-day count or average daily population does not capture the full jail workload. These counts are also poor measures for calculating rates, e.g., inmate deaths as a percentage of inmate populations.
- Better data are needed on jail admissions and releases, which are more sensitive than average daily populations to changes in criminal behavior, law enforcement, and sentencing. Length of stay needs to be based on intake rather than a single day's count.
- The consequences of jail operations on the criminal justice system are not fully captured in current statistics. The large volume of people moving through jails provides an opportunity to address public health issues. The Centers for Disease Control is interested in capturing information from jails on public health problems.
- The current system results in missed opportunities for policy development and funding. It is possible to identify a variety of trends by looking at jail populations, which are more dynamic than prison populations.

New Data Collection

BJS proposes an addendum to the Annual Survey of Jails, but field collection will depend on the complexities involved in development and on OMB approval. The focus of the addendum is to send out separate items to the largest jails, which have the greatest opportunity to benefit from additional data and the smallest burden in providing it. BJS plans to focus in the first year on the largest 100 jails. Possible items to be included in the addendum are:

- Admissions counts by month
- Number of persons vs. admissions
- Level of offense/charge (June)
- Probation/parole violators (June)
- Split sentences imposed by court (June)
- Offense type (June)
- Other workload measures (e.g., holds for other authorities; medical exams; psychiatric; detox; drug tests; risk/needs assessments; treatment services)
- Release counts by length of stay by conviction status (grouped data in June)

- Method of release for convicted and pre-trial offenders (i.e., expiration; to probation/parole; warrant/detainer; appeal; transfer)

Additional Discussion

BJS is committed to working with NIC to improve the collection of relevant information on jails. Because BJS has to set priorities for its budget and work effort, it would help to have specific support from large jail administrators for collecting data on admissions and releases. If there is a real interest in collecting such data, BJS will move ahead quickly to make it happen.

Information represents power. It sets the tone and direction of discussion and it influences policy. Having information available can influence the policy agenda, while, in the absence of appropriate information, you are at a disadvantage. Large jail administrations can have a real impact on what gets discussed.

Richard Geaither asked meeting participants to turn in their names to him if they wished to participate in a possible subcommittee to address jail data. The proposed group may meet in person as a focus group or may be asked to do individual reviews of draft materials developed by BJS. Recommendations for the potential group's involvement will be worked out in the near future.

For additional information, contact Allen J. Beck, Ph.D., Chief, Corrections Statistics; U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics; 810 Seventh St., NW; Washington, DC 20531; (202) 616-3277; becka@ojp.usdoj.gov

PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG EMPLOYEES

WILLIAM MONTAGUE, SHELBY COUNTY (TENNESSEE) DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS

In the past, jail administrators did not have to cajole people to do what they should in terms of personal relationships. However, it is now important to address the issue of personal relationships among employees in order to eliminate hostilities, build teamwork, and simply to administer a jail effectively. Following are some perspectives and practices that can successfully address this issue:

- **Management by Walking Around.** Starting from the top of our organization, all managers are required to do daily walking tours. As there are 18 buildings spread over a large area, it is impossible to get to them all every day. However, it is very important to let people know that you are around and have a hand on the operations. Touring the facility enables you to find out what is happening and to deal with a variety of issues. The practice can also lower tensions and provide direct feedback to staff. Small problems that might mushroom into large ones can be eliminated; rumors can be controlled and eliminated.
- **A Standards of Conduct Policy.** Most law enforcement and corrections agencies have certain expectations and codes of conduct by which their employees are expected to abide. Shelby County is currently revising its Standards of Conduct Policy. In developing such a policy, agencies can get copies ethics codes as models from professional associations. Supervisory and non-supervisory staff should be in mixed classes to eliminate "bashing" from either side. Violations should carry the same sanctions for supervisors and for line staff in order to ensure a sense of fairness and integrity. Once a policy is written and critiqued, it should not be established as practice until everyone has been trained and tested and their scores documented. Montague personally teaches "Standards of Conduct" in Shelby County's in-service class for all staff.
- **Employee Recognition and Corrective-Progressive Discipline.** When employees contribute to the organization, they need to be recognized immediately. They also need to be disciplined quickly, but all disciplinary measures need to stress that the actions--whether letters of warning, oral reprimands, written reprimands, suspensions, even terminations--are designed to be corrective measures. If you discipline incorrectly, the action taken loses its effectiveness.
- **Ownership.** If your staff members believe that what they are doing has a real impact, they contribute more actively. Tie the sense of real contribution, of ownership, into unit management or direct supervision.

- **Interdependence Building.** We need to create a sense of mutual respect and understanding among staff. We sometimes allow people to feel that they are not as important as others, and we need to correct this tendency.
- **Follow up and Feedback.** Good communication is crucial. Get back quickly to someone who comes to you with a problem or question.
- **Wise Approach to Filling Vacancies.** Be careful when you recruit. Don't be in such a desperate hurry that you begin to think that anyone will do.
- **Important Events.** Give your staff an important event to anticipate. For example, if you have a planned visit from community leaders, your employees are likely to come together with a sense of pride.

For additional information, contact William Montague, Administrator of Operations, Shelby County Division of Corrections; 1045 Mullins Station Road; Memphis, TN 38134; (901) 385-5120; Montag-b@co.shelby.tn.us

A copy of a work sheet to help administrators gauge the climate of their institution in terms of personal relationships between employees is available from the NIC Information Center.

DONALD MCWILLIAMS, HARRIS COUNTY (HOUSTON, TEXAS) SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT

There are 3600 people in the Harris County Sheriff's Department. Being a microcosm of the world, our department's employees often develop relationships that cause problems. There have been some very serious problems related to relationships among employees. For example, some staff who have been in relationships with other staff have also been involved in domestic violence incidents.

Destructive relationships among staff are not necessarily romantic relationships. In one instance, two staff friends who were not romantically involved got in an argument over a football game, and one of them shot the other.

Our Reluctance to Intervene

In all situations involving staff relationships, some supervisor probably knew something was seriously wrong long before it culminated in tragic circumstances. One reason the supervisor took no steps to intervene is that we do not like to deal with the sloppy details of other people's lives. This is not responsible behavior on our part, however. As managers of organizations that get sued about once a day, we should be concerned about relationships between employees because they can have legal consequences.

Although most of our agencies have an Employee Assistance Program, these programs do not eliminate our responsibility. The problem is that we as managers do not know where the line lies between concern about employees' relationships and meddling or gossip mongering. I would like to provoke some discussion of this issue. If any of you have tackled this problem successfully, I would like to hear about it.

For additional information, contact Major Dan McWilliams, Harris County Sheriff's Department; 1301 Franklin St.; Houston, TX 77002; (713) 755-7260;DMcwilliams@itc.co.harris.tx.us

Roundtable Discussion

Meeting participants suggested the following approaches for responding to personal relationships among staff:

- Policies and procedures should cover such relationships, but they usually do not. The close proximity in which people in law enforcement work makes it difficult to control relationships among staff. It helps if the administrator speaks strongly against such relationships.
- A values-centered organization is the key to dealing with employee relationships. Administrators must have a strong personal value system, and one value must be a commitment to staff. Many supervisors feel

uncomfortable dealing with human relations, so they need someone they can turn to for help in this regard. We need to recognize that dealing with staff relationships is an important role for administrators.

- Santa Clara County has a workplace violence protocol that starts with a recognition of symptoms of problems. Avoiding violence should be an important aspect of training first line supervisors. They need to know that they must intercede before violence occurs.
- A positive jail climate results from strong leadership. It is important to get a sense of the mood of the organization and the relationships among staff and to send the message that administrators care about staff.
- It is impossible to stop employees from having personal relationships with others on staff. It is important, however, to take a very strong stance on sexual harassment. We must make sure that staff understand the difference between harassment and a consensual relationship.
- Respect is the central issue. Those who respect each other do not create problems. Problems emerge when people think that they "own" each other. Mutual respect is the key, and no rule can cover that.
- There is a constant sense of frustration among administrators about this issue, in part because we see a distinction between ourselves and a new generation that doesn't seem to have a good understanding of boundaries. We are looking for a context in which to view their behavior and for an understanding of what to do about it. Training on this issue often focuses on legal responses, but this is not the core of the issue.
- Town hall meetings can help inform employees about the values of the organization.
- Administrators can create an appropriate culture by doing consistent training and holding supervisors accountable. If there is foul language in the workplace or dating among staff, it is the responsibility of the supervisor to safeguard the workplace. Our message can be: if you intend to go beyond a work relationship with another staff member, you must declare your intention to me.
- Supervisors must be conscious of what is going on and should use mediation skills in difficult staff situations.
- Values are established from the top down. What we do as administrators sets the tone for the whole organization, and we must hold ourselves accountable. Values are critical in getting the appropriate message to staff. Managing by

walking around is clearly important.

STAFF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT WITH INMATES

ALBERT GARDNER, RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Background

Until the early 1970s, all female offenders from Rhode Island were housed in Massachusetts. Because of a lawsuit in the '70s, they were returned to the Rhode Island Department of Corrections, which now holds more than 300 female inmates.

The original staff for female housing units included only female officers and supervisors, but a female lieutenant successfully filed suit to be considered for a captain's position at a male maximum security facility. That was the beginning of cross-gender supervision.

Rumors soon began to surface of sexual misconduct, but as there were no specific complaints, administrators tended to ignore them. As a result, the problem got more serious. At its lowest point, a female probationary officer saw a male officer having sex on the floor with a female inmate. The warden suggested that she forget what she saw. When the head of a new internal affairs unit called her in, she denied having seen anything. The incident came to light about eight years later when the same male officer was discovered engaging in the same activity and was terminated from employment. At that point, the now-veteran female officer went to internal affairs, told of the warden's intervention, and said that she had lied. The warden had by that time left the facility. This episode finally prompted a real investigation into sexual misconduct at the female facility.

The Current Picture

The Rhode Island Department of Corrections (DOC) finally became serious about staff sexual misconduct. Passed with the support of the union and administration, new legislation in the state made sexual conduct between correctional employees and inmates a felony punishable by five years of incarceration.

In the past four years, there have been 25 complaints of staff sexual misconduct. Of the 25 complaints, three were determined to be unfounded; 20 resulted in the resignation or termination of staff; and two resulted in felony convictions for staff members.

Policies are important, whether they address sexual misconduct specifically or only generally. However, specific language defining inappropriate acts makes it easier to prosecute and design administrative remedies. It is important to remember that the problem is not limited to line staff or uniformed staff but can permeate the whole organization. Policies should address the entire staff.

Information about sexual misconduct comes from many sources. The inmate involved sometimes comes forward. Other inmates are also sources of information, sometimes because they believe they will get special consideration for bringing it to the notice of administrators. The spouse or significant other sometimes reports sexual misconduct. Other staff also report sexual misconduct, sometimes anonymously and after much soul-searching.

Remedies

Mechanisms for dealing with sexual misconduct should include:

- *Reporting mechanisms.* Although our agencies all have grievance processes, most inmates won't use these grievance processes to report sexual misconduct because they lack confidentiality. Rhode Island has instituted a hot line number directly to Internal Affairs.
- *A strong Internal Affairs unit.* There have been few false reports to our Internal Affairs unit because the unit investigates all reports very thoroughly. They move forward only after being sure that a complaint is well founded. This approach goes a long way to protect the innocent, among both the inmates and officers.
- *A separate prosecutorial function.* Internal Affairs officers should not be prosecutors. We bring in the state police early in an investigation if we plan to prosecute a staff member. Two state police detectives are assigned to the Department of Corrections and have offices in the prison complex. These police officers clearly understand that staff sexual misconduct is unacceptable.

Checklist for Staff

The Rhode Island DOC has developed the following staff checklist of questions related to potential sexual misconduct:

1. Do you look forward to seeing a particular inmate when you come to work?
2. Have you done anything with an inmate you wouldn't want your family or supervisor to know about?
3. Would you be reluctant to have a co-worker observe your behavior for a whole day?
4. Do you talk about personal matters with inmates?
5. Do you believe you can ask an inmate to do personal favors for you?

6. Have you ever received personal advice from an inmate?
7. Have you ever said anything to an inmate that you would not want tape-recorded?
8. Do you have thoughts or fantasies of touching a particular inmate? Does this extend into planning how you can be alone with the inmate?
9. Do you think you have the right to touch an inmate wherever and whenever you want to?
10. Do you have a feeling of not being able to wait to share good/bad news with a particular inmate?
11. Do you think inmates are not allowed to say no to you, no matter what you ask?
12. Have you ever allowed inmates to talk about past sexual experience or sexual fantasies or tell sexual jokes in your presence?

If you answered yes to one or more of these questions, you are at risk for developing an inappropriate relationship with an inmate. You should discuss the issue with a supervisor as soon as possible. Do not risk your career.

Warning Signs for Supervisors

The following signs may help warn supervisors that a staff person is at risk for or is involved in sexual misconduct:

- Staff a loner, disconnected from peers;
- Depression and low self-esteem;
- Marriage, personal, or financial problems;
- Change in dress or behavior;
- Unusual volunteering for assignments to special area;
- Staying late and coming in early;
- Often seen with the same inmate;
- Halo effect surrounding an inmate;
- Increased sensitivity to inmate issues;
- Regarding inmate as "my employee";

- Finding "common ground" with inmate;
- Being emotionally understood by inmate.

For additional information, contact Albert Gardner; Assistant Director, Rhode Island Department of Corrections; 40 Howard Avenue; Cranston, RI 02920; (401) 462-5163; agardner@doc.state.ri.us

Roundtable Discussion

Meeting participants made the following observations:

- It is important to walk through your facility with an eye toward what can get you in trouble.
- If an employee has already been disciplined for minor sexual harassment, administrators might want to consider assigning the person only to same-sex facilities. Those who have previously exhibited inappropriate behavior seem more likely to be involved in sexual misconduct.
- Unions are also concerned about this issue, and they can be supportive of administrators' efforts to address it.
- NIC has an active interest in this area, according to Richard Geather. Technical assistance and training are available. The U.S. Division of Civil Rights and Amnesty International are also very interested in the issue of sexual misconduct and are now looking actively at jails. NIC has a variety of resources to support corrections organizations; those currently involved in providing NIC training on the topic of sexual misconduct are former members of the Large Jail Network.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Meeting participants had an opportunity on Tuesday morning to raise any additional issues of concern or to make an announcement. Following is a summary of these announcements.

David Parrish, Hillsborough County, Florida

- **AJA Statement on Positional Asphyxia.** Steve Engley, Executive Director of the American Jails Association, put together a group representing all the professional associations to develop this statement on positional asphyxia. Although most problems seem to occur in the back of patrol cars, positional asphyxia can happen in jails as well. It is important for all of us to have a strong policy on this issue.
- **Adult Local Detention Standards.** A committee is working to revise the ACA standards. It will be a year before the revised standards are completed. They will then go before the Standards Committee and then be sent for field testing.
- **Health Care Standards.** The ACA health care standards, which were actually drafted for prisons, are also being revised for jails. ACA has a new rule that says if either ACA or the National Commission on Correctional Health Care already accredits an institution, it will be accepted as meeting ACA medical standards. However, an institution newly seeking accreditation must meet both sets of standards.

John Dantis, Bernalillo County, New Mexico

- **Legislative support for jail officers.** At the last meeting, participants spoke about making an effort to develop legislation similar to the COPS program but focused on jail officers. Dantis would like to spend some time during the next Large Jail Network meeting to work on strategies for advancing legislation for a national correctional officer program. If jails are to get national recognition, they need to be treated equally with fire and police agencies.

EMPLOYEES WITH MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS

DAVID S. OWENS, CAMDEN COUNTY (NEW JERSEY) CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

When I first worked in a cellblock, there were one or two inmates with mental health problems, which we were all aware of. Years later, during a strike, I went back to a cellblock as a Captain and was shocked at the large number of inmates with severe mental health problems. Concerned about this, I asked our psychologist to do a study of every admission. The study, which did intensive psychological screenings of every new inmate, found that 17-20% of inmates belonged in a mental health institution, and another 15-17% were questionable. These results enabled us to argue for additional mental health resources.

A number of incidents convinced Camden County that both inmates and staff needed better mental health services. These incidents included:

- An officer with sterling record went home one day and killed his wife.
- The Deputy Warden of an institution was killed by an inmate group, and the officer who had let them into the Warden's office developed serious emotional problems.
- About five years ago, I was sued on the basis of a hostile work environment, which an officer charged was the reason for his breakdown. His suit did not meet the legal standard, but we wondered as a group what we could have done to prevent his emotional collapse.
- A teacher in our system was involved in a hostage situation. The teacher came back to work the next day, insisting that he was all right. He came back too soon, though, and subsequently had a breakdown.

Dealing with Employees with Mental Health Problems

The high stress level in our institutions creates pressure on both inmates and staff. As administrators we need to be involved in making sure that employees receive mental health assistance when they need it. We have a lot invested in our employees. For example, for a new hire, we have paid for recruitment, training, background checks, medical tests, and psychological evaluations, a total of as much as \$100,000 to get a new employee through their first year. In addition, we are in the people business. To the extent that we can help a staff person, the result is a better employee.

Following are some recommendations for dealing with mental health problems of

staff:

1. Read the psychological evaluations of staff because they often indicate potential psychological problems.
2. Create a policy of mandatory time off for certain situations.
3. Do a better job of training supervisors to deal with a new generation of staff.
4. Pay attention to employees and indicate a concern for them.
5. Document problems. If you send an employee to a psychologist, explain in writing what the problem is and why it concerns you.
6. Discuss troubled individuals with the management team and talk about how to intervene productively.
7. Identify someone to counsel the individual. Although some supervisors have good counseling skills, others do not.
8. Make the employee aware of services available to him/her through the benefit package.
9. While an employee is on leave, assign someone to stay in touch with him/her.
10. When you send a person back to work, be sure you are aware of what the psychologist has said.
11. Establish a reentry strategy for an employee returning to work.
12. Be sure your psychologist understands the jail environment.

For additional information, contact David S. Owens, Jr., Warden, Camden County Correctional Facility; 330 Federal Street; Camden, NJ 08103; (856) 225-7632; dowens@co.camden.nj.us

UTILIZING STAFF EFFECTIVELY: MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES

RALPH GREEN, HUDSON COUNTY (NEW JERSEY) CORRECTIONS CENTER

Previous Management Structure

Hudson County previously had a centralized form of supervision in which the tour commander had absolute control. We realized that the structure was not effective in administering a large jail, but it has been difficult to take power away from supervisors and give it to others.

Black supervisors recently sued me in Federal court for discrimination, and white supervisors charged me with reverse discrimination. It became apparent during cross-examination that black supervisors tended to know only about black officers, and white supervisors knew only about white officers. In other instances, an employee committed suicide, and although a supervisor knew the employee was having problems, a racial difference kept the supervisor from telling the administrator. It was clear that Hudson County needed to make some serious changes.

Advantages of Unit Management

We are now changing our philosophy related to supervision, by moving to the Unit Management concept. However, older supervisors and administrators are reluctant to change. Hudson County's facility is highly unionized; "quality of life" is not an accepted vision. Regardless of union acceptance, though, there is nevertheless a strong commitment to decentralizing supervision.

Those of us who have worked in small jails may not realize that our previous management styles and structures will not work in a large jail. I recommend that you look at your organization chart and move to a decentralized supervision structure if you are not already using one. Unit management gives a manager the opportunity to know the people under them and to understand their situations. We have an obligation to deal with staff as individuals. Decentralized supervision is the only approach that will work in a large facility or jail system.

For additional information, contact Ralph Green, Director, Hudson County Corrections Center; 35 Hackensack Avenue; Kearny, NJ 07032; (201) 558-7000; Rapgreen@aol.com

UTILIZING STAFF EFFECTIVELY: PROMOTING WORKING RELATIONSHIPS AND AVOIDING BARRIERS THAT HINDER TEAMWORK

MICHAEL COSTA, SONOMA COUNTY (CALIFORNIA) SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Fostering Good Supervisor-Subordinate Relationships

Although law enforcement and corrections agencies are paramilitary organizations, they are not the military, especially because relationships between supervisors and subordinates are very different. To benefit our organizations, we must develop close working relationships that create effective teams.

It is important to sit down with both our boss and our subordinates to discover each other's expectations, goals, and objectives. Following are some recommendations for fostering good relationships with both your supervisor and your subordinates.

A) Know Your Supervisor

1. Goals and Objectives--It is important to understand your supervisor's overall goals and objectives.
2. Pressures--A sheriff lives in a pressure-packed world. The entire community and the organization are pulling at him. At the same time, he must cope with budget limitations.
3. Strengths and Weaknesses--A sheriff may, for example, be a good politician but may not know very much about law enforcement or corrections.
4. Preferred Work Style--Is your boss formal and organized or informal and intuitive?

B) Know Yourself

1. Your Strengths and Weaknesses--It is sometimes hard to step back and look at ourselves. It may help to sit down with a subordinate and ask how we are doing.
2. Your Personal Style--We all have different learning styles. For example, some people, including myself, work visually; we must *see* the picture.
3. Your Dependence on Authority--Our dependence on the boss varies,

but we must always know the limits of our authority. There is always a mutual dependency at work, which we must understand.

C) Developing and Managing the Relationship

1. Compatible Work Styles--Peter Drucker says that there are "listener" and "reader" types. A listener wants documentation to follow a discussion. A reader wants all documentation ahead of any discussion of an issue.
2. Mutual Expectations--We must understand specifically what we expect of one another.
3. Flow of Information--How does information move from one to another? Will we use technology to communicate? How does the boss want to learn about things? What pieces of information are crucial? Sending an email is likely to be the best way to get a response.
4. Dependability and Honesty--We must be honest with both our boss and our subordinates. It may take courage to do so, but if we are not honest, it will hinder our performance. It is also important to keep disagreements with our boss strictly between us.
5. Good Use of Time and Resources--Time is valuable. We need to let subordinates know how much we want to know.

Command Philosophy

Laying out a specific command philosophy enables all employees to understand our values and expectations. Everyone needs to know where the administrator stands, what he/she believes.

We have a responsibility to mentor our staff. Laying out expectations can create strong teamwork. Be totally honest with your subordinates and your boss. Integrity should be the highest value in the organization.

For additional information, contact Michael M. Costa, Assistant Sheriff, Sonoma County Sheriff's Office; 2777 Ventura Avenue; Santa Rosa, CA 95403; (707) 565-1422; Mcosta@sonoma-county.org

UTILIZING STAFF EFFECTIVELY: LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE

KENNETH RAY, YAKIMA COUNTY (WASHINGTON) DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

Level of Importance Survey

Yakima County agencies recently developed a set of county-wide leadership standards. Based on those standards, the Department of Correction created a survey designed to evaluate the performance of current leaders and help future leaders understand expectations. The department surveyed 187 staff in all areas and at all levels.

The survey asked respondents to put themselves in the position of a recipient of leadership and to rate a series of performance statements on a scale of 0=not important to 3=extremely important. Survey participants scored the performance statements under seven overall areas of performance established by the county. The performance areas were as follows:

- I. Integrity
- II. Basic Job Proficiency
- IIIA. Communications-Personal/Interpersonal
- IIIB. Communications-Conflict Management
- IVA. Resource Management-General
- IVB. Resource Management-Productivity/Self-Management
- V. Teamwork
- VI. Customer Satisfaction
- VII. Accountability

Results

By looking at traits that got a score of 85% or better, it was possible to identify what qualities employees value most highly in their leaders. The traits that received high scores, indicating that respondents placed a high value on them, included:

- Under **Integrity**:

- * "Decisions are based on sound principles of honesty, forthrightness, and openness."
- * "Issues are dealt with in a straightforward manner."
- **Under Basic Job Proficiency:**
 - * "Demonstrates on a daily basis the knowledge, skills, abilities and willingness to do the essential functions of the job properly and responsibly."
 - * "Adheres to, and holds others to, County and Department Policy and Procedure, applicable laws, regulations, rules, contracts."
 - * "Is reliable and punctual."
 - * "Sets an example for subordinates, to other leaders, and others."
- **Under Communications-Personal/Interpersonal:**
 - * "Openness - shares appropriate knowledge and information with others; easily approachable; honors confidentiality; practices direct communication."
 - * "Listening - gives uninterrupted time to hear others; questions or paraphrases to gain clarity."
 - * "Responsiveness - accepts and follows through on assignments in a timely manner; provides requested support and guidance."
- **Under Communications-Conflict Management:**
 - * "Models conflict management skills for subordinates and peers; remains calm in stressful situations."
- **Under Resource Management-Organizational Management:**
 - * "Inspires confidence and communicates clear goals, direction, standards, and deadlines."
- **Under Teamwork:**
 - * "Contributing to a positive work environment."
 - * "Builds rapport and gains respect through appropriate actions, comments,

and execution of plans."

- **Under Accountability:**
 - * "Understands and follows County and Department policies, procedures, and governing regulations."
 - * "Honors commitments."
 - * "Follows through on agreements."
 - * "Demonstrates ethical business standards."
 - * "Maintains an awareness of consequences of actions and decisions."

Comparisons of Responses of Leaders and Non-Leaders

A comparison of the responses of current leaders and non-leaders to the survey suggested some areas that needed to be discussed. For example, leaders tended to value integrity, basic job proficiency, customer satisfaction, and communication skills somewhat more highly than non-leaders did.

The Department of Corrections has used the survey results in its Leadership Academy. The document has also been used at meetings every month for the last year to help everyone understand the organization and to discuss the traits that would make everyone a better leader. The survey and follow-up discussions have helped subordinates feel that they are part of a well-led organization.

For additional information or a copy of the survey instrument, contact Kenneth A. Ray, Director, Yakima County Department of Correction; 111 N. Front Street; Yakima, WA 98901; (509) 574-1704; kenray@co.yakima.wa.us

Richard Geaither provided information as a follow-up to issues raised during earlier portions of the meeting:

- *Staff Sexual Misconduct*—NIC can provide staff training on sexual misconduct. The Washington Jail Association will address this topic at its next meeting.
- *Directors of Professional Associations*—Richard will initiate a standing invitation for the Executive Directors of the American Correctional Association, American Jail Association, National Sheriff's Association, and the National Association of Counties to attend future meetings of the Large Jail Network.
- *Work Group on BJS Jail Data*—Eight persons have indicated an interest in serving on a possible work group on jail data. Following publication of the meeting's Proceedings, those who did not attend the meeting may also express an interest in serving. The potential role of the recommended work group will be discussed over the next several months.
- *New Members of the Large Jail Network*—The Network looks very different than it did several years ago because there are many new members. Richard noted that because of this, the group might need to make some changes in its meetings. An example is the change in Sunday night's opening session for this meeting. Richard plans to ask members for help in defining a vision statement for the Network and in planning for future meetings.
- *Large Jail Network News Brief*—Richard asked meeting participants to read the News Brief announcement related to "Identifying New Jail Planning, Design, Construction and Transition Issues in Urban Counties." He noted that he will be contacting Large Jail Network members over the next few months for assistance on this initiative.

TOPICS FOR THE NEXT MEETING

The following topics were proposed for consideration for the next Large Jail Network Meeting, which will be held January 6-8, 2002:

- Racial profiling in jails
- The aging inmate population
- Female inmates

- Innovative strategies for dealing with special needs inmates
- Inmate suicides
- A discussion of the COPS program and a work session developing support for legislative funding for a similar program for corrections officers
- Role of large jails in civil unrest in big cities
- Presentations by the National Association of Counties and/or the National League of Cities
- Families of inmates and community involvement
- Future visions; what will corrections be like?
- Legal update
- Technology innovations for offender management and community custody

The group agreed that the overall theme for the next meeting should be "The Future." A futurist will be invited for Sunday night to provide a framework for the discussion, which will focus all day Monday on aging prisoners, females, special needs inmates, and technology. There will be a half-day session on legal issues on Tuesday morning.

APPENDIX 1

MEETING AGENDA

APPENDIX 2

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX 3

CENSUS OF JAILS, 1999

APPENDIX 4

**NATIONAL JAIL STATISTICS: RECENT FINDINGS AND NEW DATA
COLLECTIONS**

