



U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
I

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST ANNUAL

SYMPOSIUM ON

DIRECT SUPERVISION JAILS

MAY 1, 1986

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST ANNUAL

SYMPOSIUM

DIRECT SUPERVISION JAILS

MAY 1, 1986

PRINTED SEPTEMBER, 1986

National Institute of Corrections
Jail Center
Boulder, Colorado

Proceedings of the
First Annual Symposium on

**New
Generation
Jails**

Edited by: Jay Farbstein and Richard Wener

Held: May 1, 1986

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Panel Summaries	2
Papers	
Stephen Carter: A e-Assessment of the Direct Supervision Management and Design Concept	8
Richard Van den Heuval: The Training Needs of Mid-level Managers in Direct Supervision Jails	11
W. Raymond Nelson: Can Cost Savings Be Achieved By Designing Jails for Direct Supervision Inmate Management?	13
Kevin Gilmartin and Russell Davis The Correctional Office Stockholm Syndrome: Management Implications	21
Linda Zupan, Ben Menke and Nicholas Lovrich: Podular/Direct Supervision Detention Facilities: Challenges for Human Resource Development	29
Attachments	
Symposium Program	
List of Contacts	

INTRODUCTION

NIC's Role in Sponsoring the Symposium

The concept of new generation - or direct supervision - jails is one of the major emphasis areas for the National Institute of Corrections. In past years, the Institute has supported and coordinated the development of new generation jails, but in a more or less *ad hoc* fashion. More recently, the Institute has been considering modification of its approach in a number of ways which may include more directed funding, dedicated staffing, tracking of facilities, and establishing a network of individuals and agencies concerned with new generation jails.

One concrete step forward has been the sponsorship of a one day symposium on new generation jails. This was held on May 1, 1986, immediately following the American Jail Association Conference in Seattle, Washington. An effort was made to identify and invite as many as possible of the jail systems which are now operating or are planning new generation jails. In the event, the symposium was attended by 37 individuals, representing 29 jail systems or other organizations.

Symposium Format

The symposium was organized around topics suggested by the participants. Four panels offered the opportunity for presentations and discussions about:

- design of new generation jails
- transition to new generation operation
- costs and benefits of direct supervision
- operation of direct new generation jails

Each of these panels is summarized in the following pages together with the papers which were presented. In addition, the symposium program and a list of contacts are included in the attachments.

Symposium Evaluation and Future Meetings

The symposium was felt by participants to be an exciting and successful event. It was thought to be the first time that so many systems which are committed to direct supervision were assembled together. Since there was no need to explain or attempt to convince people unfamiliar with or unconvinced about the concepts, the atmosphere was somewhat more open and a spirit of shared experience prevailed.

Sixteen participants completed an evaluation form on the symposium. There was a high degree of agreement that the panels were "good" to "excellent". One area of improvement was in giving more advance notice, especially for panelists. Almost all participants felt that the next symposium should be held in conjunction with next year's AJA conference.

It is the intention and hope of NIC that this symposium be held each year. NIC hopes that future symposiums will further explore evolving issues and that participants will form a network of information and support. This is especially important, since NIC's resources for training, technical assistance, and travel appear to be increasingly limited. Therefore, if you are interested in receiving information about future symposiums, please contact:

National Institute of Corrections - Jail Center
1790 30th Street, Suite 440
Boulder, Colorado 80301
Telephone: (303) 497-6700

Panel 1: ROUNDTABLE ON DESIGN OF NEW GENERATION JAILS

Moderator: Jay Farbstein

Panelists: Jay Smith, Steve Caner, Virginia Yang, John Kibre

The Role of the Architect/Planner in the Decision to Use Direct Supervision

Lip service is often paid by the architect about serving the client by providing whatever the client says he or she wants. But, what is the *real* relationship between the architect and client? Does the architect ever suggest the idea of direct supervision to the jail system: or probe and test whether that is the way they really **want** to go? How is the suggestion or probe received? Should the architect *advocate* one management approach over another?

Steve Carter described his planner role as being a conduit between design professionals and policy makers. He said that architects have broadened their services for marketing purposes: and as a result tend to be timid and non-committal in recommending direct or indirect supervision approaches. The client, however, deserves to know where the architect stands on the issue. Caner noted that there is a tendency for architects to “backslide” away from the commitment to direct supervision as projects progress. Architects tend to make decisions in the direction toward a harder environment, one that can be easily adapted to indirect supervision just in case the next administrator is not committed to the concept of direct supervision. This, Carter said, produces an architecture that “has no backbone or commitment to the concept.” To correct this situation, Carter said that policy ought to lead the design profession in decision-making rather than the other way around. In addition, better education of clients and architects through PONI type programs is necessary to help them develop a stronger commitment to direct supervision.

Jay. Smith stated that it is appropriate for architects to expose clients to different possibilities so they can get the most out of their project. He related his experiences in the design of two facilities. In the case of Ventura County, he advocated a more “modem” (though not direct supervision) approach than the clients envisioned. For Santa Clara County, he made **an** effort to expose the client to the direct supervision approach as a more effective way to operate and manage a jail. The programmer for the project had no commitment to direct supervision, advocating a more flexible - more “safe” - approach. Smith advocated the “unsafe” approach. He created an “armchair tour” with slides to show the client what could be done. The “tour was well received. Smith cautioned, however, that the architect doesn’t have to live with the facility. The success of direct supervision depends upon the support and commitment of the owner. The architect, therefore, must design jails that people are prepared to operate.

Much of the audience comment centered on the issue of flexibility. It was said that the ability of a facility to accommodate both kinds of supervision is advantageous in case direct supervision fails or the political climate changes. The point was asserted, however, that flexibility adds an unnecessary cost akin to “wearing a belt and suspenders.” In addition, it was argued that if a control booth is used. it will subvert the direct supervision concept despite management policy.

The audience also commented that architects should not tell owners how to manage, but should expose them to choices. In the end, the owner must make the decisions.

Is Visual Surveillance Needed in Direct Supervision Jails?

Great attention is paid to developing plans which allow all pans of an indirectly supervised housing unit to be seen from its control booth. What about direct supervision? Is single-point observation capability necessary?

John Kibre discussed how the issue of surveillance was addressed in the design of the Contra Costa jail. The goals of the design were to achieve good surveillance capability, break up the population into smaller groups, and encourage staff officers to move around to create more contact between officers and inmates. Kibre explained the trade-offs made to achieve these goals. Surveillance is not achieved by 100% visibility from the staff station, but by the officers' "awareness" of what is going on. Officers rove rather than remain in a fixed position. This approach was compared to a Santa Clara facility which has 100% visibility, does not split up inmates, and has a fixed post staff station. In addition to these physical differences, the facilities differ in management style. Kibre reported that the amount of visibility provided at Contra Costa is enough to make the unit work very well; no problems have surfaced there.

Virginia Yang explained how the issue of surveillance was addressed at a Sonoma facility. The degree of emphasis on surveillance, she said, varies from client to client depending on how they want to run the facility. She described one facility where the priority was not on 100% surveillance, but on achieving an outdoor recreational area adjacent to the unit. She described another in which a half circle design provides complete visibility. For the Sonoma facility, the sheriff's department decided on a direct supervision approach, and were initially convinced that they needed a direct line of sight. The first design, which was crowded onto a very small site, had long rectangular units without columns and nooks and crannies. The design, although 100% visible, reminded the client of a linear jail. Despite the clear line of sight, it was difficult to see what was happening at the opposite end from the entrance area. At the same time, the sheriff's department began to re-examine its criteria for direct supervision and eventually dropped the site constraint and the requirement of needing to see every single corner of the living unit. The new design is similar to the approach used at Contra Costa. Surveillance is achieved by using all the **senses** of officers - including their "6th sense." Eventually, more members of the sheriff's department became committed to direct supervision and provided a great deal of input into the design.

Officer Stations **Versus** Control Booths

We can find examples of new generation jails with officer stations in the unit and others which have control booths, either as back-up (e.g., for the night shift) or for periodic use during all shifts. Some jurisdictions have "inherited" booths by virtue of changing to direct supervision after construction. Other jurisdictions have consciously chosen (as some architects recommend) to include the booths to provide "flexibility" in case management approaches change. It can also be argued that provision of booths too easily allows the system to abandon direct supervision at will. Which is the right way to go?

Jay Smith said that the basic concept of the control booth is a hangover from a "retreat" concept. He questioned whether everyday operations ought to be dominated by a design for emergencies only. He cited an alternative approach at Santa Clara County which provides convertability. The basic configuration is provided so that the station can be converted to "0" modules if necessary.

Steve **Carter** said that good planning involves exploring future scenarios. It is only by considering what future needs will be that decisions about design can be made, rather than deciding immediately on a flexible solution. He pointed out that there are a lot of up front costs to providing flexibility.

Audience members debated whether facility design or management has more to do with how much staff will interact with inmates. It was argued that the success of direct supervision depends upon training and management. If staff are expected to spend their time out of the booth, then they will do so. Others argued, however, that design has a major effect on what one is capable of managing. For example, at the Tombs, guards get stuck in the staff station just pushing buttons. The control station communicates to the officers that anything outside the booth is a high risk for them. In addition, a control booth is an invitation not to interact. Finally, it was pointed out that direct supervision concepts and principles can be effective in a variety of settings. The architecture does not prohibit implementation, but the issue is how design can help the approach. Good training and management have made direct supervision work in far from ideal settings, but it is preferable to have a design that does more than merely accommodate it. Comments were also made about the need to change state standards that require control booths.

PANEL 2: TRANSITION TO DIRECT SUPERVISION

Moderator: Richard Wener

Panelists: Richard van den Heuvel, Paul Bailey, Russel Davis, Sarah Heatherly, Donald Manning

There seem to be two main themes in the transition process: getting key people in the correctional system to “buy in” to the direct supervision model; and actually making a smooth move from one facility to another. This panel dealt with both of these issues, although the primary focus was on the former.

“Buying In” to the Direct Supervision Model. Without adequate support for direct supervision as an operational and architectural model from a number of players in the political and correctional system, the direct supervision facility will never be built, or if built will not run as intended. The key groups include the community, political figures with direct decision making power over the jail (such as a board of commissioners), managerial staff, and line correctional staff.

Rick van den Heuval (see paper for more detail) discussed the need to focus more attention on middle level managerial staff for training and the “buying in” process. Van den Heuvel noted that considerable attention had been paid to training correctional officers, often to positive effect. But middle level managers, such as sergeants, have received relatively little systematic focus. He and others from Middlesex County, New Jersey will be working with the NIC to develop a middle level manager training program.

Discussion centered around the difficulty that people at this level often have accepting the direct supervision systems. Van den Heuval suggested that the problem was several fold. First, direct supervision gives the officer much more control over basic living functions than previously was possible, but managers are often reluctant to relinquish that control to officers. Second, managers often don't have the knowledge to help and supervise officers: the officer may have more experience with direct supervision than the manager. Third, managers must now work more remotely than before, because they have less ability to directly observe living area behavior.

Others in the panel and audience noted that they have dealt with the same problems. Sarah Heatherly described training in Miami where supervisors were trained first, and then they trained line officers. Paul Bailey commented that they stressed enhancing of the role of sergeants, and tried to teach them to work as “mini-wardens”, managing with less direct contact with inmates.

Sarah Heatherly and **Paul Bailey** described their different approaches to community acceptance of Direct Supervision. Heatherly noted that they had paid close attention to community acceptance, and had spent a great deal of effort going to community meetings, talking to the press, and taking critical politicians and media representatives on visits to model jails. These efforts, combined with strong leadership from the top and the efforts of NIC spokespersons, allowed them to gain widespread acceptance for their plan.

Bailey said that his local community was not inclined toward the direct supervision model, and so he focused on a gradualist approach, introducing changes slowly, rather than trying to sell the system wholesale. He is opening his facility with some use of the direct supervision model, and expects to gradually introduce more and more concepts.

Don Manning and **Russel Davis** discussed entry into new facilities. Manning noted that transition actually starts with the first planning sessions for a new design. His planning team was his transition team. Davis noted that Pima County, against all advice, was forced to complete transition in one day. They were able to do this successfully, he said, because of the extensive orientation efforts, which included training for inmates as well as staff.

PANEL 3: COSTS AND BENEFITS OF DIRECT SUPERVISION

Moderator: Jay Farbstein

Panelists: Ray Nelson, Jerry Meece, Jay Smith, Steve Caner

Clearly, among the most important aspects of selling the direct supervision concept to communities are the costs and benefits of the approach. Does it cost more or less? Are there savings? Why? Can these be proved? This panel addressed the initial costs of building, and the staffing and operational costs as they accrue over the life of the building.

Ray Nelson presented findings from a "Preliminary Report on a Survey of Cost Savings in New Generation Jails." The survey addressed human, capital, and operating costs of new generation jail design (the paper is included in these proceedings).

Jerry Meece described an evaluation of alternative design options for the Dade County Stockade Expansion Program. The study found that a "third generation" jail would be significantly less expensive to own and operate than a "second generation" facility. The only major cost advantage of the "second generation" jail is a lower initial construction **cost**. [cannot understand tape]

Steve **Carter** reported the results of a detailed cost comparison between direct and indirect supervision for a Prince Georges County facility. It was found that for a six hundred bed institution, direct supervision would require 24 less staff than indirect (a difference of 185 versus 205). The approaches were also compared from an operational efficiency perspective: i.e., how staff is used in the housing units. For at least one measure, direct schemes were more efficient. An indirect configuration required 44 minutes for bedcheck as opposed to 24 minutes for a direct supervision design.

Jay Smith described a survey that addressed the question of how many cells to have in a living unit, and what effect of the number of cells has on the life cycle cost of the jail. Specifically, is there a way to rationalize that figure? The survey results indicate that among a dozen new generation jails and MCC's, staffing per 100 units of design capacity typically ranges from 35 to 50 total staff. The number of officers in the living units typically ranged from one-fourth to one-third of the total staff. The cost effect of a 20% change in the number of cells is equal to a 20% change in staffing. This is significant because over a thirty year period, a 20% difference in staff cost would be equal to one-third to one-half of the cost of construction.

Audience members offered their experience with appropriate numbers of inmates in living units. At Contra Costa, officers are most comfortable with a total of fifty pre-trial inmates, although they can handle up to sixty. There are differences between sentenced and pre-trial inmates since sentenced inmates have a more consistent daily routine.

The audience posed several questions for further study. At what point does the number of inmates per unit exceed the officers ability to directly supervise: i.e., when does the correctional officer become a guard? How does direct supervision compare to remote supervision in response to overcrowding? A representative from one direct supervision facility (Ventura County) said that he feels that the facility could double its population without disruption of operations.

PANEL 4: OPERATION OF NEW GENERATION JAILS

Moderator: Richard Wener

Panelists: Larry Ard, Russell Davis, Thomas Barry, and Linda Zupan

The basic principle of direct supervision (direct officer contact with inmates) has been well enunciated. However, many important details of operational style and systems are developed uniquely and ad hoc by administrators in the course of managing an institution. This session presented three administrators who discussed issues in facility operations, and a researcher who presented information on staff training and satisfaction.

Larry Ard discussed the role of the chief administrator of a direct supervision facility in getting the facility up and running, and maintaining quality of operation over time. Ard suggested that the strength of the chief administrator's commitment to direct supervision may determine the success of the facility. The administrator needs to possess a clear sense of mission and purpose, and communicate that mission to the staff. Early in operation, the administrator needs to be strong and authoritarian, Ard suggested, to be sure direct supervision is adequately implemented.

Once the facility is "stable" and is functioning well, the administrator should introduce greater participation in management, encouraging administrative staff to take a greater role in setting policy. At some point, when others have had experience in management, the chief administrator should back off from daily operational decisions. The goal of this procedure is to assure that the success of the facility does not become dependent on one person. Ard described his use of this kind of phased program at Contra Costa detention facility.

Russell Davis (see paper for more detail) presented research he had conducted with Kevin Gilmartin on the application of the "Stockholm Effect" in jails. The term "Stockholm Effect" was coined to refer to the phenomenon of kidnapped victims or hostages identifying with their captors (after a Stockholm bank robbery). Davis suggested that in this case the officer may be seen as the victim and can identify with inmates to the point of breaking rules to do things for them. The isolation of officers from more positive and healthy social relationships, because of the demands of their job, and the additional stress of the job, encourage this phenomenon. Davis suggested several management procedures which can minimize the likelihood of this effect occurring. (Note that this phenomenon was observed in an indirect supervision jail: the paper is included here because the issues it raises may be even more important in direct supervision institutions.)

Thomas Barry described the management procedures used in the Tombs to reduce the negative effects of large institution size and bring middle level supervisors into greater contact with staff. The Tombs facility makes use of "mini-jails" which operate as semi-autonomous units. Each mini-jail is administered by an associate deputy warden, who is in effect the warden over a unit of no more than 150 inmates. This allows greater knowledge of and contact with individual officers and inmates. Training at the Tombs has focused on reducing the negative bias to supervision, and getting supervisors to look for, and reinforce, successes by officers. The smaller scale reduces anonymity, both by officers and inmates, and keeps problems from being overlooked in the course of daily operation.

Linda Zupan (see paper for more detail) has been studying job satisfaction and training among officers in a variety of direct supervision jails. She noted that one key advantage of direct over indirect supervision facilities is the presence of a strong and well-enunciated mission and philosophy. She compared this to successful companies discussed in the book *In Search of Excellence*. Her research points to the critical nature of selection and training procedures in direct supervision facilities.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Moderators: Mike O'Toole and Bill Frazier, NIC

A number of issues were raised and comments received from the audience. These included:

Link to AJA. Participants agreed that AJA was the most appropriate organization around which to focus future meetings.

Training. With less NIC training, support is still needed for technical assistance and exposure to the new generation concepts. A video tape of case studies might be an efficient way to spread the word and share experience. Training is needed for executive level administrators who must commit to and support direct supervision as well as for line managers and correctional officers.

Definitions. Terms used to describe direct supervision and new generation need to be defined to reduce the confusion about the concepts.

Networking. NIC strongly wishes to encourage networking among new generation jails. Regional contacts with peers (a "buddy system") was suggested. Identification is needed of who is using or planning to use the new generation model. Making an **AJA** committee on new generation jails was suggested.

Future Symposium Topics. Bringing services to inmates versus inmates to services. Budgeting for transition expenses. What are essential record keeping items for new generation jails (if different from other jails). Comparison of staffing arrangements and patterns; use of civilian staff.

Research Topics. Periodic questionnaires or evaluations of new generation jails, using accepted criteria. Identification of what is working and what is not, without being prescriptive or proscriptive

A RE-ASSESSMENT OF THE DIRECT SUPERVISION MANAGEMENT AND DESIGN CONCEPT

By Stephen A. Carter, Carter Goble Associates, Inc., Columbia, SC

For the past several years, I have had an opportunity to advise a number of jurisdictions, ranging in size from 20,000 to a million or more on their jail construction programs. In each of these programs, **my advice** has focused upon the direct supervision management and design concept. The following is my assessment of progress according to various groups of persons that will be impacted by the design and management approach of the facility.

The Owner

Without exception, those owners that invested the time and resources to attend the PONI Program in Boulder have been easier clients to convince of the merits of the direct supervision approach. Regardless of the size of the jurisdiction and the facility that they construct, those owners who were exposed to the NIC program came away from the experience with positive feelings. My most difficult task has been maintaining that commitment to a philosophy the longer the owner is away from the persuasive environment of the National Academy of Corrections.

This problem is particularly difficult when the state inspection or plan review agency is opposed to the concept and offers a range of reasons why direct supervision is not only inappropriate, but probably will not satisfy the state's minimum standards. In Florida, it has been very difficult to maintain the philosophical commitment that the client earlier made to the direct supervision approach with the continued barrage of criticisms of direct supervision from the State Department of Corrections.

One method of insuring the continued commitment of the client to the philosophy would be short refresher courses that might be conducted at the state level by resource persons in each state. Another would be a well-developed video tape that could be purchased or borrowed from NIC by "doubting Thomases" to remind them of the reasons for their earlier commitment to the approach.

Another benefit to the owners would be NIC-sponsored field trips to operating models of the direct supervision concept. This will be difficult until we have a more extensive resource base of completed, operating direct supervision facilities. By 1988, there should be at least 12 to 20 good examples of direct supervision facilities at various locations throughout the country. NIC might consider assigning resource persons at several of these selected facilities to regularly share information and conduct tours for other jurisdictions. It is essential that both small and large facilities be included in this resource base.

The Design Team

For the most part, the "name brand" architects have climbed onto the direct supervision bandwagon, since they view it as a new marketing approach. Although a large number of firms claim to be disciples of direct supervision, in actual fact, I am convinced that many do not understand the concept. In many instances, architects view direct supervision as a design concept, rather than a management and classification philosophy that architecture serves.

While many architectural "converts" have been achieved, a large number of the small- to mid-size county correctional facilities continue to be designed by architects who are not only unfamiliar with direct supervision, but for the most part do not have any experience in correctional facility planning and design. My personal experience has been that these small firms often are easily converted to the direct supervision approach. Most are open-minded and willing to take advice regarding the integration of management and

design philosophies. Some of my best experiences during the last several years have been with firms that have never designed a correctional facility.

Another group of correctional architects exists that have substantial experience in the field, but simply do not accept the direct supervision approach. Sometimes they pay lip-service to the concept, but when the client really begins the detailed scrutiny and questioning of the concept, they rush to stainless steel and security glass at record speeds. I have one project in particular at the present time with a nationally known architect where I am concerned about the architect's willingness to ride-out the pending storm with me. I can already see signs of "fox-hole fright" that is likely to result in a major battle between the consultants (us) and the architect to convince the client of the most appropriate design approach. In such a battle, consultants have a difficult time winning, since we are viewed only as the planning consultants and not as the more "knowledgeable" architects.

In thinking of ways to improve this condition, I believe that the AIA and NIC could jointly sponsor more regional seminars. They would be well attended because architects are genuinely interested in the concept and do not want to miss any opportunity to gain a marketing edge on their competition. In such jointly-sponsored efforts, the focus should not be exclusively upon architectural considerations, but far more information concerning the management and classification issues that drove the emergence of the direct supervision concept in the first place. I believe that architects would be willing to pay to attend such meetings, especially if some recognition could be awarded for their attendance and understanding of the basic principles of direct supervision.

Since NIC has a problem sponsoring private sector oriented training, I believe that the AIA could assume the lead, drawing resource persons from NIC's training and technical assistance staff.

The Operators and NIC

I am convinced that the only way to gain the support of the facility administrators and operating staff is to have them experience direct supervision first-hand. I can talk until I lose my southern accent and still never convince a hard-core indirect management oriented correctional officer that placing him or her in a housing unit with inmates is in the best interest of his/her career. The major problem is not with the fear syndrome, but with the attitude that persists among correctional officers that the inmates' behavior will not be influenced by change in communication style or the incarceration environment. Most correctional officers have views of inmates that are based upon the "we and them" school of thought. The idea that an inmate might elect to behave if they occasionally could speak to an officer simply does not register with most of the staff that I have contacted.

The key to changing this position will rest with jail administrators and wardens with a strong influence of policy from the county commission, board of corrections, or sheriff. Even though many officers might personally oppose the approach, a committed sheriff or county council member can go a long way toward convincing the jail administration, and ultimately the line officer, of the value of this approach.

As additional direct supervision facilities are added to our resource base, it would be helpful if NIC would expand its on-site training opportunities for an increased number of administration and line-officer personnel. The on-site training experience that the Prince George's County officers received at Contra Costa will go a long way to insuring the success of their new facility. Without exception, the officers returned with a new perspective of management and a changed attitude toward inmate/officer relations.

As East Coast and Midwest facilities are completed, regardless of their size, it would be very helpful to expand the number of officers that would be exposed to on-site training opportunities. Due to the shortage of resources of many counties, it will be necessary for some form of financial assistance to be made available to the jurisdictions to participate in the on-site training. Once exposed to and successfully

First Annual Symposium on New Generation JailsStephen A. Carter: A Pie-Assessment of the Direct Supervision Management and Design **Concept**

completing the training, these “operational disciples” should then be used to train other officers, not only in their jurisdiction. In this way, the officers develop a sense of ownership and commitment **to the concept**. Using these “disciples” to conduct training programs in counties that are considering the concept, but have not yet convinced operating staff of its benefits, could be a very effective tool of having peer group affiliations accomplish purposes that consultants simply cannot achieve.

A major aspect of direct supervision that we must recognize is that the smaller the facility, the less true direct supervision design can be accomplished. For example, in the 600-bed Prince George’s County, Maryland, facility, it was very easy to achieve a direct supervision approach in the 48-bed modules. However, in Stearns County, Minnesota, where the 48-bed module had to be subdivided into three or four different inmate classifications, a true direct supervision concept is practically impossible. However, I believe that the management approach that drives at direct supervision design solutions can be equally evident in small facilities. The creative aspect will be to develop design solutions, especially in the housing areas, that allow the correctional officer to be responsible for more than one inmate category in his/her position. In Stearns and Cass Counties, Minnesota, we assigned a correctional officer to one dayroom, but with the responsibility for supervising other categories of inmates in other dayrooms. While this has given some state inspectors (not Minnesota) heartburn, it is usually their narrow view of staff responsibilities that drives their negative reaction.

The National Small Jails Prototype will afford a unique opportunity to present practical solutions to the direct supervision approach in small facilities. Although the greatest number of bedspaces to be constructed in the next ten years will be in large jurisdictions, by far, the greatest number of new facilities will be in small- to mid-size jurisdictions.

In conclusion, promoting and/or defending the direct supervision management and design concept has been relatively easy in the last few years. However, as many additional facilities are constructed that claim to be direct supervision, I fear that some confusion may result as to the merits and de-merits of the approach. Many architects are marketing their facilities as being direct supervision concepts, when in actual fact they are not. If the consuming public visits some of these facilities as “models,” then our job of promoting the concept will become more difficult.

I believe that NIC and the Academy can go a long way by selecting the best examples and promoting tours and resource-sharing with those facilities.

THE TRAINING NEEDS OF MID-LEVEL MANAGERS IN DIRECT SUPERVISION JAILS

By Richard Van den Heuval, County of Middlesex, NJ, Department of Corrections

A number of the direct supervision jails have been experiencing difficulties with respect to the mid-level managers. Upon consideration, it has been recognized that there is a need to establish both a clear role-model for these managers and a training program to prepare them to supervise direct supervision operations successfully.

Obviously, where the role of the mid-level manager is unclear, it should be expected that job performance will tend to be uncertain or uncommitted. In such an environment the direct supervision principles will be undermined. It should be expected that the line officers' decisions will frequently be reversed, and that they will lose respect for their supervisors. In any case, the result will be managerial conflict and operational confusion.

In order to begin to address this problem, it is informative to examine a case of transition into direct supervision. The Mercer County Detention Center (Trenton, New Jersey) was designed in the mid-1970s as a podular remote-surveillance jail. As the time for opening the building approached, it became clear that a number of conditions existed which made it impractical to operate the building as designed (line of sight from the control booth did not include showers, interview rooms, portions of the day room, and other essential areas). As a result, a new administrator determined that it would be necessary to post an officer inside the housing unit. This was seen as a radical break with past practice in the old linear jail as well as with planned practice for the new building. As such, it was extremely upsetting to the staff and severe resistance to the plan developed. The staff went to court in an effort to obtain an injunction to prevent the county from opening the new facility. In spite of minimal transition planning and very limited staff training, the building opened in the Spring of 1978.

One corrections officers reaction to the new work environment is particularly instructive. Shortly after the new building opened, one of the officers who had been extremely negative about the new work conditions approached the administrator who had led the staff preparation sessions. The officer offered an apology for his disruption of the training session. He went on to say that although he never would have believed it, he had become convinced that working directly in the population had finally given him the ability to do his job successfully. He admitted how surprised he had been to see that verbal abuse had virtually stopped and how well the inmates now responded to his individual authority since in the past they would constantly taunt him right up to the point where he would have to call for reinforcements to back up his orders. The crowning statement came when he said that he had started a masonry business in order to leave the jail, but now he was feeling so good about working in the new housing unit that he was going to stay. After years of working at the jail, he was starting to enjoy his job. (Recently it was learned that this man is still on the job.)

For the present purposes, this story re-emphasizes that direct supervision principles enable successful jail operation. Even without the transition preparation and the staff training available today these methods were able to establish significant rewards in working conditions and staff satisfaction.

Due to the pioneering work of a number of direct supervision leaders, the successful interplay of the basic principles of direct supervision management has come to be widely recognized. Through the active support of the National Institute of Corrections jails all over the country are becoming familiar with the principles of direct supervision management and corrections officers are being taught the principles and the skills needed for the role of the direct supervision corrections officer.

However, it has also come to be recognized that the overwhelming successes experienced by the line officers are not being seen in the ranks of the sergeants and lieutenants. In fact, many institutions are

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

Each jail has had its own experiences in this regard, but the concerns are so widespread as to alert us that there is a need to address this problem in the jails which are "on line" as well as for those which will be making transitions into direct supervision methods in the future. NIC has recently funded a project in cooperation with the Middlesex County Department of Corrections and Youth Services (New Jersey) to **develop a training** program for mid-level managers in direct supervision jails. The focus of this effort will be to identify a specific role model for the direct supervision managers, and then develop a training program to **instill the related methods** and skills. It is anticipated that this project will be completed by the end of 1986.

Until such time as this new training program is available to the other jails, several interim approaches can be suggested. First, it is important to recognize the workplace realities which serve as the foundations for the problem. After all, it must be remembered that the mid-level managers got both their experience and their promotions under different operating methods and it should be anticipated that they will want to remain loyal to what they know best.

For jails which have already moved into direct supervision operations, one suggestion for an immediate response would be to call the mid-level managers together for a training session. Tell them that other jails are having these problems and ask them to identify approaches to bringing the sergeants and lieutenants in those other jails "on-board". Clearly, this approach is "asking the patient to prescribe his own treatment".

In cases where the transition training has not yet taken place, the initial rounds of training should be presented exclusively to the superior officers. This can be expected to foster a sense of credibility with the line officers since they will be hearing about it from their superiors first. Second, it is suggested that a number of the key officers be involved in training the line officers (rather than just the usual staff trainers). This should yield a double advantage in that it will both increase the line officers' respect and it will foster greater commitment on the part of the superiors, since, as we know, people will be committed to what they create.

CAN COST SAVINGS BE ACHIEVED BY DESIGNING JAILS FOR DIRECT SUPERVISION INMATE MANAGEMENT?

by **W. Raymond Nelson**, Corrections Consultant, Boulder, CO

(Editor's note: This paper was prepared for and with the assistance of the National Institute of Justice and will be published by it (in a slightly edited form) as a Construction Bulletin.)

At a time when many American communities face the financial burden of jail construction, a new inmate management concept that may reduce costs is especially timely. Local governments have earmarked approximately three billion dollars for jail facilities currently being designed or under construction.¹ In addition to the 1983 jail space shortfall of 33,255 inmate spaces, increases in the local jail population are estimated at 21,000 additional inmates each year, the equivalent of a new 400-bed jail every week.² While many county officials would prefer to spend their scarce revenues on schools, hospitals, and libraries, the crisis in and potential liability of jail crowding and other unsafe conditions or specific court orders often necessitate a change in priorities.

In this paper, the direct supervision inmate management concept is examined from the perspective of *potential* cost savings. The word *potential* is underlined to emphasize the relative nature of the term "cost savings." In most cases of jail construction, real comparable alternatives do not exist and savings are reported as cost avoidance. A further complication is that three types of costs must be considered: capital, operational, and human. Readers should be able to draw their own conclusions from the information presented here as to what, if any, reductions in cost the direct supervision inmate management concept may offer them.

Direct supervision inmate management is not used in most local jails. During the past several decades, the trend in jail management and architecture has been to reduce contact between staff and inmates as much as possible. The two most common architectural design and inmate management categories in American jails are "linear-intermittent surveillance" and "podular-remote surveillance." Jails using "linear-intermittent surveillance" have inmate housing areas consisting of rows of cells at right angles to secure surveillance corridors. Staff are unable to observe all inmate housing areas from one location and are obliged to patrol the inmates' living areas. Not surprisingly, most prisoner behavior problems occur during the intervals between the intermittent patrols.

Jails using "podular-remote surveillance" have divided the inmate living areas into pods or modules. Approximately 50 cells are clustered around a dayroom that is under continual observation by staff in a secure, glazed observation compartment. Cell doors are electronically controlled from this station and communication with inmates is by intercom, thereby enabling officers to avoid direct contact with inmates. One of the main reasons most new jails are designed for "podular-remote surveillance" is that the potential for inmate surveillance is increased in comparison with traditional linear designs.

Characteristic features of both the "linear-intermittent surveillance" and the "podular-remote surveillance" jails include *secure*, vandal-proof fixtures, furnishings, and finishes in anticipation of destructive inmate behavior. Despite these costly items, vandalism and graffiti are still endemic to many of these jail environments.

The "podular-direct supervision" jail stands out in sharp contrast to the two previously described forms of jail design and management. The new concept differs from the earlier practice of direct staff contact with inmates in that principles of human behavior and facility design are used to create detention environments that facilitate officers' effectiveness. And while some aspects of the two podular designs are similar (cells clustered around a dayroom, for example) the differences are dramatic. The furnishings, fixtures, and finishes found in the direct supervision housing pod are usually of normal, commercial grade, Staff

assigned to the unit are in continuous contact with the inmates. Approximately a dozen detention facilities in the United States currently use this form of inmate-management; at least two dozen more are in the design or construction phases.

To many people direct supervision appears to fly in the face of conventional wisdom. The knowledge gained from the experience of operating traditional linear jails does not offer much support for this concept. What can be gained by exposing officers to continuous contact with prisoners and equipping the facilities with furnishings and fixtures that are not designed to resist the abusive behavior that jail prisoners are known to display? Surprisingly, managers of direct supervision jails respond that officers are placed in inmate housing units to increase staff and inmate safety and that it is unnecessary and, perhaps, counter-productive to pay a high price for secure, vandal-proof fixtures, furnishings, and finishes when officers are in a position to supervise inmate behavior continuously.

This response does not win many converts. However, more and more jail managers are convinced after seeing the direct supervision concept in action and are beginning to understand the human behavior principles upon which this inmate management concept is founded.

Since its formal recognition by the National Institute of Corrections in 1983, the concept has been endorsed by the American Jail Association, the American Institute of Architects, and the American Correctional Association, and has been incorporated into the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections' Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions and Standards for Adult Local Detention Facilities. It can now be considered the state of the art in inmate management and housing unit design.

Despite widespread professional recognition of direct supervision inmate management, its efficacy is by no means universally accepted. This may be partly attributed to traditional resistance to change, but there are good reasons for choosing other forms of inmate-management and design. It is not the purpose of this Bulletin to advocate the use of "podular-direct supervision," but to provide information on the potential cost savings for interested jurisdictions. To learn more about the direct supervision inmate management concept contact the National Institute of Corrections Jail Center (303-497-6700) or the NIC Information Center (303-444-1101).

The method used to identify potential cost savings of facilities designed for "podular-direct supervision" inmate management was to send a questionnaire on cost-related issues to twelve jurisdictions. Nine of these are operating direct supervision facilities and three are constructing them. Of the nine jurisdictions currently operating direct supervision institutions, three were designed for that purpose, three were originally designed for "podular-remote surveillance" and then converted to direct supervision, and three were designed to accommodate either direct supervision or remote surveillance. The period of time during which the nine operating facilities had been practicing direct supervision at the time of the survey ranged from one month to five years.

The small number of institutions in the sample and the wide variations in operating conditions prevent realistic direct comparisons. Despite these obvious obstacles to objective evaluation of a fairly new form of inmate management, the questionnaire yielded many similar, if not identical responses. These responses may prove useful to decision-makers exploring cost effective alternatives to traditional jail management and design practices.

Human Cost

All respondents agreed on some basic issues that bear directly on the human cost of operating a detention facility and indirectly on economic factors. There was universal agreement from the managers of the nine operating facilities that direct supervision inmate management:

- is an effective technique for managing their institutions;
- has a positive effect on staff morale;
- reduces violence: and
- reduces vandalism and graffiti.

While there is total agreement among these managers that direct supervision inmate management techniques are effective in their detention facilities, some did not hesitate to add that increased management attention and staff training were required. One administrator stated that it takes a lot of management time to encourage team work and remove the feeling of isolation that staff have when assigned individually to housing units. Another manager reported that direct supervision contributed to the effectiveness of his management by reducing conflicts between staff and inmates and allowed for closer inmate supervision. One went so far as to say, "It is the most positive trend in jail administration that I have encountered in my professional career."

The respondents were asked to substantiate their claim that direct supervision had a positive impact on staff morale. They cited the following:

- improvement in staff attitudes;
- improved treatment of inmates by staff;
- decreased number of staff -inmate conflicts:
- discussions with staff members in which they reported their satisfaction:
- comments of visitors who have spoken with staff members;
- decrease in staff tension:
- reduced use of sick leave:
- improved institutional cleanliness and orderliness:
- reduction in employee misconduct and confrontations with management; and
- active involvement of staff in participatory management.

Some of these will be examined further in the section on operating cost.

While all respondents reported fewer incidents of violence in their direct supervision facilities, only a few were able to give a quantitative estimate of the difference between their current and previous operations. Pennsylvania's Bucks County reported that fights have dropped by at least 50 percent; the use of disciplinary segregation has diminished by 30 percent. New Jersey's Middlesex County reported that in their 18 months of operation with direct supervision they have had no incidents of inmate-officer or inmate-inmate violence. Colorado's Larimer County Jail Manager commented: "Much less violence. We are in charge for a change!"

The occurrence of vandalism and graffiti in direct supervision facilities is equally rare. While the virtual absence of vandalism and graffiti has a positive effect on the work environment and operational costs, few of the respondents were able to quantify their experience in terms of cost savings. The Pima County Detention Center was able to provide some cost comparison figures that will be examined further under the section on operating cost. This finding also has some probable implications for construction cost that will be discussed in greater detail in the section on capital cost.

Graffiti is so common in our society today that its absence from some of our jails is incongruous with our knowledge of typical jail environments. In New York City, where most public facilities are adorned by the handiwork of graffiti artists, the Manhattan House of Detention, the City Department of Corrections' only direct supervision facility, is a surprising exception to the rule. While all respondents reported that they saw less graffiti, several said they have encountered virtually no graffiti at all. Two respondents pointed out that, while they saw much less graffiti on the living unit, they found just as much in the court holding tank, which is designed and supervised in the traditional manner. Behavioral inconsistencies displayed by inmates exposed to two different kinds of management and design practices within the same institution

are convincing evidence of the strong influence that the jail environment can have on inmate behavior.

Capital Cost

Several factors suggest that direct supervision inmate management contributes to reduced construction costs. All of the managers of direct supervision jails reported that they were able to achieve construction savings or intend to achieve construction savings in the next facilities they construct in the following ways:

1. **Commercial grade plumbing** fixtures can replace the vandal-proof stainless steel fixtures in general population living areas. The degree of cost savings obviously depends on the differences in the costs of fixtures and installation. Several years ago there was a considerable difference in cost between the two types of fixtures, but given the recent-drop in cost of vandal-proof fixtures, it may turn out to be a "wash" between the two.

The average cost of three major brands of Stainless Steel Combo Fixtures is approximately \$600 per fixture.³ A porcelain watercloset and lavatory, comparable to those used in Federal Prison System facilities, list at approximately \$350.⁴ The difference is approximately \$200 when installation and accessory costs are considered. These cost figures provide only a rough estimate of the difference, due to the variables involved in the bidding process. The only reliable cost figures will be those received on a bid or a quote at a specific time, for a specific quantity, at the specific site.

While the difference is not huge in relation to construction costs, some believe the increased durability of steel fixtures will pay for itself in replacement cost over the life of the structure. This belief, however, cannot be supported by the history of direct supervision facilities to date. Annual replacement costs would be only a fraction of the interest on the difference in capital cost; One manager commented that even if there is no difference in cost between vandal-proof and commercial fixtures, the use of vandal-proof fixtures gives the inmates the message that you expect negative behavior.

2. **Lighting fixtures** in the general population living areas need not be vandal-proof. A good quality commercial fixture designed for frequent use will be sufficient. A security surface-mounted fluorescent fixture costs approximately \$435 (installed) compared with \$120 for a commercial grade surface-mounted fluorescent fixture (installed).⁵

3. **The cost of control stations on** each living unit can be eliminated.

4. **The cost of walls and glazing** to divide 46 cell living units into smaller 12 or 16 cell subunits, as is the custom in "podular-remote surveillance" detention facilities, can be eliminated.

5. **Furniture** for use by inmates in general population living area can be of the normal, commercial variety rather than the usually more expensive vandal-proof line. For example, a 4-person steel table with attached seating costs \$975 (installed) compared to \$320 for a comparable commercial pedestal table with four chairs⁶

6. **Cell doors, frames, and hardware** in the general population living areas can be the normal, commercial, institutional variety rather than secure steel doors and sliders. Some facilities report successful use of wood doors. Appropriate wood doors also have a fire safety advantage, in that they do not expand as much as steel doors when exposed to heat, eliminating the jamming that has interfered with prompt evacuation. The differences in costs are significant. A maximum security door with frames (installed) costs approximately \$2,300, while a hollow metal door and frame costs approximately \$300 and a solid wood door (3 hour fire rated) and frame approximately \$600.⁷

Nelson: Can Cost Savings Be Achieved by Designing Jails for direct Supervision Inmate Management?

Despite these cost savings, some direct supervision jails still cost more to build than the average detention facility being built today. Each of these jails has different reasons for the variation in comparable cost with other facilities as demonstrated by the wide range in basic architectural characteristics. Table I provides a comparison of the basic characteristics of the twelve jails surveyed and an average figure for ten comparable, contemporary remote-surveillance facilities. The Tucson Metropolitan Correctional Center is listed to show the comparative characteristics for a campus style detention facility.

Aside from the items listed above there are some other areas of potential cost savings that should be explored for the sake of future facilities. For example, if experience with direct supervision established that there is virtually no vandalism in general population living areas, perhaps interior cell walls could be built to hotel room wall standards, using steel studs and gypsum board. An example of this sort of construction in a maximum security jail living area setting could not be found. However, the Chicago Metropolitan Correctional Centers experience over the past ten years, where the interior cell walls are made of concrete block, suggests that gypsum board, conforming to hotel wall standards, would have been satisfactory in the general population housing units.

Dry cells with access to centralized plumbing facilities, similar to dormitories, might also be considered for a portion of the inmate housing units. In a recent analysis of this option it was determined that dry cells cost approximately \$7,000 less per cell than wet cells.⁸ These are just some of the areas of potential cost reduction that should be explored when designing detention facilities for direct supervision inmate management.

Table 1: Basic Characteristics of the County Detention Facilities Included in the Cost Analysis Survey of Pod&r-Direct Supervision Jails

Facility	Date Opened	Design Capacity	Original Design Intent	Total Cost	Cost Per Sq.Ft.	cost Per Bed	Sq.Ft. Per Bed	No. of Staff
Contra Costa	1-81	386	Direct	\$20.7M	\$121.	\$53,600	442	213
New York	11-83	425	Optional	26.0M	107.	61,200	572	330
Multnomah	11-83	430	Optional	35.4M	145.	82,300	565	168
Larimer	1-84	152	Remote	6.7M	105.	44,000	421	80
Middlesex	11-84	330	Remote	18.0M	136.	54,500	402	220
Clark	10-84	814	Direct	42.5M	121.	52,200	430	285
Pima	6-84	468	Remote	18.6M	121.	39,800	329	265
Bucks	6-85	368	Direct	13.5M	108.	36,700	340	168
Erie	12-85	404	Direct	21.0M	101.	51,900	516	179
Spokane	6-86	483	Direct	19.1M	132.	39,600	300	137
Hillsborough	1-89	1344	Direct	69.5M	126.	51,700	409	465
Dade	1-88	1000	Direct	37.0M	131.	37,000	287	185
Average	85	550	Direct	27.0M	121.	50,400	418	41/100
Remote Sample	84	395	Remote	20.3M	111.	51,400	462	
Tucson MCC	3-82	202	Direct	7.1M	111.	35,100	351	65

*The remote sample represents the average figures for 16 remote surveillance facilities selected from the 1983 and 1984 Architecture for Justice Exhibition Publication.

Operating Cost

Since operating costs represent ninety percent of the life cycle costs of a detention facility, they are obviously the most critical.⁹ Capital construction cost savings gained at the expense of future operating costs are false economies. The following operational areas emerged from the respondents' replies as opportunities for cost savings:

1. **Personnel** represents the greatest operational cost and management problem for local jails. Personnel expenditures account for seventy percent of jail annual operating budgets.¹⁰ In a 1982 survey of 2500 local jails the National Sheriffs' Association discovered that personnel was the number one management problem.¹¹ While all respondents operating direct supervision jails reported that staff morale was improved by this inmate management approach, few were able to quantify this observation in terms of cost savings.

There was one indicator, however, that provided a quantifiable response: sick leave. All but one of the direct supervision jail operators responding to the questionnaire indicated that sick leave usage had declined since the introduction of direct supervision. The only exception was a jurisdiction (Pima County) in which staff were obliged to work regularly scheduled overtime for 18 months with only one day off per week.

A study of the Manhattan House of Detention conducted by the National Institute of Corrections in 1985 for the year 1984 revealed that sick leave usage was significantly less than the average rate for the city's other four houses of detention.¹² This difference amounted to an annual cost avoidance of 1,810 person-days. That is equal to eight full-time positions or approximately \$250,000 in overtime expenditures if overtime is used to fill the vacancies.

It is fair to conclude that the reduced sick leave usage is entirely attributable to direct supervision management techniques? There is no method for determining absolutely why these staff do not use as much sick leave as staff in traditional detention environments. But, while the data is not conclusive, there are strong implications that improved working conditions and job enrichment, which have been identified as products of direct supervision, may result in lower sick leave usage rates. If this trend is found in other direct supervision facilities and if it is repeated in succeeding years, that may be proof enough.

The importance of improved working conditions for staff will increase as the work force continues to diminish, as is predicted for the remainder of this Century. In their recent book, *Re-inventing the Corporation*, futurists John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene contend that, "By 1987, there will be a negative net gain in the labor force: More people will be leaving than will be entering. That combined with the accelerating economy that is creating almost all the new jobs, will result in a return to full employment. . . . All the people we will hire between the year 2000 are not only born, they are at least five or six years old. We can calculate almost exactly how many will be coming into the work force, and there will not be enough to fill all the new jobs being created." The growing demand by the private sector for trainable employees indicates that jails will face more and more personnel problems before the end of the 20th Century. A jail that can offer safe, clean, and orderly working conditions, as well as opportunities for fulfillment and career advancement, will be in a good position to compete for the limited work force that will be available in the next decade. The "podular-direct supervision" facility appears to offer all of those things.

Nelson: Can Cost Savings Be Achieved by Designing Jails for direct Supervision Inmate Management'?

The major question remains: Do "podular-direct supervision" facilities need more staff than other jails do? The answer to this question varies to the degree that jail staffing patterns vary. The new direct supervision facility currently under construction in Dade County will house 1000 inmates. It will require approximately one half the staff needed to operate their old linear jail, which houses approximately 1100 inmates.¹³ On the other hand, several facilities surveyed have higher staffing ratios than is considered desirable. This is usually the case where there are fewer than 48 cells in a housing unit.

Texas is the only state to have identified a specific staffing ratio in their jail standards. They require one housing area officer for 48 inmates. In other jurisdictions higher ratios are acceptable. Readers will have to determine if housing area staffing ratios of one officer to 48 - 60 inmates are acceptable for their jurisdictions.

2. Building maintenance is an important area where respondents reported lower costs. They indicated that there were fewer broken windows and lights and fewer fires, and that plumbing repairs and painting were needed less often. The Contra Costa County Detention Center reported that their old facility needed to be painted each year, while their new facility is being painted for the first time since it was built five years ago.

3. Respondents reported less frequent damage to **supplies and equipment**. The responses indicated less of a need for repair and replacement of clothing, television sets, mattresses, and linen. In the old Pima County Detention Center inmates ruined 150 mattresses each year. Every week approximately two television sets had to be repaired and 15 - 25 sets of inmate clothing were lost. Two years ago Pima County opened a new detention center. In those two years they have lost no mattresses, repaired only two television sets, and lost only about fifteen sets of inmate clothing.

Several respondents reported an increased use of cleaning supplies in their new facilities.

Conclusion

The literature on the subject and the information gleaned from this survey suggest that costs can be reduced through the "podular-direct supervision" facility design and inmate management concept. But it is not necessarily cost effective for every institution in every situation. Jurisdictions interested in reducing capital, operating, and human costs will find this concept worthy of further exploration.

References

1. Based on a projection of data provided by a survey of 30 states conducted as of December 31, 1985, by Kimme Planning and Architecture under a grant from the National Institute of Corrections.
2. "1983 Jail Census", Bureau of Justice Statistics, November 1984.
3. Cost analysis prepared by the construction management firm of CRSS Constructors, November 1985.
4. List price quoted by American Standard for stock items AS-2529.014 watercloset and AS-0356.015 lavatory, March 1986.
5. *Building Construction Cost Data 1985, 43rd Annual Edition*, Robert Snow Mean Company, Inc., Kingston, MA.
6. Catalogue, Stephens Inc.. Institutional Supplies, Spring-Summer, 1985.

Nelson: Can Cost Savings Be Achieved by Designing Jails for direct Supervision Inmate Management?

7. Southern Steel Company, *Price List for Detention and Institutional Hardware and Furnishing*, 1985.
8. Cost analysis conducted by Kimme Planning and Architecture, November 1985.
9. Oraftik, Chuck. "Adult Local Detention Facilities: An Analysis of Construction, Lie-Cycle, and Multiple/Single Cell Cost." Unpublished paper, Hellmuth, Obata and Kassabaum, Architects, San Francisco, CA, 1982.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *The State of Our Nation's Jails* by the National Sheriff's Association, 1982.
12. *The Manhattan House of Detention: A Study of Podular Direct Supervision*, an analysis by the National institute of Corrections, July, 1985.
13. Harper & Buzinec Atchitects/Engineers inc. *Comparative Analysis of Design Schemes, Dade County Stockade Expansion*. Coral Gables, FL, 1983.

THE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER STOCKHOLM SYNDROME: MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

By Kevin M. Gilmartin and Russell M. Davis, Pima County Arizona Sheriff's Department

In the decades prior to World War II a work ethic existed which was characterized by the "Average American Neighborhood." The husband worked, the wife was a housewife, all the neighbors knew each other, the family belonged to a church and relatives lived down the street or a few blocks away. The job was a place to earn money to buy the house with the white picket fence or send the oldest son to college. American society was less mobile and more stable. The average worker was able to gain a sense of identity from belonging to various social support groups.

Over the past few decades the employment role has shifted importance to the average American worker.' The role of employment to meet the purely economic needs of the worker has given way to an increased importance of the work role to meet social and emotional needs.' A sense of rootedness in the community has been lost for the average American as neighborhoods disappear. People tend to identify themselves more with the place and role of their employment than the place or neighborhood of their residence. Management philosophies have been expanded to meet the increased expectations and needs of employees at the workplace.² Peter Drucker, in his overview of management philosophies, reflects the shift by stating, "The shift in the structure and character of work has created a demand that work produce more than purely economic benefits. To make a living is no longer enough, work has also to make a life."³

Management in the corrections field has not by any means been spared the effects of the change in importance of the work place. If anything, correctional administrators must be more keenly sensitive to the increased importance of what takes place at the workplace and its emotional/behavioral consequences. These emotional/behavioral consequences in manufacturing or other industry are often a loss in productivity. In a corrections setting, however, the consequences could often be a breach in security or a life-threatening situation. Heavy emotional demands through stress are placed daily on the corrections officer.

In decades past, the management philosophy of "keep your personal life out of the institution" has been employed. That philosophy was based on the underlying premise that the correctional officer had a personal life: another life away from the work place that had a sense of identity, a sense of neighborhood where he/she could talk to the person next door. The white picket fence street, where every neighbor knew each other, and people went to work only to earn money, is a thing of the past.

The average correctional officer today is reflective of today's American society, a highly mobile society that for more than two decades has been experiencing radical changes in the family structure. The geographic mobility in American society has spread the extended family of brothers, sisters, parents, aunts, and uncles over an entire continent. As the sunbelt population explosion continues, a correctional officer might find his support system of an extended family spread over several thousand miles.

At the same time geographic mobility is spreading the extended family, divorce is breaking down the nuclear family. As the more traditional support systems deteriorate, church membership declines. The correctional officer who runs into a crisis at work or at home, and could seek support from family, neighbors, or church members a decade ago, must now seek support from the only viable support system: his place of work. What if correctional managers are not sensitive to these significant changes in the importance of the work place?

A correctional officer, like any other person, can be expected to experience crisis in his life. Strong arguments can be made that the very nature of the "pressure cooker atmosphere that many correctional officers work under makes them a higher than average risk for stress related crisis."⁵ If we define a crisis as a

subjective reaction to a stressful life experience, so affecting the individual that his ability to cope is severely impaired, we see ability to cope as the significant determinant.⁶ One's ability to cope is directly related to the extent of emotional support systems available to the individual. As the traditional support systems break down and work becomes more important, we find the correctional officer, who is experiencing a crisis, must decide where to turn for support.

One of the foundations of the new generation jail concept is Maslow's hierarchy of needs. The physical design and management systems for a direct supervision jail are designed to fulfill the safety and security needs as well as basic biological needs of the inmates. If we conceptualize the officer along Maslow's hierarchy of needs ranging from basic biological survival to self-actualization needs, we see the officer may enter the institution with a higher number of unmet needs than did his predecessors of a decade or two ago.⁷

Just as successful management of a new generation jail is dependent on a thorough understanding of the needs of the inmate, a successful manager must consider that corrections officers also have needs. The needs unmet by the disappearing traditional support systems will be met at the workplace either by competent management, peer camaraderie, or by manipulation of inmates.

The 1980s will see a dramatic increase in the application of the podular/direct supervision jail concept. Each new facility will be similar in some respects but at the same time, unique in design, management, **and** staffing features. One characteristic of new generation jails is constant: success is fully dependent on enlightened management that fully understands human behavior and the importance of meeting people's needs. Officer safety and integrity can be potentially compromised by less than competent management perception.

As the concrete and steel control of the older, linear intermittent supervision institution gives way to the behavioral, interpersonal relationship controls of the new generation facility, a specific syndrome of security compromise potentially may develop.

In a traditional facility the separation, by bars, of inmates and staff allows each to maintain a degree of anonymity. The interpersonal relationships between officer and inmate which are utilized in the podular/direct supervision facilities permit emotional transference between both parties to take place. This transference actually decreases the likelihood an inmate will strike out and assault an unknown officer. Now the officer is a person with a history of behavioral interaction with the inmate. The particular officer's pod management style has developed for him a track record of interaction with the inmates. This officer is a "real person" to the inmates not an unknown symbol of authority. Consequently, many of the deviant behavior patterns of acting out that typified older institutions have disappeared as behavioral management of the new generation facility replaces the brutality and steel controls of older institutions.

This emotional transference, however, is a two way street. The inmate also becomes a "real person" to the officer. This behavior/interpersonal style of interacting alleviates many of the traditional problems of inmate-officer interaction. Indifference, brutality and hostility give way to more rational behavior. A cooperative joint effort of both inmate and officer to have a supra-ordinate goal, running the pod, is the result.

Social psychology has demonstrated the behavioral effects of dividing people by bars with differential roles of officer and inmate. Each participant responds to his individual needs most often at the expense of the other. Hostility quickly increases and brutality may surface.⁸ The Zimbardo/Stanford studies demonstrate this phenomenon. However, one even more basic social psychology phenomenon of supra-ordinate goals has been demonstrated for decades. If two previously antagonistic groups are placed in a close proximity and are required to accomplish a similar task cooperatively, the previously held differential roles and antagonism break down. Joint cooperation takes place and a new singular role identity forms. This has been clearly demonstrated for decades since the classic Sherif studies on

supra-ordinate goals.⁹ This phenomenon has substantial relevance for the direct **supervision jail**.

What if management retains a management style of distant authoritarianism and places these high-needs-unfulfilled officers into correctional settings with increased recognition of the inmate as a person? Since an officer in crisis no longer has an effective support group outside the job, he will generally turn to his **peer officer for support**: the peer officer he used to walk the floor with in a traditional facility, the peer officer he **interacted with as their paths** crossed during rounds. However, in a podular/direct supervision facility there are significant differences that may have an adverse impact on support. The officer may still see his "buddy" at briefings before shift and after shift, and maybe even on a brief break if he gets off the pod. However, eight to ten hours a day his interpersonal interaction is with the inmate population; both locked behind the same doors, both living in the same area, both feeling the same feelings of isolation and frustration if support services or management is not responsive to their needs. The inmates hopefully do not become the officers peer group, but they can quickly become his reference group for many of the day-today events that impact both the officer and the inmate's life.

It seems now that not only have the traditional support systems of neighborhood, family, and church disappeared as a place for the officer to turn to have his needs met, but his fellow officer is locked away, unreachable in another pod. The two remaining alternatives for having needs validated for the officer become first line management or the inmates. Insensitive or incompetent supervision, that alienates an officer and does not attempt to meet whatever need is currently present, in effect pushes the officer towards security violations with the inmates. When the officer states "we", and he/she is referring to the inmates and himself on the pod, one has experienced semantic evidence of emotional transference taking place.

This transference is itself worth exploring. Why do hostages find their emotional loyalties shifting from the rescuers to the hostage taker as the period of confinement together increases? The answer is a phenomenon known as "emotional transference."¹⁰ What we observe are people in close proximity, with the same supra-ordinate goals, jointly cooperating and merging short term emotional and rational belief systems. First identified in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1971 after a foiled bank robbery which generated into a hostage seige, the phenomenon has been labeled the "Stockholm syndrome". The hostages shifted loyalties and began advocating for the hostage takers. These processes of shifting loyalties have been described in psychological literature for decades and have direct bearing in correctional management techniques.¹¹

There are several variables that force the development of the Stockholm syndrome. Finding oneself in an isolated situation with distance from the individuals you previously perceived as meeting your needs appears central to all theoretical formulations of the syndrome. If the isolated individual feels potential jeopardy or a risk from the parties with whom or by whom he is being held, the syndrome accelerates its development.

In the correctional setting one would be naive to believe that the Stockholm syndrome does not potentially take place between inmates and a correctional officer all of whom have been confined in a limited area for a long time. It would be equally naive, however, to believe that the syndrome would manifest itself as quickly and as drastically as it would in a police hostage seige situation. In the correctional setting, one can expect the phenomenon to begin more at the semantic level with the "we" referring to the officer himself and inmates he manages.

From a semantic level, one would predict that the shift and development in the Stockholm Syndrome would proceed to a minor behavioral level where the officer would begin engaging in a minor rule infraction to make things easier for "his people". **These minor rule infractions would begin at the level of acts of omission and proceed to acts of commission.**

The “minor” acts of omission would be demonstrated by a laxity in enforcement of security measures. Searches for makeshift weapons and other contraband would not remain intense as the interpersonal level of comfort between officer and inmate grows. The belief “my people would not do that” can falsely grow in naive correctional officers who feel comfortable working in close proximity to a singular group of inmates.

At the level of acts of commission, these minor rule infractions, such as bringing extra food, sugar, coffee, candy or other items on to the pod, would not be perceived by the correctional officer as contraband or rule violations, but rather as attempting to use management philosophies to keep things running smoothly on the pod.

The third stage of the syndrome development would be what Hacker in his classic work on hostages calls the “poor devil” syndrome.¹² “It is here where the victim/hostage begins feeling sorry for the “poor devil”. A correctional officer in close proximity to an inmate in the jail setting who “feels sorry” for an inmate who possibly will receive a lengthy prison sentence or even a death sentence may be experiencing more than just casual reflection on a lengthy prison term. The Stockholm syndrome has developed to the extent that hostages have thrown themselves in front of the hostage taker only to be killed by rescuing police bullets intended for the hostage-taker.¹³ Equally as intense in a correctional setting, the Stockholm syndrome has accounted for loyal and competent correctional officers actively conspiring to engage in escape attempts.

The present authors have extracted twelve cases of the Stockholm syndrome over a three year period. All cases are from *one* correctional setting where officers demonstrated emotional loyalties to inmates ranging from intimate sexual contact with an inmate while on duty to a successful conspiracy to assist in an escape from a maximum security institution. The uniqueness of each of these cases is that they are not merely instances of corruption for monetary gain or compromise out of mere intimidation by inmates: genuine ideological shift of loyalties to the inmates had taken place. In the case studies, pre-employment psychological test evaluations were available to be reviewed including Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventories, psychologist’s notes, and extensive background information. No meaningful singular profile or diagnostic category could be extracted from this data. Each officer had a satisfactory to outstanding career prior to the acts of compromise which resulted in termination, and, in some cases, criminal prosecution.

It appears a lifestyle profile of the officers would be more informative than formal testing in attempting to understand who might be the high risk officer to develop the Stockholm syndrome. Each officer had a career in law enforcement/corrections where he/she highly identified with their position as officer. This position was highly important to each individual and met many emotional needs that were not completed in other aspects of their lives. This exaggerated importance of the officers role led to an over-identification with the job and a narrow, rigid view of the people depending on whatever label was placed on them. This narrow rigid, labeling view of people lets the correctional officer perceive all inmates in one distasteful category until one or a small group of inmates does not fit into the officers pigeon holed perceptual set and exceptions begin to be made.

The role of officer was central, in each case, to the officers self-concept. These individuals who tended to over identify with their job as officers were quite popular with their fellow officers, but all tended to be uninvolved in meaningful, emotional relationships in their private lives. The only married officer of the group at the time of security compromise was experiencing severe marital disruption.

In each case, the officers were able to function adequately until assigned a position in the facility which required close proximity daily to small, specific group of inmates. It appears that at this time, the daily close proximity to a simple inmate group led to the development of the “poor devil syndrome”. The officers began believing that the inmate was a victim and began feeling sorry for him. One officer stated, “I just wanted to keep seeing him because I realized he might get the death sentence and I felt so bad about it.” The high risk officer starts as one who has a highly unfulfilling private life, and uses the rigid identity of an

officer as an important veneer of an incomplete self-concept.

The syndrome seems to crystallize and become specific to one inmate when this high risk officer is placed in close proximity to an inmate who is risking, or who has already received, a lengthy prison term or possible death sentence. The high-risk inmate, therefore, is the high-publicity inmate who is in prison typically for violent, and on many occasions, potentially heinous crimes. This makes the formation and liaison between inmate and correctional officer even more baffling to those who attempt to understand it without sensitivity to the issues currently being discussed. In each of the cases studied, the compromised officer stated that publicity had a role in his actions. One officer stated the inmate "wasn't anything like what the newspapers said he was like." This attitude represents a form of cognitive dissonance where the officer felt the inmate was "different from the rest of the inmates and rigid stereotyping broke down in favor of preferential treatment."¹⁴

The profile to this point can be developed to a needs-unfulfilled officer whose job many times is the only meaningful interaction in his life. This officer comes into contact with a high-publicity, usually highly manipulative inmate. The officer begins spending excessive periods of time with a small group of inmates and begins minor behavioral infractions on behalf of these particular inmates.

The cardinal feature of each case, however, that initiated the Stockholm syndrome was a personal crisis in the officers life immediately prior to the time of compromise. These crises often went unnoticed by w-workers or management at the institution. In several cases, officers were punitively reprimanded by management for behavior stemming from these crises. These action only forced the officer closer to the only viable support system available -the inmates. This support system of inmates became the only place in each officers life where the term "we" had a genuine meaning.

This theory presents a scenario which has significant implications to management in new generation jails. The very principles and dynamics which make the new generation jail work also support the development of the Stockholm syndrome. Management misperception and insensitivity may be the cardinal feature of the correctional Stockholm syndrome in each case identified. Taking an unfulfilled officer who is currently experiencing a personal crisis that either goes undetected or is even punitively handled, and placing that officer in close proximity daily to a small group of inmates, can be expected to foster the development of the Stockholm syndrome.

The Federal system, as well as Contra Costa County, California, shared a characteristic which is not shared by many of the newer, direct supervision jails. In both systems, an officer who was having trouble functioning in a direct-supervision jail could transfer to another assignment for a relief period or on a permanent basis. In the Federal system, officers could transfer to other traditional type institutions. In Contra Costa County the officers could transfer to law enforcement duties in the field.

In other new facilities, such as Larimer County, Colorado, Multnomah County, Oregon, and Pima County, Arizona, the flexibility for transfer is not available. The law enforcement and corrections sections of the departments are separate job classifications with separate career paths. Within the institutions, 70-90 percent of the corrections officers work in direct-supervision pods and the remainder in control rooms, escort, or other support services. In Pima County, the staff composition is approximately 30 percent female officers; consequently, there are a large number of female officers working male housing pods. The ability to find an alternate assignment to increase the proximity with other officers and minimize contact with inmates is extremely limited.

The result of these significant differences may have an adverse impact on the application of direct supervision in facilities with similar characteristics. The correctional officer Stockholm syndrome should by no means deter an agency from adopting the new generation jail concept. When all aspects are considered, the new generation concept is by far the best method of design and management of jails today.

What, then, can management do; and who are the high risk managers? The first thing management must do if it attempts to develop a viable program for preventing the development of the Stockholm syndrome is to become introspective and not extra punitive. Management must accept responsibility that the solution to avoiding the Stockholm syndrome lies in proactive management strategies, not punitive reactionary discipline against the officer, when clear symptoms of the syndrome are identified. A proactive approach must address the central issues of the Stockholm syndrome: isolation, and vulnerability felt by the officer.⁽¹⁵⁾ Management cannot let an isolated correctional officer feel like his needs are not being met. Whether these needs are for extra toilet articles for his pod or for a sympathetic ear after a stressful day, the officer must not be left to feel that "he is in the same boat as the inmates."⁶

Management must strive to develop group identities and loyalties to the organization as a whole. Strategies such as requiring officers to take meal breaks away from the pod or work unit and eating with fellow officers, should not be seen as merely a break or benefit for the officers but as genuine security measures that have preventive value. Scheduling should be developed for breaks other than mealtime where officers can relax with fellow officers and rekindle peer officer camaraderie. Many managers might view this "down time" as officers just "wasting time". These operationally-oriented managers could prove extremely short sighted if the appreciation of officers' camaraderie is missed. The result would be the "I've" syndrome where officers might be more concerned about whether "their pod" passes inspection than if the departmental bowling team was getting together.

The proactive manager, in avoiding the Stockholm syndrome, has constructive debriefings after shifts so that officers are not required to have makeshift debriefings at the local pub. Although these "choir practices" can have minimally constructive benefits to the establishment of peer camaraderie, they can prove to be fertile ground to the development of abusive drinking patterns that can jeopardize home life stability and only further remove a remaining support system from the officer's life.

Management, in taking a preventive/proactive approach, would need to see that autocratic authoritarian communication patterns must decrease in proportion to the degree of close proximity inmate-officer contact. An autocratic style must give way to a participatory bent in management. In order to avoid the "loyalty slippage" of the Stockholm syndrome the central issues of isolation and distance from peer support felt by correctional officers would need to be directly addressed. Many of the management philosophies exposed by Peters and Waterman and their volume, *In Search of Excellence*, would lend themselves directly to a correctional institution's attempts to create a need fulfilling work environment for the officer.¹⁷

Each manager in a correctional facility must ask himself: "If I'm not meeting the needs of my officers and not listening to them, who is?" The answer can be quite frightening. Correctional officers cannot be made to feel that they are victims or left to feel that they are in the same boat as the inmates.

Correctional management has lagged behind law enforcement management in the area of utilizing behavioral science or psychological services for officers experiencing job related difficulties.* Large correctional institutions are mandated by correctional standards to provide services to inmates, yet officers are left in the institution with minimal, if any, concern for job-related difficulties affecting their lives. As the new generation of correctional facilities takes over in the profession of corrections, providing officer services and management sensitivities to officer's needs must be viewed as genuine security concerns, not extraneous fringe benefits.

The utilization of female officers in male housing pods has raised some interesting observations on this issue. It may be that the "difference" between a female officer and male inmates in a housing pod may even help the officer retain her sense of identity and "difference". The uniform and the pride associated with wearing the uniform well may also strengthen the role identity of the pod officer.

The new generation jail concept is rapidly gaining popularity and will continue to flourish in the future. The podular/direct-supervision concept has been endorsed by the American Correctional Association, the American Institute of Architecture and and National Institute of Corrections.¹⁹ It has been, and will continue to be, widely accepted by the public when “packaged and sold”, utilizing a rational, reasonable approach.

There is simply no room today for the autocratic authoritarian manager. The correctional officer represents a vast untapped resource for effectively managing inmates. If management is to be successful, it **must** strive to be “enlightened management.” Managers must become thoroughly familiar with the psychological and sociological principles of human behavior which govern the actions of staff, as well as inmates. The needs of staff as well as inmates must be fulfilled. The corrections profession is evolving rapidly. Management can guide this evolution and grow or be left in the dust. The challenge is clear.

References

1. Filipowicz, Christine, A., “The Troubled Employee: Whose Responsibility?” *The Personnel Administrator*, **1979**, **24(6)**, pp. 17-23.
2. Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H.. In *Search of Excellence*, Harper and Row, New York, 1984.
3. Druckner, Peter F., *Management Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, New York, Harper and Row, 1974.
4. United States Health, Education and Welfare Department, Special Task Force, *Work in America*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1973, p. 83.
5. Kroes, William H., *Society's Victim-The Policeman*, Charles Thomas Publisher, Springfield, 1972.
6. Bard, Morton, *The Function of the Police in Crisis Intervention and Conflict Management*, U.S. Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Associates, Inc., 1975.
7. Maslow, Abraham, *Motivation and Personality*, 2nd Ed., New York, Harper and Row, 1970.
8. Zimbardo, Phillip G., “Pathology of Imprisonment”, *Society*, April 1972.
9. Sherif, Muzafer, *Social Interaction: Processes and Products*, Chicago, Aldine, 1967.
10. Hassel, Conrad, “The Hostage Situation”, *The Police Chief*, September 1965.
11. Scholssberg, Harvey, *Psycho/gist with a Gun*, Coward, McCann, and F. Geoghegan. New York, 1971.
12. Hacker, Frederick, *Crusaders. Criminals, and Crazies*, Norton and Company, New York, 1976.
13. Lewinski, William J., *An Alternative Explanation for the Stockholm Syndrome*, Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Arizona, 1980.
14. Festinger, Leon, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson, and Company, 1957.
15. Ochberg, G., “The Victim of Terrorism: Psychiatric Considerations”, *Terrorism*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1979, pp. 147-168.

16. Schuler, Randall, S., 'Effective Use Of Communication to Minimize Employee Stress", *The Personnel Administrator*, 1979, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 40-49.
17. Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.J., *Ibid*.
18. Reiser, Martin, *Police Psychology: Collected Papers*. LEHI Publishing Company, Los Angeles, 1982.
19. Nelson, W.R., and Mike O'Toole, *New Generation Jai/s*, Library Specialist, Inc., December 1983.

PODULAR/DIRECT SUPERVISION DETENTION FACILITIES: CHALLENGES FOR HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT'

By Linda L Zupan, Ben A. Menke and Nicholas P. Lovrich
Department of Political Science, Washington State University, Pullman

Introduction

During the last decade, the practice of inmate management in local detention facilities (jails) has undergone a major re-evaluation. The questioning of the traditional philosophy has been the result of court mandated change, investigations by various state and federal jail commissions, and the activities of professional corrections associations (Nelson, 1984). From this reform movement has emerged the new generation, podular/direct supervision design for detention facility architecture and inmate management (National Institute of Corrections, 1983). The introduction of direct supervision management has dramatically changed the correction officer's role from occasional inmate supervision and crisis management to the management of all inmate behavior through continuous and direct interpersonal interaction.

The design of the podular/direct supervision facility is based on a number of principles about the effect of architecture on human behavior.² First, inmates are broken into smaller groups of 16 to 46 and housed in living areas called modules. Second, the modules are staffed, 24 hours a day, by a correction officer. Third, the modules are effectively self-contained to reduce movement of inmates and opportunities for breeches of security. Fourth, the modules are designed to enhance a correction officers interaction with and observation of inmates. Fifth, furnishings and accouterments within the modules function to reduce inmate stress associated with crowding, noise, lack of privacy and isolation from the outside world. Sixth, bars and metal doors are noticeably absent with the effect of reducing noise and the dehumanization typically associated with hard design correctional facilities.⁴

Although podular/direct supervision facilities have been in operation within the Federal Prison System for 10 years and in various local jurisdictions for as long as 4 years, there is little research about the correction officer's contribution to direct supervision inmate management. The extant literature suggests that effective inmate management is achieved through the officers ability to maintain "total control," to "communicate effectively," and to be a "good leader (National Institute of Corrections, 1983). However, little is known about the officers' implementation of these general principles in the direct supervision of inmates.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the role of the detention facility correction officer who manages inmates in a face to face context. More specifically, we focus on: 1) identification of officer behaviors which are effective or ineffective in maintaining control over inmate behavior, 2) the classification of these behaviors into performance dimensions to better understand the philosophy of interpersonal inmate behavior control, and 3) the policy implications of direct supervision inmate management for human resource development within the facility.

Methodology

Correction officers and first line supervisors in two podular/direct supervision detention facilities, located in the western United States, were interviewed about the critical behaviors required for effective correction officer job performance. The critical incident technique, a method of job analysis developed by Flanagan (1954) and commonly used in personnel-related research (Latham, et al., 1980; Latham and Wexley, 1981), was used to identify correction officer behaviors required for the effective implementation of direct supervision inmate management. Each respondent was asked to describe actual incidents of both

effective and ineffective officer job performance observed within the past 6 to 12 months. They were asked to describe, in detail, 1) the situation, circumstances or background of the incident, 2) the effective or ineffective behavior exhibited by the officer, and 3) the outcome of the incident or why the behavior was an example of effective or ineffective behavior. The advantage of the critical incident technique over other methods of job analysis is that it provides behaviorally-based information about what correction officers are actually doing and what they should be doing, and focuses on the behaviors associated with successful or unsuccessful task performance.

At each facility, subjects were selected from the following groups: 1) correction officers with more than one year of experience in a podular/direct supervision facility, 2) officers identified by a majority of supervisors as particularly effective in performance of their job ("waterwalkers")⁴, and 3) first line supervisors. Eighteen interviews (12 officers, 3 waterwalkers, 3 supervisors) were conducted at one facility while ten (6 officers, 2 waterwalkers, 2 supervisors) were conducted at the second. In addition to the interviews, a group of officers from each facility were given detailed instructions and asked to provide examples of critical incidents and behaviors in writing. Twenty-three officers in one facility and 28 in the other provided written incidents and behaviors. A total of 346 incidents were collected: 177 from interviews and 169 self-reported.

After all the incidents were collected, those that were similar, if not identical, were grouped together into one item and ambiguous incidents were eliminated. In this stage, the incidents were synthesized into 70 behavioral items. The items were then categorized according to the similarities in the effective and ineffective behavior exhibited by the officer. The analysts yielded seven descriptive categories or dimensions of critical correction officer behavior, each associated with 6 to 15 behavioral items. Content validity of the items and dimensions was assessed by withholding 10% of the incidents prior to the editing stage (Latham and Wexley, 1981). These incidents were examined after development of the dimensions and were found to describe behaviors already represented in the established items and dimensions.

In addition to the critical incident interviews, informal discussions were held with correction officers, supervisors and administrators from four podular/direct supervision facilities, one facility in the process of moving from a traditional to direct supervision design, and three traditional linear facilities. These discussions provided substantive material for contrasting correction officer performance in traditional and podular/direct supervision facilities.

The Critical Dimensions

Emphasized throughout the interviews was the relationship between an officer's behavior and the climate of the module. Officers defined behaviors as effective when they produced an environment free from conflicts among inmates and between inmates and staff. Ineffective behaviors were those that produced tension, anger and resentment, incited verbal or physical confrontations and those that, either directly or indirectly, led to inmate rebellion or misbehavior. The officers exhibited a strong belief that through effective inmate management practices they could produce a safe and humane module environment.

The following seven performance dimensions summarize the most important behaviors required to produce a positive, safe and humane detention environment. While the following behaviors may be innovative when applied to inmate management, many are clearly reminiscent of the principles of effective personnel supervision or even, as several officers pointed out, effective parenting (International City Management Association, 1984).

DIMENSION ONE: Managing the living Unit to Assure a Safe and Humane Environment - The extent to which the correction officer used observation and communication to maximize compliant inmate behavior and minimize the occurrence of disruptive inmate behavior in the living unit: clearly communicated facility rules and expectations to inmates and immediately responded to all incidents of inmate misbehavior.

Three types of behavior were emphasized by officers as vital to the day to day **management of inmates** in the module. First, they emphasized the need for a proactive (preventive) approach to inmate supervision in contrast to the traditional reactive approach where, in general, the officer responds to threats to order after they have escalated into serious incidents. In one sense, proactivity referred to the continuous and active observation of all inmates and their activities. Moving among inmates while in the module, listening attentively, engaging them in casual conversation, observing their actions, and asking questions were activities the officer engaged in to gather information about what was occurring in the module, to gauge sources of conflict or tensions, and, above all, to identify and react to situations before they escalated into serious problems. Ignoring inmates, sitting behind one's desk reading a book or newspaper, isolating oneself from the activities of inmates were described as ineffective behaviors which often resulted in inmate problems. For example, one officer described a situation involving a group of inmates who were playing cards for 5 to 6 hours a day. The officer ignored the situation and sat at his desk reading a book. The ineffectiveness of his behavior was later revealed when it was discovered that the inmates were gambling for commissary goods and that cheating and extortion were part of the game.

Another type of proactivity concerned the recognition of potential problems and the necessity for **prompt** intervention before they escalated. An officer described a situation where two inmates were arguing over the seating arrangement at dinner. At the first indication of the argument, the officer intervened and ordered both inmates to their individual rooms. This was described as effective proactive behavior because it stopped an argument before it progressed to a more serious altercation. A corresponding example of ineffective behavior occurred when an officer allowed two inmates to continue an argument over which television show to watch. The argument erupted into a physical fight. Instead of dealing with two inmates exchanging heated words, the officer was forced to intervene between two battling inmates, risking injury to himself and to other inmates.

A third type of proactivity concerned the need to act upon every violation of a facility rule. While officers had the discretion to deal with minor inmate rule violations in a number of ways, the consensus was that every rule violation, no matter how minor, must be addressed and, at the least, brought to the attention of the offending inmates. Allowing a rule violation to go without acknowledgement was viewed as a signal to inmates to test other rules.

A second group of behaviors emphasized as necessary for day to day module management focused on the need to communicate official facility rules and policies to the inmates and explain personal expectations. Effective communication of rules and expectations was performed in a number of ways that ranged from: an initial viewing of a videotape upon arrival at the facility; meeting with inmates upon their arrival in the module; holding daily meetings with inmates; and casually discussing issues when the inmates were gathered together at meal time. Officers viewed these behaviors as effective because they reinforced facility rules, alerted inmates to officer expectations, and explicitly defined the bounds of acceptable behavior. Failure to communicate rules and expectations was seen as an invitation for inmate misbehavior and was believed to result in inmate hostility and tension over disciplinary action.

A final group of behaviors defined as crucial to the daily operation of the module concerned the vigilant guarding of officers' authority to prevent encroachment by inmates. The direct supervision philosophy of inmate management is predicated on the notion that the officer can be the only leader in the module (National Institute of Corrections, 1983). This is in direct contrast to many traditional facilities which formally or informally use and tolerate inmate leaders to maintain a semblance of order. Authority, when granted to or usurped by an inmate, becomes a coercive weapon used to manipulate others, including the officer. Several incidents were described where an inmate assumed duties that were the sole responsibility of the officer. In one situation an officer assigned an inmate to supervise the clean-up duties of other inmates. The inmate was free to use the situation to his own benefit. Other inmates viewed the action as "playing favorites." Hostility and tension developed between the supervising inmate and other inmates. The situation deteriorated to the point of potential violence against the supervising inmate and disruption of the module. By retaining authority, the officer could have prevented the situation from occurring.

DIMENSION TWO: Handling Inmate Discipline - The extent to which an officer responded fairly and effectively when disciplining inmates for disruptive behavior or rule violations.

The process of disciplining inmate misbehavior takes on added importance within the direct supervision facility. Discipline consists of a complex structuring of a range of penalties designed to achieve the overriding goal of an orderly module and compliant inmate behavior. The purpose of discipline is the maintenance of an orderly environment rather than the punishment of any particular inmate.

The process through which the officer disciplines an inmate for violation of facility rules was repeatedly illustrated in the critical incident interviews. Two major behavioral themes emerged: 1) use of progressive discipline, and 2) the application of fair and consistent disciplinary measures.

Progressive discipline required officers to make a distinction between minor and serious rule violations and between occasional and repeated violations, and to take disciplinary action based on these judgements. The informal disciplinary means most often mentioned by officers were counseling or discussion with the offending inmate (discussing the rule violated by the inmate, the reason for the rule, determining why the rule was violated and explaining the consequences of repeated rule violation), a verbal warning or reprimand, and/or sending the inmate to his/her room. Informal discipline was viewed as an effective way to deal with rule violations too minor to take official disciplinary action and where the purpose of the discipline was to put to a stop the misbehavior without removing the inmate from the module. The effectiveness of informal discipline depended on the officer's willingness to follow through on warnings (or promises) to discipline continued misbehavior. Formal disciplinary options available to officers included extended lockdown of the inmate within his/her room or transfer to a segregation unit (a traditional maximum security module located within the facility).

The second of these emphasized the fair and consistent application of discipline. Officers described situations where inmate perception about inconsistent and unfair disciplinary action led to unrest and hostility, a breakdown of order in the module, stimulation of further inmate misbehavior, disruption of staff/inmate relations, and arousal of tension among staff members. Among the most effective behaviors for insuring fair and consistent discipline were: 1) disciplining only offending inmate rather than all inmates in the module, 2) disciplining an inmate in private rather than in the presence of other inmates, 3) explaining the reason for the disciplinary action to the inmate, in particular, identifying the rule the inmate violated, and 4) providing the inmate with an opportunity to explain the circumstances of his/her misbehavior.

In contrast to the discipline process in the direct supervision facility, the structure of traditional facilities (intermittent supervision) precludes fair and consistent disciplinary action. Because of the alternating presence and absence of the officer, discipline for rule infractions is differentially distributed and results from an officer's chance observation of misbehavior or from inmate snitches. Thus, in a traditional detention facility, an officer's ability to control inmate behavior is structurally compromised and his/her authority is subject to manipulation by inmate groups.

DIMENSION THREE: Responding to Inmate Requests - The extent to which an officer effectively responded to inmate requests and demands in a fair and balanced fashion avoided inmate manipulation.

In the direct supervision facility, the module officer is the most direct contact the inmate has with the facility's administration, other components of the criminal justice system and with the outside world. As a consequence, officers face a daily barrage of questions, requests for information, and complaints from inmates. How an officer deals with these questions and requests directly influences the degree of anxiety, hostility and isolation felt by inmates.

Several behavioral themes were discerned from the interviews. First was the need to acknowledge and respond to every inmate request even when the response was to deny the request. Several officers with experience in traditional jails highlighted the importance of this theme when they recounted how officers in these facilities, because of their intermittent contact with inmates, developed strategies to deal with inmate requests by lying about what they would do in response to the requests or by ignoring the requests. These survival strategies promoted further inmate isolation and hostility, led to increased tension and disorderliness within the facility and resulted in a tendency for the officer to avoid those inmates to whom promises had been made and not kept.

Other themes included responding to inmate requests in a polite and courteous manner, equal treatment of all requests, and fulfilling all promises made to inmates. One officer provided this example of ineffective behavior. An inmate requested a supply item provided by the jail to indigent inmates. The officer's response was to remind the inmate that he was in jail and should not even get air to breathe. The officer was faced not only with the hostility of the inmate but the hostility of all inmates in the module when the comment was circulated.

DIMENSION FOUR: Building Positive Rapport and Personal Credibility With Inmates - The extent to which the correction officer created an environment of mutual respect by demonstrating consistency and a courteous manner.

The officer, as the leader in the module, is expected to take responsibility for setting a positive tone for interaction among inmates and staff. If officers dehumanize, belittle or degrade inmates or are unable to control their emotions, the message communicated is that negative, antisocial and uncivil behavior is the norm. Inmate compliance and cooperation thus become problematic. If the officer's behavior reflects a mature, polite and civil demeanor, the message that incivility is intolerable is reinforced.

The need to create a module environment of mutual respect was accomplished by demonstrating consistency in day to day interactions with the inmates, maintaining a courteous demeanor, using common courtesies such as "please" and "thank you," and remaining emotionally controlled in contacts with inmates, regardless of the situation or circumstance. Several incidents were described in which officers were called derogatory names by inmates. Overwhelmingly, the officers agreed that retaliation against inmates by calling them derogatory names or taking excessive disciplinary action in an emotional fashion produced even greater inmate hostility and misbehavior.

DIMENSION FIVE: Supervising in a Clear, Well-Organized and Attention-Getting Manner - The extent to which the officer exhibited effective skill in organizing, supervising and motivating inmates in their activities.

The principles of effective supervision, irrespective of the organizational setting, require specific skills and abilities. The officers reiterated and elaborated on these general principles. Effective supervision of inmate task performance depended on the ability of the officer to 1) clearly communicate orders, requests and requirements of a task; 2) assign tasks equitably and consistent with inmate abilities; 3) motivate inmate compliance through praise and constructive criticism; 4) insure that inmates were able to comply with orders; 5) provide continual feedback to inmates on their performance; and 6) follow up on inmate compliance. The importance of effective supervisory skills was illustrated in several incidents. Two examples were given where inmates ignored officers' orders. In one situation, instead of insuring that the inmate complied, the officer gave the same order to another inmate, hoping that this inmate would obey the command. In the other situation, the officer performed the task assigned to the inmate. These behaviors were labeled ineffective because they demonstrated the officers' inability to exercise authority. It was predicted that both officers would be confronted with mass inmate disobedience in the future.

In the direct supervision facility officers rely on effective supervisory techniques to insure inmate compliance and accomplishment of daily tasks. In contracts, in traditional facilities the staff often rely on

inmate leaders or "tank bosses" to supervise completion of daily inmate tasks. This creates several problems; the correction officer's authority is compromised and inmate manipulation of other inmates is facilitated to the detriment of facility order.

DIMENSION SIX: Resolving Inmate Problems and Conflicts - The extent to which correction officers provided guidance for the solution of inmate problems; recognized the steps involved in resolution of inmate conflicts: dealt with inmates in confrontational situations.

Within the close confines of any detention facility, conflicts and disputes will arise among inmates and between inmates and the correctional staff. The officers recognized the potential for escalation of these minor daily conflicts into large scale disruptive events. They argued that the effective officer was **proactive** and dealt with these conflicts at the first sign of disharmony.

The behaviors described under this dimension focused on officers' conflict management and problem-solving abilities. The officers described generally-accepted principles of conflict resolution. They pointed out that the effective officer separated inmates in a dispute by sending them to their rooms to calm down; gathered information about the cause of disputes; offered alternatives; and negotiated agreements. In addition, the officers discussed the importance of a patient and calm demeanor and the use of innovative and creative solutions.

The officers provided a number of examples of conflict situations. In one situation inmates were arguing over the use of the telephone. Several inmates needed to make "life threatening" telephone calls at the same time. An argument ensued. To deal with the potentially volatile situation, the officer arranged a row of chairs by the telephone. Inmates were instructed to take a seat and, when the telephone was available (each call was limited to 10 minutes), move forward one seat. Although the situation appeared overly simplistic, the droll manner in which the officer offered the solution broke the tension and ended the arguing. Thus, the officer was prompt and innovative in his actions and averted a situation that was certain to erupt into a major conflict.

DIMENSION SEVEN: Maintaining Effective Administrative and Staff Relations - The extent to which the correction officer had knowledge of and consistently applied facility rules and procedures; coordinated activities with co-workers; supported the authority of staff members; communicated with supervisors and other administrators.

In traditional jails, staff-administrative relations are often mistakenly assumed to affect only the organizational dynamics and job satisfaction of individual employees. It became clear in our interviews that these relations are important for the achievement of an orderly module and for facility security. In contrast to officers in a traditional jail, the module officer is a crucial, if not the most important, organizational member.

The officers emphasized their role in maintaining effective relationships among staff and between staff and administration. Of critical importance was their emphasis on consistency between officers in dealing with inmates. In particular, consistency was demanded between module officers on different shifts. The rules enforced on one shift must be the same rules enforced on other shifts. Several behaviors were described as effective in maintaining consistency between officers including holding regular and informal meetings with all shift officers assigned to a module, providing pertinent information to relieving shift officers, refraining from expressing criticism of another officer in the presence of inmates.

Providing appropriate information to the facility administration in a timely manner was also reported to be important. One officer recounted a situation in which an inmate confessed to having committed a homicide to an officer. The officer, believing that the inmate was lying (he was in jail on different charges) did not relate the information to his supervisor. The inmate later confessed to the crime in court and told the judge that he had advised an officer of the crime. Not surprisingly, the officer faced disciplinary actions for his

failure to report the confession to his supervisor. As illustrated in this example, open channels of communication between officers and supervisors and among officers is vitally important for module order, facility security and protection of the individual officer.

The officer's knowledge of and adherence to facility policies and procedures was mentioned as a vital component of effective staff-administrative relations. The officers argued that the policy and procedures manual was, in effect, "the Bible." By behaving in ways consistent with policies and procedures, the officers avoided inmate manipulation and promoted consistency in module management. In addition, officer practices consistent with official policy created a communication system where feedback and change in formal operating procedures was accomplished in a legitimate fashion.

While many of the behaviors described above may be practiced in traditional jails, the architectural design of these facilities limits their full and effective use. The fundamental element of direct supervision is the direct and continuous contact between corrections officers and inmates. The linear design of traditional jails makes it structurally and fiscally impossible for this type of contact. Without the direct supervision of inmates, use of effective observation, proactive rule enforcement, communication, progressive discipline, consistency, personal interaction and the other principles described above are virtually impossible. Once the appropriate architecture is in place, however, the success or failure of the direct supervision facility rests on the effective performance of the module officers. Because of this the facility must assess and evaluate the processes through which officers are selected, developed and supervised.

Implications for Personnel Processes

Schein (1981:88) argues that "organizations are becoming more dependent upon people because they are increasingly involved in more complex technologies and are attempting to function in more complex economic, political and socio-cultural environments." This is nowhere more evident than in institutional corrections. External forces (courts, fiscal agents, etc.) are placing greater pressures on detention facilities to provide more humane incarceration for an increasing number of inmates at lower operating costs. Facilities have become more dependent on their employees to attain a wide spectrum of competing and conflicting goals - from maintaining facility security to protecting the community to providing safe incarceration to preventing expensive law suits. Yet research reveals that, in general, correction officers are a somewhat disaffected group. Symptoms of their plight include low job satisfaction, cynicism, alienation, job stress, etc. (Cullen, et al., 1985; Farmer, 1977; Jurick and Winn, 1986; Poole and Regoli, 1981; Shamir and Drory, 1982). The costs to the organization in terms of high attrition and absenteeism, increased error rates and reduced productivity, are astronomical.

Our research on the role of direct supervision officers implicates two factors in the personnel problems of detention facilities. These factors are: 1) the nature and design of the correction officer job, and 2) the lack of a coherent philosophy linking officer practices with detention facility goals. These two factors are inter-related. The lack of a coherent philosophy and goals prevents officers from clearly identifying the obligations of the job or the organization's expectations of their performance. Deprived of these the officer must second guess the organization or rely on co-workers (or even inmates) to provide clarity. In either case, the risks are high that the officer may be performing in direct opposition to the facility's formal mission and goals. Further distortion of the facility's goals results from the nature and design of the correction officer's job which focuses officer attention on fragmented tasks and routines rather than on the relationship of these to the overriding goals of the institution. The nature of the job promotes a focus on tasks and routines as ends rather than as means to an end. When tasks and routines predominate, responsibility for achieving goals becomes diffuse and fragmented.

An examination of correction officer activities, tasks and assignments in traditional facilities illustrates these points. The following tasks have been emphasized for New York correction officers: "Checks inmate passes and records inmates' movements in and out of areas," "-Watches for unusual incidents and reports

any to his supervisor either verbally or in writing," "Makes periodic rounds of assigned areas **checking for** faulty bars, gates, etc. and checks areas for daily fire reports," "Frisks inmates and fills out frisk sheets," "Announces sick call," "Supervises bathing," etc. (Tech, 1982:85-86). As is evident, the core obligations in the traditional correction officer role represent pluralistic, mundane and impoverished means to an end. The core obligations appear to be routine, fragmented and bureaucratic chores that require little or no judgment, initiative, or skill on the part of the correction officer and are not linked in any coherent fashion with an overriding facility philosophy or goal. In addition to promoting a means-oriented rather than goal-oriented officer focus, the nature and design of the job frustrates fulfillment of officers' deeper, more personal needs for recognition, challenge, responsibility and achievement, and produces workers who **are** dissatisfied, unmotivated, alienated from their jobs and uncommitted to the goals of the organization.

In contrast, the depth and breadth of the core obligations revealed in our data suggests that the direct supervision officers job is an "enriched" one. Hackman (1981) argues that people are motivated and satisfied by jobs which are perceived as being meaningful, provide employees with responsibility for the outcome of their efforts and provide regular feedback as to the success or failure of their performance. Under the premises of job enrichment work is redesigned to provide optimal opportunity for workers to experience these conditions. Our analysis found that the direct supervision role possesses a number of enriching characteristics. The direct supervision officer role requires officers to observe, investigate and resolve inmate problems providing officers with the opportunity to use a variety of skills and abilities; requires officers to deal with problems and situations within the module allowing them to complete a job from beginning to end; requires officers to assess the impact of management skills on module order demanding that they evaluate the significance of their role; requires officers to make decisions within the module increasing their sense of responsibility and autonomy; and finally, requires officers to monitor inmate responses to their efforts providing them with information and feedback as to the effectiveness of their performance.

Whether or not job enrichment was an intended consequence of the direct supervision design is moot. Job enrichment is a consequence of the design and as such, has implications for management practices in these facilities. Of vital importance is the articulation and inculcation of direct supervision's mission and goals to corrections officers. Direct supervision provides correction officers with new and complex responsibilities. In particular, the locus of daily decision-making and authority has shifted from supervisor to line officer. Because of the fragmented nature of the correction officer job in traditional facilities, first line supervisors compensate for the lack of employee commitment to organizational goals by either making all decisions or, at the least, closely policing the decisions made by line officers. The architectural and management style of direct supervision requires officers to assume broad decision-making responsibilities once held by supervisors. For officers to make decisions and align their activities and actions in a way consistent with the mission of the facility, they must not only possess a clear notion of what the mission is, but they must be dedicated and committed to it. When knowledge of and dedication to the organization's mission are absent, officers will look to other sources for clues on how best to perform the job. The risks are too great in direct supervision for officers to function without a clear understanding of the facility's mission.

Unlike most traditional detention facilities, direct supervision architecture and operations have been developed on a strong body of knowledge on human psychology. From this has emerged a clear and concise statement of the direct supervision mission. How the facility instills this mission with its employees - how the facility insures employee commitment to the mission - depends on the degree to which the organization has aligned its personnel practices with the direct supervision philosophy. An appropriate personnel system insures employee commitment by explicitly linking philosophy and goals to the processes of personnel recruitment, selection and socialization/orientation. It reinforces employee commitment by using the philosophy to specifically inform training, supervisory coaching and counseling, and performance evaluation. And finally, the organization rewards employees for the commitment by promoting salaries and benefits commensurate with officers' new responsibilities and by instituting collaborative management practices.

While success or failure of direct supervision rests heavily on the ability of the correctional staff to implement the philosophy, the processes through which talented and able officers are selected, developed and supervised have yet to be fully explored. Thus far, individual facilities have undertaken their own "search for excellence" in their personnel. Future research needs to be dedicated to assisting these facilities in development of personnel systems which fulfill the more complex demands on direct supervision employees. The results of our exploration into the changing role of the corrections officer leads us to offer the following for consideration:

1. The processes of recruitment and selection are crucial to insure that qualified and capable personnel are hired. Often overlooked, however, is that both send important messages about the philosophy of the facility and the standards of excellence expected of employees once hired. If, for example, recruitment and selection processes emphasize routine and mundane task performance, only by accident will employees who can integrate ends and means be recruited and hired.

Traditional methods of correction officer recruitment appear to be inadequate in fulfilling the personnel needs of direct supervision facilities. The demand for employees with the ability to make complex judgments, exercise leadership and understand and communicate with a broad range of people necessitates that the search for employees be broadened. It must be designed to draw applicants from diverse backgrounds by targeting heretofore ignored groups or categories of people. To accomplish this, the recruitment search must reach beyond local boundaries.

Personnel selection practices for traditional facilities are woefully inadequate. The process tends to focus on the "weeding out" of obvious undesirables. The direct supervision selection process must not only eliminate undesirables but must focus on ranking the qualities of those who meet the minimum standards. This process of gradation must be linked with the philosophy and practices in direct supervision facilities. The direct supervision role demands that the selection process focus on applicants' ability or potential to integrate means with ends rather than on the ability to merely perform a series of unrelated tasks.

2. Often ignored in the personnel process is the socialization or orientation period that occurs after officers complete basic training and assume regular duties. This is an important phase in the employee's development of attitudes and opinions about the job and will determine, in the long run, whether or not the employee will implement the skills learned in basic training and commit to the mission of the organization. It is vital that the facility provide an environment for the newly hired which reinforces basic training and reiterates the philosophy and goals of the facility. To meet this challenge, many direct supervision facilities have instituted a period of on-the-job training lasting up to 90 days during which the new officer is assigned to work with an experienced, qualified and *appropriate/y committed officer*.
3. While the short term goal of basic or in-service training is to provide employees with the skills necessary to perform their job, training can play an important role in instilling and reinforcing the mission of the facility. Although training needs to address the policies, procedures and practices of daily responsibilities, it must also facilitate a long term commitment to organizational goals. Training which is so narrowly and rigidly focused on task performance to the exclusion of linking tasks with goals, will consistently handicap the employee who faces unique situations not addressed in training. In this regard, the content of training must be balanced between imparting the necessary skills for task performance and providing employees with knowledge broad enough to allow formulation of effective responses in unique situations.
4. A unique feature of the move to direct supervision concerns the preparation of transitional staff (staff moving from the old to new facility). The experience of facilities who have made the transition indicates that among these employees turnover is high, there is resistance to change, and, often times, there is an attempt to sabotage the new operations. It is imperative that special attention be paid to the

problems of these individuals through the following means. First, transition staff or their representatives must be involved from the beginning in the total planning and implementation processes to foster commitment and alleviate concerns. Second, whenever possible, it is recommended that transition staff members be sent to on-line, successful direct supervision facilities for on-the-job experience. Finally, specialized transition staff training must not only emphasize the new philosophy and operations but must address employees' fears concerning change.

5. Supervisor/officer relations in the direct supervision facility are critical to successful operations yet their implications are often overlooked. First, redesign of the correction officer job has moved the locus of many responsibilities from the supervisor to the correction officer. For supervisors, the change may be perceived as threatening and result in sabotage or confusion about the dimensions of their new role. Special attention must be paid to the redefinition of supervisor responsibilities and to their training needs. Second, supervisors play an important role in the reinforcement of the facility's mission and goals. Through continuous and regular coaching and counseling supervisors can ensure that officer performance is consistent with facility goals. Third, in the long run, the style of supervision must also be re-evaluated. The changes in the correction officers' job redefines the officer as sole authority figure within the module. Supervisors must be sensitive to this. In general, supervisors should not supercede, contradict or intervene except in the most critical situations or when officers are in direct violation of facility policy. Supervisor intervention, when necessary, should be respectful of the officers' authority and expertise. Their role must reflect a more collegial worker/supervisor relationship. They must realize that their role entails not only authority over officers but support for them. A caveat is in order. Experience indicates that during the early stages of operation of the new facility, supervisors are well advised to adopt a task-oriented style. That is, the supervisor must closely monitor officer performance to assure that it is consistent with facility policy and overall philosophy. Once officers are comfortable with their new role and when all officers share in a commitment to the philosophy, the supervisor can move to a style that emphasizes watching and the provision of support (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972). Fourth, supervisors must play an active role in preventing officer's feelings of isolation within the module and the possibility of cooptation by inmates. This is most effectively prevented through frequent supervisor contact insuring that officers are relieved from the module for breaks and meals, and by insuring that there are ample opportunities for co-worker contacts.
6. The performance appraisal process provides important opportunities for the facility to reinforce the direct supervision philosophy and goals. Formal performance appraisal provides the facility with opportunities to draw attention to officer performance which is consistent or inconsistent with the facility's mission: adjust behaviors that are counterproductive or inconsistent with facility policies; identify training or re-training needs; identify those with promotion potential or the potential for added responsibilities; and, practice career development and counseling. A meaningful performance appraisal process must include the following: 1) an adequate behaviorally-based assessment instrument capable of evaluating the critical performance dimensions and behaviors of the officers; 2) a process which emphasizes the relationship between ends of direct supervision and the means of task performance; 3) supervisory commitment to an ongoing, daily appraisal process supplemented with annual or bi-annual review sessions; 4) adequate supervisor observation and recording of pertinent behaviors; 5) a goal setting philosophy that focuses on the future performance of individuals rather than dwell on past performance; 6) a link between performance and formal and informal organizational rewards; and 7) a commitment to making the process a meaningful part of the organization's planning and development.
7. The issue of appropriate compensation and rewards is critical to the development of professional personnel. Three issues regarding compensation need to be addressed. First, the increased responsibilities of direct supervision employees require that salaries and benefits be commensurate with the demands. Second, retention of competent staff depends on an appropriate performance-reward link. Third, the recruitment of individuals in direct supervision relies heavily on the nature of pay and benefit packages. One of the most important factors in deterring the development of

traditional detention facilities has been the inability to attract highly competent, motivated and career-oriented people. Part of this problem can be linked to the effects of inadequate compensation and to the fact that, traditionally, detention facility employees have been paid far less than law enforcement officers. The result is that detention facility personnel are perceived as "second class" citizens. If employees are expected to assume new and demanding roles that emphasize judgment and wisdom over routine performance, it is vital that organizational energy be channeled into efforts to secure adequate compensation.

8. The redesign of correction officer and supervisor roles necessitates that administrators re-evaluate their overall approach to facility management. The nature of officer and supervisor roles provide employees with expertise, authority and knowledge heretofore absent from their jobs. To take advantage of this situation, the managerial approach adopted by the direct supervision facility must allow for the development of open, two way communication channels and the development of a general level of trust between employees and management.

The holistic design of the officers' job and their responsibility for implementing facility policy provides officers with opportunities to evaluate the the success or failure of formal operating procedures. By soliciting the input of these "experts" management can ensure that policies are informed by practice. The importance of open, two-way communication in policy formation and evaluation was illustrated by officers in one traditional facility. In this facility, a policy was implemented which rewarded inmates for maintaining a clean living area. According to the officers, the policy not only failed to attain its goal but stimulated the deterioration of the living areas. The officers attitude in not reporting the policy's failure to management was that "they never listen." How often are employees' energies directed away from organizational goals because "they never listen"?

Creating an environment that is supportive of increased levels of officer authority, autonomy and discretion presents a dilemma for management. On the one hand, it is imperative that management maintain a tight review process to ensure that the critical elements of direct supervision are met. On the other hand, management must recognize that these new responsibilities (perhaps professional ones) require the development of trust between the administration and employees. The resolution of this dilemma lies with the development of both unobtrusive, formal controls as well as a policy of collaborative and open decision-making and policy formation. How facilities adapt to this environment depends on their recognition of its requirements and their willingness to experiment with a number of diverse management styles.⁵

Our on-site study of several direct supervision facilities and a review of the pertinent literature leads us to conclude that, while there have been many programs, reforms and changes in institutional corrections, this may be the first time where a reform has been guided by an explicit, well thought out model which links philosophy, goals, tasks and implementation. The future success or failure of this endeavor depends upon a leadership that promotes an organizational culture which is universalistic rather than particularistic and fragmented. No only **must** leadership carefully integrate both means and ends in the management and operation of the facility, but it must also do so with its personnel systems.

Notes

1. The authors wish to thank the following people for their assistance in this research. Captain Don Manning, Spokane County Detention Facility, Spokane, Washington, provided the impetus and interest for this project: Director Gordon Yach, Assistant Direct Paul Martin and Sgt. Frank Tucker, Las Vegas Detention Center, and Major Russell Davis and Captain John Alese, Pima County Detention Center, for their willingness to open their facilities for an in-depth examination: Chief Robert Skipper and Captain Joseph Golden, Multnomah County Detention Center and Director Larry Ard and Leslie Glenn, Contra Costa Detention Center, for their contributions to the study. Finally, we wish to thank all

correction officers and supervisors who-shared their time and expertise. The willingness to participate in such time consuming research is a sign of a new professionalism emerging in the field of corrections.

This manuscript was adapted from the article "New generation Jails: Innovations in Inmate Management," by Linda L. Zupan, presented at the annual meeting of the Western Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, November 1985, in Reno.

2. In tandem, the architectural design and inmate management style of direct supervision function to alleviate staff and inmate fear and predation associated with an uncontrolled environment. For a discussion of these dynamics see Zupan, Linda L., "New generation Jails: Innovations in Inmate Management."
3. The concept of self-contained, direct supervision design is not new to the field of connections and mental health care. For example, some variant of this style is found in both adult and juvenile treatment facilities. However, it is new to jails and it may be the first time where a coherent philosophy meshes architectural design and facility operations and management.
4. Harvard psychologist David C. McClelland argues that by identifying outstanding performers within an organization and by intensively interviewing them as to how they perform their job, judgments can be made about "what competencies these stars (show) that other people (fail) to show" (Quoted in Goleman 1981:36).
5. There are a number of other personnel-related issues which need further research. Probably the most important concerns corrections officer career development. Facilities have approached this issue differently. For example Contra Costa Detention Facility places officers in the facility for a period of 18 months before transferring them to the street as deputies. Other facilities have developed a correctional career track where officers spend their tenure within the facility. Both have advantages and disadvantages, and have important implications for the personnel processes within the facility.

References

Cullen, F.T., B.G. Link, N.T. Wolfe, and J. Frank (1985) "The Social Dimensions of Correctional Officer Stress." *Justice Quarterly*. 2(4): 505-533.

Farmer, R.E. (1977) "Cynicism: A Factor in Corrections Work." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 5:237-246.

Flanagan, J.C. (1954) "The Critical Incident Technique." *Psychological Bulletin*. 7:327-355.

Goleman, D. (1981) "The New Competency Tests: Matching the Right People to the Right Jobs." *Psychology Today*. January: 34-36.

Hackman, J.R., G. Oldham, R. Janson and K. Purdy (1981) "A New Strategy for Job Enrichment." In Klinger, D.E., ed., *Public Personnel Management*. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Hersey, P. and K.H. Blanchard (1972) *Management of Organizational Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

International City Management Association (1984) *Effective Supervisory Practices*, 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: ICMA Training Institute.

Zupan, et al.: Podular/Direct Supervision Detention Facilities: Challenges for Human Resource Development

Jurik, N.C. and R. Winn (1986) "Describing-Correctional Security Dropouts and Rejects: An **Individual or** Organizational Profile?" Presented at the 1986 annual Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences meeting in Orlando, Florida.

Latham, D.P., LM. Saari, E.D. Pursell and M.A. Campion (1980) "The Situational Interview." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 615(4):422-427.

Latham, G.P. and K.N. Wexley (1981) *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Nelson, W.R. (1984) "Isolation of Staff from Inmates: A Correctional Policy Issue for the 1980s." *Corrections Today*. (April): 106.

National Institute of Corrections (1983) *New Generation Jails*. Boulder, Colorado: Library Information Specialists, Inc.

Poole, E.D. and R.M. Regoli (1981) "Alienation in Prison." *Criminology*. 19(2):251-270.

Schein, E.H. (1981) "Increasing Organizational Effectiveness Through Better Human Resources Planning Development." In Klingner, D.E., ed., *Public Personnel Management*. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Shamir, B. and A. Drory (1982) "Occupational Tedium Among Prison Officers." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 19(1):79-99.

Toch, H. and J.D. Grant (1982) *Reforming Human Services*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

PROGRAM NIC SYMPOSIUM ON NEW GENERATION JAILS

Seattle, Washington; May 1, 1986

- 8:00-8:30 GENERAL INTRODUCTION (Caldwell, Frazier, OToole, Farbstein, Wener)
- 8:30-10:00 **Panel 1: ROUNDTABLE ON DESIGN OF NEW GENERATION JAILS**
Topics: Role of architect in decision to use direct supervision: need for visual surveillance with direct supervision; officer station versus back up control booth; hard or soft environment: what to do with older facilities: appropriate technologies.
Moderator: Jay Farbstein
Panelists: Steve Carter, Columbia SC; John Kibre, San Francisco CA; Jay Smith, Los Angeles CA; Virginia Yang, San Francisco, CA.
- 10:00-10:15 *Break (coffee)*
- 10:15- 11:45 **Panel 2: TRANSITION TO DIRECT SUPERVISION**
Topics: Getting officers and middle level managers to "buy-in:" staff training; phased move in versus all at once.
Moderator: Richard Wener
Paper: Richard Van Den Heuvel, Middlesex County NJ: "Training Middle Level Supervisors."
Panelists: Paul Bailey, Bexar County TX; Russell Davis, Pima County AZ; Sarah Heatherly, Dade County FL; Don Manning, Spokane County WA.
- 11:45-1:15 *Lunch (on own)*
- 1:15-2:45 **Panel 3: COSTS AND BENEFITS OF DIRECT SUPERVISION**
Topic: Comparative construction and operation costs of new generation versus traditional jails.
Moderator: Jay Farbstein
Papers: Ray Nelson, Boulder CO: "Preliminary Report on a Survey of Cost Savings in New Generation Jails"; Jerry Meece, Dade County FL: "Cost Analysis of Alternatives."
Panelists: Steve Carter, Columbia SC; Jay Smith, Los Angeles CA.
- 2:45-3:00 *Break (cold drink)*
- 3:00-4:30 **Panel 4: OPERATION OF NEW GENERATION JAILS**
Topics: Optimal staffing ratios and housing unit sizes, basic management principles, centralizing versus decentralizing programs and services.
Moderator: Richard Wener
Papers: Larry Ard, Contra Costa County CA: "Managing Direct Supervision;" Dr. Kevin Gilmartin, Pima County AZ: "The Stockholm Effect."
Panelists: Tom Barry, NYC; Rod Bottoms, Larimer County CO; Linda Zupan, Washington State University, Pullman WA.
- 4:30-5:30 **WRAP-UP: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?**
Topics: Should there be a network of new generation jails? What do the participants want in terms of support from NIC and each other? Develop an action plan.
Moderators: Bill Frazier and Mike O'Toole. NIC
- 5:30 *Adjourn*

Prior evenings: **DESIGN REVIEW**
Systems in planning or design bring plans for review by systems in operations. To be done in evenings during AJA. Arrangements to be made in advance.

CONSULTANTS

Tom Lonergan
Criminal Justice Consultants, Inc.
9900 Lakewood Blvd., #210
Downey, CA 90240
(213) 861-1251

John McGough
The McGough Group
W. 245 Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane, WA 99201
(509) 4557050

W. Raymond Nelson
Criminal Justice Consultant
6966 Carter Trail
Boulder, CO 80301
(303) 530-2882

Bob Boyle
Edwards and Daniels
525 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84102
(801) 531-7600

Ed Smith, California Board of Corrections
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-5073

John Kibre
44 Brannan Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
(415) 777-3737

Ken Ricci
Ehrenkrantz Group
19 West 44th Street
New York, NY 10036
(212) 730-1950

W. Jay Smith
Dworsky Associates
2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(213) 552-0822

National Institute of Corrections
Jail Center
1790 - 30th Street, Suite 440
Boulder, CO 80301
(303) 497-6700

Mike O'Toole
same as(above)

Jim T. Barbee
same as(above)

Dennis Liebert
same as above

Stephen A. Carter
Carter Goble Associates, Inc.
1331 Elmwood Avenue, Suite 102
P.O. Box 11287
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 765-2833

Virginia Yang
The Ehrenkrantz. Group
855 Front Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 956-4394

Bill Frazier
Contra Costa County Sheriff's Dept.
Detention Facility
1000 Ward St.
Martinez, CA 94533
(415) 372-2201

Chief James Painter
441 Bauchet, Room 1014
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-4901

Rick Scaly, Custody Commander
San Joaquin County
999 W. Mathews
French Camp, CA 95231
(209) 982-5151
in planning

Sheriff Jim Black
Larimer County Sheriff's Dept.
P.O. Box 1190
Ft. Collins, CO 80522
operational
160 beds
Oct. '83

Lt. Jack Hall
Solano County Sheriff
500 Texas Street
Fairfield, CA 94533
(707) 429-6225
in design
366 bed
mid '89

NIC NEW GENERATION JAIL SYMPOSIUM MAILING LIST

NORTHEAST

Anthony Pelicane, Director
Department of Corrections
Middlesex County Detention Center
P.O. Box 266
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
(201) 297-3636
operational
400+beds
4 years

Richard van den Heuvel
same as Anthony Pelicane, (above)

J. Patrick Gallagher, Superintendent
Erie County Correctional Facility
P.O. Box X
Alden, NY 14004
(716) 937-9101
operational
420 beds
1 month

Mr. Saxton, Director
Prince Georges County Detention Center
5310 Douglas
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
(301) 952-3857
under construction
596 beds
open in 2 months

David S. Owens
Philadelphia Central Jail
8201 State Road
Philadelphia, PA 19136
(215) 355-8221

Larry Leua, Jail Superintendent
Lake County Jail
10 North County Street
Waukegan, IL 60085
(312) 689-6300
in design
300-500 beds

Edgar Wheeler, Sheriff
Aroostook County Jail
P.O. Box 803
Houlton, ME 04730
(207) 5323471
planning
35 bed addition
open April '68

Gary Billy, Sheriff
Licking County Jail
46 South 3rd Street
Newark, OH 43055
(614) 345-9821

Sgt. Donald Erdman
Marathon County Jail
P.O. Box 1706
Wausau, WI 54401
(715) 845-8228
under construction
open Spring '87

Louis Gianoli, Sheriff
same as Sgt. Erdman (above)

Arthur M. Wallenstein, Director
Bucks County Prison
1730 South Easton Road
Doylestown, PA 18901
(215) 354-3701
under contraction
372 beds

Lt. Richard Cox
Milwaukee County Jail
821 West State Street
Milwaukee, WI 53223
(414) 278-4759
earliest planning stage

Edward Reynolds, Sheriff
Penobscott County Jail
85 Hammond Street
Bangor, ME 04401
(207) 947-4585

Warden Thomas Barry
Women's House of Detention
1515 Hazen Street
East Elmhurst, NY 11370 .
(718) 2763919

Rich Wener
Polytechnic University
333 Jay Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 643-5540

NYC Manhattan House of Detention
125 White Street
(212) 374-3249

Sheriff Babcox
Lake County, IL
(312) 689-6300

NY Metropolitan Correctional Center
150 Park Row
NY, NY 10007
(212) 791-9130

Warden O.C. Jenkins
Metropolitan Correctional Center
71 West Van Buren Street
Chicago, IL 60605
(312) 3536819

James. M. Ferels
Director of Inmate Services
917 Beach Street
Flint, MI 48502
(313) 2573406

Dave Troutman, Sheriff
Summit County
53 E. Center Street
Akron, OH 44308
(216) 379-2111
384-500 beds

Dick Ford, AJA
Hagerstown, MD
(301) 797-1181

James E. Murphy
6395 - 67th Ct.
Riverdale. MD 20737
(301) 459-6627

SOUTHEAST

Col. David M. Panish or
Steven Saunders, Planning Director
Hillsborough County Jail
1301 Morgan Tampa, FL 33602
OR
P.O. Box 3371
Tampa, FL 33601
(813) 2476411

Captain Kevin Hickey, Operations
Dade County
Corrections & Rehab. Dept., Room 722
1500 NW 12th Avenue
Miami, FL 33136
(305) 547-7029
1 - open since 1984 - 200 beds
1 - under construction - to open in '88 - 1000 bed
1 - planning (1250 beds)

Sarah Heatherty
same as Capt. Hickey, (above)

Jerry Meece
same Capt. Hickey, (above)

Jim Riechel, Director
Caddo Parish Jail
Route 5, Box 5742
Keithville, LA 71047
(318) 926-9552
waiting for bond issue to start planning

Major Can Richards
Guildford County Jail
401 West Sycamore Street
Greensborough, NC 27402
(919) 373-3226
ready to start construction
220 beds

Tom Faust, Director of Administration
Arlington County Detention Center
1400 N. Courthouse Road, Room 500
Arlington, VA 22201
(703) 558-2455

Sheriff Jim Gondles
Alexandria City Jail
Virginia
(703) 558-2455

James L. Proffitt, Sheriff
401 West Sycamore Street
Greensboro, NC 27402
(919) 373-3226
220 beds

L.R. Putnam, Warden
Metropolitan Correctional Center
Miami, FL 33177
(305) 2534400
operational
311 beds
March 76

William E. Osterhoff
Auburn University at Montgomery
Montgomery, AL 36193
(205) 271-9693

Clarence Thibodeaux
Pointe Couper Parish Sheriff Dept.
P.O. Box 248
New Roads, IA 70760
(504) 638-3737

NORTHWEST

Inspector David Hile
Hennepin County Jail
Room 6, Courthouse
Minneapolis, MN 55412
(612) 348-3744
operational
279 beds
1978

Linda Zupan, Research Associates
Dept. of Political Science
Criminal Justice Program
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4880
(509) 3352544

Captain Joseph Golden
Multnomah County Jail
1120 SW Third Avenue, Room 316
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 661-1771
operational
476 beds
1983

Robert G. Skipper, Chief of Corrections
Multnomah County Jail
1120 SW Third Avenue, Room 316
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 681-1771

Don Manning, Jail Administrator
Spokane County Jail
West 1100 Mallen Avenue
Spokane, WA 99260
(509) 4562337
under construction
510 beds
June '86

William B. Harper, Corrections Director
Snohomish County Jail
County Courthouse Complex
Everett, WA 98201
(206) 259-9395
just completed
277 beds
May 1

Rich Steele
same as William Harper (above)

Lt. Ray Dow, Operations Lt.
Salt Lake County Jail
437 South 2nd East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 535-7488
addition of 60 beds
July '87

Lt. Ken Hunt, Jail Commander
El Paso County Jail
15 E. Cucharres
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(303) 520-7166
in design
384 beds
Fall '87

Capt. Rod Bottoms
200 West Oak Street
Ft. Collins, CO 80522
(303) 221-7120

Sheriff Jim Black
same as Capt. Bottoms (above)

Phillip Briggs, Assistant Superintendent
Cook Inlet Detention Center
P.O. Box 103155
Anchorage, AL 99510
(907) 258-7267

Lt. Rickard Ross, Jail Administrator
Yellowstone County Sheriff's Detention Facility
P.O. Box 35017
Billings, MT 59107
(406) 256-2967

Pat J. Sullivan, Jr.
Arapahoe Co., CO
(303) 795-4701

SOUTHWEST

Paul Bailey, Director
Bexar County Jail
218 S. Laredo Street
San Antonio, TX 78205
(512) 2202800
under construction
1000 beds
Jan-March '87

Roberto Jimenez, Detention Director
Santa Fe County Detention Center
4250 Airport Road
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 473-4154
operational
110 beds - opened 5/85
remote supervision - DS under consideration

Gordon Yach, Jail Administrator
Clark County Jail
220 South 3rd Street
Las Vegas, NV 89155
(702)386-4011
operational
856 beds
Sept. '84

Major Russell Davis
Pima County Detention Center
Pima County Sheriffs Department
Corrections Bureau
P.O. Box 910
Tucson, AZ 85702
(602)882-2848
operational
468 beds
June '84 (266 bed addition, 7/86)

Dr. Kevin Gilmartin
same as Major Davis (above)

Gary Henman, Warden
Metropolitan Correctional Center
8901 S. W¬ Road
Tuscan, AZ 85706
(602)294-4404
operational
March '82

Larry R. Ard, Chief Deputy
Contra Costa Main Detention Facility
1000 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
(415) 3724497
operational
366 beds
Jan '81

Captain James Robinson
Main Detention Facility
1000 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
(415) 3724668
planning
1988

Les Glenn
Contra Costa Co.
(415) 3724647

Jerry Krans, Assistant Sheriff
Orange County
550 North Flower
Santa Ana, CA 92702
(714) 8345444
384 beds
April '87

Paul McIntosh
Solano County
Capital Project Office
621 Missouri Street
Fairfield, CA 94553
(707) 429-6980
in design
3 6 6 b e d s
June - Oct. '89

Jim Husset, Transition Coordinator
Sonoma County Sheriff's Dept.
Detention Division Trailer
600 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
(707) 527-3003
construction to begin Aug '86
390 beds
July '88

Lt. Frank Gontheir
Santa Clara County Jail
180 West Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95115-0020
(4 0 8) 2 9 9 - 4 3 1 1
under construction
720 beds
Dec. '87

Virgil King
same as Lt. Gontheir (above)

Earl Hindman, Jail Director
Shaunee County Jail
200 East 7th, Room 315
Topeka, KS 66603
(913) 2954073
under construction
190 beds
July '87

Al Kanahela, Warden
San Diego Metropolitan Correctional Center
808 Union Street
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 232-4311
operational
532 beds
1974

Ken Arnold, Administrator
Sedgewick County Jail
County Administrators Office
525 North Main
Wichita, KS 67203
(316) 268-7684
in design
471 beds
Feb. '88

Gary Henman, Warden
Tucson Metropolitan Correctional Facility
8901 South Wilmot Road
Tucson, AZ 85706
(602) 2944404
operational
200 beds
March '82

Lt. Doug Papagni
Fresno County
P.O. Box 1788
Fresno, CA 93717
(209) 488-3005
in design
426 beds
1988/89

Sgt. Mike Kramer
Washoe County Detention Facility
Washoe County Sheriff's Department
P.O. Box 2915
Rena, NV 89505
(702) 785-4586
in design
499 beds
Jan. 68

Capt. Mike Raymond
Merced County Jail
P.O. Box 824
Merced, CA 95340
(209) 385-7323

Capt. Ed Davies
Johnson County Jail
Johnson County Sheriffs Department
Counthouse Towers
Olathe, KS 66061
(913) 782-5000
out to bid
277 beds
March '88

Steve Keeter
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 675
Stockton, CA 95202
(209) 944-3675
planning
600-700 beds

Lt. Larry Justus
Yolo County Jail
Yolo County Sheriff's Office
P.O. Box 179
Woodland, CA 95695
(916) 666-8874
out to bid
224 beds
April '87