



Fall 2007

Proceedings of the **Large Jail Network Meeting**

**Reentry from Jails into the
Community**

**Reentry Partnerships with Public,
Private, and Non-Profit Organizations**

**Excited Delirium / Acute Behavioral
Distress Syndrome**

Women Offenders in Large Jails

**The Continuing Evolution of the
Large Jail Network**

National Institute of Corrections

Morris Thigpen
Director

Thomas Beauclair
Deputy Director

Virginia Hutchinson
Chief, Jails Division

Richard Geather
Correctional Program Specialist

National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20534
(800) 995-6423

**Proceedings of the Large Jail Network Meeting
Aurora, Colorado
September 24-26, 2007**

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections

Richard Geaither
Correctional Program Specialist
Large Jail Network Program Coordinator

NIC Accession Number 022599

October 17, 2007

Constance Clem
Meeting Recorder

This document is available online at <http://www.nicic.org/library/022599>.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
About the Large Jail Network.....	1
Purpose	1
About This Meeting.....	2
LJN Online	2
Key Themes of the September 2007 Meeting.....	3
Session Highlights at a Glance	5
Opening Remarks	7
Welcome and Introduction of NIC Staff	7
Announcements and Updates.....	9
Officer Death	9
ACA Core Standards.....	9
Jail Population Management	9
Open Forum.....	10
Purchasing	10
Deaths in Custody / Media Relations	11
The Civil Rights of Incarcerated Persons Act (CRIPA)	12
ACA Standards, Juveniles in Adult Jails	13
Offender Exposure Incidents	14
Interactions with U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement	14
Staff Code of Silence	16
Gender-Neutral vs. Gender-Specific Classification	17
Prison Rape Elimination Act—Research in Jails	17
Sharing Gang Intelligence	18
DNA Testing at Booking	19
Jail “Reality TV”	20
Air Handling Systems and Pandemic Flu Prevention	22
Absenteeism Created by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)	22
Program Session: Reentry Partnerships	23
Creative Partnerships Supporting Inmate Reentry Programs: Involving Public, Private, and Non-Profit Organizations.....	23
Lilya Wagner, Counterpart International, and Charles Walters, Orange County, California	

Program Session: Reentry Programs in Jails	27
Inmate Reentry Issues at the County Level	27
Gordon Bass, Jr., Jacksonville, Florida	
The Sentenced to Service Program: STS Homes	29
Thomas Merkel, Hennepin County, Minnesota	
Reentry—Protecting the Investment	30
Thomas C. Rovelli and Joann Morales Harrison, Hampden County, Massachusetts	
Reentry: How to Get Started	33
Joseph M. Schmitz, Hamilton County, Ohio	
 Program Session: Excited Delirium / Acute Behavioral Disturbance	 36
Excited Delirium Training	36
Pat Hunton, Monterey County, California	
In-Custody Death / Excited Delirium: Fact or Fiction?	36
Don Leach, Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government, Kentucky	
 Program Session: Women Offender Issues	 40
Responding to Women Offenders in Large Jails.....	40
Maureen Buell, NIC Prisons Division	
 The Continuing Evolution of the Large Jail Network.....	 44
Network Purpose and Direction	44
Team A. Network Communications/Technology.....	44
Team B. LJN Mission	45
Team C. New Member Issues	46
LJN Transition.....	47
Planning for the Next LJN Meeting	47

APPENDICES

Appendix A. LJN September 2007 Final Meeting Agenda

Appendix B. LJN September 2007 Participant List

Appendix C. Index of Past LJN Meeting Topics

INTRODUCTION

ABOUT THE LARGE JAIL NETWORK

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) first established the Large Jail Network in 1989 as a connection point for administrators of jails and jail systems with 1,000 or more inmates. The network was launched with 67 member agencies. The group's first meeting was convened in 1990. NIC also began publishing the Large Jail Network Bulletin in 1990, featuring articles by members and occasional guest authors. In 1998, the LJN gained an online presence with an email discussion group and later a Web site.

Currently, 178 jails and jail systems are eligible to participate in the network, based on jail population data as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

PURPOSE

The NIC Jails Division networks' mission is to promote and provide a vehicle for the free and open exchange of ideas and information and innovation among network members. In addition, NIC networks reinforce the assumption that knowledge can be transferred from one jurisdiction or agency to another, and this knowledge can serve as a stimulus for the development of effective approaches to address similar problems or opportunities.

Our belief is that, collectively, network members are likely to have developed successful strategies for meeting challenges that arise. As a group, network members are an available resource to each other. The network provides a systematic way for information to be shared, which not only benefits the network member, but also those they serve and represent – the local government, state, community, staff, and inmate.

LJN goals are:

- To explore issues facing jail systems from the perspective of network members with administrative responsibility.
- To discuss strategies and resources for dealing successfully with these issues.
- To discuss potential methods by which an IC and facilitate the development of programs or the transfer of existing knowledge or technology.
- To develop and improve communication among network members.
- To seek new and creative ways to identify and meet the needs of network members.

The LJN has been a notable success since its inception because of the involvement and contributions of its members.

ABOUT THIS MEETING

The September 2007 meeting had 51 members in attendance.

Participants met for an informal dinner the night before the meeting was formally opened. The evening included old and new member introductions, mentor/mentee matching, an orientation to the meeting format, and discussion of some operational topics. Richard Geaither gave participants copies of NIC's new Fiscal Year 2007 training catalog, introduced new NIC staffer and new LJN coordinator Mike Jackson, and reviewed the purpose and mission of the LJN group for first-time participants. He also sought volunteers to write blog updates about the meeting and others to form an advisory panel on network communications technology.

The agenda for the meeting is provided in Appendix A.

A list of LJN members in attendance and meeting guests appears in Appendix B.

An index of past topics covered at LJN meetings is provided in Appendix C.

An outline of member-selected topics to be addressed at the next LJN meeting is presented on page 47.

LJN ONLINE

NIC provides a private web site for the LJN, where members can access presentation files from this and earlier LJN meetings as well as share other materials throughout the year. A member forum facilitates a day-to-day dialog on issues facing large jails and strategies for responding to them. Current members and prospective members can access the site at <http://community.nicic.org/forums>.

For further information about the LJN, contact Mike Jackson, Correctional Program Specialist, NIC Jails Division, Washington, D.C., at (800) 995-6423, ext. 69565, or mpjackson@bop.gov.

KEY THEMES OF THE SEPTEMBER 2007 MEETING

Mental Health

Mentally ill inmates continue to make up an inappropriately large and often rapidly cycling segment of jail populations. Jails are experiencing constant pressure to find different ways of connecting mentally ill persons with the care they need so far fewer will come into county jails. The implications are seen in population management, criminal justice system planning, partnership-based reentry programming, and elsewhere. On a security and safety level, jails are encountering the problem of how to recognize mental/behavioral conditions as distinct from cases of excited delirium/acute behavioral disorder, which has been implicated in some inmate deaths.

Jail Standards and Accreditation

Correctional standards are intended to reflect and codify the best professional practices to ensure facilities are safe and well run. However, LJN members identified many ways jail standards promulgated by the American Correctional Association (ACA) are not actually useful to jails generally or to large jails in particular. The perception is that ACA standards for jails are too closely modeled on standards for prisons, despite wide differences in the functions of the two types of facilities. Participants in various sessions discussed ways the LJN could share its members' perspectives to contribute over time to a more vital and useful system of jail standards. One LJN member has been deeply involved in a project to define core standards for jails, a separate standards system now in field testing that is not intended for use toward agency accreditation but for basic guidance toward better facilities.

Reentry

Programs focusing on support for jail inmates reentering our communities are being developed in many locales. At the core of this work is partnership with local community service providers that assist populations that overlap with the jail inmate population. Speakers in five meeting sessions shared their experiences in creating partnerships that will help inmates function successfully after release and avoid reincarceration. Societal benefits include less crime, more public safety, and fewer people cycling through the jail.

Sexual Assault Incidence: Research in Jails

Research teams are in U.S. jails now, conducting interviews with inmates to produce estimates on coercive or assaultive sexual incidents taking place in jails. Participants noted that the research teams are very professional, and the process is generally smooth and without incident for jails hosting the research visits. It is advantageous for jail administrators to brief their staff on the purpose of the visits. Early findings suggest that inmate sexual assault may occur less often than was anticipated during the passage of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA).

Media Relations

Discussions on many different topics eventually turned to the need to improve the quality of information about jails that is available to the public and to other stakeholders in justice-related issues. Participants shared approaches to provide quality information that promotes understanding of jails and

the populations they work with. Participants selected media relations as a session topic for the next LJN meeting.

LJN Communications

The LJN membership is seeking more help from NIC in its members' adoption of web-based technologies that were introduced in 2006. While recognizing that the newer technology offers more features, members regret losing the speed and convenience of the earlier system. All consider it very important to recover the high levels of participation that have been a hallmark of the network. Members and NIC technical staff are committed to working toward that goal.

SESSION HIGHLIGHTS AT A GLANCE

Open Forum Topics

- (p. 10) **Purchasing**—Participants proposed the development of an online database for LJN members to share their experiences with specific products and services.
- (p. 11) A discussion of **deaths in custody** covered medical issues in jail populations and ways to promote more accurate media coverage of the care jails provide.
- (p. 12) Investigations under the **Civil Rights of Incarcerated Persons Act (CRIPA)** may be ahead for some jails. Participants recommended some ways to prepare for, and possibly avert, an investigation.
- (p. 13) LJN members discussed issues related to **juveniles in adult jails** and the need to have more jail input into development of related American Correctional Association standards.
- (p. 14) **Offender exposure incidents** must be dealt with through disciplinary procedures and also prosecuted as a sex offense if the evidence is sufficient, LJN members concurred.
- (p. 14) Jails are having varied experiences with **U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement** regarding Section 287(g) provisions that allow trained jail staff to identify aliens in custody and actual ICE practices in the removal of alien detainees.
- (p. 16) LJN agencies are not immune from the staff **“code of silence”** that can inhibit investigations and undermine morale in the jail. Participants shared strategies for motivating staff toward higher standards of ethics on the job.
- (p. 17) Does **gender-neutral or gender-specific classification** work better for women offenders, and why? Participants’ views were supplemented by a presentation by NIC Correctional Program Specialist Maureen Buell, summarized on pp. 41 et seq.
- (p. 17) Administrators said their jails are experiencing few problems as teams **interview inmates to estimate the incidence of sexual assault** in the nation’s jails.
- (p. 18) Participants discussed recent developments in systems for **nationwide sharing of intelligence** on terrorism and security threat groups.
- (p. 19) **DNA sample collection** is provided in some jails, usually in connection with felony cases. Issues include chain of custody, costs and staffing, and responses if inmates refuse to comply.
- (p. 20) Participants discussed the pros and cons of having their jails appear on the new Court TV series, **“Inside American Jails.”**
- (p. 22) Air filtering and replacement rates were discussed in the context of **pandemic flu prevention**.
- (p. 22) Participants shared strategies for responding to absenteeism created by the **Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)**.

Program Session: Reentry Partnerships

- (p. 27) Charles Walters and Lilya Wagner presented ideas for partnering with nonprofits and attracting funding support from the private sector and foundations, with examples in reentry programming in Orange County, California.

Program Session: Reentry Programs in Jails

- (p. 27) Gordon Bass, Jr., presented on inmate reentry issues in Duval County/Jacksonville, Florida, highlighting the services needed by returning ex-offenders to keep them from returning to jail.
- (p. 29) The STS Homes program in Hennepin County, Minnesota, places inmates in a year-long construction apprenticeship program that has very low recidivism and puts abandoned properties back into the tax rolls. Tom Merkel shared some history and a video description.
- (p. 30) Hampden County, Massachusetts, views its extensive reentry programs as a way of protecting the agency's investment in the future. Tom Rovelli and Joann Morales Harrison described the new Community Reentry Unit and how the agency extends reentry assistance to all inmates.
- (p. 33) Joseph M. Schmitz identified five key steps in starting a reentry program, based on his experiences in Hamilton County, Ohio, and elsewhere.

Program Session: Excited Delirium / Acute Behavioral Disturbance

- (p. 36) Jail staff need to recognize and respond appropriately when inmates who resist control may be affected by this syndrome that can lead to sudden death. Pat Hunton shared training content from Monterey County, California, and Don Leach covered recent medical/tactical research.

Program Session: Women Offender Issues

- (p. 41) Maureen Buell identified some reasons why women inmates have better outcomes when they have different assessments, programs, and management than men. She also invited participant input for shaping NIC services on women offenders to meet the needs of jails.

The Continuing Evolution of the Large Jail Network

- (p. 45) Participants discussed the future of the Large Jail Network in the areas of communications, mission, and expansion of the group to reach more eligible member agencies.
- (p. 48) Members saluted Richard Geaither for his many years of coordinating the Large Jail Network and welcomed Mike Jackson as the new LJNI coordinator.
- (p. 48) Topics for the March 2008 LJNI meeting will include media relations, contracting issues, recruiting and managing "generation X/Y," and removal of criminal aliens.

After-Hours Session: Critical Needs in Jails

A volunteer group met with NIC staff member Mary Ashton to discuss critical issues facing jails and how to capture them in NIC needs assessment research. Among the top issues raised were retention of staff, overtime pressures, mental health issues with both inmates and staff, access to information on effective programs, and public understanding of the role of the jail.

OPENING REMARKS

WELCOME & INTRODUCTION OF NIC STAFF

Richard Geather welcomed participants to the September 2007 meeting of the Large Jail Network.

Robert Brown, Chief of the NIC Academy Division, offered remarks about NIC's recent move to Aurora and plans to increase NIC's training impact through distance learning technology.

New NIC Jails Division Staff were introduced.

- **Robbye Braxton-Mintz.** Robbye came to NIC from the Arlington County (Virginia) Sheriff's Office, where she was the Manager of case management and classification. At NIC, Robbye is assuming responsibility for the Jails Division's work on jail standards and accreditation, direct supervision, staffing analysis, and Technical Assistance. She will also assist in some training programs delivered by the Jails Division.
- **Cheryl Paul.** Cheryl has 17 years' experience at the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department in Santa Rosa, California. She has served as a technical resource provider in delivery of NIC's How to Open a New Institution (HONI) program for many years and has professional experience as a writer and editor. Cheryl will take on delivery of NIC's supervisory training for direct supervision, work related to jail design and construction, and technical assistance related to HONI.
- **Mike Jackson.** Mike has been an LJN participant since 1993, first in connection with his position as director of the Fairfax County (Virginia) jail and more recently as the manager of jail training programs for the National Sheriffs' Association. Mike is assuming coordination duties for the LJN and will manage NIC's Planning of New Institutions (PONI) program, provide liaison with medium-sized jails, and manage additional technical assistance projects.

Other NIC staff present at the meeting were introduced to the LJN group.

- **Kermit Humphries.** Kermit has been assigned to the recently expanded Offender Workforce Development and Prisoner Reentry Division. He attended this meeting to gain new perspectives on reentry as it is taking shape in jails. Mr. Humphries's prior work with NIC has been focused in the areas of parole and community corrections, and he led NIC's recent work on the Transition from Prison to the Community (TPC) model. NIC's new initiative on Transition from Jails to the Community (TJC) has some different components from TPC, but as in that project, NIC's intent is not to give prescriptive information to agencies but to provide them with the background to make their own decisions about what is appropriate within their own jurisdictions.
- **Mary Ashton.** Assigned to NIC's Research and Evaluation Division, Mary attended the LJN meeting to gain background for NIC's current work on correctional agency needs assessment. She invited all those interested to attend a special focus group session at the participants' hotel on Tuesday evening.

- **Maureen Buell.** Maureen is a staff member in NIC's Prisons Division. She presented information on Wednesday to the LJN group on women offender issues as they affect jails, as well as highlighting related NIC programs, services, and resources.
- **Tracey Vessels.** An administrative officer with NIC, Ms. Vessels is responsible for NIC web site development. She co-presented a Wednesday break-out session on LJN networking technology.

Others in attendance at the meeting:

- Dr. Lilya Wagner, Counterpart International, co-presented a session on reentry partnerships and strategies for fundraising.
- Joshua Stengel, Web Services Manager, NIC Information Center (LIS, Inc., contractor), co-presented a session on LJN communications technology to a break-out group on Wednesday.
- James Gondles, Executive Director, American Correctional Association, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Constance Clem, Meeting Recorder, CLEM Communications, Longmont, Colorado.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

Officer Death

Jim Coleman (Shelby County Corrections, Tennessee) invited donations from LJN members to honor a correctional officer who was killed in an assault by inmates. Officer Susan J. Canfield of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice was overseeing a work detail when she was killed by two escapees driving an agency vehicle. LJN members made a contribution in her name to The 100 Club, an organization that helps families of officers.

ACA Core Standards

David Parrish (Hillsborough County, Florida) shared information about the Core Standards project of the American Correctional Association (ACA). In August 2007, the 20-member Standards Committee after a 6-hour negotiation approved the Core Standards for field testing. Testing is expected to take place over the next year in four to six sites. Results should be reported from these jails following this testing.

The Core Standards are adapted from ACA's jail standards (Performance Based Standards for Adult Local Detention Facilities, Fourth Edition, 2004, and 2006 Standards Supplement—Adult Local Detention Facilities, 3rd ed.). The purpose of the Core Standards has sometimes been misconstrued. They are not just for small jails, nor are they a reduced level of jail standards compared with those required for full ACA accreditation. Essentially, they distill the core life safety issues necessary to manage a jail. They could be considered as an entry point for leaders interested in improving their jails' functionality. Jails can use the Core Standards as the basis for later moving on to full accreditation.

Achieving full accreditation takes a major investment of effort; at present only 120 jails are ACA-accredited, out of more than 3,000 jails and lockups nationally.

To review the proposed Core Standards or to offer their jails as a field test site, jail administrators can contact Mark Flowers, ACA Standards and Accreditation Department, (800) 222-5646, markf@aca.org.

Jail Population Management

David Parrish mentioned to the group that his recent work on reducing his jail population qualifies him for a theoretical new position of “justice system coordinator.” Parrish shared an editorial praising Hillsborough County’s efforts at jail population control and a handout describing initiatives that reduced the jail population.

OPEN FORUM

Topic sessions for the meeting are an opportunity for participants to discuss emerging issues. These sessions were coordinated and presented by Donald Leach, Ph.D. (Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government). Leach encouraged all members to use the LJN's online forum to maximize information exchange on the topics covered at this meeting and on other issues that concern them.

TOPIC 1 – PURCHASING

Tom Campbell (Louisville, Kentucky) raised this issue for member input. In purchasing material for jails, the ideal product is of good quality, is cheap, and is available quickly. Typically jails have to settle for items that meet just two of these three criteria. As an example, the group discussed the cost-effectiveness of mattress purchases. Blue Derby mattresses are better quality and higher cost, compared to the Bob Barker brand that is cheaper but not as durable. Joe Schmitz (Hamilton County, Ohio) noted that his jail is a test site for Derby mattresses, and his jail is now testing three new seam techniques. Participants also shared observations on suicide smocks that did not provide adequate restraint. There was limited discussion of food trays.

Of interest to aid in purchasing is a tool for getting beyond the anecdotal to create substantial data on product performance. Campbell asked whether a system, such as an online database, could be established for LJN members to share vendor recommendations and experiences for products. Group discussion expanded this idea to include contract services, such as medical care, mental health care, and food service. Personal reviews from LJN peers would be more valuable than existing sources, such as a vendor catalog produced by ACA and a vendor list developed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Participants also observed that a group knowledgebase could help member agencies exert influence on manufacturers and provide a way to define the standards that products must meet. Could better communication with vendors help arrive at modest price adjustments that enable longer product life?

Other participants expressed concern about LJN member viewpoints possibly becoming public and whether there could be any liability issue in sharing these comments. One option could be to offer to speak with other LJN members rather than going on the record with negative feedback, or members could couch their opinions as preferences. Joe Schmitz expressed the view that vendors don't want negative press and are unlikely to pursue legal action in this type of circumstance. In one situation, negative product information went up the chain of command in a staff report, angering the vendor because the feedback wasn't shared with the vendor first. It was suggested that when considering a purchase, a jail manager can ask for referrals to both satisfied clients and to clients who have stopped using the vendor's product.

Participants suggested that options for an online, private LJN vendor database system be discussed with NIC's web services manager.

TOPIC 2 — DEATHS IN CUSTODY / MEDIA RELATIONS

Tim Ryan (Hillsborough County, Florida) reported that his county experienced 18 deaths of persons in jail custody last year and nine (9) deaths to date this year, two (2) by suicide. Since 2000, out of 866,000 admissions, the jail has had 117 deaths, of which three were suicides and all the rest deaths by natural causes, including 24 by HIV. Jail administrators know, as the public at large and the media do not, that inmates enter the jail with many of the most challenging and acute health problems that are present in society. When a death in custody occurs, the headlines read that “the jail is killing the inmates.”

Participants agreed that HIV/AIDS deaths are a significant portion of their inmate deaths, and that incoming populations show marked ill effects from long histories of substance abuse (particularly methamphetamine addiction), exposure to communicable and chronic diseases, under-managed mental health problems, nutrition deficits, old age, and smoking. Meth addicts arrive in the jail with “no kidneys and no heart left” due to the ravaging effects of that addiction. In sum, jails are getting the medically worst-off of the community, and they have the challenging and costly responsibility of not allowing the inmates’ medical conditions to deteriorate while they remain in custody. Participants stated that the true question is not, “why do people die in jail?,” but “why don’t more people die in jail?” Would these deaths receive any outside notice if they occurred a public hospital?

Tom Rovelli (Hampden County, Massachusetts) observed that jails have an opportunity to educate the community that many of the thousands of people who cycle through the jail each year are the same people who use hospital emergency rooms as their primary provider of medical care. Sometimes the jail is the only quality health care provider a person might see.

Several suggestions were offered for improving the public’s understanding of jail health care:

- Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) said that his agency forged a strong partnership with the county health department. When there is a death, information is shared through that department. The jail has gotten some positive press related to providing preventive inoculations against the Hepatitis-C virus.
- Ron Torres (Bernalillo County, New Mexico) has provided space in his jail for a public health office for the last 3 years. The agency also hired a public information officer who works with the health department on jail medical issues. The team proactively got their message out by bringing in media representatives and giving them information on the number of tests the jail provides for HIV and tuberculosis (TB).
- Others suggested developing a relationship with the editorial board at local newspapers. This can include having regular meetings with the editor and reporters on jail issues. In the event of an inmate death, the jail can provide specific data on the care provided. The jail can later use this data trail to explain events if questioned or to lodge a formal complaint if, despite this effort at transparency, the reporting does not reflect the true sequence of events. In at least one LJNI member jail, this approach has led to increased accuracy in reporting and better trust toward the jail by advocacy groups.

It was stressed that if the jail gets negative attention, the jail should not respond defensively. Jails can take a positive approach by providing facts on the number of health care interactions the jail provides and on the acuity of medical cases being treated in jails.

Charles Walters (Orange County, California) made several suggestions for managing information flow. Local media made an outcry when the jail went into lockdown to control racially motivated inmate-on-inmate assaults. The newspapers were relentless about loss of privileges and limited recreation, but

what would they have reported if the inmates weren't being kept safe? Orange County staff share jail information proactively by posting entries on the jail's own web log ("blog") before it is reported elsewhere and by replying to posts on other blogs. (See <http://blog.ocsd.org>.) Jail leaders stay connected with community coalitions not only after incidents, but also before they occur. In another incident, a law enforcement deputy used a Taser to stop a young man who was on drugs and running naked in traffic. The media initially covered the incident as a near-lethal use of force, but its purpose was actually life-saving. Once the facts were clear, community mental health professionals took the media to task and demanded better quality reporting.

Ron Torres (Bernalillo County, New Mexico) agreed that how jails deal with the media is critical. The press tends to listen to the vocal minority. His jail staff are responding to blog posts daily. They are connected with area advocacy groups and have a monthly meeting with the editorial board of the local newspaper. As a result, the writers have toned down the stridence of their articles. It took 6 months to see difference, but it worked. Following a case of an in-custody death, the jail sent the reporter factual material in paper copy, citing efforts that included 15 trips to the hospital, but the paper published an inaccurate account of the care provided. The jail then sent a duplicate set of the factual data to the editorial board and to local advocacy groups.

Another suggestion is that, if the jail learns that an inmate is dying, the inmate can be released from jail to die at home.

Mitch Lucas (Charleston County, South Carolina), a former public information officer, said that he allows selected reporters and photographers to have free access to the jail with a staff escort. This allows the jail to build a working relationship with local media. When media representatives are able to see the jail's medical unit, they can better understand jail medical services.

Allowing a reporter to spend a day in booking can change the writers' perspective. In turn, jails need to understand that the media is a business and needs a business approach. The jail probably cannot sell a human interest story about saving an old drunk who wasted his life, whereas negative incidents get attention.

If the media approach the jail for a story, the jail can't stop the story; the jail needs to work with the media without bending the rules or creating an adversarial relationship. If the media can't interview the jail for quality information, they may choose to interview a drunk in the trailer park instead. The more time the media people are allowed to spend in jail, the more accurate their coverage becomes.

Chuck Walters asserted that staff the Orange County Sheriff's Department post stories on the agency's blog consistently, scooping the media. It's positive and factual information. When the media bring up an incident, the jail can say, "We already posted it. And we want to hear what people have to say about it."

TOPIC 3 — CIVIL RIGHTS OF INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS ACT (CRIPA)

CRIPA legislation was enacted in 1980 and provides for investigations of confinement facilities, including jails, by the Special Litigation Section of the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division. LJNI members shared perspectives about their agencies' recent experiences with CRIPA investigations.

Tom Carroll (Delaware Department of Corrections, a unified prison/jail system) stated that in his agency, 90% of the alleged violations were false.

Don Leach (Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government) stated that a few jails in Kentucky have been investigated. CRIPA sends in consultant investigative teams examine virtually everything in the jail, down to the contents of the desk drawers and the space under the carpet, to try to find something the jail is doing wrong. Some of the findings of the investigations have been outlandish compared to a jail's constitutional duty.

Tim Ryan (Miami-Dade, Florida) recalled that CRIPA investigations in jails began in the 1980s, and interest has been relatively dormant until a recent increase. He expects most LNJ jails to be exposed to investigation within the next 3 to 5 years and suggested that jail administrators alert their legal staff to the possibility this may come up. Jails should do an internal audit to consider their facilities' operations in the context of recent settlements. Medical care services, mental health care, and practices related to the Americans with Disabilities Act should receive particular attention. All investigation reports are available online for review at <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/split/findsettle.htm>. Ryan stated that CRIPA investigators like to see that the jail is paying attention to their issues; jails can do an internal audit and by doing so may deter a formal investigation.

Some jails have successfully challenged the recommendations from a CRIPA investigation because though they may be good ideas, they aren't necessarily derived from Constitutional requirements. Jails may not be able to afford to take the steps recommended by the investigation. It was recommended that jails form their own advisory groups to head off problems with CRIPA.

TOPIC 4 — ACA STANDARDS, JUVENILES IN ADULT JAILS

Tim Ryan (Miami-Dade, Florida) posed the question of whether the LNJ should articulate a group view of an ideal approach to managing juvenile offenders in adult jails and nominate a representative to the ACA committee. Participants acknowledged that juveniles being adjudicated as adults are an issue in most of their jails. Under age or not, these are people charged with heinous crimes. Some large jails have 100 or more juvenile offenders under custody. Knowledge of requirements for sight and sound separation is a given, but from a standards perspective, it isn't clear how this needs to work.

Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) observed that jails are being held to higher standard. The Oklahoma legislature has passed legislation that affected the jail's functions with regard to juveniles. A subsequent Attorney General opinion was devastating because it defined jails as being part of the children and youth services for the state of Oklahoma. This places huge obligations on jails to provide health care, education, welfare, and other services. Legislation may be needed to correct this interpretation. Otherwise, the jails will need to have separate medical and psychiatric and educational staff.

David Parrish (Hillsborough County, Florida) observed that he was told long ago that he couldn't use direct supervision housing for juvenile populations because they were too unmanageable. But on an LNJ colleague's advice, he instructed his staff to implement direct supervision, and it's been used successfully for 13 years. His jail now holds 85 juvenile offenders, of whom two-thirds are housed in direct supervision pods and one-third are in more secure confinement. That proportion is higher than the adult population.

Mitch Lucas (Charleston County, South Carolina) observed that runaways and other juvenile status offenders are being placed in his jail pursuant to family court order. They are housed in the same building as, but in separate units from, juveniles charged as adults on serious charges, such as murder.

TOPIC 5 — OFFENDER EXPOSURE INCIDENTS

Repeated inmate self-exposure toward female officers is being raised as a hostile work environment issue in jails and prisons, particularly in jail systems with a higher percentage of women staff. The exposure also affects women public defenders who visit jails. Officials in Broward County, Florida, tried a more punitive response to control the behavior but met with local disapproval over the perceived insignificance of the problem and the sense this behavior is “normal” in jails. A prominent case addressed this in Washington State, and there was also coverage at Pelican Bay in the California Department of Corrections, where an EEOC officer told a female officer she should accept the behavior.

“No tolerance” was the approach voiced by most present. Rules and statutes are commonly posted in the housing units. Prosecution has been successful in many jurisdictions.

Suggestions and discussion covered several points:

- Rick Frey (Broward County, Florida) said that his jail began prosecuting those cases about 4 ½ years ago and had pleas on just about all of them. If the evidence rises to the standard, the jail administratively charges them and also provides the information to the state’s attorney. The jail has won every case, even one that went to trial. If women express any discomfort working in men’s housing, they can be assigned to female units. The agency lets staff know they’ll support them.
- Jim Coleman and others commented that inmate self-exposure is a sex offense and cause for discipline at minimum. At one point, prosecutors told Coleman that because it wasn’t taking place in public, they couldn’t prosecute. Legislation was later passed to explicitly criminalize the behavior. In another location, jail staff hadn’t been sending the cases over under the presumption that the state wouldn’t file charges, but the situation has since been clarified.

Others observed that exposure does not affect only women officers; male officers are also protected by rule and statutes. Tolerance is a function of the institutional culture. Another participant noted that obscene language itself is not controllable/litigable, but behavior is.

TOPIC 6 – INTERACTIONS WITH U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act went into effect September 30, 1996. It permits the U.S. Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to delegate certain immigration enforcement powers to properly trained state officers and employees. Many state and local law enforcement and corrections agencies have entered into agreements with ICE, in which ICE provides training and computer equipment for jails to identify alien detainees for deportation. What are LJA agencies’ experiences with this program?

Based on discussion by meeting participants, relationships and standard practices involving jails and ICE units seem to vary by location. Prompt pick-up of aliens can be a problem. Sheriffs are taking very different views on whether participation is right for their agencies. Several participants observed that alien detainees are often being picked up on very minor charges, such as open containers. Don Leach asked, do jails want to drive up their jail populations with this type of detainee?

Ron Torres (Bernalillo County, New Mexico) stated that his county had planned to work with the program, until it became an issue in the local media as a result of the community's strong relationship with the Mexican consulate. The jail offered to give ICE an office in their jail instead, but that offer wasn't accepted. ICE goes through a log of detainees they post on the Internet. ICE does have an agent on-site daily to review intake logs in the El Paso County (Texas) jail, per Sheriff Lupe Valdez.

One participant related that his agency sent people for training, then ICE officials said "You can take care of detention for us now, since we gave you the training." At that, the Sheriff backed out of the program.

David Parrish (Hillsborough County, Florida) described the issues that have so far caused him to recommend that his sheriff not participate in the program. First, it gives ICE open-ended agreement that lets them put whoever they want to in your jail. Parrish has worked hard to drop his jail's population by 600 and is not eager to give these beds to ICE. Also, the criminal aliens who are identified then serve time in your jail rather than being moved out of the country, and ICE has not followed its agreement to pick up the detainees within 48 hours. Parrish now has an arrangement with Border Patrol to pick up detainees, since ICE was not responsive. Another issue is the double booking that's required, plus ICE, NCIC, and FCIC database checks, all of which adds up to two more deputy positions per shift. Also, Parrish's new Criminal Registration Unit is finding criminal aliens coming out of Florida prisons—shouldn't they be working with the prisons? Working with ICE can get the jail good publicity, but it's not worth it.

Jay Heidenrich (Multnomah County, Oregon) stated that his sheriff wants the jail to consider the opportunity, but that their legal advice is that the arrangement is probably illegal under Oregon law. No Oregon jurisdictions were participating as of August 2007.

Charles Walters (Orange County, California) noted that his agency has had no difficulty in having its 3,000 to 4,000 alien detainees to date this year picked up. People on ICE detainers are picked up daily except Saturday and Sunday. Ron Torres (Bernalillo County) took a proactive approach after it was determined that if ICE did not pick up the detainees within 48 hours, a wrongful detention issue could be the result. The jail began releasing the detainees, and now ICE is there promptly, every day, ready to pick up.

Don Leach (Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government) said that Mecklenberg County (Charlotte, North Carolina) reportedly has great program. Mitch Lucas said the county can share a video describing it. Leach reported that the county has a positive cash flow of several million dollars per year as a result of holding these offenders.

Jeff Newton (Douglas County, Nebraska) reported that a regional jail in Virginia recently got a call from the U.S. Marshals Service asking if they'd care to pick up 100 federal inmates who are sleeping on the floor in Mecklenberg County. ICE regulations state that alien detainees cannot sleep on the floor, and Tasers cannot be used to control them. This raises the perception that detained aliens are receiving better treatment than U.S. nationals.

More information about the program, including a list of participating jurisdictions, is available online at www.ice.gov/partners/287g/section287_g.htm.

TOPIC 7 — STAFF “CODE OF SILENCE”

In a show of hands, several meeting participants acknowledged that their agencies had experienced recent issues with the “code of silence,” in which officers or staff may fail to come forward with information relevant to an investigation within the jail. Administrators may also see this silence in the written reports submitted to the formal record of an incident. In cases of suicide, inmate deaths, and escapes, the written record often will reflect that staff did everything by the book, per agency policy and procedure. What are some strategies for lessening staff adherence to the code of silence?

Participants offered examples of their experiences and responses.

- At a party hosted by off-duty police officers, officers beat a visitor who wasn’t welcome. Eight officers were eventually charged.
- After a disturbance in one facility, investigators viewed a videorecording of an officer who did not intervene for more than 20 minutes. Despite the evidence in the recording, the officer insisted he had not heard a thing.

Approaches to the problem:

- Ron Torres (Bernalillo County, New Mexico) advised the use of cameras throughout the facility and openness to information from inmates. Some participants noted that cameras didn’t prevent issues in their agencies. Torres noted that investigators typically come up through the officer ranks and don’t think they’ll ever be discovered in unethical practices, but when the jail starts getting information from inmates, that changes.
- Tom Campbell (Louisville Metro Corrections, Kentucky) consistently reinforces the requirement for ethical behavior. The jail provides 8 hours of inservice training yearly on ethics. The message for employees is, “You can screw up, but if you lie, you’re going to be fired.” Employees hear that “the only reason you work here is for your integrity” – it is essential to their jobs. When this is consistently reinforced as an aspect of agency culture, people are not willing to give up their careers to protect each other in inappropriate or unprofessional behavior. Campbell talks to each class at the training academy about attendance, honesty, and integrity. Evaluations show he’s making his point.
- Participants observed that an agency can’t expect to hold offenders accountable if they don’t hold staff accountable. Candor and truthfulness are essential to performance. In some locations, unions have become actively involved in helping reinforce the message that truthfulness is required of officers.
- Mitch Lucas (Charleston County, South Carolina) asked whether other administrators personally read internal affairs reports. He observed that if he and his peers take care of the small things, the big things take care of themselves. If a supervisor allows a questionable report to pass muster, the supervisor should be disciplined. Agencies have to get down to level where the code of silence exists in order to change it.
- In Don Leach’s jail (Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government), all the officers involved in an incident have to write separate reports rather than a team report. Review uncovers the report with a slightly different take and enables investigators to zero in there.
- It was suggested that members review the Brady v. Maryland case from the 18th judicial circuit, which refers to a list of officers with a list of sustained infractions.

- Tom Rovelli (Hampden County, Massachusetts) noted that staff are sometimes placed on leave without compensation as leverage for obtaining the truth. Staff can be suspended, depending on whether collective bargaining agreements permit this response.

Tim Ryan (Miami-Dade, Florida) observed that this issue is what officer ethics is all about. Reinforcing honesty helps support the people who've been good all along. Truthfulness is the first requirement of an officer. He now has eight cardinal expectations of his employees, which he shares with them and with their union, and which he covers again at officers' swearing-in.

Jim Coleman concluded the discussion by stating that allowing the "bad guys" in the jail to continue to do what they're doing is a control issue. Lying shows a lack of control within the facility.

TOPIC 8 – GENDER-NEUTRAL VS. GENDER-SPECIFIC CLASSIFICATION

Al Guerin (San Diego County, California) said that assessment staff in his agency are suggesting the agency adopt different tools for women offenders because women aren't as dangerous as men, and he asked for the views of LJNI members.

Respondents commented that gender-specific assessment is very useful for programming, and that it relates directly with jails' duty to protect inmates.

Joe Schmitz (Hamilton County, Ohio) has worked extensively with NIC on gender-specific issues. He asked whether any LJNI agencies have completed statistical studies on how classification affects women in jail or overall facility operations. He observed that women pose a lesser physical threat of escape and are less dangerous than men if they do escape; also, women inmates' fights are less violent than men's. Jails overclassify women when they use gender-neutral assessment and classification tools.

This subject was discussed at length by Maureen Buell, Correctional Program Specialist in NIC's Prisons Division, who spoke at the meeting on gender-specific assessment, classification, and programming. Her presentation is summarized beginning on page 41.

TOPIC 9 — PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT (PREA) – RESEARCH IN JAILS

Interview teams for the Bureau of Justice Statistics are now conducting visits in a representative sample of U.S. jails and have visited several LJNI facilities. What have been the impacts on and concerns of these jails? What should jail staff know about inmate sexual assault?

LJNI representatives said that on the whole, PREA survey visits have gone smoothly. In some locations, the interview process takes fewer days than anticipated. There has been a low refusal rate by inmates, which surprised some administrators. Ron Malone (Milwaukee House of Corrections) said that at a recent meeting in Washington, D.C., the data collection process was described as going very well, and that the number of sexual assaults in corrections appears to be nowhere near the estimates that led to passage of the PREA legislation.

Don Leach (Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government) observed that staff had been worried the research teams were there to stir things up. Ron Torres (Bernalillo County, New Mexico) agreed that staff had been very defensive and recommended preparing staff for the process by explaining the purpose and methodology of the interviews.

Keith Stith (Hudson County, New Jersey) said that his jail had some issues with inmates making sexual comments to the interviewed inmates when they returned to the tier. Representatives from other jails described a need to allay rumors and explain the process to inmates.

Tim Ryan (Miami-Dade, Florida) has participated in a national PREA committee as the only jail representative. He noted that discussions about jails suggest that preventative measures against inmate sexual assault may need to start at intake—for example, by asking detainees during booking as many as four to eight questions to help identify potential victims and predators so they are not celled together. Even the prison representatives, however, say this identification is hard to accomplish within a few days. So the question becomes, what actionable information can jails reasonably obtain within the first hours or minutes of a jail stay? How can this be accomplished without impeding the processing of jails' high number of cases booked daily? The committee's future recommendations for jails will be important to follow.

A participant asked, how can the committee be telling jails what they're supposed to be doing when they don't have the data to prove there's a problem? Ryan explained that PREA work has two different components that are both being moved ahead as quickly as possible: the survey part is to determine what's going on in the field as far as incidence, and the second component covers the preventive and assessment issues and the determination of what agencies should be doing.

Don Leach observed that one new topic coming out of the PREA work relates to transgender offenders and how to ensure their safety in jails. Is gender identity the next question jails will need to ask to ensure appropriate separation?

TOPIC 10 – SHARING GANG INTELLIGENCE

Participants discussed current practices in sharing gang intelligence with other agencies. Jails represented at the meeting commonly share their gang intelligence widely with law enforcement partners in their counties and states. Regional or national data-sharing is in development.

Tom Rovelli (Hampden County, Massachusetts) described a new system now being launched that was created with funding from the Department of Homeland Security. The system provides patrol officers direct access to the county's jail management database. Now, instead of the jail's data being in a silo, it is part of a Massachusetts data pipeline for secure law enforcement traffic. Jail managers can also access the system via laptop. The data can be used to track patterns of criminal behavior, and when a crime is committed, officers can search the database on significant physical attributes, tattoos, etc., using jail management data going back to 1992.

Rick Frey (Broward County, Florida) noted that the jail's classification staff has formed a gang task force that is working with the FBI so all the FBI's data can be incorporated in the classification process. So far, that hasn't brought the jail significant information specific to gang activity. The FBI, as part of its work with the National Joint Terrorism Task Force, is developing the Correctional Intelligence Initiative (CII). The CII was launched in 2003 and is staffed by FBI central office personnel and field office coordinators. The FBI worked with Broward County last year to develop a model program for data reporting. Through the CII, the FBI is asking jails to develop an internal intelligence-gathering process

and to share their data. Similar work in prisons is complete and was coordinated through the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). Frey and the BOP contact, Greg Trout, gave a presentation on this at the AJA conference and found that of 75 people at the session, only three (3) had heard of the CII initiative. The goal is a system of two-way way flow of information, which will require clearance from the FBI. Broward County is also encouraging jail inmates to share information on national security threats via toll-free phone number. Housing units have posters that encourage inmates to report any terrorism information they hear about. This has generated information of value to the FBI.

Mitch Lucas (Charleston County, South Carolina) built a data system in his jail that was built almost entirely on information shared by LJN members.

David Parrish (Hillsborough County, Florida) recalled a Los Angeles presentation on gangs at an LJN meeting about 10 years ago. At the time, he thought there was no gang issue in his direct supervision jail, and the presentation woke him up. He then worked with the state sheriffs' association to develop a system that shares gang information among all the jails in the state. The system is efficient, because jail staff identify gang activity and trends faster than anybody else. Their information helps street detectives to do better work.

Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) said that his system is similar and based on the NSA model. He runs all his prospective employees against the database before hire. Some other meeting participants indicated they also do this.

Don Leach (Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government, Kentucky) noted that the Department of Homeland Security has plans and funding to develop a national system that can integrate data from the states on a national level. This will allow officials in different regions to access each other's information. Someone has been trying to do something with NCIC, but there's very little information in it. Most is only available at a local level. If gang activity is nationwide, there's an obvious need for better access to information.

TOPIC 11 – DNA TESTING AT BOOKING

Discussion examined the circumstances and methods of jails' obtaining DNA samples from detainees at booking. What are the issues and what have been jails' experiences with inmate refusal to cooperate? Do any states have a mandate to collect DNA from all incoming inmates? Would jails be willing to do this?

Participants commented that most DNA testing is required post-sentencing.

Shirley Tyler (Mercer County, New Jersey) noted that samples are required mostly for felony offenders, and also for some people coming into the jail with a record of previous charges.

Phil Spence (Arapaho County, Colorado) said that Colorado law requires DNA samples for misdemeanor sex offenders in jail. The state department of corrections collects samples from felons.

Jim Coleman (Shelby County Sheriff's Office, Tennessee) noted that the chain of custody of the sample is an issue. Samples may not remain clean, they can be mislabeled, and they can get lost.

Mitch Lucas (Charleston County, South Carolina) said that the sheriff's association came out in January with a position that all arrestees should be swabbed. Use of blood samples for DNA identification is less likely to continue. Taking swabs is much easier.

Tom Rovelli (Hampden County, Massachusetts) said a blanket requirement would be another example of an unfunded mandate. It has the makings of a great debate. The samples would ultimately be processed by the state crime lab, and it would become a major industry. Jails would have to have qualified people to collect the samples via swab or blood draw. Currently the jail doesn't have the staff, funding, or space to do it.

Tom Merkel (Hennepin County, Minnesota) observed that Minnesota legislation calls for a swab after a probable cause determination. Because collection is tied to specific offenses, if charges are cleared the evidence has to be destroyed.

Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) said his jail is preparing to begin obtaining DNA samples. He obtained verification from several of those present that state crime labs are providing the sample kits. Chain of custody is also a concern.

Inmate refusal to give a sample was not a major issue. If inmates refuse, jails can get a court order. In some circumstances, submitting to DNA testing can be a condition of release from the jail.

TOPIC 12 – JAIL “REALITY TV”

Marilyn Chandler Ford (Volusia County, Florida) remarked that the newly airing Court TV series, “Inside American Jails,” raises some questions. Do jails really want to be depicted on reality TV like COPS? Might we prefer to keep a mystique about what jails do, given the dubious quality of information shared on this program? If the information is inaccurate anyway, is there more value in keeping jails’ role vague? What are the perspectives of LJNI leaders whose jails already have been profiled?

Participants viewed a clip from the 1989 movie, “Tango and Cash,” followed by segments from the 2007 “Inside American Jails” series. The movie clip showed an exaggerated cellblock world of litter, fires, and general mayhem. The clips from actual jails presented staff working with detainees and inmates. Segments from the Hillsborough County Orient Road Jail depicted staff managing a wandering detainee who later becomes destabilized and is placed under mental health observation. Another segment follows the intake process involving a transvestite prostitute. A segment from Tarrant County, Texas, traces an incident between two inmates that cannot be managed as an assault, since jail staff ultimately can’t prove that a pencil was used as a weapon.

“Pro” Experiences and Comments

Mitch Lucas (Charleston County, South Carolina) has seen four episodes and commented that the programs let viewers see how much jails have changed. They show articulate, intelligent human beings working in detention in clean, well run facilities. The jail is not a dungeon, and officers are not knuckle-draggers. Officers are shown using a “face down on bunks” technique for controlled cell entry. Lucas wants to use a segment in training in which staff at a shift briefing talk about finding a detainee’s tattoo ink and tiny needle.

Paul Chiano (Plymouth County, Massachusetts) commented that participating in the program offers jails a way to shape the message to show what’s real, not what the media perceive to be real.

Jay Heidenrich (Multnomah County, Oregon) had content control for the segment on his jail. He was surprised at the degree of pride expressed by his staff. They loved having their jail and jobs shown in positive light. There was quite a morale boost, which he had not expected.

Joe Schmitz noted that Hamilton County, Ohio, has been trying to get legislation passed to authorize construction of an 1,800-bed facility. An editor who saw the program was impressed enough to write, "This is why we should be funding the agency. The professionalism of the staff was astonishing." The piece went a long way to convince people that the jail can do the job and spend public money effectively.

Those whose jails have appeared agreed that having the production staff and equipment on site was not a problem.

"Anti" Experiences and Comments

David Parrish (Hillsborough County, Florida) allowed his jail to be filmed to combat the lack of real depictions of jails in the media. He was given veto power on the content and used it to cut segments that the producers couldn't explain adequately. Though he hoped the program would show significant footage in direct supervision units, it mostly covered events in booking. One segment showed the use of a restraint chair located in a holding cell that also was being used for storage during a renovation project, giving the appearance the inmate was being put in a closet.

Parrish was positively surprised at the producers' prior knowledge of direct supervision. Ultimately, however, he was disappointed that the program did not make clear his jail's use of direct supervision principles in intake and booking. (If detainees don't comply with the rules, they become part of the 10% who end up in non-direct housing). Parrish remains frustrated that the programs don't show what a real officer's life is like.

Bill DiYorio (Riverside County, California) did not allow the producers to shoot in his jail. In his view, the programs are intended only to make money, not to educate.

Tom Rovelli (Hampden County, Massachusetts) has hired a production company and is recording their own program that will be used to document best practices for training academy and community television audiences. The staff are very proud of their work, and about staff members will appear. Rovelli thinks the film may help the agency as it pursues more funding and other partnerships.

Marilyn Chandler Ford (Volusia County, Florida) acknowledged the positive viewpoints, but remained disquieted because it's essentially entertainment; the producers decide how much of the story they want to tell. It would be useful, from a research perspective, to learn whether viewers' perspectives actually change as a result of seeing the program.

There was interest in a possible program on jails by the Public Broadcasting System. Possibly some of the footage generated by this show's team could be used in a PBS production. Discussing availability of footage, some jail managers present would allow the media to film a person through the jail process but more would not.

Information about the series, plus access to video content, is available online at http://www.courttv.com/onair/shows/Inside_American_Jails.

TOPIC 13 – AIR HANDLING SYSTEMS AND PANDEMIC FLU PREVENTION

Marilyn Chandler Ford (Volusia County, Florida) asked the group for feedback on this facility design issue. Her agency's head of facility maintenance suggested that a "closed" air system be installed in the jail. When she asked about the advisability of a closed system in a jail facility with the possibility of large-scale communicability of disease, the facility head was not familiar with the term "pandemic." Can a closed system provide safe and clean air in the jail?

Bill Lovingier (Denver, Colorado) replied that even a closed system brings in some set percentage of fresh air. Also, it's been found that it is not appropriate to simply shut down a closed air system to contain a threat; it's actually better to continue running the system because the dilution effect of fresh air is safer.

Ron Torres stated that the air system provides 100% evacuation in the Bernalillo County jail, as a result of which the facility is always ready for incidents such as a mattress fire.

Jay Heidenrich (Multnomah County, Oregon) commented that the proposal was probably about saving money, but the jail should have as many air changes in an hour as it can get.

TOPIC 14 – ABSENTEEISM CREATED BY THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT (FMLA)

Andrew Taber (Shelby County Division of Corrections, Tennessee) noted that jails sometimes have staff who may be abusing the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act. What are large jails experiencing, and what are they doing to control such abuse?

Jim Coleman (Shelby County Sheriff, Tennessee) had a similar experience in which an employee was habitually coming in late. His way of restoring normalcy was to move the staff member to a completely different shift. The staff member was put on notice that he would not be assigned to work any other shift until he was able to prove he could perform on this one by reporting for duty on time.

Ron Malone (Milwaukee House of Correction) has noticed that some staff have begun going to the same doctor, who is sympathetic to their issues related to job stress. The staff who remain on duty are then forced to work double shifts for coverage, and the jail has been using a pool of retired officers to meet its staffing needs.

Joe Schmitz (Hamilton County, Ohio) confirmed that he is aware of people going on FMLA leave for stress reasons. Some then proceed to go out on disability over stress. It appears that some doctors are assisting in this. When the staff exhaust their accrued sick leave, if no other provisions have been discussed, the jail assumes they've abandoned their position and terminates them.

Mitch Lucas (Charleston County) related that one staff member made the mistake of applying to retire after a period on FMLA-protected leave. However, FMLA leave stops when staff members file for retirement. It cannot be used as a bridge to get from employed to retired status.

~ ~ ~

PROGRAM SESSION: REENTRY PARTNERSHIPS

Creative Partnerships Supporting Inmate Reentry Programs: Involving Public, Private, and Nonprofit Organizations

Presenters: Lilya Wagner, Counterpart International, Washington, D.C., and Charles Walters, Chief Deputy, Orange County Sheriff's Office, Santa Ana, California.

Law enforcement agencies are increasingly interested in finding new sources of funding to achieve program goals in areas such as reentry, because their existing resources are prioritized toward core security and public safety needs. A systematic approach to fundraising and resource development can provide lasting and long-term financial solutions.

Like most agencies, Orange County Corrections is experiencing budget pressures, especially in staffing. At the same time, the jail is working to expand its evidence-based interventions to lower recidivism, with a particular focus on reentry services for state inmates mandated by recent California legislation. The jail has begun to forge new relationships to get the services inmates need by developing community understanding of jails and by engaging in mutually beneficial partnerships.

The four economic sectors of society are:

- The public, governmental sector;
- The profit, market sector;
- The household sector; and
- The nonprofit sector.

By understanding these sectors and the ways they connect, jails will be better positioned to raise funds and/or to create collaborative relationships with nonprofits that enhance their offender programs.

The nonprofit sector is quite varied. Nonprofits can be formed to help the needy or for other purposes. They are typically independent from, but funded by, the government and profit sectors. They can be staffed by volunteers and/or professionals. They are sometimes described as tax-exempt, but most pay various types of taxes. More blurring of the lines is taking place in collaborative & cooperative efforts involving nonprofit, public, and profit organizations that are banding together for the common good.

To get funding, a jail service partnership must be able to answer the question, "What outcome will I see as result of giving you money?" The partnership or nonprofit must be capable of carrying out its promises. Philanthropy may lead to direct support of inmates and their families or to indirect support. Corporations engage in philanthropy to demonstrate social responsibility, to improve their communities, to benefit their current employees, and to improve conditions in which their future employees grow and learn. Tapping into these motivations can aid a funding outreach strategy.

Walters began learning ways to gain community support when he was assigned to a canine unit and had to find a way to replace the unit's dogs. He found that by bringing dogs to community service

group meetings and presenting the unit's record of excellence, he generated offers of help without even asking for support. People responded by asking, "How can I get involved? What do you need?"

California Population Pressures

California's 58 counties will be submitting proposals in November 2007 for state funding for offender reentry, intended to lower crowding in state prisons. Officials expect that some 3,500 to 4,000 offenders will return to Orange County, from 200 to 600 each day. Significant treatment capacity will be needed, especially in substance abuse treatment and mental health care, on top of existing needs for current jail populations.

In preparation for managing more state inmates, the county has been clearing jail beds by measures such as expanding access to community work service programs for offenders with no record of violent crime. A new express booking center also keeps jail beds free, and the county is now mailing warrant cards that instruct people to report to a facility to post bail and get a GPS monitoring band.

As new reentry services get under way, the county anticipates a need for more positions to conduct assessments. It is partnering with Orange County Probation for statistical analysis and modeling as planning continues. Staff are working to develop and expand program capacity for a continuum of services—establishing links between jail programs and community locations. Discussions took place with justice agencies first, then they were opened up to nonprofits. As everyone talked about their programs, it became apparent that all this very impressive work was taking place independently, with no sharing of information and with major duplications of effort. It was an "aha" moment when the opportunity to collaborate became clear. This led to formation of the Orange County Re-Entry Partnership (OCREP).

Successful Fundraising

Though there can be a reflexive avoidance of fundraising, focused fundraising can change an organization. A more businesslike way of thinking often results. For example, an agency may recognize the importance of diversifying its funding sources, and it may get better at expressing its aims and purposes in ways that attract support. A key principle is, "You're not raising money, you're making a goal happen." Good recordkeeping, good teamwork, and responsiveness are essential. This is all part of "donor-centered fundraising," in which fundraisers reach out to donors that want to make a difference.

Agencies seeking to attract new funding need to understand and follow several key elements of successful fundraising.

- Know basic marketing principles. Fundraising is based on shared values. Research and planning are essential preparation. Fundraising requires six "rights": the right person, asking the right prospect, for the right cause, in the right way, at the right time, for the right amount. What's the price tag for that great idea?
- Consider the environment and climate. Fundraisers must be sensitive to issues in the local economy and recent news events and their effects on potential donors. They must know the values and interests of potential donors. Cultural differences may also need attention. Donations to women's shelters rise when O.J. Simpson is in the news.
- Create a compelling case for assistance. What will be different after a prospect gives support to the project or program? Why is this important, and what will be the value and benefit—to the offender, to the community, etc.

- Involve a board & other volunteers. Making the best use of peoples' skills, talents, and networks will result in the greatest success. A team approach is always beneficial.
- Research the potential donors. Mapping the potential constituency for a program is helpful to target fundraising work. Ask the question, "Who cares about this?" At the center are groups that have the most leadership in or the greatest stake in the issue. Different types of donors may support different aspects of the project. For instance, foundations are usually most likely to give seed money for a new project, but ongoing funding may need to come from another source.
- Select a campaign method and specific tools. Fundraising can be done in a wide range of ways. Any given initiative will usually use a few different methods to maximize results.
- Document and share the plan. Writing a fundraising plan sets concrete targets, and it documents specific strategies and results. A written plan provides a basis for accountability and credibility as well as giving coherence and organization to the overall effort.
- Steward the gift. Support may be one-time, or it may continue. Maintaining a sense of shared value, with benefit to both the donor and the recipient, is important. The recipient should respect the donor's wishes, deliver on promises, and engage in ethical practices.

More Strategies for Effective Funding Appeals

Collaboration joins and strengthens all the voices on an issue, combating any perception that there's no need for the program.

The synergy of experts working together avoids any perception that the program may not be the most effective option.

Be ready to explain what will happen without funding. In the example of a public school music program, if less money is raised, the school can get a band leader and some music, but it can't buy instruments for disadvantaged children to participate. Without uniforms, there will be lower morale. Without a travel budget, the band can't go even to the next county for performances.

Forming a new entity as a sub-group of an existing nonprofit can be a good start-up strategy. The first step is finding an established organization with aligned interests.

Collaborations offer an opportunity to redefine, or rediscover, what "community" means. Fresh thinking can expand your view. For example, area universities can offer very valuable assistance to new programs via their expertise in development, philanthropy, alumni resources, and proposal development.

The OCREP Example

OCREP is the Orange County Reentry Partnership. Working together, the Sheriff's Department, the Orange County Probation Department, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation/ Parole brought together eight (8) corporations, 15 government agencies, 24 nonprofit organizations, and representatives of the released offender population to assess the needs of the formerly incarcerated and discuss reentry strategies for Orange County. The group asked, "What do we have in our successful programs and how do we connect them?" Services range very widely to meet identified needs. The media have been very interested, and this is a good foot to be able to put forward for all concerned. Everyone wins in this scenario.

Another example is the county's mental health partnership. A team went to a local mental health service organization and affiliated as a sub-entity. This enabled the group to start working without first having to spend time developing an identity package and administrative structure—they could focus just on the services and programs they wanted to offer. Later on, the group separated from the host organization with a track record of success and with the momentum and credibility it needed to form a strong advisory board, etc. The collaboration redefines “community” for mentally ill offenders. It focuses on housing, services, connecting the dots, and accessing available government subsidies. When donors ask, “How can I help?” it's important to have the methodology and structure ready.

Discussion

An attendee asked for an example of a failure in collaboration. Walters identified a situation involving a third-party relationship with a mental health association that brought a group together to connect internal and external programs. Diverging interests can influence the willingness of a collaborating partner to pursue a particular grant or fund a specific service.

In this case, they found so much diversity in interests related to mental health populations, some groups dropped out of the collaboration. The lesson taken from this experience is the importance of an executive committee made up of people who can get on the phone and leverage solutions.

Dr. Lilya Wagner, Ed.D., CFRE, can be reached at Counterpart International, Washington, D.C., (202) 296-9676, ext. 502, or lwagner@counterpart.org. Charles L. Walters is Assistant Sheriff, Orange County Sheriff's Department, Santa Ana, California, and can be reached at (714) 953-3092 or cwalters@ocsd.org.

The presenters have also developed an article on this topic that will appear in the 2007 Large Jail Network Exchange.

PROGRAM SESSION: REENTRY PROGRAMMING IN JAILS

Session 1. Inmate Reentry Issues at the County Level

Gordon Bass, Jr., Jacksonville, Florida/Duval County Consolidated Government

The best strategy for starting a reentry project is to frame reentry as a public safety issue. Jails need to research and use best practices to have an impact on crime and recidivism. In Florida, the Governor's Ex-Offender Task Force was formed with the mission of improving the effectiveness of the state and counties in facilitating the reentry of ex-offenders into their communities. This was a statewide effort involving research, data analysis, local-level collaborations and workshops held with the U.S. Attorney's office and the Department of Justice.

Florida prison populations have risen 37% in the last 10 years, and the number of offenders released from prison has increased by 350% over the past 20 years. Duval County/Jacksonville examined the locations to which offenders were returned by mapping their ZIP codes. The data showed that the prison inmates were returning to the poorest sections of the county. Demographically, the inmates returning to the county are most likely to be male (93%), black (64%), and over age 40 (40%). Almost one-third had been serving time on a violent offense. Over half (64%) were released at the expiration of their sentence and would receive no parole supervision. More than one-third (37%) of those released in the county are rearrested within a year of release.

In Jacksonville, 37% of people entering the jail have been arrested or gone through intake before. The state's habitual misdemeanor offender statute provides a mechanism for ensuring repeat offenders receive jail-based services to get them out of the jail cycle. (See Bass's article, "Justice and the Revolving Door: The Jacksonville Experience in Recidivism Intervention," available online at <http://www.nicic.org/library/period276>.)

Inmates face many barriers on release: they often have no government identification; they are issued only \$100 from state funds; they have minimal transition plans; they often lack a driver's license and access to other forms of transportation; they aren't eligible for public housing; they need counseling, medication, and/or treatment; and they have minimal work experience and can't find a job. They have little education and low literacy; they lack a steady employment history; and many jobs are off-limits to ex-offenders. Many also are parents. Any progress in keeping these people out of the justice system helps to break the cycle of poverty, hopelessness, addiction, criminal thinking, criminal behavior, and arrest, not only for today's adults but for their children and the children in their communities and neighborhoods.

Prison reentry councils can provide the coordination needed to make services available to inmates who need them. Interventions are based within prerelease, postrelease, and long-term community support networks with a matrix of partners.

On the local level in Duval County, about 51,000 jail inmates are released each year, and 37% are rearrested. This led to the creation of the Jacksonville Area Discharge Enhancement (JADE) initiative, a collaborative partnership of many diverse agencies and service providers. Affiliates include the Jacksonville Reentry Center, a one-stop shop providing services and job referrals, and Dismas, providing needs assessment and comprehensive discharge planning. Dismas's programs include the "Hammer," which provides close monitoring and support for persons with a history of gun violence.

The Frequent User Service Enhancement program follows clients from the jail to the homeless shelter and shares data with medical care providers in the health department and hospital emergency rooms. Another partner group, Operation New Hope, is showing 3% recidivism. It focuses on job skill development and education. Staff help ex-offenders improve their job application and interview skills until they get a job.

In sum, the use of local reentry councils is highly recommended. Each community is unique, and public safety and reentry solutions can best be found on the local level.

Comments

David Parrish (Hillsborough County, Florida) said that this presentation echoes an article that appeared in the Washington Post last week. In the District of Columbia, 10% of residents are returned felons.

In response to questions, Bass clarified that in the first year of operation, the target has been to serve 500 individuals.

The assessment tool used was developed by Duval County based on the tool used in a similar program at Rikers Island, in the New York City Department of Corrections. The Duval County tool has been vetted by their heads of medical and mental health services.

Gordon A. Bass, Jr., is Director, Jacksonville Sheriff's Office, Jacksonville, Florida. He can be contacted at (904) 630-5847 or gordon.bassjr@jaxsheriff.org.

Session 2. Sentencing to Service: STS Homes

Presenter: Thomas Merkel, Hennepin County, Minnesota

The STS Homes program (“sentencing to service”) was launched to employ prison inmates in rehabilitating homes that have been abandoned. Currently 20% of the crews’ work is focused on returning these properties to the county tax rolls, and the target for the future is 30%. The program operates in partial partnership with Habitat for Humanity. The homebuyers enjoy some tax breaks.

A nonprofit group is the general contractor that hires carefully selected inmates to work in the program. Both men and women are eligible. Applicants are interviewed when they are within a year of release. Those who are hired receive 2 days of safety and tool training before being placed on a job site.

STS participants learn construction skills and life skills in preparation for work after release from prison, and they appreciate the tangible results of their labor.

The program has had 300 participants in its first 7 years. Fully 98% have completed the program, and 90% to 95% have found jobs in the industry. Recidivism has remained under 5%.

Operating costs for the program were around \$800,000 for seven crews in 2007. Developers and municipalities fund more than 50% of these costs, and the program is moving toward revenue neutrality.

The program has strong support from local unions. Crew foremen are journeyman carpenters. STS is the only union-endorsed carpenter training program in the metropolitan region.

Response to the program has been very positive. In an upcoming project, workers will build cabins to be placed in Minnesota state parks.

LJN participants viewed a video about the program. For additional information, LJN agency staff can contact Bob Hunter, Division Manager, at bob.hunter@co.hennepin.mn.us or 612 348 7137.

Thomas R. Merkel is Director of the Hennepin County Department of Community Corrections, Minneapolis, Minnesota. He can be contacted at (612) 348-9982 or thomas.r.merkel@co.hennepin.mn.us.

Session 3. Reentry – Protecting the Investment

Presenters: Thomas C. Rovelli and Joann Morales-Harrison, Hampden County, Massachusetts

Hampden County has been working on reentry issues for 32 years. The vision behind Hampden County's reentry approach is, "We incarcerate to set free." The county recognizes that everyone is eventually leaving the jail, so the jail should prepare them for success upon exit through classification and programming. The Community Re-Entry Unit embodies this vision and was opened in October 2006 as a 30-day unit for inmates about to be released. An After Incarceration Support Systems program provides aftercare referrals to help ex-inmates function in the community and stay out of jail. Every inmate gets assistance developing a release plan prior to their release from any facility in the county.

Planning for reentry begins at intake. Inmates being oriented to the county's jail system receive a portfolio that will accompany them throughout their time under supervision. The portfolio is a tool to encourage inmates to take responsibility for their own success during incarceration and in the community. Inmates use their portfolios to collect information and materials that will help them succeed on release. They take the portfolios to meetings with classification and program staff as well as presenting them at parole hearings.

The inside of the portfolio cover has a checklist that shows where the offender is in terms of employability on release from jail. This is the starting point for developing a service plan and individual map for the offender. Offenders receive help in filling gaps in their preparedness. A complete portfolio documents personal contact information, identification (Social Security card, birth certificate, driver's license, and Massachusetts health care enrollment number), educational data (transcripts, certificates, and employment assessment results), job search tools (a resume, completed job application, etc.), and references (letters of reference and contact information).

At the heart of the reentry effort is an interest in population management to control crowding and costs. Tom Rovelli stated, "Whether we call it reentry or reintegration as we did a few years back, we need to solidify and expand our resource base, and reentry is now the talk of our legislators and funding authorities." His agency is very focused on proving the results and outcomes of their reentry efforts; their work is not just trial and error. All of the agency's reentry initiatives are linked with the portfolio items that are tracked at the offender level.

But the jail recognizes that it can't do it all; partnerships are essential for making a difference in offenders' lives. A central question was how to establish partnerships, market the reentry focus as an opportunity for community entities and businesses, and create community interest in participating in a correctional program. Joann Morales was involved in launching the After Incarceration Support Services (AISS) program and stated that it wasn't easy to do—at first, few people wanted to work with the jail. There was fear from a community that didn't understand what the jail did and what it was. AISS operates out of four facilities, with a women's unit opening in late 2007.

Recidivism data suggested a need to find ways to extend the sheriff's supervision into the community. Everything that relates to jail population management is the jail's business. An accountability policy is the basis for targeting factors that are directly related to relapse to a criminal lifestyle.

Intervention Approach

The earlier reentry planning begins, the better. A person might be on pretrial status for several months. A lesser offender with a district court case may have a 90 to 120 day turnaround. It's important to provide reentry assistance for all populations.

The screening version of the Levels of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) is used at orientation and is supplemented by other assessment instruments to build a service plan. It's useful to employ recognized assessment instruments in the event an inmate's service plan is challenged. The LSI-R results direct inmates into one of three basic treatment tracks: Low risk, medium/high risk, and high risk. Five weeks of mandatory programming are provided. Following basic programming, inmates move into core programs as indicated by their individual service plans.

Work is initiated on admission to obtain Social Security cards, a state identification card, a birth certificate, and a public health care system application. Linkage with community medical care is key. The jail's treatment unit is linked with the community health system, which facilitates care for inmates after release and helps keep emergency rooms from being clogged. The jail has a virtual gateway with Mass. Health, so that 30 days before release, inmates who have medical/mental health needs have a schedule of appointments for care in the community and have their eligibility card ready for use.

Inmates who are returning to jail on a violation or new offense are placed in an "accountability pod" where they have to earn privileges. Offenders have step-down choices to earn their way to lower security.

The county converted a gym in its main jail last fall to a 30-day, open-admission, revolving program. A different reentry issue is addressed every day on a rotating basis. This program is about to be moved to a new facility. As a result of creating this program, the jail can now say that upwards of 1,800 inmates have received reentry services in one year. An additional 400 inmates have completed the CRU program.

Gender-specific programming is offered through the Women's VOICES program, which addresses key domains including addiction, relationship and abuse issues, parenting, mental health/trauma, and economic marginalization.

All inmates leave with a release plan. Most can access a resource room with pamphlets and a database with geographically indexed information on available service referrals. Maximum security inmates receive staff assistance in accessing the information.

The agency views its reentry approach as an effort to operationalize the inmate. If the inmates are not marching to their orders, they aren't fulfilling key elements of reentry. If they don't participate in treatment and programs, it affects their classification.

Staffing includes four part-time reentry mentors. These are contracted positions, and the staff includes some ex-offenders. They are some of the program's biggest advocates.

The Community Reentry Unit has two program components: daily activities onsite, plus outreach. Daily activities include presentations from nearly 60 community agencies on the services they provide. Inmates are made aware of Department of Motor Vehicles services and procedures, public transit options, drop-in centers for child care, immigration-related services, and information on many more agencies and organizations.

The outreach component takes eligible inmates out into the community to connect with service agencies. They travel in vans, accompanied by academy-trained correctional staff, and return directly to the facility after meetings are completed. They have experienced no security issues whatsoever;

eligibility is determined through close work with the classification office. Inmates are strongly motivated to comply with security rules this close to release.

The CRU has three reentry counselors, an employment specialist, a housing specialist, contract staff, and a representative from AISS. Until recently, 42% of inmates were still being released from the county's main institution, but now more are being routed thru the CRU to improve their connection with community services.

Making It Work

Providing identity documents is an example of a hurdle to be overcome. Morales-Harrison built a relationship with the Social Security Administration and developed a new system in which jail staff verify and submit the information they get from the inmates. Specialized staff are trained in Social Security's virtual gateway, and agency staff visit the jail monthly to talk about issues and concerns.

It's important for the jail to be persistent in getting service linkages set up. For instance, perhaps in your county it typically might take 8 weeks to get a released offender into the county's public medical care system. To find a way to expedite enrollment doesn't mean anyone is doing the jail a favor, it just means services are being maximized for the benefit of all concerned. Morales-Harrison got a seat on many of the groups' boards and promotes the messages that we're working with the same clients, and that these are your neighbors. There is now a lot of engagement with community providers. People ask to be put on their agenda. The jail continues to learn about more community services that are helpful to inmates and their families.

With partnerships, the question is, "How far can you go?" One person started a bakery working with homeless ex-offenders. A connection with a Zen retreat led to an agreement for inmate work crews to build housing there. One-Stop employment centers have been a good partner, as well, among many other examples. The jail also provides outreach to families, and makes after-incarceration coordinators available for optional appointments with inmates. This is a break from the past when inmates would avoid any ongoing connection with the jail. Now the jail gets calls from former inmates; "I relapsed, I need help, I don't want to go back to jail." The jail conducts ceremonies each year for "graduates" who are making it in community. Between 400 and 500 attendees typically attend.

In sum, reentry programming is not new to Hampden County. The agency is now at the point of looking at what's working and what's not, and moving ahead to the next level. A reentry focus is an excellent tool for meeting corrections's public safety responsibility, and it is essential for population management. This program is growing.

Discussion

With the focus here on "factors that support a criminal lifestyle," it was asked if anybody knows what's at the top of the list. Factors are specific to the individual. The main factors that need attention typically include addictions, criminal history, friends and associates, family support, and attitude. These are domains addressed in the LSI-R assessment, but Tom Rovelli also remarked that determining the factors doesn't take tremendous science; for their purposes, it often takes looking at the official version of the offense, plus doing some talking.

Joann Morales-Harrison is the Re-Entry Unit Supervisor for the Hampden County Sheriff's Department in Ludlow, Massachusetts. She can be reached at (413) 858-0915. Co-presenter Thomas C. Rovelli is the Assistant Superintendent with the department and can be contacted at (413) 547-8000, ext. 2915, or tom.rovelli@sdh.state.ma.us.

Session 4. Reentry: How Do You Get Started?

Presenter: Joseph M. Schmitz, Hamilton County, Ohio

A show of hands indicated that most agencies represented at the meeting are conducting or developing reentry services now. Fewer agencies have been doing this type of work for 5 years or longer. Schmitz began developing jail reentry programming in Hamilton County 5 years ago. At that time, with a tight budget and in a conservative county, he was able to fund just seven 7 positions. His experience shows that a jail can accomplish a lot without spending any money. One key is partnering with the nonprofit sector. Schmitz ran a nonprofit organization for 4 years and has insights into how they work and the ways their roles dovetail with that of the jails.

Jails seeking to develop a reentry focus should focus on five tasks.

Task 1 – Pick a specific population.

It will be difficult to succeed with reentry if you begin by focusing on the whole jail population. Schmitz recommends mental health populations for two reasons: 1) jails all have a lot of mentally ill inmates, and 2) they keep coming back in the door, which demonstrates a need for effective interventions. It is essential to involve community mental health agencies in jail reentry. They have vested interest because the inmates are already in their caseload, and they lose track of the client when they enter the jail. No one wants the person to become destabilized. These agencies are probably more than happy to provide services if the jail will invite them to get involved.

Task 2 – Build a collaborative approach.

As previous presenters have mentioned, building collaborations is the most important aspect of reentry. At first, Hamilton County found some difficulty because they tried to address both mental health and substance abuse, which have separate state funding. It was difficult to establish the jail as a test site. The agency then progressed to working on a collaborative around female offender issues, which was smoother.

Issues in a collaboration:

- Trust. The collaborative process can bring a diverse group to the table, perhaps representing 14 or 15 agencies. It is necessary to create rules that support trust, such as “What goes on in this room stays in this room.” Team members need to express their concerns without it getting back to their bosses, and there must be space to confront others without repercussions. The point is that the team is working toward a common goal, and any friction shouldn’t be taken personally.
- Commitment. Team members can’t be on a collaborative and do nothing. This is not an opportunity to be seen, it’s time to get involved. Collaboratives of people who are actually working in the field every day tend to be the most successful.
- Turf issues. Nonprofits can have issues here, because they need income to survive. Some actually make significant profits, and any of course organization needs payroll and operating cash. On the other hand, a lot of nonprofits are willing to provide funding to get a collaboration off the ground, and they often can handle all the grant writing. For example, Hamilton County’s female offender reentry project just got \$450,000 from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and all the Sheriff’s Department needed to do was write a letter of support to go with the funding request. To work with nonprofits, jails need to get a group

together, get them motivated, give them direction, and tell them what you need. They're competing against each other for funding, so it's wise to get everybody involved.

Task 3 – Identify roadblocks.

Some issues present difficulties that need to be resolved with creativity and persistence.

- Social Security benefits—A decade ago, the Social Security Administration offered the jail \$200 per inmate staying longer than 30 days, in exchange for their data on the identity of those in the jail. But at reentry, these inmates had lost their eligibility for SSI benefits to pay for services needed after release. By personal, top-level contacts, Hamilton County arranged for a system of expedited benefit applications through which SSI benefits are being preapproved within 1 week instead of 3 months. Jails can also find out if any other entities in their community have already made such an arrangement with SSI. There will now be three sites in the county to apply for restoration of SSI benefits, and the jail will be one.
- Length of sentence—jails can do reentry with presentence populations. Different approaches are needed for reentry of pretrial and sentenced populations. Ohio laws give judges a broad continuum of available sanctions. Meanwhile, one jail inmate may be sentenced to a year but be ready for release in only 3 months. Or an inmate may have a 30-day sentence but actually need long-term substance abuse treatment, so you know you're going to get them back in jail fairly shortly.

Hamilton County has coined the term “benchmarks” to describe behavioral goals inmates must meet in order to be ready for reentry, and has convinced judges to allow inmates to be released when they've met all their benchmarks, based on credits applied toward the time left on their sentences. The advantage is that the jail is now controlling what's happening with these individuals, based on their readiness. The jail is now working to convince judges to give longer sentences to allow for more treatment time when needed. As a release mechanism, the pretrial services agency requests a mitigation order from the judge when a person completes his or her benchmarks, and they can be out within a couple of hours. In other cases, release eligibility on completion of benchmarks is worked out with the judge in advance. The inmate may earn 2 days credit for every day served on meeting a benchmark. Inmates are working toward several benchmarks simultaneously, for example, in educational and anger management programming.

Results are showing that this program extends the time people stay out of jail, but it isn't 100% successful. One reason is the short time frame for assessing the inmate, providing services, getting the community providers into the jail, and getting the offender back out.

Task 4—Accommodate service providers.

Many changes have been very effective and didn't cost a dime. The most important thing to do for community providers is to provide an atmosphere in the jail where they feel welcome. The jail must appear non-threatening, or it will take much more work to get a collaboration to develop. In Hamilton County, every mentally ill inmate has a caseworker, and mental health caseworkers are required to come into the jail. The jail helps this along by hosting a monthly open house with caseworkers, providing jails tours and walking new caseworkers through the process for seeing an inmate.

Another accommodation the jail made was changing the time of release. Hamilton County releases inmates between 5:00 and 6:00 a.m. to facilitate pick-up by community service agencies. The county found that if no one was on-site to meet inmates on release, they tended to disappear and miss their connection with services. Caseworkers now meet their clients inside the jail and take them straight to their new housing. This has been the single most effective change they made in handling reentry.

Task 5—Make an inventory of services.

The jail should document an inventory of all services available to inmates and to staff. As Hamilton County did this, they found a lot of people and organizations that were willing to help that nobody had known about. A detailed record of service providers can be used as a training tool and a resource for inmates. It also provides historical documentation so when staff changes happen, the knowledge and the connections are not lost.

Discussion

Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) said that his agency proactively addressed the problem of mentally ill offenders cycling through the jail through a collaboration. The jail forged a partnership with local mental health service providers and police to form and train a mobile outreach unit that responds 24/7 to situations with mentally ill persons where there is no major crime. It has drastically reduced the number of people going to jail for disorderly conduct and similar offenses. Schmitz confirmed that his agency also did that, but unfortunately their volume of mentally ill remains high even when only the severe cases of acting out on the street are coming in to the jail.

Massachusetts participants noted that a conviction on a drug charge brings an automatic 1, 3, or 5-year suspension in the offender's driving license, and other offenses can bring a lifetime suspension. This is a major barrier to employment where there are no good bus routes to employment centers offering better jobs. Transit passes aren't of much value outside the major urban centers.

Reentry program capacity is an issue in some locations. One way to address this is by making reentry options available but placing the burden on the inmate to initiate participation.

Reentry is becoming a buzzword the "big shots" want in on.

Schmitz noted that inmates get a "certificate of correctability" intended to encourage employers to hire them. In Hampden County, inmates receive a certificate of reentry completion that reinforces the offender's accountability and accomplishments. Tom Rovelli (Hampden County) agreed that certificates and awards can be useful, but he cautioned against giving inmates a written endorsement of having been reformed or rehabilitated, because the inmate's behavior can't be guaranteed.

Joseph M. Schmitz is the Director of Corrections in the Hamilton County Sheriff's Department, Cincinnati, Ohio. He can be reached at (513) 946-6606 or jschmitz@sheriff.hamilton-co.org.

PROGRAM SESSION: EXCITED DELIRIUM / ACUTE BEHAVIORAL DISTURBANCE

Concurrent Sessions:

Excited Delirium Training

Presenter: Pat Hunton, Monterey County Sheriff's Department, Monterey, California

In-Custody Death/Excited Delirium: Fact or Fiction?

Presenter: Don Leach, Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government, Kentucky

Though the terminology to name and understand them is still evolving, it is clear that sudden, in-custody deaths with no medically attributable cause are occurring in jails across the country, and their number may be increasing. Incidents typically involve a highly agitated person who becomes involved in a physical struggle with someone trying to control him and who suddenly dies for no apparent reason. The ACLU and the NAACP have asserted that these deaths are the result of abuse.

Jails are in a particular quandary because how they respond over time will be based on their definition of the phenomenon as a medical issue or as something else. At this point, jail staff have little guidance for recognizing the situation as it occurs. There currently is no recognition from the American Medical Association (AMA) or the Diagnostic Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) that the phenomenon exists as a medical syndrome. The World Health Organization recognizes it as "cardio-respiratory collapse occurring within 24 hours of symptoms." The actual term "excited delirium" (ED) was first used by medical examiners to explain deaths with no medically attributable cause. A more widely accepted name for the syndrome is "acute behavioral disturbance" (ABD).

Meeting participants viewed a video produced by the Las Vegas Police Department.

Observations, Incidence, and Possible Causative Factors

- Most, but not all, ED/ABD deaths in jails are occurring on intake.
- One theory is that these deaths are drug-related, possibly associated in particular with methamphetamine and cocaine use with their known risks to the heart. But though women are high meth users, incidence among women is reportedly low. (Data suggest just 1% to 4% of ED/ABD cases involve women.)
- Use of psychiatric medications may be a factor. Other possible contributors include brain tumors, infection, heat exhaustion, and thyroid disease.
- The extremely resistive behavior may be caused by panic when the person goes into a state of hyperacidosis and normal oxygen/carbon dioxide exchange in the lungs is interrupted. Acidosis can be caused by excessive, prolonged physical exercise.

- There are some theories that ED/ABD may be related to positional asphyxia through restraint or compression. Impact weapons, OC spray, Tasers and other electronic control devices also have been implicated.

Signs and Symptoms of ED/ABD

- It can be difficult for jail staff to distinguish between “routine” violence and/or mental illness on the one hand and a situation with ED/ABD on the other. People affected by ED/ABD show unexpected strength and endurance and a very high tolerance of pain. They typically show high levels of agitation and hostility and may exhibit bizarre behavior and speech.
- Physical signs can include dilated pupils, profuse sweating, an elevated core body temperature (as high as 103° to 110° F), skin discoloration, a distended belly, foaming at the mouth, and uncontrollable shaking or shivering.
- The person may exhibit respiratory distress and say he can’t breathe.
- The person may suddenly become quite tranquil and continue in that state for some few minutes before death occurs.

Medical Treatment

- Medical treatment of ED/ABD focuses on restoring normal blood pH levels as quickly as possible through an IV drip.
- Some treatment may also focus on dropping the person’s body temperature.
- Emergency room treatment is not always able to save the person’s life. Timing is critical.

Experiences of LJN Agencies

Tom Campbell (Louisville, Kentucky) described a situation in which a man was in custody for 3 days with no problems, then one night he began banging his head on his cell door. When the officer responded, he began fighting and almost pushed the officer off the tier onto the dayroom floor below. More officers responded, and the man was Tasered three times but continued to fight. After 17 minutes of violent struggle, he was secured in a restraint chair where he shortly died. His death was ruled to be caused by positional asphyxia. The subject had had no known history of meth use.

Rollin Cook (Salt Lake County, Utah) reported experiencing two deaths in the last year that followed this pattern. One inmate appeared to be burning from the inside out. The video records show the men going completely quiet, then they simply died. The agency was able to save the life of another person who exhibited these signs.

Pat Hunton stated that three of these incidents have occurred in Monterey County, outside of jail custody. One person was on a roof and was Tasered and stopped breathing. He went into a coma and died 2 weeks later when life support was removed.

Discussion

A discussion of Taser use repeated that it appears to increase the likelihood of death in an ED/ABD situation, though the specific mechanism is not understood. On the other hand, the Taser often is considered an important tool for protecting officers. Policy in Monterey County and some other locations limits staff to two uses of the Taser with a single subject. Anyone who is Tasered by law enforcement in Monterey and Salt Lake Counties is taken to the hospital before going to jail.

Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) noted that his agency documents use of force and the Taser as follows: threatening to use the Taser is one use of force; pointing it at an inmate is a second use of force; and firing it is a third use of force. His data show that of about 200 threatened uses, the Taser actually has been used about 25 times. Participants agreed that the Taser is useful for deterrence. If an inmate is targeted with the Taser's red dot and freezes, that situation isn't ED/ABD.

What Jails Should Know

- If ED/ABD is suspected, use of the Taser or other electronic control devices is not advised.
- Training should instruct staff to get the person access to medical personnel before starting any physical intervention.
- If physical control is necessary, the inmate should be placed on the ground in a supine position or on his side.
- If the situation is not far advanced, the inmate should be observed in a non-restrained environment, and medical staff should be brought to the scene for assessment and treatment.
- In a public location, the person should be contained and the situation announced so backup and crisis intervention personnel can be brought to the scene, and medical personnel can be summoned. If the public is not in jeopardy, it's best to slow the situation down through verbal diffusion.
- Participants observed that during an violent incident, it is not feasible to check pupils and body temperature.
- Medical personnel should get a blood sample as quickly as possible to confirm a metabolic imbalance in blood gases and begin treatment. A blood sample should be taken within 12 hours in the event of a death.

Pending Questions

- Do men have a higher percentage occurrence of ED/ABD, or just a higher number of recorded occurrences?
- Is the apparent increase in ED/ABD cases being created artificially as word spreads about the phenomenon?
- What is the incidence of this phenomenon outside corrections and law enforcement? What about mental hospitals? Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) said that this has been known to happen on airlines, where a passenger went out of control and was subdued by other passengers. Is better, non-anecdotal data available?
- What is the usual duration and the significance of the "serene" time? If some jails have had the person die after only a minute of the serene phase or while being moved from intake to the medical unit, does this suggest the serene phase is usually a precursor to cardiac arrest, or can the person still be saved at that point?
- Are those affected very likely to die if they receive no medical treatment, or can they recover with no intervention as long as the situation is not exacerbated by efforts to physically control the subject?

Information and Sources

No caselaw exists on ED/ABD, though a case is currently under way in Gwinnett County, Georgia. A video on behavior and intervention techniques is available from the Las Vegas Police Department.

Dr. John G. Peters is the contact at the Institute for Prevention of In-Custody Deaths, Inc. (<http://ipicd.com>), located in Nevada. The web site identifies resources and training opportunities.

Gordon Bass mentioned that Dr. T. C. Chan, Department of Emergency Medicine at the University of California-San Diego Medical Center, is an author of extensive research on the Taser and ED/ABD and delivered a workshop in Orlando. Another team of researchers has been looking at positional asphyxia and calls it a myth, because tests show there is still enough blood oxygen for the person to remain alive. Lt. Alan W. Benner, Ph.D, is department psychologist with the San Francisco Police Department and has developed a response protocol. A protocol in use in the San Jose Police Department is also available.

A study by a Los Angeles physician found that only 8% of ED/ABD deaths had impact weapons involvement, 11% involved the use of OC spray, 27% of cases involved use of the Taser, and 63% involved hands-on control techniques. David Walcher (Jefferson County, Colorado) noted that these figures also reflect the general rate of usage of these control techniques, so the significance of the findings is unclear.

Other Things to Consider

The media know, or should know, that ED/ABD is not formally recognized by the AMA or in the DSM-IV. Jails should ensure their public information officers are informed about this syndrome so they're prepared in the event an incident or death happens locally. Once the Arapahoe video was shown, the officers' response became a non-issue as viewers saw what the deputy was up against.

The general consensus among participants was to avoid using any particular term to describe this syndrome and instead to leave that to the jails' and counties' medical professionals. Policy will continue to evolve. Eventually officers may be called to testify about how he or she decided an inmate was exhibiting ABD, though a final determination may only be made by medical staff. If jails define ED/ABD as a medical condition, they will need to develop a policy response. There is liability exposure in how the jail responds. If this is a recognized medical condition, what are implications for protocol? Can a jail respond with force to a medical issue in order to gain control of the subject?

Jay Heidenrich (Multnomah County, Oregon) said some jails may need to review their practices. If jails place violent inmates in an intermittently supervised cell to burn themselves out, it could lead to the death of the inmate if staff don't intervene.

Don Leach concluded by stating that an inmate may develop acidosis and he may die, but the jail's main responsibility is to understand that their interventions may increase the risk of death. Information is available and will continue to improve. Jails need to know what the risks are.

Ms. Pat Hunton is Commander, Monterey County Sheriff's Office, Salinas, California. She can be reached at (831) 755-3858 or huntonp@co.monterey.ca.us. Donald L. Leach is the Senior Administrative Officer in the Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government, Division of Community Corrections. He can be contacted at (859) 425-2612 or donl@lfucg.com.

PROGRAM SESSION: WOMEN OFFENDER ISSUES

Responding to Women Offenders in Large Jails

Presenter: Maureen Buell, Correctional Program Specialist, NIC Prisons Division, Washington, D.C.

Issues related to women offenders are the focus of attention throughout state and local corrections. NIC has been addressing women offender issues since the agency's inception and has made considerable contributions within the last 15 years. Women offenders share many of the same issues in prisons, jails, and community corrections, but the systems themselves are dramatically different. NIC is now exploring how to best present information on women offender issues so it fits with the specific concerns and interests of jails, such as the need to gain the approval of funders and those in decision-making positions, including sheriffs and county commissioners.

Personnel from small, medium, and large jails have expressed interest to NIC in women offender's operational issues, but some believe they can't accomplish much because the women are in jail a relatively short time. Ms. Buell invited agencies who offer programs designed to reduce the "revolving door" effect to share their information with her. One of her goals is to develop a cadre of resource providers to assist NIC in providing training and technical assistance.

Addressing the issues of women offenders is not to treat them "special" or to reduce their responsibility for addressing the behaviors that brought them to the attention of the criminal justice system. The fact is, most correctional services and operations are naturally geared toward the majority population: men. Often, however, standard practices in areas such as security and searches can exacerbate the issues a woman inmate is already having trouble with. Women in incarcerative settings have experienced high rates of physical and sexual abuse, and these issues are often linked to acting out behavior on the units. Men, too, have had such experiences, but the frequency is significantly higher with women. The goal of gender-specific methods and services is simply to facilitate better offender outcomes.

Bureau of Justice Statistics data from July 30, 2006, showed that the number of women in jail has been rising, while the number of men in jail is steady or actually dropping. Women of color were 3.8 times more likely to be incarcerated than white women.

Differences in the Female Population

- Women offenders are much more likely than men to be a single parent with custody of her children. When a female parent is incarcerated, in 75% of cases her children must live with someone other than another natural parent. When men are incarcerated, their children live with the mother in 75% of cases. This has significant impact on the safety and security of children and our communities.
- Upwards of 75% of women in the correctional system need mental health services, and the proportion is even higher in jails. Women offenders have more depression, more post-traumatic stress disorder, and greater histories of physical and sexual abuse. Also, abuse tends to increase as women become adults, as contrasted with men, for whom abuse typically decreases with age.

- Women become addicted faster and more deeply than men do.
- Women enter the criminal justice system in different ways. They often don't have as much latitude for plea bargaining, so they may receive harsh sentences for relatively minor property and drug offenses. They often are less able to make bail, even when the amount is relatively small, and they're less likely to have their bail posted by a significant other.
- Incarcerated women behave differently than men. Nationally, only 4% to 5% of women require a high level of custody. Women who lack connections with the outside community often do much worse when incarcerated. Women with more education and more troubled women can have more difficulty adhering to institutional routines. Women tend to ask "Why?" more often, but their intention is not to challenge authority but to try to understand. They talk more and interact with staff more. By making some changes to current programming and operational practices, facilities can experience reduced rates of disciplinary reports.
- To improve their chances of remaining out of the justice system, women need several key elements that add up to community stability. They include access to safe housing, a source of legal income, freedom from continuing interpersonal violence, and appropriate treatment and social support for themselves and their children.

Tim Albin (Tulsa County, Oklahoma) observed that women support the men in their lives when the men are incarcerated (via visits, money, etc.) but women inmates tend to get abandoned by their men and even by their families. Ron Malone (Milwaukee, Wisconsin) agreed that there is much less outpouring of family support for women offenders.

Tom Rovelli (Hampden County, Massachusetts) remarked that his agency has just opened a new women's facility and is committed to providing gender-specific programs. The issues women face are deeper on an emotional and mental health level, and the women need more attention and services in parenting, addressing a background of trauma, and resolving peer associations and other deficits.

Joe Schmitz (Hamilton County, Ohio) shared several points in support of specialized jail treatment for women. When county commissioners ask why a jail should do things differently for women, he advised, jail leaders should answer, "Because what we've done for men hasn't worked for women." Another argument is that because women are the primary childcare givers, if we can help the mom maybe we can keep her children from entering the criminal justice system. Third, women are more willing to accept treatment, especially when it's based on one-to-one contacts. Women also become treatment-ready much more quickly: with men, readiness typically takes 90 to 120 days, and women are typically ready within 30 days, so jails can begin treatment a lot quicker. Because women are less of a physical threat, it can be easier to move them out of the jail and into community support, saving jail beds. Finally, it can be much easier to get community assistance to help women offenders than men. This may be because a lot of service agencies and nonprofits are run and staffed by women.

Responses to Women Offenders

In one Midwest jail system, when judges adjusted their bail requirements for women offenders, the local jail population dropped measurably. Efforts are under way to get this message out to judges via pretrial services agencies. Joe Schmitz commented that judges in his area receive 3 hours of training annually on sentencing and are learning not to place too many requirements on women, because it dooms them to failure when they are also balancing so many other life factors. Judges are also being educated and reeducated on the impact on children of their mothers being in jail. This has to be covered every year because somehow the judges forget. Schmitz recommends that jail leaders make themselves accessible to the judges to keep these issues in the forefront.

Ron Torres (Bernalillo County, New Mexico) received funding for a pilot program in his facility focusing on children's issues and transitional housing. Case management focused on bringing families together, with excellent results. While women are the highest users of the program, men are also eligible.

Lupe Valdez (El Paso County, Texas) described a program for pregnant women in jail who are paired with pregnant women on the outside who act as mentors to share parenting skills. The pairs stay matched through delivery.

Assessment and Classification

It's a big undertaking for an agency to consider moving to a new classification system. With NIC support, the University of Cincinnati has just completed two new gender-specific classification and assessment instruments that will be in the public domain and accessible on the NIC web site. One is a standalone instrument designed to be used with women as they move from intake through placement under community supervision. The second instrument is a "trailer" that can be used with current third-generation assessment tools, such as the COMPAS instrument or the Levels of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R). NIC is developing a process to support jurisdictions that express serious interest in adopting these tools. An article in the August 2007 issue of *Corrections Today* discusses these two new tools.

Gender-neutral instruments can do fairly well with women, but because they're designed for the dominant population, they miss issues significant with women. An earlier NIC survey found that in some jurisdictions as many as 70% of classification determinations for women get an override. Also, the criminogenic risks for men don't necessarily play out the same way for women, and other specific issues that contribute to risk for women are not assessed. For example, data collected in a gender-specific assessment/classification project showed that a significant history of abuse as a child may affect how women behave within correctional settings

Some assessment tools are not useful for program planning but function adequately for custody and placement purposes. The two new NIC tools for women offenders are designed to capture information on programming needs and reentry issues. It is possible that much of what we are learning in working with women offenders may have a positive impact on men as well, particularly in the area of parenting.

NIC Programs

Information on NIC's programs and resources related to women involved in the criminal justice system can be found online at <http://www.nicic.org/WomenOffenders>.

"Women Offenders: Developing an Agencywide Approach" is offered for three-member policy-maker and management level teams. It focuses on developing a system that has sustainability for the long term and is not dependent on one passionate staff leader to keep it going.

"Effective Supervision of Women Defendants and Offenders in the Community" covers gender-responsive supervision of females in community corrections and provides supervisory and line staff with additional tools for more effective work with women in community settings.

"Operational Practices in Women's Prisons" is offered to wardens, assistant wardens, and other ranking management staff who have responsibility for operations in women's facilities.

Resources

Buell referred participants to a number of NIC-developed resources on women's issues. They can be downloaded or print copies can be ordered via the NIC web site.

- 018017 Gender Responsive Strategies: Research, Practice and Guiding Principles for Women Offenders. <http://www.nicic.org/library/018017>
- 020873 Responding to Women Offenders: The Department of Women's Justice Services in Cook County, Illinois. <http://www.nicic.org/library/020873>.
- 020872 Systemic Criminal Justice Planning: Improving Responses to Women Offenders in Hamilton County, Ohio. <http://www.nicic.org/library/020872>.
- 020853 Using Jail Exit Surveys to Improve Community Responses to Women Offenders. <http://www.nicic.org/library/020853>.
- 020418 A Summary of Research, Practice, and Guiding Principles for Women Offenders. <http://www.nicic.org/library/020418>.
- 020417 The Gender-Responsive Strategies Project: Jail Applications. <http://www.nicic.org/library/020417>.
- 022247 Facility Planning to Meet the Needs of Female Inmates. <http://www.nicic.org/library/022247>.
- 020419 Supervision of Women Defendants and Offenders in the Community. <http://www.nicic.org/library/020419>
- 016419 Sentencing Women Offenders: A Training Curriculum for Judges. <http://www.nicic.org/library/016419>

With the assistance of jail administrators and practitioners, NIC is hoping to improve its services related to women in jail settings by making appropriate changes to current products or developing new products for jail systems.

Maureen Buell, NIC Prisons Division, heads NIC's initiatives on working with women offenders. She can be reached at (800) 995-6423, ext. 40121, or mbuell@bop.gov.

Information on the COMPAS instrument (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) is available at <http://www.northpointeinc.com/compas.htm>.

Information about the Levels of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) is available at http://www.assessments.com/catalog/LSI_R.htm.

~ ~ ~

THE CONTINUING EVOLUTION OF THE LARGE JAIL NETWORK

NETWORK PURPOSE AND DIRECTION

Meeting participants broke into three teams to discuss operational strategies for future of the Large Jail Network. Group representatives then reported back to the full assembly.

Team A. Network Communications/Technology

Don Leach recapped members' issues with LJN communications and the response from Joshua Stengel, NIC's Web Services Manager. A community guide handout was distributed to LJN members. Leach commented that web-based LJN networking is the next best alternative to the meetings for exchange of information, and it's particularly important for new LJN members.

A show of hands demonstrated that use of the new forum is far below historic levels using an e-mail discussion list, which was discontinued more than a year ago. Members have been slow to embrace the new communication technology provided by NIC for networking.

Several specific needs and issues were discussed with the full group of participants.

- Increase responsiveness. Members said they missed the speed of the former system. When it takes 45 seconds for a reply to be posted on a critical issue, that can be a long time. An upgrade will be implemented immediately after the meeting that should significantly reduce response time.
- Provide interactive training. Technical issues will be addressed through interactive, teleconference-like training online. NIC will offer multiple sessions to reach a large number of members. Each participant will probably need two or three sessions of training to understand the system and reinforce new skills.
- Garner feedback. Unless NIC technical staff get feedback on why members don't post, they can't change the system so members will use it to share information. A working team has been formed to provide direct liaison with the NIC Web Services Manager. Feedback is welcome from all LJN members.
- Recognize posters. When members participate in the LJN online community with uninformative user names (such as "cef," "ralph," or "Commander Bob"), other members often cannot tell who is "speaking." This is especially difficult for new LJN members. Members present said they may not even read or reply to messages from senders whose identity they can't recognize. This was less of a problem in the email-based system. By better identifying themselves and their agency affiliations, LJN members can help build the personal relationships that make the network work. Future training will cover how members can configure their online identity so that their names and agencies can be more easily recognized.
- Address usability issues. Members described the system as slow, cumbersome, and having ongoing usability barriers. Members need to learn to create and manage their password-protected online profiles and to use online and email networking tools. Members committed to continuing to work with the new system with the hope that other alternatives might be considered.

- Expectations. Stengel encouraged LJN members to approach the new system with an open mind, free of expectations based on how the old communications technology worked.
- Features. The web-based service includes several features that have had little or no use by LJN members, such as file sharing, live chat, and blog functions. Future training can alert members to the potentials in the new system.
- Involvement. Some observed that stakeholders may not have been involved adequately in the transition. Members acknowledged that some of the group are technology “dinosaurs,” but these same people hold valuable knowledge and information about jails and the Network and cannot be left behind.

Team B. LJN Mission

Gordon Bass presented the ideas of this group. The discussion found that the LJN's existing mission is fine as it stands. The group identified several new activities the LJN could engage in.

- Developing large jail standards. Participants suggested this could be valuable because existing ACA jail standards are inadequate for a truly well run jail. Accreditation does not necessarily equate with the best possible jail operations, in the view of those present. It was discussed that the LJN could send a representative to meetings of ACA's standards committee to share large jail perspectives.
- The LJN could find ways to provide more help to medium and small jails on best practices.
- The LJN should remain essentially educational in nature; it was not created to make policy or to develop consensus on tough topics in detention.
- Alternate meetings could be held at field locations in members' agencies. This would give hosts a bigger role in planning the meeting and allow them to showcase their initiatives, and more of their staff would become involved with the network and its benefits.
- Alternate meetings could include presentations by staff from federal agencies and Congressional committees to keep LJN members informed on matters related to U.S. policy and law and to share LJN perspectives with these offices.
- The LJN membership could offer more input on NIC assistance. It could advise on jail training needs and gaps that could be addressed through NIC programs. The LJN also could suggest research areas to explore. For example, NIC might have been encouraged to address the Second Chance Act or reentry issues in ways that would help jails stay on the cutting edge of emerging issues. Another focus could be NIC technical assistance in areas such as accreditation and the Civil Rights of Incarcerated Persons Act (CRIPA).

Team C. New Member Issues

Speaking for his focus group, Mitch Lucas remarked that many staff in LJN-eligible agencies are unaware of the network. Among the 178 eligible large jail systems, only about 50 are being represented at this meeting. Another 20 to 30 agencies have been to recent meetings or participate in other ways, leaving many eligible agencies outside the network. Members agree that attending LJN meetings is among their top choices for professional development and that more administrators should be benefitting.

Participants identified strategies for more outreach to future members:

- Involving professional organizations—The ACA and AJA web sites should have a link to information about the LJN. National and state sheriffs' associations could be asked to pass along information to large jails about the network.
- Sharing information—NIC could send information to jail CEOs and administrators, in electronic and paper formats, based on Bureau of Justice Statistics jail population data. The package could include a print copy of the LJN Exchange and meeting proceedings, a survey asking whether the jail leadership was aware of LJN and its meetings, and member-generated material articulating the value of participation. (For example, "The LJN meeting provides wall-to-wall information sharing—no fluff, no recreation.") Sending a meeting invitation without this context is less likely to get the message across about the LJN's value.
- Broadening the meetings' locale—If NIC decides it's feasible to move LJN meetings to different locations, they may find that more new agencies become interested in attending or hosting.
- Expanding LJN meeting capacity—Given the information that NIC's budget for LJN meetings is based on 60 attendees, some participants said they would be willing to pay their own way to open slots for new members to attend.

LJN TRANSITION

Mike Jackson spoke for the group by thanking Richard Geaither for his years of coordinating the Large Jail Network, and participants offered a round of applause.

Geaither responded by stating that he appreciates having had the opportunity to support the LJN. His experience has shown him that when the time comes to give up work that he values, new people will bring their energy and ideas, building on what's already there to make it even better. He is confident the LJN will continue to be recognized as the premier group of men and women in jails in the country. As he learns new things and builds new relationships in the future, Geaither will value his continued connection with the LJN. He closed by thanking the members present.

PLANNING FOR THE NEXT LJN MEETING

Participants discussed the merits of starting future LJN meetings on Mondays vs. Tuesdays. An alternating schedule may be used in the future.

Participants chose the following topics for the agenda of the March 2008 meeting of the Large Jail Network:

- Generation X and Y—Recruiting, retaining, and managing younger personnel can be a challenge. Jail administrators need to understand what motivates this population cohort and what they look for in their leadership and supervision.
- Media relations—Issues and technology have changed a great deal in recent years. The National Information Officers Association could be a resource. (See <http://www.nioa.org>.)
- Homeland security and removal of criminal aliens—It could be helpful for representatives of the FBI and/or Immigration and Customs Enforcement speak about the role of jails.
- Contract services.

Some topics may be addressed through a dinner speaker or other forms of network exchange.

- Jail standards and accreditation. Bringing an ACA representative to the meeting could be an opening to discuss of how appropriate the standards are for jails.
- Restorative justice. Is reparative work for victims and communities a natural fit within today's discussion of reentry?
- Transgender issues for inmates and staff. Cases in the 1st and 9th Circuit Courts of Appeals are putting jails on notice that they need to understand issues in managing, supervising, and searching people who have gender identity issues.
- Correctional personnel returning from military service. What can jails do to help staff reenter their jail careers and their communities after experiencing combat in the Middle East?

###

Appendix A

LJN September 2007 Final Meeting Agenda

12:00 a.m. LUNCH

1:30 p.m. *Inmate Re-Entry Issues at the County Level* **Gordon Bass, Jr.**
Jacksonville, FL

Thomas Merkel
Hennepin County, MN

Thomas C. Rovelli
Joann Morales Harrison
Hampden, MA

Joseph M. Schmitz
Hamilton County, OH

5:00 p.m. ADJOURN

Wednesday, September 26, 2007

8:00 a.m. *Responding to Women Offenders in Large Jails* **Maureen Buell**
Correctional Program Specialist
National Institute of Corrections
Washington, DC

10:00 a.m. *Excited Delirium: A Problem to be Eliminated or Managed*.....**Pat Hunton**
Monterey County, CA

Donald Leach
Lexington/Fayette, KY

12:00 a.m. LUNCH

1:30 p.m. *Open Forum: Hot Topics for Discussion (continued)* **Don Leach**
Lexington/Fayette, KY

2:45 p.m. BREAK

3:00 p.m. *The Continuing Evolution of the Large Jail Network* **Richard Geather**
(*Working Groups*) National Institute of Corrections

Network Communications/Technology **Joshua Stengel, Facilitator**
NIC Information Center
Web Services Management

LJN Mission **Gordon Bass, Facilitator**
Jacksonville, FL

New Member Issues **Mitch Lucas, Facilitator**
Charleston County, SC

5:00 p.m. *Presentation of Future Meeting Issues* **Mike Jackson**
National Institute of Corrections

Closeout and Adjourn **Richard Geather**
Mike Jackson
National Institute of Corrections

Appendix B

LJN September 2007 Participant List

Mr. Albin, Tim
Chief Deputy
Tulsa County Sheriff's Office

500 South Denver

Tulsa, OK 74103

Tel: 918-596-8871 Ext:
Fax: 918-596-4681
Email: talbin.dlm@tcsso.org

Mr. Altman, Terry W.
Chief Deputy
Pinal County Sheriff's Office
Adult Detention Bureau
PO Box 867

Florence, AZ 85232

Tel: 520-866-5014 Ext:
Fax: 520-866-5090
Email: terry.altman@co.pinal.az.us

Mr. Bass, Jr., Gordon A.
Director
Jacksonville Sheriff's Office

501 E. Bay Street

Jacksonville, FL 32202

Tel: 904-630-5847 Ext:
Fax: 904-630-5825
Email: gordon.bassjr@jaxsheriff.org

Mr. Bodiford, Scott
Jail Administrator
Greenville County Department of Public Safety

20 McGee Street

Greenville, SC 29601

Tel: 864-467-2305 Ext:
Fax: 864-467-2324
Email: sbodiford@greenvillecounty.org

Mr. Campbell, Tom D.
Director
Louisville Metro Department of Corrections

400 South Sixth Street

Louisville, KY 40202

Tel: 502-574-2181 Ext:
Fax: 502-574-2184
Email: tom.campbell@louisvilleky.gov

Mr. Carbery, Richard E.
Chief
Onondaga County Sheriff's Office

555 South State Street

Syracuse, NY 13202

Tel: 315-435-1710 Ext:
Fax: 315-435-1718
Email: rcarbery@ongov.net

Mr. Carroll, Thomas L.
Deputy Commissioner
Delaware Department of Correction
Administration Building
245 McKee Road

Dover, DE 19904

Tel: 302-739-5601 Ext:
Fax: 302-739-8220
Email: Thomas.Carroll@state.de.us

Mr. Chiano, Paul
Director
Plymouth County Sheriff's Department

24 Long Pond Road

Plymouth, MA 02360

Tel: 508-830-6282 Ext:
Fax: 508-830-9201
Email: pchiano@pcsdma.org

Mr. Coleman, James E.
Chief Jailer
Shelby County Sheriff's Office

201 Poplar Avenue

Memphis, TN 38103

Tel: 901-545-2414 Ext:
Fax: 901-545-2696
Email: james.coleman@shelby-sheriff.org

Mr. Cook, Rollin
Chief Deputy
Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office

3365 South 900 West

Salt Lake City, UT 84119

Tel: 801-743-5844 Ext:
Fax: 801-743-5839
Email: rcook@slco.org

Mr. DeVoe, Derek
Captain
Tulsa County Sheriff's Office

300 North Denver Avenue

Tulsa, OK 74103

Tel: 918-596-8907 Ext:
Fax: 918-596-8955
Email: derek.devoe@tcsso.org

Mr. Di Yorio, William
Chief Deputy
Riverside County Sheriff's Department

PO Box 512
4095 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92502

Tel: 951-955-2412 Ext:
Fax: 951-955-2428
Email: wdiyorio@riversidesheriff.org

Mr. Dowd, Denis
Director
Osceola County Corrections Department

402 Simpson Road

Kissimmee, FL 34744

Tel: 407-742-4301 Ext:
Fax: 407-742-4303
Email: ddow2@osceola.org

Dr. Ford, Marilyn Chandler
Assistant Director
Volusia County of Corrections

1300 Red John Drive
Caller Service 2865
Daytona Beach, FL 32120-2865

Tel: 386-323-3524 Ext:
Fax: 386-323-3542
Email: mcford@co.volusia.fl.us

Mr. Frey, Rick
Director
Broward County Sheriff's Office

555 SE First Avenue

Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

Tel: 954-831-5924 Ext:
Fax: 954-765-4054
Email: rick_frey@sheriff.org

Mr. Gillen, Brian H.
Superintendent
Plymouth County Sheriff's Department

24 Long Pond Road

Plymouth, MA 02360

Tel: 508-830-6200 Ext:
Fax: 508-830-6201
Email: bgillen@pcsdma.org

Mr. Guerin, Al
Assistant Sheriff
San Diego County Sheriff's Department

9621 Ridgehaven Court

San Diego, CA 92123

Tel: 858-974-2278 Ext:
Fax: 858-974-2291
Email: alfred.guerin@sdsheriff.org

Mr. Heidenrich, Jay
Captain
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office

501 SE Hawthorne Blvd, Suite 350

Portland, OR 97214

Tel: 503-988-4349 Ext:
Fax: 503-988-4316
Email: jay.heidenrich@mcsos.us

Ms. Hunton, Pat
Commander
Monterey County Sheriff's Office

1414 Natividad Road

Salinas, CA 93906

Tel: 831-755-3858 Ext:
Fax: 831-755-3864
Email: huntonp@co.monterey.ca.us

Mr. Husz, John
Warden
Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility

PO Box 05740
1015 North 10th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53233

Tel: 414-212-6822 Ext:
Fax: 414-212-6821
Email: john.husz@wisconsin.gov

Dr . Leach, Donald L.
Administrative Officer, Senior
Lexington/Fayette Urban County Government
Division of Community Corrections
600 Old Frankfort Circle

Tel: 859-425-2612 Ext:
Fax: 859-425-2750
Email: donl@lfucg.com

Lexington, KY 40510

Mr. Lovingier, Bill R.
Director/Undersheriff
Denver Sheriff's Department

Tel: 303-865-9566 Ext:
Fax: 303-865-9171
Email: lovingierb@ci.denver.co.us

1437 Bannock Street, #405

Denver, CO 80202-5337

Mr. Lucas, Mitch
Chief Deputy
Charleston County Sheriff's Office

Tel: 843-529-7305 Ext:
Fax: 843-529-7406
Email: mlucas@charlestoncounty.org

3841 Leeds Ave.

Charleston, SC 29405

Mr. Malone, Ronald K.
Superintendent
Milwaukee County House of Correction

Tel: 414-427-4785 Ext:
Fax: 414-427-8017
Email: rmalone@milwcnty.com

8885 South 68th Street

Franklin, WI 53132

Mr. Merkel, Thomas R.
Director
Hennepin County Department of Community Correcti

Tel: 612-490-5795 Ext:
Fax: 612-348-6488
Email: thomas.r.merkel@co.hennepin.mn.us

C-2353 Government Center

Minneapolis, MN 55487

Ms. Messick, Dolores
Assistant Chief
El Paso County Sheriff's Office

Tel: 915-546-2228 Ext:
Fax: 915-543-3810
Email: dmessick@epcounty.com

PO Box 125

El Paso, TX 79941-0125

Mrs Morales-Harrison, Joann
Re-entry Unit Supervisor
Hampden County Sheriff's Department

Tel: 413-858-0915 Ext:
Fax: 413-547-0109
Email: tom.rovelli@sdh.ma.us

627 Randall Road

Ludlow, MA 01056

Mr. Mueller, Roy F.
Director
St. Louis County Department of Justice Services

Tel: 314-615-4763 Ext:
Fax: 314-615-4329
Email: rmueller@stlouisco.com

100 South Central Avenue

Clayton, MO 63105

Mr. Newton, Jeffery L.
Director
Douglas County Corrections

Tel: 402-599-2265 Ext:
Fax: 402-444-6088
Email: jnewton@dccorr.com

710 South 17th Street

Omaha, NE 68102

Mr. Nyklewicz, Kevin
Captain
Milwaukee County Sheriff's Office

Tel: 414-226-7054 Ext:
Fax: 414-226-7099
Email: knyklewicz@milwcnty.com

821 West State Street

Milwaukee, WI 53233

Mr. Parrish, David M.
Colonel
Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office

1201 North Orient Rd.
PO Box 3371
Tampa, FL 33609

Tel: 813-247-8318 Ext:
Fax: 813-247-8897
Email: dparrish@hcsso.tampa.fl.us

Mr. Plumer, Michael L.
Captain
Dane County Sheriff's Office

115 West Doty Street

Madison, WI 53703

Tel: 608-284-6800 Ext:
Fax: 608-284-6112
Email: plumer.mike@co.dane.wi.us

Mr. Pratt, Glen
Deputy Chief
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

655 East Third Street

San Bernardino, CA 92415-0061

Tel: 909-387-3760 Ext:
Fax: 909-387-3402
Email: gpratt@sbcasd.org

Mr. Rovelli, Thomas C.
Assistant Superintendent
Hampden County Sheriff's Department

627 Randall Road

Ludlow, MA 01056-1079

Tel: 413-547-8000 Ext: 2915
Fax: 413-547-0109
Email: tom.rovelli@sdh.state.ma.us

Mr. Ryan, Timothy P.
Director
Miami-Dade County Corrections and Rehabilitation

2525 NW 62 Street

Miami, FL 33147

Tel: 786-263-6010 Ext:
Fax: 786-263-6135
Email: timryan@miamidade.gov

Mr. Schmitz, Joseph M.
Director of Corrections
Hamilton County Sheriff's Department

Tel: 513-946-6606 Ext:
Fax: 513-946-6616
Email: jschmitz@sheriff.hamilton-co.org

1000 Sycamore Street, Room 120

Cincinnati, OH 45202

Mr. Simons, David L.
Lt. Colonel
Hampton Roads Regional Jail

Tel: 757-488-7500 Ext: 2702
Fax: 757-488-2200
Email: simonsd@visi.net

2690 Elmhurst Lane

Portsmouth, VA, VA 23701

Mr. Singleton, Darrell K.
Captain
Kent County Sheriff's Office

Tel: 616-632-6401 Ext:
Fax: 616-632-6412
Email: darrellsingleton@kentcountymi.gov

701 Ball Avenue Northeast

Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Mr. Spence, Phil
Chief
Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office

Tel: 720-874-4176 Ext:
Fax: 720-874-3495
Email: pspence@co.arapahoe.co.us

7375 South Potomac Street

Centennial, CO 80112

Mr. Stith, Kieth
Acting Director
Hudson County Department of Corrections

Tel: 973-491-5535 Ext:
Fax: 973-817-8289
Email: kstith@hcnj.us

35 Hackensack Avenue

Kearny, NJ 07032

Mr. Taber, Andrew
Director
Shelby County Division of Corrections

1045 Mullins Station Road

Memphis, TN 38134

Tel: 901-377-4502 Ext:
Fax: 901-377-4503
Email: Andrew.Taber@shelbycountyttn.gov

Mr. Tighe, F. Patrick
Major
St. Lucie County Sheriff's Office

4700 W. Midway Road

Ft. Pierce, FL 34981-4825

Tel: 772-462-3396 Ext:
Fax: 772-462-3362
Email: TigheP@stluciesheriff.com

Mr. Torres, Ronald C.
Chief of Corrections
Bernalillo County Metropolitan Detention Center

100 John Dantis Drive SW

Albuquerque, NM 87121

Tel: 505-839-8701 Ext:
Fax: 505-839-8980
Email: rotorres@bernco.gov

Ms. Tyler, Shirley A.
Director Public Safety
Mercer County Corrections Center

PO Box 8068
640 S. Board Street
Trenton, NJ 08650

Tel: 609-583-3553 Ext:
Fax: 609-583-3560
Email: styler@mercercounty.org

Ms. Valdez, Lupe
Sheriff
Dallas County Sheriff's Office

133 North Industrial Blvd., Lockbox 31

Dallas, TX 75207-4313

Tel: 214-653-3460 Ext:
Fax: 214-653-3420
Email: lvaldez@dallascounty.org

Mr. Walcher, David C.
Division Chief
Jefferson County Sheriff's Office

200 Jefferson County Parkway

Golden, CO 80401

Tel: 303-271-5661 Ext:
Fax: 303-271-5403
Email: dwalcher@jeffco.us

Mr. Walters, Charles L.
Assistant Sheriff
Orange County Sheriff's Department

PO Box 449

Santa Ana, CA 90703

Tel: 714-647-1815 Ext:
Fax: 714-953-3092
Email: cwalters@ocsd.org

Mr. Wheeler, Jeffery W.
Lieutenant
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office

501 S.E. Hawthorne Blvd, Suite 350

Portland, OR 97214

Tel: 503-988-3266 Ext:
Fax: 503-988-5738
Email: jeffery.wheeler@mcso.us

Mr. Wilbourn, Jim
Captain
Adams County Sheriff's Office

150 North 19th

Brighton, CO 80601

Tel: 303-655-3411 Ext:
Fax: 303-655-3304
Email: jwilbourn@co.adams.co.us

Mr. Wilkes, Tony M.
Complex Administrator
Davidson County Sheriff's Office

506 Second Avenue North

Nashville, TN 37201

Tel: 615-880-3868 Ext:
Fax: 615-862-8590
Email: twilkes@dcsnashville.org

07J2402

Large Jail Network Meeting

Mr. Wresh, Michael A.
Captain
Hennepin County Sheriff's Office

401 South 4th Avenue

Minneapolis, MN 55415

Tel: 612-348-4424 Ext:

Fax: 612-596-8145

Email: mike.wresh@co.hennepin.mn.us

Large Jail Network Meeting Guests

07J2402

September 24-26, 2007

Mr. Jim Gondles
Executive Director
American Correctional Association
206 N. Washington Street, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-224-0000

Mr. Kermit Humphries
Correctional Program Specialist
Offender Workforce Development and
Prisoner Reentry
Washington, DC
800-995-6423 x 40118
khumphries@bop.gov

Ms. Cheryl Paul
Correctional Program Specialist
NIC Jails Division
Washington, DC
800-995-6423 x 69690
cpaul@bop.gov

Ms. Robbye Braxton-Mintz
Correctional Program specialist
NIC Jails Division
Washington, DC
800-995-6423 x 44562
rbraxtonmintz@bop.gov

Mr. Mike Jackson
Correctional Program Specialist
NIC Jails Division
Washington, DC
800-995-6423 x 69565
mpjackson@bop.gov

Ms. Maureen Buell
Correctional Program Specialist
NIC Prisons Division
Washington, DC
800-995-6323 x 40121
mbuell@bop.gov

Ms. Mary Ashton
Correctional Program Specialist
NIC Research and Evaluation Division
Washington, DC
800-995-6423 x 40378
msashton1@bop.gov

Mr. Joshua Stengel
Web Services Management
NIC Information Center
Aurora, CO
800-995-6429 x 4432
jstengel@nicic.org

Dr. Lilya Wagner, Ed.D., CFRE
Counterpart International
1200 18th St. NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20036-2561
202-296-96-76 x 502
lwagner@counterpart.org

Ms. Constance Clem, Recorder
8836 Marathon Road
Longmont, CO 80503
303-242-6278
connie.clem@indra.com

Mr. Richard E. Geaither
Correctional Program Specialist
NIC Academy Division
791 Chambers Road
Aurora, CO 80011
800-995-6429 x 4407
303-365-4407
Fax 303-365-4458
rgeaither@bop.gov

Appendix C

Index of Past LJN Meeting Topics

**LARGE JAIL NETWORK MEETING TOPICS
JUNE 1990 - SEPTEMBER 2007**

1990	June	System Approaches to Jail Crowding and Population Management
1991	January	Crowding Strategies and the Impact of Court Decisions
	July	Managing Jail Litigation Linking Jail and Community Programs
1992	January	Fair Labor Standards Act Writing and Negotiating Contracts
	July	Americans With Disabilities Act
1993	January	Blood-Born and Airborne Pathogens Health Care Costs in Jails
	July	Privatization Programs for Women Offenders
1994	January	Public Policy and Intergovernmental Dimensions of the Role of Jails, Professional Associations in Corrections: Their Influence on National Perspectives of the Role of Jails
	July	Using Data and the Resources of the Bureau of Justice Statistics Developing Resources to Provide Inmate Programs
1995	January	Gangs, Jails and Criminal Justice
	July	Trends in Employee Relations; Sexual Harassment
1996	January	The Dilemma of In-Custody Deaths The Crime Bill and It's Impact on Jails
	July	Juveniles in Adult Jails
1997	January	Meeting the Competition of Privatization
	July	21st Century Technology and it's Application to Local Jail Information and Operational Needs.
1998	January	The Future of Our Workforce: Pre-employment Testing, Recruiting, Hiring, Training and Evaluating 'New Age' Employees {Generation X} Legal Issues Update - Update of PLRA {Prison Litigation Reform Act}
	July	Taking A Pro-active Approach to the Prevention of Employee Lawsuits.
1999	January	Post-Traumatic Stress Syndrome and Critical Incidents: Preparation, Response, and Review . Legal Issues Update.
	July	Improving Opportunities for Successful Recruitment, Selection, and Retention of Staff.

LARGE JAIL NETWORK MEETING TOPICS
JUNE 1990 - SEPTEMBER 2007
 (continued)

2000	January	Criminal Justice System Coordination and Cooperation: How the Jail Benefits and the System is Improved. Legal Issues Update.
	July	Exploring Issues and Strategies for Marketing, Funding, and Auditing Large Jail Systems.
2001	January	The Use of Data for Planning, Decision Making, and Measuring Outcomes.
	July	Understanding and Using the Data & Resources of the Bureau of Justice Statistics Staff Issues in Large Jails: Staff Utilization, Relationships, Conduct & Misconduct
2002	January	The Future of Jails, Corrections and Criminal Justice Legal Issues Update
	July	Inmate Medical Care Cost Containment Succession Planning for Future Jail Leaders
2003	January	Addressing the Future of Jail Legislation, Resources and Improving Funding Legislation, Resources and Funding: A Perspective from our Professional Associations The Role and Use of Professional Standards and Internal Affairs Large Jail Network Listserv and Web Technology Legal Issues Update-Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), Admission Screening
	July	Defining the Future & Exploring Organizational Strategies Impact of Jail Population Changes on Jail Management Jail Standards & Accreditation Use of Technology for Jail Administration & Operation
2004	February	Emergency Preparedness: Planning and Implementation Contagious Disease Identification and Prevention Legal Issues Update-Inmate Medical Confidentiality, Involuntary Mental Health Treatment, Contract Provider Litigation, Arrestee "Clothing Searches"
	July	Effectively Managing Inmate Gangs in Jails Identifying Problems/Managing Inmate Mental Health
2005	January	Preparing Leaders in Corrections for the Future-NIC's Core Competency Project Training as a Strategic Management Tool Inmate Mental Health: Legal Issues, Management, Diversion Justice and the Revolving Door and Corrections Into the Next Decade
	July	Examining Federal and Local Benefits for Jail Detainees Ethics in the Administration of the Jail Human Resource Issues: Employee Recognition, Attendance, Restricted Duty

2006	January	<p>Implementing PREA: The BJS Report Statistical Analysis: Crowding, Life Safety, Managing Staff Succession Planning The Question of TASERS Legal Issues Update</p>
	July	<p>Diagnosing, Analyzing and Improving the Jails Organizational Culture Planning for Catastrophes and Other Crises Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) and Jails Criminal Registration Unit: Hillsborough County, FL</p>
2007	January	<p>15th Anniversary Meeting Large Jail Systems Assessment Research Project Changing Organizational Culture Improving Collaboration Between Jails and Mental Health Systems Legal Issues Update</p>
	September	<p>Jail Inmate Reentry Programs: Public, Private, Non-Profit Involvement Jail Inmate Reentry Issues on a County Level Responding to Women Offenders in Large Jails Excited Delirium: A Problem to be Eliminated or Managed Recruiting, Hiring, Retention of Staff The Value of Public/Private Partnerships for Large Jails</p>