



**PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
LARGE JAIL NETWORK
MEETING**

July, 1995

**National Institute of Corrections
Jails Division**

Large Jail Network Meeting

**July 9-11, 1995
Longmont, Colorado**

August 23, 1995

Table of Contents

Introduction

Opening Address. Current Trends: Deliberate Indifference 3

Lynn Lund, Attorney & Counselor at Law, Salt Lake City, Utah 3

Session 1:

Current Trends in Sexual Harassment

Lynn Lund, Attorney & Counselor at Law, Salt Lake City, Utah 5

Session 2:

Current Trends in Employee Relations

Lynn Lund, Attorney & Counselor at Law, Salt Lake City, Utah 8

Session 3:

Recruitment

Michael Schweitzer, Forsyth County, North Carolina 11

Ernest Weber, Nassau County, New York 13

Session 4:

Hiring and Selection

Herbert Bernsen, St. Louis County, Missouri 14

Terry Moore, Volusia County, Florida 16

Art Wallenstein, King County, Washington 17

Ralph Mitchell, El Paso County, Texas 19

Session 5:

Training, Performance Appraisals, and Procedures for Discipline

Richard Bryce, Ventura County, California 22

Denis Dowd, Shelby County, Tennessee 23

Session 6:

Dealing with Unions

John Rafferty, Union County, New Jersey 25

Stan Taylor, Delaware Department of Corrections 26

Bob Denham, Sacramento County, California 28

LaMont Flanagan, Pretrial Division, Baltimore, Maryland 30

Final Session:

Planning for Next Meeting 31

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

Appendix B: Meeting Participants

National Institute of Corrections

Jails Division

Large Jail Network Meeting

Longmont, Colorado

July 9-11, 1995

Introduction

This summary presents highlights of a meeting of NIC's Large Jail Network, held in Longmont, Colorado, July 9-13, 1995. The meeting was attended by approximately sixty administrators of the largest jails and jail systems in the country. Presentations and discussions focused on staffing issues in large jails and on current legal trends in employee relations and sexual harassment. An opening address by Lynn Lund, a Salt Lake City attorney specializing in corrections, pointed to current Supreme Court decisions with implications for jail management.

Meeting participants described their agencies' approaches to the following staffing issues:

- ***Recruitment*** -- Michael Schweitzer reported on Forsyth County, North Carolina's innovative approach, which requires potential job candidates to complete a basic training school prior to being considered for hire. Ernest Weber, Nassau County, New York, endorsed a similar approach, which he recommends on the basis of current applicants' more self-centered perspective than that found in previous decades' applicants with military backgrounds.
- ***Hiring and Selection*** -- Herb Bernsen, St. Louis County, Missouri, described the steps in the corrections officer selection process jointly developed by the departments of Justice Services and Personnel. In Volusia County, Florida, Terry Moore found a loophole in state training requirements that enabled that county to hire, train, and evaluate potential employees on a part-time basis. Art Wallenstein, of King County, Washington, reported on his agency's highly developed selection process, which includes a psychological screening and polygraphs. And Ralph Mitchell, El Paso County, Texas, highlighted the importance of good hiring practices in reversing the negative image of the Sheriffs Department and making it one of the best in the state.
- ***Training, Performance Appraisals, and Procedures for Discipline*** -- According to Richard Bryce, Ventura County, California, has designed training that is totally relevant to actual assignments in the facility through the use of a training manual/study guide. Shelby County, Tennessee, has also concentrated on making its

training program more relevant, according to Denis Dowd, by using staff of all ranks to develop the curriculum and by incorporating training staff into jail operations.

- ***Dealing with Unions*** - In this final session, John Rafferty, Union County, New Jersey, described a jail system in which the unions are really in control and outlined some initial steps he has taken to begin repairing labor relations. Stan Taylor, Delaware Department of Corrections, presented the department's successful strategy for dealing with unions and highlighted the importance of dealing with unions and employees in a non-confrontational manner. Sacramento County, California's success in quelling a wildcat strike (called a "sick-out" because strikes are illegal) and the recent defeat of a trouble-making union leader, was described by Bob Denham. LaMont Flanagan, of the Pretrial Division in Baltimore, pointed to the steps his agency is taking to anticipate changes in management and unions that are likely to occur as the Maryland legislature establishes collective bargaining in the next year.

Based on the requests of participants, Richard Geather of the NIC Jails Division agreed to emphasize the topic of "inmate deaths" for the next meeting of the Large Jail Network, to be held in January 1996.

Opening Address

“Current Trends: Deliberate Indifference”

Lynn Lund, Attorney & Counselor at Law, Salt Lake City, Utah

The US Supreme Court has just decided a landmark case that returns unfettered discretion to administrators with respect to inmate discipline. As background to this case, let me review the previous three great eras in jail and prison management.

- ***The “Hands-Off Era”***

The first era was the “hands-off era” in which the courts said that when someone is arrested and incarcerated, he/she has no Constitutional rights and, in effect, becomes a slave of the state. Terrible abuses occurred in the hands-off era. Judge Frank Johnson in Alabama, for example, found inmates with no medical services at all who were doing their own surgery with table knives. Texas at that time had two medical doctors for more than 30,000 inmates. And then Attica happened. When the tragic conditions at Attica were reported, the courts stepped in.

- ***The “Hands-On Era”***

The “hands-off era” ended in June of 1974 when, in effect, the courts became administrators of corrections. In the landmark case *Wolf v McDonnell* the Court said that inmates are entitled to due process. (Interestingly, due process is what the case two weeks ago was all about.) During the “hands-off era,” inmates’ cases were never dismissed in federal court, no matter how frivolous. A landmark case in this era was in 1983, *Smith v. Wade*, in which the Court said that all that was required to make a jail administrator liable was: 1. the administrator knew or should have known 2. of a pattern of gross abuse 3. and after such knowledge, did nothing.

- ***The “Great Deference Era”***

Finally, in June 1987, the courts stepped in with a case called *Turner v. Safley*. They ruled that “great deference” must be given to jail and prison administrators’ decisions. Only if it had been shown that you had been deliberately indifferent in your administrative duties could you be liable. In 1991, in *Wilson v. Seiter*, the Court said that “deliberate indifference” required a culpable state of mind.

In the 1994 case *Farmer v. Brennan* the US Supreme Court said that the objective standard of “knew or should have known” was out, that plaintiffs must *prove* what administrators actually knew. Additionally, the Court drew a distinction between “cruel and unusual punishment” and “cruel and unusual conditions.” The Court held that “. . . a prison official cannot be found liable under the Eighth Amendment for denying an inmate humane conditions of confinement unless the official knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of

serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference.”

Most administrators hailed this case, but, in fact, it has the potential to intensify adverse relationships between top administration and mid-level management. Plaintiffs will now try and establish knowledge through agency memoranda and through lower-level staff. *Farmer v. Brennan* suggests that you must work with subordinates and devise a united defense. Many think that this case takes us back to the “Hands-Off Era.”

A New Standard for Due Process

On June 19, 1995, the US Supreme Court decided (in a 5-4 decision) a landmark case, *Sandin v. Conner*, ruling that an inmate’s right to due process was not violated when he was not allowed to present witnesses at his disciplinary hearing. The Court held that unless discipline “imposes atypical and a significant hardship on the inmate in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life” or unless the discipline negatively affects the duration of the inmate’s sentence “...an inmate is not entitled to procedural protections set forth in *Wolf*”

The Court stated that prior cases decided by the Supreme Court have produced undesirable effects on jail/prison administrators and have “squandered judicial resources, with little offsetting benefit to anyone.” Further, the Court said, “Discipline by prison officials in response to a wide range of misconduct falls within the expected parameter of the sentence imposed by a court of law.”

If this were to become mainstream law following a broad range of procedural decisions, it would change the face of the American correctional system. However, administrators should not take this decision as a final message that due process is dead. One reason is that other cases are coming along that may modify this decision. The case clearly eliminates foolish litigation, which may be what the court, in the main, intends. My recommendation is, first, that you look at this case with a jaundiced eye and, secondly, that you take it to your attorneys.

I think there will be a strong aversion to this decision. In one similar case, a Nebraska inmate said he was entitled to due process at a parole hearing. The court said you do not have a right to due process at a parole hearing--except in Nebraska, because the state has set a higher standard. When the lower courts find something morally repugnant, they will pick it apart. What this case may eventually do is set even higher standards because the state courts will look to state constitutions, state statutes, and state legislatures for higher standards.

Copies of Mr. Lund’s handouts, “Current Trends: Deliberate Indifference” and a summary of Sandin v. Conner are available from the NIC Information Center.

Session I: Current Trends in Sexual Harassment

Lynn Lund, Attorney & Counselor at Law, Salt Lake City, Utah

A sexual harassment case after Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas is worth an average of one thousand times more than before Hill and Thomas.

The Supreme Court has said, in effect, "From this time forth supervisors who knew or should have known of sex harassment taking place in the workplace are as liable or more liable than the perpetrator." The new trend is to take a sexual harassment case up to the highest level of supervision possible. Personal liability is common where it can be shown that the supervisor knew or should have known of the harassment.

There are two distinct types of sexual harassment and they are treated differently in law: Quid Pro Quo and Hostile Environment

Quid Pro Quo Sexual Harassment

Quid pro quo (something for something) harassment involves a superior-subordinate relationship and the misuse of power. Quid pro quo cases involve superior-subordinate immediate relationships in which the subordinate is required to give sexual favors in order to keep job benefits, promotion, a raise, a sought-for shift or position. The coercion these days is liable to be more subtle than in the past. The courts have become so appalled with quid pro quo harassment that it carries strict liability.

A number of administrators consider office romances a right of privacy issue. However, the average life of an office romance is 89 days; after the 89 days are over, the administrator's problems begin. My advice is to prohibit superior-subordinate dating and remove the immediacy of their work relationship. Juries do not like strict liability, so if you have taken appropriate measures, juries are unlikely to make an award.

In terms of sexual harassment in an organization, it is important to remember that behavior at the bottom conforms to attitudes and behavior at the top. If you will not tolerate sexual harassment and this attitude is in place throughout your organization, harassment will not take place.

Hostile Environment Harassment

Hostile Environment Harassment invokes four levels--

- * Sex Role Stereotyping (e.g., requiring coffee-making, note-taking, errand-running)
- Gender Demeaning (verbal or visual pictures, jokes)
- Individual Targeted Abuse (verbal, visual unwanted touching)
- Pat, Touch, or Pinch

Hostile environment cases account for about 97% of sex harassment cases.. Recent caselaw states that the offense is to be judged from the victim's perspective, not from the perpetrator's. This idea needs to be reflected in your agency's policies.

EEOC Guidelines

EEOC Guidelines state that “the employer is liable where it knew or should have known of the conduct and failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action. A written or verbal grievance or complaint or a charge filed with the EEOC will provide the actual notice.” However, the Guidelines also state that “an employer is liable for the acts of its supervisors, regardless of whether the employer knew or should have known, if the harassing supervisor is acting in an ‘agency capacity.’”

You must establish an explicit policy against harassment and a “reasonably accessible procedure by which victims of harassment can make their complaints known to appropriate officials.” The agency’s policy should be a Policy on Harassment that covers not only sexual harassment but harassment based on race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, or disability. It should incorporate the precise language used in section 1609.1 of the 1994 EEOC Guidelines.

The Three-Step Tennis Court Defense for Employers Dealing with Hostile Environment Harassment

The employer’s duty:

- To have written policies and procedures;
- To have documented training and have a written grievance process--(as required by 1994 EEOC Guidelines);

If training, policies, and procedures are in place,

The duty shifts to the victim:

- To notify the employer of offensive conduct, through an established grievance process;

If a victim notifies the employer,

The employer’s duty :

- To take immediate and appropriate action to stop offensive conduct.

If effective action is taken, there is no liability, per EEOC 1994 Guidelines:

“Prevention is the best tool for the elimination of harassment. An employer should take all steps necessary to prevent harassment from occurring, including having an explicit policy against harassment that is clearly and regularly communicated to employees, explaining sanctions for harassment, developing methods to sensitize all supervisory and non-supervisory employees on issues of harassment, and informing employees of their right to raise, and the procedures for raising, the issue of harassment under title VII, the ADEA, the ADA, and the Rehabilitation. An employer should provide an effective complaint procedure by which employees can make their complaints known to appropriate officials who are in a position to act on them (*Guidelines on Harassment Based on Race, Color, Religion, Gender, National Origin, Age, or Disability*. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.)

Investigating Sexual Harassment

All the recent research suggests that a cross-gender team should investigate sexual harassment cases. It is also helpful to have a policy that anyone can make a complaint about sexual harassment to any level supervisor, to another employee, or to the team. I recommend that employees select a male and a female; all employees must vote for both people. The team is then taught Alternative Dispute Resolution concepts and interviewing techniques. This approach prevents the victim from being made a victim for a second time during the complaint process. We have found that victims usually go to both the male and female members of the team rather than one or the other. The system is very successful. In fact, the offending party usually quits before having to go through the grievance process.

What the victim Wants

You must be sure that your people are talking to the victim to find out the victim's wishes. If the victim does not wish a case to be investigated, record a conversation with the victim, and ask for the record how she wishes to proceed. This will protect you from liability. Remember that the severity and intensity of harassment have nothing to do with the victim's wishes. The victim wants:

1. The harassment to cease and desist;
2. Policies and procedures in place;
3. Superior and employee training on sex harassment;
4. A work environment free of sexual harassment;
5. Treatment as a professional;
6. Anonymity.

Copies of Mr. Lund's handout, "Current Trends in Sexual Harassment," and Section 1609.1 of the EEOC Guidelines are available from the NIC Information Center.

Session 2: Current Trends in Employee Relations

Lynn Lund, Attorney & Counselor at Law, Salt Lake City, Utah

You should use the velvet glove and the steel fist in employee relations. The Talmud has a saying: “Those who choose to be merciful to the cruel are destined to be cruel to the merciful.”

Balancing the rights of the employee and the employer is not easy. In Japan, the culture seeks harmony; in America we seek individual justice. We may have gone too far in this direction.

Employee Relations: Look for harmony.

In Maslows triangle, safety is the first need of society; next are the basic human needs and, finally, recognition. In 1933, 83% of people’s time was spent on basic human needs; we now spend only 9% of our time this way. A force has hit the triangle, and everything has inverted: society has now moved to an emphasis on recognition needs. The way society fills these recognition needs is by challenging the authoritarian management model established when safety and basic human needs were primary.

As we approach a divorce rate of at least 50%, the family no longer fulfills people’s need to be heard and cared for. This role is falling to the workplace. People need to be listened to. Eighteen states now have a mediator whose principal role is simply to listen, and 97% of cases are resolved in this way.

Violence in the workplace is escalating. Last year 1,093 people were killed at work; the number may triple this year. The days of “take your best shot” are over. Disciplining an employee may constitute a hazardous activity.

Five Basic Concepts

There are five basic concepts to master in terms of employee relations:

1. Eighty-four percent of all civil rights lawsuits were filed because someone would not apologize or would not listen.
2. John Naisbett has pointed out that high-tech environments require high touch, that is, caring. Without high touch, managers experience hostility, frustration, and litigation. High touch requires high time.
3. Newton’s Second Law of Motion also applies to human relationships: For every action there is an opposite and equal reaction.
4. People need control, a sense of importance, and recognition. People often feel swept along, with no control over their lives. When they get in a disciplinary situation, they feel that they have lost even more. Moreover, there is a 60% chance that the employee is in the process of divorce and just barely hanging on.

5. Listen. Always use questions. Teach your staff (and yourself): “Never statements, always questions.” Never threats or “take your best shot....“

Disciplinary Process

In 82% of all wrongful discharge cases, the management loses, with an average cost of \$479,000. A disciplinary process has three aspects: 1) the reason for the action, 2) procedure, including pre-disciplinary and post-disciplinary processes, and 3) punishment, which must be fundamentally fair when viewed within the totality of the circumstances. The *reason* for firing someone is not a problem. What is usually missing is the disciplinary stages, the management of the process.

The 1985 case, *Cleveland Board of Education v Loudermill* is the basis for requiring these procedures. Although many people do not realize it, the Louder-mill case has been refined. The Loudermill decision established the requirement for a notice of charges, evidence which supports the charges, an opportunity for the accused to respond, and a reasonable weighing of the response in the decision-making process.

My recommendation is that you change the term “disciplinary hearing” to “disciplinary interview.” You also should call it a “pre-decision” rather than “pre-disciplinary.” You cannot discipline without fair notice. You must be fundamentally fair, or juries will always rule against you. The BRC Defense is the only defense against the requirement for a fair process. The BRC (blind retarded chimpanzee) defense is that if a BRC would know that something was true--or inappropriate--then fair notice is not required. Otherwise, it is. Past practices also override everything else. However, if past practices need to be corrected, fair notice will override practice.

Alternative Dispute Resolution

Instead of dealing with unions through binding arbitration, I recommend that you have an Alternative Dispute Resolution Clause in your union contract. The trend is moving in this direction.

The updated version of Louder-mill plays into the informal mediation process. Loudermill only required that you call in the employee and give notice of the charges. The court now says that is fundamentally unfair; you must *give written* charges three to five days in advance of the hearing/interview. You must cite specific violations, not just cite regulations that have been violated. I recommend that when you list the charges, you leave a space under the charges and ask the employee to write responses and bring them to the interview. Don't charge the employee with more than three to five offenses; include other things as aggravating circumstances.

A union representative cannot attend a “pre-decision interview.” Make clear up front that the Louder-mill proceedings will be taped. Call it an “interview” and make clear that it will not be an adversarial process.

Take your time with the interview. Make notes; don't rush the process. Any time the employee makes a contradictory statement, note it. You must listen. “Nothing new goes in until the old goes out.” Seek to understand before you try to be understood. If you use this alternative

dispute resolution process, roughly 85% of cases will come to a mutually agreed-on settlement at the Loudermill hearing. In the process of seeking harmony, you might be willing to give a light sentence contingent on a probationary period. Unions will not fight this approach. It works.

Fair Labor Standards Act

Look at your on-call policies. On a scale of zero to one hundred, consider how much you are intruding on an employee's life. The best approach is to ask who does *not want to be on call*. Usually 65-70% will want to be on call for the extra pay; use only those employees. Set up a rotation list based on seniority, then go down the list to call people. If you do this, then you will not be intruding on the employee's life.

Some conflicts don't need to happen. Talk, listen, hear.

Copies of Mr. Lund's handout, Current Trends: "Employee Relations," are available from the NIC Information Center.

Session 3: Recruitment

Michael Schweitzer, Forsyth County, North Carolina

Forsyth County requires all applicants for positions to attend a Pre-Employment Basic Jailor School, but job candidates have no guarantee of a job if they complete the training. This approach solves the problem of hiring people and then sending them off for training, during which time you lose their services.

Application Process

Each job candidate seeking sponsorship into the Pre-Employment Basic Jailor School must:

- Complete a pre-employment application packet, which includes a County Job Application, Personnel History Statement, and Information Release Forms.
- Pay for a Criminal Records Check from their county of residence (cost: \$5)
- Clear a Preliminary Background process, including checks of the state Division of Criminal Information, the National Criminal Information Center, and a local database for narcotics division searches for criminal activities and associations.

For each school 300-400 applications are received and reviewed based on recommendations and date received by the Sheriff's Office. Twenty-five to 30 candidates are sponsored into each school. Once a candidate is sponsored, he/she must:

- Pay for a physical, meeting the requirements of the North Carolina Sheriffs' Standards and Training Commission. Cost: \$75- 100.
- Purchase course materials. Cost: \$75.
- Purchase a parking permit. Cost: \$5.
- **Total cost to candidate: \$155-180. There is no tuition cost.**
- Attend an eight-week 160-hour Basic Jailor School, Monday-Friday, from 6-10pm each night and an eight-hour Saturday class.
- Successfully complete the requirements of the North Carolina Sheriff's Standards Training Commission for the Basic Jailor School:
 - Score a minimum of 70% on 26 topic tests;
 - Score a minimum of 70% on the 200-question state exam

They must complete the above requirements for the chance to be *considered for hire* by the Sheriff's Office. The conditions of attending the school are explained to candidates when they are sponsored into the school and again during orientation on the first night of school.

Following Successful Completion of the School

Students' scores are reviewed, with input from instructors and the Sheriff's Office personnel officer, who attends class one day each week to observe classes and students. Approximately 80% of students who complete the school successfully enter the selection process for job placement. Eventually, about 50% of those who complete the school are actually hired.

Students selected from the school re-apply for a job and complete the following process:

- Job interview--candidates are rated "highly recommended," "recommended for hire," "not recommended for hire," or "recommended for reserve program"

Preliminary job offers are made to all highly recommended and all recommended for hire candidates.

- Comprehensive Background Process (takes 2-4 weeks)--Background investigation, which checks references, employers, military records, financial history, and neighbors, in addition to criminal history.
- Polygraph screening.
- Drug screening.

Of 235 candidates who have gone through the Pre-Employment Jailor School, the Sheriff's Department has hired 118. The school is run approximately four times a year.

The department targets recruitment in order to achieve a balanced staff that is reflective of the local population in terms of numbers of white males, white females, and African-American males and females.

Benefits of the Pre-Employment School

- Reduced Hiring/Training Cost
 - Savings of \$2,249 per student--a total of \$265,000 so far in salaries only, plus additional \$18,000 in training materials and physicals.
 - **Total savings during a 32-month period: \$283,742.80**
- No loss of personnel during training.
- Great opportunity to review candidates for hire through class attendance, punctuality, attitude, writing skills, appearance, class interaction.
- State-Certified Detention Officers are hired.
- Candidates that are hired are motivated, dedicated, and committed. (The normal community college dropout rate is 20-25%; jail school dropout rate is 10%).
- Develops partnerships between local government and local community college. Forsyth Technical Community College pays for the Jail School Instructors (\$15/per hour). The community college receives full time equivalency credits for the instructor's time, on which state funding of the school's operational budget is based.

For additional information, contact Michael Schweitzer, Director of Corrections, Forsyth County Sheriffs Office 115 No. Church Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101, 910/727-2243.

Recruitment

Ernest Weber, Nassau County, New York

Recruitment and Hiring Process

In the mid- 1960s, Nassau County began competitive Civil Service testing of correctional officers. Prior to that, all hirings were political appointments. From the mid-'60s to the mid-'80s, many candidates were Vietnam veterans, but today very few are from the military. The profile is different, in that potential employees tend to be more egocentric, more likely to be looking out for themselves.

Nassau has few hiring restrictions. Requirements are that candidates must be: twenty-one years old, with a high school diploma or GED, and a sufficient score on a Civil Service exam. Until last year, the starting salary for correction officer was \$37,000, with no limits on overtime. Some officers made up to \$150,000 as correction officers. The incentive for the job was clearly the paycheck. The county had no way to know if officers were committed to the department or to careers in corrections.

In the mid 1980s Nassau had an EEOC complaint from employees about inadequate recruitment for minorities. However, the county now targets 91 agencies and publications in the county and recruits through them. Minorities in the facility currently represent a much larger percentage of staff than of county residents.

Pre-Employment Training: A Guarantee of Commitment

The way to get people committed is to have them make an investment, such as through a requirement for pre-employment training and certification. Pre-employment training can be more extensive than training the county must pay for.

Nassau County developed a program that would have ensured a more motivated individual and one with marketable skills. Unfortunately, they were unable to implement it. The county developed a semester-long program at a local community college. Job candidates would take a core of college courses plus attend the training academy. They would pay tuition for the college, and be entitled to financial aid if they needed it. The pre-training program and the college courses would be completed within a semester's time, but those attending would not be our employees during this period. This was a rigorous program and the approach makes sense. It might become more widespread if NIC could encourage it throughout the country.

For additional information, contact Ernest Weber, Deputy Undersheriff, Nassau County Sheriff's Department, C.S. 1072, Hicksville, NY 11802, 516/572-4100.

Session 4: Hiring and Selection

Herbert Bernsen, St. Louis County, Missouri

In 1989, St. Louis County's departments of Justice Services and Personnel developed a corrections officer selection process in response to a class action suit charging sex discrimination in hiring. The goal was to keep 25 of 125 positions filled by females. The class action suit was beneficial; it brought Department of Justice Services and Personnel together in solving a problem and it also alerted us to the importance of having sufficient numbers of women on our staff

The county conducted a detailed job analysis that identified Task Statements and KSAs (knowledge, skills, and abilities). The selection system measures the relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities of job candidates.

Selection Process

A Job Opportunity Announcement is prepared every 12- 15 months. Applications for each position are accepted for about 30 days, during which time the position is advertised in local newspapers and through community colleges and universities with criminal justice or relevant behavioral science majors. It is also listed on the county's job hotline.

Minimum qualifications for applicants:

- three years of work experience and a stable work history; or
- three years of college level course work, preferably in the behavioral sciences, administration of justice, or a related area; or
- any combination of education and experience.
- a completed Conviction Record form;
- a completed Motor Vehicle Record release form.

Testing

Those qualified are sent a letter to come in for testing, which consists of

- reading comprehension--minimum level is 9th grade, 4th month;
- oral directions test--measures an applicant's ability to follow oral directions; and
- a writing sample

Applicants must also show their driver's license at this time and sign a Statement of Abilities affirming that they have the ability to perform the duties of the position with or without reasonable accommodation(s). For those who pass the test, the department sends the Conviction Record Check and Motor Vehicle Release form to the county police for a record check.

Reference Letters

Applicants address their own reference letters on preprinted forms to all previous employers and educational institutions. Each applicant also addresses an envelope to him/herself to be used for

notification of test results. Department staff mail the reference letters for those who pass the test; interviews are scheduled after the department has a sufficient time to receive the references.

Interview Process

Using the pre-addressed envelope, staff send a letter to potential interviewees. The interview process itself consists of structured interview questions asked of all applicants. Answers are evaluated against sample benchmark answers as outstanding, good, unacceptable. Answers are rated on a 1-5 point scale on the questions, which measure:

- motivation;
- judgment/dealing with people;
- previous work record;
- communication skills;
- training and experience; and
- general fitness.

After each interview, members of the interview board complete a numerical evaluation sheet. The interviewers are two managers/supervisors from Justice Services and one Personnel analyst. Each board has racial and gender diversity.

Post-Interview Considerations

- Applicants are evaluated on their responses to questions about evaluations, attendance, and disciplinary records at prior jobs.
- Verbal communication skills are evaluated on the basis of the interview.
- Writing ability is evaluated based on the writing sample.

The final score for an applicant is then computed. Personnel certifies a large pool of applicants, from which Justice Services fills vacant staff positions for about a year. The Department of Justice Services interviews final applicants a second time at a correctional institution to enable them to see the work environment.

At the end of this process, the Department makes a conditional offer of employment, dependent on a successful medical history report and a drug screening.

For additional information, contact Herb Bernsen, Assistant Director, St. Louis County Department of Justice Services, 7900 Carondelet, Room 161, Clayton, MO 63105, 314/889-2763. Copies of materials used by St. Louis County are available from the NIC Information Center.

Hiring and Selection

Terry Moore, Volusia County, Florida

In Florida over the past few years, state training requirements have become more difficult to meet. The State Department of Law Enforcement a few years ago mandated 440 hours of basic training for correctional officers. Officers had to attend regional training centers, either at community colleges or vocational/technical schools. This meant it took six to eight months to get an officer ready to work on a post. At the time Volusia County had a 28% turnover rate.

“Auxiliary ” Applied to Part-Time

The solution was to look closely at what state training statutes would make possible. It turned out that there was a category called “auxiliary” that had a lesser training requirement. The personnel department was persuaded that “auxiliary” could also mean “part time.” This gave the agency the authority to hire people as part time employees and send them through the training school. *After they* got full certification, they could work on a part-time basis. They were then in place and trained when full-time positions became available.

This approach gives the agency an opportunity to evaluate people prior to their formal probationary period, which begins after they have full-time employment. They can be trained without being a part of the regular schedule, because the positions created as part-time positions are not part of the organizational structure.

Selection Process

The Department has a revolving committee on the training staff that evaluates potential candidates. Over the years, it has become clear that the lower the rank of those doing the selection, the better the selection will be. Once they have made a selection and a candidate is placed on the list, hires are made sequentially.

Florida’s standards require a complete background investigation. If a candidate meets all the criteria, he/she is offered a part-time position. If the candidate accepts, he/she is sent to the training school. Eventually, those who have performed best on a part-time basis are offered full-time jobs as they become available.

This approach has been very successful. The turnover rate is now about 15%.

For additional information, contact Terry Moore, Director, Volusia County Department of Corrections, Caller Service Box 2865, Daytona Beach, FL 32120, 904/254-1552.

Hiring and Selection

Art Wallenstein, King County, Washington

It costs Ring County \$17,000 to train a new corrections officer--for three weeks in the classroom four weeks in the state training academy, and then six weeks with a field training officer. The county has increased required training from three weeks to 13 weeks, with a corresponding reduction in staff turnover rate. Staff now have a vested interest in people succeeding.

Corrections Officer Selection Process

Candidates who fail are dropped after each stage of the following process. Only one in ten of applicants are eventually hired.

- **Written Test** (to ensure verbal and basic computational skills)--King County has used the IPMA (International Personnel Management Association) entry level test for Corrections Officers, which is graded by computer. Beginning this summer, a test developed in California will be used. The test is more rigorous and has more complex requirements for reading and computation skills.
- **Personal Interview and Verbal Test** --Those who pass the written test are called, in rank order, for interviews by a team of two or three line staff members. Responses to questions are graded and lead to a pass/fail grade.
- **Background and Reference Checks** --Candidates grant written approval to release information from former employers. Staff members trained to secure information (often ex-military intelligence officers) do background checks.
- **Polygraph Examination** --Four years ago, 98% of candidates passed the polygraph. After changing vendors, polygraph results now show a 50% failure rate. The focus is on employee theft, drug use, nature of previous job departures, and other negative traits. Legal counsel advises that applicants not be informed of aspects of a failed polygraph; they are told only that they are not being offered employment.
- **Deep Psychological Profile** -- Candidates still in the process receive a psychological assessment. A skilled psychologist with extensive experience in crisis intervention, past-traumatic stress disorder for law enforcement, and employee screening conducts the test. Psychological profiles are important in predicting ability to interact with prisoners, stress, crisis situations. and other matters. They also highlight a candidate's propensity toward violence or sexual harassment.
- **Decision to Hire** --The Associate Director for Operations, who has full responsibility for all security operations, makes the sole decision to hire or not to hire. There is no appeal; a letter of rejection provides no substantive information.
- **Health Examination** --This examination cannot be given until an offer has been made. It is arranged by the county's Safety and Claims section, which notifies Corrections only if an applicant cannot do the essential elements of the job. It is considered confidential, and strict legal guidelines apply. There is now some discussion that the psychological exam should be under the same restrictions. This would mean that the exam could be given, but that results could only be summarized

and the full report read by Corrections personnel only after an offer to hire has been made. No decision has been made about this issue.

Protecting the Pre-Employment Data

The entire pre-employment file is separated from a new employee's work file. It is locked away and never consulted again, except if a very serious behavior problem emerges, where past history may be a guide. This has occurred only five times in the past five years. The files have no bearing on promotions, assignments, or any other department function.

For additional information, contact Arthur Wallenstein, Director, King County Department of Adult Detention, 500 5th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104, 206/296-1268. A copy of his handout, "Some Notes and Critical Issues on Personnel Selection," containing copies of forms, evaluations, and letters to candidates, is available from the NIC Information Center

Hiring and Selection

Ralph Mitchell, El Paso County, Texas

Importance of Good Hiring Policies

By comparing the El Paso County Sheriff's Department hiring practices prior to 1985 with procedures employed since 1985, I want to demonstrate how important good hiring practices are to the development of a professional law enforcement department.

State Standards

The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE) sets standards for the employment of commissioned officers, detention officers, and reserve deputy sheriffs. Standards include the following requirements:

- US citizenship;
- High school diploma or GED;
- Minimum of 18 years old;
- Weight in proportion to height;
- Valid Texas driver's license and proof of liability insurance;
- No felony convictions;
- Previous military personnel must also have:
 - Honorable discharge free from conditions
 - No convictions of any court martial higher than a summary court martial
 - Appropriate records of discharge
- Excellent physical and psychological health--capable of performing the job functions of a detention officer.
- Vision which is:
 - correctable to 20/40 with corrective lenses and not over 20/100 uncorrected in either eye
 - normal color vision
- Normal hearing.

Although these standards are excellent, they were given only lip service when I first joined the El Paso County Sheriff's Department sixteen years ago. For example, 66% of applicants failed a test requiring a fourth grade reading level. As a result, the reputation of the department was sinking.

Hiring Practices Prior to 1985

Before 1985, the El Paso County Sheriff's Department had a number of weaknesses in its hiring practices. For example:

- The same written test was used for all applicants, and there was only one version of the test. Thus, no matter how many times they took the test, applicants took the same exam over and over. They were allowed to retest every six months, with no limit on the number of times they could repeat the exam

- The background check consisted of a few phone calls, no in-depth questioning of references, no credit check, and no criminal history check.
- There was no verification that the applicant had in fact graduated from high school or had a GED; some employees had fake GED certificates.
- Although a psychological test was given, no one evaluated it.
- Training--Although the state required 40 hours of training, some detention officers received thirty hours, some forty, depending on how the Academy Director felt that week.
- Some officers had criminal records themselves.
- Employees were hired because of who they knew, not what they knew.
- Two sheriff's were forced from office for misconduct, and several officers were suspected of drug trafficking.

The reputation of the department was terrible. Other law enforcement agencies did not feel comfortable working with the department because they knew of its corruption.

Changes Beginning in 1985

In 1985, the El Paso County Sheriff's Department took a sharp turn in the proper direction and started on its way to becoming one of the best in the state. The change took place when a professional law enforcement officer was elected as sheriff. The new sheriff made it known to all personnel that if they did not do their jobs, they would lose them, regardless of rank. New senior officers with 20 or more years of experience were brought in to supervise department divisions.

A review of the hiring practices was also conducted, which resulted in major revisions:

- Unqualified friends were no longer hired.
- A professional written test was obtained and validated by the local community college.
- Applicants who fail the initial test can retake it one more time, a year from their initial failure date.
- There are multiple versions of the exam, so applicants do not receive the same version on retesting.
- Each applicant is given a thorough background check.
- Anyone who is untruthful on his/her background questionnaire is automatically disqualified for employment for life;
- Deputies are promoted from the detention rank; therefore, detention personnel must meet the same standards as those set for deputies.
- Training requirements have been increased to 200 hours of training, not 40.
- Six months are spent with a Floor Control Officer, who is their training officer and is similar to a field training officer.
- New officers receive monthly evaluations during the six-month period.
- Detention officers must pass a state licensing examination.

Requirements to Become a Deputy Sheriff

After one year of service as a detention officer, officers are eligible to take another written officer to become a deputy sheriff. They must also meet the following criteria:

- Successfully complete all phases of the Detention Officer Entrance Examination;
- Achieve at least a 50% on physical fitness assessment;
- Successfully complete a new background investigation;
- Successfully complete an oral interview.

The officer would be accepted at this point, pending successful completion of physical and psychological evaluations. The officer must then:

- Successfully complete a physical exam;
- Successfully complete a psychological evaluation;
- Successfully complete 740 hours of training;
- Undergo an evaluation for three months by a Field Training Officer;
- Spend one year in probationary status;
- Pass the state licensing exam for commissioned officers.

All promotions up to the rank of Lieutenant are based on competitive written examinations with assessment boards. Captains and the Chief Deputy are appointed by the Sheriff, but they must meet rigid standards. Most Captains have college degrees, are graduates of the FBI Academy course, the Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas, or have over 20 years of law enforcement experience in the state of Texas.

Benefits of Hiring Procedure Changes

The changes in El Paso County Sheriff's Department have enabled it to go from the bottom of law enforcement to the top. A good hiring policy has translated into a professional department with a good image. Some specific benefits include:

- The El Paso County Commissioner's Court has significantly raised the salary of department personnel; their decision was based on a reversal of public opinion about the quality of officers in the Sheriff's Department.
- The subsequent increase in salary reduced the annual turnover rate from over 50% to approximately 10%. Prior to 1985 only two officers had enough time in the department to retire. Since that period, six officers have retired.
- The average length of service has increased from 2.5 years to 10 years or more.
- Officers' morale is greatly improved, because they know they have joined an organization which has high standards that they were able to meet.
- The quality of applicants has improved. Most officers have completed several college-level courses and many have college degrees.

For additional information, contact Ralph Mitchell, Captain, El Paso County Detention Facility, 601 East Overland, El Paso, TX 79901, 915/546-2228. A copy of Ralph Mitchell's paper, "The Impact of Hiring Procedures on Departmental Image," is available from the NIC Information Center.

Session 5: Training, Performance Appraisals, and Procedures for Discipline

Richard Bryce, Ventura County, California

Ventura County emphasizes training that is relevant to actual assignments in the facility. There are two basic classifications in the system: deputy sheriffs and sheriff's service technicians (SSTs). The deputies are sworn peace officers, and SSTs are civilian uniformed personnel who perform administrative functions and run the control rooms. California mandates a specific curriculum for basic training; Ventura's program applies to promotional tests.

The Training Manual/Study Guide: A Relevant Training Program

A concern of many agencies is that officers know only their own assignments and cannot move easily within the facility. After experiencing dissatisfaction with purchased exams, Ventura County has adopted an approach that is designed to train and test deputies in relevant topics:

- Following basic training, Ventura County deputies are given a manual that is both a training manual and a study guide.
- The manual includes 1500 questions and answers designed to provide training across the facility and beyond the narrow information relevant to a specific position..
- The manual/study guide was developed by individuals from throughout the department.
- The Senior Deputy promotional exam is based on this manual; 200 questions are taken from the manual for the exam
- An 80% minimum passing score is required, with some sections requiring 100%.

Advantages of the Approach

- There have been no challenges to the test; it is deemed extremely fair, in part because all answers are included in the training manual/study guide.
- The test has no gender or racial bias and is based entirely on actual policies and procedures within the department.
- It works well as a training device because officers know that all test questions will be taken from the manual.
- The department has received a letter of commendation for the test from the Sheriffs' Association.

Future Plans

- The department plans to create a similar manual/study guide for the sergeant's exam.
- They will do annual testing in conjunction with annual evaluations; a few questions will be asked each time on issues critical to the department at that point.

For additional information, contact Richard Bryce, Undersheriff Ventura County Sheriff's Department, 800 South Victoria Ave., Ventura, CA 93009, 805/654-2385.

Training, Performance Appraisals, and Procedures for Discipline

Denis Dowd, Shelby County, Tennessee

Goals of the Training Program

Shelby County's comprehensive training program was designed to be more relevant to both the jail and the trainee than previous training had been. Feedback from previous training was that it was not specifically applicable to what happened in the jail. The new training program was also designed to be monitored for effectiveness.

Developing the Training Program

- A Curriculum Design/Development Team was assembled. Representatives of all ranks were drafted to serve.
 - Under guidance of the training staff team members did job analyses, reviewed policies and procedures;
 - Team members then identified discrepancies between actual tasks and written procedures;
 - Based on a review of both initial and in-service training, the team developed a new curriculum.

- A conscious decision was made to involve management and supervisory staff in developing and providing the training program
 - Managers and supervisors were made auxiliary trainers and went through a "training for trainers" program;
 - They then designed and developed their own lesson plans and delivered training;
 - After monitoring effects of their training on the staff they supervised, they provided feedback to the training unit based on what they saw.

- Training staff were involved in jail operations.
 - On at least a monthly basis, training staff act as shift supervisors.
 - Training staff also participate in the jail as line supervisors.

- A Jail Training Officer Program was implemented.
 - Shift commanders picked sergeants to be jail training officers;
 - After completing a 12-hour training for trainers program, they were given the opportunity not to participate; all remained in the program;
 - Training officers were asked to identify the key elements of the jobs of those they supervised;
 - Based on this analysis, they developed an evaluation form;
 - These officers supervise the training class just completed and provide on-site feedback on the training based on the evaluation form;
 - The Jail Training Officers also provide feedback to the Training Unit.

- Recent changes
 - On-the-job training is being increased to a full three weeks during the training program;
 - After a segment of training, the trainee works that topic in the jail to apply what has been learned.

For additional information, contact Denis Dowd, Jail Director, Shelby County Sheriff's Office, 201 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, TN 38103, 901/576-2414. A copy of Shelby County's training schedule is available from the NIC Information Center.

Session 6: Dealing with Unions

John Rafferty, Union County, New Jersey

The Northeast corridor has the worst labor relations in the country. In Union County, the unions are threatening to cripple the ability of management to run the facility. Some examples:

- The director of the facility has never been at the contract table, which means that the unions are really in control.
- The unions dropped the salaries of entry level officers so they could increase pay for upper levels.
- The union administers through distribution of overtime. Unless an officer is “one of the boys,” he gets “flipped” if he works five hours. All control of overtime is through the union office.
- “Past practices” dictate that no one works eight hours. Because it has been the practice for two years, everyone must work only seven and a half hours.
- When the administrator tried to privatize the facility’s food services, the unions objected because officials had been getting a free breakfast for 25 years. They are now going to trial over the issue of breakfast.
- Unions also control the grievance procedure. When an employee files a grievance, the form is a union form
- The union operates the facility through their rules, their forms, their time limits. Managers essentially have no control over non-economic issues.

It will take a long time to repair labor relations in the county.

For additional information, contact John Rafferty, Warden, Union County Jail, 15 Elizabeth Town Plaza, Elizabeth, NJ 07207, 908/558-2610.

Dealing with Unions

Stan Taylor, Delaware Department of Corrections

Background

In 1965, Delaware's legislature passed a law allowing collective bargaining for state employees. The bargaining was restricted to non-economic issues. Employees have to pay union dues or a service fee of equal value. Until the early '80s, the DOC was a union shop, but the state has gradually learned that this sent the wrong message to employees.

The first bargaining unit included everyone except the warden. The line staff and those disciplining them were in the same bargaining unit, which created problems. All personnel issues became tangled with union issues. It took until 1982 to separate the one large union into two smaller units, for line staff and supervisors.

The other mistake the state made was allowing post bidding, which meant that assignments, shifts, and days off were determined by seniority alone. The result was that officers knew only their own job. The least experienced employees were in the worst jobs, and officers were promoted to supervisory ranks with no real experience. By restricting bargaining to non-economic issues, the unions focused on issues usually perceived to be management prerogatives, such as post bidding, grievance procedures, and vacations. In 1987, after several prior negotiations, the DOC was able to cut into the bid procedure so that bidding is only for shifts and days off, not for posts.

Delaware DOC's Strategy for Preparing for Negotiations

1. Identify general issues to be resolved with the Deputy Director in the State Personnel Office, who is charge of labor relations and contract negotiations.
2. Review written reports that identify any problem areas in the existing contract and note recommendations for changes.
3. Establish the game plan before going to the table.
4. At the bargaining table, establish ground rules at the beginning of the negotiation process regarding location of negotiations, number of sessions per week, length of sessions, rules for behavior. This prevents the union from saying that management didn't bargain in good faith.
5. All proposals are required to be exchanged by the fourth session.
6. Sign off on agreements as they are made, with the full understanding that nothing takes effect until the full contract is ratified.

The Negotiation Process

1. The negotiation process requires a lot of wordsmithing and paraphrasing to work out misunderstandings at that stage.
2. Once the contract has been agreed on, the negotiating team, the deputy director, state personnel, and all institution managers are brought together in one room to educate them about what the contract says.

Tactics for Administering the Contract

- ◆ Interpretation and administration of the contract are more arts than sciences.
- ◆ Institution managers who are most successful follow the advice from Lynn Lund: high touch, lots of listening.
- ◆ We need to do more listening to employees, in meetings and through walking the floors.
- ◆ Union meetings should be regular and non-confrontational. Even if the other side wants confrontation, don't give in to this.
- ◆ Share your ideas and goals and ask staff for their opinions. Make sure they understand their part in the big picture.
- ◆ Working with difficult people, one gets nowhere with conflict. It is more useful to spend time with these individuals and get them involved.
- ◆ When you acknowledge employees, show them you care, it saves a lot of time.
- ◆ Labor relations are like a marriage. You can strengthen the relationship or weaken it, depending on how you manage it.

For additional information, contact Stan Taylor, Delaware Department of Corrections, 80 Monrovia Avenue, Smyrna, DE 19977-1597, 302/739-5601.

Dealing with Unions

Bob Denham, Sacramento County, California

Background: Strikes as Sick-Outs

Sacramento County's labor problems can be attributed to one individual, who joined the department in 1975. Originally an ironworker, he challenged the seniority system in Nevada. After he moved to Sacramento, a background investigation recommended against hiring him in law enforcement because of the trouble he had caused in the unions. He was hired anyway and, over the years, created major problems in the jail, including calling a sick-out. Although it was a dismal failure, the county offered a nine percent raise and they settled. This individual was then unanimously elected union president. He has negotiated five contracts over the last 15 years, all of which included some kind of job action. The county always capitulated and paid union members who had been out on sick leave their sick time. (It is illegal to strike in California, so they call it a "sick-out.")

Sacramento County's Response to Sick-Outs

One year ago today there was the first sick-out of one day after having had been without a contract for about two years. Management began gearing up for a major sick-out. The goal was to minimize the impact on law enforcement activities and keep services going,

Sacramento County's Sick Leave Policy helped; it specifies:

- Normal sick leave--Employee must be available for contact during sick time. If away from home, the must advise the watch commander where they will be.
- Extraordinary absenteeism--Based on the Sheriff's declaration, extraordinary absenteeism requires that all employees secure a physician's certification of illness and sign a document under penalty of perjury that they are sick and are unable to perform their duties. That affidavit **is** filed when they return.

In preparation for the strike, the standing order was served to every employee in the department, and they **were** required to sign for it.

The Strategic Plan calledfor the following actions, which were undertaken:

- Identified which divisions would be suspended under a sick-out and which would go to a 12-hour day;
- As soon as a strike is in effect, institutions must be stabilized. A form was served on every on-duty employee, saying that the employee must remain on duty until authorized to leave by the division commander or authorized supervisor. During the period of time following the shift, the employee is on overtime hours. Employees considered these provisions a real benefit to them. Once they had a document signed by a supervisor, employees had a way to counter the union. They could tell the union that they had been given a direct order.
- Made arrangements for sleeping quarters for employees;
- Arranged for food services;

- Established a command post with representatives of four service areas 24 hours a day, along with the chief deputy, empowered to make all decisions. All information flowed through the command center.
- Contracted with the California DOC Peace Officers Union, one of the strongest and soundest unions in the state. CDC brought in 60 corrections officers and lieutenants from throughout the state to assist in running the institution.
- Made clear that probational and on-call (provisional) employees would be terminated if they participated.
- Made arrangements for CDC personnel to sleep at a local hotel. They were on 12 hour shifts, so one officer would occupy the room for 12 hours, then another would have the room for the next 12 hours.
- Contracted with a private security firm to ensure that cars weren't vandalized.
- The County Board of Supervisors were reluctant to do anything to antagonize the union. The decision was made, however, to dock the pay of strikers.
- Went to court for a temporary restraining order. Since it was a wildcat strike, the union was not taking credit for it. Every officer had to be sued individually. Therefore every officer was served with a copy of the summons and complaint. Teams of management personnel went to every officer's residence during hours of duty and either documented that they were in violation of the standing orders or served them with a temporary restraining order recalling them to work. They were in violation if they weren't home. Many officers were eager to return to work.
- The complaint for injunctive relief required the unions to do certain things. Union officers had to be served. The restraining order served on the president essentially stopped the strike.
- The strike caused some deep wounds in the department, but they have since negotiated another contract.
- No amnesty was granted to those on the sick-out. All sick leave requests were evaluated by the employee's division commander. Only about four were granted, and the remaining employees were docked for pay.

In June, the union president was finally voted out of office by union members, who were tired of rancor and animosity. The courts have since determined that strikes by law enforcement officers are illegal.

For additional information, contact Robert Denham, Chief Deputy, Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, 711 "G" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, 916/440-5686.

Dealing with Unions

LaMont Flanagan, Pretrial Division, Baltimore, Maryland

The state of Maryland does not currently have collective bargaining, but within the next year legislation will pass establishing collective bargaining. It is not clear what the legislation will look like, but the Pretrial Division is planning ahead and anticipates that the relationship between management and unions will change.

Potential Issues:

- Work schedules--schedules are now seven days on, four off, management is trying to change that to five days on, two off, which saves a substantial amount of overtime. The unions have objected.
- Overtime and drafting--The department drafts employees because of the numbers out on sick leave or vacation. When overtime dropped, the unions complained. Now that drafting is taking place, they are complaining.
- Probationary status--All employees are now under probationary status for the first six months and can be terminated without a reason during that period. The unions object.
- Promotions--Unions would like to participate in promotion decisions, but have not been given permission to do so.
- Overcrowding--Unions can help management with this issue, because they have sway with the legislature. At present, under a compromise, when the pretrial detention center is crowded, police lock-ups are used. The courts have ruled that police lock-ups don't come under the consent decree affecting the population cap.

Basic Issues Covered in Union Contracts

- Amendments and duration;
- Discharge, discipline, and resignation;
- Insurance, pensions'
- Grievances and arbitration;
- Wages
- Working conditions; safety and health; discrimination;
- Layoffs;
- Strikes and lockouts
- Union security
- Vacations

All these areas are likely to be issues in the first round of collective bargaining. The department has been receiving help from two university departments on the basic patterns in union contracts.

For additional information, contact LaMont Flanagan, Commissioner, Division of Pretrial Detention and Services, 400 East Madison Street, Baltimore, MD 21202, 410/637-1319. Mr. Flanagan's handout, a "Negotiations Preparation Checklist," is also available from the NIC Information Center.

Final Session: Planning for Next Meeting

Meeting participants suggested a number of topics for the the focus of the next meeting. A vote among participants determined that the topic in which there is the most interest is “inmate deaths.” Therefore, the meeting of the Large Jail Network in January 1996 will focus on all aspects of inmate deaths and how they affect large jail operations.

APPENDIX A

Meeting Agenda

National Institute of Corrections
Jails Division

LARGE JAIL NETWORK MEETING

RAINTREE PLAZA CONFERENCE CENTER

Longmont, Colorado

July 9-11, 1995

AGENDA

SUNDAY, July 9, 1995

6:00 PM - 8:00 PM

INFORMAL DINNER

Welcome Larry Solomon, Deputy Director

Introductions and Program Overview

. Richard Geaither

Opening Address:

Future trends: Personnel Issues and Labor Relations.

. Lynn Lund, Esq.
Attorney & Counselor at Law
Salt Lake City, Utah

MONDAY, July 10, 1995

7:30 AM BREAKFAST

8:30 AM Legal Issues and Trends in Employee Issues

. Lynn Lund

10:30 AM BREAK

10:45 AM

Effective approaches or problem areas related to the recruitment of sworn staff and additional personnel required for the jails operations.

..... Michael Schweitzer, Forsyth Co., NC

..... Richard Cox, Milwaukee Co., WI

..... Joseph M. Stancari, Westchester Co., NY

..... Ernest Weber, Nassau Co., NY

Group discussion

MONDAY, July 10, 1995 (cont.)

12:00 NOON LUNCH

1:00 PM

Methods and procedures for the hiring and selection of sworn staff and additional personnel required for jails operations.

..... Herbert Bernsen, St. Louis Co., MO

..... Arthur Wallenstein, King Co., WA

..... Ralph Mitchell, El Paso Co., TX

..... Terry Moore, Volusia Co., FL

Group Discussion

3:00 PM BREAK

3:15 PM

Approaches in developing and conducting staff training, performance appraisals, and procedures for discipline.

..... Denis Dowd, Shelby Co, TN

..... Susan McCampbell, Broward Co., FL

..... Charles Foti, New Orleans Parish, LA

..... Richard S. Bryce, Ventura Co., CA

Group Discussion

5:00PM **ADJOURN**

6:00 PM **DINNER**

LARGE JAIL NETWORK MEETING

TUESDAY, July 11, 1995

7:30 AM BREAKFAST

8:30 AM ***Labor relations issues such as those related to unions which include but are not limited to negotiating, interpreting, and administering contracts.***

..... John Rafferty, Union Co., NJ

..... Stan Taylor, Delaware DOC

..... Robert N. Denham, Sacramento Co., CA

..... LaMont Flanagan, Div. of Pretrial, MD

Group Discussion

10:00 AM BREAK

10:15 AM Open

10:45 AM **Presentation of Future Meeting Issues**

11:00 AM **RECAP AND CLOSEOUT** Richard Geaither

APPENDIX B

Meeting Participants

National Institute of Corrections
Jails Division

95- J2402

Large Jail Network Meeting

July 9 - 11, 1995

Longmont, Colorado

Raintree Plaza Conference Center

Richard Geather/Carol Lemirande

FINAL PARTICIPANT LIST

Mr. Tim Ryan, Commander

Alameda County Sheriff's Department
1401 Lakeside Drive - 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
(5 10) 208-9812

Mr. Gary R. Blake, Jail Administrator

Chatham County Sheriffs Department
1050 Carl Griffin Drive
Savannah, GA 31405
(9 12) 652-7701

Ms. Elizabeth Robson, Deputy Director

Alaska Department of Corrections
4500 Diplomacy Drive #207
Anchorage, AK 99508-5202
(907) 561-4426

Mr. Thomas J. Pocock, Commissioner

City of Atlanta Department of Corrections
254 Peachtree Street SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 865-8062

Mr. Frank W. Henn, Captain

Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office
7375 So. Potomac Street
Englewood, CO 80112-4030
(303) 649-0903

Mr. Frank Hall, Commissioner

City of Philadelphia Prison System
8201 State Road
Philadelphia, PA 19136
(215) 685-8201

Mr. Jack Terhune, Sheriff

Bergen County Sheriffs Department
Justice Center, 1 Court Street
Hackensack, NJ 07061
(201) 646-3020

Mr. Jim Zangs, Administrator

Comm. Corrections & Detention Div
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 1st Street NW, Room 512
Washington, DC 20534
(202) 307-2755

Mr. John P. Dantis, Director

Bernalillo Department of Corrections
415 Roma Northwest
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 764-3501

Mr. Peter Matos, Deputy Commissioner

Connecticut Dept. of Correction
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
(203) 566-3717

Mr. Charles Felton, Director
Dade County Correct. & Rehab Dept.
8660 West Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33144
(305) 229-7498

Mr. David Listug, Jail Administrator
Dane County Sheriff's Office
115 West Doty Street
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 259-5950

Ms. Gayle E. Ray, Sheriff
Davidson County Sheriffs Dept.
Administration Office
506 Second Avenue, No
Nashville, TN 37201
(615) 862-8226

Mr. Stan Taylor, Chief, Bureau of Prisons
Delaware Department of Corrections
80 Monrovia Avenue
Smyrna, DE 19977-1597
(302) 739-5601

Mr. Walter R. Smith, Division Chief
Denver Sheriffs Department
P.O. Box 1108
Denver, CO 80201
(303) 331-4137

Mr. LaMont W. Flanagan, Commissioner
Division of Pretrial Deten. & Services
400 East Madison Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 637-1319

Mr. Ralph W. Mitchell, Captain
El Paso County Detention Facility
601 East Overland
El Paso, TX 79901
(915) 546-2228

Mr. Mike Jackson, Commander
Fairfax County Sheriffs Office
10520 Judicial Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030
(703) 246-4432

Mr. Michael Schweitzer, Director of Detention Services
Forsyth County Sheriffs Office
201 North Church Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101
(910) 748-4200 ex.3315

Mr. L. Larry Briggs, Chief Jailer
Fulton County Sheriffs Department
901 Rice St. N.W.
Atlanta, GA 30318
(404) 853-2034 730-5100

Mr. Edward Bauchiero, Asst. Superintendent
Hampden County Sheriffs Office
627 Randall Road
Ludlow, MA 01056-1079
(413) 547-8000 ex 2129

Mr. Mark Kellar, Major
Harris County Sheriffs Department
1301 Franklin Street
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 755-6067

Mr. Michael Jalma, Facility Commander
Hennepin County Sheriffs Office
Room 36, Courthouse
350 South 5th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(612) 348-3740

Mr. David M. Parrish, Commander Detention Department
Hillsborough Co. Sheriffs Office
P.O. Box 3371
Tampa, FL 33601
(813) 247-8005

Mr. Ralph W. Green, Chief Warden
Hudson County Correctional Center
30 Hackensack Avenue
Kearney, NJ 07032
(201) 491-5535

Mr. John T. Lagowski, Administrator
Milwaukee County Jail
949 No. 9th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53233
(4 14) 226-7059

Mr. Charles Megerman, Director
Jackson County Dept. of Corrections
1300 Cherry Street
Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 881-4231

Mr. Richard C. Cox, Superintendent
Milwaukee County House of Correction
1004 North 10th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53233
(4 14) 427-4750

Mr. Joe Payne, Deputy Chief
Jefferson County Corrections Dept.
730 West Main Street, Ste 300101
Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 574-2167

Mr. Anthony Pellicane, Director
Monmouth County Correctional Institute
1 Waterworks Road
Freehold, NJ 07728
(908) 294-5976

Mr. Arthur Wallenstein, Director
King County Dept. of Adult Deten
500 5th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 296-1268

Mr. Ernest C. Weber, Deputy Undersheriff
Nassau County Sheriffs Department
C.S. 1072
Hicksville, NY 11802
(516) 572-4100

Mr. Walt Myers, Deputy Chief
Las Vegas Metro Police Department
330 So. Casino Boulevard
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 455-3951

Mr. Kenneth E. DuBose, Chief of Administration
New York City Dept. of Corrections
60 Hudson Street
New York City, NY 10013
(212) 266-1520

Mr. Paul Myron, Chief
Los Angeles County Sheriffs Dept.
441 Bauchet Street, Room 1014
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-4901

Ms. Pamela Newsom, Supervisor Admin. Services
Oakland County Sheriffs Office
1201 North Telegraph Road
Pontiac, MI 48341
(810) 858-5026

Mr. John Tevoli, Captain
Middlesex County
Department of Adult Corrections
P.O. Box 266
North Brunswick, NJ 08902
(908) 297-3636

Mr. Jerry Krans, Asst. Sheriff
Orange County Sheriffs Department
550 North Flower Street
Santa Ana, CA 92702
(714) 647-1802

Mr. Michael Klein, Captain
Pinellas County Sheriffs Office
14400 49th St. No.
Clearwater, FL 34622
(813) 464-6354

Mr. Robert W. Conroy, Deputy Director
Santa Clara County Dept. of Corrections
180 West Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110-1772
(408) 299-4005

Mr. Peter Forman, Sheriff
Plymouth Co. Sheriffs Department
Obery Street
Plymouth, MA 02360
(508) 746-0610

Mr. Denis Dowd, Jail Director
Shelby County Sheriffs Office
201 Poplar Avenue
Memphis, TN 38103
(901) 576-2414

Mr. Milton M. Crump, Deputy Director
Prince George's County
Department of Corrections
13400 Dille Drive
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
(301) 952-7014

Mr. Herbert Bernsen, Assistant Director
St. Louis County
Department of Justice Services
7900 Carondelet, Room 161
Clayton, MO 63105
(3 14) 889-3269

Mr. Albert Gardner, Warden
Rhode Island Dept. of Corrections
P.O. Box 8249
Cranston, RI 02920
(401) 464-3801

Mr. Alan J. Croce, Undersheriff
Suffolk County Sheriffs Department
100 Center Drive
Riverhead, NY 11901
(5 16) 852-2207

Mr. Robert N. Denham, Jr., Chief Deputy
Sacramento County Sheriffs Dept.
711 "G" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 440-5686

Mr. Savala Swanson, Sheriff
Tarrant County Sheriffs Department
100 N. Lamar
Fort Worth, TX 76196
(817) 884-3162

Mr. Leonard J. Johnson, Deputy Chief
San Bernardino Co. Sheriffs Dept.
655 E. Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0061
(909) 387-3636

Mr. John Rafferty, Warden
Union County Jail
15 Elizabeth Town Plaza
Elizabeth, NJ 07207
(908) 558-2610

Mr. Ben McLaughlin, Assistant Sheriff
San Diego County Sheriffs Dept.
9621 Ridgehaven Cr.-P.O. Box 429000
San Diego, CA 92142-9000
(619) 974-2281

Mr. Richard S. Bryce, Undersheriff
Ventura County Sheriffs Department
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009
(805) 654-2383

Mr. Terry Moore, Director

Volusia County Dept. of Corrections
Caller Service Box 2865
Daytona Beach, FL 32120
(904) 254- 1552

Mr. Joseph M. Stancari, Chief of Operations

Westchester County Dept. of Correction
P.O. Box 389, Elmwood Hall
Valhalla, NY 10595
(914) 347-6011

Invited Guests From Social Security:

Judith Sale
Marilyn O'Connell
Pat Kennedy
Jim Vensel

