



U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Corrections

108185  
108191

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

108185

108191

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIC Jail Center  
U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
SECOND ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM  
ON NEW GENERATION JAILS

National Institute of Corrections  
Jail Center  
Boulder, Colorado

May 8, 1987  
Clearwater, Florida

Edited by Richard Wener & Jay Farbstein

## CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Panel Summaries	3
Papers	
108186 [ Linda L. Zupan and Ben A. Menke Job Enrichment and the Direct Supervision Correctional Officer: The Role of Management	8
108187 [ Russell M. Davis Using the Principles of Direct Supervision as an Organizational Management System	17
108188 [ Guy Pellicane Developing a Specific Role Model for Mid-Level Managers in Direct Supervision Jails	24
108189 [ Jeanne B. Stinchcomb and Sally Gross-Farina IPC Practicum	37
108190 [ Ray Nelson Unit Size and Inmate Management for Direct Supervision	45
108191 [ Steven Carter Management Decisions in the Correctional Facility Design Process	50
Symposium Evaluation	58
List of attendees	59
Symposium Program	--

## INTRODUCTION

In 1986 the National Institute of Corrections sponsored a one day symposium as a part of the annual conference of the American Jail Association, in Seattle, Washington. The goal of the full day meeting was to bring together people who are working in and with "New Generation"/direct supervision jails to share experiences, problems, and solutions. The genesis of the symposium came from a sense that greater interaction among practitioners was needed - that many problems were common, but solutions were not being shared. Facilities were often "re-inventing wheels" rather than learning from the experiences of others.

This first session was by invitation only, and limited to several dozen administrators, researchers, and designers. The goal was to gain the maximum opportunity for open exchange of information, and not to re-create direct versus indirect supervision debates. A proceedings of the meeting was compiled and is available from the NIC Information Center, Boulder, Colorado.

The evaluation of the session showed overwhelming positive response. Facility administrators welcomed the opportunity to speak with their peers and learn what others were doing. Uniformly they requested a repeat of the symposium at the next AJA conference. The only criticisms were from those seeking more detailed information on substantive issues - such as staff training - and from others at the AJA conference who wanted to be able to attend.

In response, the NIC again funded this forum, the **Second Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails**, at the annual AJA conference in Clearwater, Florida, May 1987. This time the session was made open to all who wanted to attend (there were over 100 in attendance). The goals were, again, to bring professionals in direct supervision management together to meet and share information, with a greater emphasis this year on providing greater detail on operation issues. This proceedings is a record of that session.

## ORGANIZATION OF THIS PROCEEDINGS

The symposium consisted of four group sessions and several individual papers, as well as a series of small group "break-out" sessions which were held over lunch. In this proceedings we provide a summary of each of the sessions, a report on the

**NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails**  
**INTRODUCTION**

session evaluation forms, five presentation papers, and a list of all those attending the symposium. For additional copies of the proceedings of this or the previous symposium, and information about future symposia, please contact:

National Institute of Corrections - Jail Center  
1790 30th Street, Suite 140  
Boulder, Colorado 80301  
(303) 497-6700

**VIDEO TAPES OF THE SESSION**

The entire day's proceedings were videotaped and professionally edited. The three tape set is available for use and may be obtained by writing Dick Ford, American Jail Association, P.O. Box 2158, Hagerstown, Md. 21742.

**PANEL SUMMARIES**

**INTRODUCTION TO SYMPOSIUM - MIKE O'TOOLE, NIC JAIL CENTER**

The NIC Advisory Board has concluded that Direct Supervision has been very successful, especially in the Federal System and, at the county level, at Contra Costa Main Detention Facility. The NIC Jail Center has taken on the task of recommending that jurisdictions considering new facilities look into direct supervision. To support these jurisdictions, the NIC provides a variety of programs in training and technical assistance, of which this symposium is a part.

NIC has supported this symposium at AJA to:

1. Provide detailed information on important issues in Direct Supervision
2. Provide an opportunity for networking among operators of Direct Supervision facilities.
3. Provide information for those interested in exploring Direct Supervision.

**PANEL 1 STAFF SELECTION AND TRAINING**

**MODERATOR: RICHARD WENER**

**PANEL: SAM SAXTON, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MARYLAND  
DON MANNING, SPOKANE COUNTY, WASHINGTON  
BEN MENKE, WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, PULLMAN,  
WASHINGTON**

This session presented the experiences of two institutions in selecting officers for a new direct supervision facility. The issues they were responding to were: Do officers for a direct supervision facility need to be specially selected for particular skills? What are the qualities one looks for in officers for direct supervision? What kinds of selection procedures and criteria work best in selection?

Mr. Saxton's presentation described Prince Georges County's effort to review the hiring policies of a number of jurisdictions, and distill from them a set selection principles. They concluded that ideal officer candidates should have some college education; be more mature (over 19 or 20 years old); and be married. He also stressed the need to check references, and be wary of applicants who are looking for a stepping stone to the police force. An extended probationary period is critical in

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
PANEL SUMMARIES

judging good candidates. Taking applicants on a facility tour, he noted, often weeds out those who do not really understand the nature of the job, from potential good candidates.

Don Manning and Ben Menke described their experience in designing a selection system for Spokane County jail. Mr. Manning noted that they had to more than double staff in moving to their new facility. Planning for selection began years in advance to the actual move, and made use of criminal justice researchers at the local campus of Washington State University (Ben Menke and Linda Zupan) with technical assistance funds from the NIC (see following summary and paper in proceedings). The traditional county personnel selection system has not proved effective for choosing correctional workers.

The goals of the selection project were to:

1. identify the qualities necessary for a Correctional Officer to work in Direct Supervision;
2. provide structure and training for the selection process;
3. design an evaluation system to measure employee performance and the selection/training process.

Prof. Ben Menke, from Washington State University, described the critical incident technique which was employed to do a job analysis for new generation jail correctional officers, focusing on specific job behaviors. A sample of officers and supervisors were interviewed to describe difficult situations with inmates which have occurred in the past six months, and describe behaviors which led to successful resolutions of incidents. This process revealed 7 dimensions of characteristics and 72 specific behaviors related to successful job performance (see paper in proceedings).

**PANEL 2 TRAINING MID LEVEL MANAGERS AND OFFICERS**

**MODERATOR: MIKE O'TOOLE**

**PANEL: SARAH HEATHERLY AND JEANNIE STINCHCOMB, DADE  
COUNTY, FLORIDA  
GUY PELLICANE, MIDDLESEX COUNTY, NEW JERSEY  
RUSSELL DAVIS, PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

This session focussed on programs to train staff for working in direct supervision facilities. Mr. Pellicane discussed a new NIC supported program to train mid-level managers for their special duties, while Ms. Heatherly and Stinchcomb described the training procedures for officers in Dade County, Florida. The Dade County program, called "investment in excellence", is being used to select 1000 officers for their new detention center, as well as for the 1200 additional beds under construction. The interpersonal communications training program, which is at the core of the program, involves 584 hours of training at the academy, and role playing with staff and actual inmates (see paper in proceedings).

Mr. Pellicane noted that experience has shown that getting mid-level managers to 'buy-in' to the direct supervision model can be a major problem. Major Davis also commented that as the officer develops more control under direct supervision, the supervisor loses control over day to day operation of the living area, and must undergo a major role redefinition. In some ways, these managers have the most radical shift in level and type of responsibilities. In his project for the NIC, Mr. Pellicane's group developed a detailed job description for mid-level managers in direct supervision, based on interviews with line staff, mid-level managers, and administrators. A policy review committee of managers was formed to identify management needs, define job elements, roles, and responsibilities (see paper in proceedings).

**PAPER PRESENTATION**

**PRESENTER: BARBARA KRAUT, NIC JAIL CENTER  
DIRECT SUPERVISION JAILS: INTERVIEWS WITH  
ADMINISTRATORS**

Ms. Kraut described the results of her interviews with a eleven of wardens of direct supervision jails on the importance of maintaining the direct supervision philosophy, the need for training prior to opening, budget allocation for full time transition, the importance of communication, and problems with staff and mid-level managers. The transcripts of these interviews



NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
PANEL SUMMARIES

are compiled in a publication available from the NIC Information Center.

**PANEL 3                      UNIT SIZE, STAFF RATIOS AND DIRECT SUPERVISION**

**MODERATOR: JAY FARBSTAIN**

**PANEL: STEVE CARTER, COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA**

**RAY NELSON, BOULDER, COLORADO**

**ALAN MINISH, FORT COLLINS, COLORADO**

**TOM BARRY, NEW YORK CITY**

**SAM SAXTON, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MARYLAND**

This goal of this session was to discuss the relationships of unit size, staff-inmate ratio, and staffing levels. A key issue driving much of unit design and operational cost is the allowable population levels of a direct supervision living unit. Does a unit function differently with 48 inmates to 1 officer versus 65 inmates to 1 officer? At what levels do the principals of direct supervision break down? How can maximum efficiency of staff be achieved without sacrificing quality of operation?

The panel represented administrators from jurisdictions operating settings of various sizes - from 35 inmate units to unit with over 65 inmates, as well as planners and designers. Steve Carter discussed the process a jurisdiction needs to go through in approaching decisions on issues such as unit size. He noted the need to identify at what level basic decisions are being made (administration or vendors?), and what management goals the design must help achieve. Management goals must come first so that designs can be tested against operational scenarios (see paper in this proceedings).

Mike O'Toole commented that the number of inmates which one officer can supervise depends on other variables such as the competency of staff, classification procedures, and level of double bunking. Other presenters agreed and noted other related issues. Alan Minish and Tom Barry suggested that the degree of orientation to the institution, disciplinary procedures, and unit design (such as site lines) size of the day area, and shower locations were critical. Sam Saxton noted that the level of effort is greatly affected by the degree of medical care required. He suggested that the AIDS epidemic, and the related care needs it will generate, may overwhelm the ability of many institutions to operate.

PANEL 4                      OVERCROWDING IN DIRECT SUPERVISION

MODERATOR: RICHARD WENER

PANEL: ROGER ROSE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

LARRY ARD, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Like most other jails, direct supervision facilities are often populated beyond intended capacity, at times at double original intended levels. This session was created to bring administrators from facilities experiencing significant overcrowding to discuss its impact on direct supervision. Does overcrowding inhibit the effectiveness of direct supervision? Does direct supervision respond to overcrowding better or worse than indirect models? How can administrators effectively deal with overcrowding?

Roger Rose noted that the population of the San Diego MCC has doubled, to 96 inmates per unit, although facility is functioning well. Much of the population are immigration cases, creating high turnover (100% per month) and language barriers between staff and inmates. He said that rooms with single beds have less violence than those with double bunks, although he felt violence was more related to inmate characteristics than density levels. Their largest problems from crowding comes in the areas of dealing with the levels of attorney and social visits, storage space, and maintenance. He indicated that crowding increases the importance of management visibility on the living units.

Larry Ard noted that the Contra Costs Detention Facility had also doubled in population since opening. As the unit progressively increased in population, staff complained and felt each level (48, 65, and finally 85 inmates) was the maximum possible, but in each case staff adjusted and were able to reasonably handle the population. When the population reached 85 inmates a second officer was added to the unit.

He does not feel the increase in population is without significant consequences. Noise has become a major problem, tension is increased, and mental health and disciplinary problems have increased. He suggested that in dealing with crowding administrators need to increase the amount of televisions available, offer more programs, and work harder to better classify inmates. Planners, he added, should design new institutions so that equipment, space, storage, and other facilities are scaled to possible eventual population levels.

**PAPERS**

## MANAGEMENT DECISIONS IN THE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY DESIGN PROCESS

Stephen A. Carter  
Carter Goble Associates, Inc.

By now, it is safe to assume that most correctional administrators, architects, and a growing number of correctional line officers have been exposed to a concept of integrating facility management and design solutions that is termed Direct Supervision. While the debate over the suitability of the Direct Supervision management and design approach for all types of correctional facilities will continue for years to come, it is obvious from the construction of more than 10,000 bedspaces in the last three years and another 20,000 or more bedspaces planned during the next two years under the Direct Supervision concept that this approach has a permanent place in the history of correctional system design and operation.

Recognizing this, the focus of this presentation is upon the process of designing Direct Supervision facilities that requires posing specific management questions to a range of decision makers. This presentation first discusses the issue of who is responsible for making decisions concerning housing unit management design and then attempts to frame the discussion of the management issues that will establish design criteria for Direct Supervision housing units.

Although the entire correctional facility will be influenced by the decision to design and operate under a Direct Supervision approach, the housing unit will be the most influenced by this decision. The first issue to be addressed is who should make the housing unit management decisions and, secondly, what are the decisions to be made in defining the design response to management directives and criteria.

### HOUSING UNIT MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKERS

Gary Mote, the former Chief Architect to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons and considered by many to be the father of the Direct Supervision design concept, refers to the housing unit as the institution's "form giver." Indeed, the housing unit establishes the configuration of an institution that allows the general public to distinguish a correctional facility from other governmental structures. The design requirements for exterior cells establishes the unmistakable form of a correctional facility. Since, in the design of Direct Supervision facilities, the cells are also grouped around a central dayroom, the housing

unit becomes even more of the institution's "form giver." Not only does the housing unit generally establish the configuration of the institution, but it also represents the most costly single component to both construct and operate. In most new facilities, the housing unit consumes from 50 to 65 percent of the construction budget and approximately the same range of the total salary budget for a contemporary correctional facility.

Recognizing, therefore, that the housing unit provides the form for the facility; establishes most of the critical circulation patterns; and is also the most expensive component of the facility, who, then should make the decisions concerning the management objectives and design responses for the facility? A substantial list of important people, departments, and organizations are often involved in the housing unit management and design decisions including the following:

- o Sheriff/Department Director
- o Jail Administrator
- o Advisory Committee
- o Correctional Officers
- o Elected Officials
- o Architects/Engineers/Consultants
- o Equipment Vendors

Each of these categories of decision-makers has some stake in the outcome of the housing unit management and design response. Since it is well documented that decisions made by committees often lead to "camels," should a single category of individuals make the final design and management decision regarding housing units? The following summarizes the type of vested interest in the facility design that is reflected by the various categories of decision-makers.

- o **Sheriff/Department Director.** As an elected or appointed official, this individual has a political reputation at stake that can be very much impacted by the success or failure of the correctional facility. While the initial capital cost is a concern, the Sheriff or Department Director must argue each year for funds to operate the facility. Management and design decisions will have a substantial impact upon the operating cost.
- o **Jail Administrator.** Charged with the day-to-day responsibility of managing the correctional facility, the Jail Administrator has a substantial stake in the outcome of the facility design. A design and

management decision making process that excludes the Jail Administrator or minimizes the role will prevent the development of "ownership" that is essential to the function of the Chief Operating Officer.

- o **Advisory Committee.** In an open planning process, many local officials will dedicate a substantial amount of time to the facility decision making process. In many ways, the outcome of the facility will reflect a justification for the level of effort expended by these appointed officials in achieving more responsive local government.
- o **Correctional Officers.** These men and women hold the key to a successful correctional facility. To minimize their role in the design and management decision making process will prevent the "bonding" that is essential between a management concept and the operational achievement.
- o **Elected Officials.** In many ways, the effectiveness and worthiness of Elected Officials to public confidence and support will be defined by the outcome of the correctional facility design and management decisions. Elected Officials should be held accountable for their decisions and the design and construction of a correctional facility has substantial budgetary implications that impact a jurisdiction's allocation of resources.
- o **Architects/Engineers/Consultants.** The ability to establish a reputation that translates to other business opportunities is substantially effected by the outcome of the facility design and operations.
- o **Equipment Vendors.** The ability of suppliers and vendors to sell their products in other correctional environments will be due in large measure to the success of their products in correctional facilities.

Each of these categories of individuals can play a major role in the direction that the design and management of the correctional facility takes and will be impacted in many ways by the outcome of the facility design. For some it can mean re-election or defeat; public praise or ridicule; career advancement or stagnation; and/or improved or diminished opportunities for future employment or supply opportunities.

Even though each of these seven categories of individuals has a role to play in the decision making process, not any single category of individuals should be vested with the ultimate authority to make the management decisions that impact the facility design. As complicated as the process may be, a planning approach that systematically defines the objectives of each of these categories of decision makers will generally result in a facility design that has the greatest opportunity for success by anticipating the user responses to the facility design.

### **ESSENTIAL MANAGEMENT DECISIONS THAT IMPACT DESIGN**

A comprehensive planning process leading to the construction and operation of a correctional facility involves literally hundreds of decisions by a variety of individuals over an extended timeframe. Most of the major decisions that impact the design of the facility, however, are made during the very early stages of the facility planning process. Many of the less successful institutions of today have achieved this status by a failure to ask the correct management questions during the early stages of the planning process.

In the following paragraphs a discussion of 15 management decisions that should be made prior to initiating the design process are briefly discussed. These decisions address broad areas associated with appropriate standards and building codes, policy issues, operational factors, and staffing concerns. A systematic process that presents these decisions as questions to the decision-makers previously described and defines the design implications of the decisions should result in a facility that eliminates as many of the unknowns and uncertainties as feasible.

1. **Degree of Commitment to ACA Standards and Accreditation Requirements.** The extent to which the decision makers wish to achieve accreditation of the facility by the American Corrections Association (ACA) will impact the design of the facility in numerous ways. The Standards will establish certain physical criteria while the accreditation requirements will establish an operational basis for the facility. A commitment to these standards and accreditation requirements will establish a baseline for the design of the facility.
2. **Fire/Smoke Prevention and Rescue Requirements.** Local building codes regarding life safety issues will impact many aspects of the facility design ranging from the number of cells to be grouped in an open dayroom

environment to the amount and size of glazed openings into various spaces. Corridors, stairs, and material selection will be substantially influenced by the life safety requirements of local building codes.

3. **Confidence Level Required for the Perimeter Security.** The type and configuration of the perimeter security of a correctional facility establishes a final "line of defense." If a high degree of confidence is achieved in the perimeter of a facility, whether it is through fencing or the exterior construction of the building, will influence the design and construction choices for spaces within the correctional facility. A hard and "escape proof" perimeter can generally permit the use of less secure and less costly construction and equipment on the interior of the facility, assuming adequate supervision. Also impacting the confidence level in the perimeter will be the attitude of the general public as to the facility appearance.
4. **Amount of Direct Natural Light Desired in the Cell.** The first design decision should determine if the individual cells will have windows or if natural light will be achieved through corridors or dayroom space. Assuming windows will be located within the cells, the amount of glazed area should be defined based upon environmental and security criteria.
5. **Acceptable Amount of Double-Celling.** In these times of extensive overcrowding, it is highly unlikely that any correctional facility will not be pressured into double-celling. The percentage of cells and the duration for double-bunking should be approached as a policy decision that will substantially impact the design. If the policy is to allow a certain percentage of the cells to be double-bunked continuously, then, consideration should be given to oversizing these cells to accommodate double-bunking. While the ACA has not developed a standard regarding double-bunking of individual cells, consideration should be given to an 80 to 100 square foot cell design if the policy is to double-bunk a certain percentage of the individual cells.
6. **The Meaning of the Term "Flexibility."** This term can mean creating the opportunities for multiple use of singular spaces as a design philosophy. However, the term can also mean the construction of housing unit



control rooms, but proposing to operate the units under a direct supervision approach and leave the control room doors open. Clarification should be achieved among the decision makers as to the meaning of the term "flexibility" relative to the management and design interface.

7. **Classification Responsibility and Approach.** The type and application of a classification approach will determine the number and type of bedspaces to be constructed according to custody categories. This can have an extensive impact upon the construction techniques, design layout, equipment, and hardware choices. The decision regarding classification responsibility and approach will have substantial capital and operational cost implications.
8. **Amount/Type of Out-of-Cell/Out-of-Dayroom Time.** The extent to which inmates will have ready access to scheduled out-of-cell and out-of-dayroom activities will impact the housing unit footprint, type of dayroom space, and staffing assignments.
9. **Extent to Which Services are Decentralized.** The decision regarding the type and quantity of spaces to be decentralized to the housing unit will impact the building footprint, staffing assignments and the use of equipment and furniture. This decision will also impact inmate movement and, therefore, the corridor configurations within a facility.
10. **Level of Continuous Versus Intermittent Supervision.** This management decision regarding the level of supervision will impact the configuration of the dayroom, organization of the cells by custody classification, and impact the role of surveillance technology in the overall facility operations plan.
11. **Level of Commitment to Preventive Maintenance.** The number of staff, budget, and quality of preventive maintenance will impact the selection of construction approaches, materials, equipment, and the reliance upon high technology surveillance and communication systems. This decision will also impact issues related to the types of wall and floor coverings, as well as dayroom and cell furniture.
12. **Number of Midnight Shift Officers.** The number of

midnight shift officers will influence design decisions regarding the distance of housing units from the central control room, proximity of housing units to each other, and the location of fixed versus roving patrol stations. This decision will also influence the relationships of housing unit dayrooms if officers are expected to cover more than one dayroom environment during the midnight shift.

13. **Role and Responsibilities of the Housing Officer.** Developing a detailed post description for the housing unit officer will influence design choices related to the means of controlled access to the housing unit; the type of station from which the housing officer works; the configuration of the dayroom; and the type of fixtures and furniture used in the cells and dayroom.
14. **Amount and Quality of Face-to-Face Communications.** The decision regarding the desired interaction between the housing unit officer and the inmates will impact choices related to selection of acoustical materials, configuration of the dayroom, and cell front design. The responsibility of the correctional officer to resolve, rather than simply report, conflicts will impact many of the design choices within the housing unit environment.
15. **Frequency and Duration of Cell Front Observation.** The extent of and time required to conduct cell front inspections to accomplish inmate counts and to resolve inmate problems will impact the design decision concerning the number of cells grouped around the dayroom environment and the length of a "run" of cells before a change in direction. Ultimately, this decision will influence the footprint of the housing unit.

Each of the management decision discussed above influences the design of the correctional facility housing unit. The most obvious design implications of these management decisions are summarized in the following points.

- o Size and configuration of the housing footprint
- o Size, layout, and security level of the cell
- o Type and size of the housing unit support spaces
- o Type of equipment, furniture, furnishings, and hardware
- o Capital and operating budgets

Many other management decisions impact design choices for housing units. Asking the right questions to the appropriate decision makers can assure that the design choices are based upon operational objectives rather than arbitrary design solutions.

## CONCLUSIONS

Many management decisions and design choices are made during the process of planning a correctional facility. There is no one single solution to the planning process that guarantees the success of the management or design concept for a facility. However, a process that involves a wide range of decision makers posing the type of questions discussed above will open the dialogue for more creative and management responsive design solutions to evolve. In summary, the following simple steps can be employed in the management planning and design process to assure more responsive facilities.

- o Know who and how management and design decisions are made.
- o Frame the design options in light of management decisions.
- o Test the design solution against operational scenarios.
- o Research the experience of others in the management and design process.
- o Develop ownership with decision-makers and operators.

If more than \$20 billion are to be expended during the next decade to construct correctional facilities, then the result must be more cost-effective facilities to manage. Future design awards for correctional facilities should be based upon management, rather than monumental, successes.

## SYMPOSIUM EVALUATION

Fifty-four persons attending the symposium completed AJA session evaluation forms. All (100%) said that the content fit the title of the sessions. 98% (53) rated presenters as knowledgeable and information as useful, and said they gained information which would be helpful in their work. 83% (45) said all presenters were 'excellent', 11% (6) rated the presenters as 'good', 2% (1) rated presenters as fair) and 3 did not respond.

Of the comments provided, the best features of the symposium most frequently cited were the session on overcrowding, the ability to interact and share with direct supervision administrators, the overall quality of speakers, and the discussion of interpersonal communications training. The worst features most cited concerned the schedule (too long for some too short for others), the room (too cold, smoking and noisy), and the lack of handouts. Twelve respondents spontaneously requested a repeat of the symposium at next year's AJA conference.

The most frequently recommended changes were for adding more specific information on training, management and design, and increasing the symposium by spreading it over two days or having simultaneous sessions. Other suggestions included having video tours of selected institutions, and adding officer and inmate perspectives.

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

LIST OF THOSE ATTENDING SYMPOSIUM

Alcede, Joey  
Calcasieu Parish Jail  
P.O. Box V  
Lake Charles, Louisiana 70602

Allan, Stephen  
524 W. Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Aoams, Gary S.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Aquirre, Robert S.  
Genesee County Sheriff's  
Department  
932 Beach Street  
Flint, Michigan 48502

Ard, Larry  
Contra Costa County Sheriff's  
Department  
1000 Ward Street  
Martinez, California 94553

Arnold, Kenneth  
Sedgwick County Manager's  
Office  
525 No. Main Street  
Wichita, Kansas 67203

Atlas, Randy  
Atlas & Associates  
600 NE 36th Street  
Miami, Florida 33137

Barletta, Carl V.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Barry, Sheriff Bernard J.  
P.O. Box 1118  
Colorado Springs, Colorado  
80901

Barry, Thomas R.  
Bronx House of Detention  
653 River Avenue  
Bronx, New York 10451

Bissett, Susan  
Department of Corrections  
Bureau of Inspections  
5422 W. Bay Center Drive  
Tampa, Florida 33609

Braze, Thomas  
Lake County Sheriff's Office  
10 No. County Street  
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Brents, Robert L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1203 Orient Road  
Tampa, Florida 33569

Campanella, Tom  
Morin County Administrator's  
Office  
Suite 331  
Morin County Civic Center  
San Rafael, California 94901

Capaz, Dennis  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
County Jail West  
1512 No. Clark Avenue  
Tampa, Florida 33607

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Chap. A.A. Butner  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Connors, John  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Cooley, Jerry L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Davis, Russ  
Pima County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 910  
Tucson, Arizona 85702

DiRusso, Anthony  
N.Y.C.D.C.  
17-17 Hazen Street  
East Elmhurst, New York 11370

Divens, Jill  
Pinellas County Sheriff's  
Office  
14400 49th Street, No.  
Clearwater, Florida 33520

Donder, Kay  
Spokane County Jail  
West 1100 Mallon  
Spokane, Washington 99260

Doyle, Bob  
Morin County Sheriff's Office  
Civic Center  
Hall of Justice  
San Rafael, California 94903

Elden, T.  
West Virginia Regional Jails  
P.O. Box 3102  
Charleston, West Virginia  
25332

Felitz, Sgt. Patrick H.  
Hillsborough County Jail West  
1512 No. Clark Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Finical, Steve  
Summit County Sheriff's Office  
53 E. Center Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308

Fisher, Dep. Clyde L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Fortner, Rene L.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
4102 W. Spruce Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Frazier, Bill  
Contra Costa Sheriff's  
Department  
1000 Ward Street  
Martinez, California 94553

Gardner, Deputy Bob  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Gauger, Glenn  
H.O.R.  
100 North Broadway  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Geoghegan, W.  
Morse/Diesel  
1515 Broadway  
New York, New York 10036

Goldhart, Jill D.  
Bureau of Adult Detention  
1050 Freeway Drive, No.  
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Graham, Sally  
Florida Department of  
Corrections  
1311 Winewood Boulevard  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Graham, David  
Leon County Florida  
1758 Beechwood Circle, No.  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Griffis, Bruce I.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1203 Orient Road  
Tampa, Florida 33569

Griggs, Capt. John L.  
Alexandria Sheriff's Office  
520 King Street, Room 308  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Hafernan, Sgt. Richard  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Hall, Marilyn C.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
Detention Department  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Hall, Tom  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1512 No. Clark Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Harman, Susan  
Michigan Department of  
Corrections  
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Heatherly, Sara  
1500 NW 12th Avenue, Suite 722  
Miami, Florida 33136

Hecht, Frank R.  
Pima County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 910  
Tucson, Arizona 85702

Hennessey, Sheriff Michael  
333 City Hall  
San Francisco, California  
94102

Hill, Bryan L.  
Monroe County Jail  
34 No. 7th Street  
Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania  
18360

Hill, Sgt. H. Craig  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Houghton, Bruce  
Ramois & Partners, Architects  
515 Bay Street  
Tampa, Florida 33629

Hughes, James P.  
Board/Criminal Justice  
Coordinator  
Genesee County  
1101 Beach Street, Room 312

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Flint, Michigan 48502  
Hunter, Mike  
Monolithic Constructors, Inc.  
3007 E. Telford Road  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401

Jacobson, Robert J.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Jarvis, Al  
Pinal County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 867  
Florence, Arizona 85232

Johnston, Robert B.  
Johnson County Sheriff  
Department  
Courthouse  
Olathe, Kansas 66061

Jordan, Ed  
Weld County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 759  
Greeley, Colorado 80632

Kalinich, Dave  
Michigan State University  
560 Baker Hall  
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Katz, Jake  
Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
Department  
Central Jail  
441 Bauchet Street, Room 1040  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Keller, Lt. John T.  
Travis County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767

Kerle, Ken  
American Jail Association  
P.O. Box 2158  
Hagerstown, Maryland 21742

Klopp, James  
Milwaukee County Sheriff's  
Department  
821 West State Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Knowles, Capt. E.A.  
Travis County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767

Koerner, G.  
Morse/Diesel  
1515 Broadway  
New York, New York 10036

LeVeglia, Warden Tony  
Brooklyn H.D.M.  
275 Atlantic Avenue  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Lewis, Capt. Jerry  
Summit County Sheriff's Office  
53 E. Center Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308

Lichter, Janice  
Milwaukee County Board of  
Supervisors  
901 No. 9th Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Liebert, Dennis  
NIC Jail Center  
1790 30th Street  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Lucas, Robert M.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
4192 W. Spruce Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607



NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Machado, Sgt. J.A.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Melvin, Ross  
Pinellas County Jail  
14400 49th Street, No.  
Clearwater, Florida 33520

Menke, Ben  
Criminal Justice Program  
Washington State University  
Pullman, Washington  
99164-4880

Meradith, Stan  
Johnson Data Associates,  
Architects  
5550 W. Idlewild, Suite 122  
Tampa, Florida 33634

Minish, Allen J.  
Larimar County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 1190  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

Miranda, Capt. George  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
2008 8th Avenue  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Nederhoff, Dale A.  
Prime Design, Inc.  
3010 Azeele Street  
Tampa, Florida 33679

Neuenschwander, V.  
Oklahoma County Sheriff's  
Office  
321 Park Avenue  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

O'Donoghue, Vince  
Union County Jail  
15 Elizabethtown Plaza  
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Page, Bill  
MMRMA  
37713 Schoolcraft, Building A  
Livonia, Michigan 48150

Painter, Chief James  
Los Angeles County Sheriff's  
Department  
441 Bauchet Street  
Los Angeles, California  
90012

Parish, Col. David M.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Park, Jean  
West Virginia Regional Jail &  
Prison Authority  
Capital Complex  
307 Jefferson Street  
Charleston, West Virginia

Pato, Capt. J.W.  
Osceola County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 2428  
Kissimmee, Florida 32743

Patrick, Bill, Chief  
P.O. Box 310  
1st St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20534

Pellicane, Guy  
Department of Correction and  
Youth Services  
P.O. Box 266  
New Brunswick, New Jersey  
08903

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Penn, Sgt. Richard E.  
Pinellas County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 2500  
Largo, Florida 34294-2500

Plunkett, James G.  
Plunkett Keymar Reginato,  
Architects  
6830 W. Villard Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53218

Price, Barbara Raffel  
John Jay College  
444 W. 56th Street  
New York, New York 10019

Pulitzer, Curtiss  
The Ehrenkrantz Group  
5401 Palisade Avenue  
Riverdale, New York 10471

Ramsey, Lt. Michael  
Sarasota Sheriff's Department  
2020 Main Street  
Sarasota, Florida 33578

Reed, Tammy  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33603

Rich, Peter G.  
Correctional Services Group  
410 Archibald Avenue, Suite 105  
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

Riley, Sgt. Mark  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Rivers, Robert E.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 No. Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33602

Robinson, Capt. James  
Contra Costa County Sheriff's  
Department  
P.O. Box 391  
Martinez, California 94553

Rose, Robert  
MCC  
808 Union Street  
San Diego, California 92031

Ross, Lt. Rickard A.  
Yellowstone County Detention  
Facility  
P.O. Box 35017  
Billings, Montana 59107

Rowan, Joe  
Juvenile/Criminal Justice  
International  
381 So. Owasso Boulevard  
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

Salemme, Joseph  
Union County Administrator's  
Building  
4th Floor  
Elizabeth, New Jersey 07206

Sanborn, Chloe  
Goodwill Director Corrections  
1320 24th Avenue, No.  
St. Petersburg, Florida  
33704

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Saunders, Major Steve  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Sawyer, Michael  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1301 Morgan Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Schlageter, Marv - Undersheriff  
P.O. Box 1190  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80522

Sharrieff, N.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
1512 No. Clark Street  
Tampa, Florida 33607

Sherwood, John  
Pinal County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 867  
Florence, Arizona 85232

Silva, G.R.  
Lincoln County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Box 611  
Wiscaser, Maine

Silverman, Charles  
771 14th Avenue  
San Francisco, California  
94118

Sindles, Edward  
Lake County Sheriff's Office  
10 No. County Street  
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Smith, Chris  
AIA  
9001 Edmonton Road  
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

Smith, Omer E.  
Flager County Sheriff's Office  
P.O. Drawer 1880  
Bunnell, Florida 32010

Spoon, Jeff  
Arapahoe County Sheriff's  
Department  
7375 So. Potomac Street  
Englewood, Colorado 80112

Sprecher, Rob  
Arapahoe County Sheriff's  
Office  
Littleton County  
7375 So. Potomac  
Englewood, Colorado 80112

Stewart, Deb  
Bureau of Adult Detention  
240 So. Parsons Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Sullivan, Sheriff Pat J., Jr.  
Arapahoe County Sheriff's  
Department  
5686 So. Court Place  
Littleton, Colorado 80120

Tesmer, Bernie  
Milwaukee County Sheriff's  
Department  
821 West State Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Tolson, Beverly  
Compliance Officer  
Fulton County Sheriff's  
Department  
136 Pryor Street, S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Troutman, Sheriff Dave  
Summit County Sheriff  
53 E. Center Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails  
List of Symposium Attendees

Tyler, Sgt. Andre  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Walker-Adia, H.  
Glynn County Detention Center  
1728 Newcastle Street  
Brunswick, Georgia 31520

Wallace, Capt. Steven D.  
Hillsborough County Sheriff's  
Office  
P.O. Box 3371  
Tampa, Florida 33601

Westlake, Lt. Jim  
Washoe County Sheriff's Office  
911 Parr Boulevard  
Reno, Nevada

Zemites, John V.  
Johnson County Sheriff  
Department  
Courthouse  
Olathe, Kansas 66061

# PROGRAM

## 2nd NIC SYMPOSIUM ON NEW GENERATION JAILS

Clearwater, Florida; May 8, 1987

- 8:00-8:15      **GENERAL INTRODUCTION** (O'Toole, Ford, Farbstein, Wener)
- 8:15-9:15      **STAFF SELECTION AND TRAINING**  
**Topics:** Is there such a thing as "appropriate" staff for working in direct supervision housing units or can any properly trained corrections staff manage effectively? What methods are systems using to screen and train staff?  
**Moderator:** Rich Wener  
**Panelists:** Sam Saxton with Dr. Feigenbaum, Prince Georges County MD; Linda Zupan, Washington State University, Pullman WA with Don Manning, Spokane County WA.
- 9:15-9:45      "Application of Direct Supervision Principles to Management of Department of Corrections," Russell Davis, Pima County AZ.
- 9:45-10:00      **Break**
- 10:00-11:00    **TRAINING MID-LEVEL MANAGERS**  
**Topics:** Preparing middle level managers to deal effectively with their line supervisory staff. The greater autonomy of direct supervision housing makes a problem solving and support style of management more effective than traditional, authority-based management.  
**Moderator:** Mike O'Toole  
**Paper:** Guy Pelicane, Middlesex County NJ: "Training Middle Level Supervisors."  
**Panelists:** Sara Heatherly, Dade County FL; Russell Davis, Pima County AZ.
- 11:00-1:30    **SMALL GROUP PROBLEM SOLVING SESSIONS**  
Groups of 6 to 8 participants will be formed to discuss specific problems or concerns affecting new generation jails. Topics or problems will be identified by jail systems which would like to get input, review or assistance from others at the symposium. Topics could include planning staffing, training, services, classification, budgeting, facility planning (review of designs), etc. Groups will be constituted based upon topics submitted by May 7 (at the conference) to Mike O'Toole. Each group will have a facilitator and will prepare to report back to the large group. Session will begin at 11:00 and run over lunch. Session will start with a 10 minute presentation on the results of the NICIC survey of new generation jail's problems by NICIC representative or Mike O'Toole.
- 1:30-2:00      **Report Out on Small Group Sessions**  
**Moderator:** Jay Farbstein
- 2:00-3:15      **UNIT SIZE, STAFF RATIOS AND DIRECT SUPERVISION**  
**Topic:** Is there an ideal or a maximum unit size or staffing ratio for new generation jails? What are thresholds in terms of staff effectiveness and efficiency? Which tasks should the officer be responsible for in addition to inmate supervision (meals, visiting, etc.)?  
**Moderator:** Jay Farbstein  
**Panelists:** Introduction: Ray Nelson, Boulder CO; Thom Barry, NYC; Steve Carter, Columbia SC; Scott Higgins (?), Bureau of Prisons; Alan Minish, Larimer County CO; Sam Saxton, P.G. County.
- 3:15-3:30      **Break**
- 3:30-4:30      **OVERCROWDING AND NEW GENERATION JAILS**  
**Topics:** How do new generation jails perform when overcrowded (and their inmate to staff ratios are increased, sometimes up to 90 or 100:1)? Are principles of direct supervision sacrificed? What staffing or management changes must be made? Do new generation jails perform better than traditional jails when overcrowded?  
**Moderator:** Richard Wener  
**Panelists:** Larry Ard, Contra Costa County CA; Joseph Knowles, Chicago MCC; Roger Rose, San Diego MCC.
- 4:30-5:00      **WRAP-UP**  
**Topics:** What did we learn at this session? What should be plan for next year?  
**Moderators:** Mike O'Toole, NIC
- 5:00            **Adjourn**