

HV  
9470  
.M53  
1965

TWELFTH ANNUAL  
MIDWEST  
CORRECTIONAL  
CONFERENCE

Sponsored by

Midwestern States  
Correctional Institutions

Iowa Board of Control of  
State Institutions

With Cooperation of

ENGINEERING EXTENSION

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
of Science and Technology  
April 6, 7, 8, 1965  
Ames, Iowa

BOARD OF CONTROL  
OF STATE INSTITUTIONS  
DES MOINES, IOWA

365  
Mid



## FOREWARD

This conference report for the Twelfth Annual Midwest Correctional Conference is a record of the work, efforts, and enthusiasm of the people who attended. The success and value of these conferences are dependent upon the time and effort of many people. I would like, at this time, to express my sincere thanks to all who helped make this conference a success.

The papers have been included as they were submitted. No attempt has been made to edit or add to them. Many valuable contributions and areas of discussion were recorded on tape this time and have been included with some minor revisions.

The Thirteenth Annual Midwest Correctional Conference will be held on April 26, 27 & 28, 1966, at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, in the Memorial Union. An attempt will be made to notify all persons well in advance for planning for attendance. Twelve states were represented in 1965, and it becomes an enormous task to keep everyone informed.

A planning session will be held in Des Moines during July or August to develop a theme and the program for next year. Each institution will be sent an invitation to participate in this planning session.

Again, my sincere thanks for your past help and a genuine appeal for your support, comments and help in the future.

Donald P. Hendricks  
Correctional Conference Coordinator  
Engineering Extension  
110 Marston Hall  
Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa



365  
Mid

TABLE OF CONTENTS

0

	Page
Foreward	i
Table of Contents	ii
Registration List	iii
Program	vi
Keynote Address	1
North Carolina's Training Program for Correctional Officers By George W. Randall	
Workshop Reports - Session I	
Orientation Training	9
In-Service Training	16
Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training	18
Management and Supervision Training	19
General Session - Kickoff	21
The Vitality of Staff Training By Anthony P. Trivisono	
Workshop Reports - Session II	
Orientation Training	25
In-Service Training	29
Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training	33
Management and Supervision Training	36
Banquet Speech	39
Peripheral Handicaps to Correctional Treatment By Donald Clemmer	
General Session - Kickoff	46
Creativity Versus Indoctrination By C. Murray Henderson	
Workshop Reports - Session III	
Orientation Training	51
Evaluating Orientation Training Roy W. Moore - Discussion Leader	53
In-Service Training	55
Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training	57
Management and Supervision Training	60



Registration List  
MIDWEST CORRECTIONAL CONFERENCE  
April 6 - 8, 1965

Abel, William Iowa State Penitentiary Ft. Madison, Iowa	Ellandson, Nolon Board of Control State Office Bldg. Des Moines, Iowa	Loos, Reuben Nebraska Penal & Correctional Complex Box 111 Lincoln, Nebraska
Allen, James Iowa Trng. Sch. for Boys Eldora, Iowa	Fellows, Don F. C. I. Sandstone, Minnesota	Lovely, Dorothy Women's Reformatory Rockwell City, Iowa
Armstrong, Lloyd State of Kentucky La Grange, Kentucky	Freeman, Gene F. C. I. Sandstone, Minnesota	McCauley, Lewis Wisconsin Home for Women Taycheedah, Wisconsin
Bachtel, Robert Kansas State Penitentiary Lansing, Kansas	Graves, Richard Federal Correctional Instit. Sandstone, Minnesota	Mack, Lester Wisconsin State Reform Green Bay, Wisconsin
Barba, Roberta Mitchellville Trng. Sch. Mitchellville, Iowa	Griffin, J. E. Mich. Dept. of Corrections 4000 N. Cooper St. Jackson, Michigan	Martin, Russell Ky. State Reformatory La Grange, Kentucky
Bigger, Dorothy Ia. Trng. Sch. for Girls Box 68 Mitchellville, Iowa	Hazelet, John State Office Bldg. Topeka, Kansas	Menke, Donald Iowa State Penitentiary Ft. Madison, Iowa
Black, George Box 97 McAlester, Oklahoma	Hearld, Robert Michigan Dept. of Corrections Ionia, Michigan	Menke, James Iowa State Penitentiary Box 316 Ft. Madison, Iowa
Boegler, Alvaro State Penitentiary Sioux Falls, S. D.	Howell, William Wisconsin School for Boys Wales, Wisconsin	Mettner, Charles Bureau of Prisons Leavenworth, Kansas
Boorman, James Kettle Moraine Boys School Plymouth, Wisconsin	Jacox, William Lt. Nebraska Penal & Corr. Complex Box 111 Lincoln, Nebraska	Miller, Ed Nebraska Penal & Correctional Complex Box 111 Lincoln, Nebraska
Dahlgren, Arnold U. S. Disciplinary Barracks Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas	Johnson, C. C. Box 2 Lansing, Kansas	Phend, George 2596 Girls School Road Indianapolis, Indiana
Davis, L. B. U. S. Dept. of Justice Leavenworth, Kansas	Jones, Doris Women's Reformatory Rockwell City, Iowa	Quatsoe, Donald Wisconsin Corr. Instit Fox Lake, Wisconsin
Driscoll, Warren Justice Dept. Sandstone, Minnesota	Kellogg, C. C. Kansas State Prison Lansing, Kansas	Ranard, Richard Nebraska Penal & Corr. Complex Lincoln, Nebraska
Ebert, Irma Women's Reformatory Rockwell City, Iowa	Kressin, Gus Regional Administrator Probation & Parole Services Madison, Wisconsin	



Roberts, Frank A.  
Kansas State Penitentiary  
Box 2  
Lansing, Kansas

Roscoe, Joy  
Mitchellville Trng. Sch.  
Mitchellville, Iowa

Rumbarger, James  
F. C. I.  
Sandstone, Minnesota

Saddoris, Harold  
Girls Trng. School  
Mitchellville, Iowa

Skinner, Charles T.  
U. S. Dept. of Justice  
Bureau of Prisons  
Leavenworth, Kansas

Slobe, E. L. Col.  
U. S. Army Disc. Barracks  
Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas

Smith, Dale  
Kansas Diagnostic Center  
Topeka, Kansas

Sneesby, Lawrence  
Probation & Parole Services  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Sturdevant, E. R.  
Iowa State Penitentiary  
Ft. Madison, Iowa

Thompson, George  
Kansas State Reception &  
Diagnostic Center  
Topeka, Kansas

Torrence, John  
U. S. Dept. of Justice  
Bureau of Prisons  
Leavenworth, Kansas

Utess, Louis  
State Prison of So. Michigan  
4000 Cooper St.  
Jackson, Michigan

Welborn, Vail  
Iowa State Penitentiary  
Ft. Madison, Iowa

Wilson, Russell  
Board of Control  
State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa

Winans, Harvey Lt.  
Wisconsin State Prison  
Waupun, Wisconsin

Woolveiton, Wayne  
Kansas State Industrial  
Reformatory  
Box 1563  
Hutchinson, Kansas

Zahn, Otto  
State Ind. Reformatory  
Hutchinson, Kansas

Zent, Arlo  
Kansas State Ind. Reform.  
Box 1568  
Hutchinson, Kansas

#### SPEAKERS & GUESTS

Bath, John Dr.  
ISU Psychology Dept.  
Ames, Iowa

Berles, Robert  
Dept. of Corrections  
Lansing, Michigan

Bostock, Charles  
Iowa State Penitentiary  
Ft. Madison, Iowa

Boyer, Ronald  
The Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa

Briggs, Thomas Capt.  
U. S. Disc. Barracks  
Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas

Clemmer, Donald  
American Correctional Assn.  
Dept. of Corrections  
Washington, D. C.

DeCoursey, C. T.  
Iowa State Penitentiary  
Ft. Madison, Iowa

Devine, W. P. Rev.  
Ia. Trng. Sch. for Boys  
Eldora, Iowa

Dory, Rex  
Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa

Emerson, Jim  
Freedom House, Inc.  
Kansas City, Kansas

Gorman, William  
The Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa

Hedgepeth, Paul  
Iowa State Penitentiary  
Ft. Madison, Iowa

Henderson, C. Murray  
Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa

Henry, Jim  
Iowa Board of Control  
Des Moines, Iowa

Hewitt, Lowell  
Iowa State Penitentiary  
Ft. Madison, Iowa

Hoy, James  
Ia. Trng. Sch. for Boys  
Eldora, Iowa

Jeffes, Glen  
Iowa State Penitentiary  
Ft. Madison, Iowa

Kocur, Phyllis  
Parole Supervisor  
State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa

Langerman, Phil  
Ia. Trng. Sch. for Boys  
Eldora, Iowa

Lunden, W. A.  
ISU - 204 East Hall  
Ames, Iowa

Moore, Roy  
U. S. Penitentiary  
Leavenworth, Kansas

Price, Carroll  
Board of Control  
Des Moines, Iowa



Randall, George W.  
Director of Prisons  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Reeves, Donald  
U. S. Disciplinary Barracks  
Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas

Riedel, Gary  
Asst. Director of Penal Instit.  
Topeka, Kansas

Roberts, Ralph  
The Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa

Shafer, David  
Ia. Trng. Sch. for Boys  
Eldora, Iowa

Travisono, Anthony  
Ia. Trng. Sch. for Boys  
Eldora, Iowa

Wathier, Orlyn  
The Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa



TWELFTH ANNUAL MIDWEST CORRECTIONAL CONFERENCE  
Iowa State University  
Memorial Union  
Ames, Iowa  
April 6, 7, 8, 1965

CONFERENCE THEME:  
Training Program for Correction Personnel

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

- 9:00 REGISTRATION - Entrance to Great Hall - Coffee and donuts
- 10:00 OPENING SESSION - Sunroom  
Presiding: Lowell Hewitt, Associate Warden, Iowa State Penitentiary, Fort Madison, Iowa
- Invocation: Rev. Edgar Meissner, Chaplain, Kansas State Penitentiary, Lansing, Kansas
- Welcome from University: Dr. Mervin S. Coover, Dean Emeritus of Engineering, Iowa State University
- Welcome from Iowa Corrections: Jim O. Henry, Chairman, Iowa Board of Control, Des Moines, Iowa
- 10:30 KEYNOTE ADDRESS:  
George W. Randall, Director of Prisons, Raleigh, North Carolina
- 11:30 CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS
- 11:45 ADJOURN FOR LUNCH - Through Cafeteria line
- 1:15 PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION  
Dr. John Bath, Professor, Psychology Department, Iowa State University
- 1:45 WORKSHOP GROUPS  
Workshop Goals - to determine the general and specific objectives for Federal and State Correctional Institutions for the specific type of training each group is concerned with.
- Orientation Training - Room 201
- Discussion Leader: Richard E. Ranard, Associate Warden, Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex, Lincoln Nebraska
- In Service Training - Room 206
- Discussion Leader: Donald L. Quatsoe, Associate Warden, Wisconsin Correctional Institute, Fox Lake, Wisconsin



Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training - Room 222

Discussion Leader: James Boorman, Director of Cottage Living  
Kettle Moraine Boys School, Plymouth, Wisconsin

Management and Supervision Training - Room 205

Discussion Leader: Gary L. Riedel, Assistant Director of Penal  
Institutions, Topeka, Kansas

3:15 GENERAL SESSION - Discussion Leaders Report

4:15 CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADJOURNMENT

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

8:45 GENERAL SESSION - Sunroom

Presiding: Anthony P. Travisono, Superintendent, Iowa Training  
School for Boys, Eldora, Iowa

Invocation: Rev. Cyril Engler, Chaplain, Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa

9:15 WORKSHOP GROUPS

Workshop Goals: To determine the best methods of  
training at the different levels for state and federal  
correctional institutions.

Orientation Training - Room 201

Discussion Leader: Lewis McCauley, Asst. Superintendent  
Wisconsin Home for Women, Taycheedah, Wisconsin

In Service Training - Room 206

Discussion Leader: Robert A. Berles, Supervisor of Training,  
Department of Corrections, Lansing, Michigan

Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training - Room 222

Discussion Leader: Phyllis Kocur, Parole Supervisor,  
Des Moines, Iowa

Management and Supervision - Room 205

Discussion Leader: Major Donald E. Reeves, Deputy Director  
of Prisoner Training, U. S. Disciplinary Barracks  
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

11:45 ADJOURN FOR LUNCH - Through Cafeteria Line

1:15 Jim Emerson, Executive Director, Freedom House, Inc., Kansas  
City, Kansas

1:45 WORKSHOP GROUPS - Same as Morning Session

2:45 GENERAL SESSION - Discussion Leaders Report



4:05 CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADJOURNMENT

Wednesday Evening, April 7, 1965

6:30 BANQUET - South Ballroom, Memorial Union

Toastmaster: Ralph Patterson, Director, Engineering Extension Service, Iowa State University

Invocation: Corrections Chaplain

Introduction of Speaker: Carroll Price, Board of Control, Des Moines, Iowa

Speaker: Donald Clemmer, President, American Correctional Association & Director, Department of Corrections, Washington, D.C.

Thursday, April 8, 1965

8:45 GENERAL SESSION - Sunroom

Presiding: C. Murray Henderson, Associate Warden for Treatment, Men's Reformatory, Anamosa, Iowa

Invocation: Rev. W. P. Devine, Chaplain, Iowa Training School for Boys, Eldora, Iowa

9:15 WORKSHOP GROUPS

Workshop Goals: To determine methods of evaluating present and future training programs at the different levels for state and federal correctional institutions.

Orientation Training - Room 201

Discussion Leader: Roy W. Moore, Associate Warden, U. S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas

In Service Training - Room 206

Discussion Leader: Capt. Thomas J. Briggs, Adjutant U. S. Disciplinary Barracks, Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas

Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training - Room 222

Discussion Leader: Rex G. Dory, Institutional Parole Agent, Men's Reformatory, Anamosa, Iowa

Management and Supervision - Room 205

Discussion Leader: William R. Howell, Training Coordinator, Wisconsin School for Boys, Wales, Wisconsin

10:30 GENERAL SESSION - Discussion Leaders Report

11:30 ADJOURNMENT.



Will serve as recorders:

Iowa State Penitentiary, Fort Madison, Iowa

Charles Bostuck	Glen Jeffes
C. T. DeCoursey	Paul Hedgepeth
Vail Welborn	

The Men's Reformatory, Anamosa, Iowa

Ronald Boyer	Ralph Roberts
William Gorman	Orlyn Wathier

Iowa Training School for Boys, Eldora, Iowa

James W. Hoy	David Shafer
Phil Langerman	



NORTH CAROLINA'S TRAINING PROGRAM

FOR

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

by

George W. Randall  
State of North Carolina  
Prison Department  
Raleigh, North Carolina

I was very pleased to receive an invitation from your Conference Director, Donald Hendricks, to participate in this Twelfth Annual Midwest Correctional Conference. I was pleased because acceptance would give me this opportunity to meet with some of the outstanding people in corrections, to learn from you, and to visit your great Iowa State University campus. I know I shall take home much useful information and many stimulating ideas. I hope I can pass something of value to you.

Mr. Hendricks indicated that you might be interested in North Carolina's training program for correctional officers. I will tell you something about our thinking and our efforts in this field.

First, I should explain that the North Carolina Prison System accepts all male offenders with sentences from 30 days to life, and all female offenders with sentences from 6 months to life. We have 12 prison institutions and 62 prison field units, holding a prison population of about 11,000, supervised by approximately 2500 employees.

What do we hope to accomplish by a training program for correctional officers? Obviously, we desire to increase their efficiency in the discharge of their duties. The primary duties of correctional officers are to protect the public and to rehabilitate the offender. Custody is given top priority for several reasons.

We receive inmates following a judicial determination that they must be removed from society for a period of time as a penalty for their misdeeds and to deter others from committing such acts. In addition to the punitive and deterrent objectives, the courts commit offenders to us to protect the public from further criminal conduct by them during the period of incarceration, and to provide opportunities for individualized corrective treatment. We are expected to motivate them to aspire to the better things of life, and to attempt to develop the skills and attitudes which will enable them to reach their greatest potential. Of course, corrective treatment cannot take place unless we hold the inmate for the period necessary to treat him. Therefore, a training program for correctional officers must provide them with the requisite skills for adequate custodial care of inmates, and at the same time provide them with what they need to become effective members of the correctional treatment team.

While I emphasize the importance of custody, my experience in North Carolina and what I have observed in other states convince me that most prisons are not deficient in custodial and security areas. However, most of us have been short on research and treatment. For some time we have been concerned about our deficiencies in these areas. As a consequence, we are seeing our institutions change from human warehouses of custodial care into centers of correctional treatment. To a lesser extent, but of not less importance, we are beginning to make arrangements for action, evaluative,



and basic research in corrections.

Correctional officers must be convinced that these developments are good for them as well as for the inmates. We must shape our training programs with a view to the fact that the importance of custodial and security measures can be impressed on correctional officers much more readily than we can convey correctional treatment and research concepts. We need to focus our attention specifically upon the importance of attitudes.

The American Safety Council, private foundations, and Federal and State organizations have spent vast sums of money and conducted extensive research projects trying to find ways and means to reduce the tragic loss of lives in highway accidents. Do you know what this research indicates is the greatest advantage for safety a motor vehicle operator may possess? One might suppose it to be quick reflexes, prime physical condition, a new car, or various other desirable assets. All of these are important, but the correct answer has been shown to be the proper attitude.

The paramount importance of proper attitude is not limited to the field of highway safety. If our personnel have this attribute, we can maximize our results, and to a large degree offset the limitations of deficiencies in other areas. Personnel with proper attitudes toward their work are the most potent factors among our resources for dealing effectively with the behavior of inmates. But assuming agreement on this point, we still have questions with which we must all come to grips. How do we get personnel with proper attitudes? And what about personnel already employed with many years of service? What type of correctional training will be effective and will produce personnel dedicated to the difficult task of trying to improve the thinking and behavior of offenders committed to us?

Joe Ragen speaks of the importance of attitudes in his book entitled Inside the World's Toughest Prison. When he first assumed the responsibility of a penitentiary warden, he was astonished at the wide variety of abilities exhibited by the individual officers. Some commanded the respect and obedience of the men in their charge with seemingly effortless ease, while others were able to obtain only an extremely low grade of discipline. Moreover, those whose charges were best behaved were the officers who submitted the least number of reports to the Disciplinarian. It seemed obvious that the inmates who conducted themselves most obediently would be the least likely to merit disciplinary action. By this reasoning, the inmates, rather than the officers, would be primarily responsible for the discipline maintained in any given group.

To test this reasoning, Warden Ragen worked with a situation involving two correctional officers - one assigned to a quarry and one in a textile factory. The inmates in the quarry were the tougher prisoners, yet they created very little disturbance under their correctional officer and very few offense reports were made. On the other hand, the correctional officer in the textile plant was literally flooding the Disciplinarian's office with offense reports. A shift in the officers was made and the situation reversed itself. What then was the peculiar faculty which enabled the officer to maintain such excellent order with either group of inmates? The answer according to Joe Ragen was leadership. The successful officer required only the power of his own personality to draw from his men a satisfactory type of behavior. He was a leader, a leader with the right attitude.

Since our objective is to influence constructively the attitudes and conduct of our wards, we can hardly hope to succeed with anything less than carefully selected, adequately trained, and dedicated personnel. Interactions and relationships between human beings are very important. In the prison setting, positive relationships between correctional officers



and inmates are more essential than cement and steel, fences, and guns, or any other element. Only when correctional officers truly believe this and are themselves committed wholeheartedly to improvement of offenders can prison administration accomplish its objectives. Therefore, investment in personnel must take top priority. Good buildings properly designed are fine, but capable correctional officers are far more important to the effectiveness of a prison. No amount of material apparatus can atone for the lack of them. Multimillion dollar brick and steel structures may serve as monuments to the fund-raising skills of particular administrators, but without the Divine, human quality of charity manifested in the daily dealings between prison personnel and prison inmates, the prison itself is nothing but a cage and probably will produce nothing but confirmed criminals.

There is no quick means of upgrading the qualities of our personnel. It can only come about by strict adherence to sound basic principles on recruitment, training, and promotion over a long period of time. On every occasion that we employ a person, we have an opportunity to upgrade our staff.

An evil to be avoided in any endeavor is the danger of stagnation. While we should try to reduce employee turnover in order to have stability and continuity, we must be constantly ready to combat Old Guard lethargy and resistance to change. There will always be a large number of prison employees who learned practices in past eras of penology which should be discarded in the light of new learning. This group must not be neglected in training plans and programs. They should have the opportunity to get in tune with the times. But the march of correctional progress should not be impeded by those who would stubbornly hang onto outworn concepts and hurtful practices.

In reading the Decisions of the Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections, I was impressed by the importance placed upon joint university-agency efforts as the most promising means of meeting our training needs. This conclusion of the Conference is in accord with what we have been doing in North Carolina for the past fourteen years. The Institute of Government of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has played a key role in developing the North Carolina Prison Department's personnel training programs. Mr. V. L. Bounds, an Assistant Director of the Institute of Government, has done outstanding work in the field of corrections for a number of years; and has been the guiding light in North Carolina's research and personnel training programs.

The first joint effort between the Institute of Government and the North Carolina Prison Department to provide needed training for prison personnel was a five-day course on prison management conducted in 1951. The course was repeated four times. A total of 200 supervisory officers of the North Carolina Prison System attended. It is perhaps worth mentioning that several officers resigned to avoid attendance. Training was a new and fearsome thing for our prison personnel fourteen years ago.

In the course of the continuing collaboration with the Institute of Government, a system was instituted for developing and keeping current written policies and procedures for the guidance of prison personnel. The essential features of the process have remained the same for more than a decade. This process takes advantage of the findings and opinions of the foremost correctional authorities and of the combined experience and judgment of the prison personnel directly concerned. Provisions finally approved by the governing authorities of the State Prison System are placed in the Prison Department Guidebook, looseleaf copies of which are available to personnel throughout the System.

The research and writing services of the Institute of Government are employed to prepare a tentative draft of Guidebook material. This material is distributed to key



personnel of the Prison System for critical study. Each official receiving the material meets with appropriate subordinates to discuss the proposed provisions and to elicit their ideas on the subject matter. An effort is made to give each employee an opportunity to express himself concerning Guidebook provisions covering his responsibilities.

After sufficient time has been allowed to permit careful scrutiny and full discussion of material issued in tentative form, a meeting is held attended by key prison officials and correctional specialists from the Institute of Government. At this meeting the fruits of the field discussions are gathered. Corrections in the tentative draft are made to reflect the best thinking of all concerned. The corrected draft is submitted to the Prison Commission for study. After making any corrections that they deem necessary, the Commission formally approves the proposals.

Approved policies and procedures are promulgated at a meeting of key personnel. Here any changes made in the tentative draft by the Prison Commission are explained. Officials receiving the new material are required to hold similar instructional sessions with their subordinates so as to assure that all employees affected are fully informed about and understand established policies and procedures.

The procedures adopted for the development of the Prison Department Guidebook were deliberately designed to provide an excellent type of in-service training for the participating prison personnel, and to provide the correctional specialists from the Institute of Government with an insight about the practical problems of prison administration. The Guidebook itself is an authoritative basic text and a source book for other training material.

Training of prison personnel by the Institute of Government has been chiefly limited to those with key managerial or supervisory positions. The first formal statewide program for lower level personnel was instituted in the spring of 1958. At that time the State Prison System was organized for each Division. In 1961 the personnel training was consolidated in three regional schools. In 1962 the regional schools were closed and we opened our Personnel Training Center at Sanford, North Carolina. Instead of building a new facility for our training center, we converted one of our prisons which had been closed as a result of our successful efforts to reduce the inmate population in our system. Cell blocks were converted into modern dormitories, and other buildings into classrooms and a gymnasium for instruction in self-defense and disarming tactics.

The existence of a Center dedicated to training of Prison Department officers has permitted a concentration of training activities and resources to a degree of utilization that would not otherwise be possible. The central location offers obvious advantages, and the nearness to Raleigh and Chapel Hill facilitates supplementing the regular training staff on permanent assignment with officials from Raleigh and faculty members from nearby colleges and universities. The Institute of Government provides vital support in the form of consultation on course planning and content, relevant research, instructional contributions requiring university-level competency, and the training and certification of instructors assigned permanently to the Personnel Training Center.

Permanent staff positions at the Center include a Superintendent, a Captain, two Lieutenants, six Sergeants, and a stenographer. The present Superintendent has a Master's Degree in Sociology and over ten years of experience with the North Carolina Prison Department. The line officers assigned to the Center reflect a selection, training, and testing process designed to assure competency, and to command the respect of their trainees.

The quality and range of the training programs conducted at the Center have steadily



improved. All newly employed correctional officers must successfully complete a three-week basic course there before they can qualify for permanent employment. Refresher courses are given to correctional officers periodically, highlighting the latest developments in treatment.

New employees other than correctional officers are given a one-week basic training course. We think it is important that our secretaries and clerks have a good understanding of the workings of the entire Prison System. When a clerk handles a report on an inmate, we want that clerk to realize that she is handling more than just a piece of paper, that she is dealing with a human being who in all probability has a wife, children, and loved ones somewhere. We want her to realize that what she is doing with that piece of paper is tremendously important to an inmate and to the taxpayers of North Carolina.

In addition to the regularly scheduled refresher courses and the basic courses for new personnel, specialized courses for particular personnel categories in particular subject matter areas are offered as needed.

We want our Maintenance and Construction and Prison Enterprise employees to be interested in custody, and we want our correctional officers to appreciate the contributions made by Maintenance and Construction and Enterprise personnel. We want all of our personnel to feel they are working together in a great team effort.

Few, if any, correctional systems have a sufficient number of professionally trained personnel to make an appreciable impact on the basic needs represented in the inmate population. It is recognized that we cannot make psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists, and social workers out of our correctional officers. Realistically, we also know that we will probably never have these specialists in sufficient numbers to meet inmate needs. We can, however, use our professionally trained personnel as instructors in our training program for correctional officers, and as consultants to whom those officers can turn as needed in carrying out their own duties. Thus, the impact of the professional is increased manyfold.

The basic course for correctional officers is designed to assure minimum acceptable competence in discharging responsibilities of safekeeping of inmates, maintenance of discipline and security, and the application of departmental policies on the rehabilitative treatment of inmates. It is also designed to increase the capacity of the trainees to sustain the stresses of prison work and their ability to appreciate its challenges. Among the objectives is the important one of promoting job satisfaction and recognition of prison employment as a desirable career service.

The content of the basic course for correctional officers includes such subjects as North Carolina prison history, responsibilities of prison personnel, first aid, custodial controls and security safeguards, supervising inmates, dealing with emergencies, rehabilitation programs, the needs of inmates requiring special treatment - the alcoholic, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and narcotic addict. Classroom training is supplemented by demonstration and practice.

Physical training is provided to serve two purposes: first, to weed out the physically unfit and, second, to teach techniques and develop skills in self-defense and disarming tactics. Trainees are also taught the proper procedures and safety



precautions to be followed in the care, carrying, and use of standard firearms and tear gas equipment. This instruction includes range work, as well as classroom lectures and demonstrations.

The basic course for prison employees other than correctional officers does not include self-defense and disarming tactics, or the care and use of firearms and tear gas equipment. However, they are oriented to the custodial frame of reference and to the objectives and techniques of inmate rehabilitation and treatment programs. Subject matter common to both courses cover the basics of administrative management and personnel practices in the Prison Department and the salient features of probation, work release, and parole operations in North Carolina.

Refresher courses serve to keep personnel current with changes in laws, regulations, policies, and procedures respecting prison operations. They also permit a broadening and deepening of understanding about human behavior and a sharpening of skills in the effective control and treatment of prison inmates. At appropriate levels, such subjects as research and planning, relations with the free community, and public speaking are introduced and expanded upon over a period of time.

Specialized instruction for select groups of trainees cover such matters as food management, plant maintenance, and training and use of bloodhounds and security dogs for prison service, and other technical aspects of prison operations.

A comparatively recent addition to the specialized curriculum offered at the Personnel Training Center is a course on the use of group techniques in prison work. This is where we use our limited number of professionally trained personnel to develop in our employees some knowledge in the areas of psychiatry, psychology, and sociology.

The Training Center rather than using traditional lecture methods provides structured discussion periods where new ideas and practical application of learning may be explored and crystalized. Administrative and supervisory staff and in-service training must be involved in a firm partnership of practice and education. This would be a simple relationship except for the fact that correctional work is a dynamic, developing profession. We have relatively little problem when we are teaching officers how to turn a key, guard an inmate, or carry on an administrative task. As correctional officers move into roles of professional treatment agents, in closer communication with inmates, the problem becomes compounded. The simple answer to this problem is to teach officers to look for closer supervision from their superiors and, correspondingly, to instruct and develop supervisory ability of higher echelon staff.

At times an eager and energetic officer runs amuck in this continuum of education and supervision. Sometimes our training system miscalculates, or our supervisor is not convinced in these "new fangled teachings." We must keep sensitive to the process and ready to take corrective action and improve our techniques.

To progress, we have to "scratch at our staff's consciences." Protecting the public through security measures is an easier task than providing for an inmate's emotional need, promoting his self-esteem, and helping him develop self-control. Recognition of the inmate's emotional needs and the destructive influences that old repressive measures make upon his personality are leverage points upon which real changes in practice can be made.

Correctional officers' relationships with inmates are basic to the rehabilitation of offenders. There are to my mind two cardinal abuses in a correctional system. One is the overuse of physical force. The other is indifference to inmates as people. We felt that staff had to move closer to inmates in positive, realistic ways - not in a wishy-washy,



ivory tower concept of permissive treatment, but because their influence as sound people is needed.

Psychiatrists say that people do not change without some anxiety coming to the surface. We had to arouse our staff. Some officers were shocked when they first learned of our ideas about officer-inmate relationships, but many supervisors with years of experience had already been practicing the most progressive techniques of communicating with inmates, under the table so to speak. They were sensitive, humane, and realistic. During the period of repression and force which characterized the old system, they used all measures of human relation techniques to solve and patch together many lives in the course of running a prison unit.

Society itself has changed from a period of set standards of behavior and relative simplicity to one of increased communication and conflicting values. Emphasis has to be placed upon developing an individual to the point where he can handle and understand his own feelings and attitudes in a complex, changing world. If we can believe in an inmate's self-improvement, we can also accept our own ability to change and take pride in it.

We set about to make full use of the talents of our professional staff trained in treatment. Our clinically-trained people teach in staff training sessions, dwelling on the personality patterns of individuals and describing their own clinic services. We have been fortunate in North Carolina in getting an additional sort of participation.

Our professionals helped us develop the potential of our staff through training, consultation, and support. In 1963 our Chief Social Worker introduced into our training sessions courses in counseling - not with emphasis upon techniques but through organizing role-playing among the supervisory staff. Our Psychiatrists and Psychologists taught courses in human development, with special emphasis on the importance of relationship. Over the past year and a half 100 of our staff members at all levels, in addition to our regular training courses, have attended week-long group workshops sponsored by our Chief Social Worker and in which most of our treatment staff participate. In these workshops are often individuals from all areas of inmate management and treatment. They concentrate on providing an intensive group experience aimed at challenging our staff to consider their attitude toward inmates in terms of their daily contact. Instead of a lot of formal education in group activities, they concentrate upon helping our staff examine their own group interaction and they learn confidence in how group activity can affect offenders through their own experience. Even if they do not lead groups, and I might add we have had only three out of all the people who have attended such workshops who did not desire to participate further with inmates as group leaders, they help them boil down to reality the fact that improved correctional treatment takes place in small measures and judgements exercised by the staff rather than in profound over all program changes.

Experiments with this type of training have encouraged us to adopt similar group practices within our other training sessions. Selected staff from these workshops under supervision of the Social Service Department began experimental groups last year. They worked closely with the institution heads and helped them understand and use this tool.

Some amazing things have happened as the staff developed in their understanding and ability to use themselves in treating inmates. An officer taught a mute inmate to speak. A unit for youthful felon offenders used group programs to give the staff a closer relationship with the inmates. These officers with new respect earned were moved into the dormitories with the inmates. This prison has changed from a problem unit where high-strung young men took out their anger on each other to a near model institution. The inmates were grateful. Their job performance and school grades improved. Segregation cells are rarely occupied. Four prisons are using such group programs and two more will soon



follow suit. All are putting into effect more humane methods to treat inmates.

We have made a special effort to stimulate our leaders who came up under the old school to incorporate new ideas and to provide better leadership. This is part of the practical education process of any system if ideas are going to be put into action. I mean the people who hold positions of power within the system. In our system they are dedicated career men but not usually academically trained. Slower to move and accept new ideas than the young stock, they cast a long shadow to keep the sum of idealism from blinding us.

When we first developed formal training at regional centers, these leaders served as instructors. They taught a sound, sturdy, but rather sterile philosophy of behavior to their staff with emphasis upon security. In 1963 we began to use professional staff from within our organization and from other sources as their instructors. We adopted the group method, concentrating on the inmate and his needs, challenging these Old Guard officers to test their theories and traditional practices. They were assigned an area of correctional practice to research and to present their opinions. They were invited, in addition, to analyze the experience and suggest improvements.

This year some of the chores of teaching were returned to these Old Guard officers. They are teaching with new conviction and insight into the need for teamwork and combined effort with the theme - A Partnership for Treatment and Custody.

Training is not only needed to support and handle the tasks of today, but like research is vital in keeping an organization moving ahead. Our correctional officers are encouraged to visit other institutions within the system and institutions in other states.

Our training programs, as well as inmate treatment and all other departmental programs, must be continually up-dated and invigorated. Once we let them become rigid, static, and merely repetitious, they quickly become ineffective. There must be new and challenging material and ideas. Furthermore, training programs must not be easy, either in academic or physical requirements. This is not to say that they should be unreasonably difficult. If we are to weed out the marginal applicants, this must be so. You cannot develop pride and "esprit de corps" if training is so simple that all pass.

Where do we get new material, new ideas, and concepts? There are many sources available to us such as programs of the Annual Congress of Corrections, research projects as reported by Dan Glaser in his book, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, and the writings of Dr. Maxwell Jones, the eminent Psychiatrist from Scotland who has done outstanding work in developing the therapeutic community approach for use in the field of corrections. Incidentally, Dr. Jones has spent some time with us in North Carolina acting as a consultant to help us establish an active research therapeutic community center.

I shall not return to North Carolina from this conference without some new information and some new ideas. We learn from each other. None of us has a monopoly on all correctional knowledge.

In North Carolina we have committed ourselves to the very best training program we can financially afford. Effective personnel training programs are costly. We decided that we must make a real investment in our personnel. Our training program is not everything that we would like it to be now, but we are making progress.

Each prison system will have its own peculiarities and problems. The manner in which our training program has been developed may not be appropriate in other systems. However, we believe that our program is basically sound. I invite and urge you to pass on to me any criticisms or ideas for improving it.



## Session 1 - Orientation Training

Our group met with an attendance of 13, and we experienced an initial difficulty, as I had anticipated, in defining orientation itself, but we quickly got into a rather lively discussion and I am most happy to say this that I am the winner of the thing. I recommend that at next year's convention everyone should be a discussion leader because you really learn. We build our discussion around what we thought was important for orientation training. We worked up a group of 20 questions but could have ended up with several hundred - to tell you the truth - we had to break it off. I would like to tell a story, which I have told and was borne out here again, almost perfectly, about Old Charlie the Box Knocker.\* "Old Charlie worked on the BURP Railroad and had just finished thirty years of faithful service. Charlie's employment record presented a picture of a Utopian employee. All of the good qualities were clearly visible though there was a single tragic adverse quality that could not be detected all through the 30 years of faithful service. He started as a young man, learned the procedures quickly, never missed a single day in all of the years of his employment, come rain, snow, strom or sunshine. He was a legendary figure, as reliable as the sunrise. Railroad engineers knew him from coast to coast. A modern comptometer would be sorely taxed to compute the total of the boxes he had faithfully knocked as each train glided into the station to which Charlie was assigned. Some trains were short with only a few cars, others were a mile long with nearly 100 cars, sometimes more; but without exceptions, Charlie knocked the box of each wheel of each car, never missing a one of a single train all through 30 years. Sometimes he had sprint after the last few cars moving out in order to complete this marvelous record.

Charlie was loyal, active in community affairs and extremely valuable employee but alas, policy at BURP Railroad ordained his final retirement. He was just too old to continue, so, a gala celebration was secretly planned for his retirement. It was decided to present Old Charlie with a gold watch, and the president of BURP drove to Fuddelsville for the occasion, the big night arrived, all the BURP employees and all of the local dignitaries attended the ceremonial banquet. Finally, after hours of revelry, the president of BURP rapped for order with his gavel, a hush fell over the crowd, Mr. Burp asked Charlie to step forward. Old Charlie, bent with years of box knocking, shuffled forward, whisking a wistful tear from his eyes as he did so. The president of BURP began his presentation speech, dangling the solid gold engraved watch which was a gift to Charlie to commerate his 30 years of service before him "For Distinguished, unequalled, loyal and unfailing service as you performed your duties." What did you say you did, Charlie? Box knocking for BURP over a period of 30 years. May I express the railroad's thanks along with this gift and pension. Old Charlie proudly accepted the watch and was assisted back to his seat. The president of BURP waited until the crowd had thinned, and then, perplexed, he again informally approached old Charlie who still remained seated fondly gazing at his gold watch. "Charlie my boy," said the president, "I am a bit puzzled. You see, I work in the office and don't know everything about a railroad, but just what does a box knocker do."

Charlie said, "Well everybody knows that he has to knock the box of every train that comes through the station, got to do it," he said. "I haven't missed a train."

He said, "Well why?"

Charlie scratched his head, "Darned if I know, nobody every told me."

And, if you think that is odd in our own institution to the embarrassment of the security people. I made a test with the inmate orderly assigned to me to see if we had any box knockers (this was several years ago) and I found one quite easily. I decided to send a close custody inmate through turnkey and into the warden's office and back again. I gave him phenylbarbital pills with specific instructions to absolutely show



them to the turnkey guard, who is at the sensitive, critical point. This inmate, who I will not name, has since been released, made the trip, forged his pass, got into the warden's office, delivered an empty envelope, returned, bent over the turnkey's desk and two phenylbarbital pills fell out. By prearrangement, the inmate said, "Oh, oh, there goes my eye pills." One pill fell on the floor, the guard said, "Golly we don't want anything to happen to your eyes, do we?" He reached down and gave them back to him and my boy returned. So, do we have box knockers in our organizations? They are in any organization or any institution, those who faithfully perform a function not knowing at all why they do it. During our discussion, which revolved around 22 questions, we got a variety of information. I think to avoid infringing on the time of the next person, I should reduce to printing and make available the results of our committee meeting to anyone who may wish to write to Nebraska Penitentiary for the results, if that is permissible.

I will take it upon myself to mimeograph the results, summarize and expand, and you may make what you will of it. Thank you.

\* Source - anonymous



Notes Taken During Group Discussion  
SESSION I. ORIENTATION TRAINING

Orientation is to determine one's position with relation to environment or to some particular person, thing, principle and so forth. This may seem to be a rather elementary statement presumably known to all, but it is surprising how often the importance of this meaning is ignored in the area of Supervisory Human Relations. This failure to recognize or to consider the many areas of orientation need is without a doubt one of the major causes of poor job performance, high employee turnover rate and even failure of many enterprises.

Though there are a multitude of precise definitions for areas in which need for orientation is absolutely essential to proper job performance, we as penal supervisors need not become total experts in the diagnostic process to bring about dramatic improved results. Sufficient as a start is the development of the ability to introduce an employee to his entire scope of responsibility without initially probing into the many psychological factors of orientation which will eventually determine the employee's degree of success at job growth. (However it should be borne in mind that it is entirely possible to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy whether a particular employee will be able to fill a particular position if one wishes to use the science of proper job orientation to it's fullest.) This only refers to the portion of the original definition of the word: "to determine one's position with relation to environment" or stated more plainly: to pre-determine by proper evaluation of an employee's reactions during his initial confrontation with his assignment exactly how far he is likely to progress.

As an ultimate goal, full and complete utilization of the science of employee orientation is certainly a desirable goal--but the greater immediate need among smaller state institutions seems to be one of bringing to a halt just as speedily as possible the tremendous rate of employee turnover.

Let us cast aside for the moment all of the usual excuses we use for this ridiculous rate such as low pay, poor working conditions and so on. These are invalid excuses and the subject of much debate. Let us accept the truth that pay rates are in fact secondary on most jobs. This becomes an issue usually only at the time an employee separates--or have you ever heard of an employee quitting because of low pay before he was hired? I think not for an employee has most often weighed the pay factor even prior to his application. He was attracted--and subsequently disillusioned by other factors connected with the job which brings him to the decision to separate. This may also be simply stated thusly: He found certain things to his dislike only after encountering them on the job.

What are the things that cause these quits or disgruntled labor forces? They are factors of environment which either were not revealed to the employee properly in the beginning or which were discovered the hard way in an unpleasant manner.

It would seem therefore that to get the best out of a limited session such as this we should concentrate on such objectives as follows:

1. What means do we use to attract employees? Are they designed just to attract sufficient numbers of applicants--or the right ones perhaps in lesser numbers?
2. Do we over-sell the job available? Do we under-rate the job? Which is better?



3. Do we explain in detail all of the apparent unpleasant aspects of the job?
4. Do we mislead or bait employees to gain their services?
5. Do we thoroughly explain job procedures?
6. Do we check or test their understanding of job procedures?
7. Do we re-check periodically?
8. Do we allow sufficient time for an employee to study his duties?
9. Do we invite and solicit his questions?
10. Do we explain inter-departmental relationships and the need for cooperation?
11. Do we make supervisory sources available for questions and guidance?
12. Do we utilize the basic concept of job orientation: Explanation, Illustration and Performance?
13. Do we exhibit sufficient tolerance with new employees?
14. Do we strive to develop versatile employees? (Do we fail by specializing?)
15. Do we provide sufficient safe-guard or double-check upon new employee's performance?
16. Do we re-orient older employees as conditions change?
17. Do we attempt to orient ourselves properly with relationship to employees? i.e.: Know their problems, habits, strength and weaknesses, recognize changes for better or worse within them, etc.?
18. Do we introduce them into a normal desired environment? -- or a "mess" or chaotic condition?
19. Are we qualified to orient? Should we ask others to assist?
20. Do we really know what we are talking about in job and area explanation?

## Part II.

### OBJECTIVES OF WORK-SHOP ON EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION

Tuesday, April 6, 1:30 p.m., 1965

The general assembly disbanded from the main hall and formed into smaller separate work-shop or discussion groups. Attendance was optional for members each having a choice of which work-shop to attend. Approximately fifteen or twenty attended the Orientation Workshop. This approximated one-fifth of the total attending all workshops as several elected to attend none at all.



As the work-shop convened lively interest became almost immediately apparent. The skeleton outline of possible questions proved very useful in holding spontaneous discussions to the subject of objective. One or more of these were injected from time to time to divert discussion back to the area of object. For the most part little group leader effort was required except to limit time for each person now and then. To preclude a hodge-podge of spontaneous babble, it was decided by Group Leader to institution at the very beginning a form of minimal preliminary procedure. This required recognition by the "chair" or group leader as signified by members raised hands. More than half the members thus had an opportunity to express themselves during the very short period allotted for group discussion.

Group Comments with little clarification are as follows in condensed form.

Wisconsin uses a committee system of employee applicant interview. This consists of oral interviews, background investigation as to character and experience and/or qualifications - A state civil service exam.

Many states and institutions maintain an applicant "bank" or file of eligible persons upon which to call immediately in the event of need.

State employment offices are used generally with few finding it necessary to advertise otherwise though this is approved by most if necessary.

Most institutions attempt to use or solicit local person for employment.

Final selection of a prospective employee is accomplished by referral of the top ranking three applications for selection by the institution head. Most prominent qualifications seem to be Appearance, Conversational character tip-offs, attitude of applicant towards merits of type of custody or treatment involved and experience. Academic background was deemed most desirable but secondary for most employers. Applications are kept in active "call" file for three months after which time an applicant must re-file.

High employee turn-over seemed a general problem but in many instances this was found to be partly due to separations for similar positions at greater salary or promotion.

Dramatic turnover reduction seems evident where civil service used 10% or less as compared to 50% and even 100% elsewhere. A probationary system seemed generally prevalent usually three to six months in length. An annual employee rating system seemed generally in vogue and deemed highly desirable. Some institutions required that a copy of this annual review signed by the employee be presented prior to any possible consideration for salary increase.

Most institutions wished to obtain persons who were career minded, not job minded. The problem of industrial production versus inmate treatment seemed sporadically prevalent. Most felt that treatment should be considered first even at a loss in some instances. This indicates a need for Journeyman shop supervisors highly skilled also in Human Relations and teaching methods.

Educational programs often over-emphasize academic phases rather than practical vocational phase at level of inmates capacity to attain.

Newer employees should always work with departing employee if desirable and possible - never alone without experienced assistance. In-service programs are very valuable but not at all fully utilized. Salaries are generally considered



as secondary attraction feature for prospective applicants. Dedication to a job or policy usually develops or increases after employment and is frequently not apparent initially.

A fair wage or salary cannot and is not measured in terms of dollars but in terms of comparison to local conditions and living costs. It should be proportionately adequate.

Exit interviews with departing employees are deemed highly desirable and essential as improvement tools for employee development programs. They give indications or areas or factors needing attention. Rotation of employees even upon inter-departmental plan is deemed very helpful in bringing about complete job knowledge and need for inter-departmental cooperation. Inter-Departmental communications presented problems in some degree for most institutions represented.

Nearly all agreed that there were weaknesses in job explanation procedures for new employees. All agreed that there was great need for full and complete explanation of both job and related responsibilities. Along with this there should be an explanation or discussion regarding promotions or preparation for other positions and what efforts are desired and expected of an employee to develop job growth.

Some institutions agreed that perhaps many jobs were unintentionally glamorized in discussions with new employees by omission of some routine or actual unpleasant facets. A guided tour or inspection of the institution was suggested as one possible corrective action for this.

Most institutions practice an actual training period prior to job performance rather than starting with in-service training; this included all types of employees, clerical, uniformed or otherwise. This training period varies widely however among institutions, some having none, others only a few hours, still others several weeks. Necessity of this period was unanimously deemed most desirable in any degree where possible.

Interdepartmental communications were found to be an ubiquitous problem. Causes ranged from lack of recognition of need to actual open rivalry or opposition between integral units of institutions.

Corrective procedures seem to be interchanging of employees between departments where possible and total policy information orientation of all employees and equitable treatment in uniform manner concerning supervision and fringe benefits. This problem should be looked for even though no visible signs are apparent since it often exists silently as a factor in employee morale.

Personal interest in personal problems of employees can often result in salvage of an employee who is on the decline.

Progressive disciplinary lay-offs are deemed more desirable than Summary Termination in most cases of need.

Many times a failure in one area can be an asset in another for the very reason which causes initial unsuitability. An example given was unduly suspicious typist who made an excellent pass-clerk.

The three most informative questions that can be asked by an employer are:

1. Why do you wish to work here?



2. Are you qualified to work here?

3. Can you afford to work here?

Proper analysis of the answers to these can dramatically reduce future employee problems.

Work-shop adjourned for report to General Assembly.



## Session I - In-Service Training

I wish I had thought of such a clever way of getting out of summarizing the observations of the group. What we did, in the limited time available, was try to define "in-service training" for purposes of discussion. With some consensus of opinion, it amounted to, that training which is given above and beyond after the orientation or basic training given to new officers and that training which is continuous-- continuous either throughout the year or on an on-going basis from year to year. We tried to develop some general objectives and goals that in-service training could lead to. I feel personally, I think, in some of the observations that were made that this was implied, that this matter of in-service training was one of the more difficult ones to assess, to develop and, frankly, to get excited about. With your orientation training as a rule where we formalize operation and some agreed in our group that with the in-service training it tends, at times, to become more of a chore than an exhilarating experience. Some of the goals we thought though generally could be to improve capabilities of personnel for participation in not only the custody, but also the classification, the treatment aspects of the institution as suggested this morning. To improve the quantity of the work an officer might do to broaden his own personal worth and certainly his value to the institution. Another general goal was to improve the quality and effectiveness of an officer in his more routine, on-going daily assignments that he has. Another goal that was felt desirable was to prepare, through in-service training, the custody staff for not only a greater job satisfaction, but also a broader career service to help him, frankly, to become promoted, to make him not only eligible as is the requirement in some states, but also to further the likelihood of his getting promoted as reduced numbers of supervisory and sometimes administrative jobs open up. Not only did this, we felt, improve the custodial officers morale, but in the long run, develop to a smooth divisional or institutional arrangement with its personnel and it was felt to be significant enough to be a definite part of in-service training objectives.

Among the more specific training goals leading to these broader goals, was suggested that in-service training could create interest within the employee in his work; that it could also present the best methods of performing all of his duties; that it would develop in the long run a more efficient operation in the institution; that it could prepare a man for emergency situations. It was interesting, I felt personally, in our group that a considerable amount of time was devoted to this emergency training. The amount of time that should be spent with it and the need for emergency training in the institutions many of these people in our group felt that self-defense methods, physical training, first aid; things of this sort were very vital in any training program and should be supported by the administration through their in-service training. In no way did this limit or detract from the observation made this morning that we should be spending more and more of our time hoping to change attitudes and instill philosophies, etc., but that I think what the group was implying was that these two things can go side by side, that they can proceed equally in any in-service training program.

We spoke briefly of some of the objectives within an in-service training program. Not only those objectives that the program should seek in the long run, but also in designing and constructing an in-service training program. As our time terminated, the matter of pertinent material again was brought out as being a very definite objective should be sought in in-service training. There should be something meaty and worthwhile to retain the interest of those who are attending the program that the instructors should be qualified when they are selected for this program and that people should not be chosen just because they are readily available or work cheap or whatever it might be. In designing the program itself, these factors should be brought into focus. We got into, to some extent, perhaps off the subject to a degree this matter of interdepartmental relationships, the necessity for good



relationships between not only major departments but also the personnel representing the departments and the more I think the group thought of it the more they were able to draw on their personal experiences back home. It is connected to in-service training in the sense that one thing the whole group hoped would happen is that through the lectures or whatever other methods was decided that there would be this better communication, this development of understanding, togetherness, if you will, this ability to see as spelled out this morning that no one person, no one department, no one agency is going to get this job done by itself. This is a group effort and the more we can spend time moaning about each others problems and approaches, the better the institution is going to function. There was a tendency in our particular group to want to get into the methods of handling in-service training. We could have sat there all afternoon, of course, and put together some rather vague, idealistic goals and objectives, which any of us, I am sure, could sit down and draw up on paper what sounds like the best in-service training schedule you would ever want to see. As a matter of fact, I suspect all of us back home have just such a schedule drawn up. The problem, of course, is trying to realistically, honestly implement all of these grandiose ideas, that we suggest. The tendency to try to get into these methods suggested to me at least that tomorrow's session where you get down to some of the nuts and bolts of this, where you start answering such questions as where you find the time to do these things, or who's paying for it, how do you generate all of this enthusiasm, what limitations do the unions put on you, what limitation does Civil Service put on you; these types of things are where the real meat of the session is going to come. It was suggested, as a matter of interest, and to spell out the fact that we shouldn't be too disheartened at some of the problems we face back home. It was mentioned by someone that their training is provided on the average of one hour per week and how was this done? Well, the man is assigned to work only 39 hours per week and the 40th hour is for training. How is this financed? Among other things, they saved enough on toilet tissue and related articles and then didn't give the money back to the state; they kept this and financed some of their training programs. Suggesting, I think, that there are solutions unique as that one might be, that all of us should be able to benefit from tomorrow. Thank you.



## Session I. - Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training

We talked about use of your non-uniformed personnel. It was brought out that over the past years has been a conflict of rehabilitation of the offender and society's desire for a pound of flesh this has been in a constant state of flux. Advances have been made but they have not been made in great steps not are they ever very far away from the threat of possible regression. The belief that society protection is through the rehabilitation of the offender meets the needs of both. This is the essence of which our group operated under. Now ever increasing is the belief that each member of an institutions staff has a distinct and impression effect upon every incarcerated person with whom he has contact.

Out discussion leader then presented a major hypothesis which he seemed to feel was this: that all institutional personnel should be oriented to and involved in helping training those committed to care. If such is the case, then training is at the heart of the motivating quality that produces an effective employee. The only way the trainee can attain a true perspective is by recognition from those administratively responsible for the program and its implementation.

Too many feel just like Topsy that it will just grow; well, this is not true. I think we all agreed that everyone in an institution is, in some way, involved in treatment. Various individuals representing different institutions presented some of the possibilities. I know in Iowa, some of the areas dealing here possibly along the in-service training line programs concentrated on getting along with your fellow employee's philosophy of corrections, public relations within a community relating to your institution. This involves more than just working with inmates. Again, also, personnel within an institution setting is more like a family situation in that each department must understand and be aware of the problems, in not only his department, but also other departments in which he comes in contact with.

We also talked about whether or not institutions do teach work habits, work skills. The consensus was, of course, that inmates must be taught work habits before you can teach him a vocation and of course, the question is that, is an institution a good place to teach work skills and work habits? This, of course, I think depends on the institution. Over population within an institution might present some unpopular situations for teaching good work habits. Other programs in which this might bring about a better orientation of your personnel - I think in Kansas they brought in people from the University Teacher Training Institutions to help their vocational instructors in teaching techniques and teaching skills. I think also along this line, again, that treatment does include all personnel. I think the important thing though that we have to realize is that the individual, no matter what type of treatment he is doing, must realize what his own limitations are. I think a real value along this line also with treatments aspects is allowing these people to see beyond their own job, their own little area, their own little bailiwick. This is essentially what I had.

I think the important thing for us to teach now as we brought up during the discussion that some institutions have difficulty between their so-called treatment people, the psychiatrists and the psychologists and the maintenance people, the counselor and the guards, but the discussion also established that when there was a working relationship between the professionals and the psychological and psychiatric areas and the other people so that each knew their limitations in regard to what degree of treatment was possible by each unit. For example, it was brought out that the professional person, the psychiatrist, would handle the therapeutic cases, those with deeply emotional problems, whereas the maintenance man as supporting person, as a person wanting to help other persons, can do a tremendous job in that area. I think this is probably the major discussion point at least in the latter stages. Thank you.



## Session I - Management and Supervision

"I hope that I am going to accurately report what the group decided on. When the coffee and doughnuts arrived, we may have taken advantage of the group by not drinking coffee and eating doughnuts and expounding what we thought very quickly and getting it down in notes. In deciding what we were going to talk about, we had no advanced preparation. I didn't bring any questions or prepare anything. I think we settled on two objectives which were already set down for us.

One was that the workshop goals today were to determine general and specific objectives for federal and state correctional institutions for the specific type of training each group is concerned with. The specific type of training our group was concerned with was management and supervision training. There was a somewhat lively discussion about what this meant. I think we decided on that we were talking about the training which a specific group of individuals within an organizational unit would be involved with. The group we were talking about were management and supervision people, i.e. , those people in your organization that make up management and supervision.

One of the distinctions we made was management and supervision people and their training versus these other three types of training which the other groups discussed: orientation training, in-service training, and non-uniform personnel special training. We decided we would not feel guilty about talking in a few generalities because we felt it was rather dictated here that we were to be talking about generalities more than specifics because when you get into specifics you are talking about specific skill training which we weren't talking about. So -- we decided that management and supervision training, top supervisors that is, their training would consist of training them to do a better job of management and supervision. We decided this is the type of training that was universal training. As an example, one of the analogies that was fairly well accepted among the group was that if you have a major industrial plant near the institution, or a major corporation like IBM and if they have a management and supervision program, that if they would be willing to let your management and supervision people attend their M & S training program., you don't need one. Because people like human relations, communications, general personnel policies, etc. A side product of this type of training of these people would be the fact that this group when they are all together getting this general training and general orientation, is where a lot of policies are going to be formed in the organization and your philosophy for the other training. This, then, is going to become a goal of that training for M & S personnel. You are going to have another goal there besides making them better managers and supervisors. You are going to have a goal of collective thinking which is going to result in improved policy for the others under them.

We got into a little bit of hassel about where do you draw the line on who's the top supervisor. I hope that we agreed this would be up to each organization. You know your organizational charts, you know when a man is a top supervisor and when he is just a supervisor. We could carry it on down to where a man who supervises the inmate cutting grass. He is supervising someone. This is not what we are talking about. We are talking about supervision and the top supervisor; the man who is right under management. We did not decide whether to include box knockers or not. I think that this is as specific as we got. This is just a result of what we talked about today. We did not get a real good start on it until 20 minutes after we met. It took us that long to get settled down to business.

One comment that I think happened in this group; we did have some trouble deciding where we were going and what we were trying to do, but one area I thought



came out with the need for communications and this is basic what in-service training is and training is in general is how do we communicate from the top all the way down. In our group, being concerned with management, someone spoke of starting at the top - this being the control group.- in the State of Iowa, the Board of Control, in other states, the social welfare agency, etc. But how do we communicate, involving management, starting with the controlling group in the state and between this group and the director of corrections or whatever the title might be - the superintendents, wardens, and then the directors of departments within a particular institution. I felt this in-service training or training in this area might be discussed as part of our group being at the management level. I felt that we were trying to set up the goals and objectives of the in-service training program and the training programs in general. But, I feel it all revolves around communications; how do you best communicate and what would we suggest as the methods of communications to promote and continue the kind of program and the philosophy of that department.

Another thought came up - how far do we go in the direction of using the group approach in solving and determining policy.



## THE VITALITY OF STAFF TRAINING

by

Anthony P. Travisono, ACSW  
Iowa Training School for Boys  
Eldora, Iowa

If we all stop for just one moment to try to examine the impact that the attainment of an education has had since World War II and more recently since the late fifties we can see that the anxiety level of the whole country has raised considerably. Everyone, everywhere is calling for more and more trained staff. Regardless of what field we look at, there appears to be a dearth of the right kind of staffs available. It is frightening to take a look at what is happening today and it is particularly so when we look at our own field.

We have continued to talk over communications and training during this conference for the past several years because we know of its importance and certainly communications can not come within training. We have consistently seen a dramatic shortage of qualified teachers, vocational instructors, caseworkers, psychologist, group workers, recreation leaders and psychiatrists. We need only to read the professional journals to see how many are needed. I also remember one Speaker last year saying that these kinds of disciplines are here to stay and custodial staff must learn to give a little after having complete say for one hundred years or so. We need only to listen to ourselves when we attend these conferences on how many administrators are recruiting and perhaps are attending for that purpose foremost. It appears to be almost an impossibility to attract qualified staff to our correctional complexes regardless of how attractive we can be because as long as there are severe shortages and we have not interested enough persons to try corrections, states play checkers with one another and staff goes from state to state. Each one offers a little more salary or fringe benefit to us and administrators cannot plan from week to week upon which members of his staff has had it for one reason or another and wants to try some place else. Part of this major problem has to come home to roost with us who have anything to do with policy and programming. It is because we have not permanently built into our system a feeling of togetherness that other major industries have. It is a staff that is completely working together for the benefit of the inmate or student ultimately for societies concern and his return. Institutions and correctional systems can no longer be classified as part of government where vested interests are seen to be of paramount importance.

The custodial force, cottage parents, instructors, business offices, the clinic staff and all the other kinds of staff needed to run a decent program in this day and age must be made to work together. If we want the support of the public then we can't afford to wait until someone retires before we can put into practice that which we know is correct and can work. The day of the small pocket operation and the day of one man rule is about to end. We can't afford it any longer.

Training must include the total concept of the team approach. It appears that this concept is valid to our kind of operation. Without it, it doesn't appear that we can give a real sense of value and worth to a well developed employee. The low man on the totem pole must have a sense of being worthwhile and that his opinion is worth listening to in a formalized manner. He should be worth more than the brawn it takes to hold up the rest of the institution. We must build into our programs, the kind of spirit that will give a sense of prestige, dignity, pride and loyalty to himself and the system and above all the eventual care and treatment of the inmate. If and when we ask ourselves what this really means, we don't have to think very far beyond the question of how much dignity and prestige do we give a custodial officer whose sole responsibility is walking a range or having tower duty and is told not to get involved with the inmates because that's the counselors duty and they don't like it. Or about the cottage parents whom we have asked not to get to close to any kid because its bad for the group and after all they are really not qualified to counsel. It appears very evident that each of us in industry of ours must



take a look at our value system and begin a planned up-grading process at all levels and to begin to trust staff at least as much as we do inmates. In a recent survey of employees in the largest manufacturing plants in the U. S. it was learned that the number one wish of the majority of the employees was not money, was not working conditions, was not fringe benefits, but was a sincere desire to be appreciated for the job they perform. Each one strives on this kind of appreciation and love if you wish to call it that. It is a basic ingredient of any staff training program and institutional concept. How can a tower guard get this feeling when the only time he can show his stuff is at the time of a break. He has no contact with anyone and his total job is watching and waiting. We must think of new ways to cover this important assignment so no one man's job any given day is devoted to this routine entirely. As we tend to upgrade the line positions from the bottom we will eventually see a new look of appreciation and a mutual respect for other kinds of needed jobs.

When we are able to have top administrators and boards feel that this kind of system change is necessary and they are willing to fight for it then I believe we can hire good staff and begin training those we presently have who are willing to do assignments because they believe and understand in them rather than because they were told to do so. Staff training gives meaning to all phases of one's daily experience. Just as one person is trained to be a nurse or a technician and so must eventually our total custodial cottage parent staff be trained. Ideally the bulk of the core training should take place prior to assignment but I don't believe we have arrived at this kind of training yet. It is too bad we haven't!

Some people still don't feel training is necessary because we really don't teach what is pertinent or required for the job. I have heard the comment, "The front office wants to make us all head shrinkers, who needs it!" It is this kind of comment that good training programs tend to eliminate. These comments should be faced squarely and explored. Certainly each training program must provide within its framework a basic understanding of human behavior, medicine, psychological concepts and the role and value of the various professional disciplines needed to run an institution. It also must have as its focus the information an employee really needs to know when he is functioning in his office, shop, range, tower or cottage. He wants to know the why and the how and any program that attempts to do this solely through classwork, films or traditional teaching methods will not get the job done. It must come through an on-going supervisory relationship through the use of conferences, meetings, demonstrations, etc. This kind of training program prepares us to face the day to day crisis that are a part of our business. We thrive on them, we expect them and through a good training program the frequency of them can be lessened.

Training means that we can provide staff with an escape valve for criticism and helpful suggestions. It might mean that helpful suggestions regarding the various abilities of particular staff could be discussed in a positive manner in a seminar. Perhaps instead of the custodial force or cottage parent staff being considered ill-trained and slovenly, and as our kids would say "wasted", and the custodial cottage parent staff saying that the so-called professionals are stupid and are being conned every day by inmates who really know more than they do, they both together could gain an appreciation of the others role and try to live as team members within the same goal. We don't think it necessary for custodial officers or supervisors to be caseworkers or psychologists nor vice versa, however, we should expect and demand that staff share a professional orientation that all positions are important and wholesome to a sound program.

When all staff behavior can be turned away from personal desire to that of the immediate necessities of the inmate with a view toward long range programming than staff training is proving its worth. This is as valid for non-clinical staff as it is for clinical staff. This attitude is displayed when a custodial officer or a teacher can act in a professional manner when he thinks about how he can help a boy or a man get over a



fit of rage or aggression rather than expressing his own anger simply to satisfy himself. Then it is evident that what we should be looking for is a significant knowledge about our own job and a mutual understanding of each others job.

To accomplish this the following basic points should be given a great deal of consideration:

1. All employees must have a starting place and it should be with what is familiar to them and what they have as an immediate concern.
2. Employees, regardless at what level, should be given the freedom to question rules and regulations. The day when an answer to a question is "Because I said so" or "because we have always done it this way" or "Don't rock the boat" or even, "I don't like it either but we have no choice," should be over with in modern correctional staff relationships.
3. Administrations should allow staff some flexibility in experimenting with new ideas. Many new and useful tools and methods of approach can be extremely valuable if tried on a limited scale.
4. Staff should have the feeling that they can criticize without any retribution planned for them. Many of the best ideas and concepts can come from front line staff. Administrators aren't the only persons who can think.
5. In order to encourage this kind of staff participation administration must also give the benefit of attitude and feeling that staff can grow and become inmate oriented and cast aside a defeatist point of view.
6. Staff also must have the knowledge that administration is fighting for better standards of salaries, working conditions and that our jobs are important. When we examine the job bulletins and only recently noticed an ad for a warden for one of our neighboring states stating a salary of between 661-885 monthly plus housing, we can't say that a climate of progressive salary structure prevails in all of our states. No one has successfully demonstrated that any thing can rehabilitate inmates except people who are concerned. Brick and mortar does no good without good people. Salaries do reflect our concern and in many instances our concern is not very great.
7. Staff training should be on company time if it is to have the status we wish it to have. In any given 40 hour work week each staff member including all levels should have a minimum of two hours devoted to a broad approach in their job. It must be built into the program with a healthy atmosphere. There are many methods to impart and share knowledge and I would like to list some that can be attempted.

A. With the approval of Warden and Superintendent necessary:

1. Regular staff meetings at all levels. From top to the bottom.
2. Supervision - on going and regular from unit heads to staff members, etc.
3. Seminars and lectures
4. Conferences regarding specific problems
5. Team meetings
6. Individually prescribed readings.
7. Guest lectures and institutes on various specific subjects.
8. Use of manuals.
9. Case discussions for problems solving process
10. Use of professional journals.
11. Films and slides and other visual aides.



12. Staff writings
  13. Participation in professional organization
- B. The Central Administrative body can help to upgrade staff by arranging for the following types of training programs.
1. Use of training centers set up under Public Law 87,274 (Center for Study of Crime and Delinquency at Southern University in Carbondale, Illinois).
  2. Short courses at various colleges and universities.
  3. Use of paid consultants.
  4. Inter-agency meetings, allowing for the exchange of ideas, concepts.
  5. Statewide joint planning.
  6. Exchange of personnel to break traditional staffing problems and for a greater view of the total field.
  7. Use performance ratings which are openly discussed, read and signed by unit supervision and employer.
  8. Pay incentives for training beyond required for job.
  9. Paid educational leave for employees who want further training and who really want to upgrade themselves.
  10. Use of the facilities as a training site.
  11. Use of volunteers to supplement paid staff.
  12. Use of research to prove out what we are doing.
  13. A positive public relation program providing for tours, speeches, lectures, given by staff at all levels, not just the top level staff.
  14. Attendance at interstate conference much more liberally than is allowed today.

In conclusion, it may appear to all of us who are in this Business that planned change is a serious business which we must face squarely or be called upon to answer for in the near future. The public has a right to know what we are doing to meet the needs of the increased crime and delinquency rates throughout our country. They also have the obligation to listen to us in our quest to improve our services.

Cybernation or the computer world has not yet begun to reach us but we know it will come soon. How many of us are researching and exploring the use of the dynamic scientific changes that can be made in our institutions. How many of us have asked to try to use closed circuit television beyond the front entrance. It is feasible on the ranges or in the cottages. How about computers and the use of IBM type of information for case records. What have we transposed from the knowledge of our space program regarding men and animals being coped up for long periods of time. What does this do to our bodies. Have we explored the full use of psychiatric medications and their potential for allowing an inmate to be in reasonable control of his destiny. What have we learned about huge institutions and the literature saying that the smaller the institution the less the returnee rate, the larger the institution the higher percentage of return.

It behoves all of us regardless at what level we are to search out and create a new society of corrections that maintains the dignity of the staff and the inmate to fit into the evolving pattern of the New Great Society that is emerging.



## Session II - Orientation Training

Actual recording for our session and our particular session was involved in determining the best methods of orientation training at different levels for state and federal correctional institutions. I am going to review a little bit of yesterday's program where we were talking about purposes because we feel that this is important in determining what methods we should use. We feel that in this orientation training, it is a very, very important foundation for creating career opportunities. We do not like to believe that this is just getting some one ready to take a job, that it should be a career opportunity and related to this is a matter of recruitment. It is very important that we select people who will be trainable and, of course, a lot of factors such as salary, educational background, and ability goes into this. We feel that in terms of functions of orientation training that this is to provide information to promote new employees adjustment on the job, in such a manner that he can function well and not get into too much difficulty in the very beginning because this is a crucial period of life. It is to advise him of potential trouble spots and we feel this is necessary because in some institutional settings, a new officer coming in has never been exposed to the type of various and unusual behavior patterns that he will run into in an institution. We also want to let him know what is expected of him and what he may expect from the institution. Today, where the correctional officer is involved to some degree in the treatment program and custody, with other limitations, he has to understand this fully so that he can do the job better. It also allows us to provide a constant flow of information to him on various situations and as he learns more about the institution and his job. Communications must be extremely good in the orientation part of the training so that we can have some uniformity of procedure and that all of the officers operate in the same way. I think every new officer is, in many cases, placed under pressure because someone is testing him and it is necessary that his procedures be that of the older officers.

We feel that the teaching material that we are going to be giving to the new officers should be quite simple because the more abstract or difficult material is, the more time it takes for a person with little experience to gain any help from this. The more abstract it is the more difficult it is to understand it unless you have a lot of experience. These correctional officers have very little. Training actually starts on the first day and these first days, as I mentioned previously, are quite critical to both the institution and the employee in terms of turn-over rates of people who are just left to their own job. Someone coming on the job may feel that the creating of a proper atmosphere for them is essential and that the people that he is working with be introduced to him and that he be given a tour of the physical plant and that he might know where problem areas would exist in terms of security and have some understanding of what is happening in the other departments as far as the security or custodial officers positions would reveal.

After a person is first placed on the job by the trainer and usually left in the care of the senior officer, we feel it is quite important for them to make a follow-up frequently during the first couple of weeks because this is when he becomes most anxious, the new trainee that is, and has not had an opportunity to have been exposed to all of these problems, and as they come up he might not understand them. This is when the contact should be made by the trainer, not just the supervising officer. Some general methods of training that we talked about as we moved into this discussion were the audio-visual on the job training and outside readings post evaluative summaries. We also explained that the learning process actually involves three areas and that the first of these would be skills,



basic skills. They are almost mechanical the type of thing that perhaps a turn-key would have to do in opening and unlocking doors; making a cell-block search and these skills can be improved simply by repetition. But, they do not necessarily have to be improved beyond a certain point. Some people reach a level even in the very early stages of training where they will remain. Others will become more adept at this.

Next, we are dealing with attitudes and attitudes in the correctional program are quite important, and we should be dealing with these very soon when an officer begins because attitudes are created by an emotional response to some experience. If he has been duped by an inmate or has been placed in a difficult situation, he can become quite defensive and even though he is told about it later, he will still act in a certain way. We feel that carry-over into a permanent position will exist, and it is difficult to get rid of these attitudes.

Then, we feel that there is knowledge involved and, of course, gaining knowledge would probably relate more to the actual in-service because we feel that this is a situation where its a complex group of situations and academic learning process where you are dealing with mostly in the philosophy of the institution and policies and thie type of thing.

We have listed these skills, attitudes, and knowledge in what we thought would probably be their order. We then spoke about the existing methods that are being used now and some of these came from materials that we obtained or I had prior to coming to the conference from other institutions on the east, west, and gulf coast area and this is the use of outside resources, law enforcement type of things. In many states they use the FBI and state police and this is somewhat strange, but it seems to be the case in many of them. They have a central training department where they are drawing information from and this allows each of the institutions to draw this without trying to set up individual training plans and programs themselves. They can draw individual subject material and if they just have one session, they can draw from the central department. They have the question box, the question-and-answer session and this is in some of the institutions where the officers in the orientation training may have questions but they are afraid to ask them in a general group like this because they feel they will be critized. They place it in the question box without signing it and then they will talk about it, and one person mentined that this is done in the very beginning at their institution. Here one of the members if present, and then again at the end of six months. There is a difference in the number of questions that would come in and the types of questions.

Staff evaluations on a continuing basis is done frequently perhaps by the individual department heads and by the trainers. Partial scholarships which the individual divisions or state correctional systems help support and post evaluations where the new trainee will write an analysis or summary of the duties he has on a post and then on the job training.

We mentioned a few things we felt would be necessary in an effective orientation training program. One of these being the fact that the material must be specific and explicit and that a man should know what he is doing, why he is doing it that there be a testing program to evaluate the learning processes. We spoke about the fact that some of our people undergo quite a bit of activity and they look like they are learning a lot. When you speak to them, they respond very well and there is just a lot of activity in general, but until they are tested, you are unable to tell exactly what they have accomplished.



We also discussed the fact that the presentation in terms of audio-visual or lectures and movies is important in that it is received and retained differently and as I recall, the example given from a research study done by a chemical company that when a visual and oral presentation was given the retention beyond 3 days was six and one half times as great. So that lectures such as we have in many institutions are not too effective, perhaps the slides without discussion is not too effective or movies, but combined they are.

This is information on a general content of the orientation program and a question was submitted which was written here that should the material be the same for all personnel in the institution that the orientation program include not only the clerks, but also the social workers, counselors, custodial people and almost everyone agreed that they are involved in the program and that they should be exposed to training that custodial officers have. This is how we felt the information should be provided to the new trainee. Theory in practice to begin with the very first day or so then on the job training. We felt that this should be done without responsibilities for a specific post, and that they should be with another officer. Of course, there is a time element involved in terms of how soon they should assume the duties of a post. They should become familiar with the other posts in the institution, and then from this type of training go on to an in-service training program which would carry them throughout their career. There should be a proper balance of classroom and on the job training during those first few days to break up the monotony so that you don't have one week of strictly lecture type of training and then another of on the job. But, we should break this up so that the person is moving day to day from a post situation to a lecture situation and back and forth until his training is completed.

Most felt that the optimum length of time necessary to train a person before they are assuming post responsibilities was 30 days. Not everyone is doing this but they felt that this was the absolute minimum before someone should have the responsibility of a post. Of course, this is a problem that has to do with the financial situation of the institution or administration and staff problems.

Now we went into a discussion on smaller institutions where they would have four or five people going into an orientation program throughout a whole year, and it is very difficult to set up something to carry any weight for just one or two people. Would we gather five or six together after they have been on the job for six months and then begin an orientation program. This, of course, would not make too much sense and most of the systems have a six months training program, and then a probationary period or the two combined so that you have to begin immediately. Often an institution such as the one I come from where the number is very small, this has to be done on the one-to-one basis on a lecture system calling in the use of the department heads and still using whatever audio visual material we have.

These training programs we feel can be modified to fit whatever size or groups we are dealing with in training. When do we start each phase of training at the very beginning, we felt that the individual should become involved in learning about what he is gaining from his work or his personnel problems, and then he should be going into the regulations and policies of the institution, familiarization with the physical plant. Some of this stuff you can see we go back and forth on and that he should know what the degree of his responsibility is and that he should know what his relationship with the inmates should be. In many of our programs today, of course, we expect a correctional officer to be mature and to be able to relate to the inmates, but we know this also varies from one institution to another. We should let him know what he can do in terms of his relationship with the inmates.



As one person mentioned whether or not we like to admit it, they will establish a relationship whether you say you can or cannot and perhaps it might be better to say that this is something we expect of you. There should be periodic observations and rating of new employees and they should be advised again of the potential problems and the preventative type of training. We should advise them of the possibility of the others not seeing an ambitious and over-zealous person as being one that they would like to have, i.e. some of them said that they felt older officers would have a tendency to hold back some information. They felt a person was too capable though most of us felt this shouldn't happen, but that it does occasionally. They should not over-look what appears to be obvious to the older officers that if someone makes a point that seems to be quite trivial, that it may not be to the trainee or probably isn't to the trainee, but this should be taken up, discussed and clarified.

They should advise them on such things as contraband, how to cell block search. All of these things are taken into consideration. Finally, let him know to err is human.

We felt that realistically the initial training program must be and can be modified frequently because if we set these up as I said in glowing terms to be adapted to just one group or one particular group that we will have to change this. They can also be adapted to the juvenile institutions with some changes for counselors rather than the custodial officers, and we generally conceded that the time spent in the initial training is well worth the money and time in terms of employee stability and loss of money due to staff turn-over. I guess this pretty well covers our group discussion.



## Session II - In-Service Training

Apparently Mr. Randall has a rather ideal set up in North Carolina. He talked about all of the ways in which his training program got developed and I did not discount one bit some of the things he was saying. His experiences were different from mine, however, and I always thought that we in Michigan were quite progressive in the area of our training programs. But, I, at least personally, ran into a great deal of resistance to training and so in preparing for our workshop, we structured the thing around the concept of resistance to training and overcoming resistance.

I believe that we have made some progress on that, but we are no where near where Mr. Randall reported that his state was. Perhaps we are not doing enough in the area of in-service training in Michigan our format, at least, in this in-service training area is an hour a month for all personnel. In addition to this, of course, there are a lot of other staff development type activities which go on but in our hour a month sessions, we run into a good deal of resistance. It is manifested in a lot of very interesting ways and perhaps our recorder will report to us. I asked him to do it rather than myself since he was in the group and listened to the discussion and I think you might get a more accurate report of what went on from him rather than from me.

"Than was very nice and very well put. The fact is, he can't read my writing. Our discussion group went out to begin with of the general over-all problem of staff development and that in-service training was just an aspect of this. This staff development can be seen as an umbrella and using that analogy, under his umbrella all number of things such as in-service training which we will talk about. Conferences, orientation, which was talked about just prior to this, staff meetings and that type of thing. A few examples of this are things that were happening in the federal system. First, they brought up quite an emphasis on group training in small groups. They felt that this worked best. We had a man from Wisconsin who said that they were proposing in Wisconsin a centralized training which would be the same for all institutions. Again, going on into the disciplinary barracks as talked about by one of our friends in the military here, they in the military and federal system are having some courses in college. They are sending some of these people not for full-time study, but for part-time study in such courses as sociology and psychology. Now, I think everyone would agree that initially you would say that we are going to set up a training program and this is good, but as it was brought out here, there is a resistance. I think we all recognize this. Some of the reasons for this resistance as you will undoubtedly recognize when we start through them here, you have your older people or even your people who have been there a short time, but have fallen into the status-quo and don't want this disturbed. Anytime you start changing things around, you will create some anxiety because of the fear that things might go wrong. Things are working, why don't we leave them as they are. If they are not working as well as they could be, it is better not to run the risk of messing them up. This is the reason that comes up very often. Another thing is that a lot of people will feel that this is a waste of time. Either because it is not relevant or once you get out of the meeting where you have decided all of these wonderful theoretical things, it is not actually the way it is done. I am sure we have all personally experienced your come back from the formal study, and they say great - now forget it, and I will show you the way it is actually done. A lot of times the physical facilities aren't what they should be in our institutions because originally they weren't designated for this type of activity so you will be meeting not the best physical conditions: hard chairs, smokey room, etc. You might have trouble in resistance to programs by our "moonlighting" friends who feel that this training program would interfere with their moonlighting activities or other jobs.



Another reason for the resistance could be that there tends to be a departmentalization; you don't want to go into anyone else's department so that training that would naturally involve all personnel, what do I want to know about that for, that's cooking, I am incustody and so there is the tendency to resist on that point.

The term training brings up a lot of anxiety just by itself. We mentioned in our group this morning that people sometimes think of this as "Good Heavens, I am not an animal, I don't need to be trained. What do you mean, training? What does this do? I certainly have the common sense and the knowledge. I don't need to be trained!

You also have this sometimes. They sometimes feel that this is just another way the administration gets at us. The people who are to be taught feel that this is a way the institution has of putting the needle in or putting the point across. Also, too, the resistance comes from the fact that your training programs of ten fall heir to being scapegoats. Something goes wrong and you look around for something to blame it on and boom, there is your training program and the reason I didn't get the report filled out was I was up there listening to that fellow. This frequently happens. Now that there is a problem and we realize some of the ways that this comes about. We also talked to go back there for just a minute, on how you can determine this resistance. Some practical examples came up of the sleepers in the crowd. You will always, if your program isn't going well, detect this. This is a part of the fighter flight, but if people don't like the way your program is being run or are not benefiting from it, it isn't helpful to them. They will either get very upset with you or they will start to go the other way and sleep or talk in small groups, etc. How do you overcome this problem? How do you, given I am sure that we will all agree, if you want to set up a good comprehensive training program so that we might all become more knowledgeable so that people might work better with the raw materials we have and this is a personal point that I would like to interject here. The ability to go out and strike a \$1,000,000,000.00 vein of gold is problematic itself, but we all deal in a fantastic resource; the human being we have under us is an unlimited resource. This is, I think, a good thing. We want to be able to develop this resource and make it as productive and socially orientated as we can. So how do you overcome? Initially, you take these people into you system. You want to let them know what is expected of them. We do not consider you a stupid person; however, you will be along with the rest of the staff here, expected to keep up with your study and there will be courses made available to you. While they will undoubtedly be on a voluntary basis, we certainly hope that you will take advantage of these things. Let them know right from the beginning that this will be a rule - that there will be training. Set up this training to facilitate both physically and psychologically. Make it goo, make it reasonable and make it so that it really pertains to things at hand. Make it financially rewarding.

As people become more proficient and as they work on themselves to become more proficient in their area, they should be rewarded on such. This is one of the best methods of teaching, of course, is the reward. This should not be thought of as "if you do the trick, we will give you the candy", but it is a realistic way to look at this. Another thing that is very important in overcoming any resistance is to have a good high quality program. It would be my personal opinion (it didn't come out in the group discussion) it would be better not to have a program than to have one that was going to create greater anxiety among the people. So, get a good high quality program and if it has to be delayed 8 or 9 months to get it started, wait until you have a good one and then put it across. You are going to be training sick people. Why don't



you get their attitudes and suggestions. If it is the product of themselves to even some small extent, they will accept it when it is even more refined. So, ask for suggestions and you might find a thousand ways to do this. The best suggestions will this, that, and the other thing come up with a day's vacation or some reward, but it is meaningful at this level. Positive backing of the people in charge of the institution. There should never be any question as to where the program is going and if it is going or not. You are going to have training. Be sure everybody on the top agree as to what it will be and how it will be. We all are cognizant of the fact that inmates as do any people tend to play the people over them against each other. If the staff is not fully in back and fully recognizing this program, it might go a little rough.

Some of the methods that were discussed as the possible ways of overcoming this is, I thin, we could say initial hesitancy to accept training were the group discussion and the panel discussions as was brought out by one of the other institutions, I believe in the federal system as a small group. This was very valuable.

The sixty-six method was discussed where you take your group and break them down into six people who discuss for six minutes, going into this particular method here just a little bit. You take six people who are given approximately ten seconds to (1) elect chairman and another ten seconds to (2) elect a spokesman. The chairman controls the type of discussion, keeps it on the point and the spokesman sums up the thoughts of the six. This, it was pointed out, alleviates the problem of "Well, I am not going to say because I am Joe Jones and you will come back at me with what I have just said." It points at we, the committee, thought this, and you don't have to pin it down and you get pretty pointed in your suggestions and not be afraid of any personal or ego involvement.

After you decide who will be the chairman and who will be the speaker, you give them a problem - How about such and such - and you let them discuss this and come up with discussion and a decision as to what can be done about the problem or is there really a problem. This is just their topic. Then, going on, we talk about role playing as a very good method. I am sure you are all acquainted with this. Just briefly, you will have one member of the training group act as an inmate for example, another act as a guard and the inmate walks in and the guard said, and they batter it back and forth. You can become very personally involved in this. This goes on for five or ten minutes and then you say "knock it off." They knock it off. Now, what would you have done? I know personally once you get out into the institutions, things will happen that you will profit by a great deal. If you could have this knowledge before you went out there, of course, you could be able to handle these things much more adequately. By these role playing techniques, you can often get the thing to where you can structure things before they actually happen to you, so that when they do happen in real life you are prepared because you have already gone through a similar situation. Finally, we felt that the most important thing would be this, the way to get this across to people. If you get up before a group and talk in large terms over their heads, which any group can be talked down to no matter how proficient they are, you are going to alienate the group right from the beginning. On the other hand, you don't want to baby them; you don't want to insult their intelligence by putting it in such simple terms that they are going to become upset with you as they feel that you are undergrading them. We felt that rather than pitch under the general population you should probably aim just a little high. This will serve as a challenge to them, and it would be better that they miss every 18th word rather than be insulted. That was basically the way we felt that these resistances could be overcome.



Just by way of summation, how are you going to present these things? As we said before, the sixty-six method, another technique that was brought out was to start with a lecture situation and instead of going to the whole lecture time you spend 15 minutes and then throw it open to questions and if someone doesn't volunteer a question to ask, what do you think about it which brings out group participation which is a lot better by adding something yourself than to have it given to you and you can take it or leave it as you want to.

We talked about audio-visual aids which was again mentioned here. It is a sound principle of psychology that the more senses you can bring into play in learning the more you will retain and of course that is good learning. It is very exciting to hear about flying an airplane but once you get up there and you are strapped into the seat and you have the stick in your hand, you can learn quite a bit more and you retain quite a bit more a great deal better. And then other audio-visual aids such as tape recording we felt weren't too good, unless you had visual aids to go with it and then other things like overhead projectors and close-circuit TV. That is basically what we talked about. Thank you.



## Session II - Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training

It isn't that I don't think that I could actually read Mr. Roberts' writing it's just that I have gotten to that crucial point where I would have to put on my glasses to see, and I am one of those individuals who wouldn't let the doctor give me a prescription for biofocals. So, therefore, if I read, I couldn't see you and I never like to get up and talk to a group if I can't see the audience. Anyway, I am going to ask Mr. Roberts to give the report, but before that I would like to tell you about the tape that some of you heard. Actually, that tape was made from a record which can be purchased, and I thought you might like to know the name of the record and the number and where it could be ordered. The name of it is "How to Live With Yourself." It is by Dr. Murray Banks. The number of the record is MB 101. The cost is \$5.95 and it can be ordered through the Murmil Association, 8 East 63rd Street, New York 21, New York. Now if a record like this is used, I would suggest that you provide along with this a very simple outline which can be followed as Dr. Banks is giving his lecture. The outline you can make very simply by just taking the various titles or subjects that he discusses. I think that this not only helps in listening but it certainly gives something as a discussion tool.

Maybe I had better borrow your glasses. I think I could get along better if I couldn't see. This group had 23 in attendance and they rather wondered about the non-uniformed personnel special training for a while and then it tended to wander thereafter. For the most part, efforts were made to establish a means of providing a total continuity of a total broad program. There was a searching of ways to provide an individual focus on the inmate from incarceration through parole and his readjustment to his community. Since 95% of our inmates are paroleable, the necessity for such a program must be the aim of the correctional field. Then, what are ways the staffs can be more effective in carrying out treatment programs that are already in existence. There can be staff committee appointments to lead the reluctant staff member to invest himself, share his problems, and make him a part of planning as a regular and in a purposeful way. Invite all the staff to participate and become knowledgeable of an inmates treatment and parole planning. Given each staff member status and appropriate recognition and realization that he or shee is equally important in accomplishing the task. The long view in the total program should be the responsibility of the staff and the program should be formulated by them. A cooperative effort provides an avenue to promote flexibility and recognition of the necessity of change should there be a need. An implementation of a training program is a need of a design. Efforts of an enthusiastic committee can provide a working manual. The second gain but not less important is the promotion of higher morale and a greater understanding in this team effort.

It was felt in the best training methods of the total staff was the need for clarification of the terms of reference. Until this was done, the problem is circumvented and the focus of the need was less. The inmates needs could best be met through promoting a closer union of different disciplines. Attempts, and some successfully, have been made to encourage free exchange of ideas with other resource persons such as vocational rehabilitation, staff meetings with members of the parole board, and other isolated instances of trying to establish workable, wholesome relationships without other disciplines in corrections. It was pointed out that many of the training programs are unrealistic in preparing inmates for gainful employment. An inmate's institutional work experiences do not always have carry-over value for jobs outside the institution, and they cannot successfully complete for jobs. It was felt that programs must be developed to meet a demand and there was a necessity to equip the inmate with a salable skill. Staff reports were



considered somewhat inconclusive. Training of personnel and preparing reports was felt the reports could be more realistic and descriptive and less stereotyped. Descriptive pertinent information would be beneficial to the parole agent as well as the institution in formulating immediate and future plant with the inmate.

Progress has been made in planning with the institutional staff. Parole officers frequently go to our institution and help plan with the inmate. There seemed to be a definite gap, however, between the granting of the parole and the time he goes to the community. Should this be a continuous program, we would need to know that is available to inmates when they go on parole. There has been some meeting of minds of plans for individuals coming out of institutions. Evidently, lack of funds has kept this program from being wholly operational. In planning the staffs, help them interpret many needs to influential persons and the legislature. What then could be the method to promote our program. One problem is budgetary. Take it a step at a time, it was felt that this had been done and that cooperation of those interested in corrections and of those who were coming into our institutions.

Although most of this topic was dropped, there remained a gap between parole and the institution in completing the program. Someone felt that there should be an establishment of the kind of training after establishing the need. It was felt the planning was in varied ways for those of different levels and consequently only the composite received sort of a smattering. Some used resources of unions, restaurant owner, manufactures to assist in training of their personnel. Some felt that case workers, for example, who get experience and first-hand knowledge by being in the field for a short while and more understanding could be gained in appreciation of problems would be desirable in establishing a total program. Some have exchanged staff members to overcome the problems in developing a workable goal directed plan.

In training personnel to meet the needs of the individual it was felt a closer picture must be given the individual. This could be accomplished by getting the feeling of needs through reports and through staff inter-relationships. It was felt that it was necessary in guiding and helping this inmate. A definite plan should be set up for intercommunication with all officers, professionals parole boards, etc. Those who were fortunate in having diagnostic and classification centers explained that they were able to determine levels of motivations and needs and through their evaluations the training programs were started at an early date. The evaluation information was made available to parole supervisors and the center provided consultation and advice. Consideration was always given the evaluation, but occasionally, an institution asked what assignment would be next best. The communication remained clear, however. From time to time an inmate gets fragments of personality of an institution and its staff. The inmate is perceptive of the misunderstanding and the criticism. Every staff member should be asked to evaluation himself. Difficulties in promoting a wholesome climate lies in finding it difficult to assess ourselves. Perhaps, then our reactions would not be transmitted to the individual. Providing courses for staff members in the field of mental health would be beneficial in carrying out our job. It was generally agreed that both industrial work supervisors and professional staff members need special training and should be provided regularly by the week and by the month. There is a need to acquaint the staff with the recognition of emotional problems of workers and inmates and change the focus from obvious symptoms to the causitive factors. There must be an awareness of our reactions in our techniques in working with people. Often sections can be departmentalized and not present the whole picture of an individual and there is an over-sight of his problem even if he



acquires a skill. Perhaps we do not have the appropriate steps in motivating and carrying on and recognizing the total needs of the individual. A problem develops when one becomes institutionalized and he simply conforms. On the other hand, this is no measurement for his parole success. The inmate must be motivated to invest himself and be allowed to experience an atmosphere that is wholesome and positive in relating his feelings. All agreed that good training programs are built around understanding between staff members and good relationships are paramount in bringing about an effective job.



## Session II - Management and Supervision

It is pretty hard to wind up the afternoon. It is getting pretty close to the traditional cocktail hour, I'll try to keep it short and yet hope to give you the discussion as we evolved it in our group. First of all, I would like to thank the members of the group. It was a good session and everyone participated very well and we all learned something up there this morning.

Our particular subject was to determine the best method of training at the different levels for state and federal correctional institutions with emphasis on the management and supervisory level. This is where we start getting up into the staff agency heads, the wardens, the deputy wardens and also through the first line of supervisors. One of the first questions we had to discuss and decide on an answer to was, "Can M & S be treated as a single item or should they be separated." If they should be separated, where should the separation occur under organizational charts. In other words, if you are going to determine the best methods of training for a group, first of all, can you train management the same way you would consider training supervisors. The answer that we came up with as for all intents and purposes and all practical working that we could consider management and supervision to be a homogeneous group so that we could use the same methods all the way through and in some of our institutions, the size being what it is, it would be of no practical value to separate them and formulate separate programs for them.

The next question that we worked on in order to set the stage for the best methods was what should be the goal of the training program. Some of the ideas that I threw out at the beginning of the session were perhaps the goal of the training program would be to change attitudes so that later training programs would be more acceptable should we attempt to increase job proficiency or would we strive to develop an individual to the point where he becomes more valuable to us and increase his potential to the organization or the institution or some cases the system as a whole. We finally narrowed it down to two basic ways that should be the goals of our training program. One is that we should strive to increase job proficiency in the individual and the second was the combination of this one to increase his job proficiency and to take advantage of his capabilities so we will be able to exploit him to get the most out of him later on. In other words, we are developing an individual in addition to making him more proficient in the techniques in this particular job.

A third question which we worked on a little bit before we got into the methods was what part should the following play in a training program or should they be considered in developing the best method of training. The ideas which we considered in developing the training were appraisals and evaluation and the method of selecting employees and we agreed that these things do play a part when you are drafting up a training program or picking out your best method. In fact one of the individuals in the group indicated that by selecting a different group of people to come into their institutions, it changed their training program and their approach to it considerably. They had a high turnover rate. They started recruiting retired Army personnel to man certain positions and they had to adjust their training program. They were taking in perhaps a more select group, a group that really didn't have the press of money, they had their retirement pay to fall back on. They could afford to change their training program so many times these items will affect the best method you can use to pick your training program. After we had haggled these matters about and arrived at the decisions, not necessarily by consensus, let me indicate, sometimes there was a little strong arm method, we went into the various methods of training and I am just going to do no more than say that what they are and maybe one or two words of explanation because we have heard them repeated over and



over here in other groups. Apparently they are more or less universal methods and they apply almost at all levels and orientation in service and non-uniformed personnel. One although that I haven't heard is the possible consideration of internal program. Non an intern program as it is operated in many of our federal government agencies is a long range program where you are planning for your managers ten years from now. You will take a selected group of individuals, fairly young, perhaps out of school or college, graduate school, take them into your organization, put them into a training class train them within the organization, send them outside as part of their training to educational institutions and train these individuals, then when their training is completed, you bring them back in, assign them to jobs in your various departments or bureaus and let them move upward as their capabilities will move them. Now this is a long range point of view and it was expensive. Incidentally, one other thing that we recognized in developing the best method of training and first of all, there is no such thing as a best method that we could derive, you are going to have to tailor your garment or cut your garment to fit the cloth. There are limiting factors such as money, time, instructors, facilities and occasionally a resistance to training that you are going to have to consider anytime you develop your best method. So the intern program which I mentioned is a fairly expensive program. We passed over that quickly to the next one.

Another way of developing people particularly at the management level is to make them an aid to someone or an understudy on a particular job. These are self explanatory and I don't think I will dwell on it any more. It is a method of grooming an individual to take over or learn the job so that he can later take over for someone else.

Another one would be the use of formal schooling, either full or part-time perhaps under the direction of an outside institution. This could be short courses of one, two, three, four, five, days or anything up to a semester or two semesters or even a graduate degree.

Another method is professional conferences such as this one.

Another one would be meetings and memberships in professional societies and the use of professional journals as one of the members in the group indicated. Many times articles come out in the journals which may be related to mental hygiene but they are circulated to custody and everyone else. It is possible to call in outside consultants or experts to put on programs for you. You can conduct in house programs amongst yourselves from resources within the institution such as seminars, conferences, special courses training classes and visits to other institutions. It is possible to set up a selected reading list, publish it and have periodic discussions of articles or books within the field which you want to cover.

Another method would be job rotation whereby you take an individual and rotate them through several positions within the institution seeking to develop this man into a management potential or as a manager later on. Some of the institutions have made use of a training officer. Within the group we were in there were five people whose primary duty is training. We heard yesterday it is possible to have a training center for a group of institutions within a state of jurisdiction. Others are advisory committees on training formed from within the institution or possibly soliciting training advice from outside the institution. These were the methods. There is no one best method. They could be combined or selected to fit the circumstances and the facilities and the money that you have available to you.

Two other comments came up which do not bear directly upon the subject which we were discussing today, but I felt that they were of such importance that I would mention them in closing.



One is the importance of management and supervision and taking an active part in the training program. They must back it up and not only must they back it up when it starts, they must continue to develop an environment which is conducive to training.

The other one is that we may be approaching a degree of professionalism within the correctional field right now where the emphasis on the development of professional managers of correctional institutions is going to be greater and greater and perhaps this is something that is going to become more and more important in the future.

That, ladies and gentlemen, was the gist of our discussion.



## PERIPHERAL HANDICAPS TO CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT

by

Donald Clemmer, Director  
Department of Corrections  
Washington, D. C.

It is about morals, moral systems and the dynamics of morals in relation to crime and corrections that I direct my remarks this evening. No one would expect an old prison hand to really understand all this, of course, and since this is a dinner meeting and not a research seminar I am not going to trouble either you or myself with such minor considerations as definition of terms or attempts to really delineate in an exact way what I mean by the terms "morals" and "moral systems" and the dynamics thereof in relation to crime and correction.

It is my purpose to bring into focus, as I see it, of course, the impact of some aspects of the morals system under which we live as it affects our work in probation, prison and parole. That my views are not profound, I am sure, will soon become evident, though it may be of passing interest that I have chosen this topic after 35 years in three large prison systems and the year I happen to be President of the American Correctional Association. Of course, I don't speak for the Association or even for my own department, but for myself on this topic.

Whatever in totality a morals system is I presume it is safe to say that it is reflected in the criminal and civil statutes of a nation and in the predominant religious beliefs. Morals are based on utilitarian social values nurtured over the years and such values vary in time and place, of course, but when the values take on some permanence they become evidenced in the formal language of a society and are generally regarded as commonly accepted. Thus, it could be construed in the most simple terms that human behavior which is moral is that behavior which conforms with the rule of law in word and spirit, as well as the predominate religious doctrines. Contrarywise, immoral behavior would be violative of such legal codes by act or in spirit, as well as violative of established religious doctrine. Now this is a nice simple delineation and good enough for the points I have to make, though I recognize that any real student of morals could run me out of town on the basis of such a neat and easy formulation.

Let me say my interest is not in the reform of any system or sub-system of societal morals, but only in the reform of criminals. The difficulty is, the two phenomena are related and it is the occasional ugly violation of the former that makes for the difficulty of the latter. I am contending in this paper that the immoral and amoral behavior which is so prominent from time to time and here and there on the human scene as enacted by respected citizens, is the number two handicap to the rehabilitation of criminal offenders of the conventional type with whom we daily deal, and furthermore that this topic has not been sufficiently pondered in the criminological and correctional literature, or considered in the training of our employees or the treatment devices nowadays applied in our field to our wards.

It is necessary to say at this juncture that I respect and love my Country as you do and I will defend it in the overall as the greatest; and this pronouncement includes support of the philosophies and programs of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the Eisenhower years, the New Frontier and the Great Society, -- plus free enterprise, the capitalist system, cybernation, massive free education, due process of law, the Christian ethic and all the rest. But some segments in these societal programs that have made us so progressive and forward a Nation have also made us weak, for example, in the prevalence of crime and its correction which is our concern here. I mention this loyalty to our government as a precaution because some years ago in a quite informal discussion of white collar crime versus conventional crime, I was taken to task with an inference of left-wingism because I happened to mention that certain corporations on selected occasions conducted their



affairs illegally and immorally. Some Birchite of the day thought this subversive. I am about as subversive as Alf Landan!

As you can see, I am skirting around the topic of white collar crime as developed by the late, great theoretician Edwin Sutherland, formerly of several large midwestern universities. Yet I am not interested here in white collar crime as a part of total crime or in the hypothesis of its development, whether by the Sutherland interpretation of "Differential Association" or not. My interest is rather in the much publicized violations of the morals system or of the Christian ethic, so to speak, by ordinarily respected and admired citizens of the upper upper middle class or higher class and the effect of such shenanigans on the little guy offender we handle in our prisons and on probation and parole, and the challenge to find a correctional treatment that can meet this circumstance.

If my paper tonight has a thesis or central theme, I believe it can be stated thus: it is held that the goings-on of white collar crime in its many forms in the free community influence many predatory conventional offenders, particularly in prison, in adverse ways and tend to criminalize them by developing rationalizations for their past predatory conduct and stimuli for further criminal behavior on release.

I have not actually researched this theme in a formal way at all but have come upon it a priori as over the years I read the newspapers and watched the television reveal the antics of white collar crime in the free world, frequently involving vast sums of money, and then ponder what my Inmates think of such events as they compare them with their own offenses. Some years ago, I discussed these general topics with an inmate group in some depth and have since delved rather deeply into the thoughts of individual inmates on some timely bit of white collar crime in the outside world as compared with their own offense. Perhaps a few thumbnail case histories will be illustrative.

Among a group of inmates with whom I worked over several months was a 30 year old white man with an IQ of 110 or so, a not too unstable family, a spotty occupational record and who was serving his second felony offense on house burglary. His offenses had included theft of household effects such as radios, whatever cash was found, minor jewelry and silverware from homes in a fashionable section of Washington after ascertaining no one was in the residences. On his second felony, he admitted to seven burglaries with the likelihood there was that many more. We totaled up the net gain he would admit from fencing or random selling of the goods and it came to some \$1900. It might have been twice that much but probably well under \$5,000. He used the funds thus gained for expensive clothes, a flashy front, nightclubs and the pursuit of exaggerated pleasure. He was under a 3 to 9 years sentence.

Over the months and about the time I was working with this man, newspaper stories broke involving the maneuvers of how some high corporation executives of the upper classes, in a hard-goods industry had met clandestinely in motels to set and rig prices for their products. These revelations went on over a period of some months in press and television and eventually a Federal Judge sentenced these highly placed corporate executives and outstanding citizens to some three months in jail, fined them \$10,000 or so apiece, fined their corporations in amounts up to \$100,000 and ordered, as well, renegotiations with the purchasers of the products which had been sold at fantastically high and rigged prices.

This is an example of white collar crime and is common enough. Sutherland's 1949 volume entitled "White Collar Crime" and Donald Cressy's "Other Peoples Money" of 1953 show the mechanics of this kind of phenomena but do not touch on the ramifications of such behavior on the conventional offender as I attempt now. My thesis is that events of this kind which, while occurring within the morals system, are also in violation of it and effect the correctional process of conventional offenders in subtle and important ways not yet wholly understood.



In the case of the prisoner to whom I refer and as we discussed the situation together in some depth, and as might be expected, he was incensed that the corporate executives who profitted in the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars received but three months in jail while he had a sentence of 3 to 9 years for thefts of but a few thousand dollars. He had hardly realized that any penal sentence for an offense of the white collar kind was actually quite new. But more important than his hostility over comparative justice as he saw it was, I thought, a developing rationalization for his own prior thievery. As we talked from time to time on the morals system and violations of it, I thought I perceived a slowly developing intensifying of his predatory attitudes. I don't know what goes on in other men's minds but I subjectively sensed in this chap a deepening excusing of himself and a widening urge to get for himself in ways beyond the law the material gadgets and affluent satisfactions he previously had sought through burglary; and I believe part of this mental set evolved and was heightened by his speculation and ponderment of the white collar crime event referred to.

No contention is made that white collar crime as such is a major factor in the initial cause of ordinary crime or conducive to juvenile delinquency, for example, or even early adult conventional stealing in any degree; but this is not to say that the goals of ordinary young thieves are frequently not dissimilar to white collar offenders, for what both groups seem to want is economic affluence and all that it implies in this moment of history. On the other hand, the view is held here that once an adult offender is incarcerated the goings-on of white collar crime in the free world cast some influence inimical to reform in the institution, because knowledge of and brooding on such facts tend to justify past criminal behavior in comparative terms and develop gloating for the material riches in an affluent society. I will try and tie these thoughts together after a few more examples.

Now for another thumb-nail case history. Reference is made to a 34 year old white male serving 180 days for petty larceny. He had been in our institutions three times before, all for public intoxication. His larceny offense was amateurish, but involved several indictments for theft of clothing from a department store while out of work and drinking. The inmate had a fairly stable work record as a member of a Union and was classed as a Journeyman. In the idle hours of long prison nights and weekends, this inmate declined to engage in the established programs but rather watched television, listened to radio, and read the newspapers avidly.

It so happened that when he was in our custody, a story broke in the press detailing graft and corruption in his Union. Whereas there had been other news accounts of suspicions along this line over the years and occasional references to unwise expenditures of Union funds for many Unions, the press account during his incarceration was the most sensational of a local nature. It fell to me about this time to confer with the inmate on other matters and as we discussed these matters casually, he brought to attention the scandal in his Union and speculated on the amount of money missing and its probably improper use. This inmate, without knowing what was on my mind regarding the influence of white collar crime on adults in prison, talked quite freely and readily of what he called the crookedness of the business affairs of the local and in many other related craft trades and activities.

As I queried him on all of this, he revealed rather clearly, I thought, the extent of his contemplations on the violation of the moral code which was supposed to prevail, and compared his petty thefts from a department store with the large defaults in his own Union organization, thus rationalizing his own misconduct both in terms of a sense of guilt and social damage as compared with the white collar crime in an organization in the free world.

No claim is made in this brief sketch that the ruminating and the reverie and the pondering which the inmate did was generative of further larcenous attitudes on his part. Speculation could be developed, however, that if confronted again in the free society without funds with which to drink, he might easily move again towards larcenous behavior and who could say but what the ruminating and pondering he did, both inside and outside



the institution in reference to fractures of the moral system would not be a causative factor in stimulating continuing criminal conduct.

Another reference as to how events peripheral to the work and control of correctional people can handicap our efforts are the reports from time to time of misconduct, and sometimes actual graft, in other law enforcement agencies. Who can forget the scandal in a large midwestern city involving policemen on a beat who aided a mob of professional thieves in the systematic looting of large warehouses? The fact that 95 percent of the police officers in that city may well have been honest and conducted their affairs in conformance with the controlling moral system did not prevent conventional criminals in prison and on parole from drawing conclusions that all of the law enforcement machinery is corrupt and regard themselves simply as unlucky that they were caught. Such a climate tends to permit the rationalization of guilt and can be productive as well of on-going urges for additional crime. Whether defaulting behavior by law enforcement officials can be construed as white collar crime or not is a matter of definition, but there can be no doubt of its ugly damage.

Even worse than a crooked cop or a corrupt judge, in reference to prisoners at least, is the impact on the correctional climate of an institution if and when an official of the institution violates the morals system by unlawful act or even the taking of undue privilege. Such behavior even when suspicioned causes wild gossip and speculation by prisoners and moves speedily throughout the prison community and makes a mockery of otherwise earnest efforts in the training and treatment programs. It goes almost without saying that the higher up the administrative ladder the defaults occur, the more serious are the ramifications on inmates and employees alike.

Note is taken of another reference to events beyond our control and this is in the area of racial matters. Part of the Christian ethic is the concept of the brotherhood of man. This is not only in the theologies on which the Nation is founded, but in the Constitution and the moral systems. Yet, time after time over many years and in many places portions of the Negro population have been discriminated against and harmed. In recent years, of course, and especially since 1954, great public attention has been drawn to such matters and one but wonders, as Negro inmates in the American prisons note on television and in the press the wrath sometimes extended to Negroes in the free community, just how this is absorbed. The speculation is that their aggressivity is increased and hostilities deepened towards those who have blocked the Negro in his legal rights. Just how, if at all, this attitudinal set relates to rationalizing earlier crime or the increasing of criminal attitudes, is not known. I am certain of one fact in this general situation, however, that the Black Muslim sect at least, and some other Negroes as well, tend to excuse themselves of all guilt for their present offense on the basis that if they, as Negroes, had equal opportunity with whites they would have not resorted to crime. I am sure this is an accurate analysis in many cases.

Perhaps a word should be said about syndicate crime in the free community and even though it differs from white collar crime in concept, its existence has some deleterious reaction on conventional offenders and is beyond the periphery of our correctional influence as employees. I am particularly concerned with this administratively since one Valachi, a prisoner of the Attorney General, is held in one or the other of the five institutions under my command. The revelations of Valachi and others on the machinery of Cosa Nostra or the Mafia reveal in small portion only, the web of this criminal syndicate throughout many of the layers of economic life and the commercial pleasure activities in many large cities throughout the land. The fifty or so television sets in my Department glowed brightly as Valachi testified before the McClelland Committee of the Senate. All of this creates much morbid and probably degenerative interest and, once again I believe, tends to depreciate sense of guilt on the part of the ordinary offender and permits him to rationalize for his own crimes viz a viz the more serious and professional crimes by the Mafia and others.



It is the news media, of course, which bring the stories of white collar crime into the prisons and to the attention of other law violators. Newspapers, magazines, radio and television have a steady barrage of violation of the morals system and which is to their credit and is their proper role.

These media also carry advertising which whets the appetite of desire and builds up the importance of material possessions for luxuries and comforts as conspicuous consumption. No empirical facts are at hand on just how advertising on television or in the slick magazines affects the disadvantaged inmate in prisons, living as he is in some deprivation, but the guess is that the lure of the commercials in varying degree creates desires on the part of law offenders, especially those in institutions which are virtually impossible of fulfillment by honest means, so the speculation can be made that come-on advertising plays a part in the fortification of predatory attitudes. I am not attempting to condemn advertising, of course, because it is one of the great keystones of the commercial success of the Nation. I simply suggest that slick advertising affects a handful of prisoners adversely and is beyond our control as correctional workers.

Let us consider the advertising for hard liquor in the slick magazines. These customarily carry pictures of handsome, well dressed men and a beautiful girl in some ornate setting with glasses of the best whiskey in their hands, -- and anyone can well imagine how this reacts on some poor prisoner languishing in his cell on a summer night, I would think.

In reference to advertising in general, it seems to be part of our culture that the claims made for goods or services for sale are exaggerated if not downright deceitful. I believe the lawyers have found a term for misleading ads in the use of the word "puffing". Puffed or not, some advertising is in the realm of white collar crime and casts an influence on the morals system and is assimilated by law violators and, I submit and suggest, it affects behavior and is beyond the periphery of our control.

The question can well be raised as to how perceptive prisoners are in the several areas of white collar crime or quasi white collar crime that I have mentioned. Certainly some are, as shown in my references. A good many of our people desire only food for their bellies and women for their arms and don't think very far beyond these essential needs. A contrary case, however, is the inmate who some years ago brought a matter to my attention which had never occurred to me. He pointed out that daily newspapers which take highly moralistic views on almost all matters and attempt to be the city's conscience, at the same time carry in their sport pages the entries and results of horse races occurring some 3,000 miles away from the circulation center of the newspaper. The inference was clear to him, as I believe it is to me, that the race entries for Santa Anita, California, for example, carried in the dead of winter 3,000 miles away is to sell papers and for the convenience of customers who use such information to bet on the races in Bookie shops, which are strictly against the law; and furthermore, as is well known, bookie shops cannot long endure without police protection.

Oh well, this is the way it is as almost everyone knows, including prisoners.

Passing attention only is given to the subjects of sex behavior as a segment of the morals system because violations of it seem to have no serious impact on conventional offenders. Once in a while an offender against the statutory rape provision in the code will wail loudly about comparative justice when the press reveals an account of how the son of a wealthy citizen, for example, is exonerated or placed on probation for rather forceful pursuit of sexual gratification. In the large city which breeds most of the offenders who come to us there is a recorded record of over 5,000 illegitimate births a year but this doesn't seem to shock anybody very much, including law violators - basically tragic as such occurrences are. Rather illustrative of this non-challance on the state of sex morals was the account in Time magazine a few weeks ago. It seems that a 15 year



old boy told his parents rather casually that his younger girlfriend was pregnant. With this announcement, the 13 year old brother is reported to have said, "My God, you will lose your allowance."

It is now about time to try and tie these thoughts together in some sort of synthesis pertinent to this 12th Annual Midwest Correctional Conference and your theme, "Training Programs for Correctional Personnel."

In the several brief references here given to activities in the general realm of white collar crime, some are illegal and criminal and some more technically in violation of the morals system. Most of these shenanigans are carried on by respected citizens. Hundreds of other examples could be developed. If such activities were isolated, they probably would have little influence on the conventional criminal but the stories of graft and corruption go on month after weary month. It is not likely that any one or two events of this kind in the free world would be sufficient to provide the rationalization in which many offenders indulge or the stimulation of predatory attitudes, but the constancy of them in all media, plus the panorama of creative comforts always on display and the value placed on the importance of conspicuous consumption which seems to be held so high in our society, take their toll.

In a way, some of the points I have made approach puerility. Everyone knows we don't operate in a vacuum and that the whole force of the total environment engulfs us. Yet somehow or another, at least as I know the literature, insufficient stress has been placed on this circumstance as regards correctional treatment for probationers, prisoners and parolees. To be sure, the able textbook authors in criminology have recognized the phenomena of which I speak as influences in the etiology of crime or in the criminogenics as they sometimes term it, but the next step on how to explain it or even combat it in various therapies is largely uncharted. In my own Department, with some 50 or so professional employees, few structured attempts are made to meet this challenge. From time to time, in group sessions or in pastoral counseling, these knotty problems are faced but no earthy answers are forthcoming.

Here are some of the salient facts of our occupational existence in the field of corrections. Our job in its most elementary demand is to aid in the reduction of crime. We aim at this in the face of 2.2 million serious crimes last calendar year and 601,000 children involved in juvenile delinquency. We face our mission of crime reduction with some 230,000 people in felony institutions and another two million or more going in and out of jail. These are just some of the dimensions of our job.

On March 8th of this year, the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress and in the opening paragraph he said: "Crime has become a malignant enemy in America's midst. Since 1940 the crime rate in this country has doubled. It has increased five times as fast as our population since 1958. In dollars the cost of crime runs to tens of billions annually. The human costs are simply not measurable. The problems run deep and will not yield to quick and easy answers. We must identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity whether they lie in the environment around us or deep in the nature of individual men. This is a major purpose of all we are doing in combating poverty and improving education, health, welfare, housing, and recreation. All these are vital, but they are not enough. Crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness."

These views will have great impact and I venture the opinion that progress lies ahead in our field and we may yet get the personnel and the tools we need. In his message, the President also said in reference to corrections particularly: "We cannot tolerate an endless, self-defeating cycle of imprisonment, release, and reimprisonment which fails to alter undesirable attitudes and behavior. We must find ways to help the first offender avoid a continuing career of crime."



The President did not touch on, except perhaps by implication, the general theme of my remarks in this paper but I think, however, we must recognize that the total morals system is involved and is considerable of an obstacle in the correctional process and beyond the periphery of our control as workers in the field.

As to the implications on your meetings this early April of 1965 of my topic, I think first of all the problem should be faced and talked about. Second, I think correctional executives and treatment personnel of whatever persuasion should include the ramifications of white collar crime and the morals system on the agenda of all employee training systems and discuss it and research it and face the facts once they are clearly known. And finally, and very generally, I suggest that our inmates and wards of whatever type be urged to discuss these matters in social educational classes and in group approaches and in church and religious meetings and anywhere else so they come to realize what I am sure is demonstrable fact, that in spite of breaches in the morals system and in spite of a possible sub-morals system, that this national community overall provides the best climate and opportunity for the full, good life of any society on earth, and that furthermore it can improve.

Prisoners and all others should be clearly impressed that out of a population of 190 million people the vast majority live prudently, pay their bills, raise their children tenderly and educate them and contribute to their communities. And to conclude, and if I don't appear too idealistic, I submit that our erring clients be advised time and again that virtue and the good life is its own reward.



## CREATIVITY VERSUS INDOCTRINATION

by

C. Murray Henderson  
Associate Warden for Treatment  
The Men's Reformatory  
Anamosa, Iowa

Some time ago Dr. John W. Gardner, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, had an article published in the "Saturday Review" entitled "The Ever-Renewing Society." The gist of this article was that a society that has learned the secret of continuous renewal will be a more interesting and a more vital society -- not in some distant future, but in the present.

In this same vein, we talk much about revitalizing correctional programs, and we tend to put exclusive emphasis on finding new ideas. But there is usually no shortage of new ideas and new approaches in the field of corrections. The real problem is to get a hearing of these new ideas and approaches. This, of course, means breaking through the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. There is a tendency to develop elaborate defenses against new ideas -- "mind-forged manacles," a term one writer has used in describing resistance to new ideas.

Programs are like people -- when they are new there is a certain receptiveness, curiousness, and fearlessness. As time passes, these qualities fade and programs, like people, become more cautious, less eager, and accumulate deep-rooted habits and fixed attitudes.

The new institution is usually willing to experiment with a variety of ways to solve its problems. It is not bowed by the weight of tradition. It rushes in where angels fear to tread. As it matures it develops subtle policies and habitual modes of solving problems. In doing so, it becomes more efficient but also less flexible. Its increasingly fixed routines and practices are congealed in an elaborate body of written rules. In the final stage of institutional senility, there is a rule or a precedent for everything. Someone has said that the last act of a dying organization is to get out a new and enlarged edition of the rule book.

As an institution becomes more concerned with precedent and custom, it has a tendency to become dehumanized. It comes to care more about methods and means instead of how programs affect people. The man who wins acclaim is not the one who "get things done" but the one who has an ingrained knowledge of the rules and accepted practices. Whether he accomplishes anything is less important than whether he conducts himself in an appropriate manner.

I realize that some of you may feel that I have strayed quite far from the subject at hand; however, the point I would like to make is one, I believe, of real significance. I feel that many times in our in-service training programs and in our orientation programs, we are passing on to staff members "bankrupt" ideas and approaches. We pass on to them our own prejudices and our own stupidity. Many times personality deficiencies are passed on to a new employee, as well. What we have done in the past has certainly not met with conspicuous success.

We see young people enter the field of corrections with the pioneer spirit, full of imagination and full of hope for the future. We slowly see a lower level of motivation. It is not always easy to see why motivation deteriorates, but a large part of it is due to the incorporation of an accumulation of a stock pile of prejudices, misinformation, and fabrications.



Perhaps they, too, fall into the decadent habit of imagining that intense efforts toward the rehabilitation of the offender is somehow unsophisticated, that dedication is naive, and ambition a bit crude.

If our goals are to rehabilitate and return to society the largest possible number of people as productive citizens, then it must by necessity follow that any correctional institution whose program consists simply of acquiring more firmly established ways of doing things is headed for the graveyard, even if it learns to do those things with greater and greater skill.

To me, the whole emphasis on a training program in a correctional setting should be toward the stimulation of seeking new ideas and new methods. The new employee should not be indoctrinated, but, rather, encouraged to seek new answers and new approaches to old problems. He should be motivated toward the search of new knowledge. He should be encouraged to ask questions.

Many times I have visited correctional institutions and asked what the objectives were in a certain program or why a certain thing was being done. Most of the time the answer was, "We have always done it this way." In any event, the answers were many times completely devoid of any logic.

One of the primary objectives should be to acquaint the new employee with some fundamental information regarding human behavior. We should be more concerned with why an individual committed a crime than with the act itself.

A strong critic of outmoded organizational patterns once characterized prisons as "sick organizations." It is impossible for any program to function effectively without well-defined chains of command well-established goals. I have been told many times that structure is of no real importance, that the real problems are in personalities of the individuals who are part of the institution or structure.

I think we all know of many instances in institutions where we have worked where real battles arose and emotions became so charged that individuals were ready to do battle. This usually results from an organizational and assignment pattern which is so ambiguous and the lines of authority so obscure and confusing that no one knows where they are going or what they are going to do when they get there.

Before any training program can be successful, there must be a healthy organizational pattern. Each individual must know how he fits into the scheme of things, and this alone will contribute toward a real "esprit de corps."

The objectives of any training program should be to acquaint the employee with the goals and philosophy of the institution. He should be made aware of new knowledge and new techniques when they are available. There should be a willingness on the part of employees to accept new philosophy and new ideas.

The development of flexibility and the receptiveness to new ideas is basic in the evaluation of an effective training program. He should be taught to be critical of what we are doing; and when he offers new ideas, he should not be ridiculed.

Morale is certainly a factor in evaluating a training program -- the morale of the employees as well as the people we are working with.

What about the turnover? Does the program have a large turnover of staff? Do they see correctional work as a temporary expediency or do they see it as a permanent



proposition?

Does the employee have a sense of direction insofar as the goals of the institution are concerned? It may be difficult to separate personal goals from institutional goals in the evaluation of the individual. He should be ambitious, and unless he is in tune with the direction and goals of the institution, he is apt to go around in circles and confine his work rather aimlessly and purposelessly. He should develop a "nostalgia for the future." When the employee ceases to be a goal-striver and has nothing to look forward to, many times his usefulness to the institution is finished.

Understanding. Understanding depends upon good communications. Communication is vital to any correctional program. We cannot react appropriately if the information we act upon is faulty or misunderstood. To deal effectively with a problem we must have some understanding of its true nature. Most of our failures in human relations are due to misunderstandings.

Many times we expect people to react and respond and to come to the same conclusions as we do from a given set of facts or circumstances. But we should remember that no one reacts to things as they are, but as they pertain to his own mental image.

From a human relations point of view, the employee should understand that because someone disagrees with him, it does not mean that the other person is being malicious or willful, but perhaps he just has a different interpretation of the circumstances. Tolerance for the other person's point of view can do much toward developing an orderly institution and at the same time not have one that exists in an air of strict conformity.

Many times we create confusion when we add our own opinion to facts and come up with the wrong conclusion. This is especially true in a correctional setting where different frames of references are used. An inmate participating in group therapy may be subjected to disciplinary action. The therapist assumes that the disciplinary action is to personally annoy him. Staff members must learn to not react as though they had been personally punished, but rather to pause, analyze the situation, and select the appropriate response. We must adopt the motto: "It doesn't matter who's right, but what's right."

A staff member must learn to admit his mistakes and errors and not to cry over them, but rather correct them and go forward. We must have the courage to risk making mistakes, risk failure, and risk being humiliated; and this should be a part of the basic philosophy of any correctional program. A step in the wrong direction is better than staying "on the spot" all of the time.

I would certainly judge the results of any training program for correctional workers as to whether or not the employees had been inculcated with the spirit of charity and interest in their co-workers, as well as their clients. They should develop a respect for the other person's problems and needs. They should respect the dignity of the individual and deal with other people as if they were human beings rather than as pawns in their own game. They should recognize that each person is an individual with a unique personality which deserves some dignity and respect.

Our feelings toward other people affect our capacity to understand ourselves. When a person begins to feel more charitable toward others, he inevitably becomes more charitable toward himself. The person who feels that "inmates are not very important" cannot have very much deep down self-respect and self-regard, for he, himself, is people and with what judgment he considers others he, himself, is unwittingly judged in his own mind.

The employee will develop a better and more adequate self-image when he begins to



feel that other people are more worthy. People are important and cannot long be treated like animals or machines to secure personal ends. This is true in a correctional institution, in a parole relationship, or in an individual relationship.

I would certainly judge the success of any training program by the amount of self-confidence and self-esteem that the employee has. The correctional worker should be able to use his errors and mistakes as a way of learning and then dismiss them from his mind. Carlyle once said, "The most fearful form of unbelief is unbelief in yourself."

Successful training programs should build self-esteem and self-confidence. The person with adequate self-esteem doesn't feel hostile toward others. He isn't out to prove anything. He can see the facts more clearly and isn't as demanding in his claims on other people.

Creating a better self-image on the part of the staff member does not create new abilities, talents, and powers; but it does release what abilities, talents, and powers the employee has and utilizes them to the fullest extent. An employee can make a mistake, but this does not mean he is a mistake. We must recognize our mistakes and shortcomings before we can correct them.

We, as correctional workers, must strive for self-understanding, self-acceptance, and recognize those areas in which we are weak. The first step, of course, toward becoming stronger, is the recognition of the problems we have.

There is a tendency in correctional programs to stifle new ideas and to discourage creativity. Diverse views should be encouraged, not to the point that they cause power struggles and departmental battles; but certainly any program should be willing to entertain diverse views. There should be built-in provisions for vigorous criticism. It should protect the descenter and the nonconformist because it is only through open and frank discussions that new approaches, new methods, and innovations can be fostered.

What I am really trying to say is that training programs should not create individuals who are slaves to strict habits and attitudes; but, rather, the correctional worker should be versatile and adaptive and not trapped in the techniques, procedures, or routines of the moment.

In a rapidly changing world, versatility is a priceless asset, and a correctional worker should not be imprisoned by extreme specialization. One of the problems in corrections has been that each of us, whether psychiatrist, social worker, psychologist, correctional officer, or teacher, has felt that his own particular brand of magic was the answer. Sometimes the highly specialized person is unable to adapt to change. An old friend of mine, an M. D. (a general practitioner), referred to this type as "narrow gauge specialists." The correctional worker may be a specialist, but he should also retain the capacity to function as a generalist.

Above all, we should avoid indoctrinating the young employee in an elaborate set of fixed beliefs which may very soon be obsolete and in complete disrepute. Instead, we must develop in the employee skills, attitudes, habits of mind, and the kinds of knowledge and understanding that will be the instruments of continuous change and growth. We must foster a climate in which new ideas can survive and the "deadwood" of obsolete ideas can be discarded. Above all, we should foster and develop innovative, versatile, and charitable men and women and give them room to breathe.



The following are references which may be referred to:

Bindman, Arthur J.; David W. Haughey; and Irving Wolf, Mental Health Applications in Correctional Practices. Boston University, December, 1960.

Committee on Riots Under the Auspices of the American Prison Association, Prison Riots and Disturbances. New York: American Prison Association, May, 1953.

Gardner, John W., The Ever-Renewing Society. (Northwestern Bell Employee Booklet Service).



### Session III - Orientation Training

Of course, as you know, our workshop goals were to determine methods of evaluating present and future training programs at the different levels for state and federal correctional institutions. I think we wandered quite a little bit and I am sure that we overlapped quite a little with in-service and other types of training, so I feel real fortunate in being able to talk first.

The objective of orientation training is to provide an initial introduction to prison work: its goals and objectives. It is only the first phase of training and must be followed by more detailed and continuing training. Orientation training is important because it is here that the new employee develops his first attitudes about his new environment, about his employers, about his co-workers, the inmate population, the organization and his place in that organization as a member of the correctional treatment team.

As methods of training, we have discussed audio-visual, classroom lectures, presentations, and demonstrations, formal and informal interviews, observation assignments with write-ups on the operation of the post to which assigned, tests and reports, and outside reading.

Why evaluate? We know that orientation training is necessary and we agreed that it accomplishes a purpose. Then, why bother with this evaluation? Well, there is one reason I think we all can understand because training costs; it costs time and money and our financial resources are limited. We do need to know and be able to convince the budget people that our training is worth the cost and is accomplishing the purpose for which it is intended.

Evaluation, too, can help us find the most effective training methods and techniques, so, what are we going to evaluate? Our main concern is in final results in the man on the job, and how much the training has helped him.

Let us consider some techniques. Step (1) We may want to determine the reaction of the trainees to the classroom sessions. If they react unfavorably to speakers, methods, presentations, then learning on their part is difficult if not impossible.

A written comment sheet could be used. It is designed so the reactions can be tabulated. Of course, to get honest reactions we should require no signatures; keep it completely anonymous. Then we can allow trainees to write additional comments. This reaction rating then can be supplemented with the training coordinators rating. This is an important evaluation, but it is limited. It tells whether the trainees liked the training, but it does not tell what the trainee learned.

Step (2). Learning . What principles, facts, and techniques were understood and absorbed by the trainee? Written quizzes or tests after a days session can be used and written reports by the trainee of his on-the-job assignment. One state institution used a task performance statement. In this case, their orientation training was actually spread over a period of some six months. The person was assigned to a job initially when he came to work, and then the training spread out through the six months. At the end of that period, the employee wrote a rather complete statement of the duties and objectives of his job.

Of course, in testing, a before- and-after approach would help relate the effectiveness of the training itself. As far as possible, learning should be



measured on an objective basis where possible, a control group could be used. This I have not found to be done in any of our orientation training. I think it would be almost impossible to do.

Now the first two steps then tell us whether the trainee likes the training and will listen and step (2) endeavors to measure the learning.

Step (3). Behavior. A further and possibly most important step is to determine how the training effects the employees behavior on the job. This is the phase that I think all of us have been practicing at least in part. This is the matter of appraisal of on the job performance. It is made by one or more of the following groups: by the person receiving the training, by his superior or superiors, by the other people familiar with his performance.

What do we look for in the trainee? Well, some of the elements that we look for are: does he seek knowledge, is he trying to learn, does he demonstrate in his relations with employees and inmates, his fundamental understanding of human behavior; this is pretty important as we are dealing with people. Does he understand the organizational pattern (you certainly need to know this and know his place in it), does he show tolerance of others, does he admit mistakes and seek to correct, does he have a spirit of charity, an interest in both co-workers and clients, does he have respect for the other persons problems and needs, does he corecognize that each person is an individual with a unique personality which deserves some dignity and respect? Certainly this applies both to co-workers and inmates. Does he feel that people are important and worthy? Does he have self-confidence, does he have self-understanding? Does he have self-esteem? Does he have any ideas and does he express them? These were all things which I am sure we look for in evaluating the person. Another thing is, does he understand the goals and philosophies of the institution? After a thirty-day orientation period, I think it is quite possible that he would not fully understand the goals and philosophy. Another important evaluation is that of the morale of both the staff and the inmate population. This certainly we can't credit all to orientation and training. As I say, orientation is imply the first part, but it does play a part. The exit interview is used in some places in order to evaluate training. Finally, there is a fourth step. There is a need for that kind of evaluation which tells us how we in correctional work are accomplishing our goals of returning the prisoner to society as an acceptable citizen. Along with this, there needs to be a determination of how effective our training has been, in what areas can the training be improved? The scope of this task is beyond the reach of the individual agency. It will require research by professionally trained people. We can and we do some research in the agency, but it is limited. It is logical that we look to our universities, such as our hosts, Iowa State University and the Wisconsin University, are involved in it and many others.

If we are to develop the corrections profession to its highest capacity, it will be through the forced utilization of all sources of knowledge and experience. The first step orientation training is but the start of the long and expensive process of developing a raw recruit into a real professional correctional workers. Good orientation training can help him see the overall picture and can help him develop first attitudes which in turn help motivate him toward striving to become a real pro on the correctional team.



## EVALUATING ORIENTATION TRAINING

Discussion Leader: **Roy W. Moore**  
Associate Warden, U. S. Penitentiary  
Leavenworth, Kansas

OBJECTIVE of Orientation Training is to provide an initial introduction to prison work, its goals and objectives. It is only the first phase of training, and must be followed by more detailed and continuing training. Orientation Training is important because it is here that the new employee develops his first attitudes about his new environment, about his employers, his co-workers, and the inmate population, about the organization, and his place in that organization as a member of the Correctional Treatment TEAM.

As METHODS of training, we have discussed:

1. Audio - visual
2. Classroom lectures, presentations and demonstrations.
3. Formal and informal interviews.
4. Outside reading of books and professional journals.
5. Observation assignments, with write-up on operation of the posts to which assigned.
6. Tests and reports.

### WHY EVALUATE?

We know Orientation Training is necessary, and we 'agree' that it accomplishes a purpose. Then why evaluate?

1. Because training costs time and money! Our financial resources are limited. We need to know, and convince the budget people, that our training is worth the cost and is accomplishing purpose for which intended.
2. Evaluation and re-evaluation can help find the most effective training methods and techniques.

So what are we going to evaluate? Our main concern is in final results - in the man on the job - and how much the training has helped him.

Let us consider some techniques.

Step 1. We may want to determine the Reaction of the trainees to the classroom sessions. If they react unfavorably to the speakers, methods, presentations, learning is difficult if not impossible. A written comment sheet can be used, designed so the reactions can be tabulated. To get honest reactions, we should require no signatures. Allow trainees to write additional comments.

This reaction rating can be supplemented with the Training Coordinator's rating.

This is an important Evaluation, but it is limited. It tells whether the trainees liked the training. It does not tell what the trainee learned.

Step 2. Learning. What principles, facts, and techniques were understood and absorbed by trainees? Written quiz or tests, reports written by trainee, can help in measuring this learning.

A before - and - after approach to testing would help relate the effectiveness of the training itself.



As far as possible, learning should be measured on an objective basis.

Where possible a Control group should be used. (Not normally possible.)

Now the first two steps tell us whether (1) the trainee likes the training and (2) measures the learning.

Step 3. Behavior. A further - and possible most important - step is to determine how the training affects the employee's behavior on the job.

This is the phase that probably all of us have been practicing - at least in part. This is a matter of appraisal of on-the-job performance. It is made by one or more of the following groups:

1. Person receiving the training.
2. His superior - or superiors.
3. His peers - or other people familiar with his performance.

What do we look for in the trainee? These are some elements: Does he

1. Seek knowledge?
2. Demonstrate, in his relations with employees and inmates, a fundamental understanding of human behavior?
3. Understand the organizational pattern?
4. Show tolerance of others?
5. Admit his mistakes and seek to correct them?
6. Have a spirit of Charity, and interest in both co-worker and clients?
7. Have respect for the other person's problems and needs?
8. Recognize that each person is an individual, with a unique personality which deserves some dignity and respect?
9. Feel that people are important? and worthy?
10. Have self-confidence?
11. Have self-understanding?
12. Have self-esteem?
13. Have ideas, and express them?
14. Understand the goals and philosophy of institution?

Finally, there is a need for that kind of evaluation which tells us how well we, in correctional work, are accomplishing our goals of returning the prisoner to Society as an acceptable citizen. Along with this, there needs to be a determination of how effective our training has been. In what areas can it be improved? The scope of this task is beyond the reach of the individual agency. It will require research, by professionally trained people. We can do some research in the agency, but it is logical that we look to our Universities, such as our hosts, Iowa State University, for assistance. If we are to develop the Corrections profession to its highest capacity, it will be through the fullest utilization of all sources of knowledge and experience. The first step - Orientation Training - is but the start of the long and expensive process of developing a raw recruit into a real professional correctional worker.

Good orientation training can help him see the overall picture, and develop first attitudes which in turn may help motivate him towards striving to become a "Pro" on the Correctional Team.



### Session III - In-Service Training

Our mission this morning was to evaluate the in-service training, and I think that the best thing that a person could do at the institutional level is take a big step backward, and look at the program as a whole, from the top on down. What are we trying to do, who are we trying to do it to, and how are we going to determine if we did it? I think that each of us is guilty in one respect or another of not following through on everything that we do. In-service training is really a line of communication between the warden and the custodial force and if the policy defined from the front office isn't preached consistently from the front office on down to the guard then the communication link is broken and the training program as such then becomes relatively ineffective. The important thing is to get the determination of penal philosophy at your institution and follow through. When a man is selected as an instructor, the evaluation then begins. He is given a subject area, he should as well be given some guidelines as to what he is to instruct in his given area, what the warden wants, what the philosophy is, when he is on the podium, some method of evaluating what he is giving. He may be giving all the straight stuff, but if his method and manner of presentation is such that the students are asleep - then again the link is broken. The evaluation then should be of the instructor and of his instructional materials, of his manner of instruction, and then the evaluation of the student, what has he learned, how well does he put it into practice, what has he gained from all of this? It doesn't make any difference if it is classroom training, formalized training or informal training. There are various ways we can always give a man a test like we had in school.

When he completes his training, give him a test; see what he learned. Determine those areas where he is weak and increase the training in those areas. If the whole class is weak in a given area, take another step back and take a look at your training program because evidently there is a failing somewhere in it if the whole group did not get one area of instruction.

Use of a rat sheet, which was covered in the preceding speech, what we call a rat sheet is an unsigned sheet of paper where a student has an opportunity to interject his ideas, his complaints, his suggestions. Do away with this, increase that, he can elaborate on individual areas of instruction, individual instructors; he can say we need some more instruction in this area or we need less instruction in that area.

Then we discussed as to whether or not this should be a signed or an unsigned document. We had some institutions that used such a rat sheet that have it signed and others have it unsigned. At the disciplinary barracks, we use unsigned and we find that we get a little better participation. The first time we had it signed and we had 100% accolade; but a great job, terrific. When we said "Don't bother to put your name on it," we got a few more objective answers. Personnel evaluations from the individual overseers and supervisors. How are the men doing on the job? Is there any change in their job performance which can be related back to the effectiveness of his training program. It should be remembered that the training, whatever it might be, is directed to the guard, but as a rather sneak attack on the prisoner population. We try to affect an attitude change in the guard and through that attitude change, effected behavior oral change in the prisoner population. Our end result is people and if the people, our product, is not up to the standards that you want it to be, then our methods of production are wrong. Anybody that is in a supervisory role at an institution should be able to sit back and observe certain things to determine how a program is going. If he has an effective training program, then the treatment in the institution should go up because each and every guard



who is subjected to this training becomes a treatment individual, a contact man with the inmate. As the treatment program goes up, the security and control problems of the institution should go down. If we see fewer disciplinary reports, fewer people in the hole, this is an indication then that we are doing a pretty good job, because this is what we want. In our industries, we should see an increase in prisoner production because they are on the team. They are not happy to be there, but they are willing to do their share. They are willing to participate. At the same time we should find that the prisoner population should voluntarily increase their participation in those areas that were designed to teach and treat them. Alcoholic Anonymous, our educational facilities, our athletic programs, anything that is designed for the prisoner himself. He should want to get in these things - a spirit of belonging. Security control problems throughout should be lessened. Our intermediary subject of course, is a guard, but if our program is effective, then we should find we have fewer managerial problems with our guard force. Where does his loyalty lie? Does it lie with the institution or does it lie with his moonlighting job downtown in the gas station? If we can make him belong, if we can make him feel he is a part of our job, if he is a key man, if he is the one that the whole institution revolves on, then we are in business. The guard should be more aware of his role, more aware of the institutions's role and the institution's mission and of the institution's product. He should be more willing to participate in community activities as a representative of the institution as a preacher to society to re-educate society because not only do we rehabilitate the prisoner, but we have responsibility to rehabilitate society so that it can accept these men back. If we don't do both, then we are only doing half the job.

One of the subjects that were brought up in the discussion which is amazing because it is strictly forbidden by our Army regulations and this was an inmate council type of thing which some of you evidently do. Where the prisoners have an opportunity to meet with representatives of the staff and make suggestions and make complaints and talk things out. As I listened to the discussion, I found it is probably a pretty good idea even though it is forbidden for us. Because it established rapport for one thing between the custodial force, between the administrative staff and between the prisoner population. It also gives us an opportunity to identify with the prisoner, to look at his viewpoint, understand his problems and his way of thinking on these things.

In closing I would just like to say that the key to your program and to my program is a continuation of the thinking from the front man and if it doesn't get down to the guards, if it is the intermediary's thinking, if it is the instructors thinking and not the boss's, then we might as well pack up our bags and not have a training program. It is not going to be effective and no training program is any more effective than your method of evaluating it to determine what your job is and if you have done it. I would like to thank the members of the discussion group for a whole-hearted participation this morning, and I would like to extend an invitation to anybody who is in the Ft. Leavenworth area to stop by and when you come by the drinks are on Col. Slobe out front here.



### Session III - Non-Uniformed Personnel Special Training

Mr. Henderson, friends, we had one of the most congenial groups assembled this morning that was possible to get. There wasn't a strong argument in the whole group. I enjoyed being the discussion leader very very much. Our particular problem at hand was that of evaluating the future and present training programs of non-uniformed personnel. We eliminated all custodial staff but we found that the deputy wardens in charge of custody and those in charge of treatment were non-uniformed so we had to include them. The problem was just so great that we had to limit it in many respects so we drew some rather generalized conclusions and they seemed to agree with what we had to propose and proposed several of their own. We thought that the training program instituted for the men who are going to work in an institution should be improved particularly for those men who are coming into the institution. We eliminated any discussion in our group with a formalized training in the universities and colleges of socialists, psychologists, shop supervisors, custodial people, instructors in the schools.

We have no question, we permitted no question about the formalized training of those people because it was technical and beyond our realization. We thought that a man should be permitted to know something about problems that exist in an institution if he becomes behind the walls to work in the rehabilitation of these men that have fallen from society. We thought that perhaps a program of research among you gentlemen that are in the field working might be of some value to the psychologists coming in, the social worker who is coming in, the educator who is coming behind the walls or anybody else. But the problems that you have faced and solved successfully and your mistakes that you are aware of that has placed you in a position of responsibility which you hold today might become the possession of this man. This man who you have coming in behind the walls to work, not with the idea that it will solve his problems - not at all - but that it will give him some maturity, if you please, in his thinking before he comes in and it reverts itself to the basic fundamental definition of education, so that the possession of the aged or the older might become the possession of youth. You men who have been in institutions have profited by mistakes, and are better after five, ten, or fifteen, or twenty years of service and that your invaluable knowledge might become available to the new man who is coming in - be he sociologist, teacher, etc. We even went so far as to develop a little security for this newcomer who is coming in that the physical training department of your college or university might give him a little judo or hand-to-hand combat. To give him a sense of security, give him if you please, a sense of superiority.

The specific things, which they were very congenial in arriving at a conclusion, was this - that if we could get more material thinking, more dedicated individuals in our institutions, more people who are concerned with the restoration of the down trodden, fallen individual back into an upright position in our society, there would be less second and third offenders. We then won't be the lawless, that there would be less turnover of personnel, that this man might know what he can expect; not that it would solve his problems, but he would have a more mature attitude in attacking the problem and arriving at his own solution. And further than that - that the man on the inside, the inmate with whom he works, might feel free to go to the non-uniformed personnel for help at the critical time and an example was given that if this boy is on a machine and is goofing off this morning, apparently he is not doing his usual work. The supervisor of the particular shop or industry might come up and say, "Jack, what is the matter this morning?"



Jack might say I got a "Dear John" yesterday. That is the time for individual counseling and whether it comes from a shop supervisor, an educational director, a sociologist, a counselor or whoever it might come from, that is the most valuable time for counseling. It would give this inmate a feeling of security and responsibility toward those who are supervising and working with him, and we thought that that would be one of the greatest tests, and we went even so much further than that.

We have learned of one institution in the United States where there is such a conflict within the people working within the institution that they scarcely speak to each other. We thought that if we could get well trained, dedicated people in every institution with the sphere of their activities and staying within that sphere of activities that there would be responsibility from one to the other and that individualism and growth would be completely eliminated and our institution would grow and develop and improve the inmates. And I want to say to you people visiting from other states and ours that the condition of disrespect does not exist in our institution. It perhaps would be amiss here, but I must take this opportunity to express my appreciation as an institutional parole agent working for the board of parole inside the walls with men who are working within the institution and for the board of control, that it is possible or even hoped for that everyone to an end is dedicated to his job and doing the very best that he can and not once in my tour of duty have they failed to give me aid, help, or assistance in my work or any information that I might need in the parole recommendations of these people. I think that this is an outstanding monument to what I mean by an advanced training program to dedicate men to their work and secondly to the institution. The reduction of turnover of staff and absolute dedication and responsibility to the management of the staff and to the institution, if you please of the crime rate in the second and third offenders, would not return that rehabilitation and would ooze from the workers to the inmates and that our crime rate would be reduced. I think those were the main problems. Were there any others discussed? Do you have anything to add? I had one of the best recorders it is possible to get in the State of Iowa, from the penitentiary.

This will have to be kind of like, let your conscience be your guide, but in the measuring of the effectiveness of your program, these are just in the question form as we didn't think we knew the answers so we were just going to let you decide your own issue.

1. Does the program have a direct bearing on the attitudes and skills required of employees for a successful performance?
2. Does the content of the question deal with the practical correctional work situation?
3. Are available methods used in making the training realistic and accurate?
4. Does the training challenge and hold the interest of all employees?
5. Is the training presented at a level which is understandable to all employees?
6. Does the training include the coverage of new developments in correctional work which will lead to the improvement of the correctional program.



7. Does the program permit and encourage the employee to take part in and contribute to the training program?

That is for the effectiveness and to evaluate your program we still have this in question form because we didn't think we had the answers.

1. Comparative analysis of the employee's performance reports over two or more years, not over one incident, not over one little happening, but I mean evaluating his part in the program over a period of time.

2. Survey of an employee's attitudes regarding his job, the objective of the program of supervision, administration and of the inmates overall. Analyze the trends regarding employee turnover, disciplinary actions, errors and accidents.

3. Survey of employee openings and regarding their training needs in terms of their job experience.

Test and examination of an employee's knowledge regarding the policies, procedures, rules, and laws under which they operate.

I hope that these questions were better than the answers.



### Session III - Management and Supervision

I see we are running ahead of schedule so that gives me an opportunity to go into my Class C speech. I will go back to my Class A - that takes three minutes.

In order to abbreviate our summary of evaluation of the training program on managerial and supervisory programs and to insure our keeping on schedule, I have asked our recorder, Charley DeCoursey, to give the report.

Thank you, Mr. Howell. In many ways than one Mr. Howell made our job relatively simple. He presented a paper at the start of our session and from the contents of it, it was evident that a great deal of time was spent in the preparation of it. It was also one that we couldn't dispute. Because much of our thunder has been stolen by the previous speakers, I am only going to outline part of what was presented by Mr. Howell and agreed on in our group.

It was pointed out that there are four areas to be considered in evaluating a training program.

1. Reactions
2. Learning
3. Behavior
4. Results

It was pointed out that the results should be heavily underlined. Now there may be other areas, but they would be overlapping, we felt, with what was outlined here.

Some of the ways we might evaluate the reactions is through questionnaires comment sheets, interviewing, and feedback.

In the learning, it has to be determined the ways it might be possibly be determined is to give tests before and after. Give the same test six months later to determine observation. The results can then be used later to sell new programs.

Behavior - it has felt that the following things must exist in the trainee if there is to be a change in job behavior.

1. He must want to improve.
2. He must recognize his own weaknesses.
3. He must work in a premissive climate.
4. He must have help from someone who is interested and skilled.
5. He must have an opportunity to try out new ideas.

Now, some of these changes, it was pointed out, may not be seen for some time. In fact in some areas, it might be years. One of the ways which we could possibly check on this is to keep a file on our employees and to check back to see when and if the change did occur.

Some of the guideposts to evaluate appraisal before and after post training appraised in about six months. Control groups, ones not receiving the training. Results if stated as results required could be classified as the up-grading of the employees. Was there a reduction in grievances, was there improved morale? Was there a reduction in the turnover and in absenteeism?



So summarize, we believe that the results could be evaluated with a good deal of common judgment as one person put it, just plain horse sense. Did the training accomplish what you had hoped it would? We can get quite involved in this, but if we keep it comparatively simple, it is believed that we can come up with an answer to, was the training any good and did it accomplish what we intended it to? Do we want to spend the time and the money to repeat the training?

It is my hope that each of us will take a closer look at his own training program and see how he can evaluate them and see how he can use his evaluation results. Perhaps a continuing exchange of information, objectives, methods, and techniques will be mutually beneficial to us all.



STATE LIBRARY OF IOWA



3 1723 02095 1216