



U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections

108185
108191

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

108185

108191

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

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

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

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
SECOND ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM
ON NEW GENERATION JAILS

National Institute of Corrections
Jail Center
Boulder, Colorado

May 8, 1987
Clearwater, Florida

Edited by Richard Wener & Jay Farbstein

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Panel Summaries | 3 |
| Papers | |
| 508186 [Linda L. Zupan and Ben A. Menke Job Enrichment and the Direct Supervision Correctional Officer: The Role of Management | 8 |
| 108187 [Russell M. Davis Using the Principles of Direct Supervision as an Organizational Management System | 17 |
| 108188 [Guy Pellicane Developing a Specific Role Model for Mid-Level Managers in Direct Supervision Jails | 24 |
| 108189 [Jeanne B. Stinchcomb and Sally Gross-Farina IPC Practicum | 37 |
| 108190 [Ray Nelson Unit Size and Inmate Management for Direct Supervision | 45 |
| 108191 [Steven Carter Management Decisions in the Correctional Facility Design Process | 50 |
| Symposium Evaluation | 58 |
| List of attendees | 59 |
| Symposium Program | -- |

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

ORGANIZATION OF THIS PROCEEDINGS

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

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails
INTRODUCTION

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

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

VIDEO TAPES OF THE SESSION

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

PANEL SUMMARIES

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

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

NIC has supported this symposium at AJA to:

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

PANEL 1 STAFF SELECTION AND TRAINING

MODERATOR: RICHARD WENER

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

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

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

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

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

The goals of the selection project were to:

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

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

PANEL 2 TRAINING MID LEVEL MANAGERS AND OFFICERS

MODERATOR: MIKE O'TOOLE

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

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

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

PAPER PRESENTATION

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

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

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

PANEL 3 UNIT SIZE, STAFF RATIOS AND DIRECT SUPERVISION

MODERATOR: JAY FARBSTEIN

PANEL: STEVE CARTER, COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

RAY NELSON, BOULDER, COLORADO

ALAN MINISH, FORT COLLINS, COLORADO

TOM BARRY, NEW YORK CITY

SAM SAXTON, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MARYLAND

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

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

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

PANEL 4 OVERCROWDING IN DIRECT SUPERVISION

MODERATOR: RICHARD WENER
PANEL: ROGER ROSE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
LARRY ARD, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

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

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

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

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

PAPERS

108189

1ST PAGE OF NEXT ARTICLE

NIC 2nd Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails
Stinchcomb and Gross-Farina

IPC PRACTICUM

Jeanne B. Stinchcomb, Dade County, Florida
and
Sally Gross-Farina, Miami, Florida

Introduction

When the Dade County Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation began to move from remote supervision of inmates to direct supervision as practiced in new generation jailing, it became apparent that a different type of "human relations" training was needed. In order to promote the acceptance and effectiveness of new generation jailing, officers needed to overcome resistance to working directly with the inmates throughout an entire shift. Traditionally, staff have been physically separated from inmates, but under new generation concepts, they are actually "confined" with the inmates in a dormitory environment. They must therefore learn to listen, observe, interpret, and react while in direct contact with the inmates--without bars, without weapons, and hopefully, without bias. In short, effective communication has become the critical component of modern correctional practices.

IPC Training

The Interpersonal Communications (IPC) training program developed by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has proven to be an excellent tool for preparing officers to work under new generation jailing. The IPC model contains 3 essential elements:

1. Basics (sizing up the situation: positioning, posturing, observing, and listening);
2. Add-ons (communicating with inmates: responding to content, feeling, and meaning; asking questions);
3. Applications (controlling behavior: handling requests; making requests; reinforcing behavior).

IPC in this format has been incorporated into Dade County's basic recruit training program, and is also offered frequently for in-service officers. The program is well-designed and includes demonstrations, extensive role-playing, and written self-tests. However, it did not provide a method for evaluating the students' level of IPC skills. Initially, we prepared a paper-and-pencil test to assess comprehension of the IPC principles listed above. The test was helpful, but it soon became clear that while good "test-takers" were easily passing the written exam, they were not necessarily able to practice what

they had learned when they reached Department facilities. The solution was to develop a method of realistically evaluating the application of skills through an IPC practicum.

The IPC Practicum Experiment

Our first attempt at providing an IPC practicum exercise was very rudimentary, designed as an experiment to determine if the concept could be implemented. Trainees were exposed to a series of 6 scenarios based on potential conflict situations which occur in correctional work. They proceeded through these exercises at the training academy, during which they were assessed by their IPC instructors. In the morning, half of the class dressed in civilian clothes and acted as role-players, doing their best to imitate inmate behavior. In the afternoon, the groups reversed. Recruits were given feedback on their strengths and weaknesses, but were not given a numerical or pass/fail score. Actually, it was more of an in-depth practice than an evaluation session.

Several factors limited the effectiveness of this first practicum, primarily because of the lack of realism:

1. Role alterations
Whenever classmates role-play, there are subtle variances in behavior based on their prior knowledge of and relationships with each other. Some role-players seemed to purposely alter their behavior for certain classmates, either to help or hinder their performance.
2. Role familiarization
The element of surprise was missing for the class members who had role-played all morning and became "officers" in the afternoon.
3. Reality of the roles
Few people who are in training to become correctional officers can accurately portray the behavior, attitudes, feelings, and emotions of real inmates.
4. Reality of the setting
In the academy setting, it was impossible to replicate the true environment of the jail. The stress factor was present, but not consistent.

This experimental practicum served to point out the above weaknesses and helped staff to recognize how the scenarios and the evaluation tool needed to be changed. Probably the primary discovery resulting from this experience was the extensive degree of organization, cooperation, and coordination needed to make the practicum work efficiently and effectively.

The Revised IPC Practicum

Learning from the first experience generated a number of additions and changes in:

1. Practicum preparation
2. Practicum location
3. Scheduling and briefing
4. Scenario scripts
5. Role-players, evaluators, and coordinators
6. The evaluation instrument
7. Debriefing

Current practices relating to each of these components are described below.

Practicum Preparation

It was determined that recruits needed an opportunity to observe inmates in a correctional setting and begin to practice their IPC skills prior to being evaluated through the practicum. Therefore, approximately one week after conclusion of the classroom portion of IPC, classes are assigned to a shift at one of Dade County's facilities. The objective is to give all trainees a chance to observe, compare, and learn about officer-inmate relationships in the "real world." They are directed to look for application of IPC skills by in-service officers and are allowed to interact with inmates, trying to use IPC techniques. But they are not to be treated as officers by those working in the facilities or to be left alone with inmates at any time. Too often, recruits in facilities are expected to "fill-in" for absent employees. This was not our intention for the practicum preparation shift, and thus far, it has not occurred. Upon return to the training academy, trainees give feedback on what they learned and have an opportunity to ask questions and clarify aspects of IPC application.

Practicum Location

In order to enhance the setting's realism, the practicum was moved from the academy to the Dade County Training and Treatment Center, where portable units housing inmates have been set up using many of the principles of new generation jailing. Units vacated during the day by inmates on work release are used, so that the practicum now takes place in one of the settings where trainees can be expected to be assigned upon graduation. This eliminates the need to attempt to simulate the sights, sounds, smells, physical layout, tensions, etc. associated with life in an actual correctional facility.

Scheduling and Briefing

The class is assigned to the Training and Treatment Center for an 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM shift. At the beginning of the day, a briefing is conducted. The class reviews the actual evaluation form outlining IPC skills on which they will be assessed. We have found that the stress level is quite high at this point, and therefore, some time is used for stress reduction, breathing exercises, and positive imagery.

Following the briefing, recruits are assigned to work in pairs at specific housing units. They move into the testing unit with their partner only when their team is scheduled to be evaluated. Teams are separated from each other throughout the day to avoid "contamination" of the scenarios. All recruits wear their trainee uniforms to distinguish them from in-service officers.

During the evaluation itself, trainees cycle through the scenarios in pairs. However, only one officer handles each situation. The pair alternates in "primary officer" status, so that each person has fifteen minutes between scenarios to refocus, observe, and prepare for the next station. The recruit being tested is given immediate verbal feedback after each station, but they do not see their written evaluation sheets until the next day.

Scenario Scripts

A "scenario" is a specific set of circumstances included in a role-playing exercise. Each scenario is designed to elicit the actual behaviors tested in IPC. Suggestions for realistic situations were solicited from experienced officers and grouped into 3 categories, (low, medium, or high stress/intricacy level), based on the type of situation and number of inmates involved. A few examples are listed below:

1. Low stress scenarios involve one inmate with a common type of question or difficulty (e.g., shaking down an inmate's bed and personal possessions because information was received that he has contraband).
2. Medium stress scenarios involve two inmates in a mild confrontation, one of whom has sought officer assistance (e.g., Inmate A is monopolizing the phone and Inmate B has a call to make which is important to him; both feel they have a right to more phone time).
3. High stress scenarios involve complex interaction between 4 inmates (i.e., dispute over the TV channel between Hispanic and non-Hispanic inmates; or having to

tell an inmate to clear up a mess around his bed. He initially refuses and is encouraged by other inmates who heckle the officer, but do not become physically involved).

Out of the 12 scenarios currently being used, each student is tested on 3, with one from each level of difficulty. No scenario is designed to lead to any physical confrontations, (and in fact, none have to date). If the trainee decides that the inmate is to be removed from the area, the exercise ends and the trainee is evaluated up to that point.

Perhaps the most important point in the development of scenarios is having clearly-defined, written scripts. In order to insure consistency for all students, it is essential that role-players closely adhere to prescribed roles. Evaluators use hand signals to assist them in doing so, and no role-player improvisation is allowed.

Role-Players

A significant improvement over the experimental practicum was the introduction of real inmates, (rather than other students), as role-players. This has resolved the problems of familiarity and role alteration mentioned earlier, and has also added a major element of realism to the exercises. Inmates selected to be role-players are chosen from the ranks of trustees volunteering for this assignment. Most often, they have little time remaining on their sentences and have been living in new generation housing units.

Scripts are reviewed with inmate role-players, and expectations are outlined to them. For example, there is no touching permitted, and they are directed to follow predetermined nonverbal signals of the evaluators during the exercises. Thus, when an inmate begins to deviate from the script, or over/underplay his role, the evaluator can signal to "escalate," "back off," "move in," etc.

The incentives for inmates to participate are obvious: it is an opportunity to do something different for the day; there is a certain amount of prestige that goes with being a role-player; it provides an inside glimpse of training; and a special lunch is offered. Role-playing is also fun for the inmates--a chance to "push," or be "uncooperative" without penalty.

The use of inmate role-players is not without critics. Some feel it gives inmates unfair or even dangerous insights into new officers and IPC techniques. We believe, however, that the

tremendous benefit of realism, as well as the positive effect on the inmates involved, outweigh the possibility that an inmate might remember a weakness in a particular recruit. (Moreover, recruits do not graduate for 8-10 weeks after the practicum, and the inmates selected are usually those who will be released before that time). But evaluators are careful not to criticize trainees within earshot of the inmates.

An effort is also made to match inmates to certain roles. Not being real actors, they should not be placed in scenes which might provoke undue hostility or discomfort. Volunteers are screened carefully to insure that no inmates are teamed up who might have a personal agenda which could erupt. If difficulties develop, roles are reassigned between exercises as the need arises.

Evaluators

Those selected to assess the students' skills during the practicum are certified IPC instructors who teach part-time and work full-time in new generation units. Certification means that they have completed a 40- or 80-hour general instructor techniques course, along with the 40-hour IPC program and a teaching internship. We try to avoid using as evaluators the instructors who taught the group which is being evaluated since they have a "vested interest" in good performance and may tend to overrate their students.

During the morning briefing, evaluators are reminded to tightly control their stations. With inmate role-players, it is critical that the evaluators guide the scenes and be prepared to move quickly to end any situation which could dangerously escalate. In large part because of the nonverbal directions given by the evaluators, we have not had any difficulties with the role-players. The evaluation instrument is also reviewed with assessors, although they are not given information on how the final scoring is done. Thus, the possibility of adjusting scores for any particular recruit is eliminated. The evaluator's job is simply to assess the student's performance--to determine whether each of the behaviors being rated was performed.

After reviewing the materials to be used, assessors meet with inmate role-players assigned to their station. They discuss role prescriptions and set up the scenarios (including props, etc.).

Coordinators

At least two training staff members function as practicum

coordinators. They "float" through the stations, monitor for difficulties, keep everyone on schedule, and serve as communicators between stations, evaluators, recruits, facility staff, etc. Additionally, training officers assigned to the class at the academy are on hand to observe recruit behavior that is not assessed in the practicum (e.g., cooperation, stress management, flexibility, etc.).

Evaluation Instrument

The form on which trainees are evaluated basically reflects the elements of IPC in outline form. (See attached). It is a checklist approach to whether the behavior was performed, not performed, or not applicable. The assessor observes trainee behavior, records it on the form, and gives initial verbal feedback. The forms used by the evaluators do not contain the scoring methodology.

Scoring and interpretation are done by an independent coordinator. Scores are assigned for each behavioral cluster or group of behaviors in a related unit. The score is assigned according to the trainee's performance on each behavior within the cluster. A maximum of 22 points can be achieved; 16 points (75%) is the minimum needed to pass.

Most classes have few, if any, failures. At this time, failure of the practicum does not automatically result in termination from the academy. However, in-depth observations about weaknesses are made in the trainee's file. A recommendation for remedial training is made for anyone who fails, and it is strongly suggested that they not be assigned to IPC units until satisfactory evaluation of those skills.

Debriefing

At the conclusion of all practicum exercises, an hour is spent reviewing what has occurred. First, role-players (inmates) are asked to make general comments about trainee behavior. This feedback has not only been quite valuable to the trainees, but it has also demonstrated how seriously inmates take their role-playing responsibilities. It is certainly unique in a correctional setting to hear an inmate telling a new recruit class to "be careful about turning your back on me;" to "watch closer for the contraband I had;" to avoid "letting me get away with so much," not to mention wishing them well on their future career! Being involved in the practicum gives the inmates an opportunity to see what it is like from the other side--as a correctional officer--and to develop a further appreciation for their role. Some have actually been so impressed with the

experience that they have expressed an interest in getting employed in some type of correctional work upon release.

After the inmates leave the room, evaluators make general observations about the class performance, and there is a brief period for discussion. Individual behaviors are not critiqued in this setting; that occurs the next day at the academy. The coordinators solicit comments from the class and give their overall impressions of how well they handled the challenge. Inevitably, class comments are extremely positive, citing the practicum as the best experience they have had in the training program.

Summary

The bottom line in new generation jailing is being proactive--dealing with inmates verbally before problems escalate to physical confrontation, which is exactly what students are prepared for in IPC. The IPC model as developed by NIC is an excellent tool for training officers to work in any modern correctional environment, but particularly one in which they will be interacting directly with the inmate population on a constant basis. The one major element missing in the program is a practical evaluation tool as described herein.

Since beginning the IPC practicums, Dade County has continually refined the scenarios, scheduling, grading computations, etc., searching for ways in which the experience can be improved. This is often a time-consuming and labor-intensive effort. But we believe that the results are worth the investment. There have been benefits from IPC for everyone involved--the students, the inmates, the staff, and the Department overall. Moreover, the practicums have been implemented at no cost to the county other than personnel time. In order to further improve the practicums, Dade County staff would be most interested to hear from other trainers throughout the country who are experimenting with similar efforts. In the meantime, we believe that IPC is the key to effectively implementing new generation jailing--and that the practicum exercise is the key to effectively implementing IPC!