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Introduction

Team management, an aspect of participatory management that concerns all staff, is being gradually introduced at Bathurst Gaol. Team management is presented in the "Prison Officers Booklet" as follows:-

"This is possibly the most important concept which will be introduced at Bathurst. While retaining the traditional 'Chain of Command' Bathurst Gaol will be managed through a series of teams. At each level officers will be able to participate fully in their team by offering suggestions, debating issues, making recommendations and so on."

Five teams are being developed at Bathurst Gaol: security, accommodation, prisoner processing, staff development and industries. To date, while there have been no meetings of these individual teams, there have been regular meetings of the overall organising body, the Gaol Management Team (GMT). The GMT meets three times a week, to decide collectively on matters appropriate to that level of decision making. The team consists of the Superintendent, his deputy, the Programme Co-ordinator, the team leaders (security, accommodation, prisoner processing, staff development and industries) as well as the Principal Prison Officer of the Bathurst Emergency Unit and the Prison Psychologist.
This report concerns the meeting procedures and dynamics of the GMT.

Since writing the progress report on unit management the researchers have designed a schedule to record meeting dynamics (see Appendix 1). The same schedule is used at all meetings in the gaol. The schedule records and rates information that assists in answering the following questions concerning the meeting dynamics:

1. Were all the relevant people involved in the decision making process?
2. Which issues were brought to the meetings? Were the issues relevant to that level of discussion and decision making brought to the meeting?
3. Was there listening and understanding?
4. Was there openness?
5. Was enough knowledge put forward before a decision or resolution was reached?
6. How effective was the chairperson?
7. Did the group achieve resolutions? How was this achieved?
8. How was conflict or a contentious issue dealt with?
9. Did the debate continue to another meeting or venue?

Questions 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were posed by the Assistant Superintendent Staff Development and used in reviewing dynamics of group decision-making exercises in training programmes she had conducted within the gaol. A full description of the development of this schedule and how it is used is being prepared.
These questions are discussed, in turn, below. It must be noted that although there is no established bench mark for the meeting dynamics, these results will allow a comparison over time, especially as the GMT is in a developmental stage and a staff training exercise in meeting procedure is scheduled in the near future.
Question 1 Were all the relevant people involved in the decision making process?

Table 1 Level of Involvement as Percentage of Issues that Warranted a Decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues where relevant people were present or represented</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues that were deferred until relevant people present or represented</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues where the relevant people were neither present or represented</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues that were cut short such that no-one had a say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant people are those people the issue concerns or affects as well as the people who have the knowledge in that area e.g., the team leader (or his principal when he is away) when the issue concerns his/her area.

The relevant people were either present or represented on 65.2% of issues. Many issues had to be deferred and the decision held up because the relevant person was away on holidays, sick days etc. (A problem that is very specific to the gaol as a work place.) This is, in the research officer's opinion, the main challenge to participatory management at this stage. Often it was legitimate to wait for the person's return as it was when the author of the catering report was on study leave. However, when you have a structure where the next most senior person is paid to act up and take the responsibility of the person who is on leave, it usually is not warranted to defer an issue until that person returns.
This problem may improve as more principals and seniors are appointed. It could be that at this stage in the development of the programme the person absent may be the only one with the relevant information. Greater communication when the teams are established could overcome this problem.

Of the 15.2% of issues on which the relevant people were neither present or represented, it was mainly prisoner representation that was lacking. Mr. D. Sutton (Programme Co-ordinator) and Mr. Hickie (Leader Accommodation Team) were the people who usually represented prisoners on the GMT, through the spoken word, submissions and reports. This process could be more efficient if the lines of communication were more formalized. For example once an issue concerning prisoners comes up, discussion could be deferred immediately to seek prisoners' ideas and feelings for the next meeting when the issue could then be dealt with more fully. One example where prisoner representation was necessary was the issue of private clothing. It was discussed at the GMT on six subsequent occasions. It was only on the fifth occasion that it was decided to bring into the debate prisoner representation by way of a submission from the Implementation Committee. This issue of prisoner representative is important if the gaol aims at participatory management at all levels.

Often the strong feelings of prisoners were neither known or acknowledged at the GMT. Personal representation or a report that is read out loud at a meeting would improve communication.
Question 2 Which issues were brought to the meetings? Were the issues relevant to that level of discussion and decision making brought to the meetings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>Categories of Issues as a Percentage of all Issues on Total Categories Coded.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 79, total number of issues that were not immediately deferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of issues</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Categories Coded*</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some issues were raised for more than one of these purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category of Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Discussion for submission or recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Problem or issue on which a decision has to be made or a resolution reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ventilation (to express or share feelings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Communication from above (e.g., Commission) or below (e.g., Prisoner Development Committee, teams, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 illustrates that the majority of issues (83.5%) that came to the GMT warranted a decision or resolution. Clarification was another important function of the GMT as approximately a third of the issues...
(35.4%) were coded as such. The GMT is also a forum for ventilation where feelings are expressed and shared among members. Ventilation was coded on 17.7% of issues. Often the GMT discuss a matter for a submission or recommendation to another section of the Department as they did on 12.7% of all issues, denoting that this is also an important function of the GMT. Communication from above or below was recorded on 5.1% of all issues. As the other teams begin to function it is expected that this figure will increase when more formal lines of communication are established.

Usually the sorts of issues discussed were applicable to the GMT level. There were a few instances where issues that could have been solved at a subordinate level were brought to the meeting but this was mainly by people new to the team and not familiar with the processes. There were some instances where members failed to report an important piece of information back to the team and there were other instances where decisions had been made outside of the team that should have been brought to the notice of the GMT if participatory management is to be practised.
Question 3  Was there listening and understanding?

It is difficult for people to be listening or understanding when they are talking over each other. Therefore "meeting order" was taken as an indicator of the above. Disorder is defined as "people talking over each other, going off at tangents or arguing in circles." Meeting order was noted as follows:-

- Not Orderly
- Sometimes Orderly
- Mostly Orderly
- Orderly

Table 3  Order as a Function of Contention

(n=79, all issues dealt with)

| Degree of Order | Not Contentious | Contentious | Highly Contentious | TOTAL | %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Orderly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes Orderly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(16.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Orderly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderly</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(67.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the data for each meeting was compared against the data for other meetings, meeting order was also found to relate to:–

(i) Who was chairing the meeting, and

(ii) Whether or not the Superintendent was present; the level of contention was higher when he was present.

From Table 3 it can be seen that the majority of issues were dealt with in an at least mostly orderly manner (82.2%). As might be expected meeting order was found to relate to the degree of contention of an issue. Where an issue was not contentious there was usually order. Table 3 indicates that the GMT has been spending a lot of time on issues that are not contentious ie, legislative matters, issues that simply need authority from the GMT. It is intended in future to draw up an agenda before each meeting and to rate the issues in order of importance so that the important issues can be dealt with more fully.

As disorder relates to contention it follows that listening and understanding are at a minimum when an issue is highly contentious. This appears to be borne out when the actual words that the Research Officer recorded at meetings, are read. For example there were several occasions on which people stated (usually in anger in a raised voice):
"You're not listening to me" - "you didn't understand what I said". These were all instances when people were at loggerheads with each other, clinging to their point of view. The statement "you're not listening to me" could also be seen as an accusation. It seems that on such occasions, team members assume that "if you can't see it my way you can't be listening or understanding".

As it is the chairperson's role to ensure that people talk in turn so that listening and understanding are possible, it is obvious that the members of the team need further training in chairing the meeting. This is intended.

Whenever the Superintendent was present at a meeting, the level of contention increased. In fact, "highly contentious" was only recorded at those meetings attended by the Superintendent. This could indicate that a strong debate was not warranted when the Superintendent was away given his power of veto. It could also indicate conflict of personalities, values, direction or power.

Question 3 (b) Was there openness?

To have an environment where openness is possible and encouraged, some trust is necessary. Members of a group need to know and trust that other members are working in the same direction for the good of the gaol and that they do not have ulterior motives e.g., personal gain, power, competition etc.
Conflict is the testing ground for both trust and openness. People feel comfortable expressing an opposing point of view in a trusting environment where colleagues will listen because they respect each other's values and believe that they are working in the same direction.

If you do not trust the other members of the group you tend to attempt to deal with a matter out of the meeting. It is in this sense that a measure of how many issues that should have come to the attention of the GMT and did not, is a measure of openness. This was not possible to measure.

The GMT meetings are positive in that people have been very frank and open in discussions and yet have been able to continue to maintain respect despite at times holding very opposed views. Openness was not apparent when people felt they would not get anywhere with their point of view. The Superintendent's power of veto and his use of it makes equal participation very difficult in this team that is ideally the model for other meetings attempting participatory management around the gaol.

There were also instances of defensiveness, that did not allow openness, where people did not feel that they were in an understanding enough environment to either move their ground or admit a mistake.
Question 4  Was enough information presented before a decision or resolution was reached?

To reach group consensus it is recognised that all relevant information needs to be presented before a group can make a well-informed decision. Ideally people make a decision or move their ground when they realise the complexities of a situation. Thus, members of a group need to be well prepared when they come to a meeting. To defer an issue until enough information is sought is preferable to making a decision on little information.
Table 4  Degree of Information presented as a Percentage of Issues that Warranted a Decision

(n = 66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>No. of issues</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some information</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good immediate information</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In almost two-thirds of the issues above there was good immediate information from the people present or previous research. When previous research was brought to the meeting in the form of reports, recent circulars or submissions, this was usually not at the appropriate time, usually the issue came up several times before research or a submission was called for.

In 35% of issues there was only little or some information. This was usually recorded when time expired, the relevant people were not present, the Superintendent placed an overriding limitation on the issue or the discussion was cut short for other reasons. Sometimes cutting the discussion was warranted when the issue was not sufficiently important to spend much time on but at other times when the discussion was cut short it proved to be the wrong tactic.

For example, when the issue of Open Day first came up on the agenda everybody knew that it would be a difficult issue and it was deferred until the end of the meeting. Time ran out and it was deferred until the next meeting. The prisoners had done most of the organising of Open Day
themselves and it was only the security matters that had be organised. When it did come up again it appeared to be a reasonable tactic when the Superintendent stated, "decide yes or no - do the mechanics away from here". A vote was taken and the majority agreed that Open Day was a possibility. However, in this instance it was not a workable tactic. Even though a committee was appointed, debate on Open Day continued at eight subsequent GMT meetings where it took up most of the meeting time and other matters had to be deferred. It was not only more information that was needed before a decision on whether or not to have Open Day was made: it was also a matter of acknowledging people's feelings as one executive envisaged when he asked, - "Do you see it as feasible to say yes and come back and say we can't make it work". As it turned out there were upset feelings as both the date and the venue had to be changed.

The GMT held a review of its meetings in May. Since this intervention more information has been brought to the meetings at the relevant time. This has proven to be a more efficient method in that deferrals and argument have been at a minimum on such occasions e.g., issue of the housing of appellants.
Question 5  How effective was the chairperson?

At a meeting to review the GMT it was decided that a different chairperson be elected after every three meetings, to allow all the members the opportunity to practise and fulfil this role. A new practice where everybody is asked in turn for general business has also been instigated. A handout was also presented by Ms Hight delineating the responsibilities of the chairperson.

Following are comments on the responsibilities of the chairperson as set out in the handout:

1. **Impartiality** - Most chairpersons have appeared to be impartial.

2. **Allowing everyone to contribute** - Meeting "order" was found to relate to who was chairing the meeting. Often, when there was disorder (usually over a contentious issue) the chairperson did not stop people from talking over each other and you could not be sure that people had a chance to contribute. Some members of the team need more practice and direction in chairing a meeting.

The recent introduction of the chair asking people in turn for general business appears to be a much more efficient way of ensuring that everyone has a chance to contribute.
3. **Clarifying Comments** - There has not been enough emphasis by chairpersons on recapitulation of ideas and decisions. Summing up of ideas and decisions was usually done by Ms Hight, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Hay and Mr. O'Shea, primarily by Ms Hight when she was present. As the GMT is in a review and developmental stage this has been the most efficient method so far. The test of developmental progress will be allowing the designated chairperson to attempt to sum up and organise ideas.

4. **Moving the meeting forward and terminating discussion at the appropriate time** - "Disorder" was often recorded when the chairperson failed to move quickly enough onto the next issue. More attention is needed in this area.

5. **Bringing about a resolution** - This will be discussed in the next section of this report.

6. **Responsible for compiling an agenda** - The one occasion on which an agenda was compiled and the issues put in order of importance the meeting was most efficient, it did not go over time and the important issues were dealt with.
Question 6 To what extent did the group solve problems and come to resolutions.

(i) How was it achieved?
(ii) How was conflict or a contentious issue dealt with?
(iii) Did the debate continue to another venue?

Table 5 Resolved and Unresolved Issues as a Percentage of All Issues Needing a Decision or Resolution.

\[(n = 66)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Schein's Scale - Rated as a Percentage of Resolved Issues

\[(n = 41)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority rule</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority rule</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group consensus</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanimity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Contention as a Percentage of these Issues Needing a Resolution

\[(n = 66)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not contentious</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentious</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly contentious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of issues that were rated as "highly contentious" and the way they were dealt with are described below.

11.5.83 Issue: Private Clothing

There was disagreement as to whether or not prisoners should be allowed to wear private clothing. This had been a contentious issue at many previous meetings. On this occasion there was conflict over the interpretation of a circular dealing with private clothing. It was decided to defer the issue until all the circulars dealing with private clothing could be brought to the GMT.

16.5.83 Issue: Private Clothing

A member who had spoken with Establishments brought up the issue once again, stating "it is clear that the programme must be implemented within the guidelines of the Department". On the other side of the debate there were those who argued that the circulars on private clothing all ended with the qualification - "at the Superintendent's discretion". One member asked the team where all the private clothing was coming from, given that prisoners are only allowed activities (sports) clothes. There appeared to be confusion over policy as different people had allowed different articles through Prisoner Processing. It was agreed to "fix up the loopholes and to tell stores that nothing was to be purchased that is not on the canteen list".
Table 8  Contention as a Function of Group Consensus
(n = 33, those issues rated as having met group consensus or unanimity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not contentious</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly contentious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A resolution was reached on 62.1% of those issues that warranted a decision. Of those issues where a resolution was achieved the majority (80.4%) were made by group consensus or unanimity, 14.6% by minority rule and 4.9% by autocratic rule. Although the "group consensus" figure appears substantial, Table 8 shows that group consensus was mainly achieved where an issue was not contentious. There were only three examples where group consensus was reached on an issue of conflict. One such issue was on the housing of appellants. Although there were differences of opinion, when research on the issue was done in the form of a submission by the Programme Co-ordinator people realized the complexities of the situation and moved their ground to agree that it would have to be at the discretion of a selected committee. This was one example where previous research was more efficient for decision making. Deferring this issue once for better information brought about a resolution at the next meeting.
Private clothing continued to be a contentious issue at subsequent meetings; the wearing of private clothing, visitors sending it in just what exactly is allowed and what is needed by each inmate. The wearing of private clothing to visits by x-wing prisoners had been the original problem. The underlying conflict was consistently the programme, which emphasises and encourages self expression, versus Departmental policies that stress conformity in the interest of security.

2.5.83 Issue: Prisoner representatives on the GMT.

There was a very definite split of opinions on this issue. Some members saw it as essential. Other members viewed the issue as "right out of the question". One member stated that "it would not be necessary to have prisoner representatives if the team leaders were doing their job properly and communicating information from the GMT". The issue then switched to a discussion about communication and to whether or not team leaders were informing people beneath them of decisions made at the GMT. Some defensiveness was apparent. One member reminded others of a suggestion that he had made previously, of leaving a gap in the minutes in which resolutions or answers could be written. Another member answered that the GMT could not take on any more at this time, that it was not functioning well. The issue was left unresolved. The Chairperson failed to organise or sum up ideas and the team went on to talk about another issue.
16.5.83 & 25.5.83 Issue: Proposed changes to the main gate.

There was conflict between the Superintendent and other members. Members had previously discussed the issue and agreed that there was no need for the proposed changes to the front gate. The reasons were explained to the Superintendent. The Superintendent stated that "it is going to happen".

18.5.83 & 29.5.83 Issue: Who to 'act up' as Deputy Superintendent at Kirkconnell in Alwan Whan's absence.

The meeting was informed by Alwan Whan that a 1st Class Officer was to act up in his absence. This caused conflict because some members felt that the decision had been made outside the GMT and that as Kirkconnell is an annex to Bathurst the matter should have been dealt with at the GMT. Another member thought that it could become an industrial matter if the proposal went ahead given that the officer was a 1st Class Officer. Others thought that the decision was acceptable. There was no resolution to the problem and it was agreed to minute a disagreement. Outcome: the 1st Class Officer did act up as Deputy Superintendent.

30.5.83 Issue: Hobby tools in cells.

There was conflict as to whether or not prisoners should be allowed to have hobby tools in their cells and if so, how many. The PPO of the BEU brought up the topic by reading out an article that dealt with an escape that used hobby tools. Once again the underlying conflict was between the
programme's encouragement of self expression and the Departmental policy on internal security. It was at this meeting that it was decided to hold a separate meeting to clarify what is meant by internal security within the management plan. No date has been set for such a meeting.

1.6.83 Issue: Location of weights

Mr Sutton had been previously asked by the GMT to discuss the location of the weights with the prisoners as the space allocated was inadequate. Mr Sutton reported back to the GMT with two possible locations: at the back of E Block or on the back oval. The Superintendent said that he could not support the building of a gym as the staff did not have such amenities and that he was not convinced that the present location was inadequate. It was decided to seek further information: the numbers using weights, the weights needed etc. The Superintendent agreed to watch a display to see if the space is inadequate. Outcome: Weights on the verandah outside the auditorium (decided outside GMT) and the prisoners believe it is still inadequate.

15.4.83 Issue: Location of Open Day

Previously a subcommittee had been appointed in an effort to resolve a conflict over the location of Open Day events. An agreement had been reached at GMT to hold Open Day outside the main gaol on the oval. As Public Works had made a temporary gate in the oval it had been decided that the BEU would man it. The Superintendent now stated that he "was not
happy about the use of the oval because of the gate", that he could "not justify the use of it". He stated that the subcommittee should have consulted him. A subcommittee member defended himself and said that he had informed the Superintendent of all the alternatives. The conflict then switched to the role of subcommittees on the GMT. One member of the GMT suggested that the Superintendent was reneging on a GMT decision and negating the role of an appointed subcommittee. It was eventually decided to defer the issue until the leader of the security team could confer with Public Works and report back to the meeting. The relevance of this consultation was not clear.

The question, "did the debate continue to another venue" is difficult to answer, although it can be assumed that wherever a decision is made by either autocratic means or minority rule (19.5% issues) somebody will not be satisfied with the outcome and will express their feelings at an informal gathering around the gaol.
CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it was found that the GMT is primarily a forum for decision making. Other functions of the GMT are clarification of prison matters, communication from both above and below, and ventilation. Discussions for decision making on ideas for submissions and recommendations to the Department is also an important function of the GMT.

The sorts of issues dealt with were mostly relevant to the GMT level. It was found that many issues were non-contentious and mostly of a legislative nature. GMT members have decided to draw up an agenda to deal with such matters promptly to allow time for debate on more important matters.

It is encouraging to note that good immediate information from the people attending was presented at all meetings studied. All members have also taken an active part in the meeting. Stimulating debate and openness were apparent on many occasions.

Deferrals were often a frustrating aspect of the GMT. Possible causes are the nature of the gaol (shift work, more holidays and sick days than other public servants etc.) and the newness of the programme. As already explained, only one person (the person away) may have the relevant
information. Deferrals may have to be tolerated at this stage although it is slowing the management processes down and is particularly frustrating to prisoners and other people awaiting decisions.

Greater guidance in chairing the meetings has been a need recognised by Ms Hight and other meeting members. Ms Hight as Staff Development Officer has already commenced giving guidelines in chairing the meeting.

The results show that at this point in time (May, 83) members of the GMT have not dealt with contentious issues in a very positive way; a way in which although some do not hold the same point of view they at least get to a point where they can live with a decision even though they do not fully agree with it. The possible reasons as seen by the Research Officer are as follows:-

1. Different work interests and responsibilities - the team leaders and professional officers have different interests and responsibilities (not necessarily values) and are not as aware of other members' responsibilities as they might be. A partial resolution of this problem may come about when team leaders change teams but for the professional officers this is not a possibility.

Differing interests (and by that is meant specifically work interests eg, security, implementing the programme, prisoner processing etc) may also come together when the programme design is further developed and integrated. Internal security versus the programme philosophy has been a
constant contention at the meetings and a separate meeting is being called to define exactly what internal security is in the new programme. Once this is defined hopefully both parties will hold the same interests and be working in the same direction. Once the programme is integrated the Programme Co-ordinator, Mr. D. Sutton will not need to be the watchdog of the philosophy, and the responsibility will not weigh as heavily on his shoulders.

2. Personal needs - as in any meeting, but particularly at higher levels of management, personal needs are present that sometimes gets in the way of rational decision making, as when people are afraid to lose face or be seen as the loser in a debate. It is difficult to know to what extent this is present in other meetings. There is no established benchmark for it. All that can be said is that this sort of ego involvement is apparent to the Research Officer at GMT meetings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There be personal representation on the GMT whenever possible of the person or people that an issue concerns or involves.

   1.1. Prisoner representatives be able to attend all meetings after security matters have been discussed, as is the case at Implementation Committee Meetings.
Rationale: This is considered necessary because, although prisoners have been represented through members of the GMT I often noticed that the members were unaware of the strong feelings of prisoners and could not respond accordingly.

2. Deferrals - more attention be given to the timing and reasons for deferrals.

Rationale: other people throughout the gaol are awaiting decisions and answers. Deferral appeared appropriate on those occasions when an issue was immediately deferred for more information or for the informed person to be present. Often, members decided to defer a contentious issue for more information, even though, in my opinion, enough information had been available. When the information was presented, these issues were often deferred again. Another problem that delayed decisions was the practice of deferring an issue when the team leader was not present, or when the Superintendent was away. If she/he was the only person with the relevant information (as was often the case when there were only skeleton teams) this was legitimate. It is expected that in future the person acting up will have the knowledge to take over the decision making role.
3. Lines of communication be formalised.

3.1. To be sure of not overlooking any communications from above or below the chairperson could ask each member in turn if she/he has anything to report from his/her team. The Superintendent and the professional officers could also be asked if they had anything to report from Head Office or any other section of the Department.

3.2. It is suggested that all written matter (submissions, recommendations, etc,) that reaches the GMT be read out aloud as it represents the thoughts of people not present. Where the material is lengthy or time is limited, it could be pre-circulated, or the issue deferred to the next meeting to allow members to read it.

3.3. A formal mechanism for conveying GMT decisions to other teams and prisoners be agreed on, and its implementation regularly reviewed by the GMT.

4. Continued guidance in chairing the meeting be provided to most members.
5. An agenda be made (as suggested at the review of the GMT) prior to each team meeting and that the issues be ranked in order of importance by the team members. This will allow purely legislative matters to be dealt with quickly and allow time for debate on more important issues.

6. More training of the GMT and its members in conflict resolution be carried out.

7. The planned meeting to attempt to resolve the major underlying source of conflict at most GMT meeting (ie, the Programme vs internal security) be held as soon as possible. If this issue can be resolved and all agree to what is meant by 'internal security within the programme', members can then all work in the same direction.
Action Taken to Improve G.M.T. Operation

The substance of this report concerning G.M.T. meetings held between 15th April and 1st June, 1983 was presented to the G.M.T. on 11th July, 1983. Partly from this, and from the members' own recognition of problems faced by the team, a review of its operations was conducted. A number of concrete steps had been taken by 26th August, 1983 which appear to have considerably improved the effectiveness and efficiency of the team's operations. These steps were:

1. The minutes of each meeting are taken by a stenographer and are circulated, as soon as possible after the meeting.

2. Agenda items are now given to the stenographer before the meeting. The proposed agenda is circulated to all members before the meeting so that they have time to prepare for the meeting. Also any written matter is circulated before the meetings so that members are ready to discuss it at the meeting.

3. It was decided to limit the time of each meeting. As far as is possible each G.M.T. meeting is kept to within one hour.

4. Ms Hight has conducted training sessions on chairing a meeting as well as showing a John Cleese film entitled, "Meetings, Bloody Meetings" that presents in a humorous manner the dismal results that can happen if members, particularly the Chairman come to a meeting unprepared.
5. It has been decided by members to spend the first half hour of each Monday's meeting working through the Management Strategy together.

6. At all meetings the chairperson asks each person in turn for general business.

7. There has been a marked improvement in members' preparedness for meetings.

8. The inaugural meetings of three of the teams have been held.

9. It was decided that principals and seniors will keep a log book of things that need to be done or followed through.

10. It was decided at the G.M.T. that prisoner representatives could make application to be present at the G.M.T. on a specific issue.

11. It was decided at the G.M.T. that team leaders will report information from their teams to the G.M.T. at monthly intervals.

12. It was decided to keep a registrar of all decisions made at the G.M.T. Ms Hight has gone through the minutes and has noted the policy decisions made by G.M.T. since October 1982.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DEFERRED</th>
<th>REFERRED</th>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
<th>RATE WAS DEC.</th>
<th>RATE RES. MADE</th>
<th>RATE SCHEIN</th>
<th>RATE ORDER</th>
<th>DID RELEVANT PEOPLE HAVE SAY</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON WAY IDEAS AND THOUGHTS INFO ORGANISED AND SUMMED UP</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS E.G., OPENNES, LISTENING, UNDERSTANDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHAIR PERSON:**

**SECRETARY:**

**DURATION OF MEETING:**

**PEOPLE PRESENT:**
**CODE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Issue</th>
<th>Rating Scale - Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Discussion</td>
<td>Disorder, definition: people talking over each other, going off at tangents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discussion for submission or recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Problem or issue on which a decision has to be made or a resolution reached.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ventilation (re. to express or share feelings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communication from above e.g., G.M.T., Commission or below.</td>
<td>Rating Scale - Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Scale for Information**

1. No information.
2. Little information.
3. Some information.
4. Good immediate information from people present.
5. Previous research brought to meeting, e.g., report, submission.

**Rating Scale Schein - Levels of Consensus**

1. Default.
2. Autocratic.
3. Minority rule.
4. Majority rule.
5. Group consensus.
6. Unanimity.