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A comprehensive report on the Overseas Study Tour, recently undertaken by this Project Team, has been compiled and forwarded to the Planning and Development Committee. I commend that report for your perusal when it becomes available.

The accompanying selective report, however, has been compiled by me and deals with matters of interest to officers employed within N.S.W. prisons. It omits references to architectural design, building techniques, costs, budgets, construction time etc., and concentrates on the procedures and the security systems of maximum security institutions of other countries.

The purpose of the report is to illustrate, in some measure, the basic differences between the N.S.W. penal system and the systems in other countries. The differences are not great nor are they unknown to the N.S.W. administrators.

The main differences are:

(a) Maximum Security prisoners in all countries visited, spend less time in their cells than do their counterparts in N.S.W. Time in cells varied from 10½ hours to 8 hours per day.

(b) N.S.W. certainly does not stand alone with regard to prisoner unrest and insurrection. Ample evidence of recent disturbances was noted in some institutions particularly in U.S.A. and Canada. As a result, most countries have introduced Unit Management for greater control and security. This type of management divides the prison population into small manageable groups or units. The units vary in size from 100 inmates in the U.S.A. to 16 in Denmark. (Danish Officers consider that 6 or 7 inmates per group is ideal). Each Unit is allocated a permanent staff under a Unit Manager who manages and operates the Unit in a semi-autonomous fashion. The number of staff allocated to each unit also varies greatly. U.S.A. appears to have more than ample staff, in N.S.W. terms. The powers of the Unit Manager and the Unit Staff differ from country to country. In the U.S.A., the Unit Staff as a body awards punishments which includes cellular confinement. The prisoner has the right of appeal to the Warden against any conviction or punishment awarded. In the U.K. the Unit Manager, whose rank is always Assistant Governor, has the powers of punishment with right of appeal to the Governor or the Board of Visitors by the prisoner. The Units are isolated from one another except at work, to varying degrees and mobility from one Unit to another is discouraged without good and sufficient reason. A quantity of literature relating to this concept of Management is appended.

(c) In all countries visited, the prisoners spend much more time indoors (wings and workshops) than N.S.W. prisoners. This custom is probably due, in part at least, to the very cold weather or perhaps the reluctance on the part of the staff to man outside posts. Under normal circumstances the prisoners spend one to one and a half hours outdoors in the open air per day and then only in the summer months.
places this is supplemented with an occasional dog patrol.

(e) England, Denmark and the Canadian Province of Ontario, do not have armed towers. C.C.T.V. once again replaces them. However, the Federal system of Canada and both the Federal and the State Systems in the U.S.A. have armed men on the walls.

(f) Every prison visited had a Control Room fitted out with monitors, screens, communication systems, geophone consoles, fire and smoke alarms. The staff of each Control Room varied from 8 officers (24 hour per day basis) in Wormwood Scrubs, England, to the most impressive Control Rooms in Toronto Canada which were operated effectively by one officer.

(g) Prisoner-Officer relationships ranged from good in England to outright hostility in Canada. The relationships, in most N.S.W. prisons, by comparison with U.S. and Canada, are very good.

(h) One of the refreshing aspects of most overseas prisons is that the number of cells is considerably higher than the number of inmates held in that institution.

(i) The ratio of staff to prisoners was greater than that in N.S.W. in every country visited. This is due to prisoners being out of cells longer and to the introduction of Unit Management. It may be interesting to note that the ratio of staff to prisoners in Denmark is two staff to one prisoner.

The question of "fences versus walls" was discussed at every institution with the whole spectrum of staff available, from the Officer in Charge of the prison to the man on the tower. Nowhere did we encounter staff that favoured fences in preferences to walls. The American institutions have fences but the administrators and the staff are far from happy with them. In the words of the Acting Warden of Marion Prison "You have to be able to lock their asses up good, make sure you've got them and then treat them humanely."

Canada also has fences around maximum security institutions but is in the process of replacing them with walls. Following is an extract from a letter to this Project Team from Inspector Villeneuve of Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services dated 22.5.79:

"... I have forwarded to you photographs of two escapes, which occurred from the Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre, one of our maximum security institutions. These escapes were both attributed to the chain link fence we were using as our outer security and as a result of these and other problems experienced with fences, the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services has reverted to walls as the outer means of security in maximum security institutions. As previously mentioned in our discussions, our correctional officers are not armed, and as can be seen from the photographs, were very vulnerable. The fence around Ottawa has, since these escapes been replaced with an 18 foot wall."

In the U.K. the programme of converting fences into walls is well advanced. The usual procedure is to spray the concrete onto erected reinforcements. This material is referred to as "gunite".

We were informed in both Denmark and Sweden that walls are always used in maximum security prisons. Fences have never been envisaged.

Superintendent.
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Marion is a maximum security Federal prison, situated in Southern Illinois, U.S.A. It replaced Alcatraz when that institution closed some years ago. It is the only Category 5 and 6 prison in the Federal system.

Category 6 approximates the terms of Sec. 22 (1) of the Prisons Act, in N.S.W.

2. PRISONERS

Marion has a 500 prisoner capacity and currently contains 400 inmates. This figure is made up on 60 Category 6 prisoners (another 30 Category 6 prisoners are awaiting transfer from other Federal institutions when vacancies become available). The 400 also includes 72 prisoners who are classed as intractable or are under punishment in a Segregation Section. Both the Category 6 prisoners, and the Segregation Section prisoners do not move outdoors at all. They are domiciled in a Section known as the Control Unit, with the cells adjacent to an indoor exercise room. The Administrative Segregation are kept in that section for a definite and limited period while the Category 6 are detained in that Section for an indefinite and usually lengthy period. A Category 6 prisoner is always handcuffed when in face to face situation with any officer.

Prisoners under ordinary discipline, that is to say Category 5 prisoners, are employed in various industries and are permitted to move outdoors into a sport area for 1½ hours per day in summer only. Indoor Sporting facilities, however, are more readily available and are more frequently utilised by the inmates. Prisoners are out of cells from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m.

3. SECURITY PERIMETER

The perimeter consists of a double wire fence, 4/5 metres high and spaced 7 metres apart. Cross arms are fixed to the poles of both fences at an angle of 45 degrees and angled down into the prison. The cross arms are liberally laced with barbed wire and galvanised razor wire. Near the top of the inner fence and at ground level between fences are fixed trip wires for alarm purposes. Against the inside of the outer fence, at ground level and one on top, are stacked three rolls of concertina barbed wire. Another roll of concertina barbed wire is attached to the top inside of each fence directly under the cross arms. The fence is set on a concrete base extending 4 feet into the ground to prevent tunnelling. This fence has been breached on more than one occasion by escaping prisoners. Outside of the fences the ground is cleared and levelled for 200 metres. This is being extended to 300 metres. This area is kept mown and clear of all obstructions.
MARION PRISON PERIMETER FENCES.
4. **TOWERS**

Originally Marion perimeter was designed with 6 towers. Sometime after it was opened, the need for an additional 2 towers became evident because of escapes.

Tower arms and furnishings are almost identical to those in N.S.W. Prisons. The rifle is enclosed in a glass fronted case, obviously to prevent tampering. When it is required, the officer breaks the glass. The pistol is in his possession at all times. A military “flack jacket” is also supplied in each tower.

5. **GATE**

The pedestrian and vehicular gates are situated in different parts of the prison. The pedestrian entrance was at the front of the gaol and adjacent to the Administrative block while the vehicular entrance was in close proximity to the industries area. The vehicular gate was not inspected by this project team, however, it did not appear to be manned but was supervised by an adjacent tower. This was considered to be satisfactory. It is assumed that additional staff and the “air lock” system was used when vehicles were entering or leaving the institution.

The pedestrian entrance was manned by an officer who operated a hand-held metal detector. After being cleared by him, entrance was gained by 3 sliding gates, electronically operated from a remote control room. Each gate is monitored by C.C.T.V. Radio communication is available between each gate and the Control Room.
The administration appeared very reluctant to discuss this point.

6. **CELLS**

The cells, for the most part, are grouped into sections of 36. Eighteen cells back to back, with service access in between. Each line of eighteen cells faces onto an enclosed corridor which has security windows to the outside. The whole building is air-conditioned. The front wall of each cell is barred only and affords no privacy to the occupant. Each cell is secured with a sliding grille door. The doors are electronically operated either simultaneously or individually.

The furnishing of the cells comprised of a bed, (some wooden and some metal) a wooden cupboard and a unit very similar in design and function to units used at Katingal; that is a stainless steel toilet and wash basin combined. Hot water was not provided in cells. The cell was illuminated by a fluorescent light behind a security screen. The conditions of the cells did not impress. There was ample evidence of a recent insurrection in one area.

The corridors in front of the cells are patrolled during the night to prevent suicide. This, by N.S.W. standards, seems to be unnecessary. During the day and up to 10 p.m. the corridors are used for passive recreation and T.V. viewing.

One section of 36 cells has two rows of 18 cells facing each other with one central corridor. In this section each cell has a window to the outside of the wing. Only trusted prisoners are domiciled in this section.

Originally, the prison had several large cells as dormitories. These are no longer used as such but have been converted to other uses.

A communal shower is provided at the entrance end of each row of 18 cells. The front of the shower recess is opened to the corridor. The shower recess is made up of 2 shower roses, with no separating stalls and a drying area.
8. **ARMOURY**

This facility does not appear to have been included in the original design. It appears to have been constructed as an after-thought. It is situated in a most inconvenient place and does not have sufficient capacity.

The arms and equipment, including a comprehensive range of riot control gear, were in excellent condition. This is understandable when it is realised that Marion employs an armorer on a full time basis. The prison does not have a riot plan but it does have a very impressive escape plan. In the event of an escape, officers report to the armoury as they become available, and are issued with weapons and an instruction folder, directing them to various key positions in the area. This type of escape plan would be unsuitable for our present maximum security prisons because of the close proximity of housing. It does, however, have some potential in relation to Parklea.

9. **DOGS**

Dogs are used for tracking escaping prisoners. Marion does not keep dogs, but hires them when necessary. The staff placed little confidence in these dogs because too much time usually elapsed between the escape and the arrival of the dogs (4 hours was stated). The dogs have never been used in a riot situation in Marion.

10. **VISITING FACILITIES**

Visiting facilities are comprised of a bank of booths with glass partitions and telephone communication. The facility is well placed. No device for the monitoring of conversations was visible. Contact visits were an exception rather than a rule. Each case is decided by the warden.

11. **COMMUNICATIONS**

(a) A P.A.B.X. system throughout the prison with appropriate override facilities by key personnel.

(b) Hooter for time signals.

(c) Beeper system for executive staff.

(d) Connected into Police Radio network for emergencies.

(e) Hand held transceivers for escapes.

(f) Video/buzzer call system from gates to control room.
12. **STAFF AMENITIES**

These amenities are made up of a common room and an officer’s mess. The meals are supplied from the prisoner’s kitchen and the cost is very nominal. The quality of the meal, perhaps, could be improved. No other amenities, except a lounge room, were evident. This lounge room is also used as a Courtroom on certain days.

13. **LEGAL FACILITIES**

Prisoners have access to legal advisors very much in the same way as prisoners in N.S.W. One interesting aspect that is built into each wing, is a Law Library. This is normally a converted cell which is stocked with the necessary legal volumes. Prisoners who are defending themselves may prepare their cases in these legal libraries, locked in on their own. A Court is available at the prison. This was not originally designed as such. When not in use as a Court Room, it is used as a staff common room.

14. **UNIT MANAGEMENT**

Although the Federal Bureau of Prisons informed us that Marion had not adopted the unit management concept, it was discovered that this was not correct.

Unit management was discussed at length at Marion. The units referred to involved between 50 and 100 inmates. Each unit had its own staff and operated semi-autonomously. The unit staff decided on and managed each inmate’s programme, performed all counselling and even awarded punishment in cases of misbehaviour. Literature relating to Unit Management in the American Federal Bureau of Prisons, is attached. The system appears to be very costly in terms of staff.

15. **PROGRAMMES**

(a) **Education**

Full time teachers are involved in the education of prisoners. Correspondence Courses, similar to those freely available to prisoners in the N.S.W. system, are rare because of the great cost involved.

Some apprenticeships have been provided in the printing industry. An apprenticeship is an exception rather than a rule.

An adequate library staffed by teachers is supplied.

(b) **Religion**

Meetings/Services are held on a regular basis for the following religions/organisations.

(i) Christian Brotherhood
(ii) Islamic Prayer
(iii) Jumah Prayer
(iv) Sunni Muslims
(v) Jehovah Witnesses
(vi) Religious Media
(vii) Prisoners Support Group
(viii) Catholic Mass
(ix) Ananda Marga
16. **RECREATION**

Because of the weather the accent is on indoor recreation. To this end, and excellent auditorium cum gymnasium is provided measuring 100 by 50 feet with additional space for stage and seating.

Principal outdoor recreation is mini golf or putt putt.

17. **OBSERVATION AND IMPRESSIONS**

The fence around Marion is insecure. Four prisoners have scaled the fence in three escape incidents and the time factor was approximately 30 seconds. The concrete antitunnelling device was useless. (This is also the opinion of the staff). Several officers including the Acting Warden, were asked what they would do to improve the security of the prison. Without exception, each stated that he would replace the fence with a wall.

Razor wire can be lethal, galvanised razor wire at Marion has rusted. It will not be replaced, as galvanised wire has a short life and a stainless steel wire is too expensive.

Trip wire fixed near the top of the inner fence and between fences malfunctions in snowy weather. They could be avoided by an escaping prisoner. They should be repositioned in such a way that an escapee cannot avoid one or both of them.

Some Category '6' prisoners are serving sentences of up to 150 years. One suspects that the sentence is the reason for the extreme classification in some cases. See the attached schedule of "Profiles of Inmates in the Control Unit".

The practice of Category 6 prisoners wearing handcuffs while in a face to face situation with an officer is dangerous. A prisoner in handcuffs is just as effective as a prisoner without handcuffs, when assaulting another prisoner or an officer.

There appears to be a greater proportion of Category '6' prisoners and prisoners undergoing punishment at Marion than would be found in a N.S.W. institution of like category and size.

18. **SUMMARY**

Marion is a well run institution operated on lines not dissimilar to those used in N.S.W. The two main areas of differences are:

(a) Prisoners out of cells until 10 p.m.

(b) Unit Management.

Both these areas require a substantial increase in staff but nonetheless, are seen to be necessary and should be introduced throughout the N.S.W. system. In the case of Unit Management, a modified form should be considered that would not be so costly in terms of staff and at the same time, would facilitate more control and security.
This institution is situated as the name suggests, in East Toronto in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

Canada has two penal systems:—

(a) A provincial system that caters for prisoners serving sentences of two years or less, and

(b) A federal system that caters for prisoners serving sentences in excess of two years.

Toronto East Detention Centre is a Provincial Institution and as such, contains relatively short sentenced prisoners. It is referred to as maximum security by the Canadian Authorities — however, by the very nature of the sentences it caters for, it would be classified, for something less than Category A in N.S.W.

The institution is five stories high with two small walled yards. No perimeter zone exists and police have been called on numerous occasions to move people who were talking from the footpath to prisoners through cell windows. The ground floor contains: Administration Offices, kitchen, visiting facilities, control room, officers mess, laundry and a small workshop. The first floor contained hospital and clinic, programmes, library, punishment block — the second, third and fourth floors were cellular accommodation. The entire fifth floor was a plant room. Elevators are used and operated by a key system. The whole building is air-conditioned.

2. PRISONERS

The prison was designed for a population of 200 and indeed it operated at that level for some years. Recently, an additional bed has been placed in some cells. The present capacity is for 320 prisoners. The additional bed has been fixed to the wall above the original bed as the floor space is insufficient for two beds.

There appears to be no security or control unit at this prison. A lock-up section of 10 cells is situated on the first floor. These are occupied by prisoners who have been sentenced to cellular confinement for a fixed number of days, and also by prisoners who are suicidal. On reception to this block, all the prisoners’ clothes are removed and he is given a dress made of durable and non-tearable material. This garment (probably light-weight canvas) is sleeveless and reaches from the shoulders to below the knees. While ever a prisoner is in this section this is the only garment he wears. It is the most degrading treatment of prisoners that this project team has come across. A bed, mattress and blankets are also provided. The blankets are made out of the same material as the dress and are removed from the cell during the daylight hours. The prisoners are permitted into a walled yard for one hour per day in summer for exercise.

3. CONTROL ROOM

The Control Room of this institution is identical to Toronto West Detention Centre. These two Control Rooms were the most impressive sections of the Ministry of Correctional Services, Ontario. The Control Room is operated by one man who is behind darkened security glass which permits him to see out while being invisible from the outside.

The electronic equipment is both simple and effective. The one officer controls all critical doors, and is in constant voice communication by radio with officers on the floors above. Fire alarms and smoke detectors throughout the prisons are indicated on the control panel. Abuse of smoke detectors by the prisoners does occur from time to time, as one is situated in each cell.
A system of "riot doors" is controlled by the Control Room. This simply is a system that seals off the institution into compartments in case of a disturbance.

During "peak" visiting times, the control room operator switches over the front door controls to an officer who is situated adjacent to the front door. During "off-peak" visiting times, the control room operates the front door and processes the visitors.

The one weakness in the system is that the Control Room is "working blind" when operating doors at the request of an unseen person at another level. We were informed each officer has a code call which identified him to the Control Room. This system is far from convincing as code calls can easily be learned and copied. However, an experienced control room officer can usually identify each voice. Perhaps the real answer would be in a C.C.T.V. system so that the control room can identify each caller before operating any doors.

4. **CELLS**

Most cells contain two beds, a combination toilet and wash basin and a wooden cupboard. The toilet is fixed with a device which causes the toilet flush to diminish on repeated flushing.

The cleanliness of the cells was just not adequate. The staff areas such as corridors etc. were in an excellent state. This is due to the fact that the institution employs contract cleaners.

Radio speakers with three channels are provided in each cell. T.V. is provided in the recreation/dining area.

The cells are serviced by the central air-conditioning system and are comfortable in all weathers.

Two showers are provided for each section of 10 cells. Problems have been experienced in this area because of a poor field of vision into the showers. This is being corrected by structural modifications.
Prisoners under ordinary discipline have controlled access to a gymnasium. Maximum of 20 prisoners are permitted at one time. This is an excellent facility and is also used by the staff at separate times from the inmates.

A very popular game played is “Floor Hockey”. This is played by the same rules as Ice Hockey but on a polished floor rather than ice.

In an adjacent room an excellent weight lifting machine is installed. This was of very high quality and apparently is much used.

Apart from floor hockey and weight lifting there was no evidence to indicate that other forms of sports or games were utilised. During summer months, prisoners are permitted one hour per day in a walled yard. There was no equipment of any description in the yard.

6. PRISONER – OFFICER RELATIONSHIPS

A relationship between prisoners and officers does not exist in this institution. An officer will not move into any area with more than 10 prisoners. The unemployed prisoners (majority) spend most of their time in the dining/recreation area adjacent to their cells. The supervising officer watches through a hatch in the door. The following is an extract from Standing Orders for the institution:—

_No staff member shall enter a corridor occupied by inmates unless he has first taken the precaution of:_—

(a) Instructing the inmate/s to move to the rear of the corridor or designated area and, upon entering the corridor, ensuring that one or more staff members are present.

(b) Immediately upon entering the corridor, ensuring the grill door has been locked by a second staff member controlling the grill.

(c) No staff member entering a corridor where inmate/s are confined shall have in his possession any keys other than the cell keys.

(d) No employee shall open the corridor gate to remove such things as garbage cans, etc., unless another employee is present.

(e) A staff member may release all inmates from a corridor by himself only under the following conditions:—

1. during evacuation for fire;

2. for other emergencies as listed in other Institutional Standing Orders or Manual of Standards and Procedures.
8. **ARMOURY**

The armoury is situated on the ground floor and is equipped with riot gear including gas equipment. No firearms of any description were kept in the armoury or indeed in gaol. No riot plan exists with the exception of the riot doors which are operated by the control room. These seal off the institution into several sections and are very effective.

9. **LIFTS**

A lift services all levels including the plant rooms. This is operated by a key which most officers carry. I feel that this is not desirable. Perhaps the operation of the lift could also be placed within the orbit of the control room. A C.C.T.V. at each floor, would then make the operation of the lift much safer.

10. **COOKHOUSE**

A central cookhouse is situated on the ground floor. This cookhouse caters for prisoners and staff mess. It is operated by a private individual who has a small key staff of his own. He then hires prisoners from the institution for general cookhouse hands.

The meals are taken to the cell levels pre-plated on unheated trolleys. The meals supplied to the project team were very adequate, however, it was not the same menu as was available to the prisoners.

11. **VISITING FACILITIES**

All visitors are required to pass through a metal detector prior to moving into the prison. The visiting facility is comprised of a row of booths, glass partitions and communication is by telephone. The prisoner is completely separated from the visitor and nothing can be passed from one to the other. The prisoners are not supervised and conversations are not monitored. There was no evidence of contact visits. The visitors seat is constructed of a concrete block with a wooden top. This makes the concealing of any contraband article extremely difficult. While the use of a telephone creates an impersonal and mechanical impression, it has one great advantage to N.S.W system — the conversations are private.

12. **DINING FACILITIES**

This institution was designed with a cluster of 10 cells (8 double and 2 single) around a recreation/dining area. The furniture in this area consisted of small tables and chairs. These are now being replaced with robust metal furnishings, fixed to the floor. The prisoners eat individually in their cells as a result of recent disturbances.

When meals arrive at each section, they are already plated. Prisoners move into their cells and are locked in. Two prisoners then pass a tray with the meal on it to each cell. I feel that a considerable degree of heat loss would occur between the cooking and the arrival in the cell. No officer moves into this area when more than ten prisoners are out of their cells. He supervises through a barred observation panel in the door.
This institution, while different in design, is similar in most respects to Toronto East Detention Centre and consequently is not covered in any detail. Prisoner population is 350 with a staff compliment of 182 officers. All prisoners are serving sentences of 2 years or less.

One wing is allocated to females and is staffed by female officers. Female officers were employed in the male section also but no male officers were evident in the female section.

PERIMETER

The perimeter is a wire fence, the exercise yards are walled and very few prisoners are permitted into the fenced area (ground maintenance only). We were informed by the Ministry of Correctional Services, Ontario, that the perimeter fence around Toronto West was being replaced with a wall.

“Lexon” laminated glass is showing signs of delamination in many places. The Ministry is currently seeking one million dollars compensation from the builder.

VISITING

The only difference to Toronto East in this section is in lieu of a telephone, a nickel plated fitting is fixed in the separating glass. This allows the passage of sound but prevents the passing of contraband. This fitting is situated at eye level and interferes with normal conversation. The visiting facility was not supervised nor were the conversations monitored.

PRISONER – OFFICER RELATIONSHIPS

Like Toronto East, this institution's most prominent feature is the absence of normal relationships between officers and prisoners. The same punishment block with inmates in dresses and the same distance is maintained between the officer and the inmate.

CONTROL ROOM

This control room, manned by one officer, like its counterpart in Toronto East, is simple and effective.
1. **CATEGORY**

Millhaven is a maximum security institution situated 300 kilometres east of Toronto Canada.

It was designed to accommodate 479 prisoners and was constructed as a matter of urgency due to a riot, and a virtual destruction of the nearby Kingston Penitentiary some years ago. Currently this institution holds 230 prisoners and in Australian terms is grossly over staffed with a total compliment of 415 officers. Kingston, which is a walled prison, will again replace Millhaven in due course, when certain modifications are completed.

2. **PERIMETER**

The security perimeter is a double wire fence which is guarded by eight (8) armed towers manned on a 24 hour per day basis. Originally the prison was designed and for some time operated, with four towers, however, as a result of a number of escapes culminating in the mass escape of 14 prisoners through the fences, the number of towers was increased to eight.

While no electric alarm devices are used on the fences, dogs are used to patrol the perimeter during the night. By night also, a vehicle with an armed officer constantly patrols outside the perimeter. During the tour, the Director and many of the staff expressed their preference for a wall to replace the fences.

3. **PRISONERS**

As a Federal prison, Millhaven received prisoners serving sentences in excess of 2 years. Those serving sentences of less than two years are catered for by the Provincial prisons.

As in other Canadian institutions, visited by the Project Team, the prison-officer relationships in Millhaven leave much to be desired. This is very prominent with the disciplinary staff. We were informed that this relationship stems from the Kingston Penitentiary riot, that in fact rioting prisoners and staff were all transferred together. This explanation is difficult to accept in view of the fact that the Kingston riot took place approximately 8 years ago.

In N.S.W. terms, Millhaven has a “dispersal unit”. This in Canada is called a “special handling unit”. The unit in Millhaven contains 50 prisoners who are serving sentences of 25 years or above and other particularly violent prisoners such as killers of Police officers, prison officers, other inmates and takers of hostages.
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They spend 23 hours in their cells, the other hour being allocated for exercise and showers. On the alternate days, half of the “unit” prisoners (25) at a time are permitted out of their cells into a common room where they can watch television for 2½ hours. Television is not permitted in the cells. When a “unit” prisoner is moved within the prison, he is handcuffed and escorted by at least two officers.

4. **CELLS**

Cells for ordinary discipline prisoners measure 3m by 2m and have an external window. (Special Handling Unit has no external windows). The furnishings consist of a bed, toilet, hand basin, desk and a seat. There appears to be a comprehensive programme of converting a number of cells into rooms to be used for various programmes, but particularly hobbies and recreation.

5. **GATE**

On arrival at Millhaven, a visitor moves into a free-standing office under an armed tower, but outside and approximately 50 metres away from the pedestrian entrance gate. The office is manned by two officers and is equipped with an X-ray machine and a walk-through metal detector. Presumably these are used on visitors to prisoners; it was not used when we entered. On leaving the institution in company with a Senior Officer, an attempt was made to use this equipment and it was discovered that the metal detector was out of order.

After being processed, the visitor moves out of the rear of the office to the pedestrian gate in the perimeter fence. This gate is operated by the adjacent tower. The visitor then enters the administrative block and is directed by the duty room officer.

The distance between the outside office and the perimeter fence constitutes a security risk. It would not be a very difficult feat to throw a weapon between the office and the unmanned pedestrian gate at a moment when the tower officer’s attention is distracted, then after being cleared through the metal detector and the X-ray machine, to retrieve the weapon on the way to the gate. The visitor would be admitted into the gaol because he has been cleared by the outside office. The local staff are aware of this undesirable situation. Ideally, the office should be at the perimeter fence, or alternatively a secured walk could be constructed from the office to the pedestrian gate. Vehicles are admitted through another unmanned gate which is situated in close proximity to another manned tower.

6. **CONTROL ROOMS**

Millhaven has one Central Control Room and three Control Units. Each control unit is protected with armoured glass and bars and we were informed, is impregnable to attack by prisoners. Each room is triangular in shape and overlooks three cell corridors. Each room is staffed by three armed officers. It is difficult to see the need for so many armed control stations bearing in mind the eight armed towers on the perimeter. This perhaps reflects the need for the large staff at Millhaven.

Apparently the control rooms serve as armouries as no other facility existed for the storage and safe keeping of arms and equipment.
The staff of Millhaven were very critical of this system stating that contraband was finding its way into the prison.

The cooked food is transported into the prison in bulk in heated trolleys. It is then plated and served in each wing or section very similar to the system used in N.S.W. maximum security institutions. It appears to be adequate. The officer's mess is apparently operated on a cooperative basis. The meals supplied to the project team were very good.

8. INDUSTRIES

The prisoners are engaged in the following industries — tailoring (soon to be replaced by upholstery), metal work, printing and canvas mailbag repairs.

As in Marion, Millhaven prisoners moving from the industrial area of the prison to their respective wings, pass through a metal detector which, theoretically, prevents metal weapons reaching the living quarters. Whether due to a faulty detector or to inadequate control and supervision is not clear, but metal weapons exist in problem proportions in the living areas.

9. VISITING

No contact visits are permitted at Millhaven nor are they envisaged in the near future. The system is a bank of booths and contact by telephone.
1 CANADA Millhaven.

DETAILS

General
Name of institution MILLHAVEN (Ontario)
Country CANADA
Type of institution MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTION FOR MEN
No. of inmates 447 inmates
No. of beds 670 beds
Year of completion 1987

Site data
Enclosed site area 102 592 m²
Site area/inmate 229.5 m²/inmate
Area of site covered by buildings 14 777 m²
Percentage of site covered by buildings 14.5%
Area of site covered by buildings/inmate 33 m²/inmate

Buildings data
Total building area at all floors 20 814 m²
Building area/inmate 46.5 m²/inmate
Building area of cell and detention (including access) 5 180 m²
Area of cell and detention/inmate 11.5 m²/inmate
No. of floors of cell blocks: minimum 1 floor
maximum 2 floors
Hospital location Separate section in other building than cell blocks
Kitchen location Outside the perimeter of the fence
Special provisions Separate section in other building than cell blocks

Eating facilities
In cell
No. of cells: Ordinary inmates C = 447
Inpatient IC = 16
Wards SW = 16

Note: More recent Canadian prisons are very different in design. See p. 32.
1. CATEGORY

Wormwood Scrubs is situated in the western suburbs of London. It is an old institution, being in excess of 100 years old. It contains 1220 cells but has held up to 1850 prisoners. The daily average population at the present time is in the vicinity of 1500. The classifications of inmates held at Wormwood Scrubs are as follows:

(a) Locals serving medium sentences and those awaiting classifications.
(b) Training wing for long sentenced prisoners.
(c) Young prisoners for training and awaiting allocation.
(d) A Borstal allocation centre for up to 300 male trainees and up to 100 unconvicted young offenders.
(e) Absconders from other institutions.
(f) A hospital which caters for referral from other institutions. (This hospital includes a section for drug dependency).
(g) A pre-release scheme which serves the institutions in the South East region.

2. PRISONERS

As the above list indicates, there is a whole cross section of U.K. criminals at Wormwood Scrubs with sentences ranging from a few days to life. It can be compared to Long Bay complex of Prisons in many respects. Because of its proximity to London, Wormwood Scrubs is very popular with the inmates.

The prisoners of this institution are dressed in fine Serge navy blue trousers and striped blue and white shirts. The clothes of the prisoners seen by the project team were all well fitting, clean and pressed. The appearance of the inmates is a credit to that institution’s administration. It is understood that the clothes are manufactured by prisoners at other institutions.

3. PERIMETER

The prison is surrounded by a 6 or 7 metre brick wall, which had several towers. These towers are not manned. The decision to remove armed officers from the walls was made in the 1950’s. Inside the wall and approximately 6 metres from it, is a high wire fence made of small mesh which cannot be climbed without aids. Approximately 4 metres from the ground, the fence is fitted with geophones which, we were informed, malfunctioned regularly. The fence was topped with strands of razor tape. C.C.T.V. cameras are placed in such a way that the whole perimeter is under surveillance by the Control Room (dealt with later in this report). Finally, the area inside the perimeter is patrolled by dogs.

4. MOVEMENT

Very few prisoners are permitted out of their respective wings without an escort. These are known as trustees and wear a red armband as identification. During several hours spent at Wormwood Scrubs this Project Team saw one such prisoner moving from one wing to another. All other prisoners are escorted. Category A prisoners (I.R.A. etc.) are escorted only by officers to whom the prisoner is personally known.
5. VISITING

Prisoners at Wormwood Scrubs receive 2 half hour visits per month or a one hour visit per month. All visits are contact visits, prisoners being searched before and after the visit. Selected prisoners are strip searched.

These visits are held in a large room which nevertheless is far too small for the number of visits going on simultaneously. There is token supervision. One officer supervises approximately 12 visits which is up to 40 or 50 people.

The prisoner and his visitors sit around a small table — they can purchase tea, coffee, cakes, sweets etc. from the canteen in the visiting room.

The canteen was very impressive and lent a “soft” tone to the visits. It is run by a women’s organisation known as the Royal Voluntary Service Canteen.

This organisation had its beginning during the Second World War when the ladies met troop trains and provided refreshments. After the war they adopted the prisons and they supply two ladies on a roster system every day of the week to run the canteen for prisoners.

I feel that perhaps some similar group could be prevailed upon to provide a similar service at Parklea.

6. INTERVENTION TIME

Wormwood Scrubs, and presumably other United Kingdom maximum security institutions, direct their efforts, in relation to escape or disturbance to minimising or shortening the ‘intervention’ time. As explained in the foregoing paragraphs, the walls are unmanned and no post officers patrol on the posts, within the prison. Consequently the security is largely dependent on the Control Room Monitors to hear on the geophones and observe on the C.C.T.V., a prisoner attempting to climb over a fence or wall. When this happens the Control Room activates certain alarms and informs appropriate officers who immediately move to the scene and deal with the problem.

The time from when the alarm is given to the time the officers arrive on the scene, is known as ‘intervention’ time.

Similarly, to compliment this system, all walls and fences are given a time rating. For example, a particular wire fence could have a time rating of say 30 seconds, whereas the same fence topped with concertina barbed wire could have a rating of 45 seconds. In other words, these barriers have each been tested, usually by military personnel, and found that they delay a climber by so many seconds.

Therefore, the ‘intervention time’ must always be shorter than the ‘time rating’ of the barrier around the institution.

While it is felt that time rating of barriers does provide a basis of comparison, it is largely academic when applied to a wall which has an armed officer mounted as in N.S.W. institutions.
"This is our control room, from here we control both prisoners".
Geophones which are fixed to the internal wire fence are also monitored in the control room. We were informed that in addition to false alarms, because of wind and snow, the prisoners often interfered with the fence by throwing articles at it from the cell windows. Most cell windows have now been meshed to stop this and also to stop the habit of throwing articles at guard dogs on patrol. During our visit, two geophone alarms were showing on the console. We were informed that these were faulty. We were also informed ‘these geophones are not adequate, but it is the best we have.’

The Project Team would agree with this. Geophones are a help, but they are far from perfect.

The O.I.C. of the control room, decides the action to be taken at any alarm. He is in contact with the Governor, all parts of the prison, the local Police and other essential services. On an alarm being activated, he takes up a position in a raised dais facing the various operators. Each operator has several monitors which are out of the field of vision of the O.I.C. If an operator feels that the O.I.C. should view one of his monitors, he flashes it up on another screen which is directly in front of the O.I.C.

The Control Room is well protected being situated in the ‘between gates’ area adjacent and above the main entrance gate. The gate is manned by another three officers in addition to an officer outside the boom gate. The internal gate of the main entrance is a sliding type grill. It moves very slowly and could be a potential hazard.

This is somewhat offset by sterile area inside the main entrance where no prisoner is permitted. At the moment however, the gate to this sterile area is inoperative and left open.

8. ASSISTANT GOVERNORS

The head of Wormwood Scrubs is the Governor. Below him are several Assistant Governors. The Senior Assistant Governor performs the duties of Deputy Superintendent in Australian terms.

Each Assistant Governor has managerial and administrative responsibility for certain sections of the institution, usually a wing.

Each has between 50 and 100 prisoners allocated to him. His office is in the wing where his prisoners are domiciled and he is readily available to them. He, in fact, manages his group, being involved in all matters relating to each prisoner from recommendations for parole to recommendations for punishment.

There are in excess of 500 Governors and Assistant Governors in the English Prison Service. Nearly one half have progressed through the Prison Officer ranks. The remainder have come from outside the Prison Service, some direct from Universities and others after experience in a wide variety of occupations. They are selected by open competitive exam for their managerial and administrative abilities.

9. BOARD OF VISITORS

This Board is made up of several people not connected with the Prison who come from the community in which the prison is located. Among their number would be some Magistrates who in fact are unpaid Justices of the Peace.

The Board of Visitors is required to meet and attend at the prison monthly, while certain members attend the prison at least once per week.
of the Board and the Governor are as follows:—

Forfeiture of remission — the Board up to 180 days; Governor up to 28 days.

Forfeiture of Amenities — Governor, 28 days.

Stoppage of Earnings — the Board up to 56 days; Governor, 28 days.

Exclusion from Associated Work — the Board up to 56 days; Governor, 14 days (the prisoner works in his own cell).

Cellular Confinement — the Board up to 56 days; Governor, 3 days (own cell).

Any of the above disciplinary awards may be suspended for up to six months provided that the offender commits no other offence against discipline during that period. Any award of ‘Stoppage of Earnings’ may be confined to a proportion of the earnings but made operative for a correspondingly longer period (this giving the offender ‘time to pay’). The prisoner has no choice as to whether the Governor or the Board of Visitors will handle the charge.

10. RELATIONSHIPS

The relationships between officers and prisoners at Wormwood Scrubs were very good for the main part. The officer mingles freely with the prisoners. This is a contrast to the relationships in Canada.
An escapee from an overseas prison made use of the cut section of the chain link fence to protect himself from the concertina barbed wire and the razor tape when escaping through the fenced perimeter.
Ringe (pronounced REEN — GA) State Prison is a walled institution — situated 200 Km from Copenhagen on the island of Funen, Denmark. It caters for male prisoners from the ages of 17 to 25, many serving their first sentence and female prisoners of all ages who cannot be safely housed in open institutions. There is no separation of the sexes. Both mingle freely within their own groups and at work. Either male or female may visit the cell of a member of the opposite sex up to 10 p.m. nightly. After having kept company with each other for some time, a couple can seek permission from the Governor to live together in a cell.

A typical day in the life of a young male prisoner at Ringe might go like this:—

He rises at 6.30 a.m. and makes himself a light breakfast of bread and cheese. He packs a lunch and walks to the prison furniture factory where he works.

The responsibility to rise and to arrive at the factory on time lies with each prisoner. He labours at medium speed all day under the supervision of an officer, stopping for 30 minutes at noon to eat his lunch.

At 4 p.m. work is over. On the way back to his unit, he stops at the prison grocery store to purchase some food. If it is Friday he stops at the prison bank to deposit or cash his paycheck. When he arrives at his unit, his girlfriend, who used to live in the next cell but now lives with him, has come home just before him. They prepare and eat their dinner, then move into the living room to watch T.V. with other members of the unit. If the mood takes them, they may at some point retire to their cell and make love. At midnight they have a late snack.
The wall is constructed of precast concrete and is 6 metres high (approximately). It is fitted with a metal "goose-neck" which makes scaling very difficult. Part of the wall is constructed in a ditch which gives the impression, from a distance that the wall is 2 or 3 metres high, and further it gives the inmates a view to the outside world.

The wall does not have towers or armed officers. It does, however, have C.C.T.V. the whole way around it. This is monitored from a control room within the prison.

There are no devices for metal detection at the entrance to the prison.

**CELLS**

The main building inside the prison is divided by a long corridor, on one side of which there are offices and classrooms while on the other side are six cell blocks, better described as housing units. Five of these blocks contain sixteen cells or rooms and the sixth contains ten rooms, a hospital and an isolation unit. In N.S.W. terms the cells are large, airy, comfortable and tastefully furnished.

Each housing unit is equipped with a kitchen where inmates cook their own meals. The food is purchased from the prison grocery store. Each inmate is given $21 per week for food. He can earn additionally, from $17 to $43 at the factory, which he can spend or bank.

**OFFICERS**

The first thing one notices when entering Ringe prison is the absence of anyone who looks like a guard. In fact, in the traditional sense, there are no guards. Neither are there any industrial officers, social workers, psychologists, or school teachers. Instead there are 46 "standard officers" who assist with these functions. Most of them are ordinary carpenters, ten of them are women. Only five have had any experience in prisons before coming to Ringe.

The carpenters are employed because the main prison industry is a furniture factory. The majority of the total population of 90 prisoners are employed in the factory. In addition to the manufacture of furniture 18 inmates are employed assembling electronic components and 2 are employed sewing mail bags.

Each housing unit is permanently assigned seven or eight "Standard Officers". Each one of these officer groups must include one female officer and at least one officer with previous prison experience. Each group makes its own decisions as to conditions and hours of work within the policy guidelines of the institution. The officer group is collectively responsible for every inmate in their housing unit from the moment he is received until he is discharged. They give him an orientation tour on reception, they assist him with various reception forms and procedures, they photograph him for the prison files, they ensure that he gets to work on time, they supervise him at work, they arrange for courses or schooling that he may need and they drive him to town to buy clothes or other supplies.

(It is on these excursions to town that most escapes have taken place).

Telephones and home leave are available so that the inmates can make their own arrangements for housing and employment on release and normally the "standard officer" is not involved in these. Each officer has received some rudimentary social work training to assist them if necessary.

The Superintendent of Ringe, Erik Anderson, said that the concept behind the staff organisation was to increase the staff member’s job satisfaction and to foster a much closer relationship between staff and inmates.
It must be pointed out that the Ringe system is not fully accepted by the officers of the other Prisons in Denmark, neither is the staff of Ringe. We were informed that greater acceptance was evident lately because of the success of the experiment of, what is usually referred to as "Co-correction".

The total staff at Ringe is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Warder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Guards</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop supervisor (furniture factory)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman (furniture factory)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop supervisor (assembly workshop)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman (painter)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman (low current electrician)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Officers (including 10 women)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk Trainee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a prison officer exchange between England and Denmark.
view. Critical gates and doors are electrically operated from the control room which also houses the prison telephone system control board. Keys are secured in the control room. Many areas including all the perimeter wall is under the C.C.T.V. surveillance, the monitors being located in the control room. Further monitors activated by movement in corridors are also located there.

There are no firearms in any Danish prison. When asked about metal detectors to prevent weapons coming into the prison, the Governor stated that it was not a problem and in fact he said that only two or 3 knife attacks had taken place since the prison was opened. Similarly, attacks by prisoners on officers are a rarity.

Male inmates behave noticeably better for female officers than for males and the social climate is much better in units with female prisoners than in those that are all male.

Another striking feature as regards security is the fact that all cells with the exception of the isolation cell have external windows, yet there are no bars and the windows are glazed with normal domestic glass.

There has been only one escape over the wall.

VISITING

Visits are permitted on a weekly basis. These are held in a private room with no supervision; in fact the room can be locked from the inside by the inmate. A setee that converts into a bed is provided and the officer patrolling a corridor knocks on the door about 5 minutes before the visit is due to end. This is common to all Danish prisons. Prisoners are searched before and after visits.

SECURITY CELL

Gross breaches of order and discipline such as threats of violence or escape, are dealt with by the normal coercive measures which in Denmark includes the security cell. This cell is certified by the Department of Prisons for that purpose and cannot be used for any other purpose. Where it is necessary, in order to prevent imminent acts of violence or self injury, a prisoner is placed in a security cell. This cell is furnished with only a bed which is fixed to the floor. The bed is equipped with leather straps which are secured around the prisoner’s waist, wrists and ankles. He is kept immobile in this position until his attitude changes.

Confinement to a security cell is, however, resorted to only when absolutely necessary and only as long as is necessary.

OBSERVATIONS BY THE PROJECT TEAM

Denmark has 15 prisons, each holds a maximum of 200 inmates. Most hold 90 to 100 inmates.

The inmates of Danish prisons are as comfortable as they would be in their own homes.

Very few prisoners serve sentences of over 12 months. The average stay in prison is 3 months.

There is little emphasis on security.

Prisoners can earn adequate wages.
There are enough officers to give every inmate as much personal attention as he wants. The Danish Prisons Department provides the discharged prisoners with financial and other resources he may need for the first few weeks following his release.

To understand why the Danish Penal System works without great sums being expended on security it is necessary to read the following extract from the Danish Corrections Magazine, March 1977. It gives a clear picture of Danish prisons and Danish prisoners.

“A tour of the Danish prison system makes clear why it is held in such high esteem internationally. Even the institutions where security is tightest would qualify as minimum security in the United States. At the brand new, maximum-security prison at Ringe, there are no guards. The inmates are supervised by carpenters who spend part of their time working in the prison’s furniture factory and the rest observing — not really guarding — the inmates in the housing units. Ringe is a co-ed prison where male and female inmates who fall in love live together in the same cell.

The ‘open’ institution to which most Danish prisoners are committed would be quickly denounced as ‘country clubs’ by conservative commentators in the United States. They are indeed open, airy institutions where inmates live and work with a minimum of supervision and from which they can walk away almost at will. Inmates in the open prisons have the right — not the privilege, but the right — to frequent furloughs home and to numerous other amenities which would turn American prisoners green with envy.

The Danish prison system is often held up by scholars and international humanitarian organisations as a model for the rest of the world. The United Nations has made a film about the prison system that is shown to university students and other interested groups around the world.
especially with regard to crime and punishment, is as different from the United States as butter is from margarine.

Denmark is a peaceful, calm and orderly society, and so are its prisons. There is little serious crime, and so there are few dangerous criminals in Danish prisons. There is little fear of crime or criminals, and so there is no need for tight security measures. The Danish public does not oppose giving prison inmates substantial rights, including sexual contact.

Denmark is an ethnically and economically homogeneous society; 97 per cent of its five million people are white, middle class Lutherans. It is a country with an economic and tax system that guarantees there will be no extremes of either wealth or poverty. No Dane can ever claim he had to steal to eat. The large, and expensive, social welfare system is designed to assure that all of the disadvantaged — the old, the mentally and physically ill, the disabled, and the criminal — are permitted to live with a maximum of dignity.

It is a common belief in Denmark that ‘society’ is as much to blame for criminality and other social deviance as the individuals involved, and so it is accepted public policy not to deal with criminals too harshly. Also, there is a general abhorrence of imprisonment that may have to do, some Danes speculate, with the horrors suffered by Danish Resistance fighters in Nazi concentration camps during World War II. There is little public, or political, resistance to the idea that prison should be used only as a ‘last resort’, and that even then sentences should be short and accommodations as comfortable as possible.

At the same time, there is a quality in the Danish personality described, depending on whom one talks to, as ‘fatalism’ or ‘realism’, which makes both ordinary Danes and Danish prison officials very pessimistic about the possibility of changing the attitudes or life styles of those who commit crimes. They declare the American preoccupation with the treatment and rehabilitation of criminals to be ‘nonsense’. While the Danish system offers conventional vocational and academic education to all inmates who want it, officials are more concerned that the system treat everyone fairly and uniformly.

The purpose of imprisonment is punishment. Danish criminal justice officials unanimously declare. But the loss of liberty should be the only punishment. The main purpose of the prisons — they are still officially called prisons in Denmark, rather than ‘correctional institutions’ — is to provide humane care for the inmates until they can be released. Thus, the Danish corrections agency is called the Direktoratet for Kriminalforsorgen — literally, the Department of Criminal Care. Aware of how odd this title sounds to American ears, Danish officials prefer to translate it as the Department of Prisons and Probation.”

Finally, the words of H.H Brydensholt, Director General, Danish Directorate of Criminal Care:—

“We know now that you shouldn’t place any high expectations on the individual offender. You don’t put an offender in an institution because you want to rehabilitate him. You put him there because you want to punish him and (achieve) a general deterrence effect . . . .”
Gymnasium from the State Prison at Ringe
During the 1960's, an expansion of the youth prison system was one of the main issues up in penal policy debate in Denmark. A report from a Commission on juvenile crime, issued in 1959, led to the formation, by the Ministry of Justice, of a committee to propose expansions for the youth prisons. The inadequate capacity of these prisons at that time was a main motive for the committee's proposal in 1962 to build a new central reception institution. The committee's recommendations were accompanied by the Ministry's supervisory architect.

A site was obtained south of Ringe, a town on the island of Funen, and the architect then prepared more detailed plans. This draft was altered in the mid-1960's, however, after a Penal Commission recommended the construction of a closed youth prison rather than a reception institution, in order to reduce pressure upon sections of Nyborg State Prison used for the purpose at that time. For several reasons, construction did not begin until May 1973, about two months after a revision of the Criminal Code eliminated the Youth Prisons Institute.

This change did not alter the intention to use the new prison mainly for younger detainees, and assurances were given during parliamentary debates at the time that young offenders would serve detentions in institutions designed to allow for their education.

As construction started, the governor of the institution was appointed in order to supervise construction, and to arrange the prison's detention system. Penal institutions had changed considerably, since the last closed prison had been built in Denmark in 1913, and so had the penal theory. In the autumn of 1973 a working group was formed, consisting of the prison governor, a representative of the Criminal Welfare Board, and the manager and chief warder appointed to the new prison. At the beginning of 1975, this group was expanded to include representatives of staff organisations.

**THE BUILDINGS:**

The 78,000 square metres site is on a hillside, with a slope of 16 to 18 metres. Because the metre high enclosure wall has been built into an artificial hollow on three sides, partly to avoid disturbing the landscape, the buildings within the enclosure, and particularly those facing north, have an excellent view of the countryside, a feature that helps considerably to disguise the traditional prison atmosphere.

The total floor area of the prison is 10,000 square metres. The living quarters are in six blocks. Five of these have each room for 16 inmates in single cells; the sixth has ten cells as well as four sick rooms and one security cell. These blocks correspond very closely to the new residential quarters erected in some open prisons, and these blocks, as well as the prison buildings generally, have no special prison-type security fittings. In this respect they correspond closely to the type of buildings used in open prisons. The individual cells are 7 to 8 square metres in size, and are furnished with the standard fittings provided in new or modernised buildings under the Criminal Welfare Service's administration. Each block has a bath and a washroom and a very well equipped kitchen for the common use of the block's inmates. Each block also has a dining room and two lounges, one with television.

The six residential cell blocks connect, like the teeth of a comb, to a common corridor area, and a guard room is placed at the entrance of each block. On the other side of the corridor area, facilities such as classrooms, medical consultation room, dental clinic, library, hobby workshops, a depot and a smaller workshop where some 15 detainees can be employed in fitting work.

The prison has 9 visiting rooms, 6 isolation cells and a smaller closed exercise area which must be considered outdated and is not likely to be used for its original purpose. Finally, in addition to the administrative offices etc., there is a small chapel and lecture hall which can be used for film shows, and a staff canteen.
The prison, Kragskovhede, is divided into three main sections all used for the prison’s furniture factory, plus offices for foremen, dining rooms for the prisoners, bathrooms and toilets, etc. The basement level is used for storage of raw materials and the finished products.

In the sports hall, detainees can play tennis, badminton, volleyball, basketball, handball and indoor football.

The enclosure wall is 675 metres long, and built of elements made at the State Prison, Kragskovhede, which also supplied concrete elements for the residential blocks. Most of the furnishings used in the prison were made in various prison workshops.

The original building grant was Dkr 35 million, including furnishings, but price increases during construction and the installations of more sophisticated equipment than originally planned increased the cost somewhat.

POLICIES:

Prisoners under 30 years who are to be placed in a closed detention, are brought to the Nyborg and Ringe State Prisons, and distributed to the two institutions after discussions between the two. Ringe normally receives those under 25 years, though consideration is given to individual factors and the possibilities available at the two prisons. Those with a particular need for education are sent to Nyborg where facilities for this are superior, while prisoners with a need for vocational training go to Ringe.

On a trial basis, Ringe also receives female prisoners who are not suited for detention in an open prison. Women prisoners are examined at the State Prison at Horserod.

A proportion of both male and female prisoners will have made escape attempts during detention in open institutions, and for this reason be transferred to closed prisons, but the majority have been sent to the institution from the start of their term.

The Ringe State Prison is expected to have 10–15 women detainees who are housed in two cell blocks so that there is an approximate balance between male and female prisoners in these blocks.

On the whole, detainees will have longer criminal records, and most will also have experience from other institutions. About 40 percent are drug addicts.

BASIC ATTITUDES

The prison’s administration system is designed to give the widest degree of influence to the staff and detainees as possible. To some degree this is aided by division of cells into six blocks, but the influence and self-determination provided is not restricted to the residential blocks. It is extended to work duties and to some extent also economic administration.

The intention of this is to give detainees the greatest possible degree of influence upon their own affairs, through performance of their social duties, and in everyday routine through practical matters like use of their private property, preparing food, payment of wages and food money in cash.

To promote shared influence on economic matters, and to provide more effective administration, programme budgeting has been applied to give an economic information and control system. This should make possible a degree of influence and responsibility in the separate sections, workshops, function groups, etc. A small computer has been installed in the prison to assist in this project, and it is linked to a large-scale computer bank in Copenhagen. In addition to use in the economic control system, the computer is used to control service norms, calculate punishments, etc., and it is being expanded to take over registration duties for both staff and detainees.
duties and to a certain degree, welfare officer duties as well. The prison staff is divided into six groups each, for a specific residence block. Each group carries out the duties required for the block, and shares other duties with the other individual groups. There is no duty roster in the normal sense, each group organises its own duty roster on the basis of an adapted flexible time system. This is again controlled by the computer.

By increasing the responsibilities of each group in this way, it is felt that motivation and job satisfaction will improve for the staff, but also for the prisoners since the staff is also given more say in matters concerning the prisoners, such as reception, enrolment, leisure activities, meeting participation etc.

THE STAFF

The prison has a total staff of 69 persons:—

1 Prison Governor
1 Chief Warder
1 Welfare Officer
5 Chief Guards
1 Workshop Supervisor (furniture factory)
1 Foreman (deputy leader, furniture factory)
1 Workshop Supervisor (assembly workshop)
1 Foreman (painter)
1 Foreman (low-current electrician)
2 Nurses
46 Foreman/standard officers
1 Prison Chief Assistant
1 Prison Assistant
4 Office Staff
1 Office Trainee.

The Prison Manager is the leader of the prison’s overall administration, which functions as a unit and is not divided into offices for specific areas.

Apart from a painter foreman the prison does not have employed staff for maintenance of technical equipment or buildings. These duties are the responsibility of the technical supervisor at Nyborg State Prison, whose duties cover all three prisons on Funen. The Ringe State Prison’s low-current electrician is subordinate to the technical supervisor.

A general practitioner and practicing dentist function as the prison’s doctor and dentist.

No special staff is required for the prison depot service which leases clothing, etc from a central depot at Kragskovhede State Prison. Depot duties are carried out by the unit officers.

Every effort has been made to rationalise prison duties. During the day, five of the six residential blocks are not staffed, and in consequence prisoners do not have access to them during working hours. If they want lunch, prisoners must therefore bring lunch packets to the workshops. The night guard is formed of four unit officers.
characterised as an open prison placed within an enclosure wall. The inner side of the wall is fitted with a stainless steel metal hood, and microwave alarm systems are installed along the enclosure walls and at some sections of the buildings. If these are interrupted, a signal is given on a display board in the guard room, and a close circuit television screen provides a picture of the area concerned. Corresponding alarms are installed in some corridor areas, but without any television screens. Centrally-situated gates and doors are opened and closed electrically from the guard room, which also houses the prison’s radio-telephone system control board. Pass-keys are administered from the guard room and from it the unmanned main entrance is controlled.

WORK SUPERVISION:

Only four types of employment are provided, a furniture factory employing 30 to 40 prisoners, a small assembly workshop for about 15 prisoners, a cleaning team which also maintains outdoor plant etc., and employs 7 prisoners, and a painting team of three prisoners. A Swedish-American engineer, Grant C. Clapper who has experience with similar duties in Swedish Criminal Welfare, has been engaged as consultant for work planning and payment systems for prisoners. The purpose is to attempt to improve the system of payments, compared to the traditional methods, in a way that will keep the overall cost at the same level as the traditional system. It should improve the earning capacity of prisoners who are prepared to improve their abilities.

Two permanent leaders and four alternating standard officers are attached to the furniture factory, one permanent leader and one rostered standard officer work at the assembly workshop. The painting team is administered by the appropriate foreman, and the cleaning group is led by the standard officer on duty.

WELFARE WORK:

In principle, prisoners are expected to manage their own social duties and overcome their own problems. If necessary they can obtain the help of the standard officer on duty in their block. If the situation requires special knowledge of welfare or other regulations, the standard officer can obtain the assistance of a welfare officer from Ringe municipality, who visits the prison as a consultant. For this purpose an agreement has been made so that the Criminal Welfare Service refunds any expenditure involved in this work for the prison. The welfare officer on the prison staff is engaged to coordinate activities in the entire welfare sector with relation to the services of the criminal welfare system.

EDUCATION:

As mentioned above, prisoners requiring normal education are generally sent to the Nyborg State Prison. In consequence, Ringe mainly receives prisoners with a need for elementary teaching or leisure time training. The prison does not have any permanent teaching staff, and an attempt has been made to meet educational needs through teachers from “outside”, mainly from the Ringe municipal school system. Negotiations have been started with the municipality for refunding costs involved in having a half teacher post provided as leader and consultant in education, but the arrangement is not expected to come into effect until the autumn of 1976.

Hobby workshops have been provided in the prison, and detainees can cultivate sports interests in the sports hall, which is in use every evening. The hall has been made available to some sports clubs in Ringe, in return for participation by prisoners in some activities.

Space has been provided for library and reading room, but until the Ringe Municipal library service has been further expanded, library service is provided by the Central Library in Odense, which sends a book bus to the prison weekly.
prepare their own food. To this end a kitchen has been provided in each block, and with the meal payments made (currently Dkr. 16.65 daily), prisoners can buy the foodstuffs they need in a shop set up in the area which originally was intended to be a central kitchen. The shop is operated by the local cooperative store. In practise, prisoners very quickly formed small cooking groups, and this organisation is left entirely to the prisoners. There has been considerable satisfaction with the arrangement, and prisoners undoubtedly consider it to be an advantage that they can decide what they want to eat.

Meal payments and wages are paid once weekly to prisoners in cash. Payment is made in a bank room provided for a local bank which agreed to operate this service.

MALE AND FEMALE

The trial arrangement of housing both men and women in two residential blocks was started after many long discussions. Probably it is less discussed within the prison, where it has become part of the natural daily routine and devoid of drama. There is much more curiosity outside the prison, particularly from foreign newspapers and television services. It is still to early to say whether this experiment will succeed, but it must be given a reasonable test. However, there is no reason to assume that the norms current among young prisoners are in this area much different to those accepted by other young people living in freedom. The attempts made to sensationalise this aspect of the prisoner appear tasteless, to put it mildly, to anyone who knows the prison’s daily routine. Both the staff and prisoners agree it would be sad if inbalanced publicity should condemn the experiment in advance.

So far, it is only possible to say that both good and bad results have been registered, which correspond to those one can meet outside prison. In some ways the presence of both sexes has created tensions, while other tensions known in traditional prisons which are generally all-male societies are removed.

The presence of women prisoners also made it necessary to engage women standard officers.

STAFF TRAINING

The prison personnel were engaged from October 1, 1975, and during three months received instructions and training which was particularly needed since most had no previous prison experience. This also encouraged agreement and understanding for the experiments to be made in the new prison. All standard officers will, however, over a period of about two years receive the normal basic training provided by the Criminal Welfare Service. During this period, about 8 members of the staff will be absent at any given time, and it was therefore necessary to close one block, and this will be used as college for other sections of the staff training programme.

CONTROL

The success or failure of the series of experiments which have been started in the new prison cannot be evaluated fully by the staff engaged in the experiments. For this reason an agreement was reached with sociologists Bjørn Evald Holstein, Ole Dala and Torben Toft to carry out surveys which could provide a basis for deciding which experiments should be included as a permanent system, and which ones should be abandoned. Attitude surveys of the staff have already been made, and new study will be made in the Autumn of 1976 and again a year after that. It is not possible in advance to say how successful the system will prove to be. If it were, one could not speak of an experiment. Nor can one assume that everything will go according to plan, for if it did, the experiments would not have gone far enough.

(June 1976).
Kumla is a maximum security institution situated approximately 200 Kilometres from Stockholm, Sweden. It houses 300 prisoners who are serving long sentences or who have proved themselves to be troublesome in other institutions throughout Sweden.

The population is broken up into units of 48 and then each unit is subdivided into 3 groups of 16 inmates.

Even though Kumla was completed in 1965, surprisingly it has no sewer connections to the cells. A “tub” system is still in use. No reason was given for this situation.

2. PERIMETER

The prison is comprised of four sections. Two contain prisoners and are walled. Between these two sections is situated an Amenities Block and the Administrative Block. This section has a wall at the rear and a high mesh fence in front. On the northern end is the final section, which contains the industries and is partly walled and partly fenced.

The walls are 6 metres high and are constructed of reinforced concrete which is angulated in a zig-zag configuration for added strength.

The walls have no towers or armed officers. The front gate into the institution is unmanned and is operated from the Control Room. The gate is in full view of the Control Room and is in radio communication with it. The two gates leading from the central section to the sections containing prisoners are also operated by the Control Room and also unmanned. Each gate is monitored by C.C.T.V. with radio communication. These last mentioned gates are seldom used for pedestrian traffic. Tunnels exist under the prison leading to all sections. All inmate traffic moves along the tunnels.

A C.C.T.V. system is utilised to keep the whole perimeter and a sterile area just outside the wall under observation. This sterile area is defined by a low wire fence (2 metres) with no barbed wire entanglements. The concrete walls are fitted with geophones which are monitored in the Control Room.

A motor vehicle is kept near the entrance of the Prison at all times to pursue escapees if the case arises.

3. STAFF

Kumla has a total staff of 350 officers for the 300 prisoners it holds. These include 10 Assistants, 40 Industrial Officers and 10 machine operators. The Superintendent considers that the prison is understaffed for adequate security and has applied for several additional security positions.

Included in the staff are 15 female officers. Unlike Denmark, the females at Kumla are rostered for certain posts only; included in these is the Control Room.

Officers who have gained some proficiency in social work or who joined the Department as a qualified social worker are referred to as “Super Guards”. These officers usually become the “Unit Managers” in due course.

The experiment of training officers in Social Work has been operating for 3 years and appears to be a success. The scheme, however, is not popular with most of the older prison officers who are critical of it but tolerate it because they do not see it as a threat to their position.
as the "tanker" in the local vernacular. It contains 36 cells. Nine of these are for violent prisoners, who are broken up into 3 units of 3 inmates each. One group never sees another group. While one group works the other is at studies and the third is at leisure. They rotate at regular intervals. If any prisoner refuses to work or study he is locked in his cell and charged.

The section has recently been renovated and the present units of three introduced. Previously there were 20 cells and the prisoners were together. They proved to be a management problem.

Notwithstanding the fact that these inmates are in the Security Unit, they are entitled to and received regular conjugal visits. The only difference from prisoners under ordinary discipline, is that the visits take place in the Security Section.

5. **ESCAPES – RIOTS – DISTURBANCES**

Several escapes from Kumla have taken place during the 13 years that it has been operative. There have been many sit-ins, roof demonstrations, other concerted actions and one incident where hostages were taken.

One notable escape involved the whole of the Special Security Unit of 15 prisoners escaping over the wall. This escape resulted in the redesigning of the Unit, revision of the Security procedures and the installation of C.C.T.V. to give surveillance of the whole of the perimeter wall. Another escape incident involved a prisoner taking a delivery truck while it was inside the walls and ramming the gate several times until it collapsed. This escape resulted in all vehicular gates being strengthened. I must add that this type of escape would have been impossible in N.S.W. as all main gates of maximum security prisons are much stronger than those at Kumla.

The hostage incident occurred in 1975 when several prisoners took hostages and demanded to be let out of the gaol. The Head Office of the Swedish Prison System had never laid down and still declines, to lay down a policy with regard to hostages. In this particular case the Governor decided to release the prisoners, however, the staff objected and rescued the hostages at the last gate. Some officers were wounded.

The current Governor states that in absence of a Head Office policy regarding hostages, his policy is to release the prisoners on demand and save the hostages.

6. **PRISONERS’ “UNION”**

A prisoner’s Council exists in each unit of 48 prisoners. The representatives of each Unit meet with the Governor regularly and once each month all representatives meet with the Governor collectively.

Although this is similar to the Problems and Needs Committee in N.S.W., it is very unpopular with the prison officers because it is seen as a union. A current demand by the prisoner’s Council is for sheets to be supplied for conjugal beds in the visiting rooms.

7. **COOKHOUSE**

The food is cooked outside the secured area and transported to the different sections in heated trolley. No prisoners are employed in the cookhouse but they take over once the food is in these respective sections and serve it. The Project Team were not given the opportunity to see any of the food.
inspected for contraband. Telephone calls are monitored. A normal prisoner stays at Kumla for approximately half of the time he has to serve. Towards the end of his stay at Kumla he is given 48 hours home leave. If his behaviour during this leave is satisfactory he is then transferred to an open institution. Once each month, dances are held at the prison. These are attended, for the main part, by social workers from the Universities.

9. **CONTROL ROOM**

A Control Room manned by one female officer is situated at the front end of the administrative building. This officer monitors several C.C.T.V. screens and operates gates and doors. It was discovered that females are much more suited for this type of work. Nevertheless, one female watched an escape over the wall on a C.C.T.V. camera and the reality of the situation did not dawn upon her until after the escape had taken place.

10. **VISITS**

Each prisoner is entitled to 2 hours visit every 14 days. All visits are held in a private room which is furnished with table and chairs and a lounge that converts into a bed. As in Denmark, an officer patrols a corridor outside these rooms and he knocks on the door five minutes before the visit is due to end. There are no apparent facilities for outdoor visits. Visitors are searched before each visit and the prisoners are strip-searched after each visit.

11. **FOYER**

The foyer cum waiting room is the focal point of the prison. From the foyer end winding stairs lead up to the next level where administrative offices are situated. Leading off the foyer at ground level are the visiting rooms and the Control Room. The foyer is tastefully furnished and nothing indicates that it is part of a maximum security prison. It is the highlight of the prison with samples of prisoners' art and crafts displayed in glass cases.
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Site data
Enclosed site area: 107,500 m²
Site area/inmate: 307 m²/inmate
Area of site covered by buildings: 17,060 m²
Percentage of site covered by buildings: 16%
Area of site covered by building/inmate: 53 m²/inmate
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Total building area at all floors: 37,700 m²
Building area/inmate: 118 m²/inmate
Building area of cell and dormitories (including access): 3,132 m²
Area of cell and dormitories/inmate: 8 m²/inmate
No. of floors of cell blocks: minimum 2 floors
Maximum 2 floors
Separate buildings
Separate sections in one building: than ordinary cell blocks
Separate sections in other building: than ordinary cell blocks

Special provisions
Separate sections for cells: ordinary cell blocks

Eating facilities
In cell
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No. of cells
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Appendix A.

Background profiles of inmates confined in the Marion Control Unit. The reason for each inmate's placement in the Control Unit perhaps reflects the violence which is never very far from the surface in American institutions.

The column headed "Total Sentence" graphically demonstrates the hopelessness of some of the inmates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Total Sentence</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Serious Assault Prior Record</th>
<th>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</th>
<th>Detainers</th>
<th>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Bank Robbery</td>
<td>Bank Robbery by Intimidation; Assault</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Numerous incidents of assault and threatening staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25 years 10 years concurrent; 10 years Accum.</td>
<td>Armed Bank Rob. Escape (2 cts); Murder 2nd; Convey Wpn.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Escape (2 cts); 10yrs. concurrent; Murder, 10 yrs consecutive.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Killing an inmate United State Prison - Marion, 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35 years, 8 mths, Aggre.</td>
<td>Robbery and Assault with a dangerous weapon; Murder 2nd; Attempted Armed Rob; Convey Wpn. within U.S.P.: Assault w/ Dang. weapon.</td>
<td>Assault with Intent to Commit Robbery</td>
<td>Conveying Wpn within United States Prison &amp; assault w/Dang. Weapon, 15 years.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Assaulted (stabbed) inmate at United States Prison - Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault Prior Record</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Theft from Interstate Shipment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Asslt. on inmate &amp; threatened staff at United States Prison - Lewisburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>67 years Aggreg.</td>
<td>Bank Robbery; Bank Robbery w/Assault; Bank Robbery w/Assault.</td>
<td>Assault on Police Officer.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Armed Robbery (2 cts) Auto Larceny Asslt. w/deadly spn.</td>
<td>Engaging in sexual acts with other inmates through use of weapons and threats. Other: disruptive conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19 years 11 months 5 days Aggreg.</td>
<td>Poss. of Fire-Arms during Felony; Motor Vehicle Theft Sodomy by Force.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sodomy by Force; 16 years concurrent</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Aiding in assault on inmate at United States Prison - Marion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Bank Robbery</td>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Plotting to kill to staff at United States Prison - 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault Prior Record</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23 years aggregate</td>
<td>Bank Robbery; Assault on Govt. Reser. Escape</td>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>Assault on Inmate, 5 years accum; Escape, 3 years accum.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Planning to kill 2 staff members at United States Prison - Max: 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Armed Bank Robbery.</td>
<td>Assault and Robbery.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Planning to escape by use of explosives and planning to kill staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>Armed Robbery; Rape</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Planning to take hostages in order to release inmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20-100 yrs.</td>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>Armed Robbery (2 counts)</td>
<td>Pending charges for Murder of Inmate and Convey Weapons.</td>
<td>Murder of Inmate; Convey Weapons; USP-Marion.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45 years aggregate</td>
<td>Conspiring to Rob Bank; Poss unregistered f/arms; armed B/Rob (2cts).</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Planning to escape from USP-MA 1978 by use of force &amp; weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault Prior Record</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19      | 15 years, 6 months aggregate | Unauthorized use of Vehicle; Armed Robbery; Convey wpn in Fed. institution | Armed Robbery | Convey wpn in Fed. Institution; 5 years accum. | Mpm. | Aiding in stabbing another inmate;
Serious & repetitive misconduct |
| 20      | 60 yrs - Life | Burglary & Asslt to Commit Arm Robbery; Kidnap | Attempted Armed Robbery | Assault w/intent to kill, 10 years accum. | None | Aiding in assaulting (stabbing another
| 21      | Life & 3 yrs | Murder; Bank Robbery; Kidnap, Attempting to Escape | None | Attempting to Escape FCI-OXF, 1978, 3 yrs accum. | None | Planning to take hostages at
United States Prison & release inmates. |
| 22      | 25 years | Bank Robbery & Asslt; Aid & Abet; Theft of Govt.Property. | None | None | Asslt. on Correc. Offcr. | Possession of devices relating
explosion at United States Prison - Marion, 1976. |
| 23      | 4-6 years; 5010-B, 6 years accum. reg. adult | Unarmed Bank Rob. Assault on Fed. Offcr. | None | 6 years, Assault on Federal Officer. | 6 years, Assault on Fed. Officer. | Assaulted two officers at EI Reno, August, 1978. |
| 24      | Life | Murder; Kidnap Asslt w/dan. wpn; rob; Larceny, Poss of Dang. Wpn & Unlawful Deten. | None | None | None | Threatening to stab a correction officer with a sharpened instr
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Total Sentence</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Serious Assault Prior Record</th>
<th>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</th>
<th>Detainers</th>
<th>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7-21 years</td>
<td>Bank Rob; Armed Robbery</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Threatened a correctional off. Assaulted correctional officer: United States Prison - Atlanta December, 1977.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>1st Degree Murder (8 cts) Rob &amp; asslt.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Encouraging a group demonstration; Threatening another with bodily harm; Asslt on staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>38 years aggregate</td>
<td>Attempted Aggravated rob; Attempted rob; Asslt; Conspir Attempted Escapé; Escape; False Imprisonment &amp; Aggravated Asslt.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Attempted Escape 2½ yrs; Escape, 5 yrs. False Imprisonment &amp; Aggravated Asslt, 3 yrs; Pending Charge of Asslt on Correc. Officer, 2 cts.</td>
<td>Asslt on Correc. Ofcr; USM:E:ILL (2 cts)</td>
<td>Planning Escape &amp; Assaulting Correctional Officer, USP-MAR: 1977.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Bank Robbery; Carry Weapon in FCI; Intimidating Employee in FCI.</td>
<td>Assault w/deadly weapon; Armed Robbery.</td>
<td>Carrying Wpn in FCI, Intimidating employee in FCI.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Incident involving taking staff hostage at knife point &amp; 3 ct of assaulting staff at FCI -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>15 years &amp; Life Consecutive; 6 months accum.</td>
<td>Conspiracy to Distribute Narcotics; Distributing Heroin &amp; Cocaine Continuing Criminal operat.</td>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>6 months assault.</td>
<td>Assault; US Attorney 6 months consecutive.</td>
<td>Stabbed inmate at United Stat Prison - MARION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>18 years Aggregate</td>
<td>Bank Robbery; Assault on Correc. Officer.</td>
<td>Armed Robbery; Battery.</td>
<td>Assault on Correc. Officer, 3 years.</td>
<td>Armed Robbery, (5 cts) Illinois.</td>
<td>Stabbing an inmate at United States Prison - MARION, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault Prior Record</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of confinement.</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault</td>
<td>Additional Conviction</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>125 years</td>
<td>Conspiracy; Bank Robbery; Bank Larceny; Kidnap Interstate Trans. of Stolen Auto Aid and Abet.</td>
<td>Kidnapping; Armed Robbery; Aggravated Asslt; Poss of Deadly Wpn.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Assault w/deadly Wpn. by Prisoner; Escape; State of Arizona</td>
<td>Involved in planning an escape from United States Prison - Lewisburg which included the use of firebombs and killing at least two officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Bank Robbery</td>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Killed an inmate at United States Prison-Lewisburg, October, 19__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Bank Larceny &amp; 1/2 Trans. of Forged Securit.</td>
<td>Armed Rob; Asslt.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Stabbing an inmate; Threatened staff &amp; extreme disruptive con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Kidnapping; NWVTA: Poss. of Firearms</td>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Killed an inmate at USP-ATLANTA, 1978.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Total Sentence</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Serious Assault Prior Record</th>
<th>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</th>
<th>Detainers</th>
<th>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>20 yrs 1 month, 15 days, aggregate.</td>
<td>Bank Rob; Bank Rob; Placing Lives in Jeopardy.</td>
<td>Possession of Wpn, 2 cts.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Assaulting 4 inmates; threatened staff &amp; extreme disruptive behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Stabbing w/ intent to kill</td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Assailed officer, 2 cts; fight with inmate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>Bank Robbery w/Deadly Wpn.</td>
<td>Asslt w/Deadly Wpn; Manslaughter</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Stabbed an inmate at United States Prison - Marion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Aircraft Piracy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Awaiting sentence for Attempted Escape; Consp to Hijack.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Attempted escape using a commandeered helicopter in which hijacker was killed at USP-Marion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Asslt w/Intent to kill; armed Rob; Sodomy; Carrying Dang. Wpn; Robbery.</td>
<td>Grand Larceny &amp; 1st degree murder &amp; attempted murder.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Raped another inmate at USP-Marion March, 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault Prior Record</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement.</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>30 years Aggregate</td>
<td>Kidnap; Murder 2nd Degree.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10 yrs. 2nd Degree Murder.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Killing an inmate at United States Prison - Marion, October 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Life &amp; 20 yrs accum.</td>
<td>Murder &amp; Attempt Murder</td>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>State of Wash. 30 yrs committed term for Robbery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Armed Bank Rob.</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Rob. by assault; IDC action of planning to Asslt. to Murder; staff members at USP-Marion Escape, Texas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>35 yrs to Life</td>
<td>Armed Rob; Rape Burglary while Armed.</td>
<td>Armed Rob; Asslt &amp; Battery</td>
<td>15 yrs to life consec. for Aggravated Sodomy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Asslt. on inmate; making sex threats; aggravated sodomy; inmate at United States Prison Leavenworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Armed Bank Rob.</td>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>Pending charge of Murdering an Inmate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IDC action of killing an inmate at FCI - Lompoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault Prior Record</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reasons for Placement in Marion Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>Distributing Narcotics.</td>
<td>Poss of Pistol</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Found guilty by IDC at Uni States Prison - Marion of ing other inmates, extorti from inmates under threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>8-10 years YCA, 66</td>
<td>Murder II:Asslt on Fed, Offcr.</td>
<td>Simple Asslt.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Attempting to riot; asslt inmates. Extreme negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>32 yrs &amp; 14 days aggregate</td>
<td>Rob; Escape; Armed Rob; Manslaughter</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Escape; 20-60 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Extreme threats to staff; history of disruptive cond threats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>7-30 yrs</td>
<td>Rob; Aggravat Battery.</td>
<td>Battery; Poss of Deadly Weapon.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Extorting money from &amp; pre other inmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>60 years Rhode Island 75 yrs aggregate</td>
<td>Rob. &amp; Escape Asslt w/Dang. Wpn; carry Firearm during Commission of Crime; Carry Wpn &amp; Asslt to Commit Murder.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Using force to organize as strong arm sex. Pressurir and threatening another ir with bodily harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Bank Rob w/ Assault.</td>
<td>Asslt 3rd Degree</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Assaulted Associate Wuder Correctional Officers at U States Prison - Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Total Sentence</td>
<td>Offence</td>
<td>Serious Assault Prior Record</td>
<td>Additional Conviction During Current Period of Confinement.</td>
<td>Detainers</td>
<td>Reason for Placement in Marion Control Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>10-40 yrs</td>
<td>Poss of Firearm Carrying Pistol Without License; Assaulting Police</td>
<td>Assault with deadly weapon; Assaulting Police; Killing inmate in USP.</td>
<td>Forced Rape; Life sentence; Assault 3 years; Forced Rape 15 years to life.</td>
<td>MR Violation, Parole Commission.</td>
<td>Assault 2nd Rape of two inmates at USP - Leavenworth, 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to Life Accum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Hijack Aircraft using Firearms to commit a Felony &amp; Consp. to Kidnap Foreign Official.</td>
<td>Bank Robbery.</td>
<td>Awaiting sentencing for attempted escape; consp. to hijack &amp; other charges.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Attempted to escape using a commandeered helicopter in which hijacker was killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Bank Robbery</td>
<td>Criminal Attempt to Rob.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 yrs concurrent for Armed Robbery, Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>16 yrs 1 day</td>
<td>Threatening Life of Pres. of US: Mailing threatening communication; Mail Threats Against Life of V-Pres.</td>
<td>Assault; Rape</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rape; Kentucky Attempted Rape; Kidnapping, Tenn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B.

American system of Unit Management. Perhaps this could be modified to suit N.S.W.
Accepting the proposition that there will always be a need to confine some of society's law violators, advocates for prison reform have persistently stressed the need for humane, rehabilitation oriented institutions. Cogent arguments have been made regarding the need for facilities with more adequate staff/inmate ratios. This is seen as a major achievement towards reducing the anonymity of offenders; as a critical component of staff coming to view those incarcerated as people and, thereby, fostering a more healthy institutional climate. Limitations on manpower and other resources suggest the need for the most efficient use of those means that are made available. With these considerations in mind, the Federal Bureau of Prisons has initiated a programme to restructure the organization of its institutions into Functional Units.

**Functional Units**

A Functional Unit can be conceptualised as one of a number of small, self-contained "institutions" operating in semi-autonomous fashion within the confines of a larger facility. The concept includes the notion of:

(a) A relatively small number of offenders (50 to 100);

(b) who are housed together (generally throughout the length of their institutional stay or as they near completion – 12 to 18 months – of a long term);

(c) and who work in a close, intensive relationship with a multi-disciplinary, relatively permanently assigned team of staff members whose offices are located on the Unit;

(d) with this latter group having decision-making authority in all within-institution aspects of programming and institutional living;

(e) and the assignment of an offender to a particular Unit being contingent upon his need for the specific type of treatment programme offered.

While it is preferable to identify a Functional Unit with a single living unit (ideally, one with different living quarters within the building), this is not a requirement. Given that the above conditions (a – e) prevail, a Functional Unit can encompass two living areas if this more adequately "fits" institutional architecture.

**Decentralisation**

The consequence of organising a total correctional institution around the Functional Unit concept to decentralise the facility's organisational structure. This means a "flattening out" of the typical hierarchical pyramid; thereby placing those having the most immediate and direct contact with the residents in close proximity (organisational) to top-level management. Specialists (such as caseworkers and educators) continue to function at a line and at the supervisory or Department Head level in both the centralised and decentralised institution. In the centralised facility the generalist, who manages activities which cross departmental lines, is represented on the table of organisation at the Associate Warden (A.W.) level; in the decentralised institution both the unit manager and the A.W. are generalists (with the latter functioning in the more "pure" managerial role, while the former individual still gets involved to some degree in the delivery of direct services).

The result of this restructured table of organisation is a smaller gap between those who have the most contact with the resident population and the policy, decision-making executive staff. However, decentralisation and the establishment of Functional Units can be a mixed blessing.
ciate warden to coordinate the programmes of the decentralised units with the rest of the institution's centralised operations. Programme information has difficulty filtering up to the associate warden. The relationship between the manager of the Functional Unit and the Department Head who ordinarily would be supervising "his" staff members in each Unit becomes one fraught with complications. Unit managers do not relish "interference" with the running of their unit. There tends to be a lack of communication between the various departments and the units. As a consequence, programme coordination becomes more difficult. Faced with these problems, the warden must make a definite decision concerning decentralisation and Functional Units.

Functional Units: Advantages

The advantages of Functional Units can be clustered under three headings — correction, care and control.

Correction

The semi-autonomous nature of the Functional Unit permits maximum flexibility, both in the initial designing of programmes and in later modifications required to meet changing population characteristics. Functional Unit programmes may be individually altered, removed, or added with only the most minimal disturbance to the facility's basic organisation.

It places services close to the users, thereby allowing decision-making in regard to planning, implementing, managing, and evaluating programmes to be in the hands of those most knowledgeable about the resident population.

The Functional Unit concept fosters decentralised case management. This provides continuity of programme responsibility by the treatment team, easier recognition of, and greater likelihood for, programme assignment to meet the offender's needs. Programme fragmentation (which traditionally occurs along department or disciplinary lines) is reduced; which in turn, results in improved interpersonal relationships among staff members and between staff and residents. Under this organisational structure, those incarcerated receive better treatment, thereby improving their chances of being ready for earlier parole and making a more successful community adjustment.

The staff also benefits by becoming a more integral part of the treatment effort; additionally, they have their immediate supervisors in close proximity. These circumstances lead to greater cohesiveness and better morale.

Care

Functional Units lend themselves to differential allocation of resources. This permits more efficient management of available resources since money, manpower, and material can all be distributed in accord with programme needs. That is, special physical facilities (e.g. maximum security features) and specially trained staff can be optimally utilised with those offenders for whom they are most appropriate. Differing staffing patterns and types of housing can be established for other types of residents for whom the aforementioned features would be inappropriate.

Staff development is also encouraged by adopting the Functional Unit Plan. The semi-autonomous functioning of the Unit (treatment) Team which requires lower level staff members to plan, implement, and manage programmes, provides an opportunity for these individuals to develop managerial skills. This allows for easier identification of training needs leading to better staff development.

Since all staff members become a more integral part of the Functional Unit's treatment plan, a greater organisational cohesiveness develops. Further, the closing working relationship between line and supervisory staff fosters enthusiasm and better morale.
Since transfers between units are discouraged, “Problem cases” are not passed around. It also permits a more easily achieved physical control of residents since there is a closer working relationship between those incarcerated and the institution staff. The yield is a maximum effort from both groups towards achieving positive goals.

Maintaining control is also aided by the friendly rivalry which tends to develop between Functional Units. Both staff and residents come to feel a sense of pride in “their” unit and its accomplishments. Rather than offenders finding a common cause in organizing against the staff, competition develops along more desirable lines; e.g. which unit has the best record in achieving some positive goal. The resulting learning can be shared among Units for the benefit of all.

Functional Units: Disadvantages

The group which most acutely feels the impact of the Functional Unit approach is management — particularly at the Department head level. The roles of Department heads change as traditional lines of authority are restructured. They need to develop or utilize new and different skills; such changes are often agonizing to undergo.

This change is reflected in a different set of responsibilities for Department heads. Their roles become one of monitoring policy implementation and maintaining performance standards across all of the institution’s Functional Units. Other duties and responsibilities are detailed below, but the main point is that some Department heads may find their altered role much less satisfying.

The loss of a direct line of authority between the department head and “his people” is reflected in the different table of organisation of a decentralised facility. The redesigning process can raise a number of problems for personnel, not only at the department head level, but also at the associate warden level. The redefining of areas of responsibility, the need to clarify vague supervisor/supervisee relationships, the role of the specialist vis a vis the generalist, the writing of new position descriptions and programme designs and the implementation of new procedures, all pose difficulties for staff. Feelings of loss of authority or status may result in staff morale problems at the upper echelon levels.

Functional Units: Types

It is possible to organise Functional Units around a variety of dimensions; these, then, become the core concept of the Unit’s programme and help identify selection criteria.

For example:
1) PROBLEM AREA — drug treatment units, mental health, alcoholism treatment units, etc.
2) PERSONALITY TYPES — the I-level subtypes described by Warren, et al. (1971); Quay’s (1972) Behaviour Categories, etc.
3) WORK/TRAINING — grouping together offenders programmed for work or academic training and/or integrating both vocational and educational training with an appropriately designed counselling programme.

Implementation of the Functional Unit concept presupposes a “sorting out” process (Admission and Orientation Programme) which results in a meaningful assignment of residents to Unit programmes. Thus, the classification procedure becomes a crucial diagnostic process — involving both staff and offender — attempting to “match” each resident, with the most appropriate total programme to meet his treatment needs.
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integrated group of staff members. This requires a multi-disciplinary Unit Team, i.e. caseworkers, clerical support, correctional counsellors, educators, and mental health personnel. Depending upon the number of staff and residents in the Functional Unit, an additional staff member — Unit Manager — is needed; he is a "generalist" and may be drawn from any of the fields represented on the Unit Team.

**FIGURE 1 — Functional Unit Staffing Pattern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff/Unit Size</th>
<th>50 Residents</th>
<th>100 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Manager</td>
<td>a/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Caseworker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Correctional Counsellors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Officers</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Educators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mental Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a/ One of the asterisked staff serves dual role as specialist and unit manager.

To a considerable degree, staff activities (next section) are dependent upon the manner in which Functional Units are integrated into the total institution. In a decentralised facility the unit managers function as programme directors. As such, they are responsible for the total operation of their unit and report directly to the office of the warden. The role of the department heads changes (see appropriate section below) to that of functioning in a coordinating role between the Warden and the Functional Unit and between the Functional Units. Figures 2 and 3 represent different "model" tables of organisation.

The table of organisation shown in figure 2 has the department head functioning as a staff role rather than in a direct supervisory relationship. In this model, the associate warden for programmes AW(P), and the associate warden for operations AW(O) play their traditional roles.

In Figure 3 the unit managers as well as programme/training area, (education, V. T., etc.) all report to a Programme Management Committee — composed of five department heads — which functions in the role similar to that of an AW(P). The AW(O) continues to be responsible for coordinating support services throughout the facility in order that the treatment programmes can function smoothly.

The within-Unit structure and its relationships needs to be made explicit. Utilizing the staffing pattern for a 100-man Unit (Figure 1), the administrative lines of authority are shown in Figure 4.

Lines of administrative authority flow upward through the unit manager to the office of the warden (i.e. the AW(P) of the Programme Management Committee). That is, members of the unit staff are responsible to the unit manager. He, in turn, is responsible to the office of the warden. The department heads function in a staff role to the warden and only have an indirect relationship with the personnel in the Unit staff.
Online assignment, implementation of the "in-Unit" treatment programme (e.g. counselling, therapy, recreation, leisure-time activity, etc.) coordination and liaison with "out-of-unit" activities, both formal and informal programme and progress reviews, "promotions" and "demotions" (i.e. handling discipline), Parole Board recommendations, pre-release programming, and so on.

In addition, the Unit staff is accountable for the physical condition (i.e. sanitation, orderliness, etc.) of their living unit. They are also responsible for maintaining control in their Unit and for observing necessary security measures. In short, each Unit is comparable to a small institution which the staff in the Unit "run". Within the guidelines formulated by both the executive staff at the facility and those issued by the Central Office, the Unit staff are free and expected to formulate a treatment approach appropriate for their "type" of offender. This Unit programme, in its initial form, is a written proposal subject to review by local executive-level administrators and approval by Central Office, prior to its implementation.

The Unit Manager

The Unit manager's function is to orchestrate the development and implementation of an effective treatment approach in his Unit. He is the administrative head of the Unit and, as such, the direct line supervisor of staff assigned to the Unit Team. In addition to overseeing the within-unit programme, the Unit manager has important liaison functions throughout the institution. In many ways, he functions in the traditional role of a department head, e.g. attending a variety of administrative meetings (budget, training, warden's staff, etc), thereby "linking" his unit into the total operation.

![Functional Units Diagram](image-url)

**FUNCTIONAL UNITS: A DIFFERENT CORRECTIONAL APPROACH**

*Figure 2. — Functional Units in a Decentralised Facility.*
*Consists of the following five department heads: chief, C&P; chief, correctional supervisor; co-ordinator, mental health services; superintendent, industries; supervisor, education.

The manner in which manpower resources will be expended in the Functional Unit are the responsibility of the Unit Manager. In establishing work schedules the unit manager should be guided by a number of operating principles: the purpose of the Functional Unit is to find ways to best help offenders, not to set up the most convenient working schedule for the staff. Accordingly, staff should be on duty at those times when residents are most available; e.g. evenings and weekends. Further, since those who are incarcerated are in the institution all year, programme activities should not cease during holiday season because all the staff have scheduled themselves for annual leave. It is the responsibility of the unit manager to see to it that staff are available to conduct programmes on an extended “treatment day” basis throughout the year.

The unit manager is accountable for the programme activities which occur in his Unit and should be knowledgeable concerning not only “what’s happening” with residents, but with staff as well. It is his responsibility to recognise and remedy programme deficiencies. Accordingly, he must be knowledgeable about the treatment philosophy being implemented and capable of either providing himself, or seeing to it that others supply needed staff training. In order that he might be aware of his Unit’s level of performance, the unit manager must place a high priority on the development and implementation of programme assessment and monitoring methods. As a “mini-warden” accolades for conducting an effective Unit are his due as much as blame for programme inefficiencies.

The Caseworker

The caseworker’s (and social worker’s) responsibilities in a Functional Unit include all the traditional duties required to move an individual through a correctional institution. They include awareness of Central Office policies, possessing the technical expertise to assess correctness of reports, knowledge about Parole Board procedures and the legalities involved etc. In addition, since caseloads are small, the caseworker takes an active role in direct treatment intervention. That is, he or she will not only function as a full-fledged member of the Unit Team in all aspects of the programming process as it relates to residents on his caseload, but he will also conduct counselling sessions or whatever treatment modalities make up the Unit’s therapeutic approach.
The Correctional Counsellor

The correctional counsellor serves as a crucial member of the Unit’s treatment team. He becomes the prime contact between his small group of 25 residents and the rest of the Unit and the institution. His role includes being a direct implementor of the agreed upon treatment modalities, a fully functioning member of the Unit Team, a liaison between outside-the-Unit activities (e.g. work assignment) and their implications for the Unit Team, an organiser and/or monitor of recreation and leisure-time activities, and so on. In general, he will have the most immediate prolonged and intensive relationship with many of the Unit’s residents, of any member of the Unit staff. Therefore, he needs training and orientation in the Unit’s philosophy and methods of treatment implementation. His supervision is the responsibility of the Unit manager in consultation with the Chief Correctional Supervisor; his training is the responsibility of the Unit staff, other institution personnel and outside consultants with whom the Unit contracts. It is the responsibility of the Unit manager to see to it that these staff members receive training in the skills required to conduct the Unit’s programmes. He must also be the responsible individual to ensure that the correctional counsellor’s skills are utilised appropriately and that the latter *not* become the “ever-ready” substitute to fill in for absentee staff in other institutional areas.
programme. His is the most difficult and least recognised function in any correctional programme; yet he is among the most influential in setting the “tone” present in the Functional Unit. Because of his day-to-day interaction with the Unit’s residents, he becomes a central figure in the establishment and efficient functioning of the “therapeutic community”. Therefore, he needs to be oriented to the mission and goals of the Unit; he should be an active participant in Unit activities; and he should be viewed as a valuable contributor to the Unit Team of information about an offender’s level of progress. In view of the Correctional Officer’s important role in the Functional Unit, care must be taken to ensure that shift rotation is conducted in such a manner that it is not disruptive to programme integrity. That is, an orderly, consistent pattern of correctional officer rotation should be established (e.g., relief, morning, day, evening). Every opportunity should be taken to rotate officers within the Unit rather than from the day shift in Unit “A” to the evening shift in Unit “B”. Promotion opportunities exist in the direction of either moving up the correctional officer’s career ladder or moving into the counselor/unit manager sequence.

The Educator

The role of the Educator (academic or vocational training instructor) in a Functional Unit has two major focuses:-

1. To function as an education/vocational training guidance counsellor — 40% of his time;

2. To monitor and/or conduct academic or vocational training, ideally within the Unit, but more likely in a central school or V.T. shops building — 60% of his time.

In addition, he is a full member of the Unit Team and a contributor to this group of information relevant for programme assignment. Depending upon the specific needs of the Unit’s residents, it is the educator’s responsibility to recommend training alternatives in order to help each individual reach goals mutually agreed upon in collaboration with the Unit Team. He may also be required to develop special “classes” which provide the Unit residents with information of relevance to the intent of the Functional Unit’s programme (e.g., “The Social, Psychological, and Physical Effects of Alcoholism” for an alcoholism treatment unit).

The Mental Health Staff Member

The mental health staff member, (psychiatrist, psychologist, psychiatric nurse) on the Unit Team has a multi-faceted role. He is expected to be involved in the admission and information gathering process prior to classification; he is a member of the decision-making Unit Team; he monitors, supervises, and/or conducts therapeutic sessions; he serves as a consultant and trainer for other staff members; and he helps to design and implement programme evaluation studies. As with other staff, the mental health worker plays a significant role in the development of the Functional Unit’s treatment programme. He is expected to become a member of the Team in every sense; his activities should be well integrated into the Team’s functioning in order that the Functional Unit operate as efficiently and effectively as possible.

If there are too few mental health personnel so that the staff pattern in figure 1 cannot be adhered to, an alternative structure has the mental health staff serve in a consultative role to the Functional Units. Under these conditions, mental health remains centralised and functions more in a staff role. However, to the extent possible, available mental health staff resources should be “assigned” to a specific unit though each staff member may cover two or more Units.
delays and disruptions in this area have marked negative influence on the therapeutic effort, and staff and resident morale. Further, the need to document programme activities and accomplishments, to describe the Functional Unit’s programme, to prepare brochures to help orient new staff, and to type articles and studies for publication, all argue for capable and adequate clerical support. Message taking, intra-unit and inter-unit communication, and administrative functions such as budgeting, timekeeping, etc., all become clerical functions without which the Unit founders. Further, by including these staff members in training activities, they can become additional treatment resources within the Unit.

The Residents

The residents are the raison d’être of Functional Units. Whether they are referred to as prisoners, inmates, residents, or students, the purpose of the Functional Unit is to provide better, more intensive, more appropriate, and more effective methods to help them cope more successfully with the problems of living following their release. In achieving this end, programmes must be designed which recognise the humaneness of those which they plan to help. Offenders must be involved in decisions which significantly affect them. Ways must be found to offer opportunities for Unit members to take intramural roles of increasing responsibility for both their own activities, as well as the smooth functioning of the Unit. In the area of decision making, as it relates to a particular individual, he should be viewed as a member of the Unit Team and have a voice in programme decisions affecting him. The “climate” of the Functional Unit should convey a clear respect for the dignity and uniqueness of each of those entrusted to its care.

The Department Heads’ Role

In a totally decentralised institution — one comprised entirely of Functional Units — the activities of department heads must, of necessity, change. As indicated in figure 4, they no longer have a line-authority relationship with “their people” in the Units. Their function becomes one of a staff role and resources person to both the warden and the Unit Managers.

As individuals, the department heads consult with and monitor the performance of Unit staff members from their area of expertise. Coordination between Functional Units is their prime area of concern; monitoring adherence to policy and standards is of almost equal importance.

Under one model the department heads could function as a Programme Management Committee. In this capacity they operate as:

* “An appeals board” to review Unit Team decisions;
* As a policy recommending, standards-developing group;
* As an advisory Council on Treatment;
* As the Warden’s Advisory Research Committee;
* As a Special Projects Task Force, etc.

Either a permanent or rotating chairman of the Programme Management Committee could be appointed by the Warden.
Despite the change in their role, department heads still have the responsibility to monitor staff activities in their area of expertise, to see to it that standards are maintained and policies adhered to. The warden can expect them to maintain high quality programmes, to handle staff problems, and to keep him fully informed.

In those instances where some programmatic areas remain centralised (e.g. vocational training) the department head may function to some degree in the more traditional model; however, even here he will share with the Unit Manager some of his former authority (e.g. rating V.T. instructors who also function as part of a Unit Team).

**The Non Decentralised Functions**

Up to this point, the article has dealt almost exclusively with those aspects of institutional functioning which are most directly affected by the Functional Unit concept. There remain a number of areas which function in the same fashion as in a centralised facility. The Business Office, Food Service, Health Services, Laundry, Mechanical Services, Personnel and Training, and Safety and Sanitation, are not significantly affected by this change in organisational structure.

Perhaps the greatest change affects the Correctional Services. In effect, three different areas emerge:

* the correctional counsellors (based in the Units and closely tied to the unit manager);
* the living quarters correctional officers (based in the units but more closely tied to the Correctional Services Department);
* and security officers (based outside the units and closely tied to the Correctional Services Department).

Security operations refer to manning towers, operating the control room, inside patrol, etc. These are characterised by having almost no direct contact with inmates. A second type of security function does have inmate contact involved — e.g., detail officer, hospital, kitchen, or school officer. Assignments to these latter areas could be distributed among the Units with the number of correctional officers attached to the Units being increased; rotation through these outside-the-Unit situations, then, becomes part of the regular correctional officer rotation sequence.

Thus, the corrections force is required to function in a variety of ways and lines of authority may not always be clear. Care has to be taken to explicate how these separate, but equally important functions will be smoothly integrated, a problem similar to that faced in the dual role played by the education staff.

**Evaluation**

In any undertaking there needs to be a built-in feedback or evaluation system so that both those conducting the programme, as well as those overseeing its operations, have data concerning its level of accomplishment. The development and implementation of assessment methods should be an integral part of a Functional Unit Programme Plan.
ment and/or evaluation system so that periodic progress reports can be assembled which will provide information regarding the degree to which the facility is meeting its stated objectives. It is the unit manager’s responsibility to accord programme evaluation high priority in the total activities of his programme. While he, himself, may not be knowledgeable in the design of evaluation techniques, such expertise should be accessible either on his own staff or through contracting with appropriate consultants.

**Conclusion**

The foregoing represents an attempt to describe the concept of a Functional Unit in operational terms. Since the experience of the Bureau of Prisons with this type of Unit (and particularly with totally decentralised institutions) is very short, these ideas will no doubt undergo growth and continuing development. This article will have served its purpose to the degree that it provides all concerned with a common frame of reference in discussions about Functional Units, and to the degree that it exposes others to a different approach in the delivery of effective correctional treatment services to incarcerated offenders.
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OVERVIEW OF UNIT MANAGEMENT

Unit Management is a new approach to correctional management in the Bureau of Prisons. This decentralised management approach is now being fully used in twenty-six of the federal institutions. There are at least one or more units in each of the Bureau of Prisons' institutions, with the exception of some of the Federal Prison Camps. There are plans to implement Unit Management as fully as possible in remaining facilities. Thus far, preliminary evaluations strongly suggest that this approach to inmate management is more humane, effective and efficient than the former, centralises approach.

The following chapter will define Unit Management, explain the goals and advantages of this approach and discuss its development in the Bureau of Prisons. The Manual will also define standards which will be met by all institutions using Unit Management. While the manual is designed to permit adaptations by institutions in many areas, a conformity to basic standards is expected, to provide a general consistency of this management concept throughout the Bureau of Prisons.

In the fall of 1975, and eighteen-member, multi-disciplinary task force representing eighteen different institutions met in the Central Office. They contributed a valuable consensus on basic Unit Management Standards which became the basis for this Manual. Subsequently, an Editorial Committee of seven, representing five institutions and Central Office Staff, prepared the final Manual.

The Unit Management Manual will be reviewed and updated by the Unit Management Administrators on at least an annual basis. Proposed changes will be handled through the procedure established in Policy Statement 1320.11, Summary and Coordination for Directives.
The essential components of a unit are:

1. A small number of inmates (50 – 120) who are permanently assigned together;
2. A multi-disciplinary staff (Unit Manager, Case Manager(s), Correctional Counselor(s), full or part-time Psychologist, and Clerk-Typist and Correctional Officers whose offices are located within or adjacent to the inmate housing unit; and are permanently assigned to work with the inmates of that unit;
3. The Unit Manager has administrative authority and supervisory responsibility for the unit staff;
4. The Unit Staff has administrative authority for all within-unit aspects of inmate living and programming;
5. The assignment of an inmate to a unit may be based on age, prior record, specific type of correctional programme such as drug abuse counselling or on a random assignment basis;
6. All unit staff are scheduled by the Unit Manager to be working in the unit evenings and weekends, in addition to the presence of the Unit Correctional Officer.

GOALS OF UNIT MANAGEMENT

Unit Management is an approach to inmate and institutional management designed to improve control and relationships by dividing the larger institution population into smaller, more manageable groups and to improve the delivery of correctional services. This is directly related to two major goals of the Bureau of Prisons:

1. to establish a safe, humane environment which minimises the detrimental effects of confinement and;
2. to provide a variety of counselling, social education and vocational training opportunities and programmes which are most likely to aid inmates in their successful return to the community.

ADVANTAGES OF UNIT MANAGEMENT

The advantages of unit approach to correctional management are:

1. It divides the large numbers of inmates into small, well-defined and manageable groups, whose members develop a common identity and close association with each other and their unit staff.
2. It increases the frequency of contacts and intensity of the relationship between staff and inmates resulting in:
   a. better communication and understanding between individuals
   b. more individualized classification and programme planning
   c. more valuable programme reviews and programme adjustments
   d. better observation of inmates, enabling early detection of problems before they reach critical proportions
   e. development of common goals which encourage positive unit cohesiveness
   f. generally, a more positive living and working atmosphere for staff and inmates.
4. Staff involvement in the correctional process and decision-making opportunities are increased, further developing the correctional and management skills of the staff.

5. Decisions are made by the unit staff who are most closely associated with the inmates, increasing the quality and swiftness of decision-making.

6. Programme flexibility is increased, since special areas of emphasis can be developed to meet the needs of inmates in each unit; programmes for a unit may be changed without affecting the total institution.

Each of these advantages provides an enriched atmosphere in which inmates may be more likely to prepare for a successful adjustment in the community.

HISTORY OF UNIT MANAGEMENT

Unit Management is the result of many independent developments over twenty years, in the Bureau of Prisons. Twenty-five years ago in the Bureau of Prisons’ institutions, a new inmate appeared before a group of department heads called a Classification Committee. Here he was informed of the programmes and work in which he would be involved during his incarceration. Generally, he had little input into the decisions. This procedure was an improvement over the previous practice of having a single staff member serve as the Classification Officer for the institution’s total inmate population.

During the mid- and late 1950’s, the Federal Reformatory at El Reno, Oklahoma, and the Federal Youth Centre in Ashland, Kentucky, developed separate Classification Teams for each caseload. In the early 1960’s, the Demonstration Counselling Project was initiated at the National Training School for Boys (NTS) in Washington D.C. A caseload of inmates was gathered together in one housing unit, and an interdisciplinary staff was selected to implement a counselling and recreational programme. This early, abbreviated version of unit management was successful, and as a result, the entire institution was reorganized according to this model.

In 1963, the Englewood, Colorado Federal Youth Centre established what was called a “unit system”. This featured “Unit Officers” in addition to the traditional Correctional Officers assigned to the inmate living unit. Each Unit Officer worked with a Caseworker, who maintained an office in the inmate housing unit where inmates on their caseload were assigned. The Classification Teams were composed of one Department Head, the Caseworker and the Unit Officer.

The Robert F. Kennedy Youth Centre at Morgantown, West Virginia was opened in 1969, and it was designed and operated according to a slightly modified Unit Management concept. This included a specific inmate classification system (Quay Typology), with different management and treatment strategies applied to the different groups of inmates.

As a result of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, in 1968, the Bureau of Prisons’ first Drug Abuse Programmes were established at Federal Correctional Institutions at Terminal Island, California; Danbury, Connecticut; and Alderson, West Virginia. Soon additional ‘NARA’ and Drug Abuse Programmes (DAP) were established in other institutions.

Generally, these specialised drug abuse programmes operated as units within institutions with centralized management (as those in the penitentiaries still do). Their operational success encouraged the further development of the decentralised unit concept of correctional management.
In 1972, Unit Management was established at the Federal Correctional Institutions at Fort Worth and Seagoville, Texas. The positive experiences at these two institutions, combined with the favourable results of previously established unit programs led to the Central Office decision to further expand the unit approach to correctional management throughout the Bureau of Prisons.

The Administration of Unit Management was brought together with the formation of the Unit Management Section in the Central Office in November, 1974. At that time, Unit Management was placed under the Assistant Director for Training. In May 1975, Unit Management was moved from this division to the Correctional Programmes Division. In late 1975, some of the responsibilities for coordination of Unit Management were moved to the Regions, and placed under the Administrator for Case Management. However, after a short while the Administration was re-centralised.

In January of 1977, a position paper was written for the Executive Staff setting out a proposal that Unit Management be regionalised. The Executive Staff approved this proposal and a Unit Management Administrator for each Region was selected. The first Unit Management Administrator assumed the responsibilities for Unit Management in the Region in May, and regionalization was established throughout the Bureau in Unit Management by September 1977. Regional Administrators have basic responsibility for implementation, monitoring, staff assistance, of Unit Management throughout their regions. The Central Office provides support, policy development, coordination of training, and liaison between Central Office and Regional Administrators. Unit Management Administrators also have responsibility for Drug Abuse Programmes, and are working closely with Case Management Administrators and Correctional Services Administrators to accomplish the development and maintenance of a system of Unit Management throughout the Bureau.

**RESEARCH AND EVALUATION**

As we discussed in the INTRODUCTION of this Manual, it is believed that there are numerous advantages to Unit Management in correctional institutions, when compared to the traditional, centralized management approach. The Office of Research, Central Office and the Regional Research Coordinator, are conducting on-going studies of this new management concept.

Findings suggest that numerous positive results exist in many institutions where Unit Management has been implemented. The Unit Management Section in the Central Office has a coordinating role regarding evaluative efforts and works with the Office of Research. Primary responsibility for coordination of research on the local level is with the Regional Unit Management Administrator and the Regional Research Coordinator. Institutions desirous of initiating evaluative projects are expected to coordinate these through the Regional Research Coordinator and the Administrator for Unit Management in the Region. Similarly copies of all research done on Unit Management and individual units should be forwarded to the Research Coordinator and Unit Administrator and a copy to the Unit Management Administrator, Central Office.

In addition to Research Projects on Unit Management, it is imperative that data on Unit Management be collected. A systematic data collection system will be utilized.
### 50 – 80 INMATE GENERAL UNITS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unit Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Correctional Counsellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk-Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>Educational Representatives Correctional Officers (3 shifts/day, 7 days/week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 80 – 120 INMATE GENERAL UNIT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unit Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Case Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Correctional Counsellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk-Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Psychologist(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>Educational Representative Correctional Officers (3 shifts/day, 7 days/week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 50 – 75 INMATE SPECIALIZED UNITS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unit Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Correctional Counsellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk-Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>Educational Representative Correctional Officers (3 shifts/day, 7 days/week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 76 – 120 INMATE SPECIALIZED UNITS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unit Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Case Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Correctional Counsellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk-Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>Educational Representative Correctional Officers (3 shifts/day, 7 days/week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bureau of Prisons has been implementing Unit Management in its institutions without the benefits of obtaining any new positions. As a result, most of the units are not yet staffed at the desired level. It is hoped that in the future these units will receive the needed additional staff, which will allow them to more effectively and efficiently perform their jobs.

It is expected that no unit will have more than 120 inmates. Larger numbers result in a significant increase in pressure on staff and a reduction in their ability to adequately fulfill their responsibilities. While temporary overcrowding affects most facilities at various times, administrators of institutions where existing units are larger than this limit should make all possible efforts to remedy the situation.
Unit Management brings about the deletion of numerous traditional staff roles and creates several new ones. The most obvious new role is that of the Unit Manager. This person is responsible for implementing a programme within the unit which provides responsible staff supervision and inmate decision-making authority. Much of the Unit Manager’s authority was previously the responsibility of other Department Heads, such as the Chief of Classification and Parole, and the Chief Correctional Supervisor.

This chapter is to broadly define roles of many staff who are directly related to the Unit Management. It is by no means exhaustive or conclusive. It attempts to generally, rather than specifically, describe how various key personnel interact where Unit Management is utilized. It provides general guidelines permitting more specific definitions to develop based upon local needs.

CENTRAL AND REGIONAL OFFICE ROLES

Administration of Unit Management is a shared responsibility involving both Central and Regional Office Administrators. The orderly development, implementation, and maintaining of this management concept is of vital importance. The responsibilities which fall to each of these administrative offices are outlined below.

CENTRAL OFFICE

Unit Management is a section of the Correctional Management Branch of the Correctional Programmes Division. Close coordination between the Case Management and Correctional Services Sections of the branch; it is necessary to assure that the Unit Management Concept is clearly understood and developed. The following responsibilities are designated to the Unit Management Administrator, Central Office:—

1. Coordinating the Unit Manager Training Programme for all newly appointed Unit Managers; development of advanced training for Unit Managers.

2. Coordinating research and evaluation efforts of Unit Management with the Research Section in the Central Office.

3. Developing policy for Unit Management throughout the Bureau of Prisons.

4. Providing technical assistance to Unit Management Administrators in the Regional Offices.

5. Monitoring the development and implementation of Unit Management throughout the Bureau through close contact with Regional Administrators, comparative data collection, and periodic visits to the field.

6. Assisting Regional Office Administrators with Regional Training Projects and Staff Assistance visits and problem areas.


8. Technical Assistance to State and local Correctional Departments.

under the guidance of the Regional Director in interpreting and monitoring the progress of Unit Management. The Regional Administrator maintains coordination and contact with Case Management, Correctional Services and other Regional counterparts to assure operational consistency and understanding throughout the Region.

1. Conducting Staff Assistance visits and audits of Unit Management in all institutions in the Region.

2. Coordinating research and evaluation efforts with the Research Coordinator in the Region.

3. Administration of Drug Abuse/Alcohol Programmes in the Region.

4. Assisting the Unit Manager Training Programme for newly appointed Unit Managers.

5. Providing input in the development of policy regarding Unit Management.

6. Establishing a monitoring system, and data collection system for Unit Management at the Regional level.

7. Maintaining close working relationships with Case Management, Correctional Services, and other Regional specialists.

8. Development of Unit Management in new institutions.


10. Technical Assistance to State and local Correctional Departments.

Regional and Central Office Unit Management Administrators will meet periodically to review the direction of Unit Management throughout the Bureau of Prisons. At least one of the meetings each year will be with the Case Management Administrators and the Correctional Services Administrators to maintain coordination with these divisions.

THE INSTITUTION ADMINISTRATION AND UNIT MANAGEMENT

Unit Management results in much of the decision-making authority which was previously centralized or the responsibility of other departments, being delegated to Unit Managers. At the same time, the administration continues to be ultimately responsible for the proper running of the institution. Therefore, ongoing dialogue between the Unit Managers and the administration is essential.

Unit Managers will serve as consultants to the administration in inmate management matters. By frequent monitoring of unit operations, and regularly scheduled meetings which include the Unit Managers, other concerned Department Heads, and the administration, a high level of communication and understanding may be achieved.
Chief Executive Officer of the institution retains full authority and responsibility for all matters occurring within the institution.

With Unit Management, there is a delegation of decision-making responsibility for most aspects of inmate services and programmes to unit staff. This will include much of the case management, security, sanitation, maintenance, and other routine operational responsibilities.

In an institution with Unit Management, the Chief Executive Officer will usually delegate supervisory and monitoring responsibilities for units to the Associate Warden.

**CASE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR**

The Case Management Coordinator is a Department Head whose role is in transition. This position may eventually be phased out in some institutions operating under Unit Management and the responsibility assumed by the Unit Manager and the Senior Case Manager.

In institutions which are still utilizing this position, the responsibilities include training of Case Managers, and Unit Secretaries, monitoring of Case Management practices, and providing quality control for Case Management. This person may serve as a consultant to the units on Case Management matters. As a consultant to the unit, the Case Management Coordinator has no supervisory or evaluation responsibility for unit staff.

**ASSOCIATE WARDEN**

As noted previously, the decentralization of correctional institutions delegates much decision-making responsibility to Unit Managers. Since the administration retains ultimate responsibility for all matters, the Associate Warden should have the expertise to understand and monitor the units, to insure quality programmes and operations.

The Associate Warden is the immediate supervisor of Unit Managers and the primary liaison between them and the Warden.

Guidelines, dissemination of policies and parameters within which the units are to work shall be set forth as part of the leadership responsibilities of the Associate Warden to assure that the philosophy and policy of the Bureau of Prisons is adhered to and the total mission of the institution is accomplished.

**CHIEF CORRECTIONAL SUPERVISOR**

The Chief Correctional Supervisor is the Department Head whose primary responsibility is the security of the institution. With the unit approach to correctional management, some of this responsibility is delegated to Unit Managers and their staff.

The Chief Correctional Supervisor serves as an advisor, consultant, and monitor for Unit Managers in matters pertaining to the unit’s security. Either the Chief Correctional Supervisor or the Unit Managers will initiate contacts as need arises. The Unit Managers and Chief Correctional Supervisors are expected to maintain a cooperative working relationship, especially since they have areas of responsibility which overlap.
with the Unit Manager's first-hand knowledge of his unit, will enhance the quality of decision-making.

**CORRECTIONAL SUPERVISOR**

The Correctional Supervisors have delegated authority for institution security matters in the absence of the Chief Correctional Supervisor.

This person serves as advisor, consultant, and monitor for Unit Managers in matters pertaining to unit security.

While there will be variations between institutions, routine operational matters require that the Correctional Supervisors and unit staff work together to assure the highest quality communications and decision-making.

**UNIT MANAGERS**

The Unit Manager is the administrator and supervisor of a multi-disciplinary team of staff members who are assigned to work in that unit. As department head supervisors, the Unit Managers will assume their share of responsibilities, including participation, on institution committees, promotion boards, serving as duty officer, and other related administrative functions.

The Unit Managers have responsibility for all matters pertaining to their units. These will include Case Management, Security, Correctional Programmes, Safety, Sanitation, and Financial Management. This person has ultimate responsibility for developing and monitoring stringent inmate file accountability practices, file checkout procedures, and file security operations. The Unit Manager serves as an on-going advisor to the administration in matters pertaining to inmate management and programmes.

The Unit Manager is responsible for all activity within the unit. In matters of security, the Chief Correctional Supervisor and Unit Manager should consult and use the expertise of both to attain the most satisfactory solution to problems or development of the most adequate security measures. There are other department heads whose expertise can be utilised to develop and maintain other types of programmes and procedures. A cooperative relationship among the Unit Managers and other department heads will ensure an effective unit operation.

The Associate Warden will regularly monitor unit operations and programmes to make certain that authority and responsibility which has been delegated to the units is effectively managed.

**CASE MANAGER**

The Case Manager is directly responsible to the Unit Manager and has major responsibility for Case Management matters within the Unit. With other unit staff, the Case Manager will assist with the unit programme development, adhere to security procedures, counsel with unit inmates, and participate in other unit operations as directed by the Unit Manager.

Supervision, training, and technical assistance for the Unit Case Manager is the responsibility of the Unit Manager. The responsibility cannot be delegated to another department head but another person such as the Case Management Coordinator or Senior Case Manager, may be utilised by the Unit Manager to assist with the training and technical development of the Case Manager. The amount of Case Management technical assistance required by each unit may be related to the level of Case Management expertise which the Unit Manager and Case Manager posses.
In institutions where there are a reduced number of Correctional Officers assigned to units and a shift is not covered, unit staff may be delegated the direct responsibility for unit security by the administration. When that occurs, it is expected that the scheduling of hours and responsibilities will not be disproportionately assigned to Correctional Counsellors.

The Correctional Counselor's primary responsibility is the counseling of assigned unit inmates. This may include formal, unplanned counseling and formal group and/or individual counseling. Other duties will be designated by the Unit Manager. However, it is expected that counseling and being directly available to the unit inmates will consume the majority of the Correctional Counselor's time. Bureau of Prisons Policy Statement 7300.125, dated 9/12/77, outlines in more detail the role and responsibilities of the Correctional Counselor.

UNIT SECRETARY

When staffing permits, one Secretary is assigned to each unit, under the supervision of the Unit Manager. This person is permanently assigned to the unit, and the duties are chiefly those of clerical/secretarial nature. Unit Managers may elect to broaden the Secretary's duties to include formal or informal counseling, participation in Unit Team Meetings, or Unit Disciplinary Committee Meetings when these duties are within the scope of the Position Description, and do not conflict with his/her primary clerical responsibilities. The Unit Secretary, under the direction of the Unit Manager has responsibilities for daily file accountability, file maintenance, and monitoring of strict file check-out procedures.

The Unit Secretary may receive additional training and training from additional sources as determined by the Unit Manager.

UNIT CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

A Correctional Officer assigned to a unit has a post with unique training opportunities and responsibilities. The first responsibilities are the inmate's accountability and security of the unit. All other duties will vary between between units and institutions and are to be considered secondary. The Unit Correctional Officer is the first-line consultant to the unit staff regarding security matters which affect the unit and institution.

Security matters affecting the unit should be brought to the attention of the Unit Manager by the Correctional Officer, who in turn will confer with the Chief Correctional Supervisor. In the absence of the Unit Manager, the Operations Correctional Supervisor will be notified for appropriate action.

The Unit Correctional Officer should become involved in the program operations of the unit. Unit Managers are expected to facilitate this participation for Correctional Officers assigned to their unit. Permanently assigned staff members will maintain a working atmosphere encouraging the Unit Correctional Officer's maximum input as an important member of the unit staff.
and the person will be a permanent member of the Unit Team. This person sees that all of
the unit inmates are properly tested and informed of available educational opportunities. This person
may also be responsible for monitoring and evaluating unit inmates in education matters as needed.

UNIT PSYCHOLOGIST

This person is generally responsible for the performance of diagnostic, therapeutic,
research, educational and evaluative functions relating to psychological services. This individual plans,
organizes, participates and provides professional expertise for unit counselling programmes. This
function includes the assessment of inmate needs and the design of corresponding programs to meet
those needs.

The Unit Psychologist may provide supervision and training for students and in-
terns.

This individual is under the general supervision of the Unit Manager. The extent
of services provided will be dependent upon whether the psychologist is assigned to the unit on a full
or part-time basis.

UNIT RELIGIOUS REPRESENTATIVE

It is recommended that institutions provide each unit with a part-time staff mem-
er, consultant or volunteer from the Chaplain’s Office. This representative will be a consultant to
unit staff and inmates on religious matters, and could also have a role in unit programmes. Primary
supervision of the Religious Representative would be the responsibility of the Chaplains Office.

GROUP COUNSELLING

It is the philosophy of the Bureau of Prisons that inmates have the opportunity
to improve their emotional and physical well-being. Group counselling can assist motivated inmates
developing an increased understanding of themselves, resolve inter-personal conflicts, learn construct-
ive problem solving techniques, increase his ability to understand and communicate with others, and
identify short and long-range goals to promote personal growth. Group counselling can also be an effec-
tive approach to resolving problems within a unit. Group counselling enhances the communication
between staff and inmates, which is essential in developing and maintaining an effective programme
and inmate control.

INDIVIDUAL COUNSELLING

Individual counselling sessions will generally be initiated when the Unit Team
and the inmate determine the need. Normally, a specific problem area will be identified and the pur-
pose of the individual counselling session agreed upon. Due to the amount of staff time required for
individual counselling sessions, they should be used discriminately for those inmates who have a gen-
uine need and who utilize these sessions productively.

Individual counselling will normally be conducted by staff members who have
skill and interest in this approach. The staff member should have the ability to understand and recog-
nize various personality disturbances and the ability to assist the inmate in personal growth. Often the
staff member will receive consultation from the Psychology Department.

GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY/INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOTHERAPY

Psychotherapy differs from other counselling approaches in that it is generally
conducted by qualified Psychology Services Staff. This often includes an in-depth diagnosis and treat-
ment of personality dynamics and behavioural disorders. Either an individual or group approach may
be used.
Advisory Groups and Committees provide a two-way communication between unit staff and inmates which is necessary for any healthy unit programme. They provide a forum whereby difficulties can be averted, and they allow for inmate input relative to all aspects of unit programming. They tend to promote a feeling of self-worth on the part of the inmates, and they are a good means for unit staff to stay abreast regarding various activities in the unit.

These groups are especially popular and effective because they are less cumbersome than large dormitory and Town Hall Meetings. Inmates specific duties, extent of authority and group structure should all be clearly defined and adhered to.

The Unit Manager is responsible for establishing procedures for selecting inmates to assure that the entire unit population is being represented and that the mission for which the committee was formed is being accomplished. Inmate involvement should be documented in the Unit Plan. The Unit Manager will carefully monitor these activities to maintain programme integrity.

**UNIT TOWN HALL MEETINGS**

Town Hall Meetings have proven to be an effective tool for enhancing positive communication between inmates and staff. Town Hall Meetings, by definition are regularly scheduled meetings involving all inmates and staff. They provide a means for disseminating information, debate and discussion, and often resolve inmate and staff concerns. It is important that these meetings be only for issues that concern the unit, not a forum for discussion of individual case management matters. No Town Hall Meetings will be held without consent and participation of unit staff.

Meeting structure and participation requirements will be different in various units. Meetings should be held at such times when all inmates and staff are available, to minimise interference with institutional operations. A clearly structured, well organised procedure should be followed to allow for an orderly running of the meeting. Published agendas for the meeting will keep the meeting efficient. Guidelines on “How to Run a Town Hall Meeting” are available from the Unit Management Section, Central Office. It is important for the Warden and other top administrative staff to attend these meetings occasionally.

**PEER COUNSELLING**

Using peer inmates as counsellors is recommended when qualified inmates can be identified. Peer counsellors may have insights into unit operations and their peer’s problems which gives them a special value in counselling services. Ongoing training in individual and group counselling is particularly important because most inmates lack experience and will need help in this area.

When peer counselling is utilised, it is essential that there is a careful selection process; that their roles are clearly defined, and that their activities are monitored by the staff. Precautions will be taken to ensure that the peer counsellor is not labelled as “staff” or assumes staff responsibilities.

**UNIT ORIENTATION**

Most institutions will have an Admissions and Orientation Programme. Some programmes will be centralized because of the nature of the institution, while others may be decentralized. There also may be a combination of both.

Regardless of the approach adopted by the institution, each unit will be responsible for its own orientation programme. This programme will serve to inform new inmates of the unit programme, operations, and to get the inmate into the “mainstream” of the unit activities as quickly and as effectively as possible. It is essential that inmates meet staff on a planned basis within the first 24 hours after assignment to the unit.
UNIT PRE-RELEASE PROGRAMMES

Each unit should design a viable, on-going release programme which recognises that the inmate's preparation must begin as soon as he is initially committed to the institution. The emphasis is to aid the inmate in making a successful reintegration into the community. This programme should meet realistic and acceptable release plans which are in line with the inmate's needs and desires. The programme itself may be a combination of the dissemination of information via lectures, video tapes, guest speakers, and/or the accumulation of documents, licences, and certificates needed by the inmate upon release.

The scope of the programme may incorporate some of the following: use of furloughs for release planning; work/study release units; programme information about after-care agencies; CTC transfers; lectures from local, State and Federal agencies; a job readiness course; condition of parole and group problem-solving as tailored to meet inmate needs.

Unit Pre-Release Programmes are viewed as being desirable. However, a supplemental centralized programme for the entire institution may be necessary to insure economy of resources. To insure a continuous comprehensive release programme, one unit staff member might be designated as the Pre-Release Coordinator.

LEISURE TIME — RECREATION PROGRAMMES

Constructive use of leisure time is an extremely important area for unit inmates. Positive experiences in this area are easily transferred to the community. To have a viable unit recreation programme, a Unit Recreation Committee can be valuable to plan activities and act as liaison with unit staff.

The Unit Manager should keep several factors in mind when planning activities via the Recreational Committee. Unit age and interest; physical plant, avoidance of institutional functions to eliminate redundancy or overlap, etc.

Suggested activities are:

1. Monthly tournaments in table games;
2. Seasonal contests at times such as Christmas, New Year's etc.;
3. Inter-Unit competition in billiards, ping-pong, table games etc.;
4. Hobby crafts.

The unit should work closely with the Recreation Department to avoid conflicts and insure a realistic, quality recreation programme.

INMATE HOUSING LEVEL SYSTEM

One of the inevitable facts of institutional life is that inmates will establish preferred living areas within each unit. Unit staff, through conscientious planning and management, will recognise this phenomenon to develop a meaningful housing level system. It will serve as an incentive and reward for whatever goals the staff establish, aiding in the control of the inmates.

If a unit elects to utilise a level system, it will be written into the unit plan. Written guidelines will be distributed to the unit population and will provide clear delineation between each housing level.
The use of consultants depends upon the availability of funds and the community resources. The 305 Cost Centre may provide funds that can be utilised for consultants. Institutions and units may share their funds and consultants to make better use of these resources.

Consultants are usually employed at the initiative of individual units to perform a specific task. This usually includes staff training, leading counselling groups, peer counsellor training and others. Generally, they will require basic orientation in custodial practices. Retaining, contracting and terminating their services will be unit responsibilities in consultation with Business Manager.

Consultants may be used for research and evaluation purposes, staff and programme development, workshops, counselling programmes and specialised training.

**STUDENTS**

The Bureau of Prisons promotes and encourages students to enter the correctional field. Many educational institutions find the Bureau of Prison’s facilities to be a positive training ground. When students are utilized, the Unit Manager will provide structured training and supervision. Individual units should develop a strategy to recruit, train and utilise college practicum students or interns.

Personal interviews are essential in determining the stability and character of the student as well as addressing the person’s capability and needs. While students are gaining experience in the correctional settings, they can contribute fresh and innovative ideas to unit correctional programmes.

The correctional institution is a complex and confusing situation for many students. It is expected that only mature students who can responsibly handle their placement will be recruited. Normally, graduate level students best meet this criteria.

**VOLUNTEERS**

Volunteers are useful to augment unit programmes. They should be used to supplement, and not replace, regular staff members. Generally, the Unit Manager has the responsibility for the recruitment, orientation and supervision of volunteers. The institution Training Officer and/or Correctional Supervisor may assist in their orientation in the critical areas of contraband, control and fundamental security procedures and basic staff/inmate relations.

Services provided by volunteers should relate to the unit philosophy and programme. It is important that clearly defined objectives and roles be provided. It is essential that volunteers be screened and their efforts be continually monitored.

**COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES**

Staff and inmate participation in community activities can provide many benefits for all concerned. The type and location of the institution determines the extent of a unit’s involvement in community programmes. Unit Managers should utilise community resources in terms of the benefits they can provide for the community, institutions and inmates.

Some of the benefits to be considered are:

1. Provides a means of normalization for inmates — contact with the “real” world.
which increases feelings of self-worth and responsibility.

4. Provides inmates with a positive experience for their use of leisure time.

5. Assists in the development of good public relations between the institution and the community.

6. Assists community organisations in accomplishing their objectives.

Other community activities that can be considered are — special recreational programmes, athletic events, field trips, and educational programmes.

The Unit Team will be selective in terms of the inmates who will participate. The Unit Manager and staff will carefully monitor the programme.

Community activities always require cooperation with various departments, especially the Correctional Department. The Unit Manager will work closely with all institutional staff to maintain the objectives of the programme. Staff will be sensitive to the concerns of the community.

MANAGEMENT OF A UNIT

INTRODUCTION

A unit which received major decision-making responsibilities from the administration is a small, but complex organisation. The generalist Unit Manager has many areas for which he is responsible. Few Unit Managers are thoroughly familiar with the many responsibilities facing them, including security, case management, personnel, supervision, training, safety and sanitation, unit programmes, budget management, research etc. The effective Unit Manager must develop expertise in each of these areas. This person will often consult with the specialist department heads for assistance in raising his own proficiency, and to see that it is maintained at the necessary level.

This chapter will mention the major areas of responsibility on which a Unit Manager should focus his attention. Because of the variety of units in the Bureau of Prisons, and local needs, some guidelines are broad and permit and encourage local adaptation. Other categories are more specific and the standards to be met are more precise.

HOURS OF DUTY/ANNUAL LEAVE

Unit Managers are responsible for establishing the working hours of their unit staff. It is expected that every unit will have evening and weekend staff coverage of the unit, in addition to the presence of the Unit Correctional Officer(s). All unit staff will be scheduled for some evening and and/or weekend coverage to ensure their availability to inmates during leisure hours and to become familiar with the total unit operation. The presence of unit staff at those times also contributes to better control of the unit inmates.

Unit Managers, to fully monitor their total unit operation, must also be present during some evening and weekend hours. With these guidelines, it is expected that each Unit Manager will develop a schedule which provides the best possible coverage.
Chief Correctional Supervisor, might be granted temporary Correctional Counsellor coverage. The Unit Manager’s annual leave should be approved in advance and scheduled by the Associate Warden.

SAFETY AND SANITATION

The Bureau of Prisons maintains high standards in the areas of sanitation. The appearance of a unit reflects its pride and the quality of management. High sanitation standards can be a positive force for fostering responsibility and pride in the unit inmates.

Unit Managers are responsible for the appearance and cleanliness of their unit. Many units have had success in utilising inmate sanitation committees. These committees may enhance a sense of individual and group responsibility. Sanitation standards are observable objectives and provide a means of evaluating an individual inmate’s level of responsibility and progress as well as the unit’s level of efficiency.

Safety within the unit encompasses not only the physical plant, but also includes the responsibility of unit staff to provide an environment where inmates can live without fear of intimidation, reprisal or unsafe conditions.

Unit staff are responsible for periodic inspection of the unit for fire hazards and any other hazards to safety and periodic safety lectures during Town Hall Meetings. During periodic shakedowns, staff should be aware of flammable materials as well as unauthorised tools. Timely confrontations from improper use of unit equipment and horseplay that could result in inmate injury are also responsibilities of unit staff.

Fire plans should be developed for all units in accordance with Fire Safety Standards and Regulations. The Unit Manager should work with the Safety and Sanitation Officer in developing these plans. The plans should include designation of fire escapes; circulation routes; periodic fire drills; and use of emergency equipment in the unit.

SECURITY

Unit Management results in the delegation of many security responsibilities to Unit Managers and their staff. These responsibilities may include providing count assistance, security shakedown inspections, contraband control, daily notations and review of unit logs, completion of bar taps, submission of security checks as required by Bureau and local policy and awareness of Post Orders.

Continuous cooperation between unit staff and the custodial department will ensure that security duties are accepted, practised, monitored, and upgraded. While unit staff have many responsibilities, maintaining high security standards will always be a primary requirement.

PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

Unit Managers always review staff constantly to assess strengths and weaknesses. While evaluation and formal training are governed by Bureau and institutional policies, the use of staff meetings, daily close-outs, unit in-service training programmes, opportunities for acting capacities, recognition of superior work, etc., are excellent methods of fostering personnel development. Whenever possible, cross training of unit staff is encouraged.

Regular evaluations and frequent informal review of performance with all unit staff will allow for efficient, positive career development. Thorough documentation of employee performance throughout the year is a good management practice. When employee evaluations occur, reference is made to the performance standards by which the employee will be rated.
Unit managers will work closely with the Personnel Department to ensure that personnel practices are being followed. Specific Personnel Policy Statements and Evaluation forms the Unit Manager needs to be familiar with are:—

1. Merit Promotion Plan.
3. Incentive Awards and Recognition.
4. Master Agreement and Supplemental Local Agreement.
5. Standards of Employee Conduct and Responsibility.
7. B.P. ADMIN — 194.
8. B.P. 150 — Executive Development Programme.

**STAFF TRAINING**

Staff training is governed by Bureau policy and the Staff Training Coordinator should be consulted to assure that each staff member has fulfilled his level of required training. Optional training should be scheduled as individual needs dictate, utilising Bureau of Prisons and outside resources. This training will allow for personal staff growth while enhancing unit and institutional operations. Training is an on-going effort, and unit staff will be reviewed for necessary training and development needs.

Training forms the Unit Manager should be familiar with are:—

1. Optional Form 170 (Required).
3. B.P.—80 M—127 — First Level Supervision Training Record.
4. J.E.T.S. Training Record.

Review of the B.P.—116 or Jets Record with the concerned employees will be made a part of the annual performance evaluation.

**UNIT PROGRAMME CHANGES**

Unit Managers should be aware of the changing needs of their inmate population. This will require an on-going assessment of the relevance of unit programmes. Programme alterations occur in all units for various reasons. While Unit Managers or their staffs will make these adjustments, they will always be completed with the review and approval of the institution administration.

Major changes in Unit Management programmes in institutions will be submitted to the Unit Management Administrator, Regional Office, for review, consultation, and approval. Copies of proposed programme changes will be sent to the Unit Management Administrator, Central Office.
Foster an environment where communication, personal growth, and building a “sense of community” can take place. It is expected that each Unit Manager will develop a leadership role that assures the presence of this positive climate.

**UNIT STAFF MEETINGS**

Unit staff meetings can be the core of a well developed unit programme and it is an essential part of any unit operation. A unit staff meeting provides the opportunity for all staff members to initiate and develop ideas, resolve problems, disseminate information and enhance group solidarity. All unit staff members are expected to contribute and participate in these meetings.

Unit staff meetings should be held on a weekly basis in order to provide continuity and maintain group cohesion. All unit staff members including the Correctional Officers should be required to attend these meetings. Although Correctional Officers are not always on duty, arrangements should be made to have them attend as often as possible. It is urged that minutes be kept of the staff meetings and widely distributed to familiarise other departments and the administration with unit operations.

**UNIT BUDGETS 305, 317, 319.**

Cost Centre 305 has been developed for Unit Management. The Associate Warden (Programmes) is the cost centre manager. Each Unit Manager is designated as a Project Manager under this cost centre. With the guidance of the Financial Management Section of the Central Office and operations memorandum recommendations, institutions should develop this cost centre for each unit according to local needs. Items placed in the cost centre will vary according to the institution, however, all institutions are urged to place as many budget responsibilities on the Unit Manager as is possible. Unit Managers will develop Project Budgets according to Budget Form 1, with instruction from the institution Business Office.

Unit Managers should develop their budgets well in advance of the time designated by the Business Office for submission of requests from the various cost centre managers. Institutions usually present their request to the regional office in July of the year preceding the next fiscal year.

It is expected that Unit Managers will receive Cost Centre/Project Manager Budget Training within 90 days of entering on duty. Unit Managers should keep a record of expenditures which they may compare with the record kept in the business office for their project number under cost centre 305.

General Units will receive their funding from the 305 cost centre. NARA/DAP and Alcohol Units will receive their funding through the 317 cost centre. Local administrators and Unit Managers will determine the most effective procedures for budget operations when the units are designated as projects under the 305 cost centre.

**UNIT TEAM MEETINGS**

The Unit Team Meeting is an essential element of the unit operations in making sound decisions regarding inmate programmes and activities. It is a multi-disciplinary approach (Corrections, Case Management, Education and Psychology), to ensure professional input from all areas of the institution which affect the inmate's institutional activities. The inmate will always be a member, unless he prefers not to be present. Each member is expected to attend the meetings thoroughly prepared to discuss the inmate under consideration. This will necessitate the reading of case material, pre-sentence reports, etc. and interviews with the inmate.
Unit Teams are composed of at least three (3) staff members, which may include the Unit Manager, Case Manager, Counsellor, Educational Representative, Psychologist, Unit Officer and Secretary. The Unit Manager is expected to be present at all Unit Team Meetings. Though it is not required that he be chairman, he must monitor these meetings and the results in order to ensure a quality operation.

Appeal of Unit Team decisions should be through established appeal procedures. Efforts should be made by the Unit Team to work out any problems which occur from Unit Team decisions. Review committees which operate under centralised management approaches are not appropriate where Unit Management is used. Responsibility, authority and accountability for all decisions made under the general guidelines which the administration and policy set forth should assure good decision making processes.

**UNIT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE AND INSTITUTIONAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

Where unit management exists in an institution, the Unit Disciplinary Committee (U.D.C.) has the responsibility for taking initial action on Incident Reports incurred by unit inmates. Since unit staff members are more knowledgeable regarding their inmates, they are in a better position to take action which will best benefit the inmate and the institution.

The U.D.C. has the authority and responsibility to impose all sanctions except forfeiture of good time, disciplinary transfers, placement in disciplinary segregation, and those which make an adjustment in parole dates. Unit Managers have the responsibility to ensure that only appropriate cases are being referred to the I.D.C.

All unit staff members will be familiar with Bureau and local policies on inmate discipline.

**UNIT PLAN GUIDELINES AND FORMAT**

Unit Plans are developed to define unit missions and goals, describe programmes, defining responsibilities, and prescribe how the unit will evaluate its operation.

Each Unit Manager will develop and maintain a Unit Plan defining the unit operation in accordance with existing institutions, Regional Office and Central Office requirements. It is encouraged that unit staff and inmates participate in the development of unit plans. Unit Plans should be developed and revised according to the Guidelines set forth in Operations Memorandum 8000.9, *Guidelines and Format for a Unit Plan*, dated 12/5/76.

**UNIT EVALUATION AND RESEARCH**

Evaluation of the unit concept of correctional management as it effects many areas of the institution is essential and is a high priority in the Bureau of Prisons. Considerable effort has been directed towards this end, and to date, some of the results of these efforts have been published and distributed.

An effective ongoing evaluation programme is a necessary element at every stage of the Unit Management process. These programmes are necessary to provide information at the local, Regional, Bureau and Department of Justice levels.
Unit-based evaluation and research may include a combination or all of the following items: Incident Reports, Unit Performance Reports, Work/School/Vocational Training Reports, Staff Contact Reports, Hospital Call-outs, Weekly Inspection Reports, Furlough Reports, Escapes, C.T.C. Releases, Assaults: Psychological Testing, Management by Objectives, etc.

Institutional Administrators and Unit Managers are urged to develop an ongoing systematic evaluation of Unit Management. The Regional Unit Management Administrator and the Regional Research Coordinator will provide assistance and guidance to the institution and development of research evaluation projects. Copies of proposals for research and evaluation should be forwarded to the Regional offices of the Research Coordinator and Unit Management Administrator, and to the Unit Management Administrator, Central Office.

Regional Unit Management Administrators will develop a reporting system for data regarding aspects of unit programmes, such as Furloughs, Escapes, Incident Reports, Activities, Population Breakdown, and such others that are necessary in maintaining an overview of Unit Management throughout the region. A Summary Report will be forwarded to the Administrator for Unit Management in the Central Office on a quarterly basis.

**WEEKLY SCHEDULE OF UNIT ACTIVITIES**

To enhance the Unit Management process at the local level, it is suggested that each unit publicise a weekly schedule of activities. This schedule should include on-going unit activities as well as special events. Wide distribution of this schedule is urged so that all concerned are aware of what is occurring in each unit.

Weekly unit schedules may be compiled for all units and distributed as a single document to concerned departments. This communication technique should contribute to further understanding of all unit programmes and operations by other institution staff.

**EVENING CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMMES**

Unit counselling groups, team meetings, as well as leisure time activities, can often be scheduled for evening hours. Evening programming reduces call-outs during the day, which in turn alleviates conflict with various institutional departments, such as Industry. Evening programming allows the inmate to function without interruption during the normal work day. It also encourages greater staff/inmate interaction at a time when unit inmates are more available.

Local needs and staffing patterns will determine the extent of Evening Programmes. Unit staff schedules should reflect appropriate programmes coverage on evening and weekends.

**INMATE FILES**

Under most Unit Management systems, inmate files are decentralised and secured in the individual unit office. Although some delegation is necessary, the Unit Manager is accountable for their security and control. Files in the unit will be maintained in a fireproof security type cabinet with a clear method of accountability being established for the removal and return of the file. Staff will ensure that files and confidential material are not transported by inmates.

Care must be taken in the organisation and documentation of the files with special attention being given to compliance with F.O.I. and Privacy Act Procedures.

The Unit Manager is responsible for complying with all inmates records related functions identified as "unit functions" in accordance with Policy Statement 7900.56, dated August 17, 1976.
the effect they have on other units and on overall institution operations. Many rules and regulations in the units can be standardised without jeopardising unique unit missions. Often unhealthy competition can be avoided if units adopt similar rules for similar situations.

Unit Managers will review proposed changes with other Unit Managers, affected department heads, and the administration, prior to implementation.

**ACTING UNIT MANAGERS**

Various unit staff members will have the opportunity to be Acting Unit Manager. This experience can act as a means of developing unit personnel, assess level of capability and responsibility as well as an encouragement and recognition of the staff members’ abilities.

Cross training with other services can be invaluable training experience to further enhance an understanding of unit operations.

**UNIT MANAGER TRAINING PROGRAMME**

In the summer of 1972, the first Unit Managers began to receive specialised middle management training. This course has been refined to include the many skills Unit Managers must develop.

The Unit Manager Training Programme is operated by the Unit Management Section, Central Office, with assistance provided by knowledgeable Regional Office and institutional staff. The training is usually held in one of the Staff Training Centres. Various management and support personnel frequently monitor the training to increase their understanding of the decentralised, unit approach to correctional management.

**RATING AND REVIEWING UNIT STAFF**

Since the inception of Unit Management, there has been much discussion about procedures for the rating and reviewing of unit staff. The 1975 Task Force on Unit Management Performance Standards, Regional Office Administrators and Central Office staff have all contributed to the procedures which were recently finalised. It is expected that these rating and reviewing standards will be adhered to in all institutions. Unusual conditions requiring adaptations should be brought to the attention of the Chief, Unit Management Section, Central Office, and the Unit Management Coordinator in the Regional Office.

**UNIT MANAGER**

The Unit Manager will be rated by the Associate Warden and reviewed by the Warden.

**CASE MANAGER**

The Case Manager will be rated by the Unit Manager. The Associate Warden will review the Case Manager’s rating.

**CORRECTIONAL COUNSELLOR**

The Correctional Counsellor will be rated by the Unit Manager and reviewed by the Associate Warden.
UNIT CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

The Unit Correctional Officer who receives the majority of his supervision from the Unit Manager (Day and Evening Watch) during the rating period, will be rated by the Unit Manager, with input from the 5 by eight cards from the Correctional Supervisors. Unit Correctional Officers who receive the majority of their supervision during a rating period from the Correctional Supervisor, will be rated by the Correctional Supervisor, with input from the Unit Manager on the 5 by eight card. The Chief Correctional Supervisors will review. Sick and Annual Relief Officers will also be rated by the Correctional Supervisors and reviewed by the Chief Correctional Supervisor.

EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVE

The part time Unit Education Representative will be rated by the Supervisor or Assistant Supervisor of Education, with input from the Unit Manager. The Supervisor of Education or Associate Warden will review.

UNIT PSYCHOLOGIST

The Unit Psychologist, who is assigned permanently to a unit on a full time basis, will be rated by the Unit Manager with input from the Chief of Psychology. A Psychologist who is assigned on a part-time basis to a unit will be rated by the Chief of Psychology with input from the Unit Manager(s). The Associate Warden will review.