

—P.A.C.T.

Pennsylvania Adult Correctional Training

Final Report

Phase II

**Charles L. Newman, Project Director
William H. Parsonage, Associate Project Director
Barbara R. Price, Assistant Project Director**

**The Pennsylvania State University
College of Human Development
Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections**

**A cooperative program with support from The Law Enforcement
Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice (LEAA
Grant #357 (222))**

P.A.C.T.

Pennsylvania Adult Correctional Training

Final Report

Phase II

Charles L. Newman, Project Director
William H. Parsonage, Associate Project Director
Barbara R. Price, Assistant Project Director

The Pennsylvania State University
College of Human Development
Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections

A cooperative program with support from The Law Enforcement
Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice (LEAA
Grant #357 (222))

General

Our overall impression is most positive of the impact of the project upon correctional services in Pennsylvania. For some of the participants at the various conferences held at the University, it was the first time that

- 1) They had been in a university setting
- 2) They had been in a training situation where people from other agencies or services were present.

Among the collateral benefits derived was the understanding by virtually all participants that there is a body of knowledge which forms the structure of the administration of criminal justice, and moreover, to be effective, the individual must be the possessor of a substantial amount of that knowledge.

While there continues to be considerable fragmentation of correctional services in Pennsylvania, and interagency cooperative endeavors are frequently lacking, it is our impression that there is less resistance now to cross-field training than ever before.

A continuing problem which occurs both in the institutional and field correctional services relates to the costs of moving, housing, and providing maintenance for personnel away from their official stations. Ordinarily agencies do not budget for, or are granted funds to provide for extensive training of their staffs. Moreover, in times of austerity, it is likely that funds that could have been used for training purposes are the first to be cut.

This was our experience in relation to several workshops that were designed, scheduled, but ultimately had to be cancelled.

Were we to "do it all over again," we feel strongly that funds should be budgeted as part of the grant award to underwrite the cost of transportation

and maintenance of participants. The agency share, then, would be limited to the payment of the staff members' salary during his training period.

We would also like to bring cohort groups together again for second phase training. By bringing such groups, as a whole, back again, we could bypass the "strangeness quotient" which has to be worked through with every new group.

One of the more lasting contributions of this grant has been the development of the various training modules which will be made available to the field agencies. In a sense, these modules will live long beyond this project since they will provide the basic outline for future training by the agencies themselves.

Literally scores of people contributed to the success of this project. We are particularly appreciative of the warm support we received from the administration of The Bureau of Corrections and The Board of Probation and Parole in carrying out these programs, and for their continuing advice and consultation.

Finally we are in deed grateful to The United States Department of Justice for the funds provided to carry out this important project.

Charles L. Newman, Head, Center for Law Enforcement
and Corrections, Professor of Law Enforcement and
Corrections, Project Director

William H. Parsonage, Assistant Professor Law Enforcement
and Corrections, Associate Project Director

Barbara R. Price, Research Assistant, Assistant Project
Director

Introduction

In 1966, the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (OLEA) developed a program of special developmental grants to state correctional systems, or to Universities selected by and working in collaboration with state correctional systems, to aid in the development and amplification of programs of in-service training and staff development for state correctional agency staffs who are primarily concerned with adult offenders.

The Pennsylvania State University, Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections collaborated with The Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole and the Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Bureau of Corrections, to develop an application for OLEA grant funds in order to enhance the effectiveness of correctional services in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The first grant award (OLEA Grant #222) provided the opportunity for officials from the two aforementioned state agencies and a number of county officials to develop a series of policy statements and operational guidelines for statewide staff development programs. The successes of that program were reported to the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance in a final report in February, 1968. A volume titled "Conference Consensus: A Laboratory Model for developing Training Policy Consensus By Agencies Involved with public offenders" provided descriptions of the styles and strategies used to achieve the desired ends of the project.

One of the more significant sets of recommendations of the first project grant became the organizational thrust of the second project grant request, which was funded under OLEA grant # 357. Specifically the executives and managers enunciated a need for the development of systematically organized training materials which could be used in the development of new employees and the upgrading of existing staff.

In the training programs themselves, we were less able to fulfill the stated project design because of the difficulty of drawing personnel to

participate from the respective agencies. In the original proposal we stated:

PROJECTED LINE OFFICER TRAINING MODEL

Pilot Training Projects for Line Level Personnel - The selection of participants for the sessions for these groups will be considered as a critical element in that all groups should be sufficiently heterogenous to insure a representative sample of all practitioners in each group in terms of age, training, education, experience, and other learning related variables. These persons, representing direct-contact service functions in probation, institutions, and parole will be placed in actual observation-participation situations where each can see the other "practice" under "live" conditions requiring "live" responses. Probation, institution, and parole personnel will have the opportunity to see security considerations developed and carried out with attention called to the implications for people-changing behavior inherent in the procedures. All three groups will be able to see the actual and potential uses to which pre-sentence reports can be put; the ways in which each and all of them need information about parole violator behavior; accounts of experiences in supervising offenders in the community; and institutional adjustment, adaptation, and response to critical experiences will be shown. The importance, necessity, desirability, and feasibility of sharing insights, knowledge, skills, and resources will be dramatically illustrated, and techniques and methods for doing so demonstrated. The interrelatedness of each element in the correctional process will be shown emphasizing their interdependence if the task is to be accomplished.

The participants in the training project will be predominantly drawn from persons playing casework-type roles by virtue of the inclusion of the probation and parole personnel. The representatives of institutional programs, however, will include, in addition, psychologists, correctional officers, work supervisors, teachers, vocational instructors

and others carrying out direct service duties. This is believed to be vital to insure: (1) that non-institutional personnel be made intensely aware of the important role such persons play in the institutional experience of inmates, (2) appreciation of the potentially rich source of service such persons can become and, conversely, what havoc they can wreak if not appropriately involved, (3) that reality insights about the inmate's daily living experiences as observed and experienced by these persons are made known, (4) that the problems involved in implementing professional recommendations in the ongoing institutional situation are made known, (5) that they understand much more adequately than is currently the case, the role and function, as well as practices and procedures of probation and parole services.

Content-oriented sessions relative to "treatment" concepts will be held, emphasizing the opportunity to respond to these concepts negatively as their limitations are perceived by these practitioners. All too frequently, such concepts have been presented as though their virtues were self-evident and, as such, their implementation assured. Such presentations have not accounted for the infinite variety of experiences, as experienced by the practitioner, in such a way as to impress that practitioner with the validity and/or utility of the concepts. These efforts have and will continue to fail, except with the extraordinarily talented who probably do not need the training initially, because they are seen as unrealistic and abstract to the point of absurdity.

The concepts to be developed will be those which have direct and immediate, as well as obvious relationships to the tasks of the participants. They will include the processes, legal and social, as well as correctional, through which offenders become labeled as such and diverted into the various components of the correctional process where these trainees interact with them. For example, it is well known that a very high percentage of all

institutional personnel, at every level of organization, do not know the basic procedures which the inmate has experienced prior to reception. Arrest, detention, bail, arraignment, pleading, trial sentencing, etc., each of which has remarkable and impressive impact on inmates, are seldom understood, even descriptively, and the import of these experiences is seldom, if ever, recognized in the institutional "handling" of inmates, except in administrative terms. In this area, probation personnel are much more sophisticated and can be utilized to "train" the other trainees and their own self-training enhanced considerably by calling attention to the extent to which they affect and are affected by these processes themselves, relative to the attainment of treatment goals.

Equally well known are the limitations of community-centered personnel in appreciating (once again, in the treatment context) the realities of imprisonment's effect on prisoners relative to community adjustment. All too frequently, unrealistic and inappropriate stereotypes about the strengths and weaknesses of institutional resources prevail and govern the treatment approaches of these practitioners. The result is that the offender sees them as naive, lacking in understanding and, perhaps most importantly, incapable of being helpful.

In an effort to deal with these problems, the training content and methods will be devoted to the development of a simple but universally relevant (the universe being the treatment activities of probation, institutional, and parole personnel) sets of principles, concepts, and practices.

From the termination of the first stage grant to the end of the second stage grant, seven (7) conferences and workshops were held. All conferences were held at the J. Orvis Keller Conference Center of the Pennsylvania State University at University Park (State College) Pennsylvania. The conferences, their participants, and dates were as follows:

(Pennsylvania Adult Correctional Training = PACT)

- Pact III State Parole Officers, County Probation Officers 5/6-5/10, 1968
- Pact IV State Parole Officers, County Probation Officers 10/7-10/11, 1968
- Pact V State Parole Officers, Chief County Probation Officers 1/20-1/24, 1969
- Pact VIII Administrator's and Managers: County Jails, County Probation, State Institutions, State Parole, State Police 2/24-2/26, 1969
- Pact VI State Parole Officers, County Probation Officers, 3/10-3/14 1969
- Pact VII State Institutional Officers, County Jail Officers 4/14-4/18 1969
- Pact IX County Probation Officers, State Parole Officers 5/5-5/9 1969
- Pact X (scheduled for Institutional Officers, but cancelled because of State Austerity Program)

The effectiveness of any training program is conditioned by a number of variables:

- 1) The quality of the educational materials presented
- 2) The relevance of the material to the interests of the participants
- 3) The willingness of the participant group to involve themselves in the training experience
- 4) The capacity of the instructional staff to communicate the material in an interesting and understandable fashion
- 5) The quality of the physical environment in which the program takes place as a stimulus to learning
- 6) The willingness of the participants to "try-out" new ideas and methods back on the job

The problem of evaluation was not one unique to this project. In planning for programs, the workshop staff made a concentrated effort to develop educational materials which were both of excellent academic quality and of relevance to the field of practice. Each session became the subject of staff concern prior to its presentation and critique subsequent to it.

Where materials seemed to lack effectiveness, we explored new strategies to communicate, either through the involvement of new didactic technique, or the modification of content.

With only minor exceptions, we found the participants eager to join us in the various learning exercises. Significant concern was given to the development of a "group dynamic" from the outset of each program. The staff indicated very clearly that the effectiveness of the program was a joint responsibility with the participants. Participants were encouraged to suggest modifications of didactic content, as well as to contribute inputs of their own.

Each of the program participants was an experienced lecturer, and as a consequence, presentations were well delivered, and received with enthusiasm. The setting, moreover, provided an atmosphere most conducive to learning. The meeting rooms of the J. O. Keller Conference Center are amply equipped with the most modern facilities, well-lighted, and with no external distractive features.

Workshop groups were kept intentionally small - under 30 - in order to enhance group communication during presentations and also during sub-group task units (see appendices to examine group task units.)

In the final analysis, however, the value of the various programs can be measured only in terms of how people perform when they return to their jobs. While the enthusiasm of an interesting program may generate all sorts of accolades from participants while they are in attendance, the real measure of worth of a program is decided by the implementation of new strategies in the field.

We attempted to assess these change factors through a questionnaire which was distributed to all participants after they returned to their home communities and their jobs. The response pattern was almost complete, and

we believe that the follow-up study reported here accurately reflects the impact of the programs upon participants.

A SAMPLE OF RESPONSES TO
FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF P.A.C.T. INSTITUTES
FOR PROBATION AND PAROLE OFFICERS

Question 1: As a result of your participation in the Probation and Parole Workshop, what are you now doing in your work or in your agency that was not being done prior to your participation in the workshop?

Adult Probation Officer from Lycoming County: "All probationers and parolees are divided into three categories for weekly, bi-monthly, and monthly contacts. Notations are made for each contact and a record is kept on these interviews."

The Chief Probation Officer from Montgomery County: "Currently in the process of establishing a group therapy program involving probationers and parolees as a result of sex deviate offenses. It is hoped that the results of the session will enable us to continue similar group therapy programs and group supervision programs involving offenses other than for sex deviants."

Adult Probation Officer from Lackawanna County: "I also operate with more confidence in probation. This is based on the knowledge and experience gained during the workshop."

Adult Probation Officer from Lebanon County: "Our pre-sentence reports are now being done in the narrative form as opposed to the preprinted form."

Adult Probation Investigator from the Philadelphia County Quarter Sessions Court: "Applying local problems (each case) to the facilities which are available in an effort to use all local rehabilitative sources effectively; special emphasis now on treatment."

Adult Probation Officer from Monroe County: "Increased group work and community organization methods; increasing the use of Act 390, Senate Bill 305 for inmates to be gainfully employed while incarcerated for certain offenses."

Adult Probation Officer from Clinton County: "...Since my participation, I have a greater concept of the importance of this type of document (pre-sentence report) and I feel confident when submitting the finished product to the Judge."

Chief Probation Officer from Adams County: "Placing greater emphasis on total case load. Installed a program aimed at up-grading our presentence investigations."

Probation Officer from Allegheny County: "The workshop has had a great effect on my total mental attitude toward my work, more than anything else. I am trying to incorporate many of the techniques of interviewing that were discussed at the workshop.....Many of the pre-sentence points discussed at the

workshop such as the criteria to consider for recommending probation and others are being considered and used by me a great deal."

Parole Agent with the Altoona District Office: "Taking a close look at case load to find areas of pending trouble or where help could be given. Also am using the Suggested Standards (of Newman's) for recommending probation."

Probation Officer from Allegheny County: "Very little, one week at Penn State isn't enough to overcome the inertia of "the office" policy. That policy is, don't rock the boat. Don't do anything new. Don't take any chances."

Parole Agent from Philadelphia District Office: "I returned to my agency with a more optimistic outlook as a result of my participation in the workshop. This outlook, I believe, enhanced my job performance. I also made an effort to better utilize the concept of caseload management, and told others about this."

Parole Agent from District Office #3 in Harrisburg: "The major influence received from the conference is my new emphasis upon additional "tools" available within the community to aid in the readjustment of a man on parole. These "tools", as pointed out at the conference, are available if one searches for them."

Parole Agent from District Office #2 in Pittsburgh: "I am now trying to do more individual casework with each parolee, as far as reading case histories and formulating goals. I am also trying to coordinate the goals with other related agencies when needed. I have divided my caseload into areas by need and have used caseload management in a successful manner. I have also been using the various eligibility factors discussed to determine adjustment."

Question 2: As a result of your participation in the workshop, in what ways have your perception and understanding of your job changed? Please describe changes.

Adult Probation Officer from Lebanon County: "One way that has changed, is that this job is not only a fine and cost collection agency, but rather an agency with its aims to assist those placed under its supervision."

Adult Probation Officer from Luzerne County: "There has been no basic change."

Montgomery County Chief Probation Officer: "A greater degree of appreciation for increased efforts toward group treatment of parolees and probationers to have better rehabilitation and readjustment within the community. A greater appreciation for the need of advisory personnel on a voluntary basis from within the community to assist the probation officers in helping violators obtain better insight into their problems."

Adult Probation Officer from Lycoming County: "A general change in the supervision of the client by the probation officer. Treated more like an individual and a greater effort is being made to help and rehabilitate him."

Parole Agent from District Office #7 in Allentown: "I believe I gained a deeper understanding of the ideas and rehabilitative attempts being used by the LEAA Project...better understanding of group counselling and I have a deeper interest in the need for this."

Probation Officer Trainee from Bucks County: "Until I had attended the workshop I really did not know what my job really was. Now, however I know what to do and am trying to accomplish the various tasks thoroughly and in a professional manner."

Parole Agent from the Philadelphia District Office: "My outlook and attitude are revitalized. Also I was pleased to know that there are so many that share my concern about problems and defeats."

Probation Officer in Westmoreland County: "I have found a better way of advising and instructing the probationers and parolees."

Probation Officer in Allegheny County: "I feel that there is a more general concern and appreciation for the corrections field and my part in it than I had heretofore believed. I am more proud about my job and my ability to do it well. I feel that the workshops are a beginning to actually professionalize the field as opposed to just talking about being professionals. There were specific things too, such as the total use of the presentence report which hadn't been considered by me and many other things which I won't enumerate."

Parole Agent from District Office #3 in Harrisburg: "...the basic change is a more through understanding of the problems faced by a parolee upon release from the institution. The bridge built through community "tools" and the agent becomes quite vital."

Parole Agent from District Office #2 in Pittsburgh: "I am now trying to be more objective and evaluative towards the goals of the job. The workshop has helped me realize the responsibility to the community and the importance of interrelationships between various agencies."

Question 3. As a result of the workshop was your attitude and understanding of the relationship of your work and the work of the other administration of justice agencies changed? If so, how?

Adult Probation Officer from Luzerne County: "Yes, we have re-evaluated activities and services and in a few instances find that other agencies occasionally upgrade the services they offer our clients; continual cooperation and exchange of information on a more frequent basis."

Chief Probation Officer of Montgomery County : "No appreciable change in this area."

Adult Probation Officer from Lebanon County: "It most certainly has, the most pointed I believe was the discussions I had with other agents as to how their departments operated. It appeared at first that everyone was doing things different, however with a closer look this was not the case. Since I attended the workshop I had the opportunity to work with agents from District #3 in Harrisburg. The experience I received at the workshop helped a great deal in my better understanding the whys and wherefores."

Adult Probation Officer in Clinton County: "My attitude was changed to a degree. But as you well know, you cannot change attitudes of a segment of the administration of justice agencies and not all segments. People still want to think of themselves as having all the answers (police, corrections, etc.)"

Chief Probation Officer in Fulton County: "Yes, not to any large degree, but certainly each time I am exposed to new ideas and change. It enables me to be more conscious of my job and my relationship with others who are working in the same field. It has also made me aware that our agency is part of a total system."

Parole Agent from District Office #9 in Altoona: "It was good to meet and hear of the problems county probation officers have. I have a much better understanding of this work."

Adult Probation Officer from Bucks County: "I personally gained some new insight into cooperation among agencies but I can't put it to use because our policies are already inflexibly set."

Parole-Probation Officer from Westmoreland County: "...I am better equipped to handle my duties."

Probation Officer Trainee from Bucks County: "My attitude and understanding was always there although the thought of importance was not. I feel now that one has as much to give as others and that for the good of the client there should be cooperation among agencies."

Probation Officer from Indiana County: "I am more conscious of the close relationship between different judicial agencies. Each has a job to do. Collectively they get the job done."

Parole Agent from District Office #2 in Pittsburgh: "It has helped broaden my knowledge of other agency's responsibilities and goals and given me a better understanding of their problems. The workshop has also left me with the feeling that some of the various agencies should be put under one head to expedite functions and eliminate overlapping."

Question 4. Have you been able to communicate things that you learned at the workshop to co-workers, subordinates, or clients? If so, what?

Adult Probation Officer from Clinton County: "Yes--especially with the clients, which are the important persons in this work. My greatest concern are those people who have been in this work for many years, who feel that they have all the answers to human behavior problems. To initiate any programs means change and after all change is a frightening experience for many. But I will continue to make changes, based upon good knowledge that workshops like P.A.C.T. can offer."

Adult Probation Officer/ Investigator of the Philadelphia Quarter Sessions Court: "Have I? Wow. I certainly have. As the department training officer, I make it a point to inculcate trainees with the new ideas, techniques (new to me at least), plans for the profession, and the relationship of our function to other agencies. Moreover, I am happy to report that many of my co-workers have asked me questions about the workshop. Also, I try to make a point of it to tell clients that many people are burning the midnight oil in an effort to rehabilitate those who commit crimes."

Adult Probation Officer from Carbon County: "The one phase of the workshop with which I was greatly interested was the Pre-sentence investigation. I told the office staff, our director, and an other probation officer (juvenile) of the necessity of extensive pre-sentence investigation and of all the various methods and procedures."

Chief Probation Officer from Montgomery County: "Affirmative. By group discussion sessions and inter-department sessions we have endeavored to communicate the principles taught during the workshop. In addition, at meetings held at the inter-county level by Chief Probation Officers throughout the various county departments, we hope to expand and develop further lessons learned in this regard."

Adult Probation Officer from Lebanon County: "To some degree, not as much as I would like, but I do believe in time I will be more successful. One thing that was well learned concerning my clients is that at no time do you remove the dignity of the man."

Adult Probation Investigator with the Philadelphia County Quarter Sessions Court: "A. I have a better view towards clients; his needs and the institutions as a treatment resource. B. Planning of client's participation in community's programs. Purposeful goals and immediate participation in some form of treatment for clients. C. Effective on the job training program now being set up. D. The broader use of vocational rehabilitation."

Chief Probation Officer from Fulton County: "Yes, clients. Understanding of his particular problem, sympathy in his weakness, developing a better communication, more able to set up positive goals."

Adult Probation Officer from Somerset County: "To the clients, Yes, the workshop was very helpful in this way and has made my job a little easier and me a little more understanding. As to my co-worker, No, they are too set in their ways. In other words, don't make waves and rock the boat."

Adult Probation Officer from Venango County: "I hope so. But probably not much. However, we will continue to try to improve on our communication techniques. We pray here that there will be a course in 1969 for further workshops and a critique on last year's impact on the participants."

Probation Officer from Allegheny County: "Yes, both myself and the other men from our agency prepared a talk for our staff about the various ideas, suggestions, and problems that were discussed at the workshop. We also talked a great deal informally with other staff members about the workshop. This was not done before and the two men from our agency who are scheduled for the workshop next are eagerly anticipating it. We did not have nearly the eagerness for it before we left that they have."

Probation Officer Trainee from Buck's County: "Thus far I have only been able to pass on things to co-workers and clients. Co-workers: 1) techniques in interviews; 2) importance of pre-sentence investigation; 3) importance of cooperation among agencies; 4) How the APPO should perform. Clients--only indirectly by making myself a better officer."

The Training Modules

What They Are

The training modules consist of thirteen separate syllabic pertaining to administration of justice. The courses are intended for use by professionals in the field for the purpose in-service training. Specifically, the courses are pertinent to the needs of probation-parole officers, correctional officers and judicial personnel. Although the range of material covered is extremely broad, each course meets definite needs of the field as delineated by executive and managerial correctional personnel at (P.A.C.T.) Pennsylvania Adult Correctional Training Workshops. The training modules developed are:

- TM6901- History of Law Enforcement and Correction in Pennsylvania
- TM6902- The Administration of Justice
- TM6903- Criminal Law, The Laws of Arrest, and Detention
- TM6904- The Police - Its History and Contemporary Place in Society
- TM6905- Pennsylvania Judicial System: The Courts, The Judge, The Jury
- TM6906- Sentencing - Two Views
- TM6907- Probation and Parole
- TM6908- Jails and Prisons
- TM6909- Capital Punishment
- TM6910- The Dynamics of Human Behavior
- TM6911- Pennsylvania Probation/Parole Research On Basic Evaluation
- TM6912- Interviewing As An Effective Tool In The Correctional Process
- TM6913- Probation, Parole, and Pardons: A Basic Course

Development Process

Training modules 6902 and 6910 were the direct results of cross-field panels at the P.A.C.T. VIII workshop. Both preliminary and final outlines

were developed by the panels and submitted to a plenary session for their criticism and approval. After the conclusion of the workshop the institute staff expanded the outlines and sent them out to the panel participants for final approval. At this point panel members suggested bibliographical materials. Visual aids were included by the staff at the recommendation of the workshop participants. The resulting product are two courses, "The Administration of Justice" (6902), and "The Dynamics of Human Behavior" (6910).

Several of the training modules were the product of several workshops. Needs in the field were presented by participants and an effort was made to meet those needs of both participants and institute staff. One of the workshop participants who had developed various courses in the field for The Public Service Institute of Pennsylvania offered to make available his notes. The Institute staff capitalized on his offer and developed from these materials several training modules (6903-6909).

Training Module 6911 also was developed out of the workshops. This module, titled "Pennsylvania Probation/Parole Research On Basic Evaluation" P.R.O.B.E. was developed as an exercise in sensitizing probation and parole workers. The exercise, known, as the P.R.O.B.E. game, was so successful that after four testings it was decided by the Institute staff to develop the game into a training module.

Briefly, the P.R.O.B.E. game identifies a method for enriching the presentence investigation via the development of information describing the individual and his behavior in group settings. The evaluator observes the defendant's behavior in a controlled group session of offenders whose discussion is led by a probation or parole officer. The evaluator then

checks appropriate behavioral characteristics on a group observation schedule. Such systematic observation provides an added dimension to the pre-sentence report and its predictive value. In the P.R.O.B.E. game all roles are played by the workshop participants, some of whom act as offenders and some of whom are evaluators.

Training module 6901 was developed by still a different procedure. It was the thinking of the Institute staff that there was a definite need for a detailed, accurate, and inclusive history of Law Enforcement and Corrections in Pennsylvania. This decision was reinforced by the workshop participants' thinking, especially at the executive and managerial level. As a result, a professional historian at The Pennsylvania State University was contracted to write the history in the Commonwealth. "History of Law Enforcement and Corrections In Pennsylvania" (6901) was written by Professor Phillip E. Stebbins.

A major training module, developed out of the expressed interests and needs of field probation and parole agents was developed in a fashion as to allow its use either as a field training course or a resident instructional unit in a university or college program. This module (6913) is a highly detailed course on probation, parole and pardons which includes seventeen lesson plans each with specific assignments as well as suggested expository reading.

How The Training Modules Are To Be Used

The training modules are each a specific entity and complete in themselves. Thus a trainer looking for a specific topic might turn to any one of the modules and present the specific topic as a complete course. However, there is a logical order to the entire package from 6901 through 6910 and ideally the trainer should employ these modules sequentially. The remaining

modules deal with special problems e.g. "Interviewing As An Effective Tool In The Correctional Process" (6912) and "Pennsylvania Probation/Parole Research On Basic Evaluation" (6911) or with an extensive long-range course (6913). These modules be used either separately or in conjunction with the entire series.

In the forward which appears at the outset of each training module a series of recommendations are made to the trainer. Emphasis is placed on the background, skill, and preparation of the trainer. It is strongly suggested to the trainer that he expand headings and sub-headings, that he employ extensive examples and a variety of illustrative material, that he draw on his own experiences as well as those of the class, and that he concentrate on concretizing concepts in order to make the material as meaningful as possible and thereby enhance the learning process.

Both bibliographical and visual aid material are given for each training module. It was the purpose of the Institute staff to present these references as basic and therefore essential and at the same time provide flexibility to the trainer. It is suggested to him that some of the references provide supplementary background material for his course preparation and, at his discretion, some or all of the material could be assigned to the class or used in the class. It was the intention of the staff to convey to the trainer in the foreword that his initiative, decisions, and preparation were essential to the success of the course.

The Confrontation Model

One of the products of Pact VIII, which brought together executives from correctional institutions, probation, parole, jails, and law enforcement was a training tool which we characterize as a group confrontation model. Briefly, the model is described as follows: In order to promote

Inter-agency understanding three panels representing different justice agencies are established for the purpose of meeting with representatives from each of the other two agencies on a confrontation basis. Participant and panel interact in an effort to clarify roles and functions.

We planned to test out the model, and had reserved a facility in which to carry it out. Unfortunately, a critical state of austerity was declared in Pennsylvania, and as a consequence, we were unable to borrow the services of several leaders, and state agents could not be sent in as participants. Hopefully, in the coming year, with the financial assistance of the Pennsylvania Crime Commission, we will have the opportunity to test out the model. We are particularly concerned to discover if the model contributes to awareness of interagency dependence, accurate understanding of roles and function of related agencies, and reassessment of each participants' own functions and role within the framework of the justice field.

* * * * *

A Group Confrontation Model

INTRODUCTION

The bureaucratic compartmentalization of the justice system has resulted in considerable lack of effective communication between the various component agencies. The group confrontation model has been formulated for the purpose of correcting and reducing inter-agency misunderstandings, misinformation, as well as inter-agency hostility. The purpose of the model is to increase awareness of inter-agency dependency and of mutual concerns while promoting an accurate understanding of the

roles and functions of the related fields. The model should, in sum, contribute to a redefinition and reassessment of each participant's own functions and role within the broader framework of the entire justice picture.

GOALS

1. To promote inter-agency understanding and mutual respect.
2. To provide an opportunity for each agency to further clarify its own roles and functions in relation to the entire justice system.
3. To provide a receptive atmosphere for the airing of negative feelings towards other agencies.
4. To promote self-evaluation.
5. To enable panel participants to return to their respective agencies with new insights as a result of the confrontation experience which they, in turn, can pass on to their fellow staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The panel should be comprised of people at the line level rather than at the supervisory or management levels.
2. Prior evaluation of both the individual participant and the agency from which he comes should be conducted.
3. Retesting and re-evaluation should be done after the confrontation experience, preferably within two years.
4. The group confrontation experience should be held on "neutral" ground, e.g. not within the confines of any of the participating groups.
5. The program should be intensive. There should be at least six panel sessions a day, each lasting from one to two hours.
6. After the panel sessions have been completed, each panel should meet as a group to write up two summaries. The first would include a consolidation of the panel's insights into the functioning of the panel's field; the second would incorporate new information and corrections of faulty information assimilated by the panel on the functions of the other two fields participating in the confrontation.

THE MODEL

Participants:

Eight Police Officers

Eight Probation/Parole Officers

Eight Institutional Corrections Officers

The Corrections Panel
(7 serve at a time)

ROUND I

1st hour - Police Off. A
2nd hour - Police Off. B
3rd hour - Police Off. C
4th hour - Police Off. D
5th hour - Police Off. E
6th hour - Police Off. F
7th hour - Police Off. G
8th hour - Police Off. H

Round II

9th hour - Prob/Parole Off. A
10th hour - Prob/Parole Off. B
11th hour - Prob/Parole Off. C
12th hour - Prob/Parole Off. D
13th hour - Prob/Parole Off. E
14th hour - Prob/Parole Off. F
15th hour - Prob/Parole Off. G
16th hour - Prob/Parole Off. H

The Police Panel
(7 serve at a time)

ROUND I

1st hour - Prob/Parole Off. A
2nd hour - Prob/Parole Off. B
3rd hour - Prob/Parole Off. C
4th hour - Prob/Parole Off. D
5th hour - Prob/Parole Off. E
6th hour - Prob/Parole Off. F
7th hour - Prob/Parole Off. G
8th hour - Prob/Parole Off. H

ROUND II

9th hour - Correc. Off. A
10th hour - Correc. Off. B
11th hour - Correc. Off. C
12th hour - Correc. Off. D
13th hour - Correc. Off. E
14th hour - Correc. Off. F
15th hour - Correc. Off. G
16th hour - Correc. Off. H

The Probation/Parole Panel
(7 serve at a time)

ROUND I

1st hour - Correc. Off. A
2nd hour - Correc. Off. B
3rd hour - Correc. Off. C
4th hour - Correc. Off. D
5th hour - Correc. Off. E
6th hour - Correc. Off. F
7th hour - Correc. Off. G
8th hour - Correc. Off. H

ROUND II

9th hour - Police Off. A
10th hour - Police Off. B
11th hour - Police Off. C
12th hour - Police Off. D
13th hour - Police Off. E
14th hour - Police Off. F
15th hour - Police Off. G
16th hour - Police Off. H

THE MODEL IN OPERATION

Mechanics:

1. Each panel is comprised of an equal number of personnel from each of the designated fields (Correction, Probation/Parole, Police).
2. In the above model there will be eight participants from each of the three fields. Only seven people will be on the panel at one time. The eighth person will be meeting before one of the other two panels.
3. The composition of each panel is homogeneous, that is, only one agency is represented on a panel. Exception - note that probation and parole have been combined.
4. The panels operate simultaneously.

5. In order to activate the confrontation three participants, one from each panel group, leaves his group and goes before one of the other two panels.
6. In the model the first correction officer (A) goes before the Prob/Parole Panel, while Police Off. A goes before the Corrections Panel, and Prob/Parole Officer A goes before the Police Panel.
7. After the first hour confrontation the A's return to their own groups to serve on the panel and the second group (B) move out to go before the same panels from which group A has just returned. This continues until each panel member has been out once and gone before one of the other two panels.
8. At this point Round I has been completed and Round II can begin.
9. The second round proceeds in a like manner with the first group of officers (the A's) moving before the panel they did not confront on the first round. For example, in the model Police Officer A went before the Corrections Panel on the first round and therefore he now meets with the Probation/Parole Panel on the second round.
10. Round II continues until each of the officers has been absent from his own panel a second time in order to go before the panel he had not met with on the first round.
11. Whenever a participant is not confronting a panel he is serving as a member of the panel with his own agency.
12. When the second round has been completed every participant has faced the other two panels and the group confrontation is completed. As shown in the model, this means sixteen series of simultaneous meetings.

CONTENT OF THE CONFRONTATION

13. Each confrontation will consist of two parts. One hour is allotted.
14. In the first half hour the "visiting" officer confronting the panel will tell the panel what he believes and understands to be the functions and roles of the panel's agency as it operates in the field.
15. The second half hour is devoted to the panel's clarifying, correcting, and redefining any misconceptions in the officer's thinking as it effects the panel's field.
16. There should be a free flow of discussion between the panel and the "visiting" officer so that both are forced to re-evaluate their thinking.

PANEL SUMMARY

17. At the end of the confrontation the panels will each meet independently to draw up a summary.
18. This will include (1) a summary of the revised thinking of the panel with reference to the roles and functions of the two other agencies and (2) a list of fresh insights and redefinitions of their own agency's role and functions which have been generated by the confrontation experience.
19. At this point the panels are prepared to meet in plenary session and present their summations.

RESULTS

1. The group confrontation experience should provide a valuable learning experience for each agency participating.
2. The relationship of each agency to the allied agencies participating in the project should have been fully explored and clarified.
3. Each agency should come away with a revitalized conception of its own roles and functions as well as a better awareness of how it is viewed by related agencies.
4. If the experience proves to be of substantial value, the group confrontation model could serve as a prototype for further explorations with other participants from the justice field.

TRAINING MODULE CONSULTANT COMMITTEE

Dr. Arthur Prasse, Commissioner
Bureau of Corrections
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania

Mr. Jacob Truxall, Training Director
Bureau of Corrections
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania

Mr. Joseph Brierly, Warden
State Correctional Institution
21st and Fairmont
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Miss Charlotte Cummings, Warden
State Correctional Institution
Muncie, Pennsylvania

Mr. Paul Gernert, Chairman
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Harry Poole, Board Member
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Ralph Phelleps, Board Member
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. John Bierstein
Director of Probation Services
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Bailey McNitt, Training Director
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Fred Downs, Chief Probation Officer
County Court House
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Mr. Stewart Werner, Consultant
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Judge Charles Sweet
Court of Common Pleas
Washington County Court House
Washington, Pennsylvania

Judge Clinton Budd Palmer
Northampton County Court House
Easton, Pennsylvania

Mr. Joseph Catalano
Chief Probation Officer
521 Court House
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. William Robinson, Warden
Pittsburgh County Jail
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. John Rattenbury, Adm. Assistant
Bucks County Dept. of Corrections
Bucks County Prison
Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Major John Thompson
Director of Training
Pennsylvania State Police
Regimental Headquarters
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Lt. William Kimmel
Pennsylvania State Police
Rockview Barracks
Bellefonte, Pennsylvania