

*micromed
st* *cat 3*

FINAL REPORT

CORRECTIONAL STAFF TRAINING INSTITUTES

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
GRANTS NO. 241 AND 317

NCJ-001117
7092

JOINTLY SPONSORED AND FINANCED BY THE:

OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE,
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

AND

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF CRIME,
DELINQUENCY, AND CORRECTIONS

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS

FINAL REPORT

CORRECTIONAL STAFF-TRAINING INSTITUTES

U. S. Department of Justice

Grants No. 241 and 317

July 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	ii
	page
A. BACKGROUND, INTRODUCTION, AND PROJECT SUMMARY..	1
B. PROJECT GOALS AND METHODS.....	7
C. PROJECT PERSONNEL.....	14
D. PROJECT TRAINING MATERIALS.....	19
E. TRAINEE REACTION: AN EVALUATION.....	24
APPENDIX I. PROJECT STAFF: RESIDENT AND VISITING.....	38
APPENDIX II. PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 1st INSTITUTE.....	43
APPENDIX III. PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 2nd INSTITUTE.....	60
APPENDIX IV. PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 3rd INSTITUTE.....	76
APPENDIX V. LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY GRANT- PRODUCED MATERIALS ACCOMPANYING OFFICIAL FINAL REPORT.....	93

P R E F A C E

O.L.E.A. Grant No. 241 marks a significant step in bringing to bear the total resources of a major university on the problems and needs of modern corrections programming.

Following a developmental program sponsored by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (Grant No. 041), the present series of three national institutes for correctional staff trainers incorporated substantial new knowledge and techniques in a systematic attempt to upgrade corrections through improved staff development programs.

Seventy-eight trainer participants and over two hundred middle-management staff and correctional officers were involved in the institutes, thus representing an impact on more than one hundred correctional institutions nationwide.

We feel justified in believing that the institute series has engaged in a significantly positive interface with correctional practice and look forward to re-examining from time to time the persistence of gains made by correctional agencies as a result of this project. More important, perhaps, are the spinoff developments from the preparation of a professional trainer with each of forty-three state correctional systems. State legislation providing budgeted funds for training and educational leave, management seminars, and the development of locally oriented training materials of professionals are but a few of the multiple outcomes already observed.

Recognition for their individual and collective efforts is richly deserved by participating training officers. As a group, they became involved in the thrust of this project and served well our special need for help in developing ways through which "carryover" would be increased upon return to their "home" institutions. Middle-management and correctional officers likewise contributed to the eventual total impact of training by performing as both students and "guinea pigs."

Mr. Brooks was the Director of the project during its operational phase. Mr. Burns, who succeeded him in September of 1969, was largely responsible for the publication of training materials and the preparation of this report. The names and affiliations of participants are provided in the appendices.

Staff members of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections participated in the project in varying degrees. Through the skilled efforts of our staff, consultants, and graduate assistants, we were in a position to develop and implement a complete training program.

Special recognition for our two Project Directors-- Robert J. Brooks and Henry Burns, Jr.--is particularly merited. Their unstinting efforts and appreciation of project importance insured a program which was characterized by soundness of theoretical foundation, appropriateness of content and technique, and closeness to the realities and trends of modern corrections.

Appreciation for the professional, but totally understanding, relationships encouraged by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance cannot be overstated. Our special thanks are directed to Messrs. Daniel Skoler, Arnold Hopkins, and Frank Jasmine.

This Final Report provides a brief summary of our Project and a number of additional documents which were generated by its activities are attached to the first copy.

Charles V. Matthews

A. Background, Introduction, and Project Summary

Training, particularly in-service training, focuses on present problems. However, in-service training is also concerned with the future. Along with the concern for present and future is the task of facing daily--built-in--problems. These are found in any program. If change is involved, the problems are magnified. Change is difficult in most walks of life; however, in corrections change seems to be the most painful of all phenomena.

Today, corrections is undergoing fermentation throughout the country. This has created a need. Part of that need, simply stated, is training for change. This theme is present not only in corrections, but in virtually every occupation and profession. Industry is calling for a higher level of education and skill among its workers. There is a great need for professionals and technicians in education, health, counseling, and other community services. The need is far greater than the rate at which the educational system can produce them. Continuous studies are underway evaluating manpower resources. Indeed, the manpower problem is becoming critical. In terms of present

needs, it is already critical. At no place is this more true than in the field of corrections.

The Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois conducted a pilot-training program for correctional staff trainers in 1967. Made possible by Office of Law Enforcement Assistance Grant #041, the institute took place prior to the present series of institutes for which this report is made. This first institute was held from March 20 through May 19, 1967. It consisted of a nine-week program bringing together institutional training officers from a number of midwestern states.

For the most part, these individuals were classified as state training officers for specific institutions. In one instance the person represented a larger--departmental level--statewide body. Each person in attendance for the nine-week period had been designated--by his own agency-- as a staff training officer prior to having been nominated to attend the program.

In addition, middle-management personnel attended from the same state institutions wherever possible. A limited number of correctional officers who were new to the field also participated. Middle management attended for

one week--the last of the nine in the institute. Correctional officers attended the seventh and eighth week.

States represented in the first institute were Texas, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Dakota. A total of seventeen training officers attended the nine-week program. Indiana, Kansas, and Tennessee each sent two. The remaining states sent one each. Some came from maximum security--penitentiary type--institutions and some came from the reformatory type. In all instances they represented adult institutions. In addition, forty-four correctional officers and thirteen representatives of middle-management participated through attendance of selected institute segments.

The term "staff training officer" as used here designates a person whose total effort would normally be devoted to personnel training. However, in many cases this individual is one nominated to serve in a training role but who, in large part, does this as only one of several tasks to which he has been assigned. Many serve as "extra officers" who participate in pre-service training for new employees and have no in-service training responsibility. Even this they do only infrequently due to recruitment

characteristics of the particular state and institution. During the remainder of his duty time, the person in this slot will serve as relief officer, escort for trip, or as a staff person available to perform any additional tasks for which a full-time man is not required.

The term "middle management" was used only during the first institute and referred to personnel in the Lieutenant to Deputy Warden range. Later, the term was abandoned in favor of "correctional administrator". The range of coverage extended upward to include those in the Deputy Warden and Assistant Superintendent--to Commissioner category.

For the first six of the nine weeks, participants engaged in various types of learning experiences previously reported in the final report for Grant #041, and for which further description is not necessary here. The remaining three weeks were divided into two weeks of teaching and one week during which the middle-management personnel were brought to the University to participate in the training program. During the two-week teaching experience, correctional officers were brought from the institutions represented by the training officers. They served as students and were taught by the nine-week participants. They departed at the end of two weeks. At the same time the middle-management people arrived for the final institute week.

From experience gained in conducting the first institute, certain changes were made in the application for another grant to carry out three institutes during the 1967-68 fiscal year. One of the most notable changes was in length of time. The first institute had lasted a total of nine weeks; however, the new series was planned for eight weeks each. The first five weeks included small team learning experiences and group lectures. Following this were two weeks of practice teaching and one week during which administrators from the home institution or agency participated.

The first institute in the new series of three began on October 2, 1967. Advance preparations had been made for a total enrollment of twenty. In addition to this number would be the attendance during the 6th and 7th weeks of up to two correctional officers from each parent institution. And, during the final week, administrators were scheduled for attendance.

As with the pilot institute, the time during which correctional officers were present was for practice teaching experience by the training officers. The correctional officers were students and training officers served as teachers. During the administrators' phase--the final

week--each management representative became acquainted with the type of program being presented. In addition, this provided a time for the individual staff trainer and his administrator to participate in long-range planning. Seminar-type group discussions during the final week gave all a chance to hear first-hand opinions from persons with widely varied backgrounds.

For this new series of three institutes, nominations were to be accepted from the entire fifty United States. Questionnaires were sent nationwide, and responses indicated there would be more than enough nominations to fill all three institutes. Favorable indications came from as far away as Alaska and Hawaii. All corners of the contiguous forty-eight states were interested--Florida, Maine, California, and Oregon. In the final count, forty states were represented in the series of four institutes covering the two-year period.

Change is taking place in corrections. Only time will tell what changes will result from this series of training institutes. The purpose of this report is to present a chronology of events that took place during the period of time participating training officers were engaged in the learning experience. It may also serve as a basis for possible further study. For example, what

was the effect of these experiences on the total correctional effort in the "home" institution or agency.

There is a saying that the "proof of the pudding is in the eating." Maybe in this case it would be best to say that such proof should be analyzed by finding out later how it was digested. Training at the University's Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections was only the beginning. What happened after these individuals returned to their home locality is more important. That will have to be a part of some future report. Hopefully, it will be made.

B. Project Goals and Methods

The thrust of this program, as with the previous one, is three-fold. The first is directed specifically at the training officer. He must teach, coordinate, participate-- or do all three of these in the instruction effort for line personnel. A second is directed toward the middle and upper-level management supervisor and administrator whose support and encouragement guide the training officer. This is a requisite part of the training program if any subsequent progress is to be made. The third thrust is toward developing a pool of trained correctional officers.

These officers received a short, very intensive training experience. This was programmed to occur in enhanced circumstances calculated to provide the latest in instructional techniques and thinking in corrections.

Early in the planning phase, project staff decided that structure and organization of each learning experience should lend itself to a realistic goal. The overall goal was simply to increase the capacity for effective teaching on the part of each participant. Institute design gave special emphasis to methods with which staff-trainers were not generally familiar, plus subject matter incorporating the best in current correctional philosophy and understanding. Educational mechanisms best suited for stimulating the trainers to learn were emphasized. A successful program was felt to require maximum contact between instructional staff and the trainees; thus, Saturday and evening activities supplement regular weekly curriculum activities.

The eight-week institute was divided into three phases. The initial five weeks consisted of preparation and development, the sixth and seventh week for performance, and the final week for an intensive summary of all previous activities. Evaluation, a constant part of our program,

took the form of a critical analysis of each individual by fellow trainers, assessments by project staff, and review by the operations analyst.

To gain a clearer perspective, we will examine these three segments separately. Each day of the first five weeks was divided into three distinct portions, not necessarily equal in time or content. Mornings were devoted to "content" type of learning experience including lectures, discussions, demonstrations, and other activities designed and conducted by staff and outside consultants. Afternoons were designated as "laboratory sessions" and used exclusively for small group or "team" meetings in which the training-officer participant met daily with a group or "team" leader (the latter a member of Center faculty). The number of training-officer participants in each "team-group" was usually seven. Evenings were taken up by audio-visual types of learning experiences and other supplementary programs.

Generally, the morning periods were well received. Some instructors were better able to meet the expectations and learning level of trainees than others. Individual training officers were asked to keep an accurate record of their reactions to all phases of the entire program. These records were kept daily and submitted each week to the project staff. Naturally, some individual presentations particularly

intrigued and interested the participants. Some lecturers utilized approaches designed to help the officer recognize and understand a variety of classroom procedures. Some of these were especially appropriate to the situation he would face in training "back home". Substantial use was made of audio-visual tape materials, blackboard diagramming, use of case history materials and other devices. All of these involved participants in their own learning experience.

Morning sessions usually meant a large group classroom experience during which new materials and new subject matter were often prepared. In contrast, the afternoons were informal and individualized. Called laboratory periods, afternoon sessions are best characterized as developmental. Training officers could ask questions more freely, explore peer group and individual reactions to the morning lecture, or obtain reactions to their own particular point of interest. Interactions on a small team basis with his colleagues from other states was--in and of itself--an exciting and truly enlightening experience. Afternoons also gave the officer a chance to catch his breath and digest instructions he had been receiving. In addition, it provided time during which considerable attention could be

devoted to discussing goals of training and different methods appropriate to attaining those goals.

A large portion of each afternoon session was devoted to the actual technology of lesson preparation. This, as time passed, became more and more a main focus of attention on the part of individual officers. Each participant was required to prepare and perform as a teacher during the sixth and seventh week. The two-week curriculum had to be planned, individual lessons assigned; and, actual teaching materials developed by participants. Pressure for satisfactory performance slowly evolved during the afternoon segment. Lesson plan preparation and content formulation was approached gradually. The purpose here was an attempt to relieve anxiety. A certain amount would naturally develop in a group of people brought together in this manner; however, by utilizing small teams and close personal identification with a team leader, a kind of esprit developed helping to motivate and maintain behavior appropriate to the goals of the institute.

The requirement that each training officer become a teacher served as an incentive. Each individual participant was motivated to prepare himself as best he could. This required him to work diligently in designing his portion of the curriculum for the two-week practice teaching period.

He was individually responsible for his own lessons, selecting necessary audio-visual aids where appropriate and arranging means of evaluating his own work. Evaluation proved to be an additional learning experience. This was true for the teacher, for the other training officers, and for the class of correctional officers as well. Of course, prior to the actual teaching experience each staff-trainer made numerous "dry runs" for the team leader and other members of the afternoon laboratory group.

Evenings during the first of the three institutes were largely utilized for viewing films. These periods provided the training officer an opportunity to familiarize himself with the range and types of audio-visual materials available for use. As expected, they reacted favorably to some and unfavorably to others. In the second and third training institutes, evening periods became more varied and included presentations other than audio-visual. There were provocative lectures, discussions and other activities. Evening sessions were limited to a one-hour period so that officers would have sufficient time for reference reading and relaxation. A listing of basic and supplementary instructional materials can be found in the appendix of this report.

The final institute week brought the administrators representing "parent" institutions and agencies of the training officers. This week provided an opportunity for their participation in a special program of instruction with time for critique and joint planning. Training officers presented sample lessons to the administrators and in turn were critiqued by not only their fellow training officers, but their own administrators as well. Additional special sessions were attended by all--training officers, administrators, and the Center faculty. Some presentations were by outside consultants brought to the campus for this week only.

The training officers, when they reach the eight-week point, are nearing completion of a course which has taken them away from their work and family for almost two months. They have just completed a teaching experience which could be viewed as a climax to the course. It should be remembered that they prepared for that teaching experience for five weeks. Then they taught for two weeks. Finally, when their administrators arrive, they are "over the hump" and see in the distance home and new duties. The administrators, on the other hand, arrive for this week only. It is a strange melting pot--a rare mixture--and has great potential for change.

C. Project Personnel

The Project (Grant #241) was funded by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance. Officially approved on September 21, 1967, it was made retroactive to September 1, 1967. The program built upon and--in some manner--continued work begun in the previous project (O.L.E.A. Grant #041) begun in 1966 and funded for a two-year period. Although reported separately, there are elements of shared personnel and resources common to both projects. Additionally, a large element of resource sharing with other programs of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections is evident.

In July 1967, Robert J. Brooks, Center faculty member since 1962, was named Project Director. Henry Burns, Jr., a veteran of O.L.E.A. Project #041, was assigned as an instructor. Duncan Mitchell, a Design Department graduate of SIU, was named instructional materials coordinator. At about this time, additional efforts were undertaken to recruit for the remaining faculty personnel positions and supportive secretarial assistance.

In late September, two additional staff positions were filled. Fleary P. Samples was recruited as an instructor, and James E. Adams was employed to fill the administrative assistant position. Although additional candidates were

interviewed during September, October, and November, no additional appointments were made. Several positions remained unfilled during the first institute. In December, Richard Pooley was employed as an instructor. Mr. Pooley filled this position during the balance of the contract period. At about the same time, Peter Rompler was retained as a consultant on a one-day-a-week basis to provide some of the evaluation service. Later Mr. Rompler accepted full-time employment with the project.

Since the Project called for graduate students to become intimately involved in implementation of the training, recruitment began for these individuals. Immediate concern was for finding people of established academic performance plus a genuine interest in the field of corrections and promise of ability to work well with trainees that would come to this project. Final selection of graduate students--later named research assistants--represented a cross-disciplinary group. Mainly from the social sciences, they came representing the College of Education, Rehabilitation Institute, Design Department, and the Department of Government. All were brought into close continuing contact with correctional personnel and with institutional programs; thus providing very specialized study for both.

Our instructors were largely responsible for the success or failure of our crucial afternoon sessions. Relying

on small group techniques, each instructor was able to effectively mesh content sessions of the morning with the individual and collective needs of our participants. Attitudes were explored and opportunities presented for constructive "ventilation". Thus, in many respects, project instructors assumed the role of group leaders and facilitators.

Research Assistants

A basic concern of the Center is development of professional staff resources. This project sought to enlarge upon and test new strategies for providing graduate educational experiences in addition to formal academic work. It is recognized that there exists an urgent need to provide students with responsible roles relevant to the work of corrections. For those supported in this project there was a varied assignment of roles and tasks. They performed tasks in the organization and development of training media, bibliographic research, teaching, scoring and interpreting evaluation instruments, audio-visual projections, as film discussants, aiding in the registration and accommodations of arriving trainees, as coordinators for correctional conferences and meetings, and in the preparation

of written lecture notes and summaries from the institute sessions.

Indeed, the research assistants occupied a unique position, both as participants and as staff. Program design included roles which recognized (1) the need to support and develop professionals for correctional positions, and (2) the needs of this project in terms of instruction, materials development, and supportive services.

Duties varied somewhat between individuals and between different institutes. For example, beginning with the first and as a continuing task, one research assistant previewed and scheduled films for use in each institute. He evaluated them and made recommendation for purchase to expand the correctional film library of the University. Another revised and brought to completion a slide-tape presentation entitled "The Development of Corrections." He organized the sequence, added to the already existing collection and wrote an accompanying script. Another surveyed the literature on simulation training and--employing this approach--designed a correctional training exercise. His work was completed in written form and has been accepted for publication in 1969.

These examples are to a certain degree typical. Attempts were made to find useful capacities which would involve each student on an individual basis as much as possible. During subsequent institutes, research assistants assumed supportive roles on a one-to-one basis with training officer participants. On the other hand, there were times when research assistants, as well as project staff, served for brief periods in routine roles. These included picking up supplies, meeting participants at the airport, and greeting visitors and newly arrived institute participants for the two-week and one-week periods. They worked several weekend shifts in this endeavor. In a more academic capacity, the research assistants compiled notes on the morning lectures and discussions. After writing, review, and revision, these were duplicated and incorporated as part of "Tools for Trainers".

The range and variety of services that research assistants performed was great. (Some--of course--became more involved than others.) Considerable cross-learning took place. Our original belief was that research assistants would enlarge their understanding of correctional systems and their personnel. It was felt that this actually took place in most instances. On the other hand, it was

expected that the individual training officer would, through his association with the research assistant, become better acquainted and more closely identified with the University and its programs.

A complete listing of staff can be found in the appendix. This compilation includes full-time staff and other Center personnel, research assistants, plus consulting and other part-time help.

D. Project Training Materials

During the series of three institutes, much material was gathered. A constant process of evaluation culled out the chaff, leaving only the more useful instructional aids. These took the form of innovations in teaching--testing materials and techniques--but most importantly, the collective experiences of those participants who came from such widely varying types of backgrounds provided the richest resource. Much of this was captured on film, paper, and through word-of-mouth communications. An additional role of the project was that of dissemination.

Early in each institute the search would begin for additional instructional training materials. Each training officer was faced with an assignment involving composing a series of lesson plans and presentation of