

FIRST UNITED NATIONS CONGRESS ON THE PREVENTION
OF CRIME AND THE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS
GENEVA 1955

PERSONNEL

and it is hoped that the Commission will
be able to provide the necessary information
for the study of the problem of
**THE RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND STATUS
OF PERSONNEL FOR ADULT PENAL AND
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS**
Report by the Secretariat



UNITED NATIONS

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC THAT THE UNITED STATES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE HAS PRINTED THIS REPORT

FOR THE PUBLIC

INFORMATION

In accordance with the tradition of past Congresses, it has been possible to secure the co-operation of certain national prison administrations for the printing of documentation for the First United Nations Congress on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, which is from an historical point of view, the Thirteenth International Penal and Penitentiary Congress. Thus the present report has been generously printed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons of the United States of America, in the prison printing plant at Leavenworth, Kansas.

A/CONF.6/C.1/L.2
3 March 1955



THE RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND STATUS OF PERSONNEL FOR ADULT PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

	<i>Pages</i>
INTRODUCTION	
Origin and purpose of study.....	1
Consideration by the Regional Consultative Groups.....	1
Scope of the study and additional documentation.....	2
Some preliminary observations.....	3
I - PRISON STAFF AND THEIR FUNCTIONS; CATEGORIES, STATUS AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE	
A. Modern conception of the prison service; tendency towards specialization and need for co-ordination.....	4
B. Categories of staff.....	7
C. Status of staff and conditions of service; non- military character.....	9
(a) Civil service status; full-time employment.....	9
(b) Conditions of service.....	11
(c) Non-military organization of staff; uniforms; carrying of arms.....	15
II - RECRUITMENT OF STAFF	
A. The competent authority; general administrative methods.....	17
B. Conditions of recruitment.....	20
(a) General.....	20
(b) Supervisory staff.....	21
(c) Higher administration.....	22
(d) Directors or executive staff of institutions.....	23
(e) Specialized and administrative staff.....	26
(f) Staff of special institutions.....	27
III - TRAINING OF STAFF	
A. General.....	28
B. Training prior to final appointment.....	29
(a) Supervisory staff.....	29
(b) Directors or executive staff.....	33
(c) Specialized staff.....	34
(d) Regional institutes for professional training.....	35
(e) Physical training and training in the use of arms.....	36
C. In-service training.....	37
(a) Advanced training courses.....	37
(b) Discussion groups, visits to institutions, and seminars for senior personnel.....	38
(c) Consultation, visits and meetings for the staff as a whole.....	39
IV - DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT.....	40-47

THE RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND STATUS OF
PERSONNEL FOR ADULT PENAL AND
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Report by the Secretariat

INTRODUCTION

Origin and purpose of study

The subject "Training of staff for penal institutions" was included by the Social Commission at its third session in the programme of work in the field of social defence which was approved by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 155 (VII) of 13 August 1948. The subject was maintained in the programmes of work drawn up by later sessions under the title "the selection and training of personnel for penal and correctional institutions". Since the fifth session of the Social Commission, it has been included in the list of priority projects.

The adoption of this subject for study has made it possible to compile and analyse information on current principles and practice in the matter of the recruitment and training of the staff of penal and correctional institutions and on the status of such staff, in order to provide Governments with information on the most advanced methods so far adopted, with a view to the improvement of existing systems.

In accordance with General Assembly resolution 415 (V)¹ recommendations on the subject have been made by the Regional Consultative Groups. The recommendations are studied in this report, and the conclusions drawn from this study are submitted to the United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders.

Consideration by the Regional Consultative Groups

The question of prison staff has been included in the agenda of several regional groups but the procedures followed in considering the question have varied from group to group.

In Europe, an inquiry was carried out in 1952 on the basis of a questionnaire prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with a Regional Working Group to which the study was entrusted. The Working Group prepared a report on the situation in the various European countries which replied to

1. See particularly paragraphs (b) and (d) of the annex to the resolution.

the questionnaire and on the conclusions which appeared to emerge from the inquiry. The report was studied by the European Group at its first Conference at Geneva in December 1952, and the Group formulated a number of recommendations which are to be found in annex IV to the report on the Conference (ST/SOA/SD/GEN.1).

The Latin American Regional Group, which held a seminar at Rio de Janeiro in April 1953, had before it both the European Group's recommendations and a number of national reports by experts of the region on the subject. The Group drafted a number of recommendations which appear in annex 2 to the report on the seminar (ST/TAA/Ser.C/13).

The agenda of the regional seminar of the Middle East Group held at Cairo in December 1953 did not include a special item on the subject of prison staff but the Group discussed the subject to some extent during its consideration of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, and its report includes a section on institutional personnel (see ST/TAA/Ser.C/17, paragraphs 234 to 247).

The Asia and Far East Group discussed the recruitment and training of prison staff at its regional seminar at Rangoon in October-November 1954. It had before it a number of national reports and reports of experts as well as the work of the other Regional Groups. The Group's recommendations are to be found in annex II to the report on the seminar (ST/TAA/Ser.C/22).

Scope of the study and additional documentation

When the questionnaire for the European inquiry was being drawn up, it was realized that the inquiry should cover the categories, status and conditions of service of the staffs of institutions, but only in so far as it was necessary to collect the information required to consider the recruitment and training of the staff in relation to the functions they are called upon to fulfil. In accordance with the suggestion made by the 1953 *Ad Hoc* Advisory Committee of Experts, this report is limited to a survey of the findings of the regional conferences (E/CN.5/298, paragraph 20), and will not discuss the different points of the questionnaire in detail.

In addition to this report, the Congress will have before it some thirty other reports from selected countries in various parts of the world. In accordance with the Committee of Experts' recommendation they describe concrete examples of programmes for the selection and training of personnel with information on the results obtained.

Some preliminary observations

In a first "Preliminary Observation" the Latin American Group states that the rules it has formulated are an attempt to present a general system, as so far no standards which can be recommended for the proper recruitment and training of prison staff have been formulated and no attempt has been made to classify such staff according to category. In this connexion it may be recalled that, in accordance with the wishes expressed by the Tenth International Penal and Penitentiary Congress, which met at Prague in 1930, the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission studied this question and in 1938 circulated a "Memorandum on the vocational training of penitentiary officials" to Governments represented in the Commission. The memorandum was published in the "*Recueil de documents en matiere penale et penitentiaire*", volume VII, (1938); and included in a collection of the Commission's works (volume XII, 1942). The memorandum contained recommendations regarding the recruitment and training of the various categories of prison staff and the improvement of their status, which had been prepared by certain experts in the Commission and approved by it.

With regard to its own recommendations, the Latin American Group further states, in a second "Preliminary Observation", that they should be considered as minimum recommendations, adaptable to all the countries represented at the Latin American Seminar, subject to their national legislation and individual methods, and that they could equally apply to other countries not represented at the Seminar.¹ In the light of this observation and those made by the Secretariat in its introduction to the draft Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (A/CONF.6/C.1/L.1), the conclusion can be accepted that what is required is to draw up a number of

1. See documents A/CONF.6.C.1/L.8 et seq.
1. A similar statement was made by the Asia and Far East Group.

basic or minimum rules which must be sufficiently flexible to be universally applicable without raising objections of principle at the regional or national level, leaving aside, of course, the limitations of available resources which may in some cases be temporarily insufficient to permit the full and complete implementation of the international recommendations.

I. PRISON STAFF AND THEIR FUNCTIONS; CATEGORIES, STATUS AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE

A. *Modern conception of the prison service; tendency towards specialization and need for co-ordination*

In the course of the discussion in the European Group, attention was rightly drawn to the importance in this connexion of the postulate of modern prison administration that in the last analysis men, not buildings or systems, play the most important part in the rehabilitation of offenders. It is therefore essential to find suitable persons for this work and to give them training which will enable them to perform their duties to the best advantage.

Originally homogeneous, because their duties were almost purely custodial, prison staffs have become or are tending to become diversified, as more complicated specialized functions, such as observation, education, psychological and social assistance and psychiatric treatment, are undertaken. This characteristic development is occurring to greater or lesser extent in every region.

Thus, the main point which emerges from the survey of the present position in various European countries is the tendency to recruit staff of an increasingly specialized and varied kind, the principal categories of which are described in section B below. This is the logical outcome of the development of penitentiary treatment methods, the application of which presupposes the employment of staff with a standard of training analagous to that of an important social service. It also entails the employment of an ever-increasing number of specialists. In reviewing the advantages of present practice, the European Group came to the conclusion that this development was a necessary one, and recommended that Governments should view it favorably.

The Group was not, however, unaware of the disadvantages of the practice, noting in particular that specialization and diversification of staff might hamper the harmonious application of penitentiary treatment. It accordingly stressed the absolute necessity of co-ordinating the activities of the various categories of staff in order to give them a deeper insight into the several aspects of penitentiary treatment and ensure uniformity and coherence in the methods employed. To that end, the Group recommended the establishment of a co-ordinating committee representing the various categories of staff, or the adoption of some other appropriate means.

As an example of the difficulty of developing an integrated approach in the treatment of the prisoners and the need to co-ordinate the work of the various categories of staff, it was pointed out that psychologists and psychiatrists should if possible have general prison experience and not merely clinical experience since they otherwise tended to consider cases from a purely medical point of view. In connexion with in-service training, the consultations to which reference will be made below [see chapter III, section C (c)] are intended to ensure such close collaboration between the various sections of the staff, which should work together as a team.

With regard to methods of ensuring co-ordination, it was pointed out that in some cases an officer was made specially responsible for co-ordination while in others there was a committee representing all categories of specialized staff.

The European Group summarized the ideas expressed in the course of the discussion in its first recommendation:

"1. The Group draws attention to the change in the nature of prison staffs which results from the development in the conception of their duty from that of guards to that of members of an important social service. This is shown by the tendency to add to the staff an increasing number of specialists, such as psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, teachers, technical instructors.

The Group is of the opinion that this change is a necessity in a modern penitentiary system and even if additional expense is involved, it recommends that it should be favourably received by Governments.

This tendency, however, may hamper an integrated approach to the treatment of the prisoners and present problems in the co-ordination of the work of the various types of specialized staff.

The Group therefore considers that it is necessary, either by the appointment of a co-ordinating committee or otherwise, to ensure that all interested specialized staff approach their task through a co-ordinated method which will also give them the advantage of a clearer insight in the several aspects of the problems involved."

The Latin American Group inserted a similar text (paragraph 4) at the beginning of its "Basic Principles":

"4. It should be stressed that the advances now occurring in penology imply a new conception of the work of the staff which demands ability and smooth co-operation on the part of every member. This development is reflected in a tendency to add to the staff an increasing number of specialists such as doctors, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, teachers, technical instructors, etc.

The Seminar considers this evolution essential in a modern penitentiary system and recommends its favourable consideration and adoption by Governments, even if additional expenditure is involved. This increasing specialization might, however, disturb the smooth running of the work of treating the inmates and might raise problems in the co-ordination of the activities of the different groups of specialized staff. To avoid the difficulty, it is suggested that a co-ordinating or similar body should be established to ensure that all members of the technical staff should, in carrying out their functions, follow one standard method which would have, among other advantages, that of giving them a clearer insight into the problems involved."

The Asia and Far East Group adopted the first part of the Latin American Group's text in paragraph 3 of its recommendations. With regard to the second part, while aware of the need for specialized staff to work for the rehabilitation of prisoners, it considered it advisable merely to point out the danger of excessive specialization and accordingly inserted the following paragraph in place of that part of the Latin American text:

3. This tendency is healthy and the Seminar recommends

that it should be favourably considered by Governments even if additional expense is involved. Over-specialization should be avoided as it may lead to difficulties in administration."

The Middle East Group also stressed the need for specialized staff by inserting a new paragraph in the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (rule 84, first paragraph of the regional text):

"So far as possible, the personnel shall include a sufficient number of specialists such as psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, teachers and trade instructors."

One of the basic ideas embodied in the European Group's text, that of a "social service", is to be found further on in the Latin American Group's "Basic Principles", in a paragraph based on rule 40 (b) of the draft Standard Minimum Rules:

"6. An effort should be made to arouse and keep alive, in public opinion and in the minds of the staff, the conviction that the staff's work is most valuable as a social service. For this purpose all publicity methods which can convey an adequate picture may be used."

In its discussion of the Standard Minimum Rules, the Middle East Group endorsed this idea, but adopted the original wording of the draft, the second sentence of which is more categorical:

"... and to this end all appropriate means of informing the public should be used"

The Secretariat considers that the various ideas embodied in the Regional Groups' recommendations regarding the modern conception of the prison service, the specialization of functions and the need for co-ordination should be adopted, textually or in substance. (See chapter IV, paragraph I to III, of the Secretariat recommendations.)

B. Categories of staff

The increasing specialization of the functions of institutional staff is reflected in the division of prison staff into various categories which are found in the prison organization of most countries.

The Latin American Group observes, in one of its "Preliminary Observations", that:

"3. The categories into which penitentiary staff have been divided [by the Regional Group] should not be regarded as final and absolute; they allow for flexibility and subdivision where necessary."

Under the heading "Status of Staff", the Group proposed the following categories:

"9. For the purpose of the rules and the performance of the duties, it is recommended that prison staff should be divided into the following categories:

- (a) Directors or executive staff;
- (b) Supervisory staff;¹
- (c) Technical staff;
- (d) Administrative staff.

The first category comprises the directors and assistant directors of the establishments.

The supervisory staff is responsible for supervision at all grades.

The technical staff includes all those engaged in functions requiring specialized knowledge, for example, psychiatrists, psychologists, doctors, social workers, etc.

The administrative staff consists of those engaged in office work; filing clerks, correspondence clerks, bookkeepers, registration clerks and other assistants concerned with internal administration.

In every establishment, the staff in these categories are under the central authority of the director in charge."

This proposal broadly corresponds to the existing division of staff in most countries and to the division adopted in the 1952 questionnaire.

However, taking into account the position in almost all countries having a system that is adequate from the point of view of prison industry and the vocational training of prisoners, the questionnaire included a special heading dealing with the intermediary category of technical staff for prison industry. This category includes engineers, heads of workshops, trade instructors, foremen, etc. Personnel in this category usually hold a trade certificate or other technical diploma and can thus be classified as specialized staff. From other

1. In some regions, the term "custodial staff" is used.

points of view, however, particularly their general educational functions which bring them into close and continued contact with the prisoners and their psychological training for this purpose, they should rather be considered as supervisory staff. In this report, therefore, observations concerning specialized staff and supervisory staff also apply accordingly to technical staff for prison industry.

In considering the Standard Minimum Rules the Middle East Group (like the European Group) did not think it necessary to make specific reference to "educators", because the title and functions of that class of personnel were not interpreted in the same way in every country. It felt, moreover, that all the staff should engage in educational work and that there might be some uncertainty in that respect if a special body of educators was specifically mentioned. This argument would appear to be valid.

Under the heading "Staff of Special Institutions", the Latin American Group specified that:

"24. The staff of women's institutions should consist of and be administered by women¹, except in the case of technical functions which cannot be performed by women."

It was specified that the second part of the sentence also applied to cases where female staff was not available.

The Asia and Far East Group (paragraph 17 of its recommendations) adopted the same text but deleted the second part of the sentence.

Except for the Latin American Group, the Regional Groups refrained from proposing any standard classification of prison staff. It would indeed appear better not to propose such a classification as it is impossible, within the scope of this study, to go into details of organization and there can be no doubt about the chief categories of staff and the respective functions to which the report refers.

C. Status of staff and conditions of service; non-military character

(a) Civil service status; full-time employment

In their replies to the questionnaire, the European correspondents described the system in existence in their countries.

1. I.e. women's institutions should be administered by women.

Comparison of the systems did not lead to the conclusion that any one of them was likely to obtain a higher standard of service from the staff than others. It did at least show that prison staff duties have become much more complex and arduous than formerly, when the only function of the staff was to guard prisoners. The European Group noted the urgent need for qualified personnel and felt that Governments should accept the additional expenditure required to build up and maintain a staff of this type.

It was considered essential by the Group that institutional staff should enjoy the dignity and independence that normally went with the status of civil servants: i.e. they should be selected according to prescribed rules, be paid by the Government and enjoy the usual safeguards as to wages, tenure of employment, pension rights, etc.

The European Group therefore considered that full-time prison staff should enjoy permanent civil service status, including pension rights, and that they should be specially recruited for their specific duties according to certain rules of selection, and not seconded from the armed forces or police [see (c) below]. The first paragraph of the Group's recommendation on the subject reads:

"2. Full-time penitentiary staff should enjoy civil service status, that is, they should be employed by the Government of their country or State according to certain rules of selection and should enjoy a permanent and pensionable status."

The Asia and Far East Group endorsed this text.

The Middle East Group also called for civil service status for prison staff in an amendment to the draft Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners [rule 81 (c) of the regional text] which also mentions security of tenure as an integral part of such status:

"... personnel shall be appointed on a full-time basis and have civil service status with security of tenure subject only to good conduct, efficiency and physical fitness. ..."

The same formula appears in recommendation 11 [see (b) below] of the Latin American Group. In its recommendation 8, the Group described in greater detail the civil service status which it specifically proposes should be granted to all members of the prison staff:

"8. All members of the prison staff, without exception, should have the status of civil servants and hence be governed by civil service rules; they should be required to satisfy certain minimum qualifications and should be recruited according to definite selection tests such as competitive examination. They should enjoy permanent status and be entitled to the benefits of a career such as promotion, social security, employment benefits and, where applicable, retirement benefits or a pension."

The same text was adopted as recommendation 7 by the Asia and Far East Group.

The two Groups last-mentioned thus went farther than the European Group in calling for civil service status for all members of the staff without exception, making no distinction between full-time staff and certain categories of staff which might be employed on other terms. For certain specialized functions, in particular, the Latin American Group's recommendation does not in fact seem to be applicable in such a general way.

In this connexion, a proposal by the Middle East Group for inclusion in the Standard Minimum Rules [rule 84, second paragraph, of the regional text] specifies that, of the specialists,

"the social workers, teachers and trade instructors shall be employed on a permanent basis" and that the director (rule 85, second paragraph of the same text) "shall not be appointed on a part-time basis".

The two recommendations which are embodied in the Secretariat proposals concerning the Standard Minimum Rules (A/CONF.6/C.1/L.1) would appear to merit consideration.

The Secretariat recommendations concerning the status and full-time employment of the staff are contained in chapter IV, paragraphs IV and V.

(b) *Conditions of service*

Favourable conditions of service for prison staff will, like civil service status, make for good recruitment. While all the headings of the 1952 questionnaire relating to conditions of service and the organization of the staff will not be considered, the recommendations which the various regional groups

have made as being the most important in this respect will be briefly examined below:

The European Group emphasized the importance of the applicable wage and salary scales in ensuring satisfactory recruitment. It was pointed out that prison warders were in too many cases treated on the same footing as certain subordinate public servants such as customs officers and policemen. Whereas this situation might have been justifiable when their duties had been purely custodial, it must be changed now that higher educational and moral qualifications are being required of them. The salaries of prison officers should therefore be raised to a level appropriate to the complexity of their present-day tasks.

As a matter of fact, the duties and responsibilities of institutional staff approximate to those of teachers. They are in more or less permanent contact with their charges, whereas other public servants such as policemen have a much more limited contact with others. The strain of such permanent and close proximity calls for high personal qualities in the staff who are, in a sense, as much "prisoners" as the inmates. Their remuneration should be commensurate with the exacting nature of their work. Higher pay is justified on other grounds: also, for example the fact that prison staffs are frequently required to work in places far from the nearest town, that they are exposed to certain risks in the course of their duties, etc.

The European Group's recommendation on this subject reads as follows:

"4. The Group considers that the conditions of service of institutional staff should be sufficient to attract and retain the right men. The salaries should not be arbitrarily tied to those of other public servants but should be related to the work which is to be performed in a modern penitentiary system which is complex and arduous and is in the nature of an important social service."

The Asia and Far East Group used the same wording in its recommendation 8 (a) but added a paragraph on housing: (see below):

The Latin American Group made the following recommendations:

"10. Prison staff should receive a salary sufficient to enable them to live respectably; at the same time, the salary should be such as to attract and retain the services of the best qualified persons. Accordingly, the salary should be calculated to compensate for the self-sacrificing service which a modern penitentiary system requires."

"11. To achieve the above purposes, the staff should devote its entire time to its service and have the guarantee of security of tenure, conditional only on good conduct, efficiency and physical fitness. The benefits of the career should be determined in the light of the earlier comments concerning the nature of the service."

The text of that last recommendation was adopted by the Asia and Far East Group as recommendation 9.

The Middle East Group stated, in rule 81 (c) of the regional text of Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, that

"... Their salaries shall be adequate to secure and retain suitable men and women, and their conditions of service shall be favourable in view of the exacting nature of the work."

With regard to staff living quarters, while no recommendation was made by the European Group because it was felt that each country must solve the problem in its own way, the idea emerged from the discussion that the administration should provide suitable dwelling accommodation for the staff, in the neighbourhood of the penal institution but, as far as possible, outside the gates. While it is desirable that the staff should be provided with living quarters free or at nominal rents, the Group considered that it was bad psychology to expose

1. Apart from recommendations in regard to the recruitment and training of prison staff, the Latin American Group adopted a "recommendation on the establishment of an independent welfare society for institutional staff" (see annex 9 of the report of the Rio Seminar):

- "I. With the object of helping to ensure an adequate standard of living for members of prison administrations,
- "II. It is suggested that an independent welfare society should be established as part of the organization of each prison administration or, alternately, co-operatives having the same objects should be established with the participation of all staff. The benefits of this welfare society should also be extended to dependents.
- "III. The welfare society might provide the following services or facilities: a general store for the supply of articles of food and clothing, and the like; social services, including medical assistance and the supply of medicaments; free legal advice; surety for the staff; housing grants; and similar benefits."

staff constantly to the tense atmosphere of the institution. It was emphasized that every effort should be made to avoid a "closed circuit", for the sake both of the supervisory staff and of their families and that staff should be allowed and encouraged to spend their leisure time outside the prison environment.

The Asia and Far East Group adopted the following recommendation on housing:

"[8.] (b) Sufficient suitable dwelling accommodation should be provided for all prison staff in the vicinity of the institution."

It is considered that a recommendation on these lines, but not explicitly extended to all prison staff, should be included in the general conditions of service (see Secretariat recommendation VI, chapter IV).

In view of the recommendation that the staff should be given civil service status, the European Group did not think it necessary to make general recommendations regarding the reputation, age or physical fitness of recruits, since recruitment should be effected chiefly on the basis of occupational qualifications and aptitudes and practical experience. However, the Group pointed out that decisions regarding retention in service should be taken in the light of the staff member's state of health and the nature of his duties. It was also noted that, owing to the shortage of qualified staff, it is sometimes necessary, in certain countries, to call retired officials back into service.

Similarly, the Group adopted no special provisions regarding pension rates and social allowances, working hours, leave, grades and promotion, compensation for accidents at work and occupational diseases, disciplinary measures and rewards, as those matters would be governed by civil service regulations, and practice varied widely from country to country. On the other hand, the European Group felt it should emphasize once more the need for consultation between the various categories of staff on, *inter alia*, conditions of work [see chapter III, section C (c)].

The other groups also refrained from making recommendations on the points mentioned. They are in fact matters es-

entially within national jurisdiction or within the purview of certain United Nations specialized agencies.

(c) *Non-military organization of staff; uniforms; carrying of arms*

In their recommendations the Regional Groups refrained from making any reference to the requirement in certain countries that applicants for appointment as prison officers must have completed a period of active military service.

They also refrained from making any recommendation concerning the wearing of uniforms in the prison service. The European Group noted that the subordinate staff in most countries wore uniforms as part of a well-established tradition dictated by expediency and devoid of any military significance. The uniform was in many cases merely a working dress. It also noted that one of the noteworthy advantages of wearing uniform was that it helped to create an *esprit de corps* and even a family atmosphere among the staff.

All the Regional Groups stressed the civilian nature of prison staff not only by requesting that they should enjoy civil service status, but also in specific recommendations such as that of the European Group in the second paragraph of its recommendation 2 [see also chapter II, section A]:

"[2.] The Group therefore recommends, as a general principle, that such staff should be specifically recruited and not seconded from the armed forces or police or other public services."

The Asia and Far East Group also adopted this text.

The Latin American Group was less categorical in this respect. On the one hand, during the debate, the idea was stressed that prison staff were civilians and should not be chosen from among members of the armed forces or of the police; on the other hand, the Group felt that some flexibility must be allowed in this general rule because there might be former soldiers with an aptitude for the work, not in virtue of their having been soldiers, but in virtue of their vocation and personal training. Service on the prison staff must not be regarded as an outlet for persons from other types of employment; as a rule, prisoners were suspicious of guards who had been in the police or in the armed forces. The Group formulated the following "basic principle":

"5. The Seminar considers that prison staff should be essentially civilian,¹ with the hierarchical divisions necessary in this type of administration, subject to possible variations in form according to the categories described below [under recommendation 9]."

With regard to the discipline to which the staff is subject, the Latin American Group was careful to avoid the term "military discipline" and to speak of "prison discipline" so as to make it clear that the prison system has its own discipline, although the staff is expected to know how to handle arms. The purpose was to combat the strong military influence on the organization and administration of prisons in a region where penal institutions tended to be run on barrack lines. At the same time, it was pointed out that outside guard duty should if possible be performed by professional prison staff and not by soldiers or the police. Accordingly, the Group made the following recommendation (which appears under the heading of "Professional Training"):

"19. Supervisory staff should be organized in accordance with the disciplinary rules of the establishment in order to maintain the necessary grade distinctions and order. It is desirable that prison staff should be responsible for surveillance outside the establishment."

The main difference between staff on the inside guard duty and those on outside guard duty is the carrying of arms. In most countries, prison warders do not carry arms; the only armed personnel are the guards on duty in sentry towers on the prison perimeter, or warders on night duty, in accordance with normal precautions against emergencies.

The European Group considered that, except in special circumstances, staff performing duties which brought them into direct contact with prisoners should not be armed and that any member of the staff entrusted with a weapon should have been trained in its use. The Group also came to the conclusion that while warders generally were not armed in order to prevent prisoners from getting possession of weapons and to avoid other incidents, an even stronger objection to the carrying of arms was that it ran counter to the new methods of treatment. Once the object was to obtain the co-operation of

1. Amended English text (Spanish original: "... debe tener un caracter eminentemente civil ...").

the prisoners themselves in the treatment they were undergoing, the carrying of arms became undesirable because of its adverse psychological effect on the inmate. On the other hand, it was essential not to leave warders without any means of defence, and they should be given special physical training [see chapter III, section B (e)].

The European Group made the following recommendations, which were approved by the Asia and Far East and the Middle East Groups and inserted by the Middle East Group in the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners [rule 89 (c) of the regional text]:

"12. Except in special circumstances, staff performing duties which bring them into direct contact with prisoners should not be armed.

It is also recommended that staff should in no circumstances be provided with arms unless they have been trained how to use them."

The Latin American Group adopted a similar text under the heading "Professional training" [see chapter III, section B (e)].

The Secretariat recommendations concerning the non-military organization of staff and the carrying of arms, based on the recommendations given above, appear in chapter IV, paragraphs VII and VIII.

II. RECRUITMENT OF STAFF

A. *The competent authority; general administrative methods*

The authority responsible for recruitment differs from country to country. In some countries it is the practice for prison directors to recruit their own staffs while in others this is done by the central prison administration. Some centralization, in conformity with the political or constitutional structure of the country, obviously makes it easier to establish rules regarding the requisite qualifications of candidates.

The European Group wished to lay down as an explicit principle that the prison administration should have the last word in the choice of candidates. Moreover it pointed out that it was important that the prison administration should be represented on the recruitment board in countries where prison staff had civil service status and were accordingly

recruited by the central administration, for example through a civil service commission.

Conversely, the Group opposed vigorously recruitment based on non-professional or non-technical considerations. It noted that recruitment based on political considerations presented a real danger, and feeling that the recommendation regarding the status of staff might not be sufficient to cope with this danger, drafted a special recommendation designed to preclude political influence in the recruitment of prison staff.

Reference was also made to the danger of the admission to the prison service of officials from other branches of the civil service, and of priority in appointment being given to pensioners or disabled ex-servicemen, as a reward for military service. This was undesirable from the professional point of view because only professional qualifications should weigh in the selection of recruits to the prison service. This point was dealt with from a slightly different angle in the European Group's recommendation concerning the granting of civil service status, where the Group considered that prison staff should be specially recruited and not seconded from other public services such as the armed forces or the police [recommendation 2, paragraph 2; see chapter I, section C (c)].

The European Group's recommendations concerning the competent authority and general methods of recruitment are as follows:

"3. The Group recommends that:

(a) recruitment should be centralized, either in the penitentiary administration or in a civil service commission;

(b) where the civil service commission is the responsible authority for recruitment, the penitentiary administration should have the last word in the choice of candidates;

(c) provision should be made for precluding political interference in appointments to the staff of the prison service;

(d) the penitentiary administration should not be required to accept men who are not properly qualified for the service."

The wording of the first four paragraphs of the Latin American Group's recommendation 13 resembles closely that of the European Group:

"13. A proper recruitment of prison staff should be guided by the following fundamental principles:

(a) As far as possible recruitment should be centralized, in conformity with the political structure of each country, and be under the direction of a prison administration;

(b) Where other State bodies are responsible for recruitment, the prison administration should have the final say in the choice of candidates;

(c) Provision should be made to exclude political interference with appointments to the staff of the prison service;

(d) Minimum requirements should be stipulated for each category of post. The prison administration should reject candidates who do not possess the required qualifications; . . ."

The Latin American Group also made some observations regarding political interference with particular reference to directors or executive staff [see the text preceding recommendation 16 of the Group in section B (d) of this chapter].

The Asia and Far East Group adopted a text which to some extent combines the texts approved by the other two Groups: the Group deleted the word "fundamental" in the Latin American text and replaced paragraph (a) by paragraph 3 (a) of the European text and paragraph (b) by paragraph 3 (b) of the European text. However, it considered that for constitutional reasons the head of the prison administration in many countries could only have a say and not the final say in the choice of candidates. Lastly, it replaced the words "political interference" in paragraph (c) by the words "political influence" and the words "prison administration" in paragraph (d) by the words "appointing authority". Thus the text adopted by the Group is as follows:

"11. A proper recruitment of staff should be guided by the following principles:

(a) Recruitment should be centralized, either in the penal administration or in a civil service commission;

(b) Where the civil service commission is the responsible authority for recruitment, the penal administration should have a say in the choice of candidates;

(c) Provision should be made to exclude political influence in appointments to the staff of the prison service;

(d) Minimum requirements should be stipulated for each category of post. The appointing authority should reject candidates who do not possess the required qualifications;

Secretariat recommendation IX, (cf. chapter IV), takes into account the differences in the constitutional and administrative structures of the various countries which do not always permit the prison administration to have the final say in the selection of candidates. For the same reason paragraph (d) of the European text cannot be adopted in its present form. In any case, the idea which it embodies appears to be expressed in the preceding paragraphs, particularly paragraph (c).

B. Conditions of recruitment

(a) General

The Latin American Group drafted a general rule under the heading "Recruitment":

"12. The prison administration should be particularly careful in the recruitment of staff, being guided by considerations of integrity, humanitarian approach and competence."

The Asia and Far East Group adopted a similar text (recommendation 10 of the Group) but amended the last portion of the paragraph to read:

... being guided by considerations of integrity, humanitarian approach, intelligence and physical fitness."

This last addition may be considered useful, despite the European Group's remarks concerning physical fitness [see chapter I, section C (b)], because it is important to preclude the recruitment of disabled ex-servicemen, etc.

The Middle East Group endorsed a provision of the Standard Minimum Rules which states another general requirement in regard to recruitment:

"The director, his deputy, and the majority of the other personnel of the institution shall be able to speak the language of the majority of the prisoners."

In conformity with the Secretariat proposal regarding this provision of the Standard Rules, the language requirement should be amended by the addition of the words "or a language understood by the majority of them."

The above recommendations are the subject of Secretariat recommendation X (see chapter IV).

(b) Supervisory staff

The European Group emphasized that the standard of education and intelligence of prison staff in general and of supervisory staff in particular should be sufficiently high to enable them to carry out their duties effectively and to profit by any courses of in-service training that might be provided. The Latin American Group shared this view and the Middle East Group included in the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners a provision (rule 82, paragraph 1 of the regional text) stating that "The personnel shall possess an adequate standard of education and intelligence."

With respect to educational qualifications, many countries do not require any special qualifications of supervisory staff; but it is obvious that higher educational qualifications would add to the prestige and authority, for example, of a chief warden. Moreover, advanced training courses can be organized to enable supervisory staff to obtain educational qualifications and qualify for promotion.

With regard to the means of ensuring that candidates possess the necessary qualifications, the European Group concluded that psychological tests, while useful in determining standards of education, etc., were by no means sufficient to enable the competent authority to form an opinion of the moral worth, integrity and other essential qualities required of candidates. It accordingly expressed the view that appropriate scientific tests should be supplemented by a probationary period to allow experienced officers responsible for observing the candidate to form an opinion of his suitability.

The European Group's recommendation is as follows:

"5. The educational standards and intelligence of officers should be sufficient to enable them to carry out their

duties effectively and to profit by any courses of training that may be provided in the service.

The Group recommends that relevant scientific tests should be used and that there should be a period of observation to allow the competent authorities to form an opinion of the character and suitability of the candidates."

The Latin American Group made similar recommendations but made specific references to various types of tests, including tests of physical fitness, and took the view that the length of the probationary period should be different for the various categories of staff:

"[13.] (e) The institutional staff should possess the intellectual qualities, character and competence required for their posts so that they benefit from the advanced training courses;

(f) For this purpose suitable scientific, physical, intelligence and vocational tests are recommended in addition to the relevant competitive examinations;

(g) Similarly, it is recommended that the staff should serve a period of probation which should be shorter in the case of supervisory staff, and longer in the case of technical and administrative staff."

The Asia and Far East Group retained paragraphs (e) and (f) of the above text in its recommendation 11, but simplified the last paragraph:

"[11.] (g) Similarly, it is recommended that the staff should serve a probationary period."

In general recommendations of this kind, it would in fact seem better not to make any reference to differences in the length of the probationary period for the various categories of staff.

For the Secretariat recommendations concerning the various points in the Regional Groups' recommendations, see chapter IV, recommendation XI.

(c) *Higher administration*

After emphasizing the social service character of the prison staff's work and the need to enlighten public opinion in that respect (see chapter I, section A above) the Latin

American Group stated, under the heading "Basic Principles":

"7. Accordingly, special care should be taken in the appointment of the persons in charge of the prison services; they ought to be suitably trained and have sufficient technical knowledge and experience."

The Asia and Far East Group (recommendation 6) adopted this text and added paragraph (d) of the European Group's recommendation 3, thus making that paragraph more specific than in the European text:

"[6.] The administration should not be required to accept men who are not properly qualified for the service."

This last provision has not been included in the Secretariat recommendations because the idea underlying it is implicit in the various paragraphs of recommendation IX. For the remaining provisions see recommendation XII (chapter IV).

(d) *Directors or executive staff of institutions*

The European Group expressed the opinion that the executive staff of penal institutions should hold university degrees, particularly in sociology and psychology or a diploma of higher social studies, as otherwise there would be a risk of their not having a sufficiently broad outlook. However, it was also pointed out that it might be dangerous to be too exacting in this respect. In the case of some countries insistence on such a requirement would mean that 90 per cent of prison governors were unfit for their posts, which is not the case. The requirement would also have the undesirable effect of preventing promotion from lower grades, thereby depriving the administration of the services of persons particularly qualified to fill higher posts.

It was pointed out in the European Group that practice varied widely from country to country and that the value of university diplomas also differed, depending, for example, on whether they were obtained by attending regular courses or evening courses. In any event it was not certain that a university degree would provide a guarantee of the qualities needed in a prison director. In some countries, directors were required to hold a degree in law, but exclusively legal qualifications were not altogether desirable. A useful balance could be struck through a combination of university graduates and officers who had risen from the ranks and had wide per-

sonal experience and special qualities. It was also pointed out that in some countries it was difficult to attract university graduates to prison work, and that it was therefore particularly important to enable promising officers from the rank and file to acquire university training.

The Group concluded that it would be inadvisable to lay down strict requirements with respect to university degrees and that it should do no more than recommend that directors and assistant directors should have a good general education while at the same time emphasizing the desirability of university training, particularly in sociology and criminology.

The European Group's recommendation is as follows:

"6. In the case of directors or assistant directors, a good educational standard is necessary and there is advantage in attracting to the service persons with university training, particularly in the criminological and sociological fields.

The directors or assistant directors who are recruited from outside the prison service, with no previous experience in that service, should, before taking up their duties, receive theoretical training and be given some practical experience of the work of a prison, it being understood that a diploma or degree in a relevant subject may be regarded as sufficient theoretical training."

The Asia and Far East Group adopted the same text (recommendation 12 of the Group).

The Latin American Group submitted detailed recommendations under the heading "Directors or Executive Staff", and made a distinction between directors of less important prisons and directors of larger prisons, for whom more specific and detailed requirements were laid down:

"14. It is recommended that the directors of establishments in which short-term sentences are served should be qualified for their work, in particular by reason of their moral background and of their personality, competence and experience."

"15. Establishments which are more important because of their size or because they can offer the prisoner special treatment, should be administered by officers who qualify for appointment on the strength of their technical and

administrative ability, personality and vocation. Preferably, persons with specialized knowledge of law or the social sciences (e.g., criminology, higher education, sociology, social service and, in general, sciences which involve adequate training for prison work) should be considered for such appointments."

As the European Group's text merely requires that directors should have a good educational standard and does not insist on university training, the distinction made by the Latin American Group between directors of local prisons and directors of larger establishments would seem to be unnecessary.

With regard to the appointment of persons with practical experience but not in possession of the qualifications enumerated, the view was expressed in the Latin American Group that it was the duty of all prison specialists to fight for the recognition of their profession, and hence professional training must be provided in prison staff schools or criminological institutes for persons who would later be in charge of specialized penal institutions. The infiltration into the service of persons unfamiliar with prison services, who in most cases were appointed through political or personal influence, must be resisted. In a discussion of this view it was pointed out that in some countries the prison system was still in embryonic form and strict rules would be unenforceable. Since political influence had already been rejected, as undesirable, a flexible recommendation should be drafted which would allow for the training of competent staff in the less-developed regions. The point was also made in the Latin American Group, as in the European Group, that lawyers or doctors had not always been particularly suitable as directors of institutions. The text adopted by the Latin American Group is as follows:

"16. When, in exceptional cases, persons without the above qualifications but of proved experience are to be appointed to directorial posts, they should be required to undergo preparation or training for a reasonable period so that they acquire adequate theoretical and practical training. A diploma granted by a specialized vocational school or university degree which proves that the person in question has followed

a relevant course of studies may, of course, be considered as sufficient theoretical training.

The Middle East Group endorsed the provision of the draft Standard Minimum Rules [rule 85, paragraph (a) of the regional text] which states that:

"The director of an institution shall be fully qualified for his task by character, administrative ability and training and experience in this field."

In view of the great difficulty experienced in certain areas in the recruitment of prison directors, the words "fully qualified" have, however, been replaced by the words "sufficiently qualified" in the Secretariat proposal on this point.

The recommendations made by the Secretariat on the basis of the regional recommendations regarding the recruitment of directors appear in chapter IV, paragraph XIII.

(e) *Specialized and administrative staff*

The European Group adopted a general recommendation concerning all categories of specialized staff (same text: Asia and Far East Group, recommendation 16):

"7. The specialized staff should also possess the necessary professional or technical qualifications."

The Latin American Group adopted the following text under the heading "Professional Training":

"21. In the recruitment of technical staff the professional training diploma or university degree evidencing their specialized training should be taken into account."

It is recommended that preference should be given to candidates who, in addition to these professional qualifications, have a second degree or qualification or specialized experience in prison work."

In this connexion the European Group expressed the view that psychologists and psychiatrists for example should have general prison experience and not merely clinical experience (see chapter I, section A).

The Latin American Group made the following recommendation regarding administrative staff (also under the heading "Professional Training"):

"23. It is further recommended that administrative employees and officials should produce evidence of their aptitudes for the work, in the form of certificates of practical

work, certificates of studies or diplomas granted by vocational training schools."

This last recommendation would seem to be already covered in substance by the general wording of the European text but a specific reference should be made therein to administrative staff.

The Secretariat recommendations regarding specialized and administrative staff appear in chapter IV, paragraph XIV:

(f) *Staff of special institutions*

The Latin American Group adopted the following provision (following its recommendation 24; see chapter I, section B) regarding penal institutions for women:

"25. This staff (whether lay or religious) should, as far as possible, have the same qualifications as those required in similar establishments for men."

The Asia and Far East Group combined this text with the first part of the Latin American Group's recommendation 24 and slightly modified the wording:

"17. The staff of women's institutions should consist of and be administered by women.¹ This staff, whatever its nature, should, as far as possible, have the same qualifications as those required in similar establishments for men."

It is considered that the recommendation concerning the qualifications of female staff, whether lay or religious, should be retained but that no recommendation should be made with regard to the directors of women's institutions as the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners do not embody a rule as strict as that proposed by the two Regional Groups (see Secretariat recommendation XV in chapter IV).

Under the heading "Staff of Special Institutions" the Latin American Group also stated that particularly experienced staff should be appointed to special security establishments, including institutions for habitual criminals, for juveniles, the mentally ill, etc.:

"26. The staff of special security establishments should be recruited from among more experienced persons with the specialized knowledge and the personal qualifications which make them suitable for such duties."

¹ I. e. women's institutions should be administered by women.

The Asia and Far East Group did not accept this provision. In fact, the work of the staff of special security establishments cannot be considered to be fundamentally different from that of the staff of other penal institutions, including open institutions for offenders likely to respond particularly well to education and rehabilitation. In any case, the staff of all these institutions should include certain specialists (doctors, psychiatrists, teachers, etc.) for specialized duties in the proper sense.

III. TRAINING OF STAFF

A. General

The European Group stressed the general principle that all institutional staff should receive a professional training which was not purely technical but which also embraced the broader aspects of prison service. It was pointed out that the importance of the spiritual aspect of the prison staff's work should be recognized; that they should have a particular faith in their mission which is the source of that moral strength so necessary to, and so continually called forth in prison work; that the object of the training should be to give the staff a general culture in which theoretical knowledge and experience of life blended to produce a harmony between the spiritual, intellectual, and practical elements, and at the same time to develop the necessary technical and professional qualities.

The Middle East Seminar, in the course of its discussion of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, drafted the relevant general rule in the following terms (rule 82, second and third paragraphs, of the regional text):

"Before entering on duty they [the staff] shall be given a course of training in their general and specific duties and be required to pass theoretical and practical examinations.

After entering on duty and while in service, they shall maintain and improve their knowledge and professional capacity by attending advanced courses of in-service training which shall be organized periodically."

In accordance with this division into two stages, which was already retained in the 1952 questionnaire, it is proposed

to discuss, firstly, vocational training prior to final appointment to the prison service and, secondly, subsequent in-service training. These two stages will be considered in turn with reference to supervisory personnel, executive personnel and specialized personnel. The two provisions quoted above will become Secretariat recommendations XVI and XXII (1) (see chapter IV).

B. Training prior to final appointment

(a) Supervisory staff

After studying the documentary material yielded by the enquiry in Europe, the European Group noted that at present no country requires candidates to possess specialized training before appointment to the supervisory staff.

In some countries professional training is given during an initial probationary period and an effort is made to give new recruits some practical and theoretical training before final appointment. Methods vary from country to country and, generally speaking, are not yet fully worked out. However, the tendency is to perfect the various systems.

There seems to be a certain preference for beginning the professional training of supervisory staff during a probationary period. Few countries organize special courses. Quite commonly, the staff themselves undertake to train newcomers in their spare time and often with inadequate means. This is not an ideal method and the European Group felt it would be preferable if special courses, given by specialists in the various branches of prison administration, were organized in every country.

Another method is to send candidates to a central professional school or to a central prison where courses may last up to six months and where instruction is given by specialists.

A third method is to send candidates direct to a penal institution before they go on to a central training school for theoretical instruction. In such cases, the probationary period may be as long as twelve months.

After considering the situation in the region, the European Group unanimously decided that the staff of penal institutions should receive practical and theoretical training. It emphasized in this connexion what it had said about staff re-

recruitment, namely, that very careful selection of candidates was an essential condition for the success of such initial training and that the personnel recruited must be capable of benefiting from the training. [see above, chapter II, section B (d), recommendation 5 of the European Group].

The training prior to appointment will, of course, depend to a large extent on the size of the prison system and on the special circumstances prevailing in each country.

On the one hand, the European Group was careful not to lay too much emphasis on theoretical instruction for new recruits. On the other hand, it thought that a candidate should not be admitted to actual service before having followed, with success, some practical and theoretical training.

After considering the various possible systems of vocational training, the Group decided in favour of a preliminary stage in a penal institution followed by theoretical training in a special school, for it felt that some practical experience was necessary to enable candidates to benefit from theoretical courses and lectures.

The purpose of the preliminary stage should be to give the candidate some general idea of the prison system and of the practical work involved. It should be a period of vocational guidance, during which a candidate should become familiar with the conditions of prison life and the regulations governing it. In particular, candidates should be taught how to handle people. It should also be possible during this stage to determine the candidate's ability to assimilate new knowledge and profit from theoretical training.

Frequently, the candidate, in the course of or by the end of this stage, will be found to be unsuitable for duty in the prison administration. At times it will be the candidate himself who will not wish to continue in the service. This will save the waste of a prolonged period of theoretical training in a special school.

It was, however, pointed out in the Group that there might be certain dangers in a practical stage performed at a penal institution before training at a special school, since there might be the temptation to employ the new recruit and entrust him prematurely with responsibilities for which he is

unprepared. A way to avoid this risk would be to recruit several candidates at a time and to pass them through the training stage as a group.

The idea was mooted that practical and theoretical training might be combined in this case. The majority of the views expressed, however, were in favour of two successive stages: elementary practical training first and theoretical training afterwards.

With respect to theoretical training, the best method, in the Group's opinion, would be to provide it in a central school where the lectures would be given by specialists.

Finally, the Group considered it advisable to provide for a probationary period of actual service during which candidates who had satisfactorily completed the first two stages could show whether they possessed all the requisite qualifications for final appointment.

From the debates in the Latin American and Asia and Far East Seminars it appears that views on the initial training of supervisory staff in those regions do not differ materially from those expressed by the European Group; this observation is borne out by the recommendations quoted below. The only qualification is that the extent to which such training can be provided for all candidates depends on the financial means available, which vary, of course, from country to country in all three regions.

The European Group's recommendation, which was endorsed by the Asia and Far East Seminar (recommendation 13), reads as follows:

"8. The Group recommends that the training of supervisory staff should be carried out in three stages:

The first stage should take place in a penitentiary institution, its aim being to familiarize the candidate with the special problems of the profession and at the same time to ascertain whether he possesses the necessary qualities. During this initial phase, the candidate should not be given any responsibility, and his work should be constantly supervised by a member of the regular staff.

The second stage should take place in a school organized by the central administration and should consist of theoretical training in professional subjects. Special attention

should be paid to the technique of relations with the prisoners, based on the elementary principles of psychology and penology.

It is recommended that during the first two stages, candidates should be recruited and trained in groups, so as to obviate the possibility of their being prematurely employed in the service, and to facilitate the organization of courses of training.

The third stage, intended for officers who have satisfactorily completed the first two, should consist of actual service during which they will be expected to show that they possess all the requisite qualifications."

The corresponding recommendation of the Latin American Seminar reads as follows:

"17. It is advisable that the professional training of supervisory staff should be progressive in keeping with the following plan:

(a) During the first stage the director should arrange an elementary course for them on educational and practical subjects of a general nature;

(b) During the second stage the officer should attend a school or course organized by the prison administration which should be responsible for the officer's theoretical and practical instruction in professional subjects. This instruction should cover developments in relations with prisoners and elements of criminal and prison law. The course of study relating to laws and regulations should also provide instruction in the elements of prison technique and related subjects;

(c) During the third stage, intended for officers who have shown greatest interest and a vocation, the officer selected should attend more advanced training courses in psychology, criminology, criminal law, penology and other related subjects;

(d) It is recommended that supervisory staff whose work involves direct contact with the prisoners should take over their duties gradually so that they acquire confidence and become better prepared at the same time."

The Latin American Group's recommendations involve, as paragraph (a) suggests, an initial practical stage of the type proposed by the European Group. The phases of training described in the two texts are very much alike. Still, it would seem excessive to require supervisory staff to attend a whole series of advanced courses during the third stage [paragraph (c) of the Latin American text], for the subjects in question are more the concern of specialized and executive personnel. Accordingly, the better solution would be simply to make provision for the possibility of such courses for supervisory staff.

Apart from this point, it is thought that an amalgamation of the two texts cited above will faithfully reflect the ideas expressed by the regional groups (see chapter IV, Secretariat recommendation XVII).

(b) *Directors or executive staff*

The European Group noted that no initial professional training in the proper sense of the term existed for directors and assistant directors. In some countries, such officers are selected on the basis of an examination or of seniority from the lower grades of the administrative staff, or even from the supervisory staff, the main criteria being the experience acquired by those concerned and whatever study courses they may have pursued on their own initiative. The system is not, however, entirely satisfactory for there are certain drawbacks in entrusting such responsible posts solely to persons who have spent long years "in the ranks". In other countries, the practice is direct recruitment of directors or assistant directors on the basis of university degrees, the person selected having in many cases held a specialist post in the prison previously. The Group noted, however, a tendency to organize a practical stage of variable length for such staff prior to their entry on duty.

It appears, therefore, that the methods applied vary greatly. For this reason the European Group felt it necessary to recommend explicitly that directors and assistant directors should receive some training before appointment [see above chapter II, section B (d), recommendation 6, first paragraph].

It was also recommended by the Group that directors and assistant directors recruited from outside the prison service

and having no previous experience in that service should, before taking up their duties, receive theoretical training and be given some practical experience of the work in the prison, it being understood that a diploma or a degree in a relevant subject may be regarded as sufficient theoretical training (*ibid.*, recommendation 6, second paragraph).

Views which in several respects coincide with the above were expressed by the Latin American Seminar [see above, chapter II, section B (d)].

The Secretariat recommendations on the initial training of directors will be found in chapter IV, paragraph XVIII. With reference to the recommendations on the recruitment of directors (paragraph XIII) it will be noted that it is indispensable to take into account existing facilities, which vary widely from country to country. The Secretariat recommendations accordingly do not lay down any rigid requirement regarding university training but stress that the candidates with no previous experience in prison administration should receive theoretical training and be given practical experience.

(c) Specialized staff

With regard to the initial training of specialized staff, the European Group considered that they should possess the necessary professional and technical qualifications [see chapter II, section B (e), recommendation 7 of that Group].

A more detailed recommendation was made by the Latin American Group which stressed in particular that preference should be given to candidates possessing a second diploma or specialized experience in addition to the above qualifications [see chapter II, section B (e), recommendation 21 of that Group].

This Group added a recommendation about assistant specialized staff:

"22. It is also recommended that assistant technical staff should attend at least the more advanced training courses, if the prison administration considers this necessary to complete their training."

The Asia and Far East Group rejected this provision on the grounds that it was covered by the European text. This would appear to be the case. See chapter IV, Secretariat

recommendation XIX, which simply refers to the conditions of recruitment of specialized staff.

(d) Regional institutes for professional training

Professional training raises practical problems for countries whose requirements are not large enough to justify the establishment of a general system of training for executive and specialized staff. In that connexion, the European Group noted the efforts made by several neighbouring countries of similar culture which were prepared to pool their resources in order to set up an Academy of Prison Administration. It would seem that groups of countries in Europe and in other regions might achieve good results by adopting the idea of an international professional school for senior prison staff.

The Latin American, Middle East and Asia and Far East Groups all adopted similar resolutions recommending the establishment of such a training centre, either independently or in association with a research institute.

Thus, on 17 April 1953 the Latin American Group adopted a resolution (see the report of the Seminar, annex 6) recommending

"to the United Nations and the Latin American Governments, the establishment of a Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of offenders . . ."

On 17 December 1953, the Middle East Group adopted a series of recommendations one of which suggested that a special regional centre should be established for the purposes of conducting theoretical and practical research, and another recommendation (report of the Seminar, annex VI, paragraph 2) declared:

"A regional staff training centre should be set up in one of the Arab countries."

The Asia and Far East Group, in a resolution dated 4 November 1954, [report of the Seminar, annex V, paragraph (c)] recommended.

1. Following exchanges of views between the United Nations Secretariat, the Federal Government of Brazil and the Government of the State of Sao Paulo, draft legislation for the establishment of a Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders was laid before the Sao Paulo Parliament in December 1954 by the Governor of the latter State.

"to the United Nations and the Governments of Asia and the Far East, the establishment of a regional Institute for training of personnel and research in the prevention of crime and treatment of offenders".

Secretariat recommendation XX (chapter IV) refers to the establishment of regional training institutes.

(e) *Physical training and training in the use of arms*

It was pointed out with reference to the non-military organization of the staff [see chapter I, section C (c)] that prison staff, and in particular guards, should not be without means of defence and that they should be given special physical training.

The carrying of arms should in principle be confined to outside guards and other officers not in direct contact with prisoners, and at least these members of the prison staff should receive additional training in the use of arms, as is provided in recommendation 12 of the European Group quoted above. (With regard to open institutions, in which no member of the staff must be armed, see documents A/CONF.6/C.2/L.1-3.)

The Latin American Group adopted a similar text:

"18. It is recommended that no weapons should be issued to staff unless they have been trained to use them and instructed in the regulations governing their use."

With regard to physical training, the European Group pointed out that it should be such as to allow staff members to overcome an adversary without serious violence. The "judo" system was mentioned in this connexion and it was further pointed out that knowledge of such a means of defence was of great value because it increased the self-confidence of the warders.

The European Group's recommendation, supported by the Asia and Far East Group, reads as follows:

"13. It is desirable that special training, whether by the system of judo or some other method, be given to prison officers to enable them to restrain aggressive prisoners and to increase their self-confidence."

The Middle East Group inserted this provision of the European Group into the Standard Minimum Rules for the

Treatment of Prisoners but in a somewhat abbreviated form [rule 89 (b) of the regional text]:

"Special physical training should be given to prison officers to enable them to restrain aggressive prisoners and to increase their self-confidence."

The Latin American Group decided upon a slightly different formula:

"20. It is recommended that staff should receive physical training so that they can defend themselves effectively and subdue violent prisoners by the means prescribed by the authorities in the relevant regulations."

Secretariat recommendation XXI (chapter IV) consists of two paragraphs drafted on the basis of the regional recommendations on the two questions described above.

C. *In-service training*

(a) *Advanced training courses*

The European Group noted that existing methods were somewhat inadequate but also that the standard of courses given to prison staff during service tended to improve. A number of countries are already giving their supervisory staff periodical courses of further training devoted mainly to criminology, psychology, elements of psychiatry and the rules and regulations. Meetings are also organized more or less regularly in the form of monthly discussions or semi-annual, annual or biennial conferences attended by all categories of staff.

Where they exist, advanced training courses are generally compulsory at least for part of the prison staff, such as chief warders, and in some countries officers are not considered for promotion until they have successfully completed such courses.

Noting the diversity of systems used and the gaps existing in many countries, the Group decided to recommend as a general rule that supervisory staff should be given in-service training and stressed that this training should be devoted to questions of principle and technique rather than to narrow matters of rules and regulations. Its recommendation is as follows:

"9. Supervisory staff should have in-service training, devoted to questions of principle and technique rather than to narrow matters of rules and regulations."

The Latin American Group, followed in this respect by the Asia and Far East Group (recommendation 18), made the general statement, under the heading "Common Principles", that all prison staff should have the opportunity of attending advanced training courses and suggested how this could be done:

"27. For the purpose of securing better training for the staff and familiarizing them with the organization and operation of each type of institution, there should be a system of staff rotation. Thus, if advanced training courses are given in one establishment only, all should be offered the opportunity to complete their training."

In connexion with the above recommendations, see Secretariat recommendation XXII.

(b) Discussion groups, visits to institutions and seminars for senior personnel

The discussion in the European Group showed that, while few countries of the region had organized courses for directors and assistant directors, it was a common practice to organize periodical meetings at which problems of administration and method were examined and discussed.

It was also stressed that, in the experience of some countries, executive staff and officials of the central prison administration could greatly profit by visits to institutions within the country and abroad, including institutions outside the penal system.

Reference should also be made in this connexion to international seminars on general or special subjects connected with the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, such as those convened by the United Nations in conformity with General Assembly resolution 415 (V).

The European Group made the following recommendation:

"10. For senior staff, group discussions are recommended on matters of practical interest rather than on academic subjects, combined with visits to different types of institutions, including those outside the penal system."

This text will constitute Secretariat recommendation XXIII (chapter IV).

(c) Consultation, visits and meetings for the staff as a whole

The European Group stressed the value of joint in-service training of the various specialists to enable them to acquire a common approach to the problem of penitentiary treatment and ensure that a real team spirit replaced any rivalry between the various specialized branches.

Stress was also laid on the value of including not only specialists and senior personnel but also the guards in such a team and extending to them this spirit of co-operation. So far, in certain countries, there has been a big difference between the attitude of lower rank staff and that of specialized officials and executive staff.

For this reason the Group felt that consultation should include all categories of prison staff and should deal not only with staff working conditions but also with the treatment of offenders, which, in its turn, should embrace the methods generally used with regard to prisoners as well as the methods used in a specific institution. In this connexion the European Group made the following recommendation:

"11. Methods of joint consultation should be established to enable all grades of the staff of institutions to express their opinion on the methods of treatment of prisoners."

The Asia and Far East Group embodied this formula in its recommendation 19, adding to it a sentence taken from the text of the Latin American Group and a recommendation on staff meetings:

"[19.] These methods may be supplemented by lectures, visits to other establishments and even periodic seminars."

"20. It is recommended that arrangements should be made for conferences at which officers may exchange information and discuss professional matters."

This group did not think that questions of discipline and similar problems should be discussed at staff meetings, which, it felt, should be confined to discussion of the treatment of prisoners. On the other hand, it thought that intervention in the administration by outside bodies should be avoided.

In both these matters, the Latin American Group went further. Under the heading "Common Principles" it set out two recommendations, dealing respectively with staff meetings to which it assigned many subjects of discussion and consultations to which it equally gave a wider scope:

"28. It is recommended that regular staff group meetings should be held in each establishment to discuss questions concerning the establishment, staff rules, discipline and the organization of the institution, improvement of the services and the encouragement of cultural activities. These discussions may be supplemented by lectures, visits to other establishments and even periodic seminars."

"29. It is recommended that arrangements should be made for consultations with the prison administration, or where it exists, with the competent technical institute or body, concerning the various technical, disciplinary or administrative problems which arise in the service. All members of the staff should also have the opportunity to express their opinions on such problems and on methods of treatment and to comment on the experience they have acquired in the course of their duties."

The last provision is more of an administrative nature and has little connexion with the subject in question.

The other recommendations are embodied in Secretariat recommendation XXIV (chapter IV). There is no need to go into too much detail about the matters to be discussed since they will vary according to conditions in each country and to the standard of staff training. It might be said that consultation and staff meetings should deal essentially with two subjects: the treatment of offenders and professional matters concerning the prison staff themselves.

IV. DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT

(A) *Modern conception of prison service*

I. *Prison service in the nature of a social service*

(1) Attention is drawn to the change in the nature of prison staffs which results from the development in the conception of their duty from that of guards to that of

members of an important social service demanding ability and good team work on the part of every member.

(2) An effort should be made to arouse and keep alive in the minds both of the public and of the staff an understanding of the nature of modern prison service. For this purpose all appropriate means of informing the public should be used.

II. *Specialization of functions*

(1) This new conception is reflected in the tendency to add to the staff an increasing number of specialists, such as doctors, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, teachers, technical instructors.

(2) This is a healthy tendency and it is recommended that it should be favourably considered by governments even though additional expense would be involved.

III. *Co-ordination*

(1) The increasing specialization may, however, hamper an integrated approach to the treatment of prisoners and present problems in the co-ordination of the work of the various types of specialized staff.

(2) Consequently, in the treatment of prisoners, it is necessary to ensure that all the specialists concerned work together as a team.

(3) It is also considered necessary to ensure, by the appointment of a co-ordinating committee or otherwise, that all the specialized services follow a uniform approach. In this way the members of the staff will also have the advantage of gaining a clearer insight into the various aspects of the problems involved.

(B) *Status of staff and conditions of service*

IV. *Civil service status*

Full-time prison staff should have the status of civil servants, that is, they should:

- (a) be employed by the government of the country or or State and hence be governed by civil service rules;
- (b) be recruited according to certain rules of selection such as competitive examination;

(c) have security of tenure subject only to good conduct, efficiency and physical fitness;

(d) have permanent status and be entitled to the advantages of a civil service career in such matters as promotion, social security, allowances, and retirement or pension benefits.

V. Full-time employment

(1) In principle, prison staff should devote their entire time to their duties and therefore be appointed on a full-time basis.

(2) In particular, the post of director of an institution must not be a part-time appointment.

(3) The social workers, teachers and trade instructors should be employed on a permanent basis.

VI. Conditions of service in general

(1) The conditions of service of institutional staff should be sufficient to attract and retain the best qualified persons.

(2) Salaries and other employment benefits should be so calculated as to ensure an adequate standard of living for members of the staff and to compensate them for the exacting service which a modern penal system requires.

(3) Sufficient and suitable living quarters should be provided for the prison staff in the vicinity of the institution.

VII. Non-military organization of the staff

(1) Prison staff should be organized on civilian lines with a division into ranks or grades as this type of administration requires.

(2) Supervisory staff should be organized in accordance with the disciplinary rules of the penal institution in order to maintain the necessary grade distinctions and order.

(3) As a general rule, it is recommended that staff should be specially recruited and not seconded from the armed forces or police or other public services.

VIII. Carrying of arms

(1) Except in special circumstances, staff performing duties which bring them into direct contact with prisoners should not be armed.

(2) It is also recommended that staff should in no circumstances be provided with arms unless they have been trained in their use.

(3) It is desirable that prison staff should be responsible for surveillance outside the institution.

(C) Recruitment of staff

IX. Competent authority and general administrative methods

(1) As far as possible recruitment should be centralized, in conformity with the structure of each State, and be under the direction of the superior or central prison administration.

(2) Where other State bodies such as a civil service commission are responsible for recruitment, the prison administration should have a say in the selection of candidates.

(3) Provisions should be made to exclude political influence in appointments to the staff of the prison service.

X. General conditions of recruitment

(1) The prison administration should be particularly careful in the recruitment of staff, selecting only persons having the requisite qualities of integrity, humanitarian approach, competence and physical fitness.

(2) Members of the staff should be able to speak the language of the majority of the prisoners, or a language understood by the majority of them.

XI. Supervisory staff

(1) The educational standards and intelligence of the staff should be sufficient to enable them to carry out their duties effectively and to profit by whatever in-service training courses are provided.

(2) Suitable intelligence, vocational and physical tests for the scientific evaluation of the candidates' capacities are recommended in addition to the relevant competitive examinations.

(3) It is also recommended that candidates who have been admitted should serve a probationary period to allow the competent authorities to form an opinion of their personality, character and ability.

XII. Higher administration

Special care should be taken in the appointment of persons who are to fill posts in the higher administration of the prison services; only persons who are suitably trained and have sufficient technical knowledge and experience should be considered.

XIII. Directors or executive staff

(1) The directors or assistant directors of institutions should be adequately qualified for their functions by reason of their character, administrative ability, training and experience.

(2) They should have a good educational standard and a vocation for the work. The administration should endeavour to attract persons with specialized training, particularly in criminology and sociology, or law, higher teaching, social work or other subjects which offer adequate training for prison service.

XIV. Specialized and administrative staff

(1) The staff performing specialized functions, including administrative functions, should possess the professional or technical qualifications required for each of the various functions in question.

(2) The recruitment of specialized staff should therefore be based on the professional training diplomas or university degrees evidencing their special training.

(3) It is recommended that preference should be given to candidates who, in addition to such professional qualifications, have a second degree or qualification, or specialized experience in prison work.

XV. Staff of women's institutions

The staff of women's institutions should consist of women and, whether lay or religious, should, as far as possible, possess the same qualifications as those required for appointment to institutions for men.

(D) Professional training

XVI. Training prior to final appointment

Before entering on duty, staff should be given a course of training in their general and specific duties and be required to pass theoretical and practical examinations.

XVII. Supervisory staff

(1) It is recommended that the professional training of supervisory staff should be carried out progressively in three stages:

(2) The first stage should take place in a penal institution, its aim being to familiarize the candidate with the special problems of the profession and at the same time to ascertain whether he possesses the necessary qualities. During this initial phase, the candidate should not be given any responsibility, and his work should be constantly supervised by a member of the regular staff. The director should arrange an elementary course in educational and practical subjects for the candidates.

(3) During the second stage, the candidate should attend a school or course organized by the superior or central prison administration, which should be responsible for the theoretical and practical training of officers in professional subjects. Special attention should be paid to the technique of relations with the prisoners, based on the elementary principles of psychology and criminology. The training courses should moreover comprise lessons on the elements of penology, prison administration, penal law and related matters.

(4) It is desirable that, during the first two stages candidates should be admitted and trained in groups, so as to obviate the possibility of their being prematurely employed in the service and to facilitate the organization of courses of training.

(5) The third stage, intended for candidates who have satisfactorily completed the first two and shown the greatest interest and a vocation for the service, should consist of actual service during which they will be expected to show that they possess all the requisite qualifications. They

should also be offered an opportunity to attend more advanced training course in psychology, criminology, penal law, penology and related subjects.

(6) It is recommended that supervisory staff whose work involves direct contact with the prisoners should take over their duties gradually so that their self-confidence grows as their training proceeds.

XVIII. *Directors or executive staff*

(1) As methods vary greatly from country to country at the present time, the necessity for adequate training, which directors and assistant directors should have received prior to their appointment in conformity with paragraph XIII above, should be recognized as a general rule.

(2) Where in exceptional cases persons from the outside with no previous experience of the work but with proved experience in similar fields are recruited as directors or assistant directors, they should, before taking up their duties, receive theoretical training and gain practical experience of prison work for a reasonable period, it being understood that a diploma granted by a specialized vocational school or a university degree in a relevant subject may be considered as sufficient theoretical training.

XIX. *Specialized staff*

The initial training to be required from specialized staff is determined by the conditions of recruitment, as described in paragraph XIV above.

XX. *Regional training institutes for prison personnel*

The establishment of regional institutes for the training of the staff of penal and correctional institutions should be encouraged; such institutes should also undertake scientific and practical research on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders.

XXI. *Physical training and instruction in the use of arms*

(1) Prison officers shall be given special physical training to enable them to restrain aggressive prisoners by the means prescribed by the authorities in accordance with the relevant rules and regulations.

(2) Officers who are provided with arms shall be trained in their use and instructed in the regulations governing their use.

XXII. *In-service training*

(1) After taking up their duties and during their career, staff should maintain and improve their knowledge and professional capacity by attending advanced courses of in-service training which are to be organized periodically.

(2) The in-service training of supervisory staff should be concerned with questions of principle and technique rather than solely with rules and regulations.

(3) For the purpose of securing better training for the staff and familiarizing them with the organization and operation of each type of institution, there should be a system of staff rotation. Thus, if advanced training courses are given in one institution only, all members of the staff should be offered the opportunity in turn to complete their training.

XXIII. *Discussion groups, visits to institutions, seminars for senior personnel*

For senior staff, group discussions are recommended on matters of practical interest rather than on academic subjects, combined with visits to different types of institutions, including those outside the penal system.

XXIV. *Joint consultation, visits and meetings for all grades of staff*

(1) Methods of joint consultation should be established to enable all grades of prison personnel to express their opinion on the methods used in the treatment of prisoners. Moreover, lectures, visits to other institutions and, if possible, regular seminars should be organized for all categories of staff.

(2) It is also recommended that meetings should be arranged at which the staff may exchange information and discuss questions of professional interest.

This archiving project is a collaborative effort between United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and American Society of Criminology, Division of International Criminology. Any comments or questions should be directed to Cindy J. Smith at CJSmithphd@comcast.net or Emil Wandzilak at emil.wandzilak@unodc.org.