

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(1\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Greening Juvenile Justice

By Robert Kravitz, President AlturaSolutions

Published: 04/06/2009



Editor's Note: Robert Kravitz is a former building service contractor who has written two books on the professional cleaning industry. He may be reached at rkravitz@rcn.com.

In 2007, the Alameda County Juvenile Justice Center opened in San Leandro, California. The ultramodern building was designed to meet the county's current detention needs as well as those several years into the future. The 379,000-square-foot facility houses five courtrooms, nine related agencies, and 360 beds.

But the building has a plus that might not be noticeable upon first inspection. It was

planned, was designed, and is now operated as a Green facility. In fact, it has met so many health and environmental standards as well as levels of efficiency, it is a LEED® (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Gold-certified building.

Among the building's Green attributes:

- Water-efficient irrigation systems save more than 5,000,000 gallons of water annually.
- The 850 kW solar panels on the rooftop meet more than 60 percent of the facility's electrical needs.
- More than 90 percent of the construction waste was recycled.
- Waterless urinals and water-efficient plumbing save about 2,000,000 gallons of water annually.
- Cleaning is performed using Green-certified cleaning chemicals and products.

“In order for a facility to be LEED certified, it must use Green cleaning chemicals,” says Steven Ashkin, President of The Ashkin Group, the leading advocate for Green cleaning in the professional cleaning industry, and the person in charge of putting together a Green cleaning program for the facility. “And even if the center had not sought LEED certification, there would have been plenty of reasons for it to use Green cleaning products anyway.”

Greener, Safer, Healthier, and More Cost-Effective Why would a detention center choose to use Green cleaning

chemicals even if it is not seeking LEED certification or any other environmental designation or honor? The answer is simple, according to Ashkin. “Environmentally preferable cleaning chemicals are safer, healthier, and surprisingly cost-effective,” he says.

Additionally, and more specific to a detention center, Ashkin mentioned the following:

- Prisoners have been known to drink cleaning chemicals. Sometimes they do this so they can be transferred to the infirmary, which is usually more comfortable than the actual detention center; in other situations, they are simply trying to harm themselves. Green products tend to be less toxic, minimizing the ramifications of such abuse.
- Cleaning tools including chemicals, mop handles, and equipment have been used as weapons; Green products tend to be less harmful if misused, and tools and equipment are typically made of more durable materials, preventing a mop handle, for instance, from being broken off.
- There is less fear of mixing chemicals by accident. Non-Green chemicals such as bleach and ammonia are used in many cleaning situations. However, when mixed together, they can be deadly. Environmentally preferable cleaning products do not contain either of these ingredients.

Ashkin adds that not only are Green cleaning chemicals safer but many of today’s Green products have proved to be very effective, which is also of great concern in a detention center. “Hundreds of people are packed together in a detention center,” he says. “This means infection, disease, and illness can spread quickly. Many if not most environmentally preferable cleaning chemicals and products perform as well as conventional products at eliminating bacteria and infection, helping to keep building occupants healthy.”

Floors a Green Cleaning Concern

Among the big maintenance concerns in a detention facility are the floors. In most settings, the facility has hard-surface flooring throughout—typically vinyl tile—and administrators want these floors to be as clean, shiny, and healthy as possible. “The appearance of the floors plays a significant role in a detention facility,” says Mike Sawchuk, Vice President of Enviro-Solutions, a leading manufacturer of Green cleaning chemicals who works with distributors that have detention center clients. “[If a floor is] messy, dirty, or unkempt, it can lower morale for inmates and staff alike and even encourage disorder. [When floors are] clean and well maintained, they can do just the opposite.”

However, Greening floorcare can be a problem, according to Sawchuk. It has proved more difficult for manufacturers to produce Green floorcare products—such as strippers, restorers, and finishes—that meet the performance levels of conventional products. “This is because most finishes, as an example, contain zinc and other heavy metals that can negatively affect human health,” he says. “Substitutes that do not contain these ingredients have not always proved to be effective.”

Sawchuk sites one situation: a facility owned and operated by the New York state government tested 23 different finishes before they found two that performed as well as the conventional finish they had used before. “Green-certified finishes and strippers do exist, and some are proving to be excellent performers and cost-effective,” he says. “Managers and administrators may need to try different brands in their own facilities to see which works best for them.”

Green Means Green

Many years ago, one reason facility managers were reluctant to select environmentally preferable cleaning products was because they tended to be much more costly than conventional ones. However, after years of

research and new technology, most Green cleaning products cost the same or even less to use than conventional products.

One reason for this is the fact that Green cleaning chemicals are usually highly concentrated, allowing them to go further, which saves money. Additionally, auto-dispensing systems are usually part of a Green cleaning program. Depending on the use of the product, these systems dilute the concentrated cleaner with water so just enough chemical is used to do the job satisfactorily so there is no waste.

And the savings can add up. The city of Santa Monica, California, reports that their costs for cleaning chemicals has been reduced by 5 percent simply by switching to Green cleaning products. Savings such as these have been replicated by the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Chicago Public School System, and the states of Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and others.

“And don’t forget the ‘intangible’ savings that often result from the use of environmentally preferable cleaning products,” says Ashkin. “We now know that a number of health problems—from respiratory ailments such as asthma to headaches, dizziness, and fatigue—have been tied to conventional cleaning products. When inmates get sick, it costs the facility—and ultimately the taxpayer—more money.”

With the current economic situation and virtually every state struggling to decrease costs and expenditures, it is a rare opportunity when a facility can be cleaner, healthier, and more fiscally responsible all at the same time. The use of Green cleaning chemicals offers that opportunity. When used in a detention facility, this may also translate into a more peaceful, optimally run center as well.

Sidebar:

More than Chemicals

Although Green-certified cleaning chemicals play a significant role in keeping a facility healthier, it should be understood that they are just one component of a Green cleaning system. Ashkin says that a Green cleaning system also involves such things as:

- High-performance mats at key entries to help capture soils and contaminants and keep them outside
- Microfiber cloths and mops that require less water and chemical to work effectively
- HEPA-filter vacuum cleaners to help protect indoor air quality
- Floorcare equipment with built-in vacuum systems to reduce airborne particulates

[Other articles by Robert Kravitz](#)

Comments:

1. ***jfn3253*** on 04/09/2009:

This makes great common sense. Anyone interested in really green products should check

out www.WowGreen.net. These are brand new enzyme based products for cleaning that are used in industry and homes - safe for infants and even us older adults. One salesman actually drank the cleaning product in front of us to show it's safe. The product was designed by Ezyme Environmental Solutions in Fort Wayne and WowGreen just took over the distributions rights. It's a network marketing group so find a representative near you. If you're in Fort Wayne area and interested in learning more about it, contact me.

Login to let us know what you think

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[Forgot password?](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 04/12/2010 [Having the Mr. Rogers Syndrome](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Management of Tuberculosis](#)

- 04/12/2010 [Northpoint Staff Honored By General Assembly](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Rapport, humor, and training](#)

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(1\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Having the Mr. Rogers Syndrome

By Tracy E. Barnhart

Published: 04/12/2010



Dear sir; I am almost never moved to respond to comments made about articles that I write but yours gave me that much needed movement.

“Dear Mr. Barnhart, First of all let me thank you for your service to our country and now to the public. I have read all of your posting and though I don’t disagree with most of your opinions it seems that you leaning on the side of what I like to call “The Mister Rogers Syndrome”. I have worked the streets and behind glass (because bars are inhumane)

*for over 23 years and it’s always a changing environment. I am proudly an A**Hole, my mother says I get it naturally and I use it daily, but for me it doesn’t matter if its an inmate or staff the key is being fair, firm and consistent. Just to clarify I have also never been assaulted and have the respect of over 600 inmates as a regular officer but as a tactical officer I have had to use the minimal amount of force necessary to complete the mission and still have that respect. One of the issues that I have seen over and over is “weakness” “back pedaling.” Most of the assaults I have seen are on “Mr. Rogers” types, they want to give, give and help these poor misunderstood humans until its time to kick butt and all the inmate sees is a liar and a hypocrite.”*

Now that I have returned from the restroom I will respond to your comment. On February 19th, 1968 Mr. Rogers Neighborhood made its first broadcast and since that date has become the longest running PBS program in history. I can only hope that my corrections career goes for 30 years without any discipline, criminal prosecution and ultimately termination. I say that because in the eight years that I have been a corrections officer I have seen countless officers investigated, terminated as well as prosecuted from force related issues.

My training related articles are geared toward officer survival issues and providing the knowledge that officers usually find out about only after the pre-disciplinary hearing. I in no way want you to be soft and timid on your post. I want you to be confident and knowledgeable in how, when and why you utilize force. I am a firm believer that officers are under trained in force related issues and administrations have the philosophy that, “If we don’t say the ‘FORCE’ word, they won’t use it.”

“Say it ain’t so!” You know I am right when I say that in corrections your use of force training relentlessly instructs you what you should not and will not do, but falls short in informing you when you can, and must use force to ensure order. This decisional issue is often left up to supervisors called to the incident to de-escalate and moderate problems. However, most correctional supervisors are just as in the dark as the officers they are directing as it pertains to the use of force. The correctional society is 20 years behind the law enforcement society as it pertains to the education and allowances in the use of force, and America is ten years behind Canada as it relates to law enforcement use of force knowledge and tactics.

The fact of this article that I hope to bring home is that we can’t do it like we did it ten years ago and I can only imagine how we will do it ten years from now. Our agency is currently under a use of force related lawsuit, Department of Justice investigations and my institution in particular is constantly in the news because we apparently are too quick to go hands on with the inmates. So for you to make the comment that I have a Mr. Rogers Syndrome makes me laugh and the phrase has now been coined at our institution. Do you remember your first internal investigation for a use of force? You can’t tell me that it didn’t take some of the wind out of your motivational sails. When I was a police lieutenant I gave Grand Jury testimony which resulted in the indictment of four of my police officers for a use of force related incident in which I was the shift watch commander.

There are thousands of uses of force related complaints and lawsuits lodged against law enforcement and correctional officers each year. A surprising report given by the National Center for Women and Policing was given that women currently comprise 12.7% of sworn personnel in big city police agencies, we would expect that female officers in these agencies should be involved in approximately 12.7% of the citizen complaints, sustained allegations, or payouts for excessive force. Yet the data indicate that only 5% of the citizen complaints for excessive force and 2% of the sustained allegations of excessive force in large agencies involve female officers. No, I am not saying that all correctional officers should be women but you have to stop and wonder what they are doing right.

- Civil Liability Payouts: The average male officer costs somewhere between two and a half and five and a half times more than the average female officer in excessive force liability lawsuit payouts.
- Sustained Allegations: The average male officer is over eight and a half times more likely than his female counterpart to have an allegation of excessive force sustained against him.
- Citizen Complaints: The average male officer is two to three times more likely than the average female officer to have a citizen name him in a complaint of excessive force.

With every article that I write I am attempting to educate the correctional officers across the country on the When, How and Why to use force and give you the necessary pre requisites, requirements, justifications and indicators. Your report must justify the “need” to use force to control or restrain a person who is breaking the law or resisting your lawful command. Simply, you should use progressively stronger techniques to bring about compliance and stop when you have gained and can maintain control over the person. This gives a person ample opportunity to comply before being subjected to stronger control techniques or the possibility of being injured. Can your use of force report answer these questions?

- The need for application of force: Was there sufficient reason to use force?
- The relationship between the amount of force used and what type of force was actually required.

- The extent of the injury inflicted by you, the arresting officer, on the person being arrested.
- The behavior of the person at the time of the force related incident.
- The actions of third parties present during the incident.
- The physical odds against you, the officer. This includes size differences as well as the number of individuals involved.

Physical confrontations often happen very quickly, as you know, but this does not justify using force in an excessive, unnecessary or malicious manner. Whenever harm is caused by negligence or the use of excessive force, you may be held liable or your liability may be shared by your department and other officers. Such liability has far reaching consequences that may include criminal and/or tort (civil) action against you. Therefore, you should use force only when warranted and solely as a means to control or restrain a person who is breaking the law or resisting a lawful arrest. This however, should not detract from using force when necessary.

Just the other day while I was video taping a violent incident an aggravated inmate who would not comply punched an officer who was using his verbal strategies in an attempt to de-escalate. Yet after the assault the officers continued their relentless verbalization in an attempt to de-escalate the inmate as he ranted and raved throughout the pod. The inmate was never restrained. I look back and the officers were clearly justified in restraining the inmate in order to bring about compliance after the assault but chose not too. Why? Were they fearful of being investigated? Did they not understand the use of force continuum? Or was it the political climate of the institution that prevented them from going hands on? I honestly believe it was a combination of all the factors.

In the federal civil action Madrid v. Gomez, which successfully challenged the use of force at Pelican Bay State Prison, on grounds of violation of the eighth amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the U.S. District Court also noted the necessity for the use of force:

Perhaps the paramount responsibility of prison administrators is to maintain the safety and security of both staff and inmates.... Prison officials have the 'unenviable task of keeping dangerous men in safe custody under humane conditions.' There is no question that this demanding and often thankless undertaking will require prison staff to use force against inmates. Indeed, responsible deployment of force is not only justifiable on many occasions, but absolutely necessary to maintain the security of the institution. As one expert at trial succinctly stated, when it comes to force it is "as dangerous to use too little as it is to use too much."

I am in agreement with you brother when it pertains to the current "Hands off policies" resulting from lawsuits and court settlements and the "Cover Their Ass Administrators" that has made our jobs harder. Correctional and law enforcement officers today are sometimes confused and apprehensive about when to initiate the use of force and often need a red light / green light indicator to start. Just realize that I am on your side and I want you to stay on the right side of the bars, that being the outside.

[Visit the Tracy Barnhart page](#)

Comments:

1. **charst46** on 05/11/2010:

Tracy, I agree with your statements. I have returned to Corrections after leaving it for a short bit. I work with new staff constantly now as I am on graves, the traditional place for new folks in our system. The use of force is almost always there, in the background usually, but still there. You can sense with staff if there is a fear of inmates or not. There are discussions regarding if we think someone will have 'your back'. These discussions are attempts by new and old staff to make sense of a new situation. The framework in which these discussions occur is created by administration and how administration approaches use of force incidents. There is and never will be justification for excessive use of force. There have been several instances where staff were justified in using force in our institution, but staff did not use it. The end result of the situations turned out appropriately for staff and offender. No violence resulted. Conversely, there have been several uses of force in other situations and it has been quite justified. 'Pulling the trigger' will always be a judgement call in the mind of the staff member. The line between appropriate use and inappropriate use can be quite gray. I think, in the end, what saves an officer is this: did the officer try to de-escalate and make sincere efforts to de-escalate a situation. It helps to build a reputation of working with to maintain standards as opposed to forcing compliance. But make no mistake, when force is necessary, it must be used. Being male and ex-military, I can feel at times that I personally am being challenged. My rep is being called into question by an inmate. But in the long run, my ability to walk away, his or her ability to walk away to scream and argue with me about a rule violation is better enhanced when I can check my ego at the door and focus on the bigger picture: having a good job and a rewarding career.

Login to let us know what you think

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[Forgot password?](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 04/12/2010 [Having the Mr. Rogers Syndrome](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Management of Tuberculosis](#)

- 04/12/2010 [Northpoint Staff Honored By General Assembly](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Rapport, humor, and training](#)

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(0\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Management of Tuberculosis

By *Federal Bureau of Prisons*

Published: 04/12/2010



Editors Note: The following is an excerpt of the Clinical Guidelines for the Management of Tuberculosis released in January 2010 by the Federal Bureau of Prisons

Purpose

The Federal Bureau of Prisons Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Tuberculosis (TB) provide recommendations for the treatment of federal inmates with TB infection and disease and for the management of contacts to infectious TB cases.

Epidemiology, Transmission, and

Natural History

TB incidence in the United States decreased during the past decade, largely as a result of more intensive TB control efforts. Nevertheless, TB control remains a public health priority for correctional systems, since TB outbreaks continue to occur in U.S. jails and prisons. Furthermore, a significant proportion of TB cases in the U.S. occur among persons who are over-represented in certain jails or prisons, including racial/ethnic minority populations, persons with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection, and persons born in foreign countries that have high rates of TB.

M. tuberculosis, the organism that causes TB, is transmitted through airborne respiratory droplets when an individual with active pulmonary TB coughs, sneezes, speaks, or sings. Transmission of *M. tuberculosis* depends on the length of time and frequency of the exposure, the degree of contagiousness of the infected person, the environment and airflow in which the exposure occurred, and the intensity of the contact with the TB organism itself. Infection with *M. tuberculosis* usually requires prolonged contact with an infectious case in an enclosed space. The majority of persons who become infected never develop active TB.

The most significant risk factor for LTBI is country of origin. The general U.S. population has an estimated TB infection rate of only 5-10%; whereas foreign born populations have an average estimated TB infection rate of 32%, with rates varying widely throughout the world. Other risk factors for infection with TB include injection drug use; being a resident or employee in congregate settings such as prisons and jails, health care facilities, and homeless shelters; and most notably, being a known contact of an active TB case. On average, 30% of

household contacts to infectious TB cases have a positive TST.

Approximately 5% of infected persons develop active TB disease during the first year or two after infection. In another 2-5%, disease will develop later in their lives. Certain medical conditions increase the risk that TB infection will progress to disease, the most important of which is HIV infection. Appendix 1 (Tuberculosis Risk Factors) lists conditions associated with a higher risk of TB disease, including evidence of prior TB disease on chest radiograph (CXR), injection drug use, history of organ transplant, immunosuppressive therapy (including steroids and anti-TNF alpha drugs), diabetes mellitus, and chronic renal failure.

Screening

Screening for TB in correctional facilities involves both ongoing surveillance for active TB disease and detection of latent TB infection. Early detection and isolation of inmates with suspected pulmonary TB is critical to preventing widespread TB transmission. Identification of latent TB infection provides an opportunity for providing treatment to prevent future development of TB disease.

Down load the full FBOP report - ["Management of Tuberculosis - FBPO - Clinical Guidelines"](#).

Comments:

No comments have been posted for this article.

Login to let us know what you think

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[Forgot password?](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 04/12/2010 [Having the Mr. Rogers Syndrome](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Management of Tuberculosis](#)

- 04/12/2010 [Northpoint Staff Honored By General Assembly](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Rapport, humor, and training](#)

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(0\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Northpoint Staff Honored By General Assembly

By *Lisa Lamb, KY DOC, Director of Communications*

Published: 04/12/2010



The Kentucky State Senate and House of Representatives honored the staff at the Northpoint Training Center on March 23rd, in recognition of their bravery and heroic actions on the night of the riot. The NTC staff was introduced in both legislative chambers and a resolution was read that commended their actions. They received a standing ovation in the Senate.

The resolution was sponsored in the Senate by Senator Jimmy Higdon, R-Lebanon, and Senator Tom Buford, R-Nicholasville; and in the House it was co-sponsored by Rep. Mike Harmon, D-Danville, and Rep. Kent Stevens, D-Lawrenceburg.

A representative group of NTC employees who were on duty when the riot erupted were able to attend and were accompanied by Warden Steve Haney and former NTC Deputy Warden of Security Don Bottom (now warden at Blackburn Correctional Complex.)

Several DOC and Justice Cabinet officials watched from the House and Senate galleries including Secretary J. Michael Brown, Commissioner LaDonna Thompson, and Deputy Commissioners Al Parke, Rodney Ballard and Kim Potter-Blair. Warden Kim Whitley was also in attendance.

Several senators stood after the resolution was read to add their own tribute to the Northpoint staff.

A RESOLUTION honoring Department of Corrections personnel for their exemplary service during the disturbance at Northpoint Training Center near Burgin, Kentucky.

WHEREAS, Northpoint Training Center is a medium security prison operated by the Kentucky Department of Corrections that housed approximately 1,200 male inmates; and

WHEREAS, on August 21, 2009, at approximately 6:30 p.m., scores of inmates at the Northpoint Training Center set fire to six buildings on the compound, destroying the medical unit, kitchen, sanitation, visiting, canteen, and multi-purpose building; and also causing extensive damage to five of the six living units at the prison; and

WHEREAS, Department of Corrections personnel immediately activated the Department's critical incident management plan and deployed Corrections Emergency Response Teams from various institutions to the scene; and

WHEREAS, the quick action of these heroic Correctional officers and staff allowed the Department of Corrections to regain control of the prison in under four hours without loss of life, serious injury, taking of hostages, or escape;

NOW, THEREFORE,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

- Section 1. The Senate does hereby honor Department of Corrections personnel whose bravery and dedication to service was instrumental in quelling the inmate disturbance at Northpoint Training Center on August 21, 2009.
- Section 2. The Senate applauds these individuals for their training, courage, and professionalism.
- Section 3. When the Senate adjourns this day, it does so in honor of the Department of Corrections personnel who were involved in resolving the Northpoint Training Center disturbance.
- Section 4. The Clerk of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Capitol Annex offices of Senators Jimmy Higdon and Tom Buford.

Comments:

No comments have been posted for this article.

Login to let us know what you think

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[**Forgot password?**](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 04/12/2010 [Having the Mr. Rogers Syndrome](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Management of Tuberculosis](#)

- 04/12/2010 [Northpoint Staff Honored By General Assembly](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Rapport, humor, and training](#)

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(1\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Rapport, humor, and training

By *Joe Bouchard*

Published: 04/12/2010



The stage was set. The class was divided into two competitive teams. Each team was provided with a sock and a small metal container filled with mints

In a purposely vague manner, I told them that the sock and the tin of mints were all that they could use to construct a weapon (or weapons). They had fifteen minutes to complete their task.

The only other rule was that they had to conceal their work whenever I was within arm's length of their work area. As I "made rounds", the students were very creative in camouflaging, making distractions, and keeping me oblivious of

their craftsmanship.

While making a round to the team that dubbed themselves "The Average Joes", I was knocked off my square (albeit briefly) by what I saw. One of the participants had used a marker (an unauthorized tool in this exercise) and drawn a Joe Bouchard puppet on one of the socks that I provided. It was unflattering, but amusing. In the many times that I have facilitated this exercise, I had never been "rewarded" with a sock puppet of myself. Live and learn.

The sock artist looked at me with an expression of amusement and challenge – clear provocation. What is an instructor to do? Did I risk losing face by letting this insolence go unchecked? Should I take control in a commanding way? Should I feign indignity to lighten the mood?

I simply looked the artist dead in the eyes and demanded with faux disapproval that the sock portrait should have a goatee. Without missing a beat, the artist's teammate implored that the puppet should also have hair.

It was a great teaching moment for me. A student's creativity pulled us into a spontaneous bit of levity. I believe this loosened the class a bit more and allowed for more creativity.

There is a fine balance in training between command and clownery. This condition is complicated by the various classroom personas that instructors adopt. I am sure that one can chart on a continuum the dogmatic and entertaining types of facilitators. And certainly, more instructors are plotted in the middle rather than on the

extremes.

When things work out well, the facilitator recognizes creativity among the students and allows this to lead the class in other directions. Therefore, the instructor must be willing to give up a little control in order to let others instruct. Otherwise, the lesson is more of a two-dimensional lecture with unrealized possibilities.

The flip side of that is pandemonium. The instructor must be able to ride what may become a high powered sports car in the form of creativity run amok. And when participants are very creative, it is not unlike a white knuckle drive in a very powerful and dangerous vehicle.

This philosophy of balance has been with us since ancient times. Remember that Icarus was advised to take the middle road – not to fly too close to the sun, nor to have wings wetted down by the sea foam. Moderation is the key.

In addition, facilitators must be true to their natures. If you are more comfortable as a factual conduit of knowledge, that is the path you should take. If, on the other hand, you shine as an entertainer, that should be your teaching tactic.

And all of this is tempered by the nature of the training. Some topics are dry due to their content. That does not, however, lessen their importance in the scheme of things. Also, there are very serious topics and debriefings that should be presented in a straight forward, serious manner.

In training, one never knows what funny, strange, or instructive things can occur. In addition to providing circumstances where pre-professionals in a college class could learn about contraband, there was more. I saw teamwork, camaraderie, quick improvisation, and humor. Plus, I have a sock puppet souvenir.

Bouchard, Joseph, Editor. Icebreaker 101 Jefferson City, MO. IACTP Publications, "Contraband Corner" 22-25:2007.

[Visit the Joe Bouchard page](#)

Comments:

1. **jstrong814** on 04/07/2010:

Very good article.

Login to let us know what you think

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[Forgot password?](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 04/12/2010 [Having the Mr. Rogers Syndrome](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Management of Tuberculosis](#)

- 04/12/2010 [Northpoint Staff Honored By General Assembly](#)
- 04/12/2010 [Rapport, humor, and training](#)