
MANAGEMENT OF PROTECTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE IN PRISONS AS AN ELEMENT
INCREASING SAFETY OF PENITENTIARY EMPLOYEES

Oktawia Jurgilewicz¹, Paweł Hydzik², Norbert Malec³, Jolanta Itrich-Drabarek⁴

^{1,2}Rzeszów University of Technology, Aleja Powstańców Warszawy 12, 35-959 Rzeszów, Poland

³University of Natural Sciences and Humanities in Siedlce, Stanisława Konarskiego 2, 08-110, Siedlce, Poland

⁴University of Warsaw, Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28, 00-927, Warszawa Poland

E-mails: ¹niemieco@prz.edu.pl; ²phydzik@prz.edu.pl; ³norbert.malec@uph.edu.pl; ⁴j.itrich-draba@uw.edu.pl

Received 18 February 2019; accepted 10 January 2020; published 30 March 2020

Abstract. By fulfilling their tasks, employees of isolation institutions contribute to the subjective sense of security of citizens. At the same time, the staff of these institutions and their dependents become a security entity which, due to the dynamically changing sense of danger on the part of prisoners, requires active prevention of factors threatening the correct execution of the penalty of imprisonment (aggression against officers, violence against inmates, self-aggression, suicidal behaviors, etc.). In fact, by undertaking a number of preventive measures, staff undoubtedly manages security in penitentiary facilities. It is also important to use appropriate protective infrastructure depending on the type and type of prison. It is worth paying attention to the situation of Polish prisons. Political changes in Poland after 1989 also caused transformations in the prison system. A characteristic feature of these changes is the normalization of relations between prison staff and prisoners. Amendments to criminal legislation, including penitentiary, have adapted the legal situation in prisons to international standards. In theory and practice, attention is paid to a more subjective treatment of persons deprived of their liberty and greater protection of their rights and freedoms.

Keywords: penitentiary institution; personal safety; security management; protective infrastructure

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Jurgilewicz, O., Hydzik, P., Malec, N., Itrich-Drabarek, J. 2020. Management of protective infrastructure in prisons as an element increasing safety of penitentiary employees. *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 9(3), 887-896. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2020.9.3\(14\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2020.9.3(14))

JEL Classifications: K32

Additional disciplines: law

1. Introduction

Penitentiary institutions are places where a group of people staying there with the employees of these institutions (officers, carers, therapists) create a specific climate and microcosm. The two-part community operating in an isolated microworld is doomed to itself around the clock. Staff members are just as hermetic as those under control (convicted, detained on remand, charges) and spend more life in a penitentiary institution than most people they supervise. The only difference is that these communities came to the penitentiary institution for completely different reasons: convicted - because he must, and the staff because he wants. Condemned, because that's what the court decided, and the staff because they decided to work here. The prisoner found himself in the institution by force, while the staff of his own free will. Coercion and freedom in undertaking various activities are mutually exclusive.

This relationship completely reflects the atmosphere prevailing among the bipolar community of penitentiary

institutions. Usually, a large population of people staying in a penitentiary institution, by nature, creates a social system with a complex structure in which elements of formal operating principles are intertwined with elements of informal relationships in an extremely complex way. A person staying in a penitentiary institution feels the impact of two polarly different decision systems coming from penitentiary employees and informal stratification of the community of isolated people.

2. Personal security management in penitentiary units

The staff of a penitentiary institution has the task of performing various functions for those under care, including educational, correctional and resocializing services, etc. The subject of the penitentiary institution is forced to comply with the staff's requirements, i.e. a legally sanctioned decision system. The second system having a significant impact on the functioning of legally isolated people are informal phenomena occurring in penitentiary institutions and they include, among others: informal stratification, various forms of so-called "Second life", which can include: aggression, self-harm, the phenomenon of tattooing, etc. All these phenomena are referred to in literature as the so-called "Prison subculture" (Dolata, 2011)

The prison subculture is an informal, created by people in isolation, various forms of mutual interpersonal relationships that differentiate convicts into better and worse, which undoubtedly contributes to the threat to the security of penitentiary institutions, so it cannot be tolerated by staff, i.e. a legal decision-making system.

The phenomenon of the prison subculture is not a new phenomenon. It was known at various times in the development of penitentiary institutions. Both moral and legal norms, language of the tattoo, and some institutions, as specific phenomena of this phenomenon were already known in the nineteenth century and often described as specific phenomena of this phenomenon (Dostojewski, 2009).

The prison subculture is a dynamic phenomenon that is expressed primarily in the variability and diversity of its forms, among others in the area of language bustle, tattoos and self-injury of prisoners and has a significant relationship with the security in penitentiary facilities (Przybyliński 2006).

The penalty of deprivation of liberty and other forms of isolation of persons violating the legal order and threatening the security of other individuals are the furthest-reaching forms of interference in the sphere of human rights and freedoms. Penitentiary isolation entails many negative consequences for incarnated units, among which situations and phenomena that pose a threat to the security of charges of penitentiary institutions, as well as the personnel responsible for creating safe conditions of stay during isolation occupy a special place. Precise identification of threats to the personal safety of isolated persons and staff is extremely difficult. It should be remembered that the nature of these threats is not homogeneous, and the intensity and scope of impact varies greatly. Phenomena and situations posing a threat to personal security include: phenomena associated with the prison subculture (various forms of aggression, self-harm, tattoo), the process of prizonization, intentional and unintentional actions or omissions on the part of the administration and the activities of criminal environments inside and outside isolation units (Szaskiewicz, 1997).

In Poland, penitentiary units are divided into prisons (87 units) and detention centers (70 units). Over 60% of prisons and detention centers were built before World War I. After World War II, 23% of units were built or adopted for the needs of prison. Currently, the infrastructure of penitentiary units is in the phase of modernization and expansion, due to the need to increase the accommodation of prisoners and to improve the technical condition and safety of the residential facilities and administrative penitentiary employees (Knap, 2005). From the point of view of criminological prevention, the issue of resocialisation of an offender in conditions of institutional isolation is of significant importance. Among the existing criminal measures, the most controversial is the imprisonment and conditions for its implementation. For many years, reflections on the usefulness of this punishment for the correct and effective process of resocialization have been conducted. Solutions to problems related to imprisonment are sought not only in the practical implementation of the penalty in individual countries, but also internationally. In reflections on penitentiary issues, there is a great deal of pessimism regarding

the effectiveness of imprisonment as a means of social readaptation.

The postulates are formulated for conducting a thorough analysis of the issue of prison isolation in all its aspects, including in the aspect of broadly understood security. The need to review the theoretical output and empirical research regarding the application and implementation of a prison sentence from the point of view of its effectiveness and enforcement effects should be fully recognized (Hołyst, 2016).

Scientific literature and results of empirical research indicate that in isolation institutions, negative changes in the human psyche, disturbances in the sphere of consciousness, feelings and decision-making occur more often than in normal environments, which in turn leads to behavioral disorders. This is manifested by the already mentioned aggressive and auto-aggressive behavior of people in isolation, threatening not only the safe conditions of serving a sentence, but also the safety of penitentiary employees (Hołyst, 2018). Psychologists examining the conditions of execution of a prison sentence emphasize the inadequacy of the isolation conditions created by the institution to the requirements of the proper mental and physical functioning of the individual. They justify their comments to prisons that man not only lives in a social and natural environment, but also his mental functions can only develop in interaction with the environment. The number and quality of environmental stimuli decide whether these functions will develop better or worse, whether they will operate in a correct or abnormal way (Hołyst, 2016). The conditions in which punishment is carried out in prison result in a failure to meet many needs. Among others, the need for self-realization, self-esteem, security, love, friendship, association and contacts with other people are deprived. As a result, there appears in the mind of convicts a sense of threat to oneself, which is strongly associated with various forms of aggression, including that directed against staff (Kędzierski, 2017).

Prison is a multifaceted and quite complicated institution, and its functioning is part of the criminal policy of the state. In turn, his task is not only to isolate criminals, but also to change their attitudes to pro-social, and thus discourage them from continuing criminal activities. The prison consists of two communities: prisoners and staff. They have different roles and goals. Therefore, there is a conflict interaction between them, which should be minimized at all costs in order to fully implement the task exchange. On the one hand, we are dealing with people who should be treated with dignity, not ignoring the principles of humanitarianism, and on the other, with ruthless criminals who often showed brutality. Therefore, it is not difficult to notice that working in isolation institutions is not easy and safe (Sołtysiak, 2012).

The penalty of deprivation of liberty performs preventive, punitive and educational functions. Preventive impact of punishment should be understood as, on the one hand, isolating the convict from the society preventing further offenses, and on the other, showing the public that the consequence of violating legal norms by committing a crime is criminal liability resulting in prison isolation. The content of the punitive function of punishment is its ailment, by deprivation of liberty, society repays the convict for his crime. Educational functions can be performed by aiming at achieving the goal of punishment of acting on a convicted person (Knap, 2005).

The execution of a prison sentence is aimed at changing the sentenced person, who will stop him in the future from committing crimes. Polish legal regulations in the field of penal law clearly emphasize that a person deprived of liberty, having the right to obtain assistance in pursuing these changes, must demonstrate in this respect their own activity and will to cooperate (Penal Code, 1997).

The penitentiary institution is a place where people who have been convicted with a final judgment of a prison sentence of imprisonment. This penalty consists in the forced placing of a convicted person for a specified period in a closed and guarded place. In addition to having to be in prison. In addition, a person in prison is subject to the rigors arising from the prison regulations, restriction of contacts with persons from outside the prison, limitation and even inability to be released under passes and the application of statutory penalties for offenses against discipline. To sum up the prison, in other words prison is a place where people convicted by a final court sentence serve a prison sentence. However, it should be remembered that prisons are intended for imprisonment, and detention on remand is in custody.

In Poland, in accordance with the Executive Penal Code (hereinafter SQC), prisons are subject to the Minister of Justice, and hence, by means of ordinances and orders, they can create new prisons, both as independent or as separate branches of prisons and detention centers (Code executive penalty, 1997). Four types of penitentiary facilities can be distinguished in Polish penitentiary law, namely facilities for juveniles, for penitentiary repeat offenders, for those serving prisoners for the first time and for those serving a military custody (Hołda, 1999). All of these establishments can be organized as closed, semi-open and open penitentiary (Dąbkiewicz, 2018).

The type of prisons determines the category of people for whom a given unit is intended. Individual types differ from each other in the degree of protection, isolation of those staying there, their obligations, permissions to move around the unit, as well as outside it. Importantly, women are imprisoned in separate prisons or in special departments for men's facilities. In addition, the Polish penitentiary system creates unlimited possibilities for the creation of penitentiary units, which can not only be responsible for the needs of prisoners of certain categories, but can also create the possibility of modeling the conditions of serving the sentence, so as to maximally use the period of penitentiary isolation to achieve corrective goals. (Bulenda, Musidłowski, 2003). There are four types of prison in Poland, namely the prison for: juveniles; serving their sentence for the first time; penitentiary repeat offenders and serving a military custody (Dąbkiewicz, 2018).

The first of these facilities, namely juvenile detention center, was separated in order to isolate convicts from the demoralizing influence of other prisoners, as well as from the belief that the group of juvenile offenders is a group of people who are still in the period of mental and biological development, in connection with which is a great chance, than for adults, of applying yet effective impacts on their attitudes (Stando-Kawecka, 2000). Juvenile detention centers are intended for persons under 21 years of age. If an adolescent has at least six months left to the end of his sentence, he may apply for parole, while an adolescent who has problems with upbringing must undergo psychological examination.

The provisions of the juvenile detention center regulations stipulate that physical education, sports and cultural and world education classes are conducted in this type of facilities, meetings with families and cooperation with trustworthy persons are organized. Convicted persons who are serving a sentence in this penitentiary institution, namely a semi-open and closed type, also have the right to additional visits in a month. This group of convicts, i.e. juveniles, are not subject to more severe disciplinary penalties (Stando-Kawecka, 2000).

The second type of penitentiary institutions, namely the penitentiary institutions for those serving the sentence for the first time, are persons who have not been directed to the juvenile institution, those serving a prison sentence, for penitentiary offenders, as well as convicts who are serving a substitute prison sentence ruled in the same case. Persons who have been convicted of unintentional offenses may also serve their sentences in facilities for those serving the sentence for the first time. Persons in such establishments have the right to benefit from teaching, employment as well as sports and socio-educational activities in a prison. As for the third type of facilities, namely penitentiary facilities for penitentiary offenders, adults who have been convicted of an intentional offense to imprisonment or a substitute sentence of imprisonment and persons who have been punished for intentional, substitute offenses are punished in this type of facilities or basic detention, and this applies to persons who have previously served this type of punishment or military detention for intentional crimes or offenses, unless any exceptional social rehabilitation considerations call for the referral of these persons to the penitentiary institution for those serving the sentence for the first time (Dąbkiewicz, 2000).

The fourth type of plant is military detention, this type of plant applies to soldiers. This type of military detention lasts at least a month and the longest two years. The convict is obliged to study and work. In this type of plant, it is very important to observe military discipline as well as elements of military training. Convicts are placed in different rooms, maintaining a hierarchy regarding the rank of the military. In such facilities, all convicts serve their sentence in full military uniform, but without the national emblem, as well as without military signs and degrees (Dąbkiewicz, 2018).

In addition to the abovementioned facilities, there are also prisons for women, which constitute 3% of the popu-

lation sentenced to imprisonment (Siemaszko, 2009).

Pursuant to Article 70 § 1 of the Penal Code, all types of bets can be organized as open, semi-open and closed bets. Individual types of establishments differ primarily in the degree of protection, the degree of isolation of convicts and, what is important, the resulting obligations and authorizations in the field of moving inside and outside the plant (Article 70 §2 of the Penal Code). The basic scope of the convicts' rights, which concerns the freedom of movement and the possibility of maintaining contact with the outside world in all types of prisons, are determined by the provisions of the Executive Penal Code and complement them by the provisions of the regulations (Stando - Kawecka, 2000).

Closed type penitentiary institutions (Executive Penal Code, 1997) and pre-trial detention centers are organized as part of a full security system which is characterized, among others, by:

- residential cells of convicts may be open during the daytime for a specified period of time, if security reasons do not prevent it,
- convicts may be employed outside the prison in a full convoy system,
- cultural, educational and sports activities as well as teaching are organized within the prison,
- movement of prisoners around the prison takes place in an organized manner and under supervision,
- convicts may use their own underwear and footwear, and with the permission of the director of the prison - also with clothing,
- convicts may enjoy two visits a month, and with the consent of the director of the penitentiary institution, use them once,
- view of convicts are subject to supervision by the prison administration; conversations of convicts during visits are subject to control by the prison administration,
- correspondence of convicts is subject to censorship of the penitentiary administration, unless the law provides otherwise,
- phone calls of convicts are subject to control by the prison administration.

Semi-open prisons (Executive Penal Code Act, 1997) are organized within a limited protection system which is characterized, among others, by:

- residential cells of convicts remain open during the day, while at night they can be closed,
- convicts may be employed outside the prison in a reduced system escorting or not escorting, including at individual work stations,
- convicts may be allowed to participate in teaching, training and activities therapeutic organized outside the prison,
- convicts may participate in group cultural, educational or sport activities organized by the administration outside the prison facility,
- convicts can move around the prison in fixed times and places in internal order,
- convicts may use their own clothing, underwear and footwear,
- convicts may be granted leave from the prison, not more often than once every two months, for a total of not more than 14 days in a given year,
- convicts may enjoy three visits per month, which may be combined with the consent of the director of the penitentiary institution,
- view of convicts are subject to supervision by the prison administration; conversations of convicts during visits may be subject to prison administration control,
- correspondence of convicts may be subject to censorship of the penitentiary administration,
- phone calls of convicts may be subject to control by the prison administration.

Open type penitentiary institutions (Executive Penal Code, 1997) are organized as part of a simplified protection system which is characterized, among others, by:

- residential cells of convicts remain open around the clock,
- convicts are employed primarily outside the prison, without a escort at individual work stations,
- convicts may be allowed to participate in teaching, training and activities therapeutic organized outside the prison,
- convicts may take part in organized by the administration, outside the facility criminal, group cultural and educational or sports activities,
- convicts may be allowed to participate in cultural and educational activities and events or sports organized outside the prison,
- convicts can move around the prison in fixed times and places in internal order,
- convicts may use their own clothing, underwear and footwear,
- convicts may receive from the deposit of a penitentiary money at their disposal,
- convicts may be granted leave from the prison, not more often than once a month, in total for a period not exceeding 28 days a year,
- convict may enjoy an unlimited number of visits,
- view of convicts may be subject to supervision by the prison administration.
- convicts, if possible, create conditions for additional preparation own meals,
- correspondence of convicts is not subject to censorship of the penitentiary administration,
- phone calls of convicts are not subject to control by the prison administration.

The functioning of security systems is carried out based on physical protection, and the protective infrastructure used by the Prison Service consists, inter alia, in the application of technical protective safeguards, alarming and communication means. Technical and protective safeguards are mechanical, electrical, electronic and construction safeguards (Macwaldowski, 2014). Construction and mechanical security are a permanent basis and do not change as significantly as the electronic security infrastructure.

The dynamic development and the increasing availability of electronic security systems have made them widely used in ensuring the security of penitentiary units. Gradually, there was a shift away from manning armed posts in favor of electronic monitoring and control systems. The architectural diversity of the facilities of the Prison Service, the location of the facilities within the unit, the use of various security systems means that one solution cannot be adopted to ensure security. Currently used solutions include:

1. Intruder alarm system (SSWiN) is one of the basic alarm systems. In organizational units, he performs the following functions:

- panic (permanent panic buttons located in the department wards, tutors, psychologists, in the outpatient department, in the corridors of residential departments, at posts, in the rooms supervising the work of prisoners - kitchen, workshops, warehouses, etc., also robotic pilots among departmental, tutors, psychologists, officers providing and implementing walks, visions;
- burglary (mainly perimeter protection, implemented by means of motion detectors, infrared barriers, microwaves, laser detectors, glass break detectors, vibrating detectors, smoke detectors, etc., but also rooms such as armament warehouses, secret offices, server rooms, archives, warehouses, entrances / exits from residential pavilions e.g. emergency exits, hatches or roof, basement windows, etc.).

2. The Access Control System (SKD) is implemented on the basis of proximity access cards and access privileges granted to these cards to specific people to specific places. The access card is treated as a key. It may allow the opening of doors and entrance grilles for residential buildings and departments, as well as doors and transition grilles in passageways only to the extent necessary for the performance of official duties performed by its user. To the implemented access control systems, the Prison Service has introduced modern electronic chips to the company ID card, which are also a cryptographic card containing database access keys and an electronic signature. Cards are issued by the Central Certification Point in the Central Board of the Prison

Service. The basis for opening the cell door is still mechanical keys. Locks, electromagnetic locks, electric strikes, electromechanical locks are executive elements in Access Control systems. The quality of these devices and the right selection for the functions carried out guarantees their efficient functioning. As experience of individuals shows, they are one of the most important elements affecting the movement of people and their safety in a penitentiary unit. As part of secure access control to rooms and zones, biometric identification and access systems are increasingly used in penitentiary units. The purpose of the biometric facility security control system is to allow access to specific places for specific people identified through biometric features. It is possible, among others through the use of biometric readers (more accurate identification of persons, linking other existing identifiers with their owner). Biometry allows for precise identification of people by using their unique characteristic features, which include fingerprint characteristics, hand geometry, face, ear, mouth geometry, iris structure, finger, hand or wrist vein system, and voice color (Bolle, Connell, Pankanti, Senior, 2003). As practice shows, biometric identification is more reliable than traditional methods to ensure security such as passwords or PIN access codes. Biometric readers are currently used in many areas of security. They have been used in access control systems since the seventies of the last century. Initially (due to high costs) biometric readers were installed only in protected facilities, such as nuclear power plants, military facilities, facilities of strategic importance (Hołyst, 2018). The rapid development of microprocessor technologies has made the availability of biometric systems more and more common, and their precision and reliability have increased significantly. As a result, they were used in many security systems intended for special security facilities, which are undoubtedly prisons and detention centers (Hołyst, Pomykała, 2010).

3. Video monitoring system (CCTV). When it comes to saturation of penitentiary units with video surveillance cameras, statistically per unit is about 83 cameras. It is important when organizing the operator / observer position to create appropriate, ergonomic working conditions to achieve the expected effectiveness of observation. In some places, mounting cameras is optional when it comes to observations of the unit's area or selected rooms of art. 73 sq m There are also places on the premises of the unit where the installation of cameras is obligatory and this applies especially to convicts who pose a serious social threat or a serious threat to the security of the plant or it was decided to carry out self-examination against them, this applies especially to those detained on remand (Article 212c of the Penal Code). In addition, by decision of the director of the unit, the camera can be installed in a residential cell and obligatorily in a security cell. The rule is that they should be cameras resistant to mechanical damage caused by prisoners and enabling surveillance also at night in the absence of lighting. Monitoring used in penitentiary units must guarantee uninterrupted, continuous operation.

4. Fire signaling system (SSP) Due to the specificity of prison facilities, certain penalties in the use of fire regulations are applied in penitentiary units. Fire alarm systems are usually installed indoors, not in entire buildings. These special rooms are: weaponry warehouse, handy weaponry warehouse, offices and archives. Due to the 24-hour supervision of physical protection, environmental conditions, behavior of prisoners who often devastate equipment, smoke cigarettes, the use of residential fire alarm systems in pavilions does not meet expectations.

A large number of cameras installed and other elements of the alarm systems, forces the installation of systems supporting the work of the operator-observer. For example, through integration or the ability to switch projected images through motion detection, intelligent image analysis. Intercoms are used to establish fast, remote communication. Intercoms, there are three solutions installed in prisons for communication between:

- prisoners in residential cells, common rooms and a departmental officer,
- prisoners and a person in a "contactless vision", i.e. seeing in a way that prevents direct contact with the visitor,
- a person at the crossings in the unit and the operator's position.

These are independent systems that should meet certain requirements: intercoms must be resistant to mechanical damage by prisoners. Video intercoms and intercoms are used at the entrances and entry gates to the unit. A separate group of devices used to ensure the security of penitentiary units are devices for controlling people and rooms, as well as detectors detecting prohibited items.

Security officers of the Prison Service use various types of control equipment. In addition to electronic devices, properly trained dogs are also used for control. An officer equipped with mechanical or electronic devices is obliged to use them for personal or cursory control of prisoners, persons from freedom, cells and other rooms, packages and objects as well as vehicles entering the penitentiary unit. Gate metal detectors - used at the entrances to units, and very often used manual metal detectors equipped with security officers. They are used to control people, parcels, correspondence, cells and rooms (things owned by prisoners). These devices are most often used in the daily work of officers.

Drug and explosive detectors used to detect drugs (in packages, correspondence, on the premises, indoors, for residential purposes, as well as by people entering the penitentiary unit) also use specially trained dogs to detect drugs. Chemical testers are used to recognize substances or ingestion of psychoactive substances. X-ray scanners are used to scan parcels that can be received by prisoners, correspondence to prisoners and SW units, as well as luggage, bags of persons applying for or leaving the premises of the unit. They are in all closed type prisons and detention centers. Scanners are also used to scan people, vehicles entering / entering the premises of the unit and outgoing / leaving. Cell phone detectors and devices interfering with the frequency of waves at which devices using mobile telephony operate.

3. Summary

Officers of the Prison Service and employees of the penitentiary unit use various wired and wireless communication systems as part of internal communication and to ensure security. All penitentiary units in Poland have online access to the Central Database of Persons Deprived of Freedom. Noe.NET is a system of records of persons staying in penitentiary units (convicted, detained and on remand). Access to the system is allowed only from the internal network, the user is equipped with an electronic certificate card issued by the Certification Point of the Central Board of Prison Service.

Other services, courts, have access to the dedicated database resource. The Noe.NET database has been classified as particularly important for national security. Electronic surveillance system (SDE) - The Prison Service is the administrator of the electronic surveillance system. This is the aforementioned prison system outside prison. The system is based on a transmitter on a hand or leg in a bracelet and a module for contact with the supervisory center installed in the convict's place of residence. This module communicates with the monitoring central in the GSM network. A schedule is programmed in the control panel when the supervised person should stay at home and when outside. Rules are established for contacting, alerting and responding when a schedule is violated (Macwaldowski, 2014).

The most difficult tasks in terms of protection and to ensure security are performed by the Intervention Groups of the Prison Service (GISW). They are to prevent extraordinary accidents, intervene during prisoner revolts and collective instances. Their existence is primarily psychological and preventive. GISW were established on the basis of an ordinance on the principles of organization and scope of activity of full-time Prison Service Intervention Groups, signed on March 31, 2010 by the Director General of the Prison Service (Kochański, 2010).

Individual provisions of the ordinance specify in detail the scope of the prison intervention group, the type of equipment, uniforms, as well as matters related to its training. Each group, consisting of 16 officers, is appointed by the SW district director and, as a superior, commissions various tasks. Group members are at the disposal of the district director 24 hours a day. The district director is obliged to provide officers of the subordinate intervention group with training and training base. As the name suggests, this is a group for intervention, not for supervision over prisoners. The main argument in favor of the creation of GISW is a change in the approach to protective activities with an emphasis on internal protection. It is about the implementation of preventive measures, e.g. conducting more frequent ad hoc inspections of facilities and prisoners, securing departmental work, control of technical and protective security, implementation of convoys of convicts requiring increased protective measures (e.g. crown witnesses or so-called dangerous prisoners). Members of the intervention group are used to secure the individual in a natural disaster situation, e.g. by organizing and evacuating prisoners to other prisons and detention centers.

In addition, in situations of the highest threat, e.g. active rebellion, where the forces of a given unit are no longer sufficient, intervention actions of specialized groups, which are undoubtedly GISW, significantly contribute to increasing the security of penitentiary units. SW intervention groups also carry out many additional tasks. They carry out, among others: implementation of convoys of particularly dangerous prisoners, transport of particularly dangerous prisoners to other units, transport to courts, transport to hospitals, transport of prisoners requiring increased protection measures, control of cells and rooms in units, prevention of extraordinary events or liquidation of their effects, training other officers in the field of intervention techniques. In addition, officers of the intervention groups of the Prison Service actively cooperate with officers of other formations gaining new practical and theoretical experience. These include: terrorist subunits of other uniformed formations, as well as the Police, Border Guard, Military Police, Customs Service and others (Prison Service), which further strengthens the sense of personal security in penitentiary units.

References

- Bolle, R., Connell, J., Pankanti, S., Senior, A. (red.) (2008). *Biometria, [Biometrics]*, Warszawa: IliM.
- Bulenda, T., Musidłowski, R. (2003). *System penitencjarny i postpenitencjarny w Polsce, [Penitentiary and post-penitentiary system in Poland]*. Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych.
- Ciosek, M. (1997). *Człowiek w obliczu izolacji więziennej. [A man in the face of prison isolation]*. Gdańsk: Stella Maris.
- Dąbkiewicz, K. (2018). *Kodeks karny wykonawczy. Komentarz wyd. IV, [Executive Penal Code. Ed. Comment IV]*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Dolata, T. (2011). *Problemy związane z tzw. „drugim życiem” w niektórych polskich zakładach karnych. [Problems related to the so-called “Second life” in some Polish prisons]* *Probacja*, 3, 59-62.
- Dostojewski, F. (2009). *Wspomnienia z domu umarłych. [Memories of the home of the dead]*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo KR.
- Hołda, Z. (1999). *Prawo karne wykonawcze. [Executive criminal law]*. Kraków: Wolters Kluwer.
- Hołyst, B. (2016). *Kryminologia. [Criminology]* Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Hołyst, B. (2018). *Kryminalistyka. [Forensics]*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Hołyst, B. (2018). *Psychologia Kryminalistyczna. [Forensic Psychology]*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Hołyst, B., Pomykała, J. (red.) (2010). *Podpis elektroniczny i biometryczne metody identyfikacji [Electronic signature and biometric identification methods]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Menedżerskiej.
- Iwański, Z. (2011). *Kryzys kary pozbawienia wolności [Crisis of imprisonment]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Menedżerskiej.
- Kędzierski, W. (2017). *Deprywacyjne oraz subkulturowe aspekty odbywania kary pozbawienia wolności [Deprivative and subcultural aspects of serving a prison sentence]*. *Probacja*, 1, 54-57.
- Knap, W. (2005). *Więzienia polskie [Polish prisons]*. Warszawa: Centralny Zarząd Służby Więziennej.
- Kochański, P. (2010). *Grupy Interwencyjne Służby Więziennej. [Prison Service Intervention Groups]*. *Forum Penitencjarne*, 10, 16-17.
- Macwaldowski, C. (2014). *Zabezpieczenia ochronne zakładów karnych i aresztów śledczych. [Protective safeguards of prisons and detention centers]* <https://edu.cossw.pl/file/redir.php?id=6360>.
- Przybyliński, S. (2006). *Podkultura więzienna w procesie zmian. [w:] H. Machel (red.) Wykonanie kary pozbawienia wolności w Polsce – w poszukiwaniu skuteczności [Prison subculture in the process of change. [in:] H. Machel (ed.) Performance of imprisonment in Poland - in search of effectiveness]* (s. 241 – 243). Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Siemaszko, A. (red.) (2009). *Atlas przestępczości w Polsce. [Atlas of crime in Poland]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Wymiaru Sprawiedliwości.
- Sołtysiak, T. (2012). *Wybrane aspekty pracy penitencjarnej. [Selected aspects of penitentiary work]* Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego.

Stando-Kawecka, B. (2000). *Prawne podstawy resocjalizacji, [Legal basis of resocialization]*, Kraków: Zakamycze

Szaszkiewicz, M. (1997). *Tajemnice grypsarki. [Secrets of influenza]*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Ekspertyz Sądowych.
Ustawa z dnia 6 czerwca 1997 r. Kodeks Karny [The Act of June 6, 1997, the Criminal Code] (Dz.U. z 1997 r. nr 88, poz. 553 ze zm.).

Ustawa z dnia 6 czerwca 1997 r. Kodeks Karny Wykonawczy [The Act of June 6, 1997, the Executive Penal Code] (Dz. U. z 2018 r. poz. 652 ze zm.).

Dr Oktawia JURGILEWICZ
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1293-6933

Dr Paweł HYDZIK
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7152-3197.

Dr hab. Norbert MALEC
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0119-2705

Prof. Jolanta ITRICH-DRABAREK
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7509-3561