

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

FALL 1997

BENEFITS OF NETWORKING FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

by

Richard E. Wyett
Chief

Division of Adult Probation and Parole
State of Nevada

Being an administrator of a community corrections agency without the benefit of networking with other state or county agencies can leave one behind and uninformed about changes that are occurring in this business. Regardless of the size of one's agency or the character of the community served, networking is vital. The business of corrections is changing rapidly, due in part to the increase of street violence and unsafe neighborhoods, a lack of community resources, unfunded mandates and limited budgets, overcrowded prisons, Megan's Law, and the movement of offenders through the Interstate Compact, to name a few. It has become increasingly apparent that one cannot stand alone and survive in this business today.

The need for meaningful communication and a willingness to cooperate with other agencies, organizations, and individuals are essential for an administrator's survival. On a regular basis community corrections administrators interact with police officials, welfare and social service agencies personnel, educators, prison officials, parole board members and staff, elected office holders, and treatment providers. These continuous relationships — whether they be formal or informal in nature — are critical to accomplishing the mission of the community corrections agency; however, when confronted with a problem that is unique to community corrections, who should the administrator look to for guidance? The answer should be obvious! Who would better understand the mission and goals of community corrections than another administrator with a similar agency? But how does one go about

locating other administrators with similar type agencies and responsibilities in a pinch? Networking may not be the only answer, but it is certainly a good start.

Knowledge is power. By networking, one can gain knowledge of and insight into the directions other states are going. As an example, community notification of sex offenders (Megan's Law) is causing certain offenders to shop for supervision in states that have not enacted similar laws. The states that anticipated problems associated with community notification and implemented policies and procedures prior to Megan's Law being enacted are now leading the "pack," so to speak. Networking with community corrections administrators in those states can be of invaluable assistance in developing a similar system and in avoiding some of their mistakes learned the hard way.

Let's take another example, the Interstate Compact. No state or county is rolling out the "red carpet" to welcome violent offenders into their jurisdiction. Likewise, they are glad to see violent offenders leave and transfer to other states for community supervision. Again, by networking one can meet other administrators in a group or one-on-one to discuss these types of problems and share and consider different views. Remember we are still in a war against crime. We will not win unless everyone works towards a common goal. The only difference between a criminal offender in the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada is his or her address. They have a tendency to look the same, act the same, and, in some cases, it has been



CONTENTS

Benefits of Networking for Administrators in Community Corrections, <i>Richard E. Wyett</i>	1
President's Message, <i>Dave Savage</i>	2
Our Responsibility as a Profession, <i>Joe Lehman</i>	3
Helping to Keep our Communities Safe, <i>Beth Anderson</i>	4
Contrasting Systems, <i>Bob Moore</i>	6
Interest-Based Bargaining for the Probation and Parole Executive, <i>Randy Parr</i>	7
When You Decide to Arm Your Staff, <i>Warren R. Emmer</i>	8
Combatting the Crime Problem by Reinforcing Good, <i>Dan Richard Beto</i>	10
News From the Field	11

said they even smell the same. But there is one indisputable trait they all possess, and that is a well-rehearsed line of "bull____."

The Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) supports several networks to promote exchange of ideas. NIC can provide a list of consultants who provide technical assistance and training in many areas of law enforcement and community corrections. NIC also provides financial assistance for travel costs to observe other agencies' programs. The State of Nevada, like others, has benefited greatly from the assistance of this very helpful federal agency. As part of its service, NIC promotes the practice of CASE (Copy And Steal Everything). My own motto is if I don't bring something back from a network meeting, the trip was a waste of time and money. When I travel to the meetings, I make sure I have extra space in my luggage because I always return with more materials and ideas than I brought. Another valuable resource is the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), an organization devoted to enhancing the quality of the probation profession by developing and delivering workshops and seminars for executives in community corrections. NAPE, like NIC, is able to provide technical assistance to national, state, and local governments, and to private institutions.

As a fellow administrator in community corrections, I look forward to meeting you and sharing ideas with you, as well as demonstrating the CASE system. The solutions to your agency's problems could be just a telephone call away. As an administrator, I personally cannot imagine going through the past five years without the hundred and one contacts that I have made with other administrators in community corrections. The underlying premise of networking is not only for sharing and exchanging ideas, but also the added benefit of all the years of experience in this field, which can be substantial. For example, in the Network of Executives of State Probation and Parole, of which I am a member, there are 27 state administrators with an average of 20+ years experience each. That equals a grand total of 540 years of experience in the field of community corrections! Over the past five years there have been few problems I have encountered that some member in this network has not experienced or dealt with before. Their knowledge and experience have been invaluable resources to me.

There's an old saying, "if you live alone, the chances are you will die alone." Community corrections administrators who engage in networking will not have to worry about this occurring.

Remember, networking works!

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



This edition of the *Executive Exchange* contains articles on a variety of subjects relating to administering community corrections and probation programs. I appreciate the contributions from each of the authors and the work of co-editors Marianne McNabb and Kaye Adkins. Both are Regional Administrators in the Washington State Department of Corrections and members of NAPE.

As the holiday season approaches and we end another year to get ready for the challenges of 1998, on behalf of the NAPE Board, I share with you our wish for the warmest of holiday blessings and success in meeting the challenges of a new year. Best wishes!

Dave Savage
President

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

Executive Exchange, the quarterly journal of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), publishes articles, reports, book reviews, commentaries, and news items of interest to community corrections administrators. The contents of articles or other materials contained in *Executive Exchange* do not reflect the endorsements, official attitudes, or positions of the Association or the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University unless so stated.

The contents of this issue are copyrighted. Articles may be reproduced without charge as long as permission is obtained from the editor and credit is given to both the author and *Executive Exchange*.

Submissions for publication consideration should be typed on 8½ by 11 inch paper, doublespaced, with at least one inch margins. Manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a black and white photograph for possible inclusion. Manuscripts exceeding one page in length should be submitted on a computer diskette, with the software used indicated.

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* should be directed to Dan Richard Beto at (409) 294-1675. Facsimiles may be sent to (409) 294-1671. All correspondence regarding *Executive Exchange* should be sent to the following:

Dan Richard Beto, Director
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296

The Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University serves as the Secretariat for the National Association of Probation Executives. *Executive Exchange* is published by Sam Houston Press & Copy Center.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY AS A PROFESSION

by
Joe Lehman
Secretary
Washington State Department of Corrections



If we are a profession by definition, what we do day to day as an occupation must be informed by a body of theoretical knowledge and research. If that condition does not exist, then by definition, we are not a profession. The interesting question is, "Whose obligation is it to ensure that this very basic condition is met?" One might conclude that all of us who work in the field have some responsibility to see that this occurs. At the same time, in order for this to occur, leaders within the profession, those of us who define what an agency does on a daily basis, must create the expectations, permission, and conditions for this to happen.

The problem is that, as a profession, we have been negatively influenced for far too long by a very popular and politicized notion that, aside from punishing and surveilling people, we had no capacity to change offenders. We have lived through a very trying time referred to as the "nothing works" era — a doctrine asserted by Don Martinson in the early 1970s. The bottom line is that we knew then that it was not true, and we know now that it is not true. Unfortunately during those dark times in which our profession's activities were politicized, we became intimidated and, in many systems across the country, programs were cut from budgets. Probation and community corrections systems re-oriented themselves around the whole issue of surveillance as the predominant task. We even changed our language about what we do to reflect the more popular politically correct notion that all we can do is be "mean and tough" either in the community or behind the walls.

What we now know from the meta-analysis of the research in our profession is that we can and are making a difference. If we focus or direct our interventions appropriately to specific offender populations or sub-populations, we do, in fact, have a capacity to intervene in offenders' lives.

Now that we have this research, the question is, "What are we to do with it?" The dilemma is, because our profession has been politicized and because we have been "beat up" and "victimized" by the political process, our organizations have not always collected information in ways that allow us to evaluate what we currently do. We have been leery of doing so for fear of being held accountable for things for which we simply cannot or should not be held accountable.

The end result being, as Todd Clear (1997) has suggested, that what we are doing today is often inconsistent with what we have learned from the meta-analysis. There is, in much of what we are doing, unfortunately, a disconnect between what we now know and how our profession is behaving, a sort of "organizational cognitive dissonance" as it were.

What that means is, we have some re-thinking and re-engineering to do. We have not created the necessary processes,

internal to our organization, that make the information available through research live in our organization. It is both a reality and challenge within our own agency. What we have to do as executives is create those structures and processes internally. We have to institutionalize a process whereby staff at all levels know not only what the research says but what relevance it has to what staff are doing on a daily basis.

In many respects the first step is to recognize that, as a hybrid of human service and criminal justice, we have created a culture and structures that are oriented around the individual case. Additionally correctional agencies have, for the most part, been created to be out of sight and out of mind. What we have done in the past is cloak ourselves in a veil of confidentiality. Our information systems, for the most part, were not established to easily manipulate and analyze data at the aggregate level. We have not readily come to value this data nor have we regularly used it to inform our decision making and policies.

Three events in the external environment will inevitably push us in a different direction. Put briefly, they are: 1) the increasing demand in the public sector to move to performance measures, most notably outcome measures; 2) the use of aggregate data for management purposes by other criminal justice agencies, most notably the police; and 3) the increasing demand of the public to know more about the offender, where they are and what they are doing. In the latter case, the cloak of anonymity previously provided to the offender by the system is being shed.

The fact is, we need to re-tool our organizations so, like the state and local police agencies, we can take data at the aggregate level and use it in a proactive way in the allocation of our resources. That may mean looking to local law enforcement in terms of their use of MAPPING and GIS systems. It should mean looking at aggregate data relative to the existence of dynamic risk characteristics in the offender population and establishing a priority in activities directed at influencing them in relation to feasibility and probable outcomes. Once again, it is the notion of stepping back; the willingness to look beyond the individual case management perspective to looking at aggregate data from a broader perspective and inviting the researchers to participate in that process.

And that brings us back to the whole issue of research and its role in our business. Understandably, part of our reluctance to use research is the fact that researchers generally write for other academicians. They often talk in languages that just are not understood by policy makers or they couch their findings and qualify them so much that they become meaningless. I think one of the real contributions of what Don Andrews, Paul Gendreau, and others have done in their meta-analysis is that they have taken and reviewed all the existing research that met certain methodological standards. They looked at the variables that exist in those programs that seem to have worked or have not worked and they have published those in a format that is much more user friendly to the policy maker in our profession today. Gendreau and Andrews give us principles of effective intervention and principles of ineffective intervention. In that sense they are like a compass pointing directions for us, in terms of our policy making and the development of programs.

As a profession, we need to also guard against being so narrowly focused that we are only looking at the literature and research in the United States or only in the area of correctional

intervention. We need to broaden our perspective to recognize that in terms of influencing criminal behavior there are other research venues to which we ought to be paying attention — for example, prevention as well as the experiences and research in policing.

Along with the notion that our case management perspective has limited us, so has our tendency to define all of the problems and solutions as if they exist in the individual. The problem in doing so is that we then focus all of our resources on tinkering with the individual and do not pay enough attention to the impact of relationships or the normative messages within the environment and their influence on behavior. Certainly, the prevention research, the correctional intervention, including the identification of dynamic risk factors, as well as the policing experience, would point us to taking a broader more holistic approach to offender management and intervention than historically has been the case.

If nothing else, the executive owns the responsibility to do two things: 1) point out the importance of research in terms of what his/her agency does — the relevance of research to the day-to-day activities of the agency, emphasizing its need to and its role in relation to influencing policy, programs and practices; and 2) the executive owns the responsibility to create processes that will ensure relevant research information is collected and disseminated to appropriate parts of the agency. You cannot do that without ensuring that line staff understand that research is important to you as an executive. You must give the message and model the behavior. If what the research says is not important to you, it will not be to those who work for you and it will not be to the policy makers who define what you do and give you the resources to operate your agency. You must seek out opportunities to celebrate what works in your agency and in doing so you should take every opportunity to show how what you are doing is consistent with what the research says works. The message must be repeated over and over again every opportunity you get. Research can be used both to inform us of what should be done, and it can also be used to point out and reinforce existing good work by staff — in other words, to reinforce what staff do.

The bottom line is, once again, if we are a profession, then information about what works or does not work in our industry needs to be known and acted upon by us. That will only be done if the chief executives responsible for correctional agencies are willing to provide the leadership this profession so badly needs.

HELPING TO KEEP OUR COMMUNITIES SAFE: TRANSITIONING TO COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

by

Beth Anderson, Ph.D.

Health Services Administrator

Washington State Department of Corrections

The traditional focus of correctional health services has been providing health care to offenders who are incarcerated

in prisons and jails. Beginning in the 1970s a series of landmark cases in U. S. District Courts and the Supreme Court established the responsibility of corrections systems to provide inmates access to medical, dental, and mental health services; to guarantee that decisions about the need for care are based on a professional medical opinion; and to ensure that medically ordered care is provided. There is no comparable legal requirement for correctional departments to provide health care to offenders when they are under community supervision. However, it is often in the best interests of corrections departments to assist released offenders in getting access to community health and other services.

For many offenders who have been incarcerated, a successful transition to the community may depend on their being able to access appropriate health, social, financial and other services in the community upon their release. The success or failure of community release is commonly looked at in terms of re-offense and recidivism. In some cases, there are real public health and/or public safety implications of an inmate being able to get connected with the necessary services when he or she is under community supervision. This can certainly be the case for offenders with substance abuse problems, sex offenders, the mentally ill and offenders who are seriously or terminally ill or who have communicable diseases like tuberculosis (TB) and HIV / AIDS.

Applying for services can be a long, involved process, and eligibility determinations can take weeks, or even months. Some agencies have experienced problems in the past serving offenders and are reluctant to accept them as clients. Once an offender is declared eligible, agencies frequently have long waiting lists of clients already seeking their services. To remove these barriers and improve community transition, correctional departments need to establish working relationships with a variety of other agencies. These organizations can include community medical clinics, public health agencies, chemical dependency and mental health treatment programs, Medicaid and other subsidized health insurance plans, social service agencies, income assistance programs, job training and employment services, and organizations involved in transitional and low-income housing.

The issues raised are much too broad to cover here, so I have chosen to focus on two groups of offenders, the seriously mentally ill and offenders with communicable diseases like HIV / AIDS and TB. The needs of these two groups of offenders and the potential threats that they pose to the community are very different. But I think both groups are good illustrations of the complexity of tasks facing correctional departments and the community agencies.

For several years, the Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC) and the State Department of Social and Health Services have been working in collaboration with the University of Washington to first identify barriers that arise when seriously mentally ill offenders are released and then to develop strategies to increase the likelihood that these barriers will be overcome.

The proportion of seriously mentally ill offenders in Washington's prison population — about 18% — is similar to that in other state correctional systems. Each month, an estimated 20 seriously mentally ill offenders are released from Washington's prisons. The University of Washington did a small pilot study on these releasees. It showed that if a Com-

munity Corrections Officer spent a higher number of hours in the first month following the release providing assistance in getting community services, there was a statistically significant reduction in recidivism. Also, recidivism was three times more likely to occur in offenders who did not get any assistance than those who received assistance making connections with each of three types of services: housing, income assistance, and community mental health centers.

In addition to defining services provided for seriously mentally ill offenders while incarcerated, the DOC's new policy on mental health services puts significant emphasis on transition to the community. The policy outlines several activities related to transition of offenders known to be mentally ill which should occur six months before release. They include community skills training; making a request for treatment in the community after release; and sending a packet of information on the offender, his/her mental health treatment, financial resources, and housing needs of the offender to the appropriate agency(s). Upon request, DOC staff consults with the community provider assigned to the case. Community custody officers have been trained to use a brief screening mental health tool, based on the lengthy Diagnostic Interview Schedule(DIS), with all other offenders assigned to community supervision. Based on the outcome of this screen, offenders will be referred for mental health treatment. While DOC can initiate these steps, clearly successful transition depends on the cooperation of other agencies.

Releasees with communicable diseases pose other issues. With the high yearly turnover rates for prisons (estimated at 50%) and jails (about 800%), these institutions have an important public health role when offenders with communicable diseases are released into the community. Some inmates released with communicable diseases need continuing treatment after release. Their release is also a public health issue for the community. The first reports of inmates spreading tuberculosis to their home communities after they were released from correctional institutions were in the 1970s. Since then, the advent of the HIV / AIDS epidemic and the development of strains of TB which are resistant to the drugs traditionally used have greatly increased the prevalence of TB both in urban areas and in correctional settings and made it more difficult to treat. In 1991, the incidence of active TB among inmates in New York State had increased by almost nine times over what it had been up in the late 1970's. About 95% of these offenders also had HIV infection. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) reported that 32% of offenders they tested from the New York system had TB strains that were multiple-drug resistant.

Many inmates who are being treated for active TB disease or who are receiving preventive therapy because of inactive TB infection will be released to community custody or reach the end of their sentence before completing their course of treatment. Although there is no legal authority to detain an offender once his/her sentence is completed, some jurisdictions have been able to make compliance with treatment protocols a condition of release. When an offender receiving any TB related treatment is about to be released, a lot of attention needs to be paid to discharge planning. Prison health care staff need to coordinate with both public health officials and community corrections officers before release occurs. Once an offender has been released, community corrections staff

need to communicate with the public health department if they become aware of any issues related to possible spread of the disease. Offenders about to be released should be given an adequate supply of their medications and clear instructions on the course of treatment that has been prescribed for them. A recent national survey done by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and CDC showed that virtually all correctional systems have policies for referring releasees being treated for TB to the appropriate program at the local public health department. Of the departments surveyed, 88% reported to the public health officials on the medical status and community location of the releasees. Fewer systems, only 41% of state and federal systems and 19% of city and county jails, said that they actually made appointments for the releasees at health departments or clinics prior to the release.

A recent NIJ report suggests several ways for community corrections officers to assist health departments in the control of TB. They include referring clients who have TB symptoms to the health department's TB program and asking questions to determine whether clients are regularly seeking care and complying with treatment. In New York City, public health and corrections officials established a pilot which takes the additional step of cross-matching health department lists of non-compliant patients with lists of parolees.

Offenders with HIV / AIDS who have been treated with combination drug therapies while in prison can face serious problems in continuing their care when released. Some medical clinics do not have providers with expertise in HIV / AIDS and in the newer combination drug therapies. The combination drug treatments for HIV / AIDS are very expensive and their costs can exceed the coverage of many health insurance plans. Some offenders might not be able to get access to these drugs unless they are enrolled in programs like the federally-subsidized AIDS Prescription Drug Program, which in Washington is administered by the State Department of Health.

Making it possible for an offender to continue treatment is not only good for that individual's health, there are public health benefits as well. An offender's continuing treatment in the community increases the likelihood that he or she will be in contact with individuals who will provide positive reinforcement and supplies for behaviors that prevent the spread of the virus. Interruptions in the drug therapy also increase the chance of drug resistant strains of HIV virus developing, which has an impact on us all.

From the examples above, it is clear that the needs of mentally ill offenders and the potential impact they can have on the community are very different from those of offenders with communicable diseases. However, with these and other groups of offenders, there are real benefits to our communities when corrections departments work in partnership with community agencies to help offenders transition to community health and other services in a timely manner.

CONTRASTING SYSTEMS

by
Bob Moore
Court Services Manager
Washington State Department of Youth Services

Never having worked in the juvenile justice system before, I assumed it would be much like the adult criminal justice system minus some of the punitive emphasis. After all, we're dealing with persons who have engaged in criminal behavior or just happen to be generally shorter, smaller, and younger. I was correct in some of my assumptions; however, I was wrong in many others. The differences for those of us working as administrators or managers are striking and must be felt before they can be understood.

About eight months ago, I made the decision to take a job with the Department of Youth Services in King County, Washington. I had worked previously for 20 years for the State of Washington in a variety of roles from Counselor, to prison Superintendent, to Assistant Director of the Community Corrections Division. I oftentimes talked about the importance of intervening early in the lives of children and the frustrations I felt working with adult offenders, and finally I made a decision to "walk the talk." The transition has been a challenging one both personally and professionally. Twenty years in the same agency had given me a more than reasonable understanding of how business was done in adult corrections and specifically within the Washington State Department of Corrections. There is comfort in that. Before I knew it, however, I was no longer the young guy learning from his elders, but one of those old hands who had been around for a while and knew the people, the significant events, and the business.

Now having been in the juvenile justice system a mere eight months, I barely have an understanding of the issues. However, I do have a sense of some of the more interesting contrasts which are worth considering. First of all, when dealing with adult offenders, whether it be in an institution or in the community, the focus and attention is directed to the individual. Whatever our philosophical orientation, there seems to be general concurrence that the offender is ultimately responsible for his/her actions and the attention — whether it be retributive or rehabilitative — has to be focused on the individual. In the juvenile justice system I learned very quickly that kids live within a family — of one sort or another — and kids either attend school or should be attending school. Any activities we engage in must consider the youth, the family, and the school, or it is likely to fail. It is very difficult, for example, to insist that a youth not change residence when his family decides to pick up and move across the state. Also it's inappropriate to insist that a youth engage in an activity, whether it be punitive or rehabilitative, during the hours he or she should be in school. Attention to these three elements must be continual and thoughtful.

Organizationally, there are similarities between the two systems. The Department of Corrections, as well as the Department of Youth Services, operates offices in the community and have staff who interact in some fashion with offenders. The substance of that interaction has some significant

differences. However we might try to shape it in the adult system, there is clearly a retributive focus and much effort is committed to monitoring offenders and ensuring they are either doing what they are supposed to do or not doing what they are not supposed to do. There is some such emphasis with kids; however, focus is more on fully understanding the youth and attempting to develop supportive intervention strategies. It stands to reason that staff who gravitate to the adult system have a different philosophical orientation than those involved in the juvenile system. Staff in the adult system have a law enforcement focus, while in the juvenile system there are numerous staff with master degrees in social work who signed on for very different reasons. To even suggest to those in the juvenile system that their primary mission is not to "fix kids" raises a very strong and vocal reaction.

The court systems are also quite different — at least in Washington State — where there are no jury trials for youth and much happens informally and quickly. Youth Services staff are very much involved in the entire court process and have working relationships with both the prosecutors and the defenders. Because Washington has essentially a determinate sentencing system for youth, it functions in a more adversarial way than I would ever had expected; however, there truly is a sense throughout the system that "we are all there to help these kids."

A further difference in the two systems that quickly becomes quite apparent is that there are a host of organizations, agencies, and individuals interested in working with the youthful offender. Many of them are good-hearted and some have developed their approach to kids intuitively rather than in a careful systematic way grounded in the "what works" model or other research which supports the benefit of their effort. Not to suggest that the same doesn't exist in the adult system; however, there are so many such organizations in the juvenile system they sometimes do not work in concert with one another and occasionally work at cross purposes. In the adult system it seemed we were always scratching for community resources that could be tapped to serve the adult offender population.

The contrasts I've highlighted are those which have been most apparent in my short eight months at the King County Department of Youth Services. There are many others which are becoming clearer the longer I work in the juvenile justice system. Needless to say, there are many similarities as well. Unfortunately, for example, there are a lot of folks who are anxious to work hard at punishing both kids and adults for their misdeeds with little thought to the long-term consequences. Also, resources are in short supply generally and competition for those resources is particularly keen. Role definition of our line staff is in flux and creates considerable frustration. The one certainty in both systems is that staff are committed to performing an important function and they will continue to do so even though the pay is less than adequate, the working conditions are oftentimes a struggle, and they rarely get the respect and support they deserve.

INTEREST-BASED BARGAINING
FOR THE PROBATION
AND PAROLE EXECUTIVE

by
Randy Parr
Director of Research
Washington Federation of State Employees
AFSCME Council No. 28, AFL-CIO



Recently 16 members of the Statewide Labor/Management Committee for the bargaining unit of Community Corrections Officers in the State of Washington participated in training on the principles of Interest-Based Bargaining. More precisely, the training was titled "Collaborative Planning and Decision Making," and was conducted by a mediator from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

So, just what is Interest-Based Bargaining? Is it just among the latest management fads, or is its growing popularity due to achieving results? Most importantly, can it be an effective management tool for the parole and probation executive?

The foremost difference between interest-based and traditional approaches to labor/management negotiations is the underlying assumption each party brings to the process. Interest-based bargaining is founded in the idea that the fundamental interests (or concerns) of labor and management typically complement one another. For example, both parties want the employer (agency) to excel at what it does — in the field of probation and parole — working together for safe communities.

Traditional labor/management negotiations are based on the premise that the outcome of negotiations creates winners and losers, and both parties use any available leverage to make sure that they are the winners. Collective bargaining laws in both the private and public sectors are written to embrace this assumption. They regulate the parties' use of power by restricting the use of "weapons" such as strikes, lockouts, and discharges of union activities. Those who explore the unconventional idea of "win-win" negotiations need to understand that the differing interests of labor and management are not easily reconciled to both sides' satisfaction.

Interest-based bargaining is the latest iteration of a problem-solving process whose use is growing in the public sector as managers seek new, less confrontational strategies to engage their line level employees in promoting organizational change and quality improvements. This process has been provided a number of names over the course of its evolution, such as "consensus bargaining," "problem-solving negotiations," "collaborative bargaining," "principled negotiations," "mutual gain bargaining," and "win-win negotiations." The method gained much of its popularity in the 1981 best seller, *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, by Roger Fisher and William Ury. In this book Fisher and Ury define five characteristics of interest-based negotiations:

- Don't bargain over positions;
- Separate the people from the problem;
- Focus on interests, not positions;

Work together to create options that will satisfy both parties; and
Insist on using objective criteria.

Critical to understanding interest-based processes is to thoroughly grasp the distinction between a position and an interest. In short, a position, or proposal, is a party's chosen solution to a particular problem or goal. The position may be one of many alternatives that meet a party's needs. An interest is the basic need or concern that is addressed by the proposal. All interests are but varying forms of a person's values, principles, fundamental beliefs, or universal human needs. This interest can be expressed as a fear, a need, a worry, or a concern relative to the problem or issue which can often be resolved by a variety of solutions which may, after discussion, be acceptable to both parties. This is not as difficult as it seems. In our training many of us, especially the Community Corrections (Parole) Officers, found the skills similar to those used regularly. However, the process does require practice and an ever-present awareness of "not getting positional," especially for experienced negotiators.

Our training assumed that the essence of any organization springs from the relationships between its parts rather than the parts themselves, and that an organization is nothing except a set of relationships. The commitment for both the labor and management parties was a recognition of our mutual interdependence, the desire to improve the quality of the relationship, and a willingness to take actions to improve that quality. We learned that relationships are grounded in the areas of rights, powers, and interests. That while both sides had exhibited skill in the first two arenas we had yet to attempt to find any common ground in the third area of interests.

The training also provided us with an understanding of the five essential dispute resolution process options. First is avoidance, where one or both of us choose to behave as if no problem exists. Second is accommodation, where in order for you to win, I must lose. Third is competition, where in order for me to win, you must lose. Fourth is compromise, where in order for each of us to win, we each must lose. The fifth is collaboration, where in order for us to gain mutually, we address each other's interests. Each of these options has their appropriate place as we interact in our everyday lives. The question typically hinges on what level of effort the dispute at hand requires to gain satisfactory resolution. For example, many of us don't fully understand "road rage" because when someone cuts us off, we are able to just let it go — or avoid any dispute.

The collaborative dispute resolution option clearly requires more effort and time than the other four. However, we found that the effort may well be worth it when the interests are diverse and the durability of the agreement reached is necessary. The process may at times be overwhelming, yet it instills ownership in the change, recognizes that the relationship is more important than the issue, and is more apt when an "outcome" is more important than an "output." Still, this should not be confused with how many of us perceive attempts to achieve consensus. In this model agreement is reached when all of the parties can live with the outcome. They do not need to be enthusiastic about the resolution, only to recognize it as the best possible solution that serves the most interests, and a solution that they will not seek to undermine at some future time.

There exists a myth that only labor and management parties who have developed a high level of trust are prepared to engage in negotiating with this process. We were assured in our training that

this is clearly not the circumstance. The process, however, does require a certain level of honesty, which may or not always be present.

Who should use an interest-based negotiating approach? Par- ticularly, those who recognize that the nature of the labor /man- agement relationship is such that it — the relationship — takes precedence over any potential issue. This recognition does not diminish the importance of issues, nor does it mitigate the differ- ences the two parties will bring to their resolution. Mostly, the executive who should investigate an interest-based approach is the one who recognizes that true change can only be achieved when that change is owned at every level of the organization and that is not always achieved through commanding it to be so.

Interest-based bargaining is not for everyone. The process can, at times, be tedious and is often arduous. It provides for collabora- tive decision-making that results in those with the greatest author- ity for decision making (namely, the designated lead management negotiator) yielding some of that authority to the collective deci- sion making of the group.

The process is useful mostly to those who recognize the interde- pendency of the labor /management relationship: i.e. without la- bor there is no need for management and vice versa. The interest- based process requires the parties, in expressing their interests, to develop a reasonable argument in articulating to the group how the problem or goal affects them. In other words, it will require you to think through issues and explain them to the satisfaction of others in the group in a fashion that requires you to question your own long held beliefs/certainties of the way things are and/or should be.

For me, the probation and parole environment appears to be among those that are most uniquely suitable for the interest based approach. First, all of the parties begin with, at least some, shared interests, goals, and values. Probation and parole is a profession that individuals train specifically for, to serve their personal iden- tity and self-actualization need. It is not a job that someone simply falls into and stays because the pay is good and they're too lazy to look for other work. Still, despite this shared impulse to serve the public in this capacity, I have found the officers that do the work represent a broad continuum of perspectives on how to best per- form the work. As someone who's training is in an entirely differ- ent field, yet has worked closely with parole officers, I have found it remarkable that any two officers could bring such very different methods of supervision to the same offender and each achieve necessary results and gain cognitive behavioral change. This di- verse continuum of ideology, from social worker to law enforcer, with each worker doing their job differently, likely makes manag- ing in this field its own unique challenge. However, through the interest-based process, when this broad diversity of knowledge is brought together into a collective "group thought" process, it can create a knowledge for problem-resolution that is much greater than the sum of its parts.

In the field of probation and parole, many agencies — largely due to their place within the corrections environment — operate with a command and control hierarchy that serves their needs through clear lines of authority and staff loyalty to the leadership or agency mission. However in our circumstance, I believe we discovered that an interest-based approach better serves any effort to foster organizational change with ownership at all levels of the agency. I have learned that while change can be dictated through authority, it will actually only become institutionalized when it has been accepted at all levels. And isn't the definition of labor /man-

agement success to gain acceptance of change and commitment to purpose at all levels of the organization?

WHEN YOU DECIDE TO ARM YOUR STAFF

by
Warren R. Emmer
Director, Division of Parole and Probation
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Bismarck, North Dakota



The arming of parole and probation staff is perhaps the most controversial thing an administrator can do. The "symbolism" associated with this act has the potential to dramatically change the direction of the agency. The fiscal impact of arming parole and probation officers is also quite significant. I think it is important that the chief executive officer (CEO) of a parole and probation system consider several factors prior to making the decision to arm their staff. The CEO should first consider the history and culture of their correctional program. Also to be considered is the type of education and train- ing of the existing staff as well as any licensing requirements. The CEO should also seriously consider what the mission of their agency really is. Alternatives to the use of firearms should be an option as well. When making the determination to arm field staff, the CEO should answer the questions who, what, when, how, and why? Finally, I think once the determination has been made to arm the staff, the CEO should be committed for the long haul. This means that the agency's training budget in particular will be greatly im- pacted. I'll discuss these concepts in more detail in the balance of this article.

A Historical Perspective: Know Your Own Culture

Every agency has evolved over the years by responding to the needs of its own system. Some systems have been resource rich and, as a result, have been quite treatment oriented. Others have not had many alternatives for the management of offenders and have generally become more enforcement oriented. Still others are directly connected to an adult system that includes a penitentiary component and, as a result, have become more responsive to the needs of the prison system. Others are totally disconnected from prison systems and do not spend much time considering the needs of the bigger corrections system.

Staffing of agencies across the country have also responded to the needs of the system. The resource rich systems have been generally staffed with people trained in a social work or behavioral science field. The enforcement driven systems have often obtained their staff from the ranks of law enforcement.

Let us stop to discuss this further. It seems to me that a CEO who manages a law enforcement trained organization will be in for a simpler transition to firearms than the CEO that manages a non- law enforcement trained organization. Additionally, the type of employees that have been routinely hired by the CEO will further impact the ease of the transition to firearms. Allow me to illustrate this point with our own experience.

The North Dakota Division of Parole and Probation has required that its staff be licensed peace officers for well over 50 years. Up to about 1970, the staffing of the division was almost exclusively from the ranks of law enforcement. Since 1970, and particularly since 1990, the staff from the division has come from outside the field of law enforcement. When we decided to arm, it was apparent that our law enforcement experience would assist us in this effort. However, we also considered that many of our staff had no expe- rience with firearms. Prior to formalizing our firearms policy in 1990, staff had a free rein in making the decision whether or not they would be armed as well as what they would be armed with. This created a bit of dichotomy within the division. Those that were armed took on more of an exclusive enforcement posture within the division while those that weren't armed took on an exclusive helping position within the division. In fact, during staff meetings, officers sat next to other officers that shared their own philosophy. Oftentimes, this was decided on whether the other officer was armed or not armed while performing their duties.

Who, What, When, How, and Why?

Once an agency has examined its own history, I think it is very important to discuss and answer the questions of who, what, when, how and why? Having been mindful of the education, training, and licensing requirements of staff and other components of their history and culture, the CEO should first determine who should be armed. Is it all the parole and probation officers within the division or department? Or is it the warrants division? Or perhaps the intensive supervision officers or a combination of the above. The CEO should then discuss what the officers may carry as a firearm. Is it their own weapons that are department approved or is it a department issued weapon? The next logical question is when should authorized officers possess a firearm. Should it be at will? During home visits and searches? Or when the officer is in the office? The next question relates to developing a plan for imple- menting a weapons policy. Policy and procedures of a firearms program should be developed prior to any implementation of a firearms program. Perhaps the best question that a CEO must again ask themselves is why are we arming our staff.

What is the Agency's Mission?

Before arming staff, it is important to consider the mission of the agency. It is my opinion that a firearm on the hip of a parole officer can become a greater symbol of the agency's mission than the mission statement that hangs on the office wall. The CEO and the middle managers of the parole and probation agency must con- tinually reinforce to their staff what that agency is all about. With- out this continued reinforcement, I believe that some staff will drift and wind up losing sight of their job duties. In our own agency, we discuss this quite often. In fact, we intend on implementing the Montana model wherein our staff will discuss the mission of the agency prior to any qualification with their firearms. On each of those occasions, we will also discuss the policies and procedures for the use of deadly force.

Force Alternatives

I think it is a mistake for an agency director to issue firearms without first developing a training program that includes the force continuum package. Another grave mistake for the administrator

involves their failure to provide officers with other safety equip- ment that might be used prior to the use of deadly force. In our case, we provide all officers with 40 hours of training in pressure point tactics. We also train officers in the use of chemical agents and have issued pepper mace. Our officers attend 40 hours of classroom training relative to the force continuum. We are now in the process of issuing life vests to all our sworn personnel.

Selection of a Weapon

The CEO needs to consider the weapons selection issue quite carefully. I think that it is a mistake for agencies to allow their officers to carry their own weapons, even if there is an additional requirement that they be department approved. In my opinion, officers should be trained on one weapon. The leather that carries the firearm should also be universal within the agency. When an agency is trained exclusively on one weapon and also utilize one form of leather, fewer problems can occur. Agencies that allow officers to utilize many different types of firearms, at the very least, run the risk of accidental discharges on the range, the jamming of weapons with incorrect ammunition, and the breakage of inferior leather.

Our division utilizes the Smith & Wesson Model 4053 semi- automatic pistol. This pistol is double action only and is as safe a semi-automatic pistol that we were able to find. All officers receive the identical training on the use and maintenance of their firearm. Officers also use similar leather. We do not allow officers to utilize shoulder holsters, boot holsters, etc.

Train, Train, and Train

Once an agency has been committed to the use of firearms, it is important that the CEO settles back and accepts the fact that the training budget is going to be impacted dramatically. The CEO will also have to make the decision whether or not the officers will receive more training during the course of the year to accommo- date the additional firearms training, or whether or not the fire- arms training will simply take a larger piece of the training pie. In our own experience, we have determined that our initial firearms training for new officers equals 80 hours. We have also determined that each officer receives about 40 hours of firearms training per year. Prior to a formalized firearms policy, our officers received approximately 40 hours of training per year. After our firearms policy was implemented, we now have doubled the training each officer attends annually.

The Price Tag

The CEO of a modern parole and probation agency is forever balancing the needs of the agency versus the available resources. Firearms have the potential to dramatically reduce the amount of the existing resources for new projects. In our experience, we have determined that it costs about \$2,000 to initially train our officers in the use of firearms. We then expend about \$700 for the firearm, the necessary leather, and ammunition. It then costs us about \$1,000 per officer to maintain that program. In addition to those costs, we are now purchasing vests for all officers. That price tag amounts to about \$370. Pepper mace costs approximately \$30 per year per officer.

When all the costs are factored in, the North Dakota Division of Parole and Probation spends about \$3,000 to initially train and

outfit each officer. It then costs about \$1,000 per year to maintain an officer's proficiency.

Conclusion

After reviewing the above information, I am sure all chief executive officers will agree that the arming of a parole and probation agency is a significant move. Each agency has to make its own decisions as to as to whether it is the appropriate thing to do. As one of my field supervisors once said, "That's why you guys get paid the big bucks."

COMBATING THE CRIME PROBLEM BY REINFORCING GOOD

by
Dan Richard Beto
Director
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

Body Count: Moral Poverty . . . and How to Win America's War Against Crime and Drugs. By William J. Bennett, John J. Dilulio, Jr., and John P. Walters. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1996. Pp. 271.



One of the more thought provoking books published during 1996 on the crime problem is *Body Count: Moral Poverty . . . and How to Win America's War Against Crime and Drugs*, written by William J. Bennett, John J. Dilulio, Jr., and John P. Walters, a trio well-versed on societal problems associated with drugs and the inner city.

Bennett, the former Secretary of Education and Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities under President Ronald Reagan and former Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy under President George Bush, currently serves as a fellow of the Heritage Foundation and co-director of Empower America. He is the author of a number of books, including the best seller *The Book of Virtues*. Dilulio, who is widely published as well, is Director of the Brookings Institution Center for Public Management, Professor of Politics and Public Affairs at Princeton University, Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, and a board member of Public/Private Ventures. One of his more significant efforts is *Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management*. The third author, John P. Walters, is Executive Director of the Council on Crime in America and President of the New Citizenship Project; he formerly served as Deputy Director for Supply Reduction for the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

In the introductory chapter, the authors, in addition to providing an insightful overview of the crime problem and its causes, coherently establish their purpose for writing the book:

Body Count is our attempt to explain America's violent crime plague; to clarify why it is happening; to define its size, scope, and distribution; to show what the response of government has been; to explode the myths that dominate the crime and drug debate; to present profiles of what works; and to mark out new policy directions on how we can best contain it.

Body Count is about violent crime, drugs, and moral poverty — and about the manner in which the first two are created by the third. By "moral poverty" we mean the poverty of being without loving, capable, responsible adults who teach the young right from wrong. It is the poverty of being without parents, guardians, relatives, friends, teachers, coaches, clergy, and others who *habituat*e (to use a good Aristotelian word) children to feel joy at others' joy; pain at others' pain; satisfaction when you do right; remorse when you do wrong. It is the poverty of growing up in the virtual absence of people who teach these lessons by their own everyday example, and who insist that you follow suit and behave accordingly. In the extreme, it is the poverty of growing up surrounded by deviant, delinquent, and criminal adults in a practically perfect criminogenic environment — that is, an environment that seems almost consciously designed to produce vicious, unrepentant predatory street criminals.

The remainder of the book is devoted to expanding on these themes, in which the authors offer a wealth of information on the "body count" from violent crime and drug abuse. Too, they point out that while the overall crime rates have stabilized or declined, what America is experiencing is merely "the calm before the storm." They argue that America is a "ticking crime bomb," on the threshold of witnessing a significant increase in a population of "super-predators," who are

radically impulsive, brutally remorseless youngsters, including even more preteenage boys, who murder, assault, rape, rob, burglarize, deal deadly drugs, join gun-toting gangs, and create serious communal disorders. They do not fear the stigma of arrest, the pains of imprisonment, or the pangs of conscience. They perceive hardly any relationship between doing right (or wrong) now and being rewarded (or punished) for it later. To these mean-street youngsters, the words "right" and "wrong" have no fixed moral meaning.

In support of their thesis, the authors, citing a number of credible studies, fill the book with more than sufficient current statistical data. In addition, they debunk both liberal and conservative explanations of the root causes of crime, and return time and again to suggest that moral poverty is the true culprit.

Bennett, et al., stress the importance of being able to restrain and punish violent street criminals and take to task America's "revolving-door" justice system. They argue that Americans have lost confidence in the criminal justice system, and for this lost confidence to be reestablished public policies must be drastically changed to provide for the incarceration of violent and repeat offenders, more community-based police initiatives in the inner city, a reinventing of probation and parole, an end to revolving-door correctional policies, and a deference to public safety and victims' rights over offenders' rights. But changing public policy is not enough; the authors emphasize that there must be more citizen involvement, more volunteers to work with troubled youth, and

more charitable giving if America expects to seriously impact violent crime, drug abuse, and moral poverty.

In the final chapter of the book, the authors suggest that the answer to moral poverty and the crime problem may be found in "remembering God." They urge "a widespread renewal of religious faith and the strengthening of religious institutions." In the concluding paragraph they write:

Many people have ignored or forgotten something that almost everybody once knew: *the good requires constant reinforcement and the bad needs only permission*. Religion is the best and most reliable means we have to reinforce the good. True religious faith enlarges the human heart; inspires us to revere and honor those things that are worthy objects of our attention; reminds people of their basic responsibilities and commitments; provides society with reliable moral and social guardrails; helps the impulse of compassion take on the name of action; and allows the "eyes of our heart" to see our fellow citizens not merely as distant body count statistics or as enemies or aliens or "other" but as moral and spiritual beings, as children of God. For that is, in fact, what they are.

Body Count is not an entertaining book; in fact, it is fairly depressing because it graphically describes our failures. Yet it is hopeful, because it provides us with a blueprint for solutions. While not all who read this book will embrace the authors' views, they will, at the very minimum, have to think about what has been written. And perhaps this thoughtful consideration can be transformed into action.

Body Count should be required reading for criminal justice practitioners, civic and religious leaders, persons charged with formulating public policy, and anyone interested in the future of America.

This book review appeared in the June 1997 issue of *Federal Probation*. It is reprinted with permission.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

FIRST EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR NEW PROBATION EXECUTIVES HELD

On September 14-19, 1997, the first Executive Development Program for newly appointed probation executives was held at the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. This program, a year in the planning, was a joint initiative of the National Institute of Corrections, National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas. This program represented a true partnership between the three entities: funding for this program was provided by the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections; the faculty was comprised of members of the National Association of Probation Executives; and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas provided staff and logistical support.

Covered during the program included such topics as "a focus on self," "working within the organization," "working in the political arena," "strategic planning," "team building," "presentation skills,"

and "media relations." Participants were provided a comprehensive workbook and a number of resources to assist them in the performance of their duties.

The class, a diverse group of probation executives from both state and county departments from across the United States, included: Nanci Bouchard (Maine), Victoria Casey (New York), Christopher C. Clark (New York), Donald J. DeVita (New York), Kevin Dooley (New Mexico), Eddie Gonzalez (Texas), William J. Hughes (New Jersey), Steven Kossman (Illinois), Larry E. Lauterjung (Illinois), Norma Suzuki (California), and Kathy Walters (Oklahoma).

The faculty, chaired by Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. (Massachusetts), included Dan Richard Beto (Texas), Susan J. Gionfriddo (California), Ron Goethals (Texas), Richard A. Kipp (Pennsylvania), Don R. Stiles (Arizona), and Richard E. Wyett (Nevada). Rick Faulkner with the National Institute of Corrections served a program manager and facilitator.

Staff support was provided by: Christie Haney of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas; Michael DeValve, a graduate student at the College of Criminal Justice; and Craig Schlicher and David Epps of the Criminal Justice Center's Information Technology Services. In addition, members of the faculty of the College of Criminal Justice made presentations during the week of training, including: Timothy J. Flanagan, Dean of the College of Criminal Justice; Distinguished Professor Rolando del Carmen; and Professor Charles M. Friel.

At the conclusion of the training, a debriefing session was held with the participants, during which comments were solicited on the content and the delivery of the material. Initial comments suggest that this was a very successful program. A formal evaluation instrument will be sent to the participants prior to the end of the year.

Additional Executive Development Programs for new probation executives have been scheduled for May 11-16, 1998, and September 13-18, 1998. Newly appointed probation executives interested in attending one of these programs are encouraged to contact Rick Faulkner at the National Institute of Corrections; he may be reached at (202) 307-3106, extension 138. In addition, members of the National Association of Probation Executives who are aware of new executives in their respective areas are urged to encourage them to apply.

NAPE MEMBER NAMED TO NIC ADVISORY BOARD

Michael K. Brown, Director of the Division of Field Services for the New Hampshire Department of Corrections and a member of the National Association of Probation Executives, was recently appointed to the National Institute of Corrections Advisory Board by Attorney General Janet Reno.

Brown, who has a bachelor's degree from the University of New Hampshire and a law degree from the Franklin Pierce Law Center, began his criminal justice career in 1976 as a forensic mental health counselor. He later served as a project director for the New Hampshire Probation Department and Hillsborough County Corrections and as a member of the New Hampshire Contract Negotiation Team. In 1986 he was named the Director of the Office of Legal Services for the New Hampshire Department of Corrections, and in 1992 he was promoted to his current position.

He is involved in a number of community activities and organizations. In addition to NAPE, Brown is a member of the American

Correctional Association, American Probation and Parole Association, and the Merrimack County Bar Association. He is a member of the Executive Board of the New England Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Brown and his wife Christine are the proud parents of a 12 year old daughter, a budding equestrian involved in cross country jumping and pony club activities. He recently acquired a pickup truck to haul his daughter's 13 year old quarter horse "Ace" all over New England.

Other new appointments to the NIC Advisory Board include: **Sharon English**, Assistant Deputy Director of the California Youth Authority; **James Gomez**, Deputy Executive Officer of the California Public Employees Retirement System; **Gayle Ray**, Sheriff of Davidson County, Tennessee; and **Odie Washington**, Director of the Illinois Department of Corrections. In addition, the following individuals were reappointed by the Attorney General: **Norman A. Carlson**, Adjunct Professor at the University of Minnesota and a former Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons; **Newman Flanagan**, Executive Director of the National District Attorneys Association; **Norval Morris**, Professor at the University of Chicago Law School; **Barry Nidorf**, retired Los Angeles County Chief Probation Officer and a member of the NAPE Board of Directors; and **Arthur Wallenstein**, Director of the King County Department of Adult Detention in Washington.

NEW MEMBERS

Since the Summer 1997 issue of *Executive Exchange* was published, a number of probation professionals have joined the Association. The new members are as follows:

Nanci Bouchard, Associate Commissioner, Community Corrections Division, Department of Corrections, State House Station 111, Augusta, Maine 04333.

Robert J. Burns, Administrator, Monroe County Office of Probation/Community Corrections, 217 West Main Street, Rochester, New York 14614.

Victoria Casey, Director, Orange County Probation Department, Main Street - County Government Center, Goshen, New York 10924.

Armando Cervantes, Chief Probation Officer, San Francisco Adult Probation Department, 880 Bryant Street, Room 200, San Francisco, California 94103.

Christopher Clark, Director, Erie County Probation Department, 25 Delaware Avenue, Room 610, Buffalo, New York 14202.

Donald J. DeVita, Director, Putnam County Probation Department, 40 Glenida Avenue, Carmel, New York 10512.

Kevin Dooley, Director, Probation and Parole Division, Department of Corrections, P. O. Box 27116, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502.

Rudy J. Evenson, Deputy Administrator, Field and Community Services, Department of Correction, 500 South 10th Street, Boise, Idaho 83720.

William J. Hughes, Chief Probation Officer, Essex Vicinage Probation Department, 110 South Grove Street, East Orange, New Jersey 07018.

Douglas R. Irvin, Court Services Specialist, Office of Judicial Administration, Kansas Judicial Branch, 301 West 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

Steven P. Kossman, Director, Peoria County Probation and Court Services, 324 Main Street, Room 520, Peoria, Illinois 61602.

Larry Lauterjung, Director, First Judicial Circuit Probation Department, Williamson County Courthouse, 200 Jefferson Street, Marion, Illinois 62959.

Calvin Remington, Chief Probation Officer, Corrections Services Agency, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California 93009.

Amador R. Rodriguez, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Cameron County Juvenile Probation Department, P. O. Box 1573, San Benito, Texas 78586.

Duane Shimpach, Director, Coconino County Juvenile Court, 2300 Huffer Lane, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001.

John J. Sikora, Chief Adult Probation Officer, Lehigh County Adult Probation and Parole, 136-150 South Fourth Street, Allentown, Pennsylvania 18102.

David L. Simmons, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Alameda County Probation Department, 400 Broadway, Oakland, California 94607.

Norma Suzuki, Chief Probation Officer, Placer County Probation Department, 11564 "C" Avenue, Auburn, California 95803.

Kathy Waters, Deputy Director, Division of Probation and Parole, Department of Corrections, 3416 Barberry Court, Edmond, Oklahoma 73013.

ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN 1998

In 1998 members of the National Association of Probation Executives will have the opportunity to elect a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, two At-Large Directors, and five Regional Directors. Persons elected will serve two year terms. The five regions are comprised as follows:

New England Region: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut;

Mid-Atlantic Region: District of Columbia, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York;

Southern Region: Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and West Virginia;

Central Region: North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky; and

Western Region: Washington, Montana, Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, California, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Alaska, and Hawaii.

Nominations for the various offices are being accepted through December 31, 1997, at the following address:

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Chair
NAPE Nominations and Election Committee
Office of the Commissioner of Probation
One Ashburton Place, Room 405
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

NAPE members are encouraged to actively participate in the election process by nominating a colleague, seeking elective office, and voting in contested races.