

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

FALL 2010

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

On August 15, 2010, in Washington, D.C., during the NAPE Annual Awards Breakfast, incoming President Ellen Brokofsky delivered the following remarks.

My name is Ellen Fabian Brokofsky and I am the incoming President of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE). I am proud to represent NAPE as this association signifies professionalism, effectiveness, positive change, and excellence in the field of probation. NAPE is the "go to" place for technical expertise in probation management. People I admire who possess strong leadership skills, are innovative, and have shown courage in their own jurisdictions are part of NAPE. NAPE strives to bring about positive change always promoting what research shows actually works. Through its relationship with the Correctional Management Institute of Texas (CMIT) at the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University and the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), NAPE continues to shine a light on the needs of probation systems across the country and forges a pathway for new executives across the nation to develop skills that will enable them to lead organizational change and continually improve probation service.

With the introduction of evidence based practices, there has never been a time when the challenges to probation have been greater and the outcomes more promising. Thinking through what I wanted to say today, I reflect on the last five years of those "challenges" and promising outcomes in Nebraska.

After 25 years in probation management on a county level, I became Nebraska's State Probation Administrator in 2005. I'd been fortunate enough to participate in an NIC training facilitated by the National Institute of Corrections' Dot Faust several months before my promotion. During the second



interview for the administrator's position, three Supreme Court Justices asked me what I would do if hired to become administrator. With Dot's training fresh in mind, I said I'd shift the system's resources so the most seasoned, highest skilled officers would be supervising the highest risk probationers instead of the new college graduates that we currently had supervising our intensive supervision units. I'd get back to

basics with probation officers able to build real relationships with those they supervise and I'd build programming and services for high risk juveniles so they wouldn't move from the juvenile into the criminal justice system. While I didn't presume this would be an easy task, I never imagined it would **then and still** require a continuous strength of commitment to evidence based principles and practices, perseverance by all staff to keep moving forward even when faced with major obstacles, and a change of organizational culture that could only be described as "profound."

Using the definition of culture that states "culture is the sum total of the learned behavior of a group of people that are generally considered to be the tradition of that people and are transmitted from generation to generation," I soon realized it took several generations of probation officers to establish "offender contacts" and "accountability based" supervision as their guiding principles — particularly in the adult arena of probation — and it would be no easy task to move into a different direction.

Also, realizing that up to 85% of organizational initiatives failed because the implementation plan did not work, it was vital to obtain commitment and buy-in from all the organization's stakeholders before the hard work began. In Nebraska, as in most probation organizations, buy-in from all the organization's stakeholders was important to begin the change process. Support was sought from probation employees both

CONTENTS

President's Message, <i>Ellen F. Brokofsky</i>	1
Leadership Perspectives from Probation Leaders, <i>Dan Richard Beto, Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D., and Christie Davidson</i>	3
The European Organization for Probation: Report on the Tenth General Assembly and Conference, <i>Dan Richard Beto and Donald G. Evans</i>	13
Summary and Conclusion: The 2010 CEP Conference "Probation Works" in Malaga, Spain, <i>John Scott</i>	17
NIC Urban Chiefs' Network: Critical Issues Discussion	19
From the Bookshelf	22
Association Activities in Washington	25
News from the Field	28

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE *cont'd*

from the line and in management positions, the judiciary, from the Supreme Court to local courts, leaders and staff from state and county government, treatment providers, law enforcement organizations, victim advocacy groups, the legislature, schools, employers, etc. The task seemed daunting but a plan was hatched.

Probation's management was tasked to meet with their staffs and then meet together to build a new vision and mission for Nebraska Probation. The managers also created a set of values and beliefs and a code of conduct to guide all staff in building a foundation for our new evidence based work. A re-alignment in duties and responsibilities occurred on the administrative level and one Chief Probation Officer moved up to administration to oversee probation's new community corrections specialized programs and aid in the development of a new blueprint for overall system change.

So here we are ready to go with a plan . . . Not so fast.

As you all know, leadership is "not for sissies." It's tough work in any venue but especially tough when you're task is leading organizational change. However, because my particular leadership style is servant leadership, my style was well suited to working with others toward change. Personally I can't bear change and as a result I haven't moved the furniture in my living room one time in the last 14 years. But strongly believing in the value of building a probation system on a foundation of evidence based principles and practices made the motivation to change feel worthwhile.

Within a year of becoming Nebraska's Probation Administrator, there were many unexpected challenges including a change in judicial leadership, a proposal to move probation from the Judicial to Executive Branch, a suggestion to unionize probation officers, and an outright effort to dismantle the EBP initiate as it was "too soft on crime."

So not only was the challenge to implement EBP statewide, it now became the challenge of implementing EBP statewide while there were new strong political and organizational barriers to change. I can only compare this "change" environment as trying to build a new house in a new city while you and your family are still living in the basement of the house. Daily the moving company comes to try to jack up the foundation and move your house to a new location, and every night the neighborhood bully is trying to burn the house down. You have very few friends as you are the new family in town, you're not sure exactly how to get from home to school every day, and the kids are telling you regularly what a mistake you made taking the new job and moving away from friends and family. Change is tough but in this environment it became extremely difficult.

Bill Burrell wrote a paper entitled "Implementation: The Achilles Heel of Evidence-Based Practices" which more than adequately speaks to the elements necessary to implement EBP. Those elements are: Leadership, Environmental Factors, Staff, Training and Technical Assistance, Communication, Change Agent, Integration, Resources, Time, and Fidelity.

I remember the day that article came across my desk. It was several years into Nebraska Probation's transformation but I'd thought I'd died and gone to heaven because Bill had written about all of the areas and challenges we stumbled upon as necessary to create a successful change plan. As Deb Minardi will tell you — Deb is Nebraska's Deputy Administrator for Community Based Supervision, Programs, and Services — that article validated our efforts and supported our moving forward. We actually took each one of Bill's elements and wrote about Nebraska Probation's efforts in

those elements in a newsletter entitled "Moving Forward" that can be found on our website www.supremecourt.ne.gov.

Digressing for a moment, it is noteworthy to mention that Deb Minardi's Division of Community Based Supervision, Programs, and Services received the 2010 American Probation and Parole's President's Award for its Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision Program.

Relief and support came again when I attended the first NIC network meeting of Probation and Parole Administrators in Denver in 2008. All of Nebraska's efforts were validated, when administrators — many of them NAPE members — like Kathy Waters from Arizona, Sharon Neumann from Oklahoma, Cheryl Barrett from Illinois (sadly we lost a great lady when we lost Cheryl last year), Tom Quinn from Colorado, Ginger Martin from Oregon, and others from Kansas, New Jersey, Minnesota, and Virginia, talked about the same struggles and obstacles. Again, in May of 2009 this network of professionals joined other NIC networks in Norman, Oklahoma. I recall the excitement of listening to programs that worked and programs that didn't work as well as new ideas for programming and the new concept of "parallel practice." This practice illustrated how evidence based principles and practices implemented for probationers had the same or similar results when managers implemented them for staff. What a concept!

Over these last five years as Nebraska's Probation Administrator I've witnessed an incredible transformation of business delivery. We've built our Community Safety Models for both adults and juveniles that paint a picture of Nebraska's new operations and standards — assessment, intervention, services, and programs, and evaluation and positive outcomes. We've re-thought those in leadership positions, we've developed new learning modalities and curriculum, we've trained all officers in motivational interviewing and cognitive group facilitation, we've developed state of the art specialized programs and reporting centers, and we've engaged both the Legislative and Executive Branches in our change process. Probation in Nebraska will always be a work in progress because we are a fluid organization meeting expectations and ready for continuous change.

I've been in Probation Management for over 30 years. It's been extraordinary to watch the changing roles of probation officers during the last five years of our movement toward EBP implementation, evolving from enforcers of court orders and service brokers to agents of behavioral change. I'm excited about the relationship between NAPE, APPA, and NIC in the training of our up-and-coming probation leadership. I'm also proud of NAPE's collaboration with NIC in its executive orientation training targeted for new executives. I believe six of Nebraska Probation's Chief Probation Officers have completed this excellent training.

I appreciate the network of NAPE members and our NIC networks who in my case gave me the information and stamina to lead another day. I challenge all of us to actively engage these positive support systems as we continue to work to improve the delivery of probation services across our country.

Ellen Fabian Brokofsky
President

LEADERSHIP PERSPECTIVES FROM PROBATION LEADERS

Today's probation executives believe they need to create internally more effective unity within a critical and unsupportive external environment. Undoubtedly, they know that leadership is a critical factor in transforming probation toward a more effective system to engender public support and positively impact public safety. However, even though many competent probation executives know this unprecedented leadership challenges, what needs to be done, and even how to do, only few executives seem to be successful in effectively leading this transformational change. In response, probation executives need to realize that "the primary determinant of a leader's success or failure is not a lack of know-how but the leader's beliefs and attitudes" (O'Toole, 1995, p. xiv).

Last year, in an effort to identify leadership characteristics and collect information on leadership development and values, a survey of ten questions was sent to several persons recognized as exemplary probation leaders. Persons responding to this questionnaire included:

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court in Boston, and a former President of the National Association of Probation Executives;

Ellen F. Brokofsky, State Probation Administrator for the Nebraska Supreme Court in Lincoln, immediate past President of the National Juvenile Court Services Association, and the current President of the National Association of Probation Executives;

Ronald G. Schweer, Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the District of Kansas, in Kansas City, and Vice President of the National Association of Probation Executives;

John R. Tuttle, Member of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole in Harrisburg, and immediate past President of the National Association of Probation Executives; and

Janice Yamada, Probation Administrator for the First Circuit Court Adult Client Services Branch in Honolulu, Hawaii.

The ten survey questions were inspired by: 1) Questions developed by the Kennedy School of Government's Center for Public Leadership at Harvard University; 2) *The Leadership Challenge* by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner; 3) *Harvard Business Review* on *What Makes a Leader*; and 4) *Handbook of Leadership Development* by Cynthia D. McCauley and Ellen Van Velsor (eds.). In addition, the questions were reviewed by a small committee to assist in the development of a meaningful questionnaire. The questions, and their responses, follow.

1. What does it take to be an effective leader?

Corbett: Effective leaders establish a clear vision, set ambitious but manageable objectives, and with others organize the related work and keep staff motivated to achieve the goals.

Brokofsky: First and foremost it takes courage. Practicing leadership is not for sissies. Leadership requires believing in what you do, being at the table and listening to issues, understanding what

people need, looking for opportunities to improve, and most importantly clearly communicating how and what you believe. Leaders shouldn't be afraid to take risks, but need to calculate the potential intended and unintended consequences of taking the risk before they take it. Effective leaders know their own leadership style, and understand their advantages and deficits so they tend to place people around them whose talents balance their own.

In my view, it is important for leaders to understand the culture of the organization. I call it taking the temperature of the organization regularly. The process of changing organizational culture is like changing the course of a river. Leaders create a systemic environment where staff feels valued and it's safe for staff to provide both positive and critical feedback. Leaders understand baby steps are sometimes all that is possible.

Schweer: Persistence — In order to implement change, a leader should be persistent in their pursuit of making sure the desired change actually takes place. Likewise, when programs or projects are initiated the leader should be persistent in evaluating if the desired change was implemented according to plan and if the result was consistent with the anticipated outcome.

Credibility — Careers are enhanced or decimated by the presence or lack of credibility. To be credible, a leader must possess the knowledge, skills, and ability to navigate any environment presented by the daily operation of the agency. Staff must be able to know the leader is respected by both peers and subordinates.

Trust — A good leader has the trust of staff to make the right decisions which directly impacts all members of the staff, their customers, and the agency mission. Trust is the cornerstone to building successful relationships and partnerships, both with people and with other agencies. Trust is essential to motivating others in achieving personal and organizational goals. If you have the trust of subordinates, peers, and superiors, there is no boundary to the achievements the organization may experience. Without trust, there is universal discord and fragmentation of the agency mission and values.

Respect — A good leader respects the opinions of others and exhibits respect for one's self. If a leader expects to be respected, then the leader must respect others. In a general sense, a good leader should "walk the talk" and not be a "do as I say, not as I do" person. I have often witnessed leaders directing subordinates to follow specific policies and procedures which they, as the leader, do not follow themselves. Staff are very keen on the visibility and actions of the leader. The leader is the most watched person in the agency and the conduct of the leader is what subordinates draw from in determining their own conduct and behavior. A leader that has the respect of staff has undoubtedly exhibited this characteristic to the staff.

Transparent — What I mean by this is that a good leader does not possess a "hidden agenda" in their leadership of the agency. A good leader is a "what you see is what you get" person and does not project being a split personality. I have unfortunately worked for a boss with a Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde personality that was incredibly detrimental to the agency and the people in it. A good leader is consistent with mood, humor, personality, behavior, mannerisms and general conduct.

Executive Exchange

Pride — A good leader takes pride in the work they perform, the work performed by their staff, and the mission for which the agency exists. This is not confused with “blind pride,” where a leader has pride in performance that is not shared by the staff, customers, superiors or partners. A good leader is a model representative for the good things produced by the agency and the positive contributions of staff therein.

Commitment — I can think of few things worse than a leader that is not committed to performing their job in the best way possible. Commitment to excellence is a minute-by-minute, hour-by-hour, and day-by-day lifestyle where the leader literally loves the job and the people they work with, and for, to perform it. A good leader projects confidence in being committed to a job well done and the sense of accomplishment that comes at the end of every day.

Thankful — A good leader is thankful for the opportunity to lead fine people in a worthy endeavor for the right reasons.

Common Good — I frequently recall the statement by President John F. Kennedy where he stated to the American people [paraphrase] to not ask what government could do for them, but instead ask what they could do for their country. If a leader looks at the job as a means to serve their personal wants, needs, and desires then this message will be conveyed to staff. A good leader will serve the agency and the people in it, which is consistent with servant leadership.

Tuttle: An effective leader must communicate the vision and the manner in which the agency mission will be achieved at every opportunity. The leader determines how high the performance bar is set and routinely interacts with staff to promote the activities necessary for goal achievement.

Yamada: An effective leader would follow the five practices of exemplary leadership from the *Leadership Challenge*, by James Kouzes and Barry Posner, which include the following: 1) Model the way; 2) Inspire a shared vision; 3) Challenge the process; 4) Enable others to act; and 5) Encourage the heart.

An effective leader is able to communicate with staff (during both the good and the bad times) and be honest with them. The individual should be willing to listen to staff’s concerns/questions and respond to them in a timely manner. He/she acknowledges when he/she makes a mistake and when he/she doesn’t know the answer he/she will find out.

An effective leader is positive, works hard and is competent. He/she should always be planning for the future.

Also, in order to lead, you need people who want to follow you so it is important to develop a good professional working relationship with staff (having credibility/integrity is essential).

Plan to have celebrations with staff when milestones are accomplished.

2. How did you go about learning leadership skills and perspectives? For example, did you do so by watching others, watching persons react to particular events, studying historical figures, reading books on leadership, or attending leadership specific training?

Corbett: All of the above. Learning about leadership takes many forms: observing and emulating great leaders, learning from history, learning from your own fledgling efforts, and training can contribute as well.

Brokofsky: In the early years of my career, I learned how I didn’t want to be as a leader by observing others. In the early 70s and 80s, it was acceptable for bosses to yell at the employees. My early experience with an abusive boss led me to my foundational belief that the working environment needs to be a safe place for people to know they can make mistakes and learn from them. I also had a boss who was afraid of public speaking in any venue so I learned early on to face my fears and take the action. When I was appointed Chief Probation Officer in 1990 a colleague who was appointed at the same time said “we’ve finally made it, now we can sit back and relax.” I recall thinking how much work I had to do and who had time to relax. Leadership requires hard work and carries with it awesome responsibility. That colleague was demoted within 5 years.

I was fortunate in that this same boss who was afraid to speak out did see my leadership potential and promoted me to a management position in 1981. In the mid-80s I earned a certification in Juvenile Justice Management from the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the National Juvenile Court Services Association (an Association I am proud to have served as President). Being exposed to training from Dr. Todd Clear, who was my first trainer, and other nationally distinguished faculty so early in my management career began to help me define my leadership style.

I also need to stress the value of potential leaders preparing for leadership via committee or board participation, or asking for mentoring from someone you want to emulate. I always looked for opportunities to learn and recognized early on the value of accepting criticism (although I never like it) as an opportunity to be better.

I’m what could be described as a lifelong learner, earning a management certificate from the University of Nebraska in the 90s and a master’s degree in management in 2006. I’ve read extensively about both men and women in leadership positions, with particular focus on women who lead major organizations. In my view, cultural stereotypes of women influence employees’ perception of a woman leader’s ability and capacity to lead.

Schweer: The easy response to this question would be “all the above.” My entry into the criminal justice field was based on the respect afforded to those in the police uniform. My friends and colleagues early on listened to “the law” and followed the instructions of those in uniform. I also considered myself a helping person, a characteristic developed from observing the aftermath of several automobile accidents as a youth.

As I entered college, membership in a fraternity afforded me the opportunity to network with various alumni. Some of the members of the alumni were district court judges, prosecutors, and colleagues in the law enforcement community. I was majoring in criminal justice at the time, with an emphasis on law enforcement, so these connections served me very well in the years to come.

Although I did “study historical figures” in the book sense, I was drawn to the leaders of our Nation (specifically past Presidents). I felt a very strong desire to make something of myself. During the course of my years, I have read many books on leadership and currently find myself very much intrigued by President Lincoln. I have attended workshops on “Lessons Learned from Lincoln” and read related books. I am currently reading the book *Team of Rivals* by Doris Kearns Goodwin. My graduate degree in Public Administration was a great foundation in my early career

as a leader and serves as the cornerstone to what I would call "success." I have also completed the Leadership Development Program, a three-year program, through the Federal Judicial Center (FJC) and have served as faculty to several FJC programs.

My associations with specific people have likewise served as building blocks to where I am today. I have been very fortunate to meet and come to know people who visibly respected by others. Much like the saying "birds of a feather flock together," I feel this is true. To a certain extent, how you as a leader are perceived by others is directly related to those you associate with and share time.

Tuttle: Leadership skills were learned from watching others (coaches, teachers, superiors, and co-workers). I also am an avid reader of books on leadership (Maxwell, Drucker, etc.) and have attended leadership specific trainings (including NAPE/NIC sponsored executive leadership training).

Yamada: I have had a number of supervisors during my tenure at the probation office and while working with them have learned either what to do or what not to do. I believe that it is important to have good mentors as when people are placed into supervisory positions there is not a lot of training.

I had an opportunity to attend the Leadership Challenge, a two week course sponsored by NIC. It was a wonderful learning experience and I had an opportunity to network with other corrections administrators.

3. What are your five core values and how do they shape how you lead?

Corbett: Integrity, compassion, hard work, commitment, and perseverance are my five core values. I measure my own efforts against these values constantly — in the manner of a self-report card. I also look for external feedback, to see if my own self-perception is aligned with what others observe.

Brokofsky: 1) Be authentic. Be kind. Expect your staff to be successful and believe they will. Treating people the way I want to be treated has always been my mantra. I try to be empathetic and understand their point of view even when I disagree. My job is the business of probation so even though empathetic to whatever the situation, my personal feelings must come second as the best interests of the probation system are my priority. I try to be straight with information because I know they will recognize insincerity and I always expect success. Where I have to stay vigilant and aware is always taking into consideration a person or a system's current capacity or ability to achieve before expecting a certain outcome.

I believe my passion for probation service served me well over all these years. I've been criticized a bit for being too passionate. I always respond with how can you be "too passionate" if you believe in what you're doing and want others to follow you in that belief.

2) Doing the right thing or taking the right action trumps the leader's need to be right. A leader has to work to keep their ego in check. The greater good, and the right and ethical action must take precedent over the leader's need to be viewed as always knowing all the answers. In every leadership role I've assumed, I've tried to establish an environment where a person's mistakes become lessons learned. How I do that to some degree is twofold:

I acknowledge and accept mistakes made by staff as part of the job and good learning experiences, and when I make mistakes, act swiftly to apologize (this is still always hard) then rectify the mistake in a matter of fact manner before moving forward.

3) Face your fear and don't be afraid to fail. There is always more than one way to move forward or solve a problem. What I've found astonishing through the years is how many people in positions of authority make the "safe" and sure decision rather than the "best" decision for fear of failing and being perceived as "less than." There is also this fear of not having all the answers so better do nothing than move forward. I try to hire people whose talents compliment mine in order to have a better chance to keep my decisions balanced and show me other ways to address projects or problems than the way I've decided. Utilizing a management team helps with the "fear factor" because through the team every aspect of the situation or problem is seen from a different point of view. So the situation or problem doesn't appear so dauntingly overwhelming. I've realized the only way to face fear is to go through it one step at a time. I've also learned my way is not always the best way.

4) Leaders in probation are held to a higher ethical standard and the ethical decision is always the right decision. It's taken three years as Probation Administrator but the system will soon submit a Code of Ethics to the Supreme Court for approval. In the first three years of my tenure as Administrator, we developed a vision, a mission and a set of values and beliefs. All of these were created by representatives from every level of probation as was the draft Code of Ethics.

Leaders must exemplify the behavior they want to see in others. Leaders often influence others and may have power and authority with their leadership. Using power wisely necessitates guidelines for appropriate conduct. As a leader, people are observing what you say vs. what you do. I've learned to be held in esteem by others as well as by myself; I have to conduct myself in an "esteem-able" manner in all I do.

5) Always be professional and aim for excellence in everything you do. When I was a new Chief Probation Officer, I discovered one of my employees who transferred to another office had made some negative hurtful comments about me personally. Of course I was devastated. When I saw that employee several months later as she passed me in the hallway of her new office, I ignored her greeting and looked away.

I was quickly chided by a colleague walking with me. She said you are a Chief Probation Officer, therefore a role model for these officers. How you behave will influence how they behave. From that time forward I've consciously attempted to act in a professional manner both on and off the job.

Schweer: My favorite rule of three is "don't ask me to do anything that is immoral, illegal, or unethical and we'll get along just fine." When I think of core values, my first core value is to be true to myself. What I mean by this is that I should not act like someone that I am not. Heaven knows that I am not the sharpest tool in the shed, but I'm not the dullest one either. I am who I am, and this has served me well to this point in time.

Another core value is to treat others as I would have others treat me. To be kind, considerate, and respectful is simply the right thing to do. Likewise, to treat others with dignity is the right thing to do.

Being viewed as trustworthy is another core value I live by as a leader. I feel that a leader should never promise something

Executive Exchange

they know can't be delivered. Be honest in responding to questions and issues. It is my opinion that people respect and admire honesty, and can detect deceit from a mile away. By being trustworthy, a leader also builds credibility with others and can be counted on for a true picture of virtually any situation or subject.

Model with your own actions what you expect of others. If you expect specific behavior and professional conduct in your staff, then model it yourself. Establishing standards for others that are above the standards set for yourself is an accident waiting to happen. If you expect hard work, long hours, and "above and beyond" performance from your staff, then model these same expectations as a leader.

Place the needs of others before your own. There have been several occasions over the years when the needs of others have been made the priority over my own needs. Examples include the purchase of furniture and equipment for staff versus me; giving time off away from work following large project or assignment; covering hearings/meetings/tasks for staff when the volume of work conflicts with their being at three places at the same time, and similar situations. To lend a helping hand at stressful times can pay substantial dividends in the long run.

Tuttle: Important core values for our business include: 1) a balanced approach skill set, 2) respect, 3) teamwork, 4) positive "can do" attitude, and 5) integrity ("doing the right thing the right way.") I would also include diplomacy, listening (communication) skills and objectivity as important traits. All of these values promote the effective communication referenced in question #1.

Yamada: Honesty/Integrity — be honest with others because it is the basis for trust and establishing good relationships and always do what you say you are going to do. In order to develop good working relationships with people they need to know that they can trust and depend on you, and I like to feel that I can trust and depend on them.

Fairness — Try to be fair with everyone, live by the golden rule of doing unto others as you would like others to do unto you. If staff perceive that you are trying to treat everyone fairly and by the same rules they will understand and have more respect.

Hard work — On most days I put in a lot of extra time and come in on the weekends. Staff can see that I am committed to the agency and hopefully this commitment will transfer to them.

Assisting others/having compassion for others — If others need assistance I will try and help. Staff can see that I am approachable and will spend the time with them as needed

Taking time for myself (exercising on a regular basis) and spending time with my family — This helps me be revitalized so that when I come to work I can concentrate my renewed energy on the job.

4. What are the attributes and competencies you value most in yourself that have served you well in leading your organization? As a follow up, what attributes and competencies do you value in your employees?

Corbett: What I have come to value most — in myself and my colleagues is, first, a passion for the business we are in — nothing can substitute for a true gut-level desire to see a profession thrive and accomplish its mission. Second to that, I would mention relentlessness, the insistence on achieving goals not matter how long it takes or whatever the resistance or impediments.

Lastly, I would mention focus, which is the ability not ever to be distracted from your major goal.

Brokofsky: In terms of my attributes and competencies: I respect a variety of points of view regardless of whether they are consistent with my beliefs. I strive to cultivate talent and most often don't feel threatened by staff or others who may be more talented than me. I compartmentalize and delegate. I empower others and find resources to help them succeed. I am definitely a visionary as I most often can see the next 10 or 20 steps we need to take to achieve a goal or solve a problem while most people can only see what's in front of them or the next 2 or 3 steps in front of them. As I stated before, I am a lifelong learner cognizant of the fast pace world. I believe my job is to stay on top of information and assist staff prepare for and implement change. I call it helping staff prepare for "sustainable resiliency."

In terms of valuing an employee's attributes and competencies: Employees who show courage in their convictions by challenging the status quo in an orderly manner impress me. When I see an employee who thinks more deeply and takes next steps before being asked to do so, I'm impressed. I value loyalty and often find myself giving more leeway in situations where employees have been devoted to the organization and are making their best effort to do the right thing. Employees who show passion for the job and care for their clients are worth watching.

Schweer: One of my attributes is that I always try and travel the "high road" in responding to situations, rather than going to the gutter with a negative response or attitude. The high road is the least traveled by many and you get a great deal more done in a shorter period of time. The gutter breeds discontent and seeks out company to languish and fester. I try to smile in situations where most would frown and identify the positive aspects of a situation when most are relating to the negative. It is not that I'm always smiling, but I truly try to seek out the best elements of situations and build on the positive, not the negative. I also work to keep my emotions in check, and not wear my emotions on my sleeve (as one saying goes). Emotional responses to stressful situations can definitely cloud good judgment and informed [good] decision-making. I live by the thought that "he [or she] who angers you, controls you." If I hand over my emotional being and response to another person, then they are in control of my mood and thought process. To become upset by what others say and do grants them a degree of control over the fulfillment of my day. As I grow older, I value every day and want to be the one who controls my life, not others.

I value these same attributes in others. A positive personality makes the job more enjoyable and the work environment not only tolerable in some cases, but actually fun. I value hard work, smart work, commitment, loyalty, honesty, integrity, trust, and servant leadership exhibited by others. These are the characteristics and values I work daily to foster in others like I do myself.

Tuttle: One of my favorite sayings is "They don't pay us for the easy ones." Leaders must be willing to tackle and solve difficult problems. I value staff with that attitude/approach, especially those with technical and analytical abilities to create solutions.

Yamada: I would include good organizational skills; good communication skills (listening to what others are saying); being collaborative/inclusive — willing to get input from others before

making the final decision; being a team player; knowledgeable about the organization; willing to learn new things; hard working; and having perseverance.

I value the same characteristics in my employees.

5. How do you determine where you want to take your organization? What are, or have been, the motivating factors?

Corbett: Determining where to take the organization turns on two important considerations: 1) Why does your organization exist, what is its core mission, and how does it add value? and 2) How well is it accomplishing the mission at the current time and what are the next improvements that can be made?

Brokofsky: When I became Administrator three years ago I instructed all the managers statewide to meet with their staffs and complete two assignments. First, identify and prepare a listing of every problem they believed needed to be addressed in our system, and then tell us where probation as an organization needs to go in the future. From this work, Probation's Strategic Plan and Vision/Mission were developed. From this example, you can see I believe to a great degree in ground-up management. I am a servant leader but I also believe it's my responsibility to lead the strategic planning charge, correct the course if need be, and provide the road map for the future with input from all levels of the organization (top down/bottom up). I also believe it's my job to take the temperature of the organization through various means to determine its capacity to move forward. That said . . . research and evaluation are heavy motivators as to what's working/what's not working and what looks promising that fits with our Vision/Mission.

Schweer: I read, think a lot, and connect with others to determine the vision and direction of where to take the organization. Finding out what the external environment is experiencing allows me to know what not only to plan for (eventually) in our own backyard, but also envision how I might integrate external ideas into internal operations. I also evaluate data: case tracking system data, expenditure reports, budget projections, growth forecast information, case filings, economic indicators, and the like to get a grip on whether or not to initiate new programs or continue existing programs. It is important to me to keep informed and not live in a vacuum where contact with the outside world is extremely limited.

One of the motivating factors in leading an organization for me has been the finite period of time we have in the federal system. There is a mandatory retirement age of 57 and I am a believer in leaving a positive mark on the system. I want to be proud of what has been built when I walk out the door. We spend a huge portion of our lives at work. The question I ask is: Why should we not enjoy our jobs, work to an end that produces the best outcomes, and be proud of what has been accomplished?

Tuttle: Success must be defined in order to know where you want the organization to go. Aiming to reduce recidivism and establishing the performance goals to achieve that mission. Having a supportive agency head and competent, enthusiastic co-workers are motivating factors.

Yamada: Our Adult Client Services Branch (Adult Probation) is a member of the Interagency Council on Intermediate Sanctions

(ICIS) which is a collaborative effort of state and county government agencies with a shared vision of reducing recidivism in the State of Hawaii by 30%. There is a strategic plan of implementing the systematic application of empirically based tools to assist in the management of offenders and to establish a continuum of effective services that meet their needs. In order to work towards this shared vision, ICIS adopted the National Institute of Corrections model of the eight principles of recidivism reduction which include: assess actuarial risk and needs of the offender, enhance intrinsic motivation, target interventions, skill train with directed practice, increase positive reinforcement, engage on-going support in the community, measure relevant practices, and provide measurement feedback.

Our agency continues to work on the eight principles. We assess our clients with a Proxy, LSI-R and ASUS. For the sex offenders we have the sex offender trailers which include the Static 99, Stable and Acute. For the DV offenders we utilize the DVSI, and SARA. We have trained staff in motivational interviewing, cognitive behavior therapy and case plans. We have monthly ICIS meetings with personnel from different agencies to continue carrying out parts of our strategic plan. The goals of ICIS have shaped the direction that our Adult Client Services branch is taking.

I also work closely with three probation administrators on the Neighbor islands (Maui, Kauai and Hawaii) and we have monthly meetings to discuss pertinent areas that we need to address. We all want to provide a safe community for our islands and strive together to do this.

6. How important is vision in leading? How do you go about inspiring a shared vision with your staff?

Corbett: Vision is everything. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." You can't move an organization if you don't have a strong sense of where you want to go. You can bring staff along and keep them motivated if the vision statement is inspirational because it is tied to important values and ambitious. People want to be part of an important enterprise and they want to be part of a team that is determined to win, to achieve great things.

Brokofsky: I happen to be a visionary so it's easy for me to say "yes" vision is a necessity for leadership. However, I know many leaders who are not visionaries but rely on others to help plot the future. I see my role as always preparing the organization for the future. It helps that I can pretty clearly see next steps.

In terms of inspiring a shared vision, my management style lends itself to natural opportunities for shared vision. For example, engaging staff from the onset in creating the vision instills ownership in the vision. Engaging staff always takes more time but that time is well worth it in the long run.

To implement the vision means engaging staff personally, meeting with staff as much as possible, using many different methods of communicating with staff and for them to communicate with you (personal visits, phone, email, newsletter, web ex, memos, etc.) ensuring all levels of the organization are hearing the same message and have the skills and resources to carry out the message. Using just email for communication is a mistake. I use standing committees with both management and line staff as members. The committee is empowered to take on projects and find solutions.

One place I've erred and need to continue to work on is building strong, safe feedback loops for staff to speak critically. We've

Executive Exchange

just developed an intranet and we're thinking about a blog, or something of that sort, which we hope helps.

Schweer: Vision is critical to leading. To lead without vision implies no direction. Without direction there is chaos. Where there is chaos, there is trouble. True leaders have a vision for where they want to see an agency go, and a method/plan/process to get there. It is my vision for the agency I now lead that we be viewed as the "benchmark" for the federal probation and pre-trial services system. While this vision is certainly attainable, it is how the method/plan/process is implemented that will lend credibility and support to the definition of benchmark.

It is my hope to share this vision with staff in such a way that they embrace the vision and make it their own. Painting the picture is only one way to convey the vision, providing data and outcome measures reflecting the vision is possible will be the key factors for selling the vision.

Tuttle: A clear, well articulated vision is critical. I constantly reinforce the message (bi-annual meetings with staff in every district, quarterly management meetings, newsletters, training, etc.) and try to do it in various ways (verbal, visual examples, in writing).

Yamada: I believe that our staff needs to have a good idea of our vision for the future as they become more engaged and want to be a part of the process. We try to promote the vision and the mission in our meetings.

Three years ago (when we had extra money) I was part of a three man team who planned a statewide probation officers' conference. We had staff from the different islands come together for a two day conference on Oahu. We had the Chief Justice attend and had all staff take the oath of office. We brought in mainland and local speakers to talk about evidence based practices and reducing recidivism. We had staff engaging with each other about the purpose of their work and the direction of probation.

At Christmas we passed out candy bars to staff with our vision, "a safe community" and thanking them for promoting our mission, "helping offenders become productive and responsible citizens through evidence based practices and community collaboration."

We have meetings with Administrators on a regular basis and recently began including all supervisors. We discuss how we can continue to forge ahead especially in view of our budget cuts.

7. Please provide us an example of how you have overcome resistance to bring about needed change?

Corbett: I undertook an effort in the 1990s to move probation officers from an office-based system to a community based system, which would take officers out of their comfort zone and cause them to work unconventional hours working the streets of distressed communities. This was a radical change. The resistance was overcome by asking those who volunteered to do the work initially sell it to their colleagues — for its impact, its gratification, and its sense of really contributing to the fight against crime. Staff led the way — management acted as cheerleaders.

Brokofsky: When I took over as Administrator the culture of the organization was one of "over-worked, under-paid, undervalued, no resources, and sick and tired of hearing they needed

to work smarter." To say there was an atmosphere of resistance would be an understatement at best. For the first year as Administrator all I heard about was the poor morale of the staff, my high expectations of them, and how all the new "stuff" I was talking about was just a "flavor of the month" and would fade away.

Some of the management complained that I was moving too fast (which I was, too much too fast is not good) and I was asking them to do too many new things at once (which I was, and needed to do).

The first step I took to address the resistance was to understand that this was an expected reaction to a major overhaul of their world. This acceptance helped both myself and our management team to listen more with an empathetic ear, provide more focused training addressing issues heard from the field, communicating messages (regularly and authentically) with relevant information and personal thanks for hard work, and be amenable to adjusting, or modifying a course of action if need be. Finding and cultivating "heroes" who supported the changes helped.

Painting pictures helped a lot. The analogy of building a house served me well during the transformation of probation. We all lived in the basement of the house (had to keep on conducting business) while the house was being built. Living in the basement while workers were building a foundation and erecting walls is certainly not a pleasant experience. I also found using the analogy of putting up the framework of the house to illustrate the changes we were making in re-writing all of our policy, developing new programs, new training etc. After a couple of years, we were talking about a roof and drywall. We compared the utilization of committees to an architect working with the family building the house. We're still using the house analogy to help paint the picture of where we've been, where we are and where we're going as a system. What's important is Probation's house is a "living" house. We will always be building on, strengthening the infrastructure, changing the furnishings and updating the fixtures.

I met with my management team once a week to keep up to date on progress. We took the temperature of the organization constantly by calling Chiefs randomly and inquiring how things were going, by moving out of our offices and into the field, to listen but also to be seen and heard.

Schweer: I have always been one to state expectations up front and encourage those who climb aboard the train that is leaving the station. Many philosophies exist about qualifying resistance, but the one I like most (and subscribe to) relates to the 20/50/30 fence. Generally, in most agencies a leader will have 30% of the staff on their side of the fence and consisting of those who support the vision and direction of the leader. Approximately 50% of the staff are on the fence. They have yet to decide whether to support the leader or to support those opposed to the leader. The 20% on the opposite side of the fence are opposed to the leader and may never even reach the 50% on the fence. So, the decision for the leader to make is whether to expend considerable effort on the 20% who may never reach the fence, or concentrate on the remaining 80%. It has been my practice to concentrate on the 80%, with the thought in mind that the 20% will either convert to at least the 50% on the fence or place themselves in a position where they leave the agency, either voluntarily or involuntarily through adverse action.

In addition, it has been my experience that rewarding the 80% for tasks well done projects to the opposition (20%) that good

things will be recognized. Some of the 20% will desire similar positive recognition and actually convert to the 50% or even the 30% on your side. The agency leadership will need to keep in mind that those who will not change will consume a great deal of time to accomplish a separation from the agency. Rewards may include approval of projects, training opportunities, verbal and material recognition, promotions, letters of recognition, or any other assortment of positive acknowledgement of a job well done.

Tuttle: Our Agency culture has traditionally been very conservative. As one example, by demonstrating to staff that a reduced technical violence rate would result in the provision of more agency resources (avoid building expensive prisons with a resulting increase in our budget to continue this trend) without compromising public safety (no increase in convicted violators) staff have been more willing to embrace the evidence-based practices era and a more balanced approach to their work.

Yamada: It takes a lot of time and effort to overcome resistance. In fact, we are still encountering resistance by some of our staff in the implementation of evidence based practices (EBP). When we first began to utilize EBP and adopted the LSI-R assessment instrument we had a lot of problems with staff who were not ready to move forward. We needed to keep trying to engage staff by giving them factual information (research based) on the positives of EBP and having discussions with them on our new practices. We continue to stress that it is important for them to develop a good working relationship with their offenders, assess their stage of change and work together on goals and objectives. You need to listen to staff concerns; however, be firm in your decision and direction of the agency goals. We also try to provide additional training for staff as needed if they have difficulty grasping a concept.

In addition to this, we provide staff feedback on how we are progressing with the changes that are taking place. We have a researcher at the Attorney General's Office who provides research results for staff on our new practices.

8. How have you created an environment for innovation within your leadership team or organization?

Corbett: It comes down to whether you create an environment where people are encouraged to take chances, to break molds, and to try something new, even if the old system ain't broken. If staff believe coming forward with new ideas will be applauded, they will do it. Management must constantly reinforce the need for continuous improvement.

Brokofsky: Creating constructive change is one of the tenets of the Nebraska Probation mission statement. Personally, I hate change. I can't bear to change the curtains, bedspread or furniture in my own house. Yet I'm a life-long learner. I worked and went to school for 20 years to earn a degree, then finished a master's degree in two years at the age of 55. I love to learn and believe there are many different ways to approach an issue.

So my approach to innovation and change has been one of encouragement and empowerment. I publicly support the individual or entity offering a new idea in terms of the offer rather than the particulars of the idea thus encouraging people not to be afraid to speak out. I also used two kinds of committees

to encourage bottom up input and creativity. I asked the Chief Probation Officers to select their best and brightest staff to participate in evidence based programming implementation teams (EBP Teams). These teams came up with both new approaches to existing programming and new ideas for programming.

I also empower Probation's Standing Committees and the Deputy Administrators and Chiefs who oversee them to be places of frank discussion and ideas. Over the years I've heard comments about how innovative I am, yet I found myself stumbling trying to think of how I created an environment of innovation. So I asked some of the people who work for me how they would answer the question for me. One of the responses reflected a few of the points others said. It is below:

"It goes beyond creating an environment, you have also shown us how to be innovative i.e.; finding funding for administrative positions without legislative funding, going beyond normal interaction with other state agencies by creating partnerships with other state agencies. The whole movement toward EBP has been an innovation considering where we came from to where we wish to be."

Schweer: One of the first things a leader can do to create innovation is to hire it. During the interview process, a leader can identify specific characteristics and expectations in applicants for positions within the agency. For existing staff, a leader can take a chance on an idea and let an employee (or group of employees) run with it. One example I am very familiar with is the creation of an Offender Employment Program (OEP). The leader conveyed the desire to all staff that he wanted to create an employment program. This communication resulted in several volunteers stepping forward to work toward the vision of the leader. The leader then left it to the volunteers to create the program. As a result, the agency together created an OEP that now serves as the model for the entire federal probation and pretrial services system. With this success, other members of the staff brought ideas forth for consideration, were encouraged to create new programs with the support of management, and succeeded in a number of areas. Programs such as Home Ownership, Young Offenders, MoneySmart, Clothing Room, Food Pantry, and others were created for offenders to successfully re-enter the communities following incarceration.

In addition, a good leader will create an environment where creativity is encouraged, supported, and rewarded. The worst thing a leader can do is shoot the messenger. What I mean by this is for the leader to cut down, shelve, disregard, or demean the person or persons conveying their ideas to the leader. If this happens, the members of the staff will be less likely to bring other ideas forward for consideration, if at all. This is also the kind of bad karma that spreads like a plague through an agency and from which some leaders are never able to recover.

Tuttle: We have reinvested increased collection dollars to reward staff by accessing the best national level training offered. By providing staff opportunities to become the best they can be, we should also positively impact offender outcomes (quality interventions).

Yamada: We have tried to do different things — started a teleworks program where pre-sentence staff work out of their homes and come to the office only once or twice a week. This is good for staff and saves cost for us on office space.

Executive Exchange

We have a regular round table discussion at the end of our meetings where we discuss our administrator's ideas/suggestions on new ways of doing things.

We had a Workload Committee formed with staff (supervisors and line staff) to determine how we could work smarter and better. They made proposals and I plan to have a discussion with the Criminal Administrative judge on some of these suggestions to determine if the court will allow us to implement.

9. While no one likes to acknowledge weakness, what tendencies or characteristics do you possess that have caused your problems as a leader? How have you strived to overcome these shortcomings?

Corbett: I can be impatient and sometimes short-tempered. I can sometimes talk more than I listen. If I am fixated on certain goals, I can be inflexible about incorporating new developments. I strive to overcome these by buying a big mirror and prayer.

Brokofsky: My staff will tell you I worked them too hard, too fast, with too many projects at once. All of this is true. While I worked as hard as they did, my expectations for what I called their "deliverables" was very high. In my defense, I went for a "moment in time" where there was both political will and funding to transform probation service delivery and find the resources and infrastructure needs to support the change. The staff will also tell you I'm a "visionary" who sees things from a bird's eye view and that I'm not a detail person. So given the fact the "devil is in the details" I fall short, but I work hard to keep detail people close.

After three years of building and taking advantage of the "moment in time," we're focusing now on quality assurance, and evaluation. There are always challenges but the pace doesn't seem quite so hard now.

Sometimes my expectations are too high. I'm a pusher. I push limits, I push people. I almost always believe people will be successful. I've found when I expect more, people generally rise to the occasion and find they can reach a new level of achievement. That said, sometimes I find myself pushing too hard and expecting too much of people. I have to literally stop and check out my behavior. That means checking with the people themselves, or keeping trusted people close whose opinion you value. Pulling back and apologizing are necessary actions that I always work on.

Leaders are subject to scrutiny. Others watch leaders, what they do and what they say. Leaders don't have to be perfect. It is necessary, in my view, that they are "real." Real people make mistakes. Knowing this and incorporating this realization and acceptance into everyday behavior is a constant challenge.

Schweer: There are times when I can become impatient in getting things done. Luckily, I have members of the staff who bring this to my attention and are able to calm my desire to move on something quickly, and in favor of a balanced approach. I try to remember the old saying of "haste makes waste" when I become impatient, so this positive self-talk has a way of easing the anxiety associated with impatience.

In addition, there are times when I may operate in the gray area when a decision needs to be made in a black or white situation. What I mean by this is that my tendency is to over-evaluate or delay a decision when the need for a decision is very clear to those around me. Again, luckily I have those around me who are more than willing to point this out to me.

In summary, I acknowledge that I am human. I cannot be all things to all people, even though I try at times. I admit when mistakes are made and I seek to correct the mistakes. Obviously, since I make mistakes there is a sense of fair play that I must likewise accept the mistakes of others.

Tuttle: I can recall times when I attempted to address too many issues at once (hopefully lesson learned). One must strategically prioritize the initiatives that can be accomplished with available resources . . . "choke the motor" on other items as needed.

Yamada: I have difficulty delegating work tasks to administrators and program specialists and often end up doing a lot of the work on my own. I need to be better in this area as I always have so much to do. I'm still working on this.

I have difficulty confronting individuals and telling them that their work performance is poor and what improvements need to be made. I am getting better at this as I have had to deal with a number of personnel issues.

10. What are your own measures of effectiveness for you personally and for your organization?

Corbett: The measures of effectiveness for me are the same as those for the organization — are we achieving our established goals and constantly improving our performance in doing so.

Brokofsky: Let me first say that although I've been a leader for almost 20 years, the last three years, without a doubt, were the toughest of my career and why I believe "courage" is a necessity for leadership. I'd like to share a bit of personal information with you prior to answering your question.

I was hired in October of 2005 by the Supreme Court of Nebraska. Within a year, I finished my master's degree, took on the job of caring for my elderly mother who had five bypass heart surgery and lives on her own and my grandchildren who needed to finish school after their parents moved to a new city. My husband, who was employed at a major university, lost his job in a downsizing effort. My boss who hired me unexpectedly decided to retire and a state senator (ex-employee of probation) decided to make a full throttle effort to re-align the probation system under the Executive Branch, rather than the Judicial Branch of government. This state senator had a large group of disgruntled probation officers as followers, who were quick to advertise the bad morale, low pay, high expectations, etc.

Also, I was not familiar with state government having been promoted to the state level from county government. I am a commuter, commuting two hours each day, which made for very long days. In this new world, in this new environment, facing many personal issues, I was challenged to lead the transformation of a probation system that had not undergone any kind of change for almost 20 years.

Where I failed miserably was taking care of myself. Where I succeeded was taking care of others and leading the Probation system. The system is built on a strong foundation now. I could leave tomorrow and there would be a number of people who could step right in and move forward without missing a beat. I'm just beginning to recover, taking time off regularly, not working evenings and weekends unless it's a special project. I'm even thinking about exercising again.

Almost all of my administrative staff has flourished during the last three years. They're highly motivated, creative; they think on their feet and are role models for others. All of them physically look and feel better than 3 years ago. I've heard they don't feel so oppressed anymore.

From almost all accounts, the system (through staff visits and feedback, management commentary, committee participation, personal visits and correspondence, and information from outside entities) has embraced the new world of EBP and actually begins to appear motivated for change. For example, 3 years ago there were many complaints of low morale (administration expecting too much, not appreciating their work, giving them too much work), this complaint is rarely heard, if ever heard now. I've been waiting for an opportune time to send out a survey to the system. We've sent out small surveys to small groups over the last few years but feared a statewide survey too soon, in regard to the new business of probation, might promote a lynch mob.

In terms of the business of probation, during the last three years, the Vera Institute, the Nebraska Medical Center and the University of Nebraska/Omaha conducted studies specific to certain new probation programs. Results are promising. We've brought in consultants from both public and private agencies to help us transform our management information system to include both performance and outcome measures.

Probation's management information system required a complete overhaul due to our system change and focus on delineating performance and outcome measures. There is not enough paper to document the political and financial acrobatics we faced trying to get this accomplished.

It's important to note "buy-in" sometimes is not always tangible but very important. Nebraska's District, County and Separate Juvenile Court judges illustrate this buy-in. In three years, all juvenile and adult presentence and predisposition investigation practices were changed. I recall a District Court Judge announcing to a packed audience four years ago that the "presentence would change over his dead body." Now he is one of the biggest supporters of our new "predictors of recidivism" instrument(s) that are now incorporated in very different, much more focused investigations. The Chief Probation Officers and Administrative Office worked hard to inform, explain and prepare judges to "want" new information in their investigations. We've administered three separate surveys to the judges with results ranging from skepticism the first year to over 95% in support this past year.

Schweer: I am a believer in anonymous surveys that provide an opportunity for staff to state their degree of agreement with the vision and mission of the agency. This includes the rating of managers and leadership. It is through this forum that leaders are able to learn what others think of them personally and professionally. This forum also provides a "safe" method for staff to say things they ordinarily wouldn't.

Garnering feedback from others outside the agency is also a way to find out if the agency is accomplishing its mission. These constituents of the agency function are a valuable source of information to make constructive changes, or provide resources the agency does not possess.

Regarding personal effectiveness, keeping my personal compass pointing in the right [positive] direction affords me the opportunity to sleep comfortably at night and not require a continual "looking over the shoulder" lifestyle. I have six years

left to serve in my current position before mandatory retirement, and you can bet they will be the best six years of my life.

Tuttle: We have established agency performance measures, eighteen of which are submitted to the budget office and reported on quarterly. There are additional internal performance measures (a total of 45) that are tracked. If we meet, and in many cases exceed, our goals, effectiveness is achieved for the organization and the employees (self included).

Yamada: For staff to believe that our agency is a good place to work and that we are making a difference in utilizing evidence based practices in working with our offenders to get them to be productive and responsible citizens. When I can go down the hallways of the office and hear the majority of our staff working together with their offenders on the offender's goals rather than just telling them what to do.

Resources are tight right now because of the economic downturn in Hawaii; however, I would like to continue to be able to get resources for the staff so that they can continue with the eight principles of recidivism reduction.

Conclusion

Given the importance of effective leadership in the field of probation, these five probation leaders candidly shared their beliefs and attitudes, which may be identified as qualities of principle-based leadership. Consistent with the five fundamental practices — challenge the process; inspire a shared vision; enable others to act; model the way; and encourage the heart — identified by Kouzes and Posner (2002), these exemplary probation leaders have successfully incorporated these five practices.

The most critical question raised here is what values and attitudes contributed to their successful five leadership behaviors. Interestingly, there are two common theses in their values-based leadership. First, they believe that leaders must be a value sharper. This core value means that you are willing to change yourself in order to successfully set up a vision, communicate the vision, be a role-model, and overcome the resistance to change since you cannot ask your followers to make a sacrifice that you yourself are unwilling to make. Second, they have beliefs and attitudes that a wholeness or completeness is achieved by your followers with healthy self-confidence and self-esteem. Accordingly, they avoid the traditional heroic leadership style, and they treat their followers with trust and encourage their inclusion and participation. This values-based leadership seems to be the most critical determinant in overcoming refusal to be followers and resistance to change.

To truly transform probation toward a more effective system, these two core values — integrity and dignity — in leadership are applied by and are expected from all probation executives, managers, and supervisors.

References

- Center for Public Leadership (2008). *Conversations on leadership: Leadership and the next presidency*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School. Retrieved from www.centerforpublicleadership.org/ under Programs.
- Harvard Business Review (1998). *Leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Executive Exchange

Harvard Business Review (2001). *What makes a good leader*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge, 3rd Edition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCauley, C. D., & Van Velsor, E., Eds. (2004). *Handbook of leadership development, 2nd Edition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Toole, James (1995). *Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This survey, the responses, and the resultant article were crafted, compiled, and edited by the following:

Dan Richard Beto, Editor of *Executive Exchange* and a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, Bryan, Texas.

Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Criminal Justice, Angelo State University, San Angelo, Texas.

Christie Davidson, Executive Director of the National Association of Probation Executives, and Assistant Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, Huntsville, Texas.

Executive Exchange is grateful to the five probation executives who took the time to share their thoughts on the important subject of leadership.

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

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

Articles may be reproduced without charge as long as permission is obtained in writing from the Editor and credit is given to both the author and *Executive Exchange*.

Submissions for publication consideration should be formatted for letter size paper with at least one inch margins. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a

photograph for possible inclusion. Submission may be sent electronically to probation.executives@gmail.com or by conventional mail to:

Dan Richard Beto
Editor, *Executive Exchange*
National Association of Probation Executives
P.O. Box 3993
Bryan, Texas 77805-3993

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* may be directed to Dan Richard Beto at (979) 822-1273 or to Christie Davidson at (936) 294-3757. *Executive Exchange* does not accept advertisements.

The Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University serves as the secretariat for the National Association of Probation Executives.

NAPE LISTSERV AND WEBSITE

Members of the National Association of Probation Executives should feel free to use the NAPE Listserv to pose questions or share information about relevant topics in the administration of community corrections agencies. Members wishing to send out information on this exclusive service may address emails to nape_members@shsu.edu.

At present there are over 200 members registered on the NAPE Listserv. Members who are not receiving this service but wish to should send an email to probation.executives@gmail.com, indicating a desire to be added to the NAPE List-

serv. In addition, members who would like to update their email addresses, or add a second email address, should feel free to do so.

In keeping with the Association's policy not to accept advertisements in its publications, the NAPE Listserv will not, as reasonably possible, be used to promote products or services.

If you have not done so recently, please visit the NAPE website at www.napehome.org.

THE EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION FOR PROBATION: REPORT ON THE TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND CONFERENCE

by

Dan Richard Beto
and
Donald G. Evans

The European Organization for Probation, commonly known as CEP, held its 10th General Assembly and Conference on May 27-29, 2010, in the southern coastal city of Malaga, Spain.

CEP: The Organization

By way of background, CEP exists “to promote the social inclusion of offenders through community sanctions and measures such as probation, community service, mediation and conciliation.” In addition, CEP is committed to enhancing the profile of probation and to improve professionalism in this field, on a national and a European level. The organization “promotes pan-European cooperation by organizing conferences on actual topics in probation.” By making the reports of these events available, by publishing its digital newsletter and through its website, CEP stimulates the exchange of ideas on probation (CEP website, 2010).

Member countries in CEP include: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jersey, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom (UK).

Members include agencies and organizations working in the field of probation and interested individuals. As a result, CEP, headquartered in the Netherlands, brings together practitioners, managers, academics, stakeholders, and others working in the field of probation and criminal justice from all over Europe. In concert “they represent a unique network of expertise about positive ways of working with offenders in the community” (CEP website, 2010). Their common concern is how to protect society without resorting to the costly sanction of incarceration.

To European bodies such as the European Union and the Council of Europe, CEP is the voice of probation by providing expertise and comparative data.

In 2007, at the 9th General Assembly in Tallinn, Estonia, the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE) and CEP entered into an affiliation agreement. At the time that agreement was executed, then CEP President John Scott noted this relationship “was desired and appropriate, since both organizations represent the leadership of probation in two important geographical areas — CEP in Europe and NAPE in North America” (Beto & Evans, 2007).

CEP, in existence for three decades, is governed by a board consisting of the President, two Vice Presidents, and a maximum of eight other persons elected by the General Assembly, which meets every three years.

Tenth General Assembly

On May 27, 2010, CEP held its Tenth General Assembly at the Hotel Monte Malaga in Malaga, Spain, during which President

Patrick Madigou of France presided over an ambitious agenda (CEP, Agenda and working papers).

Following opening remarks by President Madigou, the members considered and approved the minutes of the Ninth General Assembly held in Tallinn. The assembly also approved a number of new members, including full, associate, individual, and honorary. All outgoing board members were granted honorary membership status.

Both Leo Tigges, CEP Secretary General from the Netherlands, and President Madigou provided detailed reports on the activities of the organization during the past three years, which included a report on the number of topical conferences relevant to community corrections delivered. Delegates also reviewed the financial reports for this same time frame.

Particularly interesting was the time devoted to the subject of “probation values and principles,” in which an initial draft was laid out to the assembly. This initiative goes back to the General Assembly at Tallinn three years ago, where the Board was asked to articulate a collective vision for probation in Europe and formulate a set of basic values that would be shared by all members. This document was prepared with the assistance of Professor Rob Canton, an advisor to the Council for Penological Cooperation with the Council of Europe, following extensive consultations with CEP members (CEP, Agenda and working papers). Comments were solicited that will be considered and incorporated into another draft.

Another area of interest was the discussion dealing with three identified strategic objectives, which included:

- Unite organizations and individuals who share similar principles;
- Enhance the professionalization of the sector of probation; and
- Raise the profile of probation.

A great deal of thought had gone into developing these objectives, and during the General Assembly breakout groups were utilized to expand on and fine tune these strategic areas.

Also addressed was the budget for the next three years, membership contributions, and membership levels. In addition, the assembly approved some amendments to the bylaws.

The next item on the agenda was the election of officers and directors. Marc Ceron of Spain was elected President, and Suzanne Vella of Ireland and Gerhard Ploeg of Norway were elected to fill the two Vice President positions. Elected to the Board were: Dimitar Rusinov of Bulgaria; Ulrich Futter of Germany; Eric Moriniere of France; Sebastinao Ardita of Italy; Daniel Biancalana of Luxembourg; and Sue Hall of the United Kingdom. The assembly also voted to continue Leo Tigges as Secretary General of the organization.

The meeting was concluded by brief remarks provided by incoming President Ceron, who spoke about the importance

adhering to a sound business plan, maintaining a close relationship with the Council of Europe, working together with passion to protect the public and reintegrate offenders, and treating people well.

The General Assembly was conducted in English, Spanish, and French, with simultaneous translations into these and several other languages.

Despite their many differences, members attending this General Assembly shared a common goal of advancing probation services and the profession in Europe. It was refreshing to observe their commitment to service, their professionalism, and their willingness to work together or overcome common obstacles.

Conference: "Probation Works"

On May 28-29, 2010, the conference portion of this gathering of probation professionals was continued at the Hotel Monte Malaga. The theme of the conference was "Probation Works" and the many workshops were relevant and related to practice and research.

Mary Anne McFarlane of the UK and an outgoing CEP Board Member opened the first day of the conference; she called on several officials to welcome participants. She also outlined the scope of the conference.

The plenary session — "The Context in which Probation Systems in Europe Operate" — was moderated by Montserrat Toha, Director of the Social Rehabilitation Institute Foundation (IRES) in Spain, and consisted of two other speakers. Candido Agra, Professor in Law at the University of Porto in Portugal, spoke on "New Trends in Crime, Social Issues, and Correctional Policy," and was followed by Sonja Snacken, Professor of Criminology, Penology, and Sociology of Law at the Free University of Brussels and Chair of the Council for Penological Cooperation for the Council of Europe; the topic of her presentation was "The Impact of the new Criminal and Social Context on Probation Systems in Europe."

Professor Agra introduced his presentation by noting that he was indebted to three individuals who have inspired his approach: Goya, the painter; Foucault, the philosopher; and Augustus, the founder of American probation. In developing his theme of new trends in crime, social issues, and correctional policy, he raised the following question: what happened to us and what is the meaning of our experience? In proposing an answer, he briefly outlined the history of probation, organized under three themes or time periods:

- Rationality of safety/security (1980-present). He discussed changes in criminality, globalization of crime, economic crime, and the rise of insecurity as a social phenomenon, emergence of a victim movement which has led to a complex system, and the organizing of criminal justice policies based on risk and responsibility.
- Welfare rationality (1945 to 1980). He locates probation within the context of the welfare state in which policies of treatment and social reintegration prevailed. In the European context this was the period of interest in "social defense" as the motivator for penal policy.
- Disciplinary rationality (1840 to 1945). Agra described the birth and history of probation and discussed the role of John Augustus in Massachusetts. Probation migrated to Europe in the late 1850s through the emerging juvenile delinquent legislation.

In concluding his presentation, he noted that the three rationalities are not mutually exclusive, although the first one is currently dominating criminal justice policy-making. In another reference to John Augustus, he noted that Augustus work was actually empirically based and that he documented his experiences, which were recorded. On this last point he stressed the need for greater use of the scientific method and critical thinking and not be lulled to sleep by myths and magic rituals.

Professor Snacken presentation outlined the difficulties encountered in defining probation and in developing European Probation Rules. She gave an overview of the work to date in the development of Probation Rules, taking into account the context of probation in Europe, and attempted to provide a framework that included different traditions of community sanctions and measures in Europe. Snacken noted the Council of Europe Probation Rules R (2010) states that probation:

relates to the implementation of community sanction and measures, defined by law and imposed on an offender. It includes a range of activities and interventions, which involve supervision, guidance and assistance aiming at the social inclusion of an offender as well as contributing to community safety. It may also involve providing information and advice to judicial authorities to help them reach informed and just decisions; providing guidance and support to offenders while in custody in order to prepare their release and resettlement; monitoring and assistance to persons subject to early or conditional release: restorative justice interventions; and offering assistance to victims of crime (Snacken, 2010).

Snacken gave a brief overview of the development of probation in Europe and suggested three generations in the history of probation:

- Non-custodial sanctions initially developed as a result of criticism of short-term imprisonment in the 19th century. Starting in 1950 and lasting about 20 years was the emphasis on re-socialization.
- By the 1980s countries were beginning to experience a rise in prison populations and probation became more carceral in attitude as the emphasis shifted to intensive supervision, surveillance and monitoring, and attention to high-risk offenders. It was also the time that the "what works" approaches began to surface.
- A focus on restorative practices and sanctions appeared.

Given these developments, Snacken stated that the social and political context in which probation operates is complex. For probation to have status, it has to be seen as not only effective but also legitimate. She outlined four areas that are critical to establishing legitimacy for probation. They are:

- Effectiveness in reducing recidivism;
- Public opinion, better understanding of what probation does;
- Concern for and assistance to victims; and
- Offenders not only compliant to orders but concern for human rights and special needs must be taken into account.

She concluded her presentation by noting that in dealing with offenders, imprisonment should be a last resort, while community sanctions and measures should have legitimacy as an intervention in their own right.

Following this plenary session, conference participants could attend one of four workshops, which included: "The Implementation of the EU Framework Decision 2008 in a Context of Increasing Numbers of Foreign Nationals on Probation Caseloads" facilitated by Leo Tigges of the Netherlands; "Crimes of Gender-based Violence: A Challenge for Probation Services" led by Lidia Seratusell, Director of the Restorative Justice Department in Spain; "Probation Services and New Types of Crime: A Real Phenomenon or a Result of Net-Widening?" with Marie Brossy Patin, Judge and former President of the National Federation of Reception and Reintegration (FNARS) of France; and "Probation Interventions with People who have Committed Serious Offenses: Models of Intensive Supervision" led by Jose Vidal Carballo, Director of the Central Penitentiary Sevilla II in Spain.

After lunch, a second plenary session took place. Moderated by Peter Van Der Laan, a Professor of Social Sciences and Behavior at the University of Amsterdam, this session focused on "The Effectiveness of Probation Systems in Europe." Participating in this session were Professor Friedrich Losel, Director of the Cambridge Institute of Criminology, and Santiago Redondo Illescas, Professor of Psychology and Criminology at the University of Barcelona. Professor Losel spoke on "What the Evidence Tells Us," with emphasis on the importance of applied research, and Professor Redondo Illescas addressed the subject of "The Use of Technical Tools to Support Effective Practice," with particular reference to assessment devices.

Professor Losel began his presentation by noting that the title of his talk can be taken as either a statement or a question. He acknowledged two key factors: the general effects of probation are not clear and that generalization is still difficult, partially due to the international differences in the research and practice. The evidence, he said, tell us that: there are international differences in research orientation; there exists different cultures of evaluation and know how; resources are different as are the evidence bases; and of critical note there are difficulties of transnational transfer of knowledge and practice. Losel outlined three phases of the "what works" research and practice: general proof that rehabilitation works; differentiated analysis of what works best for whom and under what conditions; and integrating the knowledge on single programs into a broader systems perspective and routine practice. Losel then proceeded to walk the participants through a general overview of meta-analyses and the findings from a number of studies. He concluded this section of his presentation by summarizing what had been learned to date:

- Offender rehabilitation works;
- Positive results were found in community and custody programs;
- The risk-need-responsivity approach was an important step forward, but the evidence of what works is much broader;
- Other models such as multi-systemic treatment, therapeutic community, social therapy and restorative justice have shown positive results;
- More studies from non-English-speaking countries are needed;
- Better knowledge about transfer from and to other countries is needed; and
- Many factors determine outcomes needs to be acknowledged.

He also acknowledged that there are some critical arguments against the "what works" approach and discussed Tony Ward's Good Lives Model where Ward lists nine "goods" a

person requires to be successful. They seem obvious but need to be remembered in our work with offenders (for details of this approach see Ward & Maruna, 2007). However, this approach, although helpful, has not been subjected to empirical research or evaluation. It includes input from the research on desistance and natural protective factors, and the "what works" approaches would benefit from integrating this knowledge into current practice. He closed his presentation by reminding the participants that the problem of crime is more than an issue for criminal justice; it is also a public health, education, and welfare issue. This was a very informative and insightful overview of what we know and don't know about offender rehabilitation and community supervision.

Professor Redondo Illescas began his address by examining the relationship between socialization and punishment. Since crime is rooted in society, he believed it would be useful to think about emphasizing mechanisms such as socialization, education, and social support in our efforts to suppress criminal activity. He argued that if our penal system was based on those factors we would see less use of imprisonment and more use of probation. However, in recent times there has been a trend toward more punitive control, generally associated with intolerance, at the expense of socialization, education, and social support, which are generally associated with tolerance and civilization. He backed up his thesis by a review of statistical data on the continued use of imprisonment in a number of European countries, even though these countries have recorded falling rates of crime. Redondo Illescas suggested that this development of the hardening attitude towards offenders has led to prison overcrowding, less focus on high-risk cases, an increase in general recidivism, high financial and social costs, and a general decline in our social and political values.

He then turned his attention to possible solutions to this development, including the use of instruments and programs to more effectively reduce offender re-offending, such as:

- Objectives for change need to reflect the dynamic risks, social skills, and substance abuse;
- A clear supervision strategy; and
- Integrity of implementation of programs.

Redondo Illescas then reminded us that change takes time and the higher the risk of re-offending the more difficult the change process. Risk assessment is a crucial aspect of our work and he outlined the positive aspects of this activity, but noted that there were also negative aspects to be wary of. The major consequences of risk assessment from a negative aspect is the fact that it is a process that is not sensitive to diverse circumstances and has tendency to lead to stigmatization and social exclusion.

The professor would like to see governments use available knowledge, empirical evidence, and rationality to find a balance between achieving public safety through control and achieving offender rehabilitation by care. He felt that this is the ideal role for probation — balancing the roles of control and care. He closed his address by making three points that he felt were reasons for probation being the method to balance care and control in managing offender behavior, namely: criminological, economical, and ethical/moral.

This was a very stimulating presentation and although some might not agree with all of his observations it should produce some significant thinking regarding the role of probation today.

A second series of four workshops followed, which included: "Assessment Tools: The Measurement of Risk and Protective

Factors" with Robin Moore, Head of OASys – Data, Evaluation, and Analysis Team (O-DEAT) in the UK; "The Role of Victim-Offender Mediation in Probation" led by Jaume Martin, Chief of International Relations with the Spanish Secretariat of Penitentiary Services; "Social Reintegration Programs to Prevent Reoffending" facilitated by Gerhard Ploeg, Senior Advisory in Correctional Services at the Norwegian Ministry of Justice; and "Responding to Hate Crime and Extremism," led by Sue Hall, Chief Executive of the West Yorkshire Probation Trust and Chair of the Probation Chiefs Association in the UK.

The second day of the conference consisted of a plenary session followed by some concluding observations.

The plenary session dealt with the topic of "Communication Strategies" and was moderated by Luis Arroyo Zapatero, a Professor at the University of Castilla – La Mancha. Participating in the session were Shadd Maruna, Professor of Justice and Human Development in the School of Law at Queen's University in Belfast, and Sjef van Gennip, Director General of the Dutch Probation Service. They spoke on "Managing the Media" and "The Importance of Consistency in Internal and External Communication."

Professor Maruna's presentation centered on exploring the issue of punitive public opinion and addressing how we might influence the opinions the public hold or are perceived to hold relative to dealing with offenders. Using research, he addressed four myths about public opinion: public punitiveness is natural and inevitable; punitiveness is a reaction to victimization and fear; the public just needs better information; and economical reasons — high costs of prisons — would be persuasive. He then turned his attention to exploring whether there was any evidence that might work in providing an anger management program for a punitive public. Maruna outlined four possible approaches to try: focus on moral debates about what type of society we want to live in; use reparation as a frame of reference; employ the redemption message; and the use of narrative stories that put a face on the offender.

There is still much more probation administrators and leaders need to learn about influencing public opinion but it is heartening to know that academic researchers are exploring this important area.

The final speaker of the plenary session was Sjef van Gennip from the Netherlands, and his presentation was a good case study on the importance of maintaining good and consistent communications, both externally and internally. While there are many external stakeholders, particular attention should be devoted to the media and the government. This will involve participating in national debates and disseminating scientific research related to the field of probation. Internally, he felt that as Director General he needed to be informed on all relevant issues, to have a feel for what goes on in the organization, to understand what his managers and workers need, and to remove unnecessary bureaucracy.

In terms of external communications he advises that for him a good relation with the government is essential, as is investing in relations with their stakeholders and making sure never to surprise them. Finally he noted that we need to work hard at maintaining our networks.

In closing his presentation van Gennip suggested four key points in maintaining consistency between internal and external communications: be transparent; tell the same story; don't walk away from responsibilities; and keep in mind your agency's place in society.

Leonor Furtado, President of the Institute of Social Reinsertion with the Portuguese Ministry of Justice, and workshop leaders made some observations about the first day's workshops. They were followed by John Scott, Former President of CEP and Deputy Director of Estates with the UK Ministry of Justice, who summarized the Malaga conference (his remarks are found elsewhere as a separate article in this issue of *Executive Exchange*).

The conference organizers did a commendable job of crafting an agenda that was both scholarly and practical and that contained something for everyone.

International Exchanges

As in the case of most conferences, some of the richest exchanges of knowledge occur during breaks, over a meal, and at receptions. This was also the case at the Malaga conference. From our perspective, some of the best discussions on probation practices occurred with practitioners and academics from Hungary, Ireland, Northern Ireland, the Netherlands, Scotland, Spain, England, Sweden, Norway, Romania, Denmark, and the Czech Republic.

A particularly interesting discussion was with CEP's Leo Tigges, who has proposed a world conference on probation. While still in its infancy, this idea has merit, and something in which NAPE should play a role.

References

- Beto, D. R., & Evans, D. G. (2007). Conference Permanente Europeenne de la Probation (CEP): A report on the ninth General Assembly and Conference. *Executive Exchange*, Fall.
- CEP (2010). *Agenda and working papers*, May 27. CEP, the European Organization for Probation. Retrieved June 7, 2010 from www.cep-probation.org.
- Snacken, S. (2010). *The impact of the criminal and social context on probation systems in Europe: The Council of Europe probation rules in context*. Malaga, Spain: PowerPoint Presentation.
- Ward, T., & Maruna, S. (2007). *Rehabilitation: Beyond the risk paradigm*. London: Routledge.

Dan Richard Beto, a former Chief Probation Officer and the founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, is a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives. He serves as Chair of the NAPE International Committee.

Donald G. Evans, a past President of the International Community Corrections Association and the American Probation and Parole Association, serves on the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives and the American Correctional Association. He is also the APPA International Liaison.

They were the only persons from North America to attend this European Probation Conference.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS: THE 2010 CEP CONFERENCE “PROBATION WORKS” IN MALAGA, SPAIN

by

John Scott

These are the remarks of John Scott, who served as President of CEP from 2004 to 2007, given at the conclusion of the Probation Works Conference held Malaga, Spain, on May 28-29, 2010. They provide an excellent summary of the issues discussed during the conference and a unique perspective from a true leader and public servant.

Introduction

A good conference makes you ask hard questions, provides some answers, opens your mind to new ideas, widens your network, inspires you to do something different on Monday, and challenges you to reach for a new level in your career or your contribution. So, have you just drifted through this event or have you worked afresh on the questions: Does probation work? What is the next development? How is my country contributing to evidence based practice?

I am going to tell you the questions that have been at the top of my mind — but my questions are less important than yours so I suggest you stop listening to me and write down your own.

My summary will be shaped in the following way:

- Sharing some answers;
- Assessing the mood/spirit of the event;
- Challenging you with the four themes that have emerged from the conference; and
- Ending with some advice from my father!

Personal Questions

Is probation a science or an art?

It has to be both — on the one hand, utilising evidence, structure, processes, organisation and specified outcomes — on the other, passion, creativity, spontaneity, humour, and unexpected outcomes. Good art can change a person or a society — as Goya and Dickens demonstrate — just as much as good science can. So I have been thinking that probation methodologies need to combine the cool minds of the north with the warm hearts of the south.

How can we bring effective practice alive for a new generation?

I dread creating a new orthodoxy, with probation practice becoming a stagnant reprise of dog eared programmes. We need to encourage innovation, teach best practice and have an ethos of continuous improvement. This event has demonstrated the value of teaching comparative practice from across Europe and a willingness to learn from those jurisdictions that are not weighed down by long probation histories, but are doing new things like the Czech Republic, Turkey, and Estonia.

What can CEP do to generate more research on European methods?

Rather than resisting North American research, let us do our own! If every CEP member country instigated just one soundly based research project and published it before the next General

Assembly there would be at least 30 new European studies – that would constitute a refreshing body of knowledge. It is my view that we need to learn from the United States and Canada and build research into each major development proposal rather than add it as a bolted on after thought. There are many Director Generals here, think what a difference you could make if you each found the money to contribute to growing European evidence.

What would I have done differently to develop evidence based practice?

I ask this because my days as a probation leader are over, yours are not, so perhaps knowing what I wish I had done might be helpful. On reflection, I wish I had got in the media more. The argument for community sanctions should not take place behind closed doors. I grew up in the era when it was regarded as a success for probation to be out of the public eye, but every day inimical views are given currency in the papers and on the airwaves so I now believe I failed by not participating in the debate. I wish I had told more stories about offenders and, more significantly, found ways for offenders to tell their own stories.

I once heard Sir Graham Smith say rather shockingly that: “Probation must understand it is part of the entertainment business.” We have the example of how Sjef van Gennip in Holland fought for the reputation of probation — brave rather than entertaining — but over time the balance has changed and the relationship with journalists in Holland has been transformed.

Other wishes are: that I had observed more practice, listened to more front-line staff, set up more joint practice training and development with prison and police officers, and that I had been less captured by the demands of “managerialism.”

The Spirit of the Conference

I have been to many international events and want to highlight three marked components of the atmosphere here in Malaga:

1. the willingness to learn from different jurisdictions and cultures — there is less competitiveness and defensiveness;
2. there is an impressive increase in the connection between universities and probation services; and
3. the workshops have been where the buzz has been for me — probation people presenting with belief and confidence work that is making a difference.

I do not detect fear of the recession, but a “can do” mentality. A confidence illustrated by the reward you will receive if you complete the conference’s evaluation form — a bottle of special CEP correctional fluid that “is an evidence based intervention tool that corrects all mistakes and shows everybody can start with a clean slate.”

The Main Themes

I have identified four themes in the conference and, as is popular in reality shows, will announce them in ascending order.

Resources — The link to evidence is clear. There is going to be competition for resources for prison and probation places. Unless we marshal our evidence probation will lose out to prison — or the police, or health, or education. Dealing with the recession is going to be every government's overwhelming priority over the next five years. Probation needs to respond in a mature way with strong arguments that it IS cheap, flexible, and effective. We have to develop community products that save money and win the confidence of politicians and public alike and marketing will be a top priority. In the business world, you do not cut your advertising budget during a recession. Every jurisdiction needs a policy to reduce the use of prison, and probation has a key role in delivering the savings that a reduction in prison sentences will bring. In the drive to identify efficiencies there is always the temptation to go for "easy" cuts rather than seeking ways to hold on to effective practice. Holding firm to priorities will be essential. I have a friend who says: "Don't waste a good recession." This phase in the economic cycle is demanding but it is an opportunity to "shape up and sharpen up."

Partnership — I am not keen on the way partnerships can be used to justify talking shops. It seems to me that this event has emphasised the potential of international partnerships to deliver practical, hard nosed products — Probation Rules, framework agreements, and information sharing for cross-boundary benchmarking. If offenders are increasingly mobile, probation services need to be seamless between jurisdictions so that assessments and community sanctions can be exchanged as easily as prison sentences. CEP should be the enabler for pragmatic implementation of the framework agreement for the transfer of orders — partnership in action. I wonder if we have not yet explored the potential of system wide approaches to specific crimes at the international level. I have a colleague who espouses the value of inter-disciplinary approaches to crimes such as gun crime or people smuggling and has wondered whether CEP could examine collaborative work with Interpol and the International Prosecutors Association and Directors of Social Services to develop new approaches.

But I do not want to undervalue what may be seen as "soft" international gains through sharing of ideas and experiences — CEP helps probation colleagues to keep in touch and there is mutual support and encouragement from partnership work which definitely inspires fresh enthusiasm and positive action. My perception of "twinning" partnerships is that the so called "experts" receive as much as they give.

Practice — The link to evidence is clear — unless we can demonstrate effectiveness the benefits of probation will be drowned out. This whole event has focused on what can reduce offending behaviour, how to assess offenders and analyse offences. The scientific approach is gaining credence so that practice is not driven by whim or pet interests. There is less investment in "welfare" but we have been challenged to move on from the "care vs. control" argument — not least by representatives from the Czech Republic who have suggested that 21st Century thinking should be systemic and focused on "seeking resolution of the whole process." It is argued that the victim mediation dimension prevents probation being sidelined into a pro-offender position and creates new space for probation interventions. Evidence is required but in a sense every practitioner is part of gathering evidence — the skill is to capture it. We have much to learn from the health model where community doctors are as committed to writing papers to spread best practice as learned professors.

Leadership — Top theme! Everyone here is a leader of practice, of a team, an academic department, or a national service — so my challenge is to use your leadership position to:

- develop a joint curriculum for probation staff using shared materials across Europe;
- make probation more visible;
- hold onto your roots;
- reach beyond "fortress Europe" to spread the probation methods we know work; and
- be evangelical in reaching out to those countries in the Council of Europe which do not yet have developed probation systems.

One of the strengths of probation is that leadership comes from all levels across our organisations, but as current leaders, we have the responsibility to grow the next generation of leaders — not boring managers. Dan Beto, who has been with us during this conference, reminded me that Isaac Newton, the Cambridge physicist, once said, "If I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants."

I recommend that we use CEP's shoulders to help the future leaders of probation to see further. Money may well be short but I believe probation exchanges of staff between different jurisdictions will open the eyes and minds of the next leaders like nothing else. Let us use the CEP seminars and workshops to initiate our young people into comparative practice — and not send the "usual suspects."

An act of leadership, which I would urge on the new Board of CEP, is to organise a World Congress on probation perhaps linked to CEP's General Assembly in Germany in 2013 — let's act on the world stage with confidence.

Concluding Advice

I promised some paternal advice. My father worked for Rowntrees of York — they make Kitkats and Smarties and were bought out by Nestle — the Swiss have great taste in chocolate. He is in his 80th year so I asked him what had made Rowntrees successful through good and bad economic times. He highlighted his view of four factors:

1. continuity of leadership;
2. conservative finances;
3. strong products; and
4. excellent staff relations.

My advice is to attend these four priorities during the recession and be confident in what you can do — above all be confident in your probation people. It is our probation staff and their quality that will see us through. Our people are our gold. Dig alongside them.

John Scott is Deputy Director of Estates Capability, Finance and Commercial Group, with the Ministry of Justice, headquartered in London, England. Previously he served as Head of the Public Protection Unit in the Home Office and as the Lead Probation Manager for the Implementation of Offender Management across England and Wales. From 1994 to 2005 he served as Chief Officer of the Bedfordshire Probation Area.

NIC URBAN CHIEFS' NETWORK MEETING: CRITICAL ISSUES DISCUSSION

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC), Community Corrections Division's Urban Chiefs Network is one of a five professional networking groups sponsored by NIC's Community Corrections Division. The primary objective of the network is to provide a forum for informed discussion among members, including sharing information about effective organizational processes and programs, keeping up with research and best practice, and providing a supportive atmosphere for problem solving.

In May of 2010, the Urban Chiefs Network met in Portland, Oregon, and their agenda included a session on critical and emerging issues for community corrections. During this session, participants discussed challenges faced by their departments, with much of the conversation focused on the financial crises and budget cuts. The effects of these cuts on core operations, human resources, and the integration of evidence-based practices (EBP) were key components of this discussion.

NIC has compiled a summary of these critical and emerging issues, along with the thoughtful comments of discussion participants. NIC hopes that this information will inform and provoke additional dialogue at local, state, and national levels.

Summary of Critical and Emerging Issues in Probation

1. **State and Federal Legislation:** There is an important role for probation professionals to play in the development of legislation at the state and federal levels

Discussion

- Probation professionals need to develop ongoing methods of sharing information about EBP with elected officials, especially with those who are newly elected. Meeting regularly with legislators and other policymakers helps to build relationships and inform policy decisions.
 - Building relationships with advocacy and non-profit organizations and providing them with education regarding EBP helps to build collaboration and constituency in support of evidence-based policy.
 - Sharing stories of successes accomplished using EBP, including decreases in prison populations, juvenile commitments, and recidivism helps build policymaker understanding of how investments in probation may save overall system costs.
 - Pending federal legislation, such as Senator Jim Webb's (D-VA) bill to create a national commission to study criminal justice, stands to significantly affect future criminal justice policy. State and local probation professionals need to be aware of and engaged in these issues.
2. **Staff Development and Human Resources**
 - i. Probation officers are increasingly required to deliver cognitive behavioral programming. Officers who deliver programming report increased job satisfaction and perceive themselves as building better relationships with their probationers, though not all probation officers have the skills and abilities to successfully deliver these programs. Departments need to monitor for quality and fidelity of internal program delivery, just as they do with external providers.

- ii. Probation officers are taking a more active role in victim restoration, improving collection of victim restitution and more actively seeking out victim input. Probation departments should include measurements of victim satisfaction with departmental services as part of their quality assurance plans.
- **Succession Planning:** Probation departments are facing increasing numbers of retirements and related loss of institutional knowledge and skills as baby boomers begin to leave the workforce.
 - i. Departments are identifying core competencies to clarify the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) needed to successfully meet performance indicators and to support the professional development of existing staff. KSA development should be done with an eye to the future, e.g., staff need increasingly strong technology skills.
 - ii. Departments are implementing leadership development training that includes low-cost options, such as job shadowing and mentoring, and are encouraging continuing educational opportunities through partnerships with local educational institutions.
 - iii. Departments should focus leadership development efforts on candidates who show promise by meeting and exceeding performance indicators and who show initiative in support of departmental goals.
 - iv. Supporting and fostering the professional development of staff not only builds internal departmental capacity, but also supports the field as high performing staff are recruited by other agencies/ departments.
 - **Human Resources:** Departments are increasingly employing flexible methods of scheduling and other mechanisms to meet the needs of a changing workforce and support the implementation of EBP.
 - i. Departments implementing flexible/variable scheduling need to develop clear and structured systems for managing and monitoring schedules within labor agreements. Variable scheduling should only be available to staff who meet performance indicators and should be combined with an accountability system.
 - ii. Some departments are facing law suits regarding Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) issues. Departments should regularly revisit FLSA with staff, provide reminders for any initial non-compliance, and discipline staff who continue to engage in non-compliant behavior.
 - iii. In response to increasing numbers of younger staff and their families, departments are focusing on being more family friendly, including allowing for more flexible work schedules.
 - iv. Some departments are pairing officers as teams to allow one officer to monitor in-office traffic and paperwork, while the other officer spends time in the field visiting probationers.
 - v. An aging probation workforce and the economic recession, which has led to delayed retirements, have

resulted in increasing numbers of employees who no longer meet the fit for duty standards.

- vi. The economic downturn has also increased departments' insurance costs as employees add unemployed family members to departmental policies.

3. Officer Safety: Probation departments are redesigning offices and using technology and other strategies to increase staff safety.

Discussion

- Office environments are being redesigned to enhance safety by improving the traffic flow of staff and probationers.
- Departments are increasing their use of office security and screening equipment.
- To monitor officer safety in the field, many departments use dispatch centers operated by the local sheriff or law enforcement as a means of avoiding the costs of an internally operated center.
- Departments are also using GPS monitoring devices on vehicles to support officer safety in the field.
- Finding a location to work while in the field can present safety and logistical challenges. Departments are partnering with local churches, non-profits, and other agencies to make geographically convenient office cubicles available to probation officers for brief periods of time while they are in the field.
- There is an ongoing need for quality safety training for officers.
- Departments should consider creating a Critical Incident Stress Management Team and supporting the development of a nationwide critical incident reporting mechanism.

4. Housing Sex Offenders in the Community: Probation departments are finding it increasingly difficult to find housing for sex offenders.

Discussion

- Laws restricting where sex offenders live make it more and more difficult for probation departments to find housing for sex offenders.
- High housing costs in some geographic areas, especially urban areas, contribute to the challenges of finding appropriate housing.
- Sex offenders, who are unable to find housing, often end up homeless, making it more difficult for probation departments to monitor and hold them accountable for their behavior.

5. Managing Offenders with Mental Illness: As availability of services to individuals with mental illness continues to decline, more end up in the criminal justice system. Probation departments struggle to manage these offenders due to resource and skill limitations.

Discussion

- Human service agencies' responses to budget reductions often have an adverse impact on probation, such as shifting funds away from probationer mental health assessments to backfill funding for an agency's crisis center.
- Some jurisdictions are working to shift costs associated with managing offenders with mental illness in jails to less expensive and more appropriate community-based housing.
- Offenders with mental illness who may be assessed as low risk to reoffend and placed on administrative supervision,

may decompensate. Jurisdictions need to collaborate with human services agencies to ensure appropriate service referrals for these offenders.

6. Treatment Programming: Ensuring the availability of appropriate and quality treatment services for probationers represents a challenge for most probation departments

Discussion

- Ensuring that treatment providers are delivering appropriate treatment requires that there be incentives for doing so. One jurisdiction worked with their state licensing agency to develop a state license specific for corrections treatment program providers, others are offering EBP training opportunities for provider staff.
- Some states are offering probation departments increased funding for treatment programs as incentives for reducing revocations.
- Budget reductions in state and local agencies whose core mission includes the provision of substance abuse and mental health treatment services have negatively affected the availability of treatment and shifted the burden more towards probation departments.
- The most recently implemented and often innovative treatment programs are often the first to be eliminated by budget cuts.

7. Specialty Courts: Many state and local jurisdictions are implementing specialty courts, including drug, mental health, and others, but there is a continued need for clear standards and outcome expectations.

Discussion

- Jurisdictions implementing specialty courts need clear standards for maintaining program fidelity to evidence-based models and for achieving outcomes.
- Specialty courts may drive the use of higher cost models that don't necessarily improve outcomes, but do shift funding away from core services.
- Specialty courts support collaborative justice, bringing agencies together for planning and implementation, and increasing opportunities to educate partners regarding EPB.
- Specialty courts, such as restitution courts, provide a unique opportunity for victims to be heard.

8. Domestic Violence: There is a lack of evidence regarding what works for batterers' intervention programming.

Discussion

- Much of the research regarding batterers' intervention programming indicates that it does not work to reduce recidivism. Additional research is needed to identify more effective programming.
- Jurisdictions should focus more on domestic violence victims, including the development of safety plans and the use of reverse GPS to monitor probationer location.

9. Criminal Justice System Realignment Efforts: States are attempting to realign their criminal justice systems by shifting populations from institutions to community-based supervision.

Discussion

- The shifting of populations from prisons to community-based supervision must be accompanied with correspond-

ing funding shifts; otherwise the increased caseloads negatively affect the ability to use research-based supervision methods and thereby public safety.

- Realignment efforts often support funding only for new services/programs, instead of supporting underfunded existing core services.
- Discharge planning and transition services are critical as increasing numbers of offenders return from prison and jail to the community.

10. Performance Measurement Systems: Departments are developing performance measurement systems that align with EBP, but are finding implementing and using the results of these systems challenging in the tough financial climate.

Discussion

- Given current budget challenges, departments wonder if the benefits of implementing complex performance measurement and evaluation systems are worth the costs (e.g. for 360 degree evaluation systems), the need for supervisor training, and the associated increased workload.
- Some departments are moving from a control model of supervision and performance monitoring to a strengths-based system combined with auditing of EBP-related indicator measures.
- The role of supervisors is critical to the implementation of EBP. Their performance indicators need to be clearly identified, they need to receive related training, and they need to be held accountable to meeting specified goals.
- Monitoring and documentation of performance provides background information to support decision-making during workforce reduction, although in some cases, labor agreements do not allow for consideration of this data.
- Departments are using shadowing, spot checks, and vehicle GPS monitoring devices to hold officers accountable for meeting their stated goals while in the field.
- Using information, such as performance indicators to make promotional and other position change decisions, supports the shifts in organizational culture needed to successfully implement EBP.

11. Budget Cuts: Almost all departments continue to face significant budget cuts, which increasingly threaten departments' ability to maintain core services and focus on furthering implementation of EBP. Meeting participants shared some of the challenges they're facing and responses they've made to these financial pressures.

Discussion

- Some jurisdictions are using early termination of probation through earned time credits to achieve jail and probation costs savings. Providing a clear roadmap to probationers on how to earn these credits, has also resulted in increased probationer satisfaction.
- Reducing over-supervision by shifting offenders at low risk to reoffend to administrative caseloads has alleviated some of the increased caseload pressures caused by personnel reductions.
- Intensive supervision programs have increased their caseloads and shifted program staff to regular caseloads to backfill layoffs.
- When faced with these budget crises, probation departments need to reexamine their legal mandates to deter-

mine what they are legally required to provide, and then use evidence-based principles to build their services and budgets around these core services.

- Probation professionals may use the budget crises as an opportunity to educate elected officials about EBP, such as focusing limited resources on medium and high risk offenders.
- Some budget decisions are forced by labor agreements and legislation, leaving departments without the ability to conduct layoffs based on competency, performance, and/or commitment to EBP, or to effectively manage span of control and thereby staff accountability.
- Funding streams are increasingly unstable, e.g., local taxes.
- Probation professionals need to take an active role in shifting opinion and educating stakeholders about the value of probation. Leaders need to be able to translate probation work into estimated dollar savings, such as in the numbers of victims avoided, and costs avoided due to recidivism reduction.

12. Information Technology: Increased investment is needed to make more effective use of information technology (IT) for case management and information sharing.

Discussion

- Most state and local jurisdictions lack integrated criminal justice systems. The databases that do exist are often unable to share information, requiring duplicate data entry into multiple systems. Key to the success of integrated criminal justice systems is the use of single identifiers for offenders.
- Data warehouses and fusion centers (with support from Homeland Security) are facilitating information sharing across agencies in some jurisdictions.
- Probation departments need to invest in quality case management systems to improve efficiency, increase probationer and probation officer accountability, and enhance the availability and use of data.
- New technology, such as reporting kiosks, require an increased investment in IT infrastructure and support.

Urban Chiefs' Network Membership

Members of the Urban Chiefs' Network, most of whom are members of the National Association of Probation Executives, include: **Paul Becker**, Houston, Texas; **Robert L. Bingham**, Indianapolis, Indiana; **Don Blevins**, Downey, California; **Barbara Broderick**, Phoenix, Arizona; **Gayle R. Dittmer**, Columbus, Ohio; **Mack Jenkins**, San Diego, California; **Sally Kreamer**, Des Moines, Iowa; **Thomas R. Merkel**, Minneapolis, Minnesota; **Michael E. Noyes**, Dallas, Texas; **Rocco A. Pozzi**, White Plains, New York; **Jesse Reyes**, Chicago, Illinois; **Vincent N. Schiraldi**, New York, New York; **Scott Taylor**, Portland, Oregon; **Tom Williams**, Washington, D.C.; and **Janice Yamada**, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Executive Exchange wishes to thank NAPE former President **Robert L. Bingham**, Chief Probation Officer for the Marion Superior Court Probation Department in Indianapolis, Indiana, and a member of the Urban Chiefs' Network, for bringing this report to the attention of the NAPE membership.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

The reviews found in this issue of *Executive Exchange* deal with the subject of desistance from crime, a topic of discussion prevalent at criminal justice conferences in Europe. We are grateful to Todd Jermstad and Donald G. Evans for contributing these relevant reviews.

Todd Jermstad, J.D., is Director of the Bell-Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department, headquartered in Belton, Texas. Donald G. Evans is a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario.

WHY DO PEOPLE GO STRAIGHT?

The Dynamics of Desistance: Charting Pathways through Change, by Deirdre Healy, Willan Publishing, Cullompton, Devon, U.K., 2010, 228 pp., \$69.95 (hard cover).

In the United States, most students studying criminology are exposed to numerous lectures, monographs, and books on criminality. However while all students of criminology are aware that most criminals eventually cease their unlawful activities, few are taught the reasons why people involved in crime “graduate” to a crime free lifestyle at some point in their lives. The reason so few students in this country are taught why some people “desist” from crime is because even fewer academics study this phenomenon. This is not so in Europe.

Desistance is the study of why people change from a life of crime to one of law abiding behavior. Deirdre Healy, an Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences (IRCHSS) Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at the Institute of Criminology, University College Dublin, has just written a book exploring the nexus between social and personal forces in the desistance process. This book consists of nine chapters, a preface, general introduction, appendix, references, and an index. The book has a number of valuable tables and figures that make the author’s argument more understandable. The references are also quite extensive.

At the outset it should be noted that this is a very complex topic. It is not just that there are a number of social, economic, situational, and psychological reasons why a person may desist from criminal activity, but desistance is not a linear or abrupt process; just as criminals do not engage in criminal activity constantly and may go through cycles when they do not engage in any criminal activity, desisters may not come to some sudden revelation and immediately cease all their criminal activities. Thus the author describes the pathway to desistance as tumultuous, dynamic, and uncertain.

The author notes that longitudinal studies reveal that criminal activity tends to peak in adolescence and then taper off in young adulthood. This phenomenon, known as “the age-crime curve,” shows that by the age of 28, most offenders have ceased to be involved in crime. Hence the author concludes that desistance from crime is the norm rather than the exception. However, recognizing the phenomenon and understanding the reasons are two entirely different matters. It is the attempt to formulate a theory of desistance that has recently intrigued criminal justice thinkers in Europe.

Healy describes desistance as a two stage process. The first consists of any hiatus in criminal activity, which she refers to as primary desistance, and the second comprises a more permanent state of non-offending that she refers to as secondary desistance. An offender may begin the stage of primary desistance

for a number of reasons. The most likely reasons, however, are because the person gets tired of being arrested and going to jail or prison, the offender has formed a personal attachment with another person and realizes that time spent in prison or jail will be lost time with that significant other, and because the offender successfully attended a therapeutic or educational program. Thus the author identifies the deterrent effect of punishment, social bonding, and external interventions as contributing to the initial decision to cease criminal activity.

The author contends that research indicates that there are several factors involved in a person transitioning from primary to secondary desistance. The first involves human agency, i. e., personal or free will. The offender who moves to the secondary stage of desistance tends to believe that he or she can make a successful transition and even when recognizing the obstacles the person may face along the way, still believes that he or she will overcome those challenges. People who do not make the transition, on the other hand, tend to view themselves in passive terms. Thus offenders who recognize volition as an essential element in their life narrative are much more likely to live crime free lives than those who do not. Or, as Healy otherwise states “the salience of psychological factors supports the view that offenders are active participants in desistance and do not simply respond passively to social events.”

The second factor leading to secondary desistance is the person assumes a new personal identity, one in which the person no longer identifies as a criminal but now a law-abiding individual. Moreover in formulating a positive self narrative the desister interprets past events in terms that support his or her new self-identity. The author states that desisters attempt to gain something positive from their criminal pasts by drawing insights from past events in their lives and by integrating the past into their new identities. Offenders who do not successfully transition to secondary desistance tend to reject their past and do not find any meaning in past experiences that can be incorporated into a new self narrative.

The third factor leading to secondary desistance is the establishment of social capital. The author explains that in order for change to occur, the offender needs not just the motivation to change but also the capacity to change. Hence, Healy emphasizes that unless the offender is also provided with opportunities to exercise his or her new-found skills; i.e., have access to the necessary social capital, then there will be insufficient factors to bring about lasting change. Moreover the author states that while research indicates that both static and dynamic factors contribute to desistance, it is the dynamic factors that are more important.

This book has serious implications regarding the utilization of evidence-based practices. The author does not advocate dispensing with evidence based practices but does question its long term effectiveness in preventing recidivism. Healy argues that it is

social factors that appear to have a long term effect on behavior and that research suggests their effects are not immediate but are amplified slowly over time. The author further contends that research suggests that while cognitive-behavioral programs can have a highly significant short-term effect on recidivism, it does not reduce re-offending in the long-term.

The author states that advocates of the risk factor approach believe that if they can identify a consistent set of risk factors, this information can be used to design interventions to address these problem areas and this will, in turn, lower participants' risk of offending. However, Healy argues that while certain factors consistently emerge as correlates of recidivism, the ability of these factors to predict behavior is less evident when measured prospectively, particularly in the long term.

What is needed is "evidence-based practices plus." The author states that efforts to reduce risks and needs should be supplemented with attempts to increase social and human capital and develop individual strengths. Thus assessments should not be done away with and cognitive-behavioral programs should remain in place. However, Healy stresses that these measures alone will not lead to permanent desistance.

Healy has written a very valuable and thought provoking book. She has identified a subject matter that should be given greater attention by criminal justice practitioners in this country. While there is much more to learn about desistance, she has shed much light on this subject. In addition, Healy has raised some serious questions regarding the reliance — or perhaps overreliance — on evidence based practices. In doing so she has issued a challenge to the field of community corrections to design better programs and develop newer approaches that will have a longer lasting effect on recidivism.

Todd Jermstad, J.D.

PROBATION AND DESISTANCE FROM CRIME

Review of Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, Social Context and Desistance from Crime, by Stephen Farrall, Willan Publishing, Portland, Oregon, 2004, pp. 244 (paperback).

While we in North America are still attending conferences concerned with "what works," EBP, and the implementation of these approaches there is another concept being considered in work with offenders in community settings. In Europe, for example there is a growing interest in the concept of "desistance" that attempts to explain how the offender desists from a criminal career. Stephen Farrall's book is one such contribution to the growing body of literature on the subject of desistance. Farrall is with the Department of Criminology at Keele University in England and is widely published on probation, criminal careers, and the fear of crime. This book draws on large body of research and information that looks at what actions in probation supervision are conducive to desistance from offending or contribute to re-offending. It reports on an important investigation into the outcomes of probation supervision and addresses the critical question "what works" in probation. The investigation and research was carried out when Farrall was at the Centre for Criminological Research at the University of Oxford. It is an attempt to understand probation from the perspective of both probation officers and probationers.

The book is organized into twelve chapters and four main sections. Section One contains the introduction and has three chapters that introduce the desistance agenda relative to the social context of probation, examines realistically the criminal careers of probationers and the resulting complexity this entails, and finally describes the study that informs the premises of the book. The second section of the book contains six chapters and is entitled "probation, motivation and social contexts." These chapters examine the issue of how success is defined, the focus of probation, the role of supervision in resolving obstacles to desistance, and the critical role of motivation in assisting offender desistance.

Section Three uses two chapters to examine desistance, change and probation supervision, and factors associated with offending. In regard to this last item, the key finding was that offender motivation and the social circumstances played a role in the offender's persistence in crime or desistance from crime. Sections Two and Three explored the responses of probation officers and probationers to the obstacles faced by the probationers that contributed either to cessation from crime or continuation of offending behavior. Section Four forms the conclusion and seeks to summarize the findings from the study and to note lessons learned from this research.

What was learned? Regarding removing obstacles to desistance the author records the following:

- Probation officers tended to rely upon discussions with the probationer in order to tackle obstacles.
- The range of obstacles identified mirrored the general accepted risk factors.
- Where officers and probationers identified the same obstacles both expected that the successful tackling of an obstacle would be contingent upon a range of factors, many of which seem to be outside of the control of either of them.
- No specific probation interventions were associated with successful obstacle removal.

The author offers some possible explanations for the above findings that include the probationer's motivation and his/her social and personal circumstances. In exploring these findings it was noted that social and personal contexts in which these efforts to remove obstacles were situated were the critical determinates of success. The implications of this research appears to be a renewed interest in developing both human and social capital as part of the task of probation. The research found that as the problem social circumstances increased the opportunity for desistance decreased. Farrall notes that: "The elements which this study has most frequently found to be of most help in assisting probationers overcome obstacles and avoid further offending have not come from officers, etc., but from the probationers themselves (their motivation) and from changes in the nature of the social contexts in which they lived."

Farrall suggests that probation officers might be more effective in reducing re-offending if they concentrated on desistance-related factors rather than offending-related factors. In terms of a future research agenda, he recommends that the investigations of probation outcomes focus on the role of the social contexts that assist probationers to combat risk factors and ultimately to desist. If we are interested in furthering the "what works" approach then, he says, "rigorously collected qualitative data should become part of the methodological toolbox." Future research should, he notes, focus on two main areas:

- What individual officers and the wider probation service can do about addressing not just offending-related factors but also desistance-related needs; and
- How probationers' social capital can be increased in such a way as to foster desistance.

Farrall states that "probation should assess what people require in their lives to ensure that they stop offending and then attempt to produce these features in their lives in such a way that they do actually stop offending."

This is a very interesting study and certainly raises a number of questions that should encourage further research that, if conducted, would benefit the field of probation. There is no doubt that the concept of desistance is being explored and the implications of this conceptualization will probably call for a revision of current probation practice in some jurisdictions. This concept seems to call into question our current reliance on cognitive-behavioral programs, by suggesting that they are insufficient and need to be complemented with efforts to address the social and economic problems of offenders.

Probation leaders would be well advised to keep abreast of this emerging literature.

Donald G. Evans

DESISTANCE: LIVING WITHOUT OFFENDING

*A review of *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*, edited by Shadd Maruna and Russ Immarigeon, Willan Publishing, Portland, Oregon, 2004, pp. 302 (paperback).*

Recently, more attention is being given in research and in practice to how offenders quit their criminal activity and become contributing members of society. In order to gain a greater understanding of this movement that is prevalent in European literature and is surfacing in North America, I have been reading some of the earlier works that promote the concept of desistance. Readers of *Executive Exchange* will have been introduced to this concept in McNeill's article "What Works and What's Just" (Summer 2009).

After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration, edited by Shadd Maruna and Russ Immarigeon, serves a useful purpose by bringing together a number of articles by European and American researchers who are exploring new avenues to assist offenders to change and to cease offending behavior. The chapters in this book remind the probation practitioner of the challenges probationers and parolees face in reintegrating into society. These papers address specifically some of the challenges facing offenders re-entering community settings. Although the authors write about different aspects of reintegration, there is a commonality to their efforts in that the theme of desistance connects them to each other. The authors rely on theories of desistance and thus place discussions of reintegration practice into a much larger context, namely why offenders desist from criminal activity. The editors have organized the book into four parts and eleven chapters.

Part One deals with the general topic of desistance theory and reintegration practice. The first chapter by Shadd Maruna, Russ Immarigeon and Thomas P. LeBel discuss the theory and practice of ex-offender reintegration. They note that current re-entry practices are geared to attempts to reduce re-offending

but they argue they generally fail because these practices are not grounded in theoretical explanations. They believe if the concept of desistance was included in the normal interventions it would be more efficacious. The authors also address the idea of desistance in greater detail and note that it is more than just cessation of criminal activity but changes in life chances and style. The second chapter is contributed by Gordon Bazemore and Carsten Erbe and deals with the relationship between reintegration and restorative justice. Their interest is in examining the theory and practice of informal social control and support. Stephen Farrall, in the third chapter, addresses the issue of social capital and its importance in offender reintegration and is interested in making probation desistance focused.

Part Two pulls together articles that articulate methodological considerations that emerge when measuring the effects of desistance theory and practice. In chapter four, Shawn D. Bushway, Robert Brame, and Raymond Paternoster write about connecting desistance to recidivism and the efforts to measure changes in criminality over the offender's lifespan. Alex R. Piquere, in the fifth chapter, discusses the intermittency of criminal careers.

Part Three brings together a number of contributions dealing with applied research on desistance. In chapter 6 Leana Allen Bouffard and John H. Laub ask whether military service would facilitate desistance from crime. Ros Burnett looks at the ambivalence of convicted property offenders in chapter 7. Chapter 8 is a helpful piece in understanding gender considerations in applying desistance theory when Gill McIvor, Cathy Murray, and Janet Jamieson ask is desistance from crime different for women and girls.

Part Four covers the important topic of desistance-focused reintegration research. Stephen C. Richards and Richard S. Jones in their contribution entitled "beating the perpetual incarceration machine: overcoming impediments to re-entry" rely on interviews of ex-inmates to explore obstacles facing them after release from prison. The recommendations they make appear to be consistent with desistance theory. In chapter 10 Faye S. Taxman, Douglas Young, and James M. Byrne examine a community justice model focused on strengthening informal social controls. This is a description of a new program called the Re-entry Partnership Initiative. This chapter contributes a good assessment of the critical role of the community in offender reintegration. The final chapter by Christopher Uggen, Jeff Manza, and Angela Behrens look at the role of citizenship in what they call the civic reintegration of convicted felons. This is an interesting chapter especially considering prevalence of after punishment laws that strip some offenders of the rights and privileges of citizenship.

This is a good introduction to the general concept of desistance and the efforts to incorporate the theory with ongoing reintegrative practices. The book is easy to read and has plenty of examples of program models. Most of the papers are the result of qualitative research efforts and if you are looking for more quantitative analyses you will have to look elsewhere. This limitation does not distract from the overall value of this book and the probation administrator or program developer will find useful information in this book.

Donald G. Evans

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES IN WASHINGTON

On August 14-15, 2010, the National Association of Probation Executives held its annual events, this year at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C., immediately prior to the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association.

MEMBERS RECEPTION

Approximately 150 probation professionals gathered for the NAPE Members Reception on Saturday, August 14, 2010. During this event NAPE members renewed acquaintances, met new colleagues, and discussed issues relevant to the community corrections profession.

NAPE is fortunate to have corporate members who provide additional financial resources to support the organization. The Members Reception and the Annual Awards Breakfast were sponsored in part by NCTI, Varian, AnyTrax, and Alcohol Monitoring Systems.

AWARDS BREAKFAST

During the NAPE Annual Awards Breakfast held on August 15, 2010, those in attendance heard an exclusive presentation by President **Ellen Brokofsky**, Nebraska State Probation Administrator, during which she discussed her vision for NAPE and probation. Her remarks may be found in the "President's Message" of this issue of *Executive Exchange*.



Ellen Brokofsky

tion," and "dedicated service" were used to describe the award recipients.

Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award

This year the *Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award* was presented to **Sally Kreamer**, Director of the Fifth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Des Moines, Iowa. This award, the Association's oldest and most prestigious, is presented jointly by NAPE and the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University to recognize a probation executive who has given unselfishly of his or her time and talents and who has demonstrated qualities of leadership.

While still an undergraduate student at Iowa State University, Kreamer began her community corrections career as a crisis

intervention volunteer in Ames, Iowa. Upon graduating from Iowa State University in 1989, she served as Residential Advisor at the Curt Forbes Residential Center and later as Sex Offender Aftercare Facilitator for the Second Judicial District Department of Correctional Services.



Sally Kreamer

Kreamer steadily advanced within the probation industry by assuming several, diverse positions within adult and juvenile corrections programs. She has worked in a Batterers Education Program, served as a Domestic Violence

Facilitator, been employed as a Community Treatment Coordinator, functioned as a Day Program Center Treatment Supervisor, and advanced to the position of Executive Officer II in Offender Services for the Iowa Department of Corrections. Since August of 2003, Kreamer has worked first as the Assistant Director of Field Services for the Fifth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services, and from December 2006 she has served as that agency's director. In that capacity, she oversees an annual budget of over \$24,000,000 and 280 employees, serving over 9,000 adult offenders.

While Kreamer has advanced to a significant leadership position within Iowa probation, she is best known nationally for her comprehensive knowledge of evidence based practices and its effective implementation within community corrections. She is highly regarded nationally as an EBP expert on both the administrative and practitioner levels. She is a national trainer in EBP, the Level of Services Inventory (LSI-R), and additional research-based corrections curricula. For several years, she has served as a consultant and trainer for the National Institute of Corrections to assist other jurisdictions in implementing EBP policies and procedures.

Kreamer is a member of multiple state and national associations, including the Iowa Corrections Association, International Community Corrections Association, American Correctional Association, American Probation and Parole Association, American Association of Community Justice Professionals, and the National Association of Probation Executives.

As a result of her leadership qualities, she is the recipient of several state and national awards, including the American Correctional Association *Best in the Business Award*, the *Outstanding Woman in Corrections Award* from the Iowa Corrections Association, and the *David Dillingham Silent Leadership Award* from the International Community Corrections Association. In addition, from 2006 to 2007 she served as President of the Iowa Corrections Association.

In her capacity as Department Director, Kreamer has advanced the Fifth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services to a standard of excellence envied by many, but achieved by few, within the probation field. Her department is regarded nationally as an exemplary probation system which has taken

Executive Exchange

well-designed strides in implementing EBP to reduce recidivism and better protect local citizenry. Fifth Judicial District programs and applications are considered national models, and despite a demanding workload, Kreamer is always available to assist other jurisdictions in best implementing EBP and valid, effective probation programs.

This award was first presented in 1989, and prior recipients include **Barry Nidorf** (California), **Don R. Stiles** (Texas and Arizona), **Donald Cochran** (Massachusetts), **Cecil Steppe** (California), **Don Hogner** (California), **T. Vincent Fallin** (Georgia), **M. Tamara Holden** (Oregon), **Richard A. Kipp** (Pennsylvania), **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.** (Massachusetts), **Richard E. Wyatt** (Nevada), **Rocco A. Pozzi** (New York), **Ron R. Goethals** (Texas), **Cheryl N. Townsend** (Arizona, Nevada, and Texas), **E. Robert Czaplicki** (New York), **Robert L. Bingham** (Michigan and Indiana), **Gerald R. Hinzman** (Iowa), **James R. Grundel** (Illinois), **Joanne Fuller** (Oregon), **Tom Plumlee** (Texas), **Ellen F. Brokofsky** (Nebraska), and **Christopher Hansen** (Nevada).

Dan Richard Beto Award

Recognized with the *Dan Richard Beto Award* was **Robert J. Malvestuto**, Chief of the Adult Probation and Parole Department in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This discretionary award, first presented in 2005, is given by the President of NAPE to recognize an individual for distinguished and sustained service



Robert J. Malvestuto

to the probation profession. It is named after **Dan Richard Beto**, who served the Association as Secretary, Vice President, and President.

A life-long Philadelphian, Malvestuto began his career at the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, Court of Common Pleas, Adult Probation and Parole Department, on June 26, 1972. He holds a Bachelor of Science degree from Thomas Edison State College. In addition, he completed the Executive Development Program for Chief Executive Officers at Sam Houston State University.

During his tenure with the Adult Probation and Parole Department, Malvestuto has held several specialized positions of increasing responsibility, culminating with his appointment as Co-Chief in 1998. After the retirement of the other Co-Chief in early 2007, Malvestuto became the sole Chief Probation and Parole Officer.

In addition to the day to day responsibilities that go along with the supervision of nearly 400 employees and 49,000 offenders, Malvestuto has been involved in a number of projects outside the Department. During the late 1990s, he served on the Youth Violence Reduction Project with Public/Private Ventures and the Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition Steering Committee. He was appointed to and is still a member of the city-wide Youth Violence Reduction Partnership Steering Committee. He was also a member of the Reinventing Probation Council, a project of the

Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute in New York, whose work lead to the production of the highly acclaimed monograph *Transforming Probation Through Leadership: The Broken Windows Model*.

Malvestuto was a member of the Philadelphia Offender Consensus Process which produced a report on parole reentry entitled *They're Coming Back: An Action Plan for Successful Reintegration that Works for Everyone*. Malvestuto served on the Advisory Council which overseen the implementation of the report's strategies. He was Co-Chair of the Pre and Post Release Subcommittee, where he co-authored the published report *A Coordinated Re-entry Plan for Philadelphia County Inmates*. In 2010 he co-authored "Low-Intensity Community Supervision for Low-Risk Offenders: A Randomized, Controlled Trial" recently published in the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*.

In the spring of 2009, Malvestuto oversaw the complete reorganization of the department using an actuarial risk tool developed by researchers at the University of Pennsylvania. Using this tool, offenders are categorized as low, moderate, or high risk depending on their likelihood of committing a new serious offense. The departmental reorganization has shifted resources from those offenders least likely to commit a new serious offense to those most likely to do so in order to maximize the department's impact on public safety. The Chief has also introduced a rigorous management tool, PROB-START, which holds Directors and Supervisors accountable for the operations within their units through monthly reviews of statistical packets of information on contacts, new arrests, and a myriad of other measures.

In addition to the National Association of Probation Executives, Malvestuto is a member in numerous professional organizations, including the American Probation and Parole Association, the Fraternal Order of Police-Criminal Investigators Lodge, the Pennsylvania County Chiefs Association, the National Association for Court Management, and the Pennsylvania Association on Probation, Parole, and Corrections.

Recipients of the *Beto Award* have included Beto, for whom the award is named, **Christie Davidson** (Texas), **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.** (Massachusetts), **George M. Keiser** (Maryland), and **Thomas N. Costa** (Pennsylvania).

George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership

This year's recipient of the *George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership* was **Mark D. Atkinson**, Judge of Harris County Criminal Court-at-Law No. 13 in Houston, Texas. This award, named in honor of **George M. Keiser**, Chief of the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections, is presented jointly by the Community Corrections Improvement Association (CCIA) of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and NAPE. Presenting the award was past recipient and past NAPE President **Dan Richard Beto**.

Judge Atkinson has served as a judge in Texas for 24 years, during which he has assumed a significant leadership role within the Texas judicial system.

In 1986, Judge Atkinson, a graduate of the University of Texas at Austin and South Texas College of Law in Houston, was elected judge of a newly-created Harris County, Texas, court handling primarily criminal cases. He has served in that capacity for six four-year terms of office. Judge Atkinson presides over a high-volume, fast-paced, urban court. During his distinguished career he has presided over more than 100,000 cases and conducted ap-



Dan Richard Beto, Judge Mark Atkinson, and George M. Keiser

proximately 1,000 jury trials. On average, his court disposes of 5,000 cases annually.

Early during his tenure on the bench Judge Atkinson instituted creative approaches to sentencing and supervising offenders, particularly in the areas of repeat driving while intoxicated and family violence cases. He has involved family members when working with youthful offenders and he has placed great emphasis on addressing the needs of victims.

Judge Atkinson's service also includes assuming a number of judicial leadership roles. In Harris County, he served his colleagues in various leadership positions, both as the elected judge to preside over administrative matters and as a chair or member of numerous local committees. As the elected presiding judge of the Harris County Criminal Courts at Law, he has dealt with jail overcrowding, the representation of indigent defendants, and mental health issues.

In addition to his leadership roles in Harris County, Judge Atkinson has served as the elected leader of the judges of Texas as the Chair of the Judicial Section of the State Bar of Texas. Judge Atkinson has served as Chair of the Texas Center for the Judiciary — the entity responsible for providing judicial education to Texas judges. He also served as Chair of the state's Judicial Curriculum Committee and he worked on developing curriculum for judicial education conferences over ten years.

Other leadership roles Judge Atkinson has held include serving as a Member of Judicial Advisory Board to the Texas Association for Court Administration, Executive Board Member for the Houston Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, member of the faculty of the Texas College for New Judges, and President of the Texas County Court at Law Judges Association.

Judge Atkinson has been the Chair of the Judicial Committee of the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) since 2002; as such, he has regularly organized and led roundtable discussions among judges attending the bi-annual APPA conferences regarding "hot topics" in sentencing and correctional policy.

In 2006 Judge Atkinson was a member of a delegation of criminal justice professionals, organized by the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), on a mission to Poland, where he was asked to observe sentencing practices of judges and the work of probation officials in several Polish cities. Upon his return, his observations were published in *Executive Exchange*, NAPE's

publication. Since that time he has been a member of several international delegations in his capacity as Chair of the Judicial Committee of the American Probation and Parole Association and as a member of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives. He also has traveled internationally at the request of the U.S. Embassies in San Jose, Costa Rica, and Warsaw, Poland, as well as the U.S. Consulate in Krakow. Judge Atkinson regularly welcomes observers from other countries to his courtroom in Houston, Texas.

He has 13 years of judicial teaching experience — both in the United States and internationally — and has taught in the following areas: judicial ethics, criminal law, case-flow and docket management, family violence, sentencing and supervising offenders, driving while intoxicated, cultural and ethnic diversity in the courts, maintaining control and dignity in the courtroom, judicial immunity and liabilities, indigent defense, and cooperation between judges and probation officers. Moreover, he has consulted with judges and other justice officials throughout the United States and from the countries of Costa Rica, Mexico, Poland, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Russia, Denmark, Canada, and Australia.

During his distinguished career Judge Atkinson has been the recipient of several awards, including the Houston Police Officers Association *Judge of the Year Award*, the Mexican-American Bar Association *Amicus Award*, and the Houston Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse *Judicial Award*. In addition, he has been recognized by the League of United Latin American Citizens and the Texas College for Judicial Studies.

In presenting the award, Beto said that Judge Atkinson, who is not seeking reelection following close to a quarter of a century on the Harris County bench, has been a true leader and a strong advocate for probation, and it is fitting that NAPE recognize him with this award.

Prior recipients of this award include Keiser, for whom the award is named, **Carey D. Cockerell** (Texas), **Dan Richard Beto** (Texas), **Donald G. Evans** (Ontario), **Rocco A. Pozzi** (New York), **John J. Larivee** (Massachusetts), **W. Conway Bushey** (Pennsylvania), **Douglas W. Burris** (Missouri), and **Robert L. Thornton** (Washington).

Special Recognitions

Also during the awards breakfast there were two special recognitions. President Brokofsky presented immediate past President **John Tuttle** with a plaque in recognition of his dedicated service and leadership over the past two years.

In addition, a surprised **Ellen Brokofsky**, immediate past President of the National Juvenile Court Services Association, was presented with a plaque for her service to that organization by Executive Director **Amanda Bilnoski**.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

HOLLAND TO HEAD VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

Earlier this year Virginia Governor **Bob McDonnell** appointed **Helivi L. Holland** as Director of the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice. A native of Suffolk, Virginia, and a graduate of Virginia Tech as well as the College of William Mary Marshall-Wythe School of Law, Holland has been a practicing attorney in Virginia since 1991. She has served in the legal community as a senior prosecutor, an adjunct professor, a deputy city attorney and as a guardian *ad litem*.

As a prosecutor for more than ten years, Holland served in the Portsmouth and Suffolk Offices of the Commonwealth's Attorney. In addition to writing and managing grants in each office, she prosecuted major juvenile crimes in Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court and Circuit Court. Her prosecutorial style and training skills on criminal prosecution earned her the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice's *Victim Assistance Award*, the *NOBLE National Lloyd Sealy Award*, and the *Community Services Award* for the Commonwealth of Virginia. For more than 12 years, Holland served as an adjunct professor at Paul D. Camp Community College. She taught on two campuses as well as at a correctional facility of the Virginia Department of Corrections.

Holland comes to the Department of Juvenile Justice from having served in the appointed position of Deputy City Attorney for the City of Suffolk. In that capacity, she appeared weekly in Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court representing the Suffolk Department of Social Services in child welfare cases. Additionally, she supervised all of the assistant city attorneys and support staff of the Office of the City Attorney, wrote and managed the office's budget, represented the Department of Human Resources, served on the Management Advisory Team of the City and served as the liaison to the courts of the City. She remains qualified as a guardian *ad litem*. Further, Holland stays active in the community, having served on the board of directors of The Children's Center, Suffolk Education Foundation, Suffolk Chapter of Red Cross, and the Genieve Shelter of battered women and their children. Holland regularly speaks and trains on various subjects of law relating to juvenile crimes, domestic violence, child welfare, and juvenile delinquency.

ATKINSON TO WORK FOR THE TEXAS CENTER FOR THE JUDICIARY

In June 2010 the Texas Center for the Judiciary (TCJ) announced that Judge **Mark D. Atkinson** had been selected as the new Judicial Resource Liaison for the Texas Center for the Judiciary's Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Grant. Judge Atkinson takes over for Judge **David Hodges**, who has been serving as the Judicial Resource Liaison since the inception of the TxDOT grant in 2005. Judge Hodges has accepted a position with the Texas Association of Counties (TAC) beginning October 1, 2010, and will become the Judicial Project Manager for TAC responsible for designing and implementing of all the judicial education for constitutional county judges and their staff members.

Judge Atkinson, who did not seek reelection this year, served 24 years on the bench, presiding over more than 100,000 criminal cases, 20,000 of those being for the offense of Driving while

Intoxicated (DWI). Since 1988, Judge Atkinson has implemented creative DWI sentencing practices, particularly with repeat offenders. Many of those sentencing practices are similar to those currently used in DWI Courts. During his years on the bench, Judge Atkinson has received a number of recognitions, including the Mexican-American Bar Association of Houston *Amicus Award*, the Houston Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse *Judicial Award*, the League of United Latin-American Citizens *Certificate of Recognition*, and the Houston Police Officers' Association *County Court Judge of the Year*.

He is past chair of the Judicial Section State Bar of Texas and the Texas Center for the Judiciary. He chairs the American Probation and Parole Association's Judicial Committee and is a member of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives.

NEW CHIEF IN EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

On May 7, 2010, **G. Edward "Eddie" Towe**, age 41, was administered the oath of office by Chief U.S. District Judge **Leon Holmes** as the new Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

Towe replaces **Claretha G. Nelson**, who retired April 30, 2010, after reaching the job's mandatory retirement age of 57.

Towe is a Tennessee native who has been the Deputy Chief Probation Officer under Nelson since September 2008. Before coming to Arkansas, he worked for the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee in Nashville.

HARRIS COUNTY GETS NEW JUVENILE PROBATION DIRECTOR

The Juvenile Board of Harris County, Texas, named **Tom Brooks** Executive Director of the juvenile probation department in June 2010.

Brooks was appointed interim leader of the 1,500-employee department in November 2009 following the retirement of long-time administrator **Harvey Hetzel**.

Brooks, 51, has worked for the department for nearly 27 years. The board selected him for the permanent position after a national search. The department has 148 juveniles in its detention center. Brooks said he intends to continue the department's work reaching out to the community in search of alternatives to detention.

NEW LEADERSHIP AT NIJ AND BJS

On June 22, 2010, Assistant Attorney General **Laurie O. Robinson** welcomed the confirmation of two new directors within the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs (OJP). The U.S. Senate confirmed **John H. Laub**, Ph.D., as the new director for the Justice Department's National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and **James P. Lynch**, Ph.D., as the new director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS).

"I am pleased to welcome these two renowned researchers to the Department of Justice," said Robinson. "Supporting basic social science research, while expanding our inventory of evidence based approaches, is one of the President's priorities. We

welcome the expertise and experience that they bring to their respective bureaus, and look forward to their leadership within the Office of Justice Programs.”

Laub, a distinguished professor from the University of Maryland’s Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, will be the first criminologist in four decades to serve as director of NIJ. He also is a Visiting Scholar at the Institute for Quantitative Social Science at Harvard University. His areas of research include crime and deviance over the life course, juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice, and the history of criminology. He has published widely and has won three major book awards for his work.

Lynch, a distinguished professor in the Department of Criminal Justice at John Jay College in New York, was previously a professor in the Department of Justice, Law, and Society at American University, where he also served as chair of the Department. Throughout his career, Lynch has focused on measurement issues in criminal justice data and statistics. His work on the nation’s two crime measures — the Uniform Crime Report and the National Crime Victimization Survey — is the authoritative source comparing national crime statistics. He has published three books and numerous articles on crime statistics, victimization surveys, victimization risk, and the role of sanctions in social control.

The National Institute of Justice, a component of the Office of Justice Programs, is the research, development, and evaluation agency of the U.S. Department of Justice and is dedicated to researching crime control and justice issues. NIJ provides objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of crime and justice, particularly at the state and local levels. The Institute actively solicits the views of criminal justice and other professionals and researchers to inform its search for the knowledge and tools to guide policy and practice.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, also a division of the Office of Justice Programs, is the primary statistical agency of the Department of Justice. BJS collects, analyzes, publishes, and disseminates information on crime, criminal offenders, crime victims, and criminal justice operations. BJS annually publishes data on criminal victimization, populations under correctional supervision, and federal criminal offenders and case processing. BJS also provides financial and technical support to state, local, and tribal governments.

The Office of Justice Programs provides federal leadership in developing the nation’s capacity to prevent and control crime, administer justice, and assist victims. OJP has seven components: the Bureau of Justice Assistance; the Bureau of Justice Statistics; the National Institute of Justice; the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; the Office for Victims of Crime; the Community Capacity Development Office, and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking.

MENDOCINO COUNTY GETS NEW CHIEF

Career probation professional **Jim Brown** has been appointed the new Chief Probation Officer for Mendocino County, the Superior Court announced on July 2, 2010.

Brown has worked for the county probation department for 27 years, beginning as a juvenile hall counselor in 1984. He went on to serve as both the Juvenile Division manager and the Juvenile Hall superintendent. Brown was also the Adult Division manager, and was appointed interim chief probation officer when the former chief, **Wes Forman**, resigned to take a position in Shasta County.

Juvenile Court Judge **David Nelson** praised Brown’s appointment: “He receives the highest praise from all of those who have interacted with him in his years with the department, and we are lucky to have such a qualified candidate available to appoint from within.”

PARCHMAN RETIRES IN BRAZOS COUNTY

On August 31, 2010, longtime NAPE member **Arlene Parchman**, Director of the Brazos County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Bryan, Texas, retired following a distinguished career that spanned a quarter of a century.

Parchman, who earned a bachelor’s degree and a Master of Arts degree in sociology from Texas A&M University, joined the department in 1984 as a probation officer. Over the next several years she held positions of increasing responsibility, including Coordinator of Brazos CORPS, the department’s community service program, and Deputy Director.

In 1991, following the departure of **Dan Richard Beto**, she was named the department’s Director, a position she held until retirement.

Her involvement in probation matters was not limited to Brazos County. During her career, Parchman served on the Board of Directors of the National Association of Probation Executives and the Texas Probation Association. In addition, she chaired the Advisory Board of the Texas Probation Training Academy at Sam Houston State University.

As a result of her commitment and service to the field of community corrections, Parchman has been the recipient of a number of awards and recognitions, including the *Distinguished Service Award* by the Texas Probation Training Academy, the *Outstanding Adult Correctional Administrator Award* by the Texas Corrections Association, and the *Charles W. Hawkes Lifetime Achievement Award* by the Texas Probation Association.

Parchman, the department’s longest serving director, was replaced by **John McGuire**, who previously served under her. Prior to assuming the post in Brazos County, McGuire briefly served as Director of the Judicial District Community Supervision and Corrections Department for Walker, Grimes, Madison, and Leon Counties.

NEW DIRECTOR IN SARATOGA COUNTY

New York’s Saratoga County Probation Department has a new Director. **John H. Adams**, previously the Director of the Hamilton County Probation Department, assumed the post in August 2010.

Adams, 45, replaced **Paul Viscusi**, who retired on May 31, 2010, after 35 years of distinguished service with the department and 40 years with Saratoga County.

Adams has also served in the probation departments in Warren, Cortland, and Tompkins counties. He has served on several state committees dealing with probation matters.

ILLINOIS GOVERNOR NAMES ACTING JUVENILE JUSTICE HEAD

On July 16, 2010, Governor **Pat Quinn** named **Arthur Bishop** as Acting Director of the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJJ). Bishop, who served as deputy director of field operations for the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), will lead the agency merger with DCFS.

Executive Exchange

"Arthur Bishop has the experience, knowledge and integrity to deliver the treatment and services our youth need," said Governor Quinn. "This merger will ensure that at-risk youth have access to the services and support they need to become positive, productive members of society and move DJJ to a child welfare-based system."

Bishop, who has a bachelor's degree in sociology and a master's degree in human service administration, brings over 35 years of experience in administering child welfare, community mental health, and substance abuse programs. Bishop started as a caseworker at DCFS in 1995, later becoming a field service administrator and the department's assistant chief of staff before being named deputy director.

As deputy director of field operations, Bishop supervised more than 500 employees and is responsible for more than 5,000 children and youth in state care. He has led several initiatives requiring interagency collaboration between public, private and community-based partners, including family advocacy centers, paternal involvement centers and the Fatherhood Initiative. Bishop has also represented DCFS on the Governor's Task Force on the Condition of African American Males.

Governor Quinn's appointment of Bishop is seen as another step in a process to reform the state's juvenile justice system to one focused more on treatment. Research has shown that the overwhelming majority of youth in detention struggle with the effects of childhood maltreatment and would benefit from trauma-informed services.

In January, Governor Quinn made appointments to the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission, an advisory group on juvenile justice and delinquency prevention issues.

Governor Quinn has also proposed the merger of the Department of Juvenile Justice and the Department of Children and Family Services, in order to bring a strength-based, treatment model to youth committed to state detention centers. Since then, interagency workgroups have been designated to study the benefits and impact of the merger.

Governor Quinn recently signed House Bill 5913 into law, which permits shared services between the two departments.

Bishop's appointment was effective August 1, 2010. He succeeds **Kurt Friedenauer**, who resigned in July.

NEW DYRS INTERIM DIRECTOR NAMED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington, D.C., Mayor **Adrian M. Fenty** named **Robert Hildum** as new Interim Director for the District's Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS) on July 19, 2010. DYRS is the District's cabinet level juvenile justice agency, helping court-involved youth become more productive citizens while ensuring public safety. August 2 marked the end of outgoing Interim Director **Marc A. Schindler's** 180-day post.

"I thank Interim Director Schindler, who has been instrumental in the great reform efforts within the Department," Mayor Fenty said. "As we continue to build on the many successes we've garnered, I am confident that Robert Hildum's experience and leadership will assist the agency in moving forward."

DYRS has made significant improvements in the last several years including: the vast improvement of District's facilities for youth rehabilitation; improved safety and security; a substantial reduction in the number absconders; and expanded workforce development opportunities for youth. The agency is becoming

a national model of how juvenile justice agencies function and was recognized by Harvard's Kennedy School as one of the top 50 most innovative government programs in the nation.

"I am honored by this appointment and look forward to working with all the District's juvenile justice stakeholders to ensure that the reform and progress made at DYRS in the last five years continues," Hildum said.

Hildum brings to DYRS broad experience in the juvenile and criminal justice systems, on both the defense and prosecutorial sides. He joined the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) in February 2007 in the civil division. In September 2007, he was appointed deputy attorney general for public safety. In that position, Hildum supervised the juvenile section, responsible for prosecuting juvenile offenders. He has worked closely with the court and other juvenile justice stakeholders to implement the Juvenile Speedy Trial Act, which increased the efficiency of the juvenile justice system so that youth being detained pending trial spend less time in detention before resolution of the charges. In addition, Hildum served on the Executive Board of the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) with District juvenile justice stakeholders. The goals of JDAI are to reduce overcrowding in juvenile detention centers, improve key outcomes for youth, improve facility conditions and create community-based alternatives to detention.

Hildum began his legal career as an assistant attorney general in New Orleans from 1992 to 1995. During his tenure with that office he handled hundreds of juvenile cases and prosecuted the first hate crime brought to trial in Louisiana. From 1995 to 2000, he worked as a partner in the law firm of Manasseh, Hildum & Gill in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where he specialized in criminal defense.

In 2000, Hildum left private practice to work for the Louisiana attorney general as an assistant attorney general in the criminal section. From 2002 to 2007, he was a senior trial attorney with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission in Washington, D.C., prosecuting civil enforcement actions for fraud and other violations of federal law.

GEORGIA PAROLE BOARD APPOINTS NEW DIRECTOR

On July 6, 2010, the Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles appointed **Michael Nail** as Director of Parole. Nail comes to the Board from the Department of Corrections where he served as Corrections Division Director. **Beth Oxford**, who has served as Director of Parole since May 2003, is transferred to the Office of Budget/Fiscal as Director.

"Michael Nail is one of the most qualified leaders I've had the pleasure of working with over the years. He brings with him a wealth of experience in corrections and community supervision," said **James Donald**, Board Chairman. "Likewise, Beth's professionalism and experience will continue to serve us, especially as we continue to look for ways to optimize our budget."

Nail began his career with the Department of Corrections as a probation officer in 1989. He has held several management and leadership positions in the field of probation, to include Director of Probation Training, Director of Probation, and Deputy Director of the Corrections Division. At the time of his appointment he served as the Director of the Corrections Division, responsible for the day-to-day oversight of Facility Operations, Probation Operations, and Special Operations. Collectively, these operations are

responsible for the management and supervision of over 150,000 adult felony probationers and over 60,000 adult felony inmates.

Oxford began her career with the Parole Board in 1983 as a Parole Officer and has held several leadership positions. In 2001 she left the Board as the Division Director of Community Based Services to become Division Director of the Programs Division at the Department of Corrections. In 2003 she returned to the Board as Director of Parole.

NEW PROBATION SERVICES MANAGER NAMED IN MANATEE COUNTY, FLORIDA

According to a recent article appearing in the *Bradenton Times*, Manatee County Chief Probation Officer **Jennifer Schaefer** was selected as the county's Probation Services Manager, succeeding **Bill High**, who retired. Schaefer was hired as a Manatee County probation officer in 2005 and ascended the ranks to Chief Probation Officer in 2007. Prior to moving Manatee County, she worked in similar positions for the Broward County probation program from 1996 until 2005.

"Jennifer has a solid background in Probation Services and a great vision for improving services," said County Administrator **Ed Hunzeker**. "Her energy and detail-orientated nature will serve this community through a collaborative approach to the provision of Probation Services."

In her new position, Schaefer will oversee Probation, Supervised Release, Pretrial Intervention, and the New Offender Work Program, which puts non-violent offenders to work on various projects in the county in lieu of jail time.

"It really benefits the community," Schaefer said of the Offender Work Program. "At the same time, people are serving a form of punishment for what they've done, but they're not filling up space in our jail. It's been very, very successful so far."

Since launching in March, those in the Offender Work Program have collected more than 29,000 pounds of trash along 260 miles of roadway. Each month, Probation Services oversees about 1,400 probationers. Pretrial Intervention programs on a monthly basis assist about 100 non-violent, first-time offenders in avoiding prosecution. Supervised Release supervises about 600 defendants per month.

NEW MERCED COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, CHIEF SWORN IN

On September 27, 2010, **Scott Ball** was administered the oath of office as Chief Probation Officer for the Merced County Probation Department in Merced, California; he was sworn in by Presiding Judge **John Kiriara**. The former Stanislaus County Juvenile Field Services Director was hired after undergoing panel interviews with county department heads and other officials, reports the *Merced Sun-Star*.

He was joined at the ceremony by outgoing Merced Chief Probation Officer **Brian Cooley**, who retired after 37 years of working in the probation field.

Ball, who has been at the department for the past three weeks, thanked Cooley and others for helping with the transition to his new job. "Everyone has bent over backwards to assist me," Ball said. "Chief Cooley stayed around to show me the ropes and introduce me to everybody."

Cooley spoke highly of his successor. "The department is in excellent hands. I truly mean that."

Ball's career in probation began in 1991 with the Sacramento County Probation Department, where he began as an on-call probation assistant. He became a deputy probation officer in 1996, serving in Sacramento County's juvenile field services.

He became a probation officer in Stanislaus County in 1998, supervising adult narcotic offenders. He rose through the ranks, working in the department's high-risk offender unit and serving as division director of the county's juvenile field services division.

Cooley, who served as Merced County's Chief Probation Officer for five years, said he's planning to move onto his boat in Alameda County and spend his retirement sailing with his wife.

After Monday's ceremony, several well-wishers thanked Cooley for his service to the county. Before working in Merced County, Cooley had worked for probation in Siskiyou and Solano counties.

NEW EXECUTIVE ORIENTATION PROGRAM HELD

From September 26 to October 1, 2010, another Executive Orientation Program for new probation and parole executives was held at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. This program, in existence since 1997, is the result of a successful collaboration of the National Association of Probation Executives, National Institute of Corrections, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas.

Participants in this recent program included: **Jarvis Anderson**, Director of the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in San Antonio, Texas; **Michael Daly**, Chief Probation Officer, Marin County Probation Department in San Rafael, California; **David Eberhard**, Director of the Arkansas Department of Community Correction in Little Rock, Arkansas; **Amy Gault**, Administrator, Montana Department of Corrections Probation and Parole Bureau, Region 1, in Missoula, Montana; **Janice Harris**, Chief of District 8 Probation and Parole, Virginia Department of Corrections, in South Boston, Virginia; **Tracy Lavelly**, Chief of District 29 Probation and Parole, Virginia Department of Corrections, in Fairfax, Virginia; and **Leslie Matney**, Chief of District 40 Probation and Parole, Virginia Department of Corrections, in Fincastle, Virginia.

Also attending were: **Arnold Patrick**, Director of the Hidalgo County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Edinburg, Texas; **Kendall Rhyne**, Chief Probation Officer for the Gila County Probation Department in Globe, Arizona; **Vincent Schiraldi**, Commissioner of the New York City Department of Probation in New York, New York; **Steve Sentman**, Chief Probation Officer for the Orange County Probation Department in Anaheim, California; **Denise Symdon**, Administrator of the Wisconsin Division of Community Corrections in Madison, Wisconsin; **Ellen Walker**, Chief Probation Officer for the 4th Judicial District in Colorado Springs, Colorado; and **Tanner Wark**, Administrator of Deschutes County Adult Parole and Probation in Bend, Oregon.

Presentations during the week covered a variety of topics relevant to a new administrator; they included working in the political arena; power mapping; data driven management; legal liability issues; ethics; managing change and influencing the organizational culture; personnel and human resource issues; and management through teams. Participants were also exposed to presentations on: media relations; presentation skills; evidence based planning and implementation; and staff safety issues.

Executive Exchange

Faculty members were provided by NAPE and included: **Dot Faust**, Director of the Second Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Ames, Iowa; **Marcus Hodges**, Chief Probation and Parole Officer for District 21 in Fredericksburg, Virginia; **Martin J. Krizay**, Chief of the Imperial County Probation and Corrections Department in El Centro, California; **Rocco A. Pozzi**, Commissioner of the Westchester County Probation Department in White Plains, New York; and **Christie Davidson**, Assistant Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas in Huntsville, Texas. In addition, **Phillip Lyons**, J.D., Ph.D., a member of the faculty of the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University, assisted in the presentation of material.

NEW CHIEF IN EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

On October 1, 2010, **Anthony C. Harvilla** became the Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. He is responsible for a staff of 57 employees and a jurisdiction of 33 counties, with offices in Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Harrisburg, and Williamsport. A federal probation officer for 21 years, Harvilla earned a master's degree in public administration from Marywood University and a Bachelor of Science in law enforcement and corrections from Penn State.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Who We Are

Founded in 1981, the National Association of Probation Executives is a professional organization representing the chief executive officers of local, county and state probation agencies. NAPE is dedicated to enhancing the professionalism and effectiveness in the field of probation by creating a national network for probation executives, bringing about positive change in the field, and making available a pool of experts in probation management, program development, training and research.

Why Join

The National Association of Probation Executives offers you the chance to help build a national voice and power base for the field of probation and serves as your link with other probation leaders. Join with us and make your voice heard.

Types of Membership

Regular: Regular members must be employed full-time in an executive capacity by a probation agency or association. They must have at least two levels of professional staff under their supervision or be defined as executives by the director or chief probation officer of the agency.

Organizational: Organizational memberships are for probation and community corrections agencies. Any member organization may designate up to five administrative employees to receive the benefits of membership.

Corporate: Corporate memberships are for corporations doing business with probation and community corrections agencies or for individual sponsors.

Honorary: Honorary memberships are conferred by a two-thirds vote of the NAPE Board of Directors in recognition of an outstanding contribution to the field of probation or for special or long-term meritorious service to NAPE.

Subscriber: Subscribers are individuals whose work is related to the practice of probation.

Membership Application

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ E-MAIL _____

DATE OF APPLICATION _____

CHECK	Regular	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 50 / 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> \$95 / 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/> \$140 / 3 years
	Organizational	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 250 / 1 year		
	Corporate	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 500 / 1 year		

Please make check payable to **THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES** and mail to:
NAPE Secretariat, ATTN: Christie Davidson, Correctional Management Institute of Texas, George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center,
Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296

(936) 294-3757